

The Noahic Covenants and Redemptive Judgment

By Jeong Koo Jeon

In general, liberal theologians consider the account of Genesis 1–11, including the episode of the Flood judgment, as a myth which does not reflect historical events. Recently, some evangelical scholars have begun to perceive Genesis 1–11 as “theological history,” taking on a middle ground between history and myth. Representatively, Longman and Walton insist that “the flood story of the Bible” recorded in Genesis 6–9 is neither myth nor history but “theological history,” which reflects “the hyperbolic presentation” of “real events of the past through the use of figurative language.” Here, they summarize their logic:

We do not believe the flood story of the Bible is myth, but neither do we believe the author of Genesis 6–9 intends to give us a straightforward depiction of the

event that lies behind it. We believe there is an event that inspired the story; after all, Genesis 6–9 is theological *history*. However, we believe the best understanding of Genesis 1–11, which of course includes the flood account, is that it talks about real events of the past through the use of figurative language. In the case of the flood story, we have identified the use of hyperbole to describe the flood. But there is a real event behind the story just as there was an actual conquest behind the hyperbolic presentation of Joshua’s conquest as presented in Joshua 1–12.¹

However, we believe that the account of the Flood judgment in Genesis 6–9 is the reflection of a real historical event at the time of Noah without any exaggeration and distortion, written by the prophet Moses under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, God demonstrated *the pattern of biblical eschatology* through the Noahic Flood within the historical context of the Prediluvian Noahic covenant in Genesis 6:5–8:19.²

We can learn several elements of *biblical eschatology* from the judgment of the Noahic Flood. First, it was a redemptive judgment in which God separated the covenant community from the non-covenant community. In addition, it was not a local but a universal judgment because it alluded to the final universal judgment which will happen on the day of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. The Noahic Flood judgment was a visible judgment, as seen in the covenant lawsuit based on the Edenic covenant of works, which was broken by the first Adam. Furthermore, it was a verification of the validity of the imputation of the original sin, which was imputed to all the descendants of the first Adam. Lastly, God showed a typological picture of the glorious union of the new earth with “the holy city, new Jerusalem” (Rev.21:2) when the Ark was united with the present earth as the earth dried up after the Flood judgment.³

THE AUTHOR: Jeong Koo Jeon is an ordained minister in the Korean Capital Presbytery in Presbyterian Church in America. He has written *Biblical Theology: Covenants and the Kingdom of God in Redemptive History* (Wipf and Stock, 2017), *Calvin and the Federal Vision: Calvin’s Covenant Theology in Light of Contemporary Discussion* (Wipf and Stock, 2009), and *Covenant Theology; John Murray’s and Meredith G. Kline’s Response to the Historical Development of Federal Theology in Reformed Thought* (University Press of America, 2004). Also, “The Abrahamic Covenant and the Kingdom of God” (v7, 2011) and “The Covenant of Creation and the Kingdom of God” (v9, 2013).

1. Tremper Longman III & John H. Walton, *The Lost World of the Flood: Mythology, Theology, the Deluge Debate* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2018), 145.

2. For biblical theological discussions of the distinction between the Prediluvian and Postdiluvian Noahic covenants, see Michael Norton, *Introducing Covenant Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books), 111–28; Jeong Koo Jeon, *Biblical Theology: Covenants and the Kingdom of God in Redemptive History* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2017), 33–57; Meredith G. Kline, *Kingdom Prologue: Genesis Foundations for a Covenant Worldview* (Overland Park, KS: Two Age Press), 212–62.

3. For the eschatological understanding of the Flood judgment, see Geerhardus Vos, *The Eschatology of the Old Testament*, ed. James T. Dennison Jr. (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2001), 81–83. Interestingly, Vos describes the Noahic covenant as “the general covenant”

Meanwhile, after the Noahic Flood judgment, God restored and resumed the covenant of common grace through the Postdiluvian Noahic covenant in Genesis 8:20–9:17. In doing so, God secured world history on the present earth until the final judgment comes through the means of the covenant between God and all humanity including the earth. God's continuation of the covenant of common grace, originally inaugurated in Genesis 3:16–19, not only provided stability for humanity after the Flood judgment, but also the presence of the church as a covenant community, saving the elect until the Second Coming of Jesus Christ on the present earth.

A. THE NOAHIC FLOOD AND REDEMPTIVE JUDGMENT

God is not only love, but also holy and righteous. God visibly demonstrated his infinite holiness and righteousness through the Noahic Flood judgment. After the completion of the Ark by the faithful and obedient Noah, the Noahic covenant community entered into the Ark based on God's commandment. Entering into the Ark was a process in which there was a visible separation of the Noahic covenant community and the non-covenant community.

Jesus Christ, as the mediator of the New Covenant, was a redemptive-historical theologian who exemplified mastery of the interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in light of redemptive history patterned in the creation, Fall, redemption, and consummation. In fact, Jesus Christ was an *infallible* redemptive-historical theologian during his public ministry in his sermons and teachings, so that his disciples as the original apostles, as well as the apostle Paul, were able to follow his example of redemptive-historical interpretation of the Hebrew Bible after the Pentecost event, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. In his famous Olivet Discourse, Jesus Christ compared the Flood judgment at the time of Noah with the final judgment on the day of his Second Coming:

³⁶But concerning that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only. ³⁷As were the days of Noah, so will be the coming of the Son of Man. ³⁸For as in those days before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day when Noah entered the ark, ³⁹and they were unaware until the flood came and swept them all away, so will be the coming of the Son of Man. ⁴⁰Then two men will be in the field; one will be taken and one left. ⁴¹Two women will be grinding at the mill; one will be taken and one left. ⁴²Therefore, stay

awake, for you do not know on what day your Lord is coming. ⁴³But know this, that if the master of the house had known in what part of the night the thief was coming, he would have stayed awake and would not have let his house be broken into. ⁴⁴Therefore you also must be ready, for the Son of Man is coming at an hour you do not expect. (Matt. 24:36–44)⁴

In Jesus Christ's address to his disciples, we find a remarkable truth. The day of "the coming of the Son of Man" (vv. 37, 39) as his Second Coming is the same day of the final judgment, separating the elect from the reprobate (vv. 41–42). God separated the Noahic covenant and non-covenant community. The Noahic covenant community entered into the Ark and God closed the door of the Ark, and began to pour out his infinite wrath against the non-covenant community. Similarly, on the day of "the coming of the Son of Man," God will execute his final judgment, visibly separating the elect and reprobate. Verses 40–41 ("40 Then two men will be in the field; one will be taken and one left. 41 Two women will be grinding at the mill; one will be taken and one left") are a parabolic expression of the separation of the elect and reprobate on the day of the final judgment when Jesus Christ returns.

which can be identified as the covenant of common grace, while he views the covenant of grace as "the *foedus speciale*" which God made with the elect. In doing so, he doesn't make a proper distinction between the Prediluvian and Postdiluvian Noahic covenants, which is warranted: "Szegedin, Musculus, Polanus, Wollebius, and others make a distinction between the *foedus generale*, the general covenant, which God established with all creatures, animals as well as men, and the *foedus special ac sempiternum*, the special and eternally enduring covenant that is made with the elect. For the first, the covenant with all creatures, one can appeal to God's covenant-making with Noah. With that, God promised that the orderings of heaven and of earth would not again be disrupted by a flood and placed the rainbow as a sign and seal of it... In Genesis 6:13; 9:9; and the following verses, between God and Noah. Here, however, it is said repeatedly that it is a covenant between God and every living soul, not excluding the animals. Thus it is not simply the covenant of grace. It is a covenant of nature." Geerhardus Vos, *Reformed Dogmatics: Volume 2: Anthropology*, trans. and ed. Richard B. Gaffin, Jr. (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2014), 122–127.

4. Vos properly makes the comparison between the Noahic Flood judgment and the final judgment at the time of the Second Coming of Christ in light of eschatology: "Finally, the New Testament places the epoch of Noah in parallel with the second coming of Christ (cf. Matt. 24:37; Luke 17:26). These passages point out a comparison between the sinfulness immediately preceding the two periods under consideration. But it is especially the suddenness of the coming of Christ that is stressed in this connection. First Peter 3:20ff. compares the water of baptism with that of the flood. Both have an eschatological significance and are directed toward salvation. The water was an instrument of the world-judgment and separated godly and ungodly as it does in baptism." Vos, *The Eschatology of the Old Testament*, 82.

