

THE INTRUSION AND THE DECALOGUE

MEREDITH G. KLINE

THE often canvassed subject of Old Testament Ethics still beckons the investigator onward in search of a more adequate solution of its peculiar complex of problems. In this search no other standard of righteousness is available to one who would think his Maker's thoughts after Him than the standard which emerges in the description of the words and ways of God which have been inscripturated. But if it is in this very connection that the problems appear, what is the investigator to do? What, indeed, but to recognize that problematic as the divine activity seems to his ethical sensitivities, perverted as they are and so often confused by faulty interpretation of the Word, it yet conveys a revelation of law. So will he give himself again to the exegesis of the Word in the conviction that the solution of the ethical problem must be one and the same as its accurate and adequate formulation. The attempt is, therefore, made here to seek a solution in terms of a somewhat fresh formulation of certain distinctive elements in the religion of the Old Testament.

THE CONCEPT OF INTRUSION

It is by tracing the unfolding eschatology of Scripture that we can most deftly unravel the strands of Old Testament religion and discover what is essential and distinctive in it. For eschatology antedates redemption. It appears immediately after creation. Farther back we must not force it lest we distort eschatology from the consummation doctrine of divine revelation into the eternal tension of a Barthian imagination and reduce the creation to a myth.

Creation is not eschatological. But it does provide the pattern for eschatology. It does so necessarily, for the creature must pattern his ways after his Creator's. Since the Creator rested only after He had worked, it was a Covenant

of Works which, immediately after Creation, was proffered to Adam as the means by which to arrive at the Consummation. In the sense that it was the door to the Consummation, the Covenant of Works was eschatological.

That door, however, was never opened. It was not the Fall in itself that delayed the Consummation. According to the conditions of the Covenant of Works, the prospective Consummation was "either/or". It was either eternal glory by covenantal confirmation of original righteousness or eternal perdition by covenant-breaking repudiation of it. The Fall, therefore, might have introduced at once a Consummation of universal damnation. The delay was due rather to the principle and purpose of divine compassion by which there was introduced the Covenant of Grace, with its historical corollary Common Grace, as the new way of arriving at the Consummation. For the thesis of this article it is especially significant that the delay and Common Grace are coterminous. In saying this we would not lose sight of the positive character of Common Grace in contributing toward the eschatological program, as it does, for instance, in providing the field of operation for Saving Grace and its material as well.

Moreover, there is positive significance in the favor enjoyed under Common Grace by the unbeliever who is ultimately to prove reprobate because, for one thing, his present experience is, equally with his imminent experience in the Consummation age, meaningful; and, for another, the aggravation of his guilt by continuing unrepentance in the face of God's new mercies provides the positive ground for a more dreadful revelation of God's wrath in the hour of Messianic Judgment. Indeed, the fact of delay in itself, which as the consequent of a successful probation in paradise could have been only negative, must be regarded as being in part positive when considered against the actual background of the Fall, for it now provides for a differently complexioned Consummation — one with a more intensive and extensive revelation of the divine perfections — from what could have been realized without it. It is not the delay of mere postponement, but the delay of gestation. But it is at the same time true that the Consummation and commonness are mutually exclusive. In this limited sense, therefore, Common Grace may be called

the antithesis of the Consummation and, as such, epitomizes this world-age viewed under the aspect of a delay during which the Consummation is abeyant.

This change in covenants from Works to Grace does not change the canons of eschatology. The creation pattern still reigns. However, though rest must still follow after work, that work must now be performed vicariously and as a soteric accomplishment by the God-man. Moreover, as already suggested, there is a difference in the Consummation reached *via* the Covenant of Grace. It is no longer "either/or" but "both/and". Whereas the Covenant of Works was universalistic, all being in Adam either for the tree of life or for death, the Covenant of Grace is characterized by non-universalistic election. Some are in Christ for salvation, but some continue only in fallen Adam unto a condemnation of more stripes. Hence man's apocalyptic prospects now include both a glorified paradise and a lake of fire. And whereas eschatology was ready to spring to its goal in one leap by the Covenant of Works, it advances only by slow steps under the Covenant of Grace.

Or, changing the figure, the appearance of the Consummation is now a birth-process in the post-lapsarian world and is, therefore, painful as well as slow. Because of the Fall, it is with sorrow that the creation brings forth so that it groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. But it is the Consummation-child himself who particularly interests us, and we suggest that he might as well be named Perez. For he breaks through beforehand, making a breach for himself. That is, the Covenant of Grace all along the line of its administration, more profoundly in the New Testament but already in the Old Testament, is an intrusion into the period of delay of the power, principles and reality of the Consummation. By virtue of this Intrusion, the Covenant of Grace is more pervasively eschatological than the Covenant of Works, which envisaged the divine introduction of the Final State as its goal but did not experience any such anticipation of it. For fixity is of the essence of Consummation and fixity is the contradiction of probation, which was of the essence of the Covenant of Works.

