

**Canadian Society of Biblical Studies 2012
Complete Programme**

(updated May 18, 2012 with room number and withdrawals)

Sessions will be in the Modern Languages Building (MLB), Environment 1 (EV1) and J. G. Hagey Hall of the Humanities (HH) on the Waterloo campus: <http://uwaterloo.ca/map/>

Saturday, May 26 / Samedi, 26 Mai

14:00-19:00 (MLB 216)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING / RÉUNION DU COMITÉ EXÉCUTIF

Sunday, May 27 / Dimanche, 27 Mai

9:00-11:45 (MLB 246)

HISTORICAL JESUS / JÉSUS HISTORIQUE

Chair / Président: **Dietmar Neufeld** (University of British Columbia)

9:00-9:30 **Cecilia Wassen** (Uppsala University)

“Jesus’ Attitude to Purity Laws in the Context of His Healing Activities”

► What was Jesus’ attitude towards purity *halakhah*? Did he intend to challenge the system of purity laws, or did people perceive his actions in that way? These questions are subject to great scholarly debate. I will address these questions by focusing on the stories of Jesus healing the ritually impure. I will investigate Jesus’ actions in comparison to those of other healers of the time. I will also consider the possible influence on Jesus of stories about the miracle-working prophets from the Hebrew Bible, Elijah and Elisha, and discuss how this might add to the picture. My analysis will be informed by purity laws in biblical texts and Jewish literature of the time, the Dead Sea Scrolls in particular.

9:30-10:00 **Matthew Mitchell** (Canisius College)

“Revisiting the exegetically burdensome ‘Easy Yoke’ (Matt 11:28-30)”

► Matthew 11:28-30 has been the source of a good deal of attention from interpreters. The saying is as famous as it is curious, especially its assertion that “my yoke is easy, and my burden is light” (Matt 11:30). Numerous studies have appeared concerning the provenance and transmission of the saying, the possible scriptural allusions it contains, and most have also thoroughly sifted the metaphorical use of the image of the “yoke” in biblical, parabiblical, and rabbinic writings. The various interpretations advanced as to the meaning of the passage, however, center upon issues that are not easily resolved by these approaches. For example, what exactly is “the yoke of Jesus”? Is it meant as a contrast to the Torah, or is it somehow a claim to its authority? Is its language clearly related to identifiable passages in the wisdom literature, or is there really no clear dependency on other texts? These questions are important and worthy of scholarly investigation, yet insufficient attention has been paid to some crucial smaller

matters. One such issue is the range of meanings possible for the word usually rendered as “easy” (*chrēstos*). This paper explores some of the interpretative avenues opened up by other translation options, and casts a different light on the various debates surrounding the passage as a whole.

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **Christopher D. Land** (McMaster Divinity College)

“Jesus Before Pilate: A Discourse Analysis of John 18:33–38”

► John’s Gospel is often said to reflect a shift of responsibility whereby the Roman authorities are exonerated and the Jewish people are speciously blamed for Jesus’ death. In this paper I will analyse a brief dialogue between Pilate and Jesus (John 18:33-38). I will argue that Jesus interacts with Pilate as with a political pawn who is being manipulated by others and that Pilate interacts with Jesus as with an ethnic inferior. The former point suggests that John does not view Jesus’ death as the death of a victim; the latter reveals that John is able to view Jesus as the object of an ethnic prejudice directed against the Jews.

10:45-11:15 **Calogero A. Miceli** (Concordia University)

“Understanding the Coin Jesus Requests: The ‘Question about Paying Taxes’ Episode in the Gospel of Mark (12:13-17)”

► The following paper explores the denarius used by Jesus in the Markan version of the ‘Question about Paying Taxes’ episode (12:13-17). For the most part, scholars have generally read the coin in light of its historicity. This piece looks to add to such historical understandings and argues that the coin can also be read as having a narrative function, which works as a symbolic prop within the story. I argue that the coin can be read as an object that Jesus skillfully utilizes which – though it has roots in historicity – simultaneously functions as a literary device.

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

8:45-11:30 (MLB 354)

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES IN ANTIQUITY / TECHNOLOGIES DE L’INFORMATION DANS L’ANTIQUITÉ I

Chair / Président: **Frederick S. Tappenden** (Manchester)

8:45-9:15 **Alan Kirk** (James Madison University)

“Scribes and the Synoptic Tradition: Narrowing the Field”

► “Scribes” and “scribal practices” are extraordinarily broad rubrics. Scribal education and competence could vary wildly, and around the Mediterranean there was diversity in the status and cultural significance of scribes. Cultural practices associated with authorship, composition, and transmission of texts also were hardly uniform, and media conditions and practices changed over time. This imprecision besets attempts to study classic synoptic research problems in the framework of ancient scribal practices. Where on these varying yet intersecting cultural, social, and media axes should we plot tradents of the synoptic tradition

and its history? This essay attempts to take the measure of the problem and to build upon some of the existing proposals.

