

As Christians live in the modern world, it is right and good for Christians to seek to ask: How then should we live? This is simply what Christians do. We know Christ is Lord, and we know our lives ought to be devoted to serving the Lord. Should not our devotion to the Lord in *some* way have certain implications for the nature of politics? That is: does not (1) the Lordship of Christ have *some* sort of relation to (2) our thinking about the nature of political order? We might re-phrase this slightly, to say: What is the connection between (1) Christianity and (2) culture.

One option that is before us is a model which generally goes under the name “Two Kingdoms.” Currently, David VanDrunen is probably the most prolific and scholarly voice who advocates this position. It is a thoughtful and attractive option.

The purpose of this talk is as follows. First, I will summarize the key tenets of the position. Secondly, I will offer both a positive and negative critique of the position. Thirdly, I will close with a few brief theological reflections.

So, first, what is “Two Kingdoms”?

## I. *The “Two Kingdoms” Option: Key Elements*

### 1. **The place of Adam**

Adam was the pinnacle of creation, was made in God’s image, and central to this image is:

- Exercising dominion and subduing the earth.
- Being fruitful and multiplying
- And: like God, *finishing* the work and *resting* from the work.

To grasp, what VanDrunen is doing one *must* grasp the following: While Adam’s image-bearing *entails* or *consists in* exercising dominion (and all the rest), the following commands given to Adam *do not* apply to mankind *after* Adam:

- Exercising dominion and subduing the earth.
- Being fruitful and multiplying
- And: like God, *finishing* the work and *resting* from the work.

[Note: will VanDrunen be able to (1) continue to affirm that *we* are image-bearers, since (2) he connects image-bearing to these three bullet-points above, which *do not* apply to us?]

To communicate clearly: Adam failed in his dominion mandate, in being fruitful and multiplying *as a part of that image-bearing and dominion mandate*, and is indeed unable to *fulfill* his obedience and *enter into rest*.

So, as David VanDrunen sees it, man *today* does *not* have an ongoing dominion mandate.

Examples:

- “Christians will attain the original destiny of life in the world-to-come, but we do so not by picking up the task where Adam left off but by resting entirely on the work of Jesus Christ, the last Adam who accomplished the task perfectly.” (LIGTK, 50).
- “If Christ is the *last Adam*, then we are not new Adams. To understand our own cultural task as picking up and finishing Adam’s original task is, however unwittingly, to compromise the sufficiency of Christ’s work.” (LIGTK, 50-51).
- “Christians do not pick up and continue the task of Adam. Thanks to the finished work of Christ, Christians should view their cultural activities in a radically different way from the way that the first Adam viewed his. We pursue cultural activities in response to the fact that the new creation has already been achieved, not in order to contribute to its achievement.” (LIGTK, 56-57).
- Because of the glories of justification, and God imputing to us the righteousness of Christ: “God therefore does not call us back to complete the task that the first Adam fumbled.” (LIGTK, 57).
- “Our cultural task as already-justified Christians is fundamentally different from that of the first Adam, who was to perform his cultural work during a period of probation.” (LIGTK, 58).
- “Christ does not restore us to Adam’s original task but takes us to where Adam was supposed to arrive.” (LIGTK, 59).
- “Thus Christians’ cultural endeavors should *not* be understood as getting back to Adam’s original task.” (LIGTK, 62).

So, VanDrunen in a sense moves rather quickly from (1) failed Adam to (2) successful Christ, or (1) disobedient Adam to (2) obedient Christ. What does *not* get purchase in VanDrunen’s scenario is the option that redeemed sinners might still be image-bearers that engage in:

- Exercising Dominion and subduing the earth
- Being fruitful and multiplying
- [we will return to the third here: *finishing* the work and *resting* from the work]

Note: Bottom line: Christ has accomplished all that is necessary for our redemption, and he is (of course!) the obedient “Last Adam.” But, contra VanDrunen, I argue that the Christian—now “in Christ”—is nonetheless called to live, do, act. And as Christ is being formed in the believer (Gal. 4:19), it makes sense to see everyday Christians as those who—in Christ—exercise dominion, subdue the earth, and should be fruitful and multiply—*all as aspects of being creatures made in the image of God.*

It should also clearly be said: Our acts of dominion, subduing, etc., are not meritorious; they are simply a part of the Christian life, the Christian life of the one

who has been completely, once-for-all justified by or via faith, on the basis of Christ's perfect obedience in our place—an obedience seen in his perfect life and sacrificial death.