THE INTRUSION AND TYPOLOGY

Breaking through first of all in the Old Testament period, the Intrusion finds itself in an age which is by the divine disposition of history, or, more specifically, by the divine administration of the Covenant of Grace, an age of preparation for a later age of fulfillment and finality. Its appearing, therefore, instead of being in all its heavenly finality is amid earthly forms which at once suggest, yet veil, its ultimate glory. Not to be obscured is the fact that within this temporary periphery of the Intrusion there is a permanent core. The pattern of things earthly embodies an actual projection of the heavenly reality. It is the Consummation which, intruding into the time of delay, anticipates itself.

As for the peculiar forms of the Intrusion in the Old Testament age, they have a pattern coherent and comprehensive — for things must always be done decently and in order in the house of God. Taking an Old Testament standpoint among these forms as belonging to the reality that is, we may say that they also point to a reality that was (as an archetype in the heavens) and that is to come (in the Messianic age). They are antitype¹ in relation to the reality that was. They are symbol in relation to the core of the present Old Testament Intrusion of that reality. And they are type in relation to that reality as it is to come.

When the Old Testament forms are viewed as type, the New Testament age is to be classified along with the eternal state as their antitype,² so epoch-making in the unfolding of the Intrusion is the revelation in the Son. This is the case even though the apocalypse of Jesus Christ and his kingdom is still in the category of Intrusion rather than perfect Con-

¹ ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν (Heb. 9:24).

² Some confusion arises in the terminology through the double use of the word "antitype" to signify both that the Old Testament is the copy of the prior heavenly pattern and that the New Testament reality corresponds to the earlier Old Testament pattern. Thus, not only are both Old Testament and New Testament antitype (though in different senses), but the Old Testament is both type and antitype (again from different points of view). Possibly it were better then to style the Old Testament forms simply "copies" as viewed in relation to the things in the heavens. Cf. Heb. 9:23, ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

summation, as is signaled by the fact that the New Testament age is still characterized by Common Grace, the epitome of the delay. The identification of the New Testament age with the Consummation keeps pace with the stages in the exaltation of the Son of Man, and while we see Him sitting on the right hand of power we have not yet seen Him coming in the clouds of heaven.

It follows that for every aspect of Old Testament typology there is not yet a corresponding antitype. Certain features find their antitype in the New Testament and, indeed, only there in some cases (*e. g.*, the sacrifice of the Passover lamb); but the fulfillment of other Old Testament types is realized only in the world to come (*e. g.*, the actual possession of the promised land by the people of God). While, therefore, the Old Testament is an earlier edition of the final reality than is the New Testament, and not so intensive, it is on its own level a more extensive edition, especially when considered in its own most fully developed form, *viz.*, the Theocracy.

Integral to the foregoing is the conception of typology as an attribute of the anticipatory Intrusion of the Consummation into the era of delay. Typology then is primarily eschatological; and secondarily it is pedagogical because it is an attribute of the Intrusion in the age which was a preparation for the Messianic fullness of time. To give a definition: Typology is the prospective aspect of the peculiarly Old Testament forms of the Intrusion. Typology is not then coextensive with the Old Testament Intrusion, for that contained core-elements which were not peculiar to the Old Testament (*e. g.*, the Holy Spirit's application of salvation to the elect and His operations of revelation and inspiration in the production of the Old Testament Canon). Nor can it be said without qualification that typology is coextensive with the symbolic periphery of the Old Testament Intrusion, for there are symbols which in whole or part give visible representation to spiritual elements in the core of the Old Testament Intrusion and to that extent have no prospective reference (*e. g.*, the sign of circumcision).³ Such signs of

³ The word "prospective" is used here for the earlier and later, not of mere continuity but of progress from lower to higher. The above statement, therefore, is not a denial but, in effect, an affirmation of the essential

realized eschatology are sacraments whereas types are signs of unrealized eschatology. The following rule may be used for distinguishing the typical elements in the Old Testament: Whatever in the Old Testament is both inexplicable in terms of Common Grace alone (*i. e.*, whatever is of the Intrusion) and not essentially unchanged when later seen again in the antitypical age introduced by Christ (*i. e.*, whatever is not of the core of the Intrusion or sacramental thereof)⁴ is typical.