Response: Robert Derrenbacker (Laurentian University)

9:15-9:45 **Judith H. Newman** (University of Toronto)

“Liturgy as Media in Judaism of the Greco-Roman Era”

► Much attention has been devoted in recent scholarship to the role of scribes in the composition and transmission of texts in early Judaism and formative Christianity without much consideration of the performative contexts in which such activity took place. My talk will discuss liturgical contexts as one such venue by providing an overview of the role of liturgical maestros as figures who engendered such transmission through their interaction with texts.

Response: Steven Muir (Concordia University College of Alberta)

9:45-10:00 Break

10:00-10:30 **Lincoln Blumell** (Brigham Young University)

“The Medium and the Message: Some Observations on Epistolary Communication in Antiquity from the Papyri”

► In antiquity the most common form of communication between two or more parties who were physically separated was the letter. As a result, letters often constitute important source texts for a wide variety of issues and figure prominently in early Christian literature. However, to fully utilize the evidence provided by letters in any particular investigation it is important to realize that these texts are conditioned by a number of internal and external factors that can affect the message(s) they convey. To elucidate some of these import factors this study will survey the epistolary evidence provided by the papyrological remains of Roman Egypt (first century BCE through fourth century CE). The advantage of using this particular set of data resides in the fact that it allows one to study the original letter, as opposed to some later copy, and so one is able to evaluate certain factors like physical format, script, and structure. As part of this analysis other pertinent issues like the use of scribes and letter carriers will also be considered. By examining this diverse set of factors this study hopes to more fully highlight how the medium (i.e. letter) was shaped and conditioned and how this subsequently impacted the message and how it was received. On a more general level this investigation hopes to engender a greater awareness of certain epistolary issues and the potential bearing they can have on the production and transmission of a letter.

Response: John W. Marshall (University of Toronto)

10:30-11:00 Questions and Discussion

11:00-11:30 Business Meeting

8:30-11:45 (MLB 349)

HEBREW BIBLE / BIBLE HÉBRAÏQUE I

Chair / Président: Peter Sabo (University of Alberta)

8:30-9:00 **Tyler F. Williams** (The King's University College, Edmonton)

“Blessed be Yahweh, the God of Israel’ — The Form and Function of the Doxological Divisions in the Hebrew and Greek Psalm Traditions”

► There are a number of different compositional features and indicators of editorial shaping found in the Masoretic Psalm tradition. These include psalm superscripts and postscripts, differing psalm divisions, as well as the doxological formulas that divide the Psalter into five “books” (Pss 41:14; 72:18-20; 89:53; 106:48). This study will explore the form and function of these compositional features, with a particular focus on the doxological divisions in the Hebrew psalm tradition and its relationship to the Septuagint Psalter.

9:00-9:30 **Markus Zehnder** (Ansgar Theological Seminary)

“Comparative Observations on Blessing and Curse in Leviticus and Deuteronomy”

► The paper aims at investigating the relationship between the two most elaborate curse sections related to the pentateuchal law collections, Lev 26 and Deut 28, by addressing, i.a., the following questions: What is the specific function of the curse sections in their respective literary context? What are the parallels in language, style, and content between the two sections? What are the differences? How are the two texts related to each other? Can a case for the assumption of the dependency of one text on the other be made?

9:30-10:00 **John Kessler** (Tyndale Seminary)

“Covenant and Temple in Haggai 1:3-15; 2:15-19”

► It is well known that Hag 1:3-15 and 2:15-19 employs vocabulary similar to the “covenant curses” found in Lev 26, Deut 28, Hos 6, the treaty texts of Esarhaddon, and the Sefire, and Tell-Fekherye inscriptions. Significant debate, however, surrounds Haggai’s use of such language. Specifically, what precise relationship between temple and covenant does such language imply? Some scholars (Beuken, Petersen), affirm that Haggai is charging the people with severe covenant violation or even a decisive breaking of covenant through its neglect of the temple. Others (J. Tollington) see the language here as merely borrowed from the Sinai covenant traditions to make a rhetorical point. This paper will propose a “third way”—that the book of Haggai’s associates reconstruction of the temple with the Sinai covenant due to its conception of covenant and temple as two separate but related institutions, both essential to the nation’s identity.

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **Edward Ho** (Chinese Online School of Theology)

“Reconsidering the Arguments of Job’s Three Friends in the First Cycle”

► According to literary critic James Phelan, in narrative, the author cultivates the interests of the reader by means of two types of unstable relations. The first, called instabilities, are those occurring within the story, conflicts between

characters, created by situations, and complicated and resolved through actions. The second, called tensions, are conflicts of value, belief, opinion, knowledge, expectation between the author and the reader. Applying Phelan's insights to the speeches of Job's three friends in the first cycle of dialogue, this paper reconsiders the arguments of the friends and explores their contributions to the development of instabilities and tensions in the narrative.