God sovereignly set *the day of the Lord*, which was the day of the visible appearance of glorious theophany and judgment. When the day of the Lord came, Noah's family entered into the Ark, which Noah as a faithful servant of God had built over 120 years, enduring persecution by idol worshippers who were hostile toward God and the covenant community. After the Noachic covenant community entered into the Ark, God appeared as theophanic Glory and closed the door of the Ark, which was the Ark of salvation on the original earth. By doing this, God did not provide further opportunity to enter the Ark; rather, he closed and sealed the door. The beautiful Glory closed the door of the Ark, which was an earthly picture of the invisible heaven. Closing the door of the Ark meant that God finished the process of the visible separation of the covenant community and non-covenant community:

¹³In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month, on that day all the fountains of the great deep burst forth, and the windows of the heavens were opened. ¹⁴And rain fell upon the earth forty days and forty nights. ¹⁵On the very same day Noah and his sons, Shem and Ham and Japheth, and Noah's wife and the three wives of his sons with them entered the ark, ¹⁶they and every beast, according to its kind, and all the livestock according to their kinds, and every creeping thing that creeps on the earth, according to its kind, and every bird, according to its kind, every winged creature. ¹⁷They went into the ark with Noah, two and two of all flesh in which there was the breath of life. ¹⁸And those that entered, male and female of all flesh, went in as God had commanded him. And the LORD shut him in. (Gen. 7:11–16).

5. However, there was an exception. When the covenant community of Israel conquered the Promised Land, God commanded the armies of Israel to fight holy war on behalf of Yahweh. It is a typological demonstration of God's infinite wisdom to reveal that the glorified believers at the day of the final judgment will participate to judge the reprobate alongside Jesus Christ, who will be coming as the final Consummator and Judge.

6. Longman & Walton, *The Lost World of the Flood*, 85. We believe the root problem lies in their view of the Bible, which is deeply rooted in their adaptation to and the implications of the historical-critical reading of the Bible, which is the presupposition of liberal theologians. Endorsing the historical-critical reading of the Pentateuch with adaptation of the redaction criticism, they plainly reject the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch as well: "As intriguing as it is, however, we are not saying this particular flood generated the story of the flood. We do not believe we can reconstruct the historical event from the biblical account. However, we are confident, due to the genre (theological history) of Genesis 6–9 and in our affirmation that the Bible is true in all that it affirms, that there was a historical event. Our conclusion is that the Black Sea flood is the *type* of devastating flood

We need to pay special attention to verse 13: "On the very same day Noah and his sons, Shem and Ham and Japheth, and Noah's wife and the three wives of his sons with them entered the ark." In particular, "on the very same day" (בַּעֲצֵם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה) is a crucial key which indicates that the Flood judgment was a *concomitant event* between the blessings of life and curses of death. Here, we find God's remarkable wisdom. God separated two different groups of people when the Flood judgment happened on the day of the Lord. Nevertheless, there is a logical and chronological order when God divided the two different groups. First, God secured the Noachic covenant community, sending them into and closing the Ark before he demonstrated his infinite wrath against the sinners who were hostile against the Kingdom of God. Afterwards, God as a righteous Judge began to display his incredible, infinite, fearful, and merciless judgment upon the original earth where the sinners against God lived.

It is noteworthy that God did not deploy man-made weapons, although they are the fruits of the covenant of common grace inaugurated in Genesis 3:16–19. Rather, God used the Flood as the means of his glorious and righteous judgment. This is a visible demonstration of God's infinite wisdom. When God displays his redemptive judgment, he does not need help from arrogant and sinful humans. This pattern continues when God executed his redemptive judgments as we see in the historical episodes of the judgments of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the Red Sea, among others.⁵

Longman and Walton deny the authenticity of the Flood judgment which occurred at the time of Noah. In doing so, they insist that the Flood was not global but local, reading and evaluating the flood episode in Genesis 6–9 in light of the Ancient Near Eastern cultures and religions:

For reasons described in other parts of this book, we do not believe the flood was worldwide, but we do believe it was particularly devastating. We don't think it is possible to date the event, locate the event, or reconstruct the event in our own terms. That is not a problem because the event itself, with which everyone in the Near East is familiar, is not what is inspired. What *is* inspired and thus the vehicle of God's revelation is the literary-theological explanation that is given by the biblical author. We are interested in how the compiler of Genesis used the flood and how he described what God was doing in and with the flood.⁶

However, we believe that the Flood judgment was not a local but a global and universal judgment which covered the whole earth. The universal Flood judgment was God's sovereign revelation that the final judgment will be global and universal, as the judgment will be at the Second Coming of Jesus Christ, the final Parousia. Due to the Flood judgment, all the people outside of the Ark perished because the holy and righteous God displayed his redemptive judgment against their sins, in which they followed not God but the gods of that time.

When the final Parousia comes, God will separate the elect and reprobate, granting the eternal Kingdom of God to the elect in the last Adam while the reprobate in the first Adam will be thrown into the Kingdom of Satan, which will be the completion of hell. God desired to demonstrate and reveal the pattern of final judgment through the Noahic Flood judgment. In doing so, God did not separate the elect and reprobate, but rather the covenant community and non-covenant community through the Flood judgment in the original earth. For example, Ham was a member of the Noahic covenant community, so he was able to enter the Ark, escaping the Flood judgment. In addition, Ham participated in worship as a son of the Noahic covenant family. Nevertheless, the Bible depicts Ham not as one of the members of the elect, chosen by God before the creation of the world to be saved in Christ in the milieu of the covenant of redemption (the *pactum salutis*), which was made among the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Calvin rightly shows that Ham was not a member of the *invisible* church, although he was saved in the Ark during the Flood judgment as a member of the *visible* church, interpreting "And Ham, the father of Canaan" in Genesis 9:22 thus:

It is received by common consent, that piety towards parents is the mother of all virtues. This Ham, therefore, must have been of a wicked, perverse, and crooked disposition; since he not only took pleasure in his father's shame, but wished to expose him to his brethren. And this is no slight occasion of offense; first, that Noah, the minister of salvation to men, and the chief restorer of the world, should, in extreme old age, lie intoxicated in his house; and then, that the ungodly and wicked Ham should have proceeded from the sanctuary of God. God had selected eight souls as a sacred seed, thoroughly purged from all corruption, for the renovation of the Church: but the son of Noah shows, how necessary it is for men to be held as with the bridle of God, however they may be exalted by privilege. The impiety of Ham proves to us how deep is the root of wickedness

in men; and that it continually put forth its shoots, except where the power of the Spirit prevails over it. But if, in the hollowed sanctuary of God, among so small a number, one fiend was preserved; let us not wonder if, at this day, in the Church, containing a much greater multitude of men, the wicked are mingled with the good.⁷

In that sense, Ham will not inherit the eternal Kingdom of God when the final redemptive judgment comes at the Second Coming of Jesus Christ, even though he escaped the Flood judgment.

It is noteworthy to recognize the method of God's judgment at the time of Noah. God completely destroyed everything outside of the Ark, killing all the humans of that time. In doing so, God withdrew the benefits of the covenant of common grace that he had bestowed on the elect and reprobate alike without any discrimination after he inaugurated the covenant of common grace in Genesis 3:16–19. God withdrew the common blessings of kindness, love, and mercy that he had graciously and temporarily bestowed upon the reprobate and world in his original earth. When the day of the Lord arrived, God waged holy war against sinful humans and a world that followed the spirit of the Kingdom of Satan. It was the war of total destruction (*cherem*), which was later commanded by God to the covenant community of Israel when they entered the Promised Land. In that sense, God used holy war when he executed his redemptive judgment through the Noahic Flood, thus putting an end to the covenant of common grace.

Furthermore, the physical death of the reprobates outside of the Ark was not the end of the story. God sent all the souls of the cursed people from the Flood judgment to hell. As mentioned, what happened outside of the Ark in the Flood judgment was the visible picture or type of hell, cursing all the non-covenant community with physical death.⁸ Further, he sent the souls of all the dead to hell, which is now the invisible realm as

that could have ultimately inspired the biblical account, even if it is not itself the biblical event. Whatever the precise historical event, the story was told from generation to generation, eventually forming the basis for the *toledot* ... coming down to the Israelite narrators and the later redactors of the final form of the Pentateuch who used the story of Noah and the flood for their important theological message.⁷ Ibid., 149.

7. John Calvin, *Genesis*, in *Calvin's Commentaries*, 22 vols., trans. John King (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1996), 9:22.