In adopting this formulation of typology we necessarily confine the phenomenon to the Covenant of Grace. For if typology is by definition an attribute of the Intrusion, it cannot be a feature of the Covenant of Works, in which the Consummation did not intrude itself but was present only as a goal on the horizon. Accordingly, the opinion that Adam's rôle in the Covenant of Works was typical (in the specific sense) of the rôle of Christ in the Covenant of Grace is erroneous. That Adam is styled *τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος* (Rom. 5:14) does not overthrow our conclusions. We cannot arrive at an understanding of the nature of typology by an indiscriminating compilation of passages containing the word *τύπος*. In fact, that word is not used anywhere in the New Testament in the specific sense. What Paul teaches in Romans 5:14 and context is that God has dealt with mankind according to the principle of federal headship under the Covenant of Works and of Grace. This parallelism in the rôles of the first and last Adam is adequate explanation of Paul's application of the term *τύπος* to the former.

It is also manifestly impossible to include within the scope of typology defined as a phenomenon emerging in the administration of the Covenant of Grace and, moreover, one which prefigures the actual consummating of that Covenant, anything standing outside the Kingdom of God hostilely intent on preventing its perfection. Even on more general grounds this should be evident. For the very idea of antitype denotes attainment or, more specifically, expression in a higher sphere; but Satan, though he strives with the increasing tempo of desperation, never attains. The kingdom of Satan is one of ever-compounding frustration whose disintegration is in direct proportion to its energizing. When, therefore, it puts forth its extreme effort and the apocalyptic Beast ascends from the abyss, it does so only to be cast with Satan into the lake of fire and brimstone and its never-quenched torments (Rev. 11:7; 17:8, 11; 20:10).

Within the orbit, therefore, in which God suffers Satan to move there is found no place for an antitype. Satan may imitate typology but

identity of Old Testament Circumcision and New Testament Baptism in function and meaning.

⁴ In some cases the sacramental and typical may be found as different aspects of one complex sign.

cannot get beyond imitation. His Antichrist is at most only a counterfeit antitype of, let us say, Antiochus Epiphanes, and Antiochus then is only a pseudo-type or, better, no type at all. It is true that various enemies of the Covenant people figure in the typical judgments of the Old Testament as the objects of the divine wrath (e. g., Pharaoh's hosts at the Exodus). But it does not follow that these foes can be isolated from the specific historical instances as types in themselves of the general hostility of the world against the church or of Satan's hordes which gather together against the Lamb and His army in the last hour (Rev. 19:19; 20:8), as though there were a self-contained typology within the Satanic enterprise. On the contrary, both earlier and later foes of God's Kingdom operate on essentially the same level in the continuing Satanic enmity to the Christ of God, while it is only the judgment of God against these foes which ascends to a higher level as it moves on from its Old Testament expressions to the revelation of Jesus Christ from heaven in flaming fire taking vengeance.

To summarize thus far: Perez makes the breach in the Old Testament; that is, the Consummation intrudes itself there. This Intrusion has realized eschatology as its core while its symbolic surface, the sacramental aspect thereof excepted, forms a typical picture of eschatology not yet realized. In the recognition of the true character of core and periphery and in the further recognition that the core is always present within the periphery lies the proper understanding of much in the Old Testament.

For instance, it is only so that the true nature of the Abrahamic Covenant can be perceived. As the core of that covenant there was a vital and indissoluble spiritual relationship whereby the Lord was a God to His chosen. That was realized eschatology. But there was also the periphery of unrealized eschatology represented in a pattern of types, namely, the outward organization of Abraham's seed as a nation in the promised land. In this connection it might be well to illustrate the application of the test for types suggested above. It was not by reason of any principle inherent in Common Grace that the earthly prosperity of the theocratic nation continued in direct proportion to the national religious well-being. Such ordering of the earthly blessings of God's people can be ascribed only to the Intrusion. Moreover these blessings are peculiar to the Old Testament and so are unlike the spiritual core of the Abrahamic Covenant which continues essentially unchanged in the New Testament, though in-

tensified by the Messianic outpouring of the Spirit. When they reappear in the age of antitypical fulfillment, it is in the radically transformed character of the permanent kingdom of the new heavens and new earth. They thus satisfy both the requirements for types and are to be regarded as constituting the typical periphery of the manifestation of the Intrusion in the Abrahamic Covenant.

THE INTRUSION AND ETHICS

It is now possible to address ourselves directly to the ethical questions in the Old Testament. As this field is surveyed there emerges a *divinely sanctioned* pattern of action in conflict with the customary application of the Law of God according to the principles of Common Grace operative within the era of delay. But this conflict should not now appear strange, for it serves to bring into still clearer relief what we have found to belong to the essential nature of the Old Testament, *i. e.*, the Intrusion of the Consummation, which is the antithesis of Common Grace. Our purpose then is to display this ethical strand as an integral and congenial element within the Old Testament, and, therefore, as an occasion not of uneasiness for the believer but of glorying in his God, who in Old Testament days as in these last days showed Himself One sovereign and omnipotent in salvation and in judgment.