10:45-11:15 **Mark J. Boda** (McMaster Divinity College)

“When God's Voice Breaks Through: Shifts in Revelatory Rhetoric in Zechariah”

► Many scholars have noted an awkward flow in the rhetoric of Zech 1:1-6 and 7:1-14, highlighting confusing levels of quoted material in Zech 1:1-6 as well as awkward prophetic formulae and confusing shifts in speaker in Zech 7:1-14. Past scholarship has focused on diachronic solutions, looking to underlying sources or redactional activities to explain these features in the text. This paper argues that no matter what the sources were for these texts, the resulting rhetoric appears to be designed to impact the reader to hear the message of past generations as fresh revelation for the present generation. This subtle rhetoric resonates with the explicit reference to “the former prophets” in these texts, and lays a foundation for what follows in Zechariah 9-14.

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

LUNCH FOR ALL STUDENTS AND NEW MEMBERS / CASSE-CROÛTE POUR ÉTUDIANTS ET MEMBRES NOUVEAUX (12:00-12:30; MLB 349)

SPECIAL SESSION ORGANIZED BY STUDENTS / SESSION SPÉCIALE ORGANISÉE PAR LES ÉTUDIANTS (12:30-14:00; MLB 349)

Topic: Technology and Biblical Studies: Trends and Trajectories

Presiding: **S. Kostamo** (Alberta)

Panelists: Ehud Ben Zvi (University of Alberta), Kyung S. Baek (University of Manchester), Philip A. Harland (York University)

14:00-15:20 (EV1 1408)

STUDENT ESSAY PRIZES / PRIX ESSAI ÉTUDIANT(E)S

Chair / Président: **Marion Taylor** (Wycliffe College)

14:00-14:30 *Jeremias Prize Paper*: **Courtney J.P. Friesen** (University of Minnesota), “Dionysus and Jesus: The Incongruity of a Love Feast in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* 2.2”

14:30-14:40 Questions

14:40-15:10 *Founders Prize Paper*: **Ian Douglas Wilson** (University of Alberta), “Tyre, a Ship: The Metaphorical World of Ezekiel 27 in Ancient Judah”

15:10-15:20 Questions

15:30-17:00 (EV1 1408)

CSBS ANNUAL MEETING / ASSEMBLÉE ANNUELLE DE LA SCÉB

Presiding / Présidence: **Marion Taylor** (Wycliffe College)

17:15-18:15 (EV1 1408)

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS / CONFÉRENCE DU PRÉSIDENT (EV1 1408)

Presiding / Présidence: **Edith Humphrey** (Pittsburgh Theological Seminary)

Marion Taylor (Wycliffe College)

► “Hidden Voices: Toward a more Inclusive History of the Interpretation of the Bible”

19:00-23:00 (Wildcraft Grill Bar, 425 King Street North, Waterloo)

CSBS ANNUAL DINNER / BANQUET ANNUEL DE LA SCÉB

Monday May 28 / Lundi, 28 Mai

8:30-11:45 (MLB 246)

PAUL

Chair / Président: **Matthew Mitchell** (Canisius College)

8:30-9:00 **Frederick S. Tappenden** (University of Manchester)

“Peter and the Ethnic Other: Petrine Reputational Politics and Mixed Table-Fellowship in Early Christian Memory”

► This paper explores the development of the apostle Peter’s reputation in early Christian memory, specifically with respect to issues of mixed (i.e., Jewish-Gentile) table-fellowship in the Pauline and Lukan writings. Attention will be given to two divergent images of Peter – one that is relatively early and largely negative (Gal 2:11-14) and another that is later and largely positive (Acts 10-11, 15). Viewing the reception of the earlier (more difficult) Petrine reputation in light of first century Oral-Written media dynamics, it will be argued that the Lukan author functions as a reputational entrepreneur who simultaneously acknowledges Peter’s difficult past while recasting the apostle as a favourable, inclusive champion of inter-ethnic ideals. In addition to critically examining the relationship between the Pauline and Lukan writings, this paper will explore the differing ways that distinct genres (i.e., letter and narrative) function as vehicles of mnemonic and reputational negotiation.

9:00-9:30 **Gregory Fewster** (McMaster Divinity College)

“Reading Pauline Body Metaphors: Comparing Historical, Canonical, and Literary Strategies”

► Historical readings of Paul often emphasize chronology and theological development, especially viewing pseudo-Paulines as a witness to the authentic Paul. On the other hand, canonical readings emphasize reception history and the implications of canonical shaping, regardless of authenticity. Both of these reading strategies, while valuable, place particular constraints on the free-flow of interpretation. Using some insights from post-structural literary criticism — particularly from Barthes, Foucault, Kristeva, and Derrida — this paper examines Paul’s use of the body metaphors in four authentic and disputed letters (Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians), comparing the interpretive possibilities of these perspectives.