8. A classic example of preaching about the existence and reality of heaven and hell can be found in Jonathan Edwards, *Sinners in the Hands of An Angry God* (Middletown, DE: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2019). Edwards vividly describes and illustrates

well. To be sure, all the souls sent to hell through the Flood judgment will experience bodily resurrection when the final Parousia comes. However, their bodily resurrection will not be the glorious bodily resurrection of “the resurrection of life” (v. 29), as it will be for the elect in the last Adam. It will be the bodily resurrection of the wicked as “the resurrection of judgment” (v. 29), so that they will be thrown into the Kingdom of Satan which will be the completion of hell (John 5:25–29).⁹

B. THE COVENANT LAWSUIT AND THE VERIFICATION OF THE ORIGINAL SIN

God is a covenantal God who makes, remembers, and faithfully keeps his covenants. God never forgets his covenants, because he is omnipotent and omniscient. Surprisingly, the backdrop of the judgment of the Noahic Flood goes back to the holy Garden of Eden where God made the covenant of works with the first Adam. When God made the covenant of works with the first Adam in Genesis 2:15–17, Adam represented all his descendants, because he was the representative covenantal head. So, God remembered this covenant when he executed the Flood judgment against the non-covenant

community. However, God saved the Noahic covenant family in the Ark in light of the covenant of grace, inaugurated in Genesis 3:14–15 while he executed the judgment of death to all the people outside of the Ark in the milieu of the covenant of works broken by the first Adam.¹⁰

In that sense, the Noahic Flood was God’s redemptive judgment, executing the judgment of death through his covenant lawsuit based upon the Edenic covenant of works. Certainly, the first Adam was not under the covenant of grace but the covenant of works as the representative covenant head of his descendants after him (Gen. 2:15–17).¹¹ As the first Adam ate the forbidden fruit from

meant much to me. But the issue is too important to suppress, and I am grateful to you for challenging me to declare my present mind. I do not dogmatise about the position to which I have come. I hold it tentatively. But I do plead for frank dialogue among Evangelicals on the basis of Scripture. I also believe that the ultimate annihilation of the wicked should be at least be accepted as a legitimate, biblically founded alternative to their eternal conscious torment.” *Ibid.*, 318–20.

9. Interpreting John 5:29, Vos affirms the bodily resurrection of the elect and reprobate at the final Parousia in light of “the completeness of the theodicy” which will be visibly manifested in the completion of the eschatological Kingdom of God: “In John 5:29, Jesus draws a formal distinction between ‘the resurrection of life’ and ‘the resurrection of judgment.’ At this point we once more verify that our Lord’s doctrine of the resurrection rests on a broader basis than that of individual soteriology. The raising of the dead forms part of a process of cosmic proportions which draws within its range the entire physical universe and therefore extends to the wicked as well as the righteous. Even in the case of the wicked the resurrection of the body and the recompense in the body are necessary to the completeness of the theodicy which forms the essence of the final coming of the kingdom.” Geerhardus Vos, *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: The Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos*, ed. Richard B. Gaffin, Jr. (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 1980), 322.

10. Vos properly categorizes two different groups of people after the Fall. The elect are receiving spiritual benefits “under the covenant of grace” while the reprobate are condemned “under the covenant of works.” In light of that, it is proper to view that God occasionally executed his redemptive judgment against non-covenant community through the covenant lawsuit based upon the Edenic covenant of works as the type of the Final judgment: “Insofar as the covenant of works went beyond the natural relationship between God and man, it has passed away for those who are under the covenant of grace. Still here, too, one should distinguish carefully. . . . The nonelect natural man is also still under the covenant of works, if one takes the covenant of works only in its broadest sense. He is not under it in the sense that his life here on earth would still be a probation, for he is put to the test and succumbed in Adam. He is one fallen, not one who is tested. He is under it insofar as his punishable culpability is at its root connected with Adam’s breaking of the covenant, whether he would acknowledge it or not. By the breaking of the covenant of works, he did not revert to his natural relationship.” Vos, *Reformed Dogmatics: Volume Two: Anthropology*, 44–46.

11. Growing numbers of scholars and theologians deny the historical and logical orders of the covenant of works and the covenant of

the reality of the “everlasting wrath” of hell as follows: “It is everlasting wrath. It would be dreadful to suffer this fierceness and wrath of Almighty God one moment; but you must suffer it to all eternity. There will be no end to this exquisite horrible misery. When you look forward, you shall see a long for ever, a boundless duration before you, which will swallow up your thoughts, and amaze your soul; and you will absolutely despair of ever having any deliverance, any end, any mitigation, any rest at all. You will know certainly that you must wear out long ages, millions of millions of ages, in wrestling and conflicting with this almighty merciless vengeance; and then when you have so done, when so many ages have actually been spent by you in this manner, you will know that all is but a point to what remains. So that your punishment will indeed be infinite.” *Ibid.*, 36.

Some scholars and theologians of an evangelical posture deny the existence of heaven and hell. This phenomenon is at best contrary to the principle of the good news of the Gospel and the dual aspects of God’s redemptive judgment, revealed in the Bible. For example, an influential evangelical theologian, John Stott, denied? (since he died in 2011?) the existence of eternal hellish punishment. David L. Edwards and John Stott, *Evangelical Essentials: A Liberal-Evangelical Dialogue* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1988), 313–20. Supporting the annihilation of the wicked, Stott denies that there will be eternal punishment in hell against the reprobate: “The third argument in favor of the concept of annihilation concerns the biblical vision of *justice*. Fundamental to it is the belief that God will judge people ‘according to what they [have] done’ (e.g. Revelation 20:12), which implies that the penalty inflicted will be commensurate with the evil one . . . I am hesitant to have written these things, partly because I have a great respect for longstanding tradition which claims to be a true interpretation of Scripture, and do not lightly set it aside, and partly because the unity of the world-wide Evangelical constituency has always

the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in the holy Garden of Eden with his wife Eve due to Satan's temptation, he broke the covenant of works. The breaking of the covenant of works by the first Adam was not an isolated event which resulted in minor consequences. The impact and implication of the broken covenant of works in the Garden of Eden are more significant and serious than we can ever imagine. Adam and Eve were expelled from the Garden even though they were saved by God's grace through faith in the Coming Messiah. Nevertheless, they lost the right to live in the holy Garden of Eden because it was the earthly projection of the glorious heaven, and sinners lost their special privilege to live there.

God remembered the broken covenant of works when he executed his redemptive judgment, separating the Noahic covenant community and non-covenant community. God poured out his righteous wrath against sinners outside of the Ark through the covenant lawsuit, based upon the broken covenant of works in the Garden. Simultaneously, God destroyed the holy Garden of Eden through his Flood judgment, even though it was the earthly picture of the invisible heaven. The Noahic covenant community was saved in the Ark because they were the recipients of the benefits of the covenant of grace, which was inaugurated in Genesis

grace as well as law and gospel or grace which are the essential hermeneutical and theological tools for the good news of the Gospel and God's sovereign grace, granting salvation and eschatological Kingdom to hopeless sinners after the Fall. For example, Niehaus denies the validity of the distinction between the covenant of works and grace, mixing works and grace together, which is at best a monocovenantalism: "But what can explain God's gracious act? His grace does not avert justice, because the man and the woman would still die. God must remain true to all of his covenantal commitments because doing so actually means that he remains true to his own nature, out of which covenantal relationships and commitments arise. But he also does the one thing that his covenant does not require: He reinstates his fallen vassals so that the covenant might continue. And so it did, with humans ruling and multiplying, although in a sinful and fallen world. On such grounds (as well as those noted earlier), it becomes clear that the Adamic or Creation covenant cannot simply be called a covenant of works. The continuation of the covenant clearly does not depend on the obedience, or the successful work, of the vassals, for the covenant has continued in spite of their disobedience—because God himself has graciously continued it. The Noahic covenant, which (as we discuss later) is a renewal of the Adamic covenant, only fortifies this position, since it guarantees further the continuance of the key provisions of the Adamic or Creation covenant. We therefore submit again that, on such grounds, the concept of a *covenant of works* is not adequate to explain all the aspects of the Adamic covenant. It cannot account even for the most fundamentally important fact about the covenant—namely, that it continues after the Fall and continues to this day. Therefore, this foundational covenant is no covenant of works but, rather, a covenant of grace and works. We will see that the

3:14–15 when the gracious God introduced the primitive Gospel to Adam and Eve in the name of woman's offspring, the coming Messiah.

Growing numbers of scholars within the so-called evangelical community began to reject the original sin and its imputation.¹² Representatively, Longman, sharing his opinion with Walton, rejects the idea of the original sin, claiming that it does not have any biblical support. Rather, it was the invention of Augustine in the early church without any biblical warrant:

In short, the idea that we inherit a sin nature, guilt, and death from Adam (and Eve) does not derive from the Old Testament or Paul, but from the thinking of Augustine. Now Augustine was one of the greatest theological thinkers of all time, but he was not infallible. Augustine got off to a bad start by mistranslating the Greek of Romans 5:12 which properly rendered says "just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all people, *because* (*eph hō*) all sinned." Augustine translated "because" as "in whom" (*in quo*), thus changing Paul's point that we all are guilty because of our own sin to the idea that we are all guilty because of Adam's sin.¹³

same is true, *mutatis mutandis*, of all the divine—human covenants." Niehaus, *Biblical Theology* (Wooster, Weaver Book Co., 2014), 1.79–80.