THE INTRUSION AND THE FIRST TABLE

There is a marked difference between the relevance of the Intrusion concept in the application of the first and second tables of the decalogue.⁵ The point will be developed below

⁵ As used here these terms do not have precisely their usual significance, for I am unable to accept the traditional logical or numerical divisions of the decalogue. The customary logical categories, *i. e.*, our duty to God and our duty to man, seem to be a misapplication of our Lord's words (Matt. 22:37-40), for to state the heart of all Old Testament law is not identical with giving the logical structure on which the decalogue is organized. I take the position that the first table is concerned with man's direct glorifying of God (*i. e.*, by worship) and the second with man's indirect glorifying of God (*i. e.*, by patterning his life after the ways of

that the relationships governed by the second table are mutable and, more particularly, that they undergo certain changes when they enter the sphere of the Consummation. It will be maintained further that these changes ground a new application of the laws which legislate for them. The Consummation then, together with its Intrusion into the age wherein Common Grace is operative, is most significant for the application of the second table. But in the creature's obligations toward the immutable God, which are the exclusive concern of the first table, there is no such mutability. In particular, the termination of the principles of Common Grace at the Consummation introduces no change in that relationship. Hence, there can be no ground for a different application of the first table because of the Intrusion of the age to come during the Old Testament dispensation.

There is, however, variableness in the sanctions annexed to these laws of the first table. The violation of them by a covenant member in the New Testament dispensation is subject to ecclesiastical discipline, but the sword may not be wielded by either church or state in punishment of offenders. On the other hand, in the Consummation the portion of those who are unable to fulfill these laws will be "the second death".

In consonance with this principle, in the Old Testament Theocracy where the Consummation is typically anticipated, death is prescribed for violations of these laws (*cf.*, *e. g.*, Lev. 24:16; Deut. 13:6; 17:2-7). The difference between the Old Testament and New Testament cannot be explained simply by an appeal to the civil aspect of the Theocracy because, for one thing, the ordinary state had no more authority in the Old Testament than in the New Testament period to enforce the first table. In respect to these sanctions, therefore, the ethics of the Old Testament conflict with principles operative under Common Grace. The Intrusion appears most vividly

God), and, moreover, that the Sabbath law belongs in the second category. This yields the numerical divisions 1-3 and 4-10. The justification of such a disposition of the fourth word lies outside the scope of this article, for, as I understand the matter, it would require an extensive examination of the sacrament concept. For the present also the relation of the Sabbath to the Intrusion will not be treated, except to state that the Sabbath might well be called the symbol of the Intrusion.

in those cases where the infliction of death is not the act of a theocratic official but of God (*e. g.*, Num. 10:1, 2; 16:31-35; II Kgs. 2:24).

The discussion of this feature at this place does not imply that variableness in sanctions is peculiar to the first table of the Law. There are several laws in the second table the violation of which was punishable by death in the Theocracy⁶ and these further illustrate this matter (*cf.*, *e. g.*, Ex. 21:15-17; 31:14-35:2; Lev. 20:10; Num. 15:32-36; Deut. 19:16, 19; 22:22).

THE INTRUSION AND THE SECOND TABLE

The second table of the decalogue deals with laws of intra-creational relationships. In contrast to the laws of the first table, which enunciate principles invariable in their application, these laws of the second table are subject to change in their application because the relations they govern are subject to change.

Biblical laws have been classified according to their ground as laws founded: 1) on the nature of God; 2) on permanent relations of men in their present state of existence; 3) on temporary relations of men or conditions of society; and 4) altogether on positive commands of God.⁷ Discussing the question of how far the laws contained in the Bible may be dispensed with, Hodge says that the laws of group 1 are immutable; that the laws of group 2 may be set aside by the authority of God; and that the laws of groups 3 and 4 are mutable, the positive laws of the Old Testament being, as a matter of fact, now abolished together with those laws of

⁶ Although in dealing with the second table appeal might more plausibly be made to the civil aspect of the Theocracy to explain the use of the sword, exception would have to be made even here in the case of the Sabbath law. But, more fundamentally, such an appeal is obviated at every point by the fact that neither the Theocracy as a whole nor any aspect of it can be equated with the ordinary state so as to warrant the automatic transfer of the functions of the one to the other.

⁷ See C. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, Vol. III, pp. 267-269; *cf.* W. Brenton Green, "Ethics of the Old Testament", *Princeton Th. Rev.*, April 1929, pp. 179-181.

group 3 which were designed exclusively for the Hebrews living under the Theocracy.