9:30-10:00 **Richard Last** (University of Toronto)

“Were There Officers in the Corinthian Christ-Group?”

► Paul reciprocates Gaius (Rom 16:23), Fortunatus, Achaicus, Stephanas and Stephanas’ household (1 Cor 16:15-18) with symbolic and social capital in return for the economic assets that they expended on the Corinthian congregation. The possibility that their services constituted (part of) their duties as officers in the Christ-group is not usually entertained since Paul never mentions that they or anyone else in the group held offices at that time (1 Cor 12 is ambiguous on the matter). This paper adds to current explanations for Paul’s failure to record Corinthian offices by exploring the extent to which an officer’s title was worthy of mention in association honorific inscriptions.

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **Bruce Worthington** (McMaster Divinity College)

“Paul, Law, and the Economy of Desire: An Ideological Analysis of Romans 7:8”

► While the purpose of ethical law is to give human desire a framework of limitations, the Apostle Paul is perhaps the first to identify a causal relationship between law and the production of desire. For Paul, law is not a passive character in the production of sinful desire, rather law aids in the very production of what it seeks to limit, and is the site of ultimate contradiction and death. Paul’s simple, humble observation “Sin, seizing the opportunity afforded by the commandment, produced in me every kind of covetous desire” (Rom. 7:8) is a generative insight in human thought—immediately applicable to the contemporary logic of hyper-capitalism and the neurotic, pathological production of consumptive desire in the 21st century global marketplace. Using an ideological hermeneutic guided by the recent work of Slavoj Žižek and Fredric Jameson, this paper will identify salient features between Paul’s “Law” and global capitalism as systems which mutually require *failure* as a precondition for their permanent, extended reproduction.

10:45-11:15 **Ian Brown** (University of Toronto)

“Paul and *Thomas*, Schools and Schooling: a different approach to the question of Paul and the Hellenistic schools”

► Much ink has been spilled in efforts to compare Paul to contemporary philosophers, or to align his “teachings” with certain philosophical schools. And while these questions are interesting, I find that they muddle the question which I will address in this paper: might the social organizations and pedagogical models in evidence in *1 Thessalonians*, *1 Corinthians*, and the *Gospel of Thomas* be usefully thought of in terms of the social organization, and pedagogical strategies found in philosophical schools? Focusing on the recipients of Paul’s letters rather than on Paul himself, I will argue that Paul’s social formations do in fact resemble schools, and I conclude by comparing Paul and *Thomas*, arguing that the rhetoric of effort in *Thomas* can shed light on Paul’s pedagogical hopes, especially in *1 Cor.*

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

8:30-11:45 (MLB 349)

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES IN ANTIQUITY II

Chair / Président: Steven Muir (Concordia University College of Alberta)

8:30-9:00 **Karlsruen Feuerherm** (Wilfred Laurier University)

“The Early Development of Cuneiform as an Encoding System for Language”

□ This paper will explore the token theory of the origin of cuneiform in light of scholarly critiques and then trace the development and use of cuneiform for the encoding of Sumerian from the earlier to later stages, and ultimately its adaptation, in varying script traditions, to early Akkadian. Application for religious purposes will be examined along the way.

9:00-9:30 **Robert Derrenbacher** (Thorneloe University)

“The Medium is the Message”: Towards an Identification and Understanding of the Medium for the Sayings Gospel Q

□ This paper will explore the potential medium for the Sayings Gospel Q, with particular focus on the early form of the codex. The implications of this potential medium for how Q was used by its first readers and how it was appropriated and deployed by Matthew and Luke will also be discussed.

9:30-10:00 **Steven Scott** (Concordia University, Montreal)

“The Art of Oraliture”

► Within our modern society and especially within biblical studies the written is given precedence over the oral. This is especially true when discussing “information technologies”: the techniques surrounding the passing on of information tends to focus on the written. This paper will address this imbalance by focusing on techniques used in the passing on of oral tradition. Topics discussed include “literature” versus “oraliture”, the control of tradition and the degree of variability allowed in oral societies, memory and brain function, the use of poetic and structural devices to aid memory, and the concept of “frozen orality”. In the preparation of this paper, I was assuming that it would be made available beforehand and that the presentation would be a summary of the handed out paper. This format naturally allows for more to be discussed, and what is discussed to be done so in more detail. If it is not to be made available beforehand, let me know, and I will adjust the content (and the abstract) accordingly.

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **Robert Kerr** (Wilfred Laurier University)

“From formal to informal writing as seen in Punic” - a sociolinguistic study of the changes in text genre and spelling habits from Carthaginian to Roman North Africa.”