12. For a biblical and theological affirmation and discussion of the original sin and its immediate imputation, see John Murray, *The Imputation of Adam's Sin* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 1959).

13. Longman III, *The Story of God Bible Commentary: Genesis*, 72. Similarly, Walton rejects the biblical doctrine of the original sin, arguing that Augustine falsely formulated it without biblical support and warrant: "Augustine pushes beyond what Paul says, and Paul has moved beyond what Genesis says. In Old Testament theology there is no apparent necessity for asserting the fall, though they understand the reality of sin. Even in Paul, it is not original sin that pervades his writing but the need for the savior... If Augustine's model has been undermined on both counts (starting point and mechanism), one might think that it would have collapsed under its own unwieldiness. The theory, however, has become so deeply entrenched in the history of theological thought and development that it has taken on a life of its own almost independent from its essential roots. Perhaps the time has come for the church to reconsider how original sin is formulated and understood... Another critique of Augustine's model comes from the recognition that he was working from a Latin translation of Romans 5:12. This is what led him to believe that Paul was saying that all sinned 'in Adam' whereas the Greek text has been purported to actually say 'in this way death came to all people, because all sinned' (NIV), indicating that we all sin *because* Adam sinned. This is a good illustration of what a big difference a little word can make, and in this case the result is a huge and longstanding debate among theologians as well as exegetes." John H. Walton, *The Lost World of Adam and Eve: Genesis 2–3 and the Human Origins Debate* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2015), 155–57.

However, God revealed the reality of the original sin and its immediate imputation throughout the history of the Old Testament. We claim that God demonstrated the visible reality of the original sin and its imputation from the historical episode of the Flood judgment. God's judgment against the non-covenant community outside of the Ark even included innocent babies and embryos. It was one of the characteristics of God's redemptive

14. As he rejects the original sin and its imputation to his descendants, Walton denies that the first Adam was the first human on the earth, falsely arguing that Adam and Eve were "the first *significant* humans." However, to be sure, the Bible clearly reveals and teaches that Adam and Eve were the first humans on the original earth: "In conclusion, rather than understanding Scripture as necessitating the view that Adam and Eve are the first humans, in light of their specific role concerned with access to God in sacred space and relationship with him, we might alternatively consider the possibility that they are the first *significant* humans. As with Abram, who was given a significant role as the ancestor of Israel (though not the first ancestor of Israel), Adam and Eve would be viewed as established as significant by their election. This would be true whether or not other people were around. Their election is to a priestly role, the first to be placed as sacred space. The forming accounts give them insight into the nature of humanity, but they also become the first significant humans because of their role in bringing sin into the world ... Adam was the 'first' man, given the opportunity to bring life, but he failed to achieve that goal. Christ, as the 'last' man, succeeded as he provided life and access to the presence of God for all as our great high priest (see 1 Cor 15:45)." Walton, *The Lost World of Adam and Eve*, 114–15.

15. Supporting theistic evolution in light of the harmony of the Bible and science, Walton falsely argues that there was "death before the fall" and human beings were "created mortal." Perhaps that is a logical conclusion because he denies the original sin, its imputation to his descendants, and God's judgment with physical death against the first Adam and his descendants. In doing so, he removes the possibility of the existence of eternal blessings of heaven and eternal curses of hell: "We have now laid the groundwork for considering the possibility that there was death before the death. In chapter eight we examined information to support the idea that humankind was created mortal. There we concluded that Paul's statement about why we humans are all subject to death was that in sinning we had lost access to the antidote found in the tree of life.... If we consider the model in which there were humans either preceding Adam and Eve or contemporary with Adam and Eve, we need to contemplate their vulnerability to suffering and death. If death and suffering can be feasibly inherent in a non-ordered world and be retained in a partially ordered world, then any pre-fall human population would have been in a state of innocence (not sinlessness) since they were not yet being held accountable, even though they *were* in the image of God. In this scenario we would expect to find predation, animal death, human death and violent behavior. Endowment with the image of God and the initiation of sacred place would provide the foundation for accountability through law and revelation. When Adam and Eve sinned, as representative priests for humanity, their sin brought disorder and accountability and made the antidote to death inaccessible. That disorder infects each one of us when we come into existence as human beings. Non-order is not being resolved according to the original plan (God teamed up with human vice-regents), and disorder brought the need for resolution through the work of Christ." *Ibid.*, 159.

judgment through the Noachic Flood. In doing so, God vividly revealed and verified the original sin committed by the first Adam and imputed to his descendants, including innocent babies as he broke the covenant of works:

¹⁷The flood continued forty days on the earth. The waters increased and bore up the ark, and it rose high above the earth. ¹⁸The waters prevailed and increased greatly on the earth, and the ark floated on the face of the waters. ¹⁹And the waters prevailed so mightily on the earth that all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered. ²⁰The waters prevailed above the mountains, covering them fifteen cubits deep. ²¹And all flesh died that moved on the earth, birds, livestock, beasts, all swarming creatures that swarm on the earth, and all mankind. ²²Everything on the dry land in whose nostrils was the breath of life died. ²³He blotted out every living thing that was on the face of the ground, man and animals and creeping things and birds of the heavens. They were blotted out from the earth. Only Noah was left, and those who were with him in the ark. ²⁴And the waters prevailed on the earth 150 days. (Gen. 7:17–24)

We need to highlight verses 21–23 again because those verses emphasize that no one survived outside of the Ark:

²¹And all flesh died that moved on the earth, birds, livestock, beasts, all swarming creatures that swarm on the earth, and all mankind. ²²Everything on the dry land in whose nostrils was the breath of life died. ²³He blotted out every living thing that was on the face of the ground, man and animals and creeping things and birds of the heavens. They were blotted out from the earth. Only Noah was left, and those who were with him in the ark. (Gen. 7:21–23)

Likewise, verses 21–23 provide a vivid picture of the nature of God's redemptive judgment upon the non-covenant community during the Flood judgment. With the exception of the Noachic covenant community, no humans, including babies and embryos, survived. They all died through God's merciless judgement. It gives us a comprehensive outlook that God will execute his final judgment through the covenant lawsuit based upon the covenant of works which was made with the first Adam in the holy Garden of Eden.¹⁴ All humans in the first Adam considered as reprobates will face the final judgment of God's Fire and be thrown into the eternal Kingdom of Satan.¹⁵ On the other hand, all humans in the last Adam as the elect will be separated from the

final judgment of Fire, and inherit the eternal Kingdom of God. This is a glorious consummation of heaven, because Jesus Christ fulfilled all the requirements of the broken covenant of works and paid full penalty of sin on behalf of the elect through his sinless life and redemptive death on the cross as the last Adam.

C. THE PICTORIAL PATTERN OF THE ETERNAL KINGDOM OF GOD

After the completion of the Flood judgment upon the wicked world, God began to dry up the flooded earth through his mighty wind. The Flood judgment was not only God's redemptive judgment upon the wicked original world, but also the process of recreation of the present earth. In that sense, the Flood judgment was a means to purify the original earth. The holy and righteous God removed and cursed the non-covenant community who worshipped idols and went against God in their hearts. Simultaneously, God recreated the present earth so that history may continue on the present earth with a habitable and stable environment until the final judgment.

Vos captures the dual aspects of the Flood judgment as the complete destruction of the original world and the new creation of the present earth:

The cosmical extent of the deluge-event is both negative and positive. First, negatively, the flood destroyed the world (cf. Gen. 6). This is a catastrophic world-judgment. This fact is confirmed by pagan mythology, where it is associated with the chaos-flood out of which the world arose. The creation and the deluge both have cosmic significance. It was not confined to man; but the purpose was that God repented that he had created the world. Second, positively, it is the commencement of a new world-order. The waters receded on the first day of the month and the first month of the year (cf. Gen. 8:13); therefore, a new year.... Now the deluge and the post-diluvian order of things prefigure eschatological crisis and the eschatological state. In other words, the deluge and "new creation" are typical of the absolute end of the world and the final renewal of the world.¹⁶

Vos summarizes the Flood judgment on the original earth and the new creation of the present earth as a remarkable contrast of God's redemptive drama which was demonstrated by the righteous and creative God. As God dried up the flooded earth through his supernatural wind, the newly created earth began to emerge. This was beautiful, because God created the present

earth with his mighty water and wind, restoring a habitable environment for humans and all other earthly creatures. Nevertheless, the present earth is not the *new earth*, which will be perfected and realized when the final redemptive judgment comes with the heavenly fire. Rather, God recreated the present earth as a habitable and blessed environment so that both the covenant community and non-covenant community can live together under the benefits of God's covenant of common grace.