It is to be observed, however, that these categories are not mutually exclusive and that, therefore, there may be more complexity in the application of a given law than this simple formulation of the problem of mutability suggests. Two of these categories may be involved as multiple aspects of one law which may then have both a mutable and immutable aspect. To illustrate, though laws five through ten are grounded on permanent relations of men in their present state of existence, they are also founded on the nature of God. For they simply apply to specific cases the grand principle that man must reflect the moral glory of God on a finite scale. This principle is immutable because it concerns the relationship of man to God. On the other hand, the relations governed by this immutable principle are themselves mutable.

In the present age we may say that the essence of these laws is that we are to love our neighbor as ourselves, and the answer to the question, "Who is my neighbor?", is the parable of the Good Samaritan. But beyond this life that parable will no longer serve as the answer to that question. Then Lazarus must not so much as dip the tip of his finger in water to cool the tongue of him who is in anguish in the flame. The Law of Heaven requires that Lazarus pass him by on the other side. Not to take pleasure in his anguish, mind you (for Lazarus has been renewed in the image of God not of Satan), but none the less to pass him by whom heaven's Lord must command, "Depart from me, thou cursed". The neighbor relationship envisaged in the parable of the Good Samaritan has, therefore, a *terminus ad quem* at the limit of the present state of existence. The unbeliever is the believer's neighbor today; but the reprobate is not the neighbor of the redeemed hereafter for the reason that God will set a great gulf between them. God, whose immutable nature it is to hate evil, withdrawing all favor from the reprobate, will Himself hate them as sin's finished products. And if the redeemed in glory are to fulfill their duty of patterning their ways after God's, then they will have to change their attitude to the unbeliever from one of neighborly love to one of perfect hatred, which is a holy not malicious passion. Just

because the grand principle which underlies laws five through ten is immutable, the application of these laws must be changed in accordance with the changes in the intra-creational relationships for which they legislate.

We conclude, therefore, that such aspects of laws as are founded on intra-creational relations are mutable and that since such relations are dealt with in laws five through ten we might expect to find unusual applications of them produced by the Intrusion in the course of Old Testament redemptive history. As a matter of fact, an examination of Scriptural history and prophecy discloses that God, who has established these relationships and has authority to change them, has in the past, and will in the future alter them, the changes (which involve variant application of laws five through ten) being of the following varieties:

1. Changes introduced as pedagogical and remedial measures, as for example, the toleration of polygamy in the Old Testament period. Such permission was in condescension to the spiritual state of the Old Testament people of God, in order gradually to instruct them and bring them to more vigorous spiritual health.

2. Changes introduced at the Consummation. For example, God will then so change the constitution of things that there is no marrying or giving in marriage and thereby the seventh commandment will lose all pertinence. The change in the neighbor concept discussed above is another case in point.

3. Changes introduced in the Old Testament dispensation by the anticipatory Intrusion of the antitypical age. These are of two types: a) anticipations of God's judgment on the reprobate; b) anticipations of God's salvation of the elect. Numerous ethical problems of the Old Testament find their proper formulation and, hence, solution in terms of this principle.

It is, of course, the third of these varieties that we desire to pursue further here, and it might be well to forestall possible misunderstandings by making certain observations at once. First, the demands of Intrusion Ethics in the Old Testament are not of a lower or laxer order. Quite the contrary, it was only in union with the highest outreach of faith that there could be true compliance with the demands of this ethic.

Second, this concept of Intrusion Ethics is not prejudicial to the permanent validity of the moral law of Moses. The distinction made is not one of different standards, for the law of Moses is recognized as the final authority at all times, in this world and in that which is to come. The distinction arises in the application of this constant standard under significantly different conditions. It is evident that such a distinction must be made between the period of Common Grace in general and the age of the Consummation. The only proposal beyond that made here is that there are anticipations of that distinction, and, to that extent, an anticipatory abrogation of the principles of Common Grace, during the Old Testament age. Finally, this concept of Intrusion Ethics does not obscure the unity of the Covenant of Grace throughout its various administrations. It does bring into bolder relief the basic structure of that Covenant in its historical unfolding and in so doing inevitably displays its essential unity.

INTRUSIONS OF JUDGMENT

The Imprecations in the Psalms

Treating first the variety of Intrusion which anticipates God's judgment upon the reprobate we come upon the old problem of the imprecations in the Psalms (see *e. g.*, Pss. 7, 35, 55, 59, 69, 79, 109 and 137). It is necessary in justification of the imprecations to point out that the welfare of man is not the chief end of man; that we sinful creatures have no inherent rights which our holy Maker must respect; that accordingly, God may, without violating any obligation, take any man's life at any time and in any way; and that it is one with this for God to inspire the psalmist to pray that He should do so in a particular instance, the prayer itself being altogether proper since divinely inspired. It is also helpful to indicate that the psalmist expresses hatred of others and prays for their destruction not in a bitter spirit of personal vindictiveness but out of concern for the honor of God's name, which has been despised, and from love of God's Kingdom, which has been opposed in that enmity displayed by the

objects of the imprecations toward the psalmist as one who represented God's Kingdom. However, when all this has been expressed by way of explanation and defence, the significance of the imprecations has not yet been fully appreciated.