► Phoenico-Punic and its long written history presents an interesting case study for the use of writing and literacy the North-West Semitic 'Kulturkreis'. Although for the most part only lapidary evidence has survived, it nonetheless presents an

interesting picture. In North Africa under Carthaginian hegemony, we find many inscriptions in but a few genres. These, for the most part stereotypical texts mostly relate to rites carried out at the 'tophet' - where the placement of a stele was seemingly a compulsory accompaniment to the rites performed. However, these steles were only inscribed in some cases. When one however looks at the surviving epigraphs from the Roman period, one sees several significant changes. On the one hand, we find Neo-Punic texts written in many new genres seemingly influenced by Latin practice along with a switch from the former historical, etymological spelling to the employment of a phonetic rendition using vowel letters. Indeed, these texts are probably the oldest NWS Semitic texts that attempt to render vowels in a systematic fashion contemporaneously. In this presentation, some key examples of neo-Punic texts will be discussed along with the underlying phonological and orthographic systems. Furthermore, these texts will also show the survival of Canaanite culture into North Africa of the Roman period. Finally, we will briefly look at the topos of "Punic books" in Classical literature and examine its significance for the production of 'books' in the Semitic world.

10:45-11:15 **Justin Comber** (McMaster Divinity College)

“Information Technologies in Antiquity”

► Post-Structuralist Suggestions for the Revision of New Testament Reader-Response Criticism. This paper will challenge the habit of reader-response critics to present their work as both respectful of the hypothetically limitless number of reader-readings and individual programmatic stories-of-reading. Making use of insights from literary theorists, I will attempt to reconstruct a theory of story that accounts for the individuality of the reader and the reality of text and apply it to the Gospel of Mark. I will demonstrate a reader-response methodology that describes the reciprocal axiological relationship between text and reader—the individual reader’s response (affective, cognitive behavioural) to text, and text’s evaluation of individual readings. It may be impossible to predict a reader’s response, but it is possible to describe textually valued responses (at the discourse level) and relate them to the textual experience of actual readers.

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

8:30-11:45 (MLB 354)

HEBREW BIBLE / BIBLE HÉBRAÏQUE II

Chair / Président: **Ehud Ben Zvi** (University of Alberta)

8:30-9:00 **Frank Clancy** (Kitchener, Ontario)

“Reading Samuel with Maps.”

► Maps may help us understand the story, emphasize the drama and so on. However, perhaps the more important function of maps may be to help us determine which texts are written by which writer. I shall argue that the Saul/Jonathan stories use one map while the Saul/David stories use another - suggesting two separate authors. Was Gibeath of Saul north or south of Jerusalem? Where was Nob? Where was Rachel’s tomb? With the help of

David Dorsey's "The Roads and Highways of Israel During the Iron Age" (1981)
I will try to answer these questions.

9:00-9:30 **J. Richard Middleton** (Northeastern Seminary)

"And the LORD Accepted Supplication for the Land": Two Ironic Narratives to Conclude (and Deconstruct?) the David Story (2 Samuel 21:1-14 and 2 Samuel 24:1-25)"

► The narrative of the book of Samuel ends with four chapters (21-24) variously described as an appendix or coda to the David story; these chapters form a chiasmic structure, with two narratives as the bookends of the chiasm. In both narratives David engages in ritual action to end a national catastrophe (handing over Saul's male heirs to be executed before YHWH to end a drought; offering sacrifices to stop a plague). Both narratives conclude with almost identical words: "And God/YHWH accepted supplication for the land" (21:14 and 24:25).

Although it is widely judged that these are unusual stories, with a perspective discernibly different from the rest of the David story, the strangest thing about them is that each contains a significant internal contradiction. In both cases, the narrative sets up an expectation that David's action precipitated the end to the catastrophe in question, then confounds that expectation. A close reading of the repeated sentence in the context of both narratives suggests an ironic (even deconstructive) perspective on David, involving a fundamental disjunction between David's interpretation of events and the narrator's (or even God's).

9:30-10:00 **Paul Evans** (McMaster Divinity College)

"Let the Crime Fit the Punishment: The Chronicler's Explication of David's 'Sin' in 1 Chronicles 21"

► While several theories have been offered to explicate the 'sin' of David's census in 1 Chronicles 21, no scholarly consensus exists. One theory offered by Johnstone (*Chronicles and Exodus*) suggested that the sin of the census was David's failure to require the collection of a levy from those registered as per the legislation in Exodus 30:11-16. Unfortunately, Johnstone failed to convincingly support this provocative thesis and left many important questions unanswered. However, this paper will follow Johnstone's lead and examine the relationship between 1 Chronicles 21, 2 Samuel 24 and Exodus 30, in an effort to understand how the Chronicler explicated the "sin" of David's census.

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **Gordon Oest** (Heritage Theological Seminary)

"'A Day like No Other' in the Context of Yahweh War: Joshua 10:14 and the Characterization of Joshua"

► Joshua 10:14 serves as an important element in the portrayal of the character of Joshua within the book of Joshua. The passage indicates that there has not been another day before or since when Yahweh listened to a human. While Joshua 10:14 has commonly been explored in connection with the description of the sun and moon standing still and the hailstorm described in Joshua 10:1-13, its fuller significance may be best understood within the larger context of Yahweh war and

the characterization of Joshua. In this context, the uniqueness described in Joshua 10:14 lies in Joshua's seizure of Yahweh's prerogative in Yahweh war and its role in bringing Joshua out from under Moses' shadow in the book's development of the character of Joshua.

10:45-11:15 **Lissa M. Wray Beal** (Providence Theological Seminary)

“Letting Josiah Rest in Peace”

► Interpretation of Josiah's narrative (2 Kings 22-23) must interact with what appears to be a fundamental discrepancy, that is, Huldah's prophecy that Josiah would be “gathered to his grave in peace” and his violent death at the hands of Pharaoh Neco. This paper will explore the discrepancy, noting and evaluating various explanations offered by interpreters. Second, this paper will forward a reading that places the discrepancy within large narrative arcs within 1-2 Kings, and traces analogies developed therein. Third, Josiah “resting in peace” will be considered in view of these analogies as part of the theological program of 1-2 Kings.

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

12:00-13:30

Women Scholars' Lunch / Casse-croûte pour les femmes savants

► Those interested in gathering should meet at ML 246 at 11:45am (after morning sessions). Everyone will walk together to the food court at the Student Life Centre.

13:30-16:45 (MLB 246)

GOSPEL STUDIES

Chair / Président: **Mona Tokarek LaFosse** (Wilfrid Laurier/Huron University College)

13:30-14:00 **Kyung S. Baek** (University of Manchester)

“Matthew's Fulfillment Quotations and Use of Scripture”

► Matthew's use of Scripture has come to somewhat of an impasse as it primarily focuses on the fulfillment quotations—evidenced by a steady stream of monographs beginning in 1954 with K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*, and more recently in 2004 with M. Menken, *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*, with many notably names filling in the gap (B. Lindars, W. D. Davies, R. Gundry, W. Rothfuchs, R. T. France, D. Moo and J. Miler). This paper, as well as examining Matthew's fulfillment quotations, will identify various problems surrounding this narrow perspective regarding Matthew's use of Scripture and suggest a way forward.

14:00-14:30 **Ken M. Penner** (St. Francis Xavier University)

“Early Christian Use of Isaiah's Prophecies”

► The early Christian writers agreed that the prophet Isaiah was a foreteller of future events. But scholars disagree about the way in which these prophecies were thought to be fulfilled. Was the Fathers' interpretation of Isaiah almost exclusively Christological (McKinion) or soteriological (Elliott)? This paper

argues that both views are only partially right because the earliest Christian authors' main use of Isaiah was for anti-Jewish polemic; this polemic was Christological because they thought Israel should have recognized the Son of God when he came, and it was soteriological because they claimed that in consequence of Israel's failure to recognize Christ, God's favour had moved from the Jews to the Gentiles.

14:30-15:00 **Rob Snow** (Ambrose University College)

“The Heavenly Temple in Mark 13:26–27”

► Some scholars argue that Mark 13:26–27 is a literal depiction of the *parousia* while for others, it is a figurative description of the Son of Man's vindication over a wayward Temple institution. While these proposals rightly consider the Danielic background of 13:26, few consider the heavenly temple setting of Daniel 7:9–14 and this text's historical context of faithful Israel estranged from the earthly temple. Mark evokes the Danielic heavenly temple to associate Yahweh and his celestial dwelling with the exalted Son of Man who comes to judge the Temple leaders who have rejected him and have estranged others from Yahweh's earthly dwelling (e.g. 11:17). After this judgment, the Son of Man's faithful followers, or “elect”, will be reunited with him in this celestial realm, not unlike the faithful ones in Daniel 7.

15:00-15:15 Break

15:15-15:45 **John Garrett Bolton** (McMaster University)

“Problems with the Two-Document Hypothesis”

► The paper will consider the problem that arises when Matthew's process of scrolling through Q is examined. Specific consideration will be given to those passages of Q that Matthew would have used to write his Sermon on the Mount. Matthew's process of going through Q to compose his Gospel is considerably different from that of Luke's, to the extent that Matthew's process of scrolling is difficult to believe. A number of scholars seeing this difficulty have attempted to obviate the problem by proposing that *two* Q documents were used (Q^{Mt} and Q^{Lk} [Luz] or “Q” and “q” [Dunn]). Others appeal to the possible use of memory as a way to explain Matthew's compositional method. No proposed solution solves this problem, however; rather further difficulties ensue. While this problem does not disprove the Two-Document Hypothesis, it does pose difficulty for the hypothesis when other potential solutions to the Synoptic Problem are considered.

15:45-16:15 **Duncan Reid** (Wycliffe College, Toronto School of Theology)

“Gospel Openings and the Synoptic Problem”

► This paper will compare the relative plausibility of three contemporary Synoptic Problem hypotheses (namely the Two Document Hypothesis, Two Gospel Hypothesis, and Farrer Hypothesis) in relation to the opening material on Jesus' origin, birth and nurture (up to his first public proclamation). The plausibility of each hypothesis will be assessed in light of the implied ordering and selection of this opening material especially in light of contemporary

encomiastic topic lists (as per the progymnasmata and rhetorical handbooks) and examples of *bioi* (e.g. Plutarch's *Lives*).

16:15-16:45 Questions and Discussion

13:30-16:15 (MLB 349)

CLOTHING AND ADORNMENT IN THE BIBLE AND ANTIQUITY / HABILLEMENT ET LES PARURES DANS LA BIBLE ET L'ANTIQUITÉ SPECIAL SESSION I

Chair / Président: Alicia Batten (University of Sudbury)

13:30-14:00 **Kristi Upson-Saia** (Occidental)

“Getting to the Root of Early Christian Significations of Hair”

► A cursory search of early Christian literature produces numerous references to regulations on how Christians ought to care for their hair. We find that tending to one's hair was considered to be a way to advertise not only one's sexual, gender, economic, and social status, but also one's religious commitments and identity. In this paper, I analyze Clement' of Alexandria's recommendations for hair styling, cutting, dying, and depilation in light of the broader societal—especially medical—notions of hair's significance.

14:00-14:30 **Carly Daniel-Hughes** (Concordia University)

“Putting on the Perfect Human: Clothing and Soteriology in the *Gospel of Philip*”

► Early Christians variously relied on the cultural significance of clothing in constructing their social and theological agendas; however, scholars have yet to consider closely the metaphorical deployment of dress in Nag Hammadi materials. This paper advances this discussion by considering the Valentinian *Gospel of Philip*. A close reading shows that the Pauline language of “being clothed in Christ” is elaborated upon in this gospel and connected to a host of ritual practices: baptism, eucharist, chrism, the kiss, and the (much-debated) bridal chamber. I illustrate that clothing language supports *Philip*'s theological vision—one in which all believers are transformed into Christs.

14:30-15:00 **Rebecca Krawiec** (Canisius College)

“‘The Holy Habit and the Teachings of the Elders’: Clothing and Cultural Memory in Late Antique Egyptian Monasticism”

► Several monastic works written by Evagrius Ponticus, Shenoute of Atripe, and his successor, Besa in late antique Egypt use discussions of clothing to regulate monastic behavior. Paul Connerton has argued for the connection between wearing clothing and writing a text as analogous processes within social memory; the ability to “read” clothing and texts depends upon proper literary and social competence. These monastic texts thus provide the opportunity to analyze how the cultural practices surrounding clothing in late antique Egyptian monasticism preserve particular memories, and enforce the forgetting of memories from past religious and social practices, in order to teach proper monasticism.

15:00-15:15 Break

15:15-15:45 Respondent: **K. Olson** (University of Western Ontario)

15:45-16:15 Questions and Discussion

14:00-16:00 (MLB 354)

IDENTITY AND ETHNICITY / IDENTITÉ ET L'ETHNICITÉ

Chair / Président: **Erin Vearncombe** (University of Toronto)

14:00-14:30 **Terry Donaldson** (Wycliffe College, Toronto School of Theology)

“*Goyim, ethnē, gentilis*, Gentiles: The Invention of a Category”

► The path leading from the Hebrew *goyim* to the contemporary English word “Gentiles” goes through disparate linguistic terrain, some of it well-known, some of it less so. The less well-known part of the journey leads from the Latin adjective *gentilis*, *-e*—which in its most basic sense served to describe a person (or thing) as belonging to a specific *gens* (clan, ethnic group)—to the English adjective and noun “Gentile”—which describes a person as not belonging to a specific ethnic group, that of the Jews. The purpose of this paper is to trace the development of the term “Gentiles,” with a view to identifying some of the problems and limitations inherent in the term.

14:30-15:00 **David M. Miller** (Briercrest College and Seminary)

“Ethnicity, Religion and the Meaning of *Ioudaios*”

► Whatever it originally meant, *Ioudaios* and its foreign cognates (*Iudaeus*, Jew, Juden, Juif, etc.) eventually came to designate, at least in part, an adherent of the religion of Judaism. Determining when this transition occurred—especially whether it had begun by the late Second Temple period—is a central question in recent scholarship on the meaning of the term and in debate about its translation into English as ‘Jew’ or ‘Judaean.’ This paper will review and critically evaluate recent proposals about the origin of a religious meaning of *Ioudaios*, and will consider implications for our understanding of early ‘Christianity’ and its relationship to early ‘Judaism.’