The Noahic covenant community was surprised by the beauty of the present earth when they came out of the Ark, because God as the almighty architect and creator beautifully recreated the present earth through the Flood judgment. In addition, the Ark safely arrived on Mount Ararat, and the Noahic covenant community walked out of the Ark along with the animals:

¹³In the six hundred and first year, in the first month, the first day of the month, the waters were dried from off the earth. And Noah removed the covering of the ark and looked, and behold, the face of the ground was dry. ¹⁴In the second month, on the twenty-seventh day of the month, the earth had dried out. ¹⁵Then God said to Noah, ¹⁶"Go out from the ark, you and your wife, and your sons and your sons' wives with you. ¹⁷ Bring out with you every living thing that is with you of all flesh-birds and animals and every creeping thing that creeps on the earth- that they may swarm on the earth, and be fruitful and multiply on the earth." ¹⁸So Noah went out, and his sons and his wife and his sons' wives with him. ¹⁹Every beast, every creeping thing, and every bird, everything that moves on the earth, went out by families from the ark. (Gen. 8:13-19).

The Noahic Ark was an earthly and visible picture of the invisible heaven. When Noah saw the completed Ark, he gazed and yearned for the invisible heaven through his faith, which was typified by the Ark. So God presented the reality of *heaven* in the earthly and visible Ark. God will consummate the new heaven and new earth and unite the new earth with "the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God" (Rev. 21:2) when the final redemptive judgment happens on the day of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. The apostle John saw a glorious pictorial vision through a revelation of the consummation of the eternal Kingdom of God on the day of the final judgment:

16. Vos, *The Eschatology of the Old Testament*, 81.

Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and the sea was no more. ²And I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. ³And I heard a loud voice from the throne saying, "Behold, the dwelling place of God is with man. He will dwell with them, and they will be his people, and God himself will be with them as their God. ⁴He will wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more, neither shall there be mourning nor crying nor pain anymore, for the former things have passed away." (Rev. 21:1–4).

The apostle John saw the pictorial vision that God will unite the invisible heaven with the new earth. Hoekema rightly observes that John's vision is the vision of the glorious union between "holy city, new Jerusalem" and the new earth:

Verse 2 shows us the "holy city, new Jerusalem," standing for the entire glorified church of God, coming down out of heaven on earth. This church, now totally without spot or blemish, completely purified from sin, is now "prepared as a bride adorned for her husband," ready for the marriage of the Lamb (see Rev. 19:7). From this verse we learn that the glorified church will not remain in a heaven far off in space, but will spend eternity on the new earth. From verse 3 we learn that the dwelling place of God will no longer be away from the earth but on the earth. Since where God dwells, there heaven is, we conclude that in the life to come heaven and earth will no longer be separated, as they are now, but will be merged. Believers will therefore continue to be in heaven as they continue to live on the new earth. "He will dwell with them, and they shall be his people" are the familiar words of the central promise of the covenant of grace (cf. Gen. 17:7; Exod. 19:5–6; Jer. 31:33; Ezek. 34:30; II Cor. 6:16; Heb. 8:10; I Pet. 2:9–10). The fact that this promise is repeated in John's vision of the new earth implies that only on that new earth will God finally grant his people the full riches which the covenant of grace includes. Here we receive the firstfruits; there we shall receive the full harvest.¹⁷

The Ark, as the visible type of invisible heaven, was united with the new earth because God removed the evil from the original earth through the Flood judgment. What Noah as a prophet saw through his own eyes from the opened door of the Ark after the Flood judgment

17. Anthony A. Hoekema, *The Bible and the Future* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), 284–85.

was the typological picture of "a new heaven and a new earth" and "the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband," united with "a new earth" that the apostle John saw through a revelation (vv. 1–2).

D. THE RECOVERY OF THE COVENANT OF COMMON GRACE AND WORLD HISTORY

The Noahic Flood was God's redemptive judgment against sinners and the sinful world at the time of Noah on the original earth. God displayed his infinite and righteous wrath. In doing so, he honored and glorified himself. Simultaneously, God displayed his infinite holiness and righteousness. In this act, God provided the typological pattern and picture of the final judgment and biblical eschatology. Nevertheless, the Noahic Flood judgment was not the final judgment, so that world history can continue until the Second Coming of Jesus Christ under God's grace on the present earth.

Providing the continuity and stability of world history after the Flood judgment on the present earth, God secured it through a means of the covenant of common grace, as we observe in Genesis 8:20–9:17. Displaying a rainbow in the sky after the Flood judgment was a sign of the covenant of common grace, which promises that world history will be secured on the present earth until the final judgment.

God commanded the original cultural mandate to Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden after he created the original heavens and the earth:

²⁶Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth." ²⁷So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. ²⁸And God blessed them. And God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth." ²⁹And God said, "Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is on the face of all the earth, and every tree with seed in its fruit. You shall have them for food. ³⁰And to every beast of the earth and to every bird of the heavens and to everything that creeps on the earth, everything that has the breath of life, I have given every green plant for food." And it was so. ³¹And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very

good. And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day. (Gen. 1:26–31)

When God created Adam and Eve, he created them in his own image, and he engraved the moral law in their hearts, clothing them with his holiness, righteousness, and wisdom. Thus they were able to govern the holy Garden of Eden for the glory of God as a vicegerent. God did not consider sin when he gave his original cultural mandate to Adam and Eve in the holy Garden of Eden, because this mandate was given in the historical context before the Fall. Adam and Eve as the Edenic covenant community had a duty to carry out the original cultural mandate, being fruitful and increasing in number, filling the earth and subduing it as the vicegerent for the glory of God. However, they failed to carry out their original cultural mandate when they broke the covenant of works, eating the forbidden fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil through the temptation of Satan (Gen. 3:1–7). Afterwards, the gracious God introduced the good news of the Gospel in the name of the woman's offspring, the coming Messiah (Gen 3:14–15). Remarkably, God introduced the covenant of common grace before he expelled Adam and Eve from the holy Garden of Eden (Gen. 3:16–19). In doing so, God provided a stable environment outside of the Garden of Eden, so that world history after the Fall continued until the original sinful world faced the Flood judgment at the time of Noah. At that time, it was necessary for God to command a new cultural mandate in the world where the covenant community and non-covenant community can dwell together on the present earth:

And God blessed Noah and his sons and said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth. ²The fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth and upon every bird of the heavens, upon everything that creeps on the ground and all the fish of the sea. Into your hand they are delivered. ³Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you. And as I gave you the green plants, I give you everything. ⁴But you shall not eat flesh with its life, that is, its blood. ⁵And for your lifeblood I will require a reckoning: from every beast I will require it and from man. From his fellow man I will require a reckoning for the life of man. ⁶Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed, for God made man in his own image. ⁷And you, be fruitful and multiply, teem on the earth and multiply in it." (Gen. 9:1–7)

Likewise, the new cultural mandate after the Flood judgment was not identical to, but similar to the original cultural mandate given to Adam and Eve, because the new cultural mandate was given to the Noahic covenant community in the historical context of the resumption of the covenant of common grace. Moreover, the new cultural mandate was suitable in the fallen and sinful world where the covenant community and non-covenant community may live together until the day of the Second Coming of Christ.

The Noahic covenant community in the Ark was the covenant community in the theocratic Kingdom, which typified the heavenly Kingdom of God. However, the theocratic Kingdom in the Ark ceased as soon as the covenant community walked out of the Ark, after the Flood judgment ended and the present earth was created. As the theocratic Kingdom in the Ark faded away, God gave a new cultural mandate to the Noahic covenant community in the historical context of the resumption of the covenant of common grace. In that sense, as God recovered the covenant of common grace in Genesis 8:20–9:17, the Noahic covenant community began to live their lives as *the diaspora and pilgrims* on the present earth. Moses noted that "the sons of Noah" going out from the Ark began to disperse: "18 The sons of Noah who went forth from the ark were Shem, Ham, and Japheth. (Ham was the father of Canaan.) 19 These three were the sons of Noah, and from these the people of the whole earth were dispersed" (Gen 9:18–19). We need to focus on verse 19: "These three were the sons of Noah, and from these the people of the whole earth were dispersed." Here, Moses emphasized that the people from "the sons of Noah" began to scatter after the Flood judgment. This is significant, because the Noahic covenant community after the Flood judgment lived their lives as *the diaspora and pilgrims*. It is noteworthy that they lived their lives as the diaspora after the resumption of the covenant of common grace in Genesis 8:20–9:17.

Nevertheless, Noah's descendants as the Babel community rejected living their lives as the diaspora, and began to build the Babel Tower. The Babel Tower was a symbol of wicked sinners' arrogance against God, idolizing their knowledge, intelligence, power, skill, strength, and wisdom. As we have indicated, God gave the new cultural mandate to the Noahic covenant community after the Flood judgment (Gen. 9:1–7). An aspect of the new cultural mandate is to "be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth" (v.1). In order for this to happen, they had to disperse and spread continuously, building new communities in new areas on the present earth.