Another important side of the picture can be brought into view by the observation that normally the believer's attitudes toward the unbeliever are conditioned by Common Grace. During the historical process of differentiation which Common Grace makes possible, before the secret election of God is unmistakably manifested at the great white throne, the servants of Christ are bound by His charge to pray for the good of those who despitefully use and persecute them. Our Lord rebuked the Boanerges when they contemplated consuming the Samaritans with fire from heaven. We may not seek to destroy those for whom, perchance, Christ has died.

But in the Judgment the Lord will not rebuke James and John if they make similar request. Then it will be altogether becoming for the saint to desire God's wrath to descend upon his unbelieving enemy. No longer will there be the possibility that the enemy of the saint is the elect of God. Then the grain harvest will be ripe for the gathering of the Son of Man and the clusters of the vines will be fully ripe for the great winepress of the wrath of God.

It appears then that we must distinguish an Ethics of the Consummation from an Ethics of Common Grace, and the imprecations in the Psalms confront us unexpectedly with a pattern of conduct which conforms to the Ethics of the Consummation. Since it is intruded by inspiration it constitutes a divine abrogation, limited and in advance, of the ethical requirements normally in force during the course of Common Grace. What is required is that we cease stumbling over this as though it were a problem and recognize it as a feature of the divine administration of the Covenant of Grace in the Old Testament which displays the sovereign authority of the Covenant God. It is also bright with promise for the future of His kingdom and people for, to make explicit the obvious, this ethical intrusion appropriately attaches itself to the activity of persons and institutions which were types

of things which were to come in the age of the Consummation. The ethical principles themselves are the core of Consummation reality within the periphery of things typical.

The Conquest of Canaan

Another familiar problem is that of justifying the Israelite dispossession and extermination of the Canaanites over against the sixth and eighth Words of the Decalogue. Defense might be attempted by comparing the function of the ordinary state when, acting through its officers against criminals within its borders or through its military forces against offending nations outside, it destroys life and exacts reparations. Such action is not in disregard but in fulfillment of the terms of Common Grace, for in God's dealing with mankind in Common Grace He has authorized the state as "an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil".

Now it is true that Israel's army was also an avenger for wrath, but while an analogy may be recognized between the two things compared, the conclusion cannot be avoided that radically different principles are at work. For if Israel's conquest of Canaan were to be adjudicated before an assembly of nations according to no other standard than that of Common Grace, it would have to be condemned as an unprovoked aggression and, moreover, an aggression carried out in barbarous violation of the requirement to show all possible mercy even in the proper execution of justice. It will not avail the counsel for the defense to claim that by a divine promise originally made to Abraham and often since reiterated to his descendants the land was rightfully Israel's; nor to insist that the iniquity of the Amorites was full and cried to heaven for judgment; nor to advise the court that the conquest was undertaken and waged according to specific directions of God to Moses and Joshua. Such facts would have no legal significance for the international tribunal judging solely by the principles of Common Grace.

It will only be with the frank acknowledgment that the ordinary standards were suspended and the ethical principles of the last Judgment intruded that the divine promises and commands to Israel concerning Canaan and the Canaanites

come into their own and the Conquest can be justified and seen as it was in truth — not murder, but the hosts of the Almighty visiting upon the rebels against His righteous throne their just deserts — not robbery, but the meek inheriting the earth.

It was earlier maintained that the Intrusion Ethics required of him who would obey its demands the highest outreach of faith. Thus in the case of the Conquest, to show mercy to Canaanite women and children would not have been rising above a condescending, permissive decree to the heights of compliance with a loftier standard. It would have been falling, through lack of faith, into the abyss of disobedience. As a matter of fact, was it not the great men of faith, a Moses, a Joshua, a Caleb, who prosecuted the Conquest with vigor; and was it not in consequence of spiritual declension in Israel that they soon began to spare and make peace with those Canaanites who were left in the land to try them? The Conquest, with the pattern of Old Testament action it exemplifies, was not, as so often stigmatized, an instance in the ethical sphere of arrested evolution but of anticipated eschatology.

Other Examples

Ethical anticipations of the Judgment of the reprobate are found in cases involving all the rest of commandments five through ten excepting the seventh for the reason that "every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body" (I Cor. 6:18).

According to the fifth commandment, Rahab owed obedience to the civil authorities of Jericho. When information was requested of her concerning the enemy spies it was, by normal standards, her duty to supply it. Nevertheless by faith she united herself to the cause of the Theocracy and so played her part as an agent of the typical Judgment, denying to the obstinate foes of God that respect for their authority which was their due under Common Grace. For so doing, Rahab receives inspired approbation (Heb. 11:31; Jas. 2:25).