15:00-15:30 **John S. Kloppenborg** (University of Toronto)

“The Moralizing of Discourse in Graeco-Roman Associations”

► Among the differences between ancient associations—*thiasoi*, *collegia* and other groups—and early Christ groups that Wayne Meeks identified as significant is the supposed fact that associations were mainly unconcerned with regulating the ethical conduct of their members. In this respect, the ethical discourse of Christ groups displays more similarities to that of *philosophiae*. Adopting the principle that “associations are good to think with” (Lévi-Strauss), this paper examines instances of ethical discourse and ethical surveillance of members of Graeco-Roman associations.

15:30-16:00 Questions and Discussion

Tuesday May 29 / Mardi, 29 Mai

9:00-11:45 (HH 373)

EARLY CHRISTIANITY / CHRISTIANISME DES ORIGINES

Chair / Président: **Alan Kirk** (James Madison University)

9:00-9:30 **Edith M. Humphrey** (Pittsburgh Theological Seminary)

*“Traduire, c’est trahir—Tendentious Traditions in the Treatment of *paradidomi* and *paradosis* by NT Translators”*

► The word group most typically associated with the concept of “tradition” in the New Testament provides an interesting illustration of how the act of translation is complicated both by the lack of precise analogues when moving from one language to another, and by the expectations and scruples of various communities. The lack of an English verb “to tradition” provides a similar difficulty to that encountered by English interpreters who handle the *dikaioyne* word-group in the New Testament, occasioning E. P. Sanders’s suggestion to coin the verb “to righteous.” This natural “deficiency” in English, coupled with the reticence of some readers to recognize the prominence of “tradition” in the New Testament (especially when it is used in a positive context) makes for some interesting observations concerning a particular trajectory of translation in well-known English versions of both the gospels and the letters.

9:30-10:00 **Ryan Wettlaufer** (Toronto)

“Another Glance at James 1:17”

► James 1:17 is a well known verse, immortalized in numerous hymns and Sunday school rhymes: *“Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom there is no variableness neither shadow of turning.”* The smoothness of the English translation, however, belies the stability of the Greek text that underlies it. There are, in fact, at least 12 different variant readings, and none of those is clearly correct. The one printed in most bibles is, as Metzger described it, merely “the least unsatisfactory reading” (*Textual Commentary*, 608). Not content to settle for the lesser of 12 evils, this paper will argue that none of the extant manuscripts correctly preserve the original text, and will instead propose acceptance, on the basis of conjecture, of an ancient emendation.

10:15-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **Jordan Ryan** (McMaster)

“Matthean Politics Reconsidered”

► Recent examinations of the politics of Matthew have explored its challenge to Roman imperialism. This paper goes beyond that notion towards an understanding of how the polemic against Jewish leadership and the Pharisees fit into the overall schematic of Matthean politics. Rather than positing Rome as the primary Matthean political opponent, this paper proposes that Matthew presents the devil as Jesus’ primary political opponent, a patron for whom Rome is a

power broker, of whose power the Herodians and Jerusalem leadership partake. This national/imperial level of political discourse in which Matthew's Jesus is engaged is distinguished from the synagogue-based local/municipal level of political discourse at which Jesus engages the Pharisees in Galilee.

10:45-11:15 **Mona Tokarek LaFosse** (Wilfrid Laurier/Huron University College)

“Like a Father’: Age Hierarchy and the Meaning of *parakaleō* in 1 Timothy 5:1-2”

► In 1 Timothy 5:1a, the fictive Paul exhorts the fictive Timothy not to rebuke an older man, but *parakalei* him as a father (as well as younger men as brothers, older women as mothers and younger women as sisters; 5:1b-2). An understanding of the word *parakaleō* in this verse must take into account the cultural context of ancient Mediterranean gender and age hierarchy. The author does not indicate how Timothy should instruct his fellow group members in the “household of God” (1 Timothy 3:15), but how his audience should behave toward one another as fictive kin. In the face of challenges to traditional age-related behaviour in the community, the author promoted a conservative strategy that strongly encouraged submission to age hierarchy and the ideal of familial concord.

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

8:45-11:45 (EV1 4408)

CLOTHING AND ADORNMENT IN THE BIBLE AND ANTIQUITY / HABILLEMENT ET LES PARURES DANS LA BIBLE ET L'ANTIQUITÉ SPECIAL SESSION II

Chair / Président: **Carly Daniel-Hughes** (Concordia University)

8:30-9:00 **Alicia Batten** (University of Sudbury)

“Theorizing Dress”

► Anthropological and sociological approaches to dress not only emphasize that it is an important form of communication about personal, socio-cultural and religious identities, it can also be a locus of debate and conflict, and, as a performance, an embodied practice that is both shaped by and shapes culture and identity. This paper surveys some of the major contributions made to the analysis of dress; then proposes various possibilities for how they can shed light on understanding references to dress within the Bible and other ancient related literature.

9:00-9:30 **