However, the Babel community decided to stop dispersing and filling the earth, rather gathered together against God, becoming the servants of the Kingdom of Satan. Genesis 11:4 summarizes the comprehensive picture of the Babel community, building “a city and a tower,” heading “its tops in the heavens,” and rejecting to disperse over “the face of the whole earth,” going against God’s new cultural mandate:

Now the whole earth had one language and the same words. ²And as people migrated from the east, they found a plain in the land of Shinar and settled there. ³And they said to one another, “Come, let us make bricks, and burn them thoroughly.” And they had brick for stone, and bitumen for mortar. ⁴Then they said, “Come, let us build ourselves a city and a tower with its top in the heavens, and let us make a name for ourselves, lest we be dispersed over the face of the whole earth.” ⁵And the LORD came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of man had built. ⁶And the LORD said, “Behold, they are one people, and they have all one language, and this is only the beginning of what they will do. And nothing that they propose to do will now be impossible for them. ⁷Come, let us go down and there confuse their language, so that they may not understand one another’s speech.” ⁸So the LORD dispersed them from there over the face of all the earth, and they left off building the city. ⁹Therefore its name was called Babel, because there the LORD confused the language of all the earth. And from there the LORD dispersed them over the face of all the earth. (Gen. 11:1–9).

Once again, dispersing and scattering over the present earth was God’s will under the principle of the new cultural mandate. However, the Babel community became the servants of the Kingdom of Satan, who were in their hearts against the Kingdom of God. As recounted in verse 4, “Then they said, ‘Come, let us build ourselves a city and a tower with its top in the heavens, and let us make a name for ourselves, lest we be dispersed over the face of the whole earth.’” This demonstrates the culmination of the wicked thoughts and actions of the Babel community against God. Moreover the statement, “lest we be dispersed over the face of the whole earth” (v.4), is the reflection of the *anti-diaspora* spirit of the Babel community as well. Afterwards, the triune God came

18. For a biblical theological discussion of the distinction between clean and unclean animals, the prohibition of eating animal blood, and the institution of capital punishment in light of the resumption of the covenant of common grace in Genesis 8:20–9:17, see Jeon, *Biblical Theology*, 46–57; Kline, *Kingdom Prologue*, 250–60.

down to the Babel community and cursed them, confusing their one language so that they were not able to communicate amongst each other. We need to pay special attention to verse 9: “Therefore its name was called Babel, because there the LORD confused the language of all the earth. And from there the LORD dispersed them over the face of all the earth.” It signifies that the Lord cursed the Babel community, confusing their one language and forcefully dispersed them, filling “the face of all the earth” to live their lives as *diaspora* or *pilgrims*, an important aspect of the new cultural mandate.

When God resumed the covenant of common grace in Genesis 8:20–9:17, he revealed several regulations for the covenant community to follow and obey. They are the regulations of the food law, the prohibition of eating animal blood, and the institution of capital punishment.¹⁸ The regulation of the food law is related to the formation and maintenance of the theocratic kingdom after the Fall outside of the Garden of Eden. The Garden of Eden was the original theocratic kingdom before the Fall on the earth. After the Fall, God formed a theocratic kingdom in the Ark. After the inauguration of the Sinaitic covenant, God instituted a theocratic kingdom in the Promised Land. The earthly theocratic kingdoms before and after the Fall were the types of the theocratic kingdom in heaven. The distinction between clean and unclean animals is closely related to the formation of theocratic kingdoms after the Fall. In redemptive history, God revealed the distinction between clean and unclean animals in the process of the formation of the theocratic kingdom in the Ark:

Then the LORD said to Noah, “Go into the ark, you and all your household, for I have seen that you are righteous before me in this generation. ² Take with you seven pairs of all clean animals, the male and his mate, and a pair of the animals that are not clean, the male and his mate, ³ and seven pairs of the birds of the heavens also, male and female, to keep their offspring alive on the face of all the earth (Gen. 7:1–3).

As God made the distinction between clean and unclean animals before the Noahic covenant community entered the Ark, he demonstrated that the theocratic kingdom in the Ark would be inaugurated with the visible execution of the Flood judgment. As the theocratic kingdom in the Ark ceased after the Flood judgment, God removed the distinction between clean and unclean animals. In that sense, it is significant to recognize that the distinction between clean and unclean animals is closely tied to the formation and continuation of the theocratic

kingdom on the earth after the Fall. Furthermore, it is important to recognize that God allowed the covenant community to consume all the animals without any distinction between clean and unclean animals in the historical context of the resumption of the covenant of common grace after the Flood judgment.

After the Sinaitic covenant was inaugurated, God formed a theocratic kingdom of Israel in the Promised Land. Once again, God made a distinction between clean and unclean animals, as well as clean and unclean people. This distinction was removed in the historical context of the resumption of the covenant of common grace in Genesis 8:20–9:17. So, the covenant community of Israel had to follow the regulations of food law, given by God through the Mosaic law (Lev. 11:1–47; Deut. 14:1–21). Under the Mosaic covenant, God commanded them not to eat the unclean living creatures. The punishment for violating the regulations of the food law was capital punishment, stoning to death in the covenant community of Israel.

However, as the New Covenant Age was inaugurated through the life, death, resurrection, ascension, and session at the right hand of God of Jesus Christ, the mediator of the New Covenant, the distinction between clean and unclean animals, along with clean and unclean people, is permanently removed by God in Jesus Christ for the New Covenant community. The Pentecost event was the audible and visible sign of the beginning of the New Covenant Age, as well as the inauguration of the theocratic kingdom in heaven. In this manner, the eschatological Kingdom of God was inaugurated with the beginning of Jesus Christ's reign at the right hand of God in heaven. So God permanently removed the distinction between clean and unclean animals on behalf of the New Covenant community so that the members of the New Covenant community are able to consume all the living creatures for the glory of God in Jesus Christ (Acts 10: 9–23; 1 Cor. 8:1–13; 10:23–33).

Although God removed the distinction between clean and unclean animals under the new cultural mandate, he prohibited consuming animal blood: "But you shall not eat flesh with its life, that is, its blood" (Gen. 9:4). It is God's sovereign wisdom when he commanded not to eat animal blood for the covenant community. It is God's pedagogical lesson that animal blood, shed and offered in altar worship after the inauguration of the covenant of grace in Genesis 3:14–15, is the type of the final sacrifice and redemptive blood, shed and offered on the Golgotha by Jesus Christ. After the inauguration of the New Covenant, animal sacrifice was continued in the temple of Jerusalem. That is the reason why the

Jerusalem Council, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, prohibited the consumption of animal blood even after the inauguration of the New Covenant Age (Acts 15:19–29). God executed his judgment through the covenant lawsuit against the covenant community of Israel who disobeyed the Mosaic covenant of law. He used the pagan soldiers of the Roman Empire to remove the covenant community of Israel from the Promised Land, which was a holy land, pouring his infinite wrath against them in A.D. 70. In doing so, God permanently removed earthly altar worship and terminated the Old Covenant order as well. In that sense, the New Covenant community as *the diaspora or pilgrims* is no longer obligated to abstain from animal blood after A.D. 70.

As God recovered the covenant of common grace in Genesis 8:20–9:17, he manifested his wisdom to keep communities, societies, and various nations out of anarchy with the institution of capital punishment.¹⁹ In light of the mission of God, it is necessary to have stable communities and nations, so that believers as *the covenant diaspora or pilgrims* may proclaim the good news of the Gospel as they are constantly dispersed and

19. God revealed the covenant of common grace in Genesis 3:16–19 after he proclaimed the *protevangelium* in Genesis 3:15 in light of the covenant of grace. After God expelled Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden, God revealed the institution of the contemporary state as the visible realm under the covenant of common grace to Cain. Kline views Genesis 4:15 as the origin of the state in light of the covenant of common grace, inaugurated in Genesis 3:16–19: "There is then no reference in Gen 4:15 to an unspecified wonder-sign that God performed for Cain's assurance, with the reader left to speculate about what it might have been. And certainly the language does not suggest a 'mark of Cain' imprinted on his body. Such interpretations assume that Cain was being given a special individual guarantee, but that, as we have seen, is not the point of the passage. It is rather concerned with a general world-order that would condition the life of all men. The meaning of the passage will therefore be brought out if we translate, not 'And Yahweh gave a sign to Cain,' but 'Thus Yahweh signified to Cain that...'"