By the same token the enemies of the Theocracy lost the

ordinary right to hear the truth as that is guaranteed by the ninth commandment. In so far, therefore, as the theocratic agent did not deny God (or to put it differently, did not violate the immutable principles of the first table of the Decalogue) he might with perfect ethical propriety deceive such as had hostile intent against the Theocracy. There is, accordingly, no necessity from the analogy of Scripture to avoid what seems the plain impression of certain passages to the effect that such deception was practised with divine approval (*e. g.*, the deception of Pharaoh by the Hebrew midwives — Ex. 1:15–21) or even by express divine command (*e. g.*, Samuel's deception of Saul — I Sam. 16:2).

In the abstract it is possible to distinguish between losing the right to hear the truth and the speaking of an untruth, and then to hold that the theocratic agent might not deceive even though the enemy of the Theocracy had forfeited his right to be informed of the truth. But in the actual historical struggle the two may, at times at least, become inseparable. Saul, for example, had no right to be told that David was being anointed to replace him. Now if we abstract Samuel's conduct that day in Bethlehem from its historical setting, we might explain his silence concerning his primary purpose simply as a withholding of information. But that would, indeed, be an abstraction, not the reality. For Samuel's action was in the living context of Saul's actively hostile interest in it; his strategy was framed with the specific intent of parrying the thrust of that enmity. To do that successfully mere silence would not suffice since his action cried out for an explanation and Saul was bound to have one. Only the positive step of creating a false impression could achieve Samuel's purpose, and he took that step by making prominent the sacrifice. Certainly, in the text itself, the command to take along a heifer and supervise a sacrifice is given as the immediate response to Samuel's desire to avert Saul's suspicion. That Samuel actually planned to sacrifice once he had been so directed is irrelevant. The point to be observed is the immediate purpose of the Lord in commanding him to sacrifice in the first place.

It was noticed above that an analogy exists between the right of the state to wield the sword and Israel's conquest

of Canaan, even though the justification of the latter is not inherent in the principles of Common Grace. So in the present instance an analogy obtains between the deception employed by a theocratic representative against an active opponent of the Theocracy and the deception practised by the ordinary state, for instance, through the agency of a military officer in a skillful tactic, while engaged in a warfare justified by the principles of Common Grace.

Implied in the cases of Intrusion Ethics which are by ordinary standards violations of the eighth Word may also be similar violations of the tenth. The discussion of the imprecations in the Psalms has already indicated that even the inward feelings of the theocratic agents might be brought by inspiration within the sphere of the Intrusion's ethical standard. Must we not, then, also regard, for example, the Hebrew man of faith engaged in the Conquest as coveting the land of the Canaanites, at least in the degree that he was obeying God's battle charge from his heart and with understanding? While this would ordinarily be to sin against one who was his neighbor, this was one of the instances where the neighbor concept operative under Common Grace was abrogated by divine ordering in favor of the neighbor concept of the Judgment and beyond, according to which God's enemies are not the elect's neighbors. When the Old Testament believer, at the Lord's command, took his typical stand beyond Common Grace, to covet the property of the unbeliever was to be in harmony with God's purpose to perfect His kingdom.

INTRUSIONS OF SALVATION

It remains to trace the other branch of Intrusion Ethics, namely, anticipations of the ethical principles entailed in God's saving His people.

The Theocracy and the Nations

Apropos of the fifth Word, it is in this New Testament age not a legitimate function of a civil government to endorse and support organized religion. This applies equally to the Chris-

tian Church, for though its invisible government is theocratic with Christ sitting on David's throne in the heavenlies ruling over it, yet its visible organization, in particular as it is related to civil powers, is so designed that it takes a place of only common privilege along with other religions within the framework of Common Grace. It is quite otherwise in the Consummation for then every dominion and power in heaven, on earth and under the earth must do obeisance to the Christ of God. Moreover, it is this ultimate state of affairs which is found intruded into the Old Testament dispensation in connection with the Israelite Theocracy, which typified the perfected Kingdom of God.

While this typical Kingdom of Heaven was in existence the other nations on earth stood in a peculiar relation to it. So, for example, it is of interest that "the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, king of Persia, so that he made a proclamation throughout his kingdom", in which he professed to have received a charge from the Lord God of heaven to build Him a house in Jerusalem (Ezra 1:1 ff.). Later Persian monarchs also gave positive support to the building and maintenance of the Temple of the Restoration and, moreover, contributed from government funds for its ritual. The famous Cyrus cylinder reveals that Cyrus' policy towards the religion of Israel was in keeping with a general policy of restoring exiled nations and their religious cultus, but that does not affect the point that it was by divine instigation that Cyrus actively supported the organized religion of Israel. This procedure is obviously not normative for civil governments in the New Testament dispensation, but is an example of the intrusion of Consummation Ethics attaching to the Theocracy as a type of heaven into which "the kings of earth do bring their glory and honor" (Rev. 21:24).