## 2. There are two key covenants in David VanDrunen's system, and these two covenants anchor or typify two kingdoms

Hence:

- (1) The *Noahic* Covenant: Anchors the *common* kingdom.
- (2) The *Abrahamic* Covenant: Anchors the *redemptive* kingdom.

The *Noahic* Covenant, then, anchors, or is the covenantal background for the *common* kingdom.

- The Noahic Covenant is universal, and perpetual, and especially in its *universal* nature provides moral guidance for all of humanity from this point on.

The *Abrahamic* Covenant, then, anchors, or is the covenantal background for the *redemptive* kingdom.

- The Abrahamic Covenant is *particular*, but also *perpetual*—in the sense that there is a fundamental continuity between the Abrahamic Covenant and the New Covenant.

## 3. The Importance of the Kingdom of God (and a certain understanding of the Kingdom of God)

- “the church is the *only* institution or community in the present world that can be identified with the kingdom proclaimed by Christ.” (LIGTK, 101).
- The covenant of grace and the redemptive kingdom “find their penultimate fulfillment in the church of the Lord Jesus Christ.” (LIGTK, 102)

Or:

- “According to the New Testament, the redemptive kingdom and the covenant of grace come to their fullest earthly expression in the church, and in the church alone.” (LIGTK, 102)

Or:

- “The New Testament announces that until this covenant of grace comes to ultimate fulfillment in the new heaven and new earth, it finds penultimate fulfillment in the work of Christ and his church.” (LIGTK, 103).

Or:

- “the redemptive kingdom finds its present manifestation and penultimate fulfillment in the church and the church alone.” (LIGTK, 106).

On a slightly different note:

- “The kingdom of heaven is therefore the kingdom of the world-to-come, which the first Adam would have attained if he had been obedient. It [the kingdom of heaven] is the redemptive kingdom come to fulfillment.” (LIGTK, 110).
- The kingdom of heaven is “the full flowering of the redemptive kingdom.” (LIGTK, 111).

Or:

- “Want to see the kingdom of heaven here and now? Look at a faithful church of the Lord Jesus Christ.” (LIGTK, 116).

Or:

- “The church is the kingdom of heaven here on earth. Though the church is not *identical* to the covenant of grace or the kingdom of heaven, it is precisely in the church that the covenant and the kingdom are experienced until Christ returns.” (LIGTK, 116).

**4. While God rules his covenant people *redemptively*, in the New Covenant, in and through the *church*, God rules *all other institutions* through the *Noahic Covenant*.** (LIGTK, 117).

- For VANDRUNEN, the *Mosaic* covenant has come to an end, but the *Noahic* covenant has not. (LIGTK, 118-19).

**5. The New Testament is rather cautious and subdued when it comes to cultural realities**

Three key points:

- (1) “Christians should pursue cultural activities not with a spirit of triumph and conquest over their neighbors, but with a spirit of love and service toward them.” (LIGTK, 124).
- (2) “the New Testament calls us to critical engagement with human culture.” (LIGTK, 126).
- (3) “the New Testament calls us to engage in cultural activities with a deep sense of detachment from this world and of longing for our true home in the world-to-come.” (LIGTK, 126).

**6. The primacy of the church**

- “The church is primary for the Christian life. Every other institution—the family, the school, the business corporation, the state—is secondary in the practice of the Christian religion.” (LIGTK, 132).
- “the church is the only earthly institution that can identify itself with the redemptive kingdom.” (LIGTK, 133—summarizing the thesis of chapter 5).

The *spirituality* and *ministerial authority* of the church

- The *spirituality* of the church. “the church is a community specially created by Christ and his Holy Spirit, a community that is not defined by or identified with any existing institution or community of the common kingdom” (LIGTK, 146).
- The *ministerial authority* of the church: “the officers of the church have authority only to minister what the Word of God teaches, not to make up their own doctrines for believing, or rules for living, no matter how compelling or wise they might seem to be” (LIGTK, 152).
  - And this is in contrast to *legislative* authority—the authority to make laws.

## II. Affirmation and Critique

### Affirmation

1. VanDrunen is clearly right that Christ, as the Last Adam, has been obedient and succeeded, where the first Adam was disobedient and failed. As we think about how the Christian is to engage culture and politics, it is good and proper to keep the sufficiency of Christ’s work front and center. To wit: we should not see our various cultural and political efforts as “completing” something missing in Christ’s work.

2. VanDrunen admirably wishes to safeguard a biblical and Protestant understanding of justification by faith alone.

3. VanDrunen does affirm that Christians should do all things to the glory of God, and should seek to do so faithfully as Christians.

4. VanDrunen should be commended for attempting to apply the Scripture to questions of culture.

### Critique

1. While VanDrunen can say he is *not* trying to promote the idea of “neutrality” in cultural endeavors, the weight of his system seems to push him in that direction.

For example, in the last chapter of LIGTK, VanDrunen uses as case studies for “Two Kingdoms” the issues of education, work, and politics. He can write of such endeavors (in the Introduction): “as an *objective* matter, the standards of morality and excellence in the common kingdom are ordinarily the same for believers and unbelievers: they share these standards in common under God’s authority in the covenant with Noah.” (LIGTK, 31).

2. A Question Needing an Answer: What *do* we do, and *why*?

Perhaps one of the chief weaknesses of the “Two Kingdoms” paradigm is an unwillingness (inability?) to articulate what we *should* do, and *why*?

For example, in his passion to safeguard a Protestant doctrine of justification (a *good* passion!) VanDrunen repeatedly speaks about what Christians should *not* do—for

Christ has done it all. So, at one point VanDrunen can say: “We have not been commissioned to conquer the Devil; Christ has already him” (LIGTK, 62). In one sense we could say, “Of course! Only Christ conquers the Devil.”

But do Christians engage in any kind of spiritual warfare whatsoever? Ephesians 6 certainly seems to teach this. And in Revelation 12 the Serpent is defeated by “the blood of the lamb and by the word of their testimony”—presumably the word of Christians. And this word is certainly a word *focused on the sufficient work of Christ for us*.

### 3. Mischaracterizing his opponents

I am a tad puzzled by how VanDrunen at times portrays his opponents. For example:

- “We need not try to be a bunch of second Adams, performing Adam’s cultural labors in order to attain the world-to-come.” (LIGTK, 139).
  - But could not one simply say the the cultural mandate means I, too, “exercise dominion,” without the least wanting to say that I am trying to “attain the world-to-come”?
- Even worse: VanDrunen seems to say that those who think the “dominion mandate” might still be in force today are essentially denying the gospel. “Jesus accomplished Adam’s task once for all, and did it for us. Thus we are justified not by the works of our hands but by faith alone in the perfect work of the resurrected Christ.” (LIGTK, 139).
  - The implication (or worse) being that those who might think we, too, should exercise dominion today are trying to be “justified by the work of [their] hands.”

### 4. Overstating differences?

At times VanDrunen seems to overstate differences.

For example: “Christianity was never meant to eliminate distinctions [????] in familial, ethnic, political, or economic association.” (LIGTK, 148).

- I think I see what VanDrunen is getting at, but does VanDrunen think that as a person is being more and more conformed to the image of the Son, that there will be no serious change in the Christian’s life in these areas. I suspect VanDrunen *would* expect significant changes in the Christian in *some* of these areas?
- In fairness to VanDrunen, he does day (and good for him): “I do not claim that the church has nothing relevant to say about politics, economics, war, or other such things.” (LIGTK, 149)

### 5. A False Dichotomy. Neo-Calvinism as Bogeyman.

One of the key views in VanDrunen’s crosshairs is Neo-Calvinism/Kuyperianism—and a certain version of that. Here is how VanDrunen speaks:

“The ship is our everlasting home and is being transformed through redemption in Christ, and thus our cultural efforts to improve the ship are fashioning the new creation itself.” (LIGTK, 166).

Or: “Our vocations have this character, however, not because the businesses we run or the products we make or our modest contributions to world economic growth are building the new heaven and new earth . . .” (LIGTK, 189).