"The author's concern with the subject of God's judicial relation to men is attested once again in Gen 4 when he turns from the Cainite succession to the line of Seth (vv. 25, 26). For he encapsulates the nature of this community in their act of confessing (naming) Yahweh as covenant Lord, to whom their judicial appeal was directed. There is, of course, a radical difference between the exercise of God's *imperium* that is in view in Gen 4:15, and his vindication of the blood of Abel and the martyr-seed of the woman restored in the line of Seth and continuing to the last judgment (cf. Rev 6:10, 11). To Cain, God signified that for mankind in general he would provide in his common grace an institutional agent to bear the sword of his wrath in the temporal course of world history (cf. Rom 13:4). For the people of his covenant, God's judicial vindication is an act of his saving grace, a coming in personal immediacy as their eschatological, redemptive Avenger." Meredith G. Kline, "Oracular Origin of State," in *Essential Writings of Meredith G. Kline* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2017), 60–61.

scattered unto the ends of the earth. In God's proclamation of the new cultural mandate, he prohibited the killing of an innocent human:

⁵ And for your lifeblood I will require a reckoning: from every beast I will require it and from man. From his fellow man I will require a reckoning for the life of man.

⁶ "Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed, for God made man in his own image." (Gen. 9:5-6)

God honors the unique sanctity of a human's life and institutes capital punishment as he says, "Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed, for God made man in his own image" (v.6).²⁰ The institution of capital punishment demonstrates that God created man as the *imago Dei*, which indicates that God clothed him with his righteousness, holiness, and wisdom, engraving the ten commandments as moral law

20. Interpreting Genesis 9:6, Calvin affirms capital punishment that God bestowed the authority to the magistrates of state "for the avenging of slaughter" so that the murderer may be punished with death penalty: "Therefore, however magistrates may connive at the crime, God sends executioners from other quarters, who shall render unto sanguinary men their reward. God so threatens and denounces vengeance against the murderer, that he even arms the magistrate with the sword for the avenging of slaughter, in order that the blood of men may not be shed with impunity." Calvin, *Genesis*, 9:6.

21. Richard Hays is a representative scholar who colors Jesus Christ's teaching on the Sermon on the Mount as the founder of pacifism or nonviolence. The fundamental problem lies in the fact that he doesn't read it in light of the proper distinction between church and state: "Our exegetical investigation of Matthew 5:38-48 has led to the conclusion that the passage teaches a norm of nonviolent love of enemies. Within the context of Matthew's Gospel, the directive to 'turn the other cheek' functions as more than a bare rule; instead, as a 'focal instance' of discipleship, it functions metonymically, illuminating the life of a covenant community that is called to live in radical faithfulness to the vision of the kingdom of God disclosed in Jesus' teaching and example. Taken alone, this text would certainly preclude any justification for Jesus' disciples to resort to violence. The question that we must now consider is how Matthew's vision of the peaceful community fits into the larger witness of the canonical New Testament. Do the other texts in the canon reinforce the Sermon on the Mount's teaching on nonviolence, or do they provide other options that might allow or require Christians to take up the sword?... Clearly it is possible for a Christian to be a soldier, possible for a Christian to fight. But if we ask the larger question about the vocation of the community, the New Testament witness comes clearly into focus: the community is called to the work of reconciliation and—as a part of that vocation—suffering even in the face of great injustice. When the identity of the community is understood in these terms, the place of the soldier within the church can only be seen as anomalous." Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics* (New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers, 1996), 329, 337.

in his heart. The violation of the sixth commandment of "You shall not murder" (Ex. 20:13) is a serious crime, not only against the sanctity of human life but also against God's commandment. God's institution of capital punishment in the historical context of the command of the new cultural mandate suggests that God made a proper distinction between church and state. So, the prosecution and execution of criminals who commit the crime of killing of innocent people do not belong to the ministry of church, but are the legal responsibility of the state.

Reading and interpreting Jesus Christ's famous Sermon on the Mount, many people have assumed that he was a pacifist during his earthly ministry (Matt. 5:1-7:29). Picturing Jesus Christ as the founder of pacifism, based upon the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount, is a fundamental misreading and misapplication of his teachings.²¹ In short, Jesus Christ's message through this discourse is not a call to pacifism but to eschatological mission, given to the New Covenant community so that believers under the New Covenant Age may exercise the heart attitude and spirit of "Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you" (v. 44). Likewise, the message of the heart attitude for eschatological mission sums up well here:

43 "You have heard that it was said, 'You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' 44 But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, 45 so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven. For he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust. 46 For if you love those who love you, what reward do you have? Do not even the tax collectors do the same? 47 And if you greet only your brothers, what more are you doing than others? Do not even the Gentiles do the same? 48 You therefore must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." (Matt. 5:43-48).

The message of "Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you" is the message of eschatological mission, which should be followed and practiced by believers under the New Covenant Age. God bestows the benefits of the covenant of common grace, recovered in Genesis 8:20-9:17 without any discrimination between the elect and reprobate, so that he sovereignly takes care of the elect and reprobate with temporary and earthly blessings as long as world history continues on the present earth. Jesus Christ as the mediator of the New Covenant in fact revealed that God temporarily blesses and loves even the reprobate, bestowing the blessings of the covenant of common grace, when

he proclaimed, “For he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust” (v.45). Likewise, Jesus Christ made a proper distinction between the covenant of common grace and the covenant of grace, as well as a proper distinction between church and state as the theocratic kingdom of Israel in the Promised Land began to fade away with the inauguration of the New Covenant Age.

The New Covenant Age was inaugurated with Jesus Christ’s life, death, bodily resurrection, ascension, session at the right hand of God in heaven, and the Pentecost event. The exalted and glorified Jesus Christ already began to rule the visible and invisible realms as “King of kings and Lord of lords” (Rev. 17:14; 19:16). The exalted Jesus Christ rules the church as the head of the church through the indwelling works of the Holy Spirit and the Word of God. However, he rules the state *indirectly*, by appointing government authorities. In that sense, a proper distinction between church and state should be maintained until the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. In light of this, even under the New Covenant, the continuity of capital punishment is valid. For example, the apostle Paul affirmed that God endowed to the government authorities to execute penalties, including capital punishment against criminals:

Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God. ² Therefore whoever resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment. ³ For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad. Would you have no fear of the one who is in authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive his approval, ⁴ for he is God’s servant for your good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword in vain. For he is the servant of God, an avenger who carries out God’s wrath on the wrongdoer. ⁵ Therefore one must be in subjection, not only to avoid God’s wrath but also for the sake of conscience. ⁶ For the same reason you also pay taxes, for the authorities are ministers of God, attending to this very thing. ⁷ Pay to all what is owed to them: taxes to whom taxes are owed, revenue to whom revenue is owed, respect to whom respect is owed, honor to whom honor is owed. (Rom. 13:1–7)

When Paul wrote the epistle to the Romans, the New Covenant Age had already been inaugurated for approximately two decades. The good news of the Gospel began to spread powerfully “in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end of the earth” under the guidance of the

Holy Spirit through the missionary endeavors of the original apostles, Paul, and other believers, just as Jesus Christ prophesied to the original apostles right before his ascension to heaven (Acts 1:8). Even as Jesus Christ maintained a proper distinction between church and state during his earthly ministry, so the apostle Paul maintained a proper distinction between church and state under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, affirming that the execution of penalties, including capital punishment, belongs to the governing authority of the state, which was ordained by God. Paul insists that the state is “the servant of God” who rules and executes penalties against criminals on behalf of God. In particular, Paul warrants capital punishment and its careful and proper execution by government authorities in verse 4: “for he is God’s servant for your good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword in vain. For he is the servant of God, an avenger who carries out God’s wrath on the wrongdoer.”²² Paul’s remark that “if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword in vain” highlights that God ordained the execution of capital punishment against killers of innocent humans, and the proper execution of capital punishment does not belong to the ministry of church but the governing authority of state until the Second Coming of Jesus Christ.

SUMMARY

Through the Noahic Flood judgment, God demonstrated a type of the final judgment, separating the Noahic covenant community in the Ark and the non-covenant community outside of the Ark. Jesus Christ as the consummate redemptive-historical theologian compared the Noahic Flood judgment with the final judgment which will occur on the day of his Second Coming (Matt. 24:36–44). It is noteworthy that “on the very same day” (Gen. 7:13) signifies that the Flood judgment was a *concomitant event* between the blessings of

22. Reflecting on Romans 13:4, Calvin properly argues that God bestowed the authority for the magistrate of state to execute capital punishment against “the guilty with death.” In doing so, Calvin adds that the magistrate executes “God’s vengeance,” obeying his commands: “This is the same as if it had been said, that he is an executioner of God’s wrath; and this he shows himself to be by having the sword, which the Lord has delivered into his hand. This is a remarkable passage for the purpose of proving the right of the sword; for if the Lord, by arming the magistrate, has also committed to him the use of the sword, whenever he visits the guilty with death, by executing God’s vengeance, he obeys his commands. Contend then do they with God who think it unlawful to shed the blood of wicked men.” Calvin, *Epistle to the Romans*, 13:4.

life in the Ark and curses of death outside of the Ark. Nevertheless, there was a *logical and chronological order* to God's saving of the Noahic covenant community in the Ark *before* he poured out his infinite wrath of death against the non-covenant community.