The "Sacrifice" of Isaac

When Abraham was commanded of God to slay Isaac it seemed to him to be in contradiction to previous revelation concerning human life, which was later to be codified in the sixth Word of the Decalogue. However, it is the Creator's prerogative to assign such significance to His creature as He

will, and it is man's duty to accept the divine interpretation. The more unaccountable to man the divine interpretation be, the better calculated it is to bring to the fore in man's consciousness the necessity that he think and live covenantally, that is, in the obedience of personal devotion to his God. As God gave a special meaning to one of the trees of the garden, which it did not possess according to the ordinary constitution of things, making it the tree of forbidden fruit; as God gave a peculiar significance to certain meats in the ceremonial of the Old Testament, making them unclean; so now God effectively redefined the life of Isaac, making it the life to be sacrificed.

Confronted with a test which accents the purely covenantal nature of the obedience which must well from the hearts of his spiritual seed, the father of believers must not apply an abstract principle which forbids human sacrifice. For the child of the Covenant must listen only to his Father's voice.⁸ If Abraham does substitute that dictum of an idol ethic for the living voice of his Father at this juncture, he will find consistency demanding of him in the Judgment that he refuse the Atonement which his Father has provided. For the ethical principles operative in the Father's sacrifice of His Son in the fulness of time are the same as those involved in the "sacrifice" of Isaac. The latter, indeed, constitutes an intrusion of that ethic within the Old Testament and, as expected, it attaches to an event which typifies the Cross. At the same time, the fact that what was actually sacrificed by Abraham was the divinely provided substitute, advises us of the inadequacy of sinful human life to serve as an atoning sacrifice.

⁸ Since the Father speaks to His children today only in the words of the completed Scriptures, we are never tested in the peculiar manner of Abraham's trial of faith; that is, there are now no immediate divine revelations whose authority we might defy by idolizing previous revelation. It is, however, also true that the "now", the present dispensation, is not a closed and perpetual order but an age open to imminent invasion and termination by the coming of the day of the Lord. The child of the Covenant, therefore, must live in expectant hope of "the appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" and, when confronted with that ultimate theophany, he must be ready to heed the new demands of his God though they annul Scriptural requirements in force during the age just a moment ago waxed old and vanished away.

It tells us that God had not intended to interpret Isaac's life as the life which must actually be sacrificed, but only to try Abraham, whether he would by faith recognize God's right to do so.

The Marriage of Hosea

The interpretation of the marriage of the prophet Hosea (Hos. 1 and 3) has been perplexed by the ethical problem with which certain views are believed to be entangled. While accepting the view that only one woman is intended throughout, and she a harlot before the marriage, it is not our purpose here to defend this view in detail whether in its realistic, visionary or symbolical variety, but only to point out that there is no insoluble ethical problem preventing its adoption.

According to the Mosaic Law, prostitution was one of the violations of the seventh commandment which required exclusion from the theocratic congregation (Lev. 19:29; Deut. 23:17). It was certainly implied in this that a harlot might not be espoused by a Covenant member. Nevertheless, in contradiction of this ordinary requirement, the Lord commanded Hosea to marry the harlot Gomer. In so doing, God was again anticipating an ethical principle entailed in His saving the elect. In this case there is intruded the principle operative when a Bride formed from a multitude of defiled sinners is received by Christ as His own.

Like Abraham, therefore, Hosea must not be enslaved to an abstract ethical standard. He must keep himself from idols and be ready to hear his Father when He speaks. If he is not prepared to take Gomer now, then when the Lamb appears for the great marriage-feast, the idol will demand of Hosea in the name of consistency that he accede not to the reception by the holy One and undefiled of sinners such as he to be His Bride.

Enough has perhaps now been presented to display how, in union with the phenomenon of typology, during the Old Testament dispensation there was an anticipatory exercise of the ethic of the world to come. Ignorance of this is fraught with danger for the formulator of Christian Ethics for he will be liable to found matters of Christian duty upon cases of

Intrusion Ethics in the Old Testament. So he will become unwittingly guilty of assuming the prerogative of God to abrogate the principles of Common Grace. One further similar caution in closing: the recognition that the hour cometh when it will be our duty to hate the unbeliever must not diminish and ought to intensify our efforts to show him the love of Christ in the hour that now is. When our Father shall say, "It is done", we must listen to His voice. But if we are listening to Him today, we are still seeking by His grace to be Good Samaritans.

Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia