

Surrejoinder to W. Ed Glenny
Dispensational Study Group, ETS
Rodney J. Decker
Nov 2006

[**Explanatory note:** This sur-rejoinder was *not* presented at the Dispensational Study Group meeting due to time constraints. I have not elaborated the reply beyond the hastily scribbled notes that I made during Ed's rejoinder at the conference. (The few additional brief comments not reflected in my notes have been inserted as footnotes below.) I have, of course, tidied up those comments and spelled them out more fully as I would have done extemporaneously had there been time for such at the conference. Being able to contemplate Ed's comments at leisure later would obviously enable a much more detailed response. I would point out that Ed's rejoinder is longer and more detailed than would often be the case since he had my written reply a week or two before the conference (often the plenary presenter hears the response paper only after his paper is presented!). In this case, mine is the shorter since it attempts to present only what I would have said at the time. As is well known, responses (esp. extemporaneous ones) "pick and choose" the topics/issues on which to comment. Ed has done that in his response and I have certainly done that in my brief sur-rejoinder here. In many ways I would have preferred that both of us had been asked to write full treatments of the Amos 9/Acts 15 passages, and then interacted with each other on that basis, but conference programs allow only so much time and this was no exception. RJD]

In the time available I can comment on only a few items that Ed has highlighted. So, in roughly the order of my hastily scribbled notes during Ed's original paper and (mostly) from his response comments...

- Often OT writers use OT language—either Hebrew or Greek/LXX—not to imply or call to mind specific OT texts or their contexts, but simply because it is familiar language, much as many Christians these days slip into "KJV English" in prayer (though that is now largely among those old enough to have grown up on the KJV!).
- Ed wonders if I am "tipping my hand" as to which text, OT or NT, I give priority in interpretation [cf. what is now the 2d page of his response paper]. I freely acknowledge that I treat the OT text as possessing "hermeneutical autonomy." That is, to the best of my ability I attempt to interpret OT texts in their own right in light of antecedent revelation without reading the implications of later revelation back into the OT. When I find an OT text cited in the NT, I *assume* that if the writer is using it exegetically, that he is doing the same thing (i.e., using it with the same meaning as it had in its OT context). Even with an analogy, I assume the analogy is based on the OT meaning. In this case, I accept that James understands Amos 9 as Amos intended. I do not expect to find a different meaning of that same text just because it is now cited in a different setting.¹

¹ I acknowledge that in the progress of revelation we may well understand *more* of a given topic and even understand better how various antecedent texts correlate—but none of this changes the meaning of the earlier text(s). Even in typology I would argue that this is the case. I think I remember Ed mentioning

- Shall we distinguish the Law as covenant from the Law as Scripture? Ed wonders if I may not be making that distinction. An interesting proposal. But what are its implications? We both agree that the old covenant is not binding on the church. But what is the difference if we acknowledge that the Law is part of our authoritative Scripture (as I certainly do) but then go on to make its provisions normative for conduct? Other than a formal distinction, if Lev 17–18 is binding on gentiles (because they are aliens), how is that different from concluding that Christians are still under the Law today? Without addressing the distinction that some make within the Law (e.g., ceremonial, civil, moral), how do we determine what is binding and what is not? Are there other OT texts that are also binding on my conduct? Am I obliged to wear a blue tassel on my garments (Num 15:38)?² What are the limits of this hermeneutic that prevents a theonomistic conclusion? In reply to a likely follow-up question (then why are these particular provisions noted in Acts 15?), I would probably explore the possibility that these were particularly sensitive issues in the Jewish culture of the day and James' counsel is not to cause offense.
- Brewer is cited in the rejoinder to substantiate the fact that Jewish writers prior to the NT used exegetical techniques similar to what was later called *gezērâ šāwâ*.³ I fully grant that (see p. 12 of my Response), but would point out that Brewer *contrasts* this approach in the LXX, Targums, etc. with the pre-70 AD scribes who did *not* do so (see my Response, p. 14). My question was why we appeal to one group and not the other.
- I must wonder if Ed's appeal to John 7:37–39 is sufficiently nuanced; it may place too great an emphasis on the “bare” statement of that text (οὐπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα). Was not yet *what*? The later scribal emendations⁴ reflect the sense that we must nuance this in some way; it cannot be a bare statement of existence (which, I am sure, is not what Ed intends). But just what does it mean and what does this imply? Time and space are always problems—in rejoinders and in their replies!
- Yes, it would have been profitable to consider Acts 13—though that discussion was in a footnote and not part of the argument of the paper. There is not time or

Isa. 7 in passing and wondering how I might handle that text. I view the use of Isa. 7:14 in Matt. 1:23 as typological; i.e., I do not think that Isaiah understood his text to be a Messianic prophecy. That it is used as such in Matthew does not change the meaning of Isaiah 7. The typological/Messianic use of that text presents new meaning only at the NT level. It is *Matthew* which is the Messianic text.

² I wonder, too, how it is that the alien is equated with gentiles in the church and why their code of conduct might be different, esp. since in the OT we are told that the alien is governed by the same regulations as the Jew (Lev 9:14; 15:14).

³ If I remember right, I think in his oral comments at this point Ed commented that since I had cited Brewer to the contrary, we ought to read what Brewer said. That is not in the written reply, so perhaps my memory is not correct at this point.

⁴ E.g., δεδομένον is sometimes added.

space to do so here. Let me point out that there are some other factors to consider in this text, though I cannot develop them. The reference in vv 32–33 to “what God promised our fathers” is a comment on v 23, where God promises to bring a Savior to Israel—i.e., incarnation, not resurrection. (Note that David was “raised up” as king, v 22.) Jesus’ resurrection does come into the argument again in v 34 (and is contrasted, δέ, with incarnation). Another full length paper... ☺

- I am not prepared to abandon my suggestion for analogy as an appropriate category. Perhaps I have not understood Ed’s use of that term and if so, then my appeal to his work on this subject is misplaced.⁵ An analogical use of Amos 9 here does not require that gentiles be equal with Israel in the kingdom. The analogy is simply that what God will do in the kingdom he is also doing now—taking out of the gentiles a people for his name.
- Ed’s final statement’s tease at some other questions, but since they are only suggested and not discussed, I will have to simply note the issues he raises and agree that we ought to discuss whether or not OT prophecies can be changed or reinterpreted in the NT or whether there is a *sensus plenior* hermeneutic involved. I would express my skepticism to any positive answers to suggestions such as these. But that is a good deal of why I have not been attracted to the progressive trail.

⁵ Ed explains that analogy is “a more general parallel than typology; they are further distinguished by a less distinct patterns between passage and event in analogy and the absence of both a prophetic element and an escalation from lesser to greater in analogy” (“Hermeneutics of the Use of the OT in 1 Peter” [Th.D. diss., DTS, 1987], 65). I did not catch a “moral truths” qualification. I also do not view the contrasting category, typology, as prophetic though Ed does.