

*In Defense of Antinomianism:
A New Covenant Theology of the Holy Spirit
and the Charge of Antinomianism,
or
The Three Uses of the Mosaic Law versus
the Three Ministries of the Holy Spirit*

*And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come.
And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will,
let him take the water of life freely.*

Revelation 22:17

Introduction:

Calvinist Cartoons by **EDDIE EDDINGS**

Beware the
Lawless Antinomians
on the Open Road of Life



Source: *Calvinistic Cartoons*, by Eddie Eddings at
<http://calvinisticcartoons.blogspot.com/search/label/antinomian>
[accessed 22 July 2010]

A. The Accusation of *Antinomianism* and our Responses to the Accusation

1. The understandable tendency towards defensiveness when faced with the accusation
2. Questions that must be asked:
 - 1) Who frames the debate?
 - 2) Are we allowing error to set the agenda?
 - 3) What should be our pattern when facing false accusations on the part of those who are committed to error?

B. The Definitions of *Antinomianism*

Recommended Sources: SHERK, Kevan, Packer

1. Two types:

1) Doctrinal Antinomianism

2) Practical Antinomianism

2. Six types:¹

1) Dualistic Antinomianism

2) Spirit-Centered Antinomianism

3) Christ-Centered Antinomianism

4) Dispensational Antinomianism

5) Dialectical Antinomianism

6) Situationist Antinomianism

C. The History of *Antinomianism* (mainline, i.e. apart from fringe groups and cults)

Recommended Sources: articles by A. H. Newman and G. Kamerau in SHERK

1. Pre-Reformation – New Testament, Gnostics, etc.

2. German Reformation – John Agricola (1492-1566)

3. English Reformation – Tobias Crisp (1600-1643)

4. Colonial American Puritans – Anne Hutchinson (1590/1591-1643)

5. English Particular Baptists – John Ryland (1723-1792), John Gill (1697-1771), Augustus Toplady (1740-1778), John Brine (1703-1765), William Huntington (1747-1813)

¹ James I. Packer, *Concise Theology: A Guide to Historic Christian Beliefs* (Wheaton: Tyndale House, 1993). Cited by Joel Gillespie, “The Christian Heresy of Antinomianism, Reprise” (September 19, 2007), and “Antinomianism II” (February 2, 2007), *Greensboro NC Christian* at <http://joelblog.wordpress.com/?s=Antinomianism> [accessed 25 May 2010].

6. Modern American Evangelicals – Zane Hodges (1932-2008)

D. The Issues with *Antinomianism* per se

- 1. Third use of the law**
- 2. Relationship between faith and repentance**
- 3. Relationship between Gospel and Law**

I. The Three Uses of the Old Covenant Law

A. The Three Uses of the Old Covenant Law in Confessional Tradition²

- 1. Convict of sin and drive repentant sinner to Christ**
- 2. Restraint of lawlessness in society**
- 3. The rule of life for the believer**

B. The Three Uses of the Old Covenant Law and the Implicit Denial of the Sufficiency of Scripture

It is high time that we suspended debate over the 3rd use of the Old Covenant Law! Instead of engaging in this debate, we should be speaking up for the 3rd use, along with the 4th use of the Old Covenant Law!

The third use of the Old Covenant Law is for “correction”, and the 4th use is for “instruction in righteousness”! Based on 2 Tim. 3:15-17 the four uses of the Old Covenant Law would be and should be:

1. Doctrine
2. Reproof
3. Correction
4. Instruction in Righteousness

However, these four uses of the Old Covenant Law are identical to the uses for History, Poetry and Prophecy, indeed for all of Scripture! The Old Covenant Law is no more and no less the “rule of life” for the believer than any other portion of Scripture. The Old Covenant Law is no more and no less profitable for the believer than the other portions of the Old Testament. To elevate the Old Covenant Law to a pedestal of “profit” as “The Rule of Life” over and above the rest of the Old Testament is to reveal the inherent legalism of those who “grind this ax”! Their partial or incipient theonomic bent is worn on their sleeve at the expense of the historical, poetic and prophetic portions of the Old Testament!

Would you object to “red letter” editions of the Bible as being in error in suggesting that there is some quasi supra-inspired quality to the words of Christ that should be distinguished from the rest of Scripture? Isn’t this what the covenantal nomists do with the Law? Aren’t they insisting that the commandments, i.e. “law” of Scripture is more authoritative or significant for our salvation and sanctification than other portions of

² Richard Brooks, “Antinomianism – The Present Confusion, Part 1”, The Banner of Truth (2005).

Scripture? Aren't they in effect arguing in effect for a "red letter" edition of the Scriptures where the commandments, the Law, is highlighted as in "red letters"? Unless they are willing to admit that this proposed "3rd use" is valid for all of Scripture, then I fail to see how they can avoid such an implication!

Consider the example of Paul's use of the Old Testament Scriptures in 1 Corinthians.³

C. The Three Uses of the Old Covenant Law and the Construction of New Covenant Nomism

More to the point, if we encounter those who still insist on the "3rd use" for our sanctification, they need to be confronted with the danger of this "nomism"! This "reconstruction" indicts them as sinners (Gal. 2:17), transgressors of the Law that they have re-erected (Gal. 2:18). Worse yet, their "reconstruction" of the Law for sanctification indicts Christ Himself as "the minister of sin"! If the epistle to the Galatians means anything, if the words of these verses mean anything, Paul would not countenance any "3rd use", nor would he tolerate those who proposed such a use!

1. The Question Asked Concerning a Change in the Old Covenant Law

What is the significance of a change in the Law?

Hebrews 7:12 - *For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.*

Acts 6:14 - *For we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us.*

Isn't the point here that the one aspect of the Law being changed points to or requires a change from one Law to another, different Law, not merely an internal or partial change, i.e., not just a change within the existing Law at that one point, but rather an entire "replacement" of the existing Law by something else?

Now, some will rise to the occasion by pointing out that this, i.e., the priesthood, is part of the "ceremonial law", and that "part" could be changed along with the "civil" without requiring a change in the entire law. How convenient! So the Law didn't change, only the priesthood, the ceremonial "law" within the "Law"! Apparently the author of Hebrews did not understand that, though, or it would have been clarified here. It would have been spelled out for us as such. This is an issue so critical that it would not be left implicit, or assumed. It would not have been left out of the argument. This understanding certainly may not be exegeted. For those with covenantal baggage it must be eisegeted to maintain their "tripartite Law". They end

³ Appendix I. Also, E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1957), pp. 10-11, 20-21, 150-187.

up, in effect, with three “laws”, rather than one! Those who go to the mat in defense of “the unity of the Covenant of Grace” end up being “hoist on their own petard” when they so cavalierly tear down the unity of the Law. But, let’s not go there! Let’s only take from this passage the principle explicit on the face of it, i.e. changes from the Law require the Law itself to be changed.

2. The Fact Established Concerning a Change in the Old Covenant Law

The Change of the Priesthood – Heb. 7:12

Let us now turn not to what some would spin off as the ceremonial or civil aspects of the Law, but to its very heart, to the Decalogue itself. Has a change in the Law been posited by those who teach an “eternal moral law”?

What is the significance of a change in the Sabbath? I.e., can the Day be changed, despite the argued retention of an “unchanged” or “retained” principle, and the Law not be changed?

Can the change of the Day be maintained without violating the “jot and tittle” integrity of the Law?

Matthew 5:18 - For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

Luke 16:17 - And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.

The questions may well be asked:

- 1) Has all been fulfilled?
- 2) Have heaven and earth passed?
- 3) Has a jot, a tittle, or more passed/failed when the Seventh Day has been erased from the stone tablets, and replaced by the First Day?
- 4) Was the Law words on stone, commandments consisting of letters and words, words and sentences containing marks and small letters known as jots and tittles?
- 5) Or, was the Law just a principle that could be maintained while changing the words?⁴

⁴ “If any should claim that while we have indeed proved **a Christian Lord's day, instituted by the apostles** and graciously owned by God, nevertheless we Have not proved that **the Sabbath of the fourth commandment remains in force under a change of day**, we answer....**The fourth commandment is an inseparable constituent**

- 6) May the Law be construed as a principle, or a set of principles that may be maintained regardless of what happens to the words that originally communicated those “principles”?

3. The Time Revealed Concerning a Change in the Old Covenant Law

The change to the Sabbath insisted on cannot be consistently maintained without granting that it requires a change to the entire Law if Hebrews 7:12 is comprehensible. The only question is when this change to the Law transpired.

Galatians 3:19-4:2 – [19] *Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, **till** the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. [20] Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one. [21] Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. [22] But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. [23] But **before** faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should **afterwards** be revealed. [24] Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. [25] But **after** that faith is come, we are **no longer** under a schoolmaster. [26] For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. [27] For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. [28] There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. [29] And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. [4:1] Now I say, That the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; [2] But is under tutors and governors **until the time appointed of the father.***

Let there be no doubt that the change of the priesthood and the change of the Sabbath are inextricably linked temporally as the changes are directly caused by the same event.

of the Decalogue, which was the foundation of God's throne and the basis of his covenant with his Church. This law is wholly moral (**except the mere element of the particular day in the fourth commandment**)....All the Reformers agree that the Lord's day is of perpetual use and obligation in the sense of **Christ's version of the Sabbath**....It appears evident, therefore, that an institution **having unchanged purposes and relations, enacted at creation, re-enacted with added sacredness on Sinai, and re-enacted with added associations and obligations by the apostles**, must be the *same institution, in spite of the mere change of day.*” (emphasis mine) A. A. Hodge, *Sabbath, The Day Changed: The Sabbath Preserved*, at <http://www.apuritansmind.com/TheLordsDay/AAHodgeSabbath.htm> [accessed 5 MAY 2010].

Transition:

“Does NCT teach antinomianism?”

ANSWER: Well, that depends upon how one defines ‘antinomianism’. For someone who believes that a rejection of the Ten Commandments as a *unit* is tantamount to antinomianism, then we are guilty as charged. (Of course, we would then argue that Jesus and Paul and Peter were antinomian in the same way.) However, if by antinomianism we mean something like, “a belief that adherents are not obligated to obey any code of law or commandments,” then we are certainly *not* antinomian. We affirm with all the vigor we can muster that Jesus Christ is Lord (and lords issue commands that must be kept by their subjects). Anyone who claims to be a Christian and yet refuses to obey Christ, or regards obedience with a cavalier attitude, would find us questioning (doubting?) whether his faith is genuine. The real question is not *if* Christians are obligated to obey laws, but *which* laws are obligatory. Where we provoke the ire of some is in our refusal to accept that the Decalogue is God’s eternal, universal, moral standard for all men everywhere.”⁵

As a matter of Scriptural fact, i.e. in order to be consistent with Biblical theology, the three uses of the Old Covenant Law posited by the covenantists (and others) should rather be seen as:

II. The Three Ministries of the Holy Spirit

These correspond directly to the “three uses of the Law” taught by covenantal nomians. Each of the points could be expanded on with further documentation from Scripture, but the passages cited should suffice to make the case that the Holy Spirit and not the Decalogue is the one under the New Covenant who effectually accomplishes these ends.

A. Conviction of sin, granting of repentance, leading to Christ (Jn. 16:7-10)

[7] Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.

[8] And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment:

[9] Of sin, because they believe not on me;

[10] Of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more;

B. Restraint of wickedness, evil and sin in the world at large (2 Th. 2:6-7)

[6] And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time.

[7] For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way.

⁵ Douglas Goodin, *New Covenant Journal* (2008) at <http://newcovenantjournal.com/faqs.html> [accessed 25 JAN 2010].

C. The rule of life for the believer (Rom. 8:1-10; 2 Cor. 3:1-11)

Romans 8:1-10 – [1] There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. [2] For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. [3] For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: [4] That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. [5] For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. [6] For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. [7] Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. [8] So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. [9] But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. [10] And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness.

2 Cor. 3:1-11 – [1] Do we begin again to commend ourselves? or need we, as some others, epistles of commendation to you, or letters of commendation from you? [2] Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men: [3] Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart. [4] And such trust have we through Christ to God-ward: [5] Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; [6] Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. [7] But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: [8] How shall not the ministration of the spirit be rather glorious? [9] For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. [10] For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. [11] For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious.

This last point is the most significant due to the emphasis on the “third use” on the part of those who level the charge of “antinomianism” against those who disagree with them.

We will need to consider the worthiness of the proposition of Ennomianism, or even better, Christonomianism⁶, as opposed to Nomianism (covenantal nomism), or Anomianism (1 Cor. 9:21). We will also need to consider, 1) whether we ought, at the same time, to oppose covenantal nomism by recasting the debate, and 2) to answer the question: “Are we “anti” or *anti*, or both?” We will come back to these questions!

⁶ “Supernomianism”, see Steve Fuchs note, *Antinomian or Supernomian?* Monday, December 7, 2009 at 8:50pm, on Facebook.com.

D. A New Covenant Theology of the Holy Spirit

Point to ponder: What is the essence of a New Covenant theology of the Holy Spirit?

Suggestion: More attention needs to be focused on the significance of the Upper Room Discourse for the development of a New Covenant theology of the Holy Spirit! Along with this must be an associated development of the significance of the anointing in 1 John 2:18-3:12 for this theology.

At this juncture let us just venture into this theological realm by considering the following three questions:

1. Where has the Spirit brought us? Are we between two mountains?

Hebrews 12:18-24 – [18] For **ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest,** [19] **And the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words;** which voice they that heard intreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more: [20] (For they could not endure that which was commanded, And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart: [21] And so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake:.) [22] **But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,** and to an innumerable company of angels, [23] To the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, [24] And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.

Must we go to Sinai to get to Zion, the Heavenly Jerusalem?

Can it be that there is no Zion without Sinai? Must we embrace both?

Galatians 4:21-31 – [21] Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? [22] For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. [23] But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. [24] **Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar.** [25] **For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.** [26] **But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.** [27] For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. [28] **Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.** [29] But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so

it is now. [30] **Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman. [31] So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.**

Should we be teaching that you cannot come to Jesus unless you first go to Sinai?
Should we be teaching that you cannot honor Jesus without honoring Sinai?
Or should we hear what the Scripture says, and obey it?

Cast out both the bondwoman and her son! Cast out the Mosaic Covenant and those in bondage to it! Cast out those who disobey this teaching of Paul in Galatians! No one can be heir of both!

Is there some gray area, some “wobble room”, here?

Are we between two mountains?

Pilgrim’s Progress - What was Bunyan’s take on Sinai being a pathway to Calvary?
(See Barry Horner on this)

A New Covenant Theology of the Holy Spirit must not see New Covenant “law” as either a restoration of the mythical eternal moral law in Adam’s heart under the Edenic covenant, nor a renewal of the Decalogue, the Old Covenant law written in stone, under the Sinaitic covenant. Pentecost must be seen as both radical and discontinuous in the newness of the New Covenant era it ushered in. The ministry of the enthroned Covenant, the ascended Christ, the King of glory, via the giving of His Holy Spirit at Pentecost, must not be reduced to a covenantal “appendix”, or minimized as some kind of “revised edition” of any previous covenant.

Rev. 22:17 - And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.

Let him who has ears to hear hear what the Spirit says:
“Come to Mount Zion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem!”

2. Where has the Spirit brought us? Should we be living in the “Shadowlands”?

“C.S. Lewis: Why am I so afraid? I never knew her love could hurt so much, and I love you and all I want is to love you. Beyond every door I hear your voice saying to me, “This is only the land of shadows. Real life hasn’t begun yet.”⁷

Paraphrase this Lewis quote with the voice being our’s speaking of Christ!

Col. 2:17 - Which are a **shadow** of things to come; but the body is of Christ.

Hebrews 8:5 - Who serve unto the example and **shadow** of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.

Hebrews 10:1 - For the law having a **shadow** of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect.

Consider the truth of 1 Cor. 13:1-8 after replacing “charity” with “Christ”!

1 Cor. 13:1-8 – [1] Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not Christ, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. [2] And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not Christ, I am nothing. [3] And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not Christ, it profiteth me nothing. [4] Christ suffereth long, and is kind; Christ envieth not; Christ vaunteth not Himself, is not puffed up, [5] Doth not behave Himself unseemly, seeketh not His own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; [6] Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; [7] Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. [8] Christ never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.

Rev. 22:17 - And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.

Let him who has ears to hear hear what the Spirit says:

“Come out of the “shadow lands” into the fullness of the light of His glory!”

⁷ “Memorable quotes for Shadowlands (1985) (TV)”, Internet Movie Database at <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0090005/quotes> [accessed 7 MAY 2010].

3. Where has the Spirit brought us? Has He returned us to the Land of Bondage? (Should we be confused about the yoke He has taught us to bear?)

Matthew 11:28-30 – [28] Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. [29] Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. [30] For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.

Acts 15:10 - Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?

Galatians 5:1 - Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

Rev. 22:17 - And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.

Let him who has ears to hear hear what the Spirit says:

“Come to Christ the Covenant and receive His rest for your soul, His easy yoke, and His light burden!”

Conclusion:

“Anti” or *anti*?

I did have a pronunciation issue when I moved from Connecticut to upstate New York just prior to my thirteenth birthday. The way Connecticut Yankees pronounce “aunt” and “quarter” got particular notice from my classmates at my new school. This distinction between “anti” and *anti*, is not, however, due to an accent or pronunciation problem.

First: am I antinomian? That depends on how someone defines *nomian*!!! Am I *anti-Law*? What *Law* are they talking about, and how are they using it? If they insist on speaking of a *moral law*, or as they speak of it, *the moral law*, my question to them would be, “What *moral law*? Where did you get that *moral law*? Did you get it from the hearts of *moral* Gentiles, or from the heart of Adam? And under what microscope did you read that *moral law* to come to me with it? Isn’t that the *Decalogue* I see? Where did you hide your stepladder and claw hammer? You ask me what stepladder and claw hammer? Don’t play games with me! The stepladder and claw hammer with which you climbed up on the cross of Christ and removed the *Law* that He nailed there! So go back and get the stepladder and claw hammer. Take your *Law* back to the Cross. Use the other side of the hammer, and put it back where you found it. Otherwise I have something for you. It is a very sharp knife, and the blade is surgical steel. It is sharpened to a razor edge, and will function very well for performing surgery. I have a command for you to obey. Right now! Will you obey the Apostle Paul? You may do so in the bathroom. Please clean up the mess when you are done. Then leave. Leave the Church. Leave it alone. And may God have mercy on your soul!”

Would you ask me again if I am antinomian? Do you have any doubt that there is a *nomianism* that I am adamantly opposed to? Away with the *nomianism* of the Galatianists, the Judaizers who would measure our sanctification by the Decalogue our Saviour took out of the way! Away with their “wannabe” Sabbath, and their “wet” circumcision that isn’t wet enough by far! We need to be very much “anti” this “nomianism”!

“Anti” or *anti*?

Second: am I antinomian? I would propose the correct position in line with the Biblical theology of the New Covenant would be more accurately characterized by one of the following: 1) Ennomianism, or better, 2) Christonomianism⁸, as opposed to Nomianism (covenantal nomism), or Anomianism (1 Cor. 9:21). In this case, the emphasis is on the significance of the Greek preposition *αντι*, which, rather than “against”, bears meanings that include: “instead of”, “in the place of”, or “in behalf of”.⁹

⁸ “Supernomianism”, see Steve Fuchs note, *Antinomian or Supernomian?* Monday, December 7, 2009 at 8:50pm, on Facebook.com.

⁹ F. Wilbur Gingrich, *Shorter Lexicon of the Greek New Testament* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957, 1965), pg. 18.

“Anti” or *anti*? Both! Both of the labels above (ennomian and Christonomian) express the New Covenant reality of the change in “law” ushered in by Christ’s institution of the New Covenant, and the giving of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost following His ascension. Both key on the discontinuity between the reality fulfilled under the New Covenant and the Old Covenant Law given at Sinai through Moses. Therefore, in the face of the covenantal nomism insisted on by covenant theologians both of these labels in the very nature of the case must be seen as both antinomian, and antinomian.