What is VanDrunen saying? That this *kind* of view (Neo-Calvinism) sees our efforts in the present is such that the present world is “transformed through redemption,” and our efforts now are “fashioning the new creation itself.

Now, that *may very well be* what the Bible teaches. That is a talk for another time. But if one is not careful, one can be led astray by VanDrunen at this point. **That is, even if VanDrunen is being unintentional, he is at risk of committing the logical fallacy of false dichotomy.** That is the reader is being told: Either you believe in (1) VanDrunen’s Two Kingdoms view or (2) you and your works are “fashioning the new creation.”

**But this is a false dichotomy, for there is a *tertium quid*—a “third thing”. One can believe that there is—at one level—just one world, God’s world, and Christians are to apply all of God’s Word to all of life. Whether such efforts can be seeing as “fashioning the new creation” is a separate issue.** And, this might also be a kind of “straw man” fallacy. Someone creates a “straw man” that is then easy to tear down. But what VanDrunen has *not* done is show that the Christian is out of bounds to try and apply all of Scripture to all of life—with the necessary changes being made, especially as Christians now live in the New Covenant era.

#### **5. VanDrunen makes unjustifiable ellisions or inferences at times.**

(1) VanDrunen says that “Scripture instructs Christians to be submissive to civil authorities” (quite true), and then writes, “but does not provide strategies for voting or reforming public policy.” (LIGTK, 155). But does Scripture give wisdom (“strategies”) for informing public policy? I will suggest below that Scripture does indeed inform public policy.

- VanDrunen’s example immediately following this—on educating children—would be a prime example where Scripture *does* give significant wisdom.

#### **6. The repeated appeal to the Noahic Covenant is not biblically warranted.**

VanDrunen makes repeated reference to the Noahic Covenant, given the importance of the Noahic Covenant for the “common kingdom.” But we should consider whether the Bible in general, or the Noahic Covenant in context (Genesis 8 and 9) make such claims.

For example, VanDrunen writes: “Through the Noahic Covenant God holds all people accountable for being honest, just, hardworking, environmentally responsible, and respectful to authority” (LIGTK, 168). This *sounds* reasonable, perhaps. But take a step back—where in the Bible in general or in Genesis 8-9 in particular do we see this kind of explicit or implicit teaching?

It is the case that the unlawful taking of human life is explicitly forbidden, for such an act is an attack on the very image of God (Genesis 9:5-6).

But do we see the following *really* in Genesis 8 and 9?

- “being honest”?
- “just”?
- “hardworking”?
- “environmentally responsible”?
- “respectful to authority”?

Such quotations are found all throughout the volume. For example:  
“As vocations to which Christians and non-Christians alike are called in the common kingdom, their objective ethics are determined by the moral demands binding all people under the Noahic covenant” (LIGTK, 193).

Really? Where? Where, *even in the Noahic Covenant* are all of these ethical standards found?

But to extend this point. VanDrunen recognizes that the civil magistrate (especially as seen in Roman 13) is to punish evil and promote good. He correctly writes:  
“First, since the state is under God’s authority it has no right to operate contrary to his moral law. The state cannot and should not attempt to punish every violation of God’s law with civil penalties, but it never has authority to promote what is evil. . .”  
(LIGTK, 197-98).

This is actually spot-on, and I think it is the reason so-called “gay marriage” is the line in the sand, even for those of us who might have libertarian tendencies. We might be happy to have a very limited (especially) federal government. But what the Christian cannot support is encouraging the civil government to give is moral stamp of approval to what is clearly egregious sin.

**7. At times VanDrunen seems to still hold that the Dominion Mandate of Genesis 1:26ff. is still in place, though his system clearly denies this at other places.**

Here is what I mean. Remember, central to VanDrunen’s paradigm is that we, as Christians are not “little Adams.” That is, the cultural/dominion mandate of Genesis 1:26ff. does *not* pass on to us. (LIGTK, 164).

But *immediately* after saying this VanDrunen writes: “though we are not little Adams we still have many cultural responsibilities here and now. God does not call Christians to take up the original cultural mandate of Genesis 1:26-18 per se, but calls them to obey the cultural mandate *as given in modified form to Noah* in Genesis 9.” (LIGTK, 164). Here VanDrunen is saying something not all that different from what I or others here might say.

But here is the rub: *The covenant with Noah is essentially a formal ratification with the covenant given in creation.* That is: if one reads Genesis 9, there is the same, or very much near the same, language given to Noah as was given to Adam—with the necessary changes being made.



For example, VanDrunen writes: “God exerted his labor upon this world in bringing it into existence and giving it order, and from the beginning he called his human creatures to exert their labor upon it under his authority (Gen. 1:26-28)” (LIGTW, 188).

VanDrunen then writes: “In the Noahic covenant God reaffirmed that all human beings bear his image, albeit in a fallen and corrupted way, and thus would continue to pursue various vocational tasks” (Gen. 9:1-7). (LIGTK, 188)

So, the Dominion Mandate still *seems* to be in place in the first quote, and in the second this first text is not challenged. The Noahic covenant reaffirms this creational situation—with the necessary changes being made, since man is now fallen.

### 8. The Two Kingdoms option does not do justice to the ways in which the biblical covenants are organically united and related.

God has revealed himself through covenants all throughout the Bible. While there are different covenants, the Bible has a way of summarizing the covenants in such a way that they kind of rise and fall together.

B.B. Warfield could use a word we do not use as much today. He could speak of how the Scriptures are brought together in a “concatenated” whole. I love that word. All of the Bibles come to us as a concatenated whole.

One example:

#### Jeremiah 33:14-22

**Jer. 33:14** “Behold, the days are coming, declares the LORD, when <sup>b</sup>I will fulfill the promise I made to the house of Israel and the house of Judah. <sup>15</sup> In those days and at that time I will cause a righteous <sup>c</sup>Branch to spring up for David [Messianic/New, but couched in Davidic language], and he shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. <sup>16</sup> In those days Judah will be saved, <sup>r</sup>and Jerusalem will dwell securely. And this is the name by which it will be called: “The LORD is our righteousness.”

**Jer. 33:17** “For thus says the LORD: ‘David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel [Davidic], <sup>18</sup> “and the Levitical priests shall never lack a man in my presence to offer burnt offerings [Mosaic], to burn grain offerings, and to make sacrifices forever.”

**Jer. 33:19** The word of the LORD came to Jeremiah: <sup>20</sup> “Thus says the LORD: “If you can break my covenant with the day and my covenant with the night, <sup>s</sup>so that day and night will not come at their appointed time [Noahic—but Creation], <sup>21</sup> <sup>y</sup>then also my covenant with David [David] my servant may be broken, so that he shall not have a son to reign on his throne, and my covenant with the Levitical priests my ministers [Mosaic]. <sup>22</sup> As <sup>z</sup>the host of heaven cannot be numbered and <sup>z</sup>the sands of the sea

cannot be measured, so I will multiply the offspring of David my servant [David, but hearkening back to Abraham], and the Levitical priests [Mosaic] who minister to me.”

Arguably, we have virtually all of the biblical covenants woven together—in a concatenated whole.

My point here is one that would take more time to develop. But in brief: If we let the Bible interpret the Bible, we are pushed to see that the biblical covenants are all related in interwoven in deep and significant ways. It would be extremely odd if we were forced to say that the Noahic Covenant (and virtually only the Noahic Covenant) is the anchor of life in the common world, while the Abrahamic Covenant is the anchor of life in the redemptive kingdom—which is essentially the Church in VanDrunen’s view.

9. The Bible does indeed talk a lot of about “two” kinds of things, in lots of ways. But the Bible does not really seem to talk at all about “two kingdoms”—in the sense of Noah and Abraham, or “common” and “redemptive” in the way VanDrunen advocates.

Rather:

(1) The “kingdoms of the world” and the “kingdom of God”

- Revelation 11:15: “Then **the** seventh angel blew his trumpet, and there were loud voices in heaven, saying, “**The kingdom of the world** has become **the kingdom of** our Lord and **of** his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever.”
- Luke 4:5: “And **the** devil took him up and showed him all **the kingdoms of the world** in a moment **of** time, . . .”
- Matthew 13:38: [parable of the sower] “**The field is the world, and the good seed is the sons of the kingdom. The weeds are the sons of the evil one, . . .**”

(2) Two *men*, or *races*, or *heads*: Adam and Christ (Romans 5:12ff.)

(3) Two eras: “This age” and “the age to come.

Ephesians 1:19-23:

“<sup>19</sup> and what is the immeasurable greatness of his power toward us who believe, according to the working of his great might <sup>20</sup> that he worked in Christ when he raised him from the dead and seated him at his right hand in the heavenly places, <sup>21</sup> far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and above every name that is named, not only in *this age* but also in *the one to come*. <sup>22</sup> And he put all things under his feet and gave him as head over all things to the church, <sup>23</sup> which is his body, the fullness of him who fills all in all.”

**Matthew 12:32:**

“And whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come.”

- (4) Two Kingdoms—but of a very different sort; essentially [1] the kingdom of darkness or Satan and [2] the kingdom of God

**Colossians 1:13-14:**

“<sup>13</sup> He has delivered us from the domain of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved Son, <sup>14</sup> in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.”

**Ephesians 6:12:**

“ For we do not wrestle against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the cosmic powers over this present darkness, against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places.”

### **III. A Case Study: The Family**

For VanDrunen the family is one of those aspects of the “common kingdom” which is governed by the Noahic Covenant. As such, it would not do to speak of the family as “holy” or “redemptive”.

But how does the Bible actually speak of the family?

1. Marriage: a picture of the Christ-church relationship

**Ephesians 5:22-32**

**Eph. 5:22** Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord. <sup>23</sup> For the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Savior. <sup>24</sup> Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit in everything to their husbands.

**Eph. 5:25** Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her, <sup>26</sup> that he might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word, <sup>27</sup> so that he might present the church to himself in splendor, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, that she might be holy and without blemish. <sup>28</sup> In the same way husbands should love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself. <sup>29</sup> For no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, just as Christ does the church, <sup>30</sup> because we are members of his body. <sup>31</sup> “Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.” <sup>32</sup> This mystery is profound, and I am saying that it refers to Christ and the church. <sup>33</sup> However, let each one of you love his wife as himself, and let the wife see that she respects her husband.

2. There is *some kind sanctifying power* in family life—both of spouse to spouse, and parent to child:

**1 Corinthians 7:13-14**

<sup>13</sup> If any woman has a husband who is an unbeliever, and he consents to live with her, she should not divorce him. <sup>14</sup> For the unbelieving husband is made holy because of his wife, and the unbelieving wife is made holy because of her husband. Otherwise your children would be unclean, but as it is, they are holy.

**Another Possible Case Study: Daniel in Babylon**

Can the “Two Kingdoms” view really make sense of fascinating texts like Daniel 3:29, 4:27, 4:37, and 6:26-27—where the ungodly king has *some* kind of heart change, and in 3:29, seems to require a law forbidding blasphemy against the one, true, God?

### *Miscellaneous Thoughts*

We mentioned earlier that VanDrunen appears at times to be engaging in a false dichotomy or a straw man way of arguing. That is, VanDrunen can argue against a view (Neo-Calvinism/Kuyperianism) that he takes to be saying: By our works and cultural activities *now* we are “fashioning the new creation” (LIGTK, 166) and the like. But by describing his opponents in that way, he has (perhaps unintentionally) not taken the time to deal how many Christians actually think: That all of Scripture should be applied to all of life.

That is: VanDrunen summarizes his opponents in one way (i.e., that they, by their works, are “fashioning the new creation”) where many folks who would not follow VanDrunen would have no interest in stating their position in that way.

**Note:** Now, in fairness to VanDrunen, he at times to say things in a way much like I would say things. For example:

“Christians are called not only to act in accord with God’s law at all times but also to do all things from faith (Rom. 14:23; Heb. 11:6) and all things for God’s glory (1 Cor. 10:31).” (LIGTK, 167).

**6. While VanDrunen highlights the *Noahic* Covenant, much of the authorities/realities VanDrunen attributes to the *Noahic* Covenant are actually found in *Creation*.**

- This is not a fatal blow for VanDrunen, since the Noahic Covenant can be seen as a kind of formal ratification with the “Creation Covenant.”
- Also: VanDrunen will *at times* refer to creation *along with* the Noahic Covenant (LIGTK, 154).