The Flood judgment was not a local but a global judgment, which covered the entire original earth. The universal Flood judgment was God's pictorial and typological demonstration that the final judgment will also be global and universal on the day of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. God did not separate the elect and reprobate, but rather the covenant community and non-covenant community through the Flood judgment. For example, Ham was saved during the Flood judgment, entering into the Ark as a member of the Noahic covenant community. Nevertheless, the Bible describes Ham as not a member of the elect who received the benefits of salvation and redemptive blessings (Gen. 9:22–25).

God waged holy war against the original wicked world and the non-covenant community who followed the spirit of the Kingdom of Satan. In doing so, God temporarily withheld the benefits of the covenant of common grace, inaugurated in Genesis 3:16–19. The physical death of the non-covenant community was only the beginning of God's infinite wrath, based upon his infinite holiness and righteousness. He sent the souls of all the dead to hell, which is an invisible realm. Certainly, the souls in hell will experience the bodily resurrection of the wicked as "the resurrection of judgment" on the day of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. They will then be thrown into the Kingdom of Satan, which will be the consummation of hell (John 5:25–29).

God's covenantal background to execute his Flood judgment against the non-covenant community was the Adamic covenant of works, made in Genesis 2:15–17. God remembered the covenant of works which was broken by the first Adam when he poured out his wrath during the Flood judgment. He poured out his wrath against the sinners outside of the Ark, including innocent babies, through the covenant lawsuit, based upon the broken covenant of works by the first Adam (Gen. 7:17–24). In doing so, he revealed the reality of the original sin and its immediate imputation to all the descendants of the first Adam.

The Flood judgment was not only God's redemptive judgment upon the original sinful world, but also the recreation process of the present earth. The present earth emerged as God dried up the flooded earth through his creative and mighty wind (Gen. 8:13–19). God demonstrated the pictorial and typological pattern of the eternal Kingdom of God as the Ark arrived on the

Mount Ararat after the Flood judgment. In fact, Noah saw the typological picture of "a new heaven and a new earth" and "the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband," united with "a new earth" when the apostle John saw the prophetic vision through a revelation (Rev. 22:1–2).

The Noahic Flood judgment was not the final judgment, so world history can continue until the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. God provided the continuity and stability of world history on the present earth through the recovery of the covenant of common grace in Genesis 8:20–9:17.

God gave the original cultural mandate to Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden before the Fall (Gen. 1:26–31). However, God adjusted the original cultural mandate into the new cultural mandate, so that the covenant community and non-covenant community can dwell together in the midst of the present earth, created by the Flood judgment (Gen. 9:1–7). In addition, God gave the new cultural mandate in the fallen and sinful world until the day of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ.

The Noahic covenant community began to live their lives as *the diaspora and pilgrims* in the present earth after the Flood judgment (Gen. 9:18–19). An important aspect of the new cultural mandate is to "be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth" (Gen. 9:1). In order to do so, people had to be scattered and spread constantly, building new communities in new areas on the present earth. Nevertheless, the Babel community, as the servants of the Kingdom of Satan, rejected this command. So, the Lord cursed the Babel community, confusing their one language and forcefully dispersing them to live their lives as *the diaspora and pilgrims*.

When God resumed the covenant of common grace in Genesis 8:20–9:17, he revealed several regulations for the covenant community, such as the food law, the prohibition of eating animal blood, and the institution of capital punishment. God revealed the distinction between clean and unclean animals in the process of the formation of the theocratic kingdom in the Ark (Gen. 7:1–3). As the theocratic kingdom in the Ark ceased after the Flood judgment, God removed the distinction between clean and unclean animals. In doing so, God allowed the covenant community to consume all the animals in the historical context of the resumption of the covenant of common grace (Gen. 9:3).

Although God removed the distinction between clean and unclean animals, allowing the covenant community to consume all the animals through the new

Continued on Page 220.

they were led to prayer and praise and to “acknowledge sin, profess faith, and renounce evil.”⁸⁹

What made everything from the opening hymn to the closing benediction new was not so much the ‘elements’ themselves, but the theology that informed them. With the Roman Catholic liturgy on one side and the Extremists on the other, in 1525, Luther composed an order of service that reflected both God’s action and man’s response. To him, both were central and provided a unified way of understanding public worship. It was God’s action that elicited man’s response.⁹⁰ For the troubled people of Wittenberg, a liturgy like this one would lead them to consider their true condition, hear of an afflicted Christ, find comfort for their weary souls in the Gospel, and be encouraged to respond with faith. The same still rings true today.

CONCLUSION

Luther’s words at the dedication of the castle church in Torgau hinted at the core of his theology of worship. “The Lord himself speaks . . . and we in turn speak . . .”⁹¹ In the gathered assembly, God serves man and in response man serves the Lord. Public worship is first a divine activity, which creates and compels corporate expressions of faith. Contra late medieval practices, it is not a ‘doing of what is in one’s self’ nor an opportunity for ‘grace to make one gracious.’ Instead, it is “an example of divine grace in action.”⁹² Luther’s view of preaching further reinforced this point. God is at work to meet the sinner in his struggles with *Anfechtungen* through his audible and sacramental Word. But as the Law and Gospel are heralded, a response of faith is called for. There is to be an intentional reaction of humility, repentance, gratefulness, and devotion. Luther’s 1525 liturgy took his doctrine of worship and converted it into a structure for doxology; in fact, it was the foundation and the fuel of his order of worship.

In a church context where the gathered assembly is increasingly being referred to as a ‘worship experience,’ Luther would no doubt disapprove, because Modern Evangelical worship is one sided. Liturgies are dominated by human action, leaving little room for divine activity in Word and Sacrament. They are focused on man’s response without first considering God’s past, present, and future work. The preached Word is minimized, in order to provide longer music sets or more extensive choral performances. Scripture is made to give way to singing, which, given song choices, centers worship on man blessing God, as opposed to God blessing man, through

90. Hans-Christoph Schmidt-Lauber, “The Lutheran Tradition in the German Lands,” pp. 396, 398.

91. Martin Luther, quoted from “The Lutheran Tradition in the German Lands,” p. 396.

92. Trueman, *Luther on the Christian Life*, p. 196.

Gospel proclamation. Additionally, the sacraments are seen as a public profession solely, to the exclusion of God declaring the visible Good News that he saves sinners in Christ and by the Spirit. These worship practices are built upon a theological foundation that leans too far in the direction of human response. Luther, however, provides a helpful perspective on and balance to the public gathering. Public worship is a service: God’s to man, first and foremost, and in response, man’s to God. The Evangelical Church in America would do well to benefit from Luther’s theology of worship in this area.

The Noahic Covenants and Redemptive Judgment. Continued from Page 162.

cultural mandate, he prohibited consuming animal blood (Gen. 9:4). It is God’s pedagogical lesson that animal blood offered in altar worship after the inauguration of the covenant of grace in Genesis 3:14–15 is the type of the final sacrifice, offered on the Golgotha by Jesus Christ as the mediator of the New Covenant. The New Covenant community, as *the diaspora or pilgrims*, is no longer obligated to abstain from animal blood after A.D. 70 because God permanently terminated altar worship and the Old Covenant order with the fall of Jerusalem.

God prohibited the killing of innocent humans in the context of his command of the new cultural mandate (Gen. 9:5–6). God’s institution of capital punishment in the historical context of the resumption of the covenant of common grace suggests that God made a proper distinction between church and state. In that sense, the prosecution and execution of criminals for the crime of killing of innocent people do not belong to the ministry of church, but are the legal responsibility of state under the New Covenant Age until the day of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. ■

Reviews & Responses. Continued from Page 180.

Jews and gentiles can get out of the covenant of works altogether” (139).

Part two is entitled “The Achievement of Justification,” and therefore treats of Christ’s accomplishment of perfection. Horton, agreeing with Lee Irons, rejects N.T. Wright’s definition of the Greek word “*dikaiois*” as being equivalent to “God’s covenant faithfulness,” and instead ties the term to the standard of the law. The second half of chapter four is a defense of the penal substitutionary atonement. Horton also defends the combination of penal substitutionary atonement with the *Christus Victor* theme, rightly in my opinion. There is no need for a false dichotomy between the two ideas. Christ’s death and resurrection is just as undoubtedly a substitution for our persons as it is Christ’s victory over Satan and his evil forces. However, this does not mean that there is something good about the ransom theory of the atonement (243). Here, I believe Sproul is on the better track: God saves us from God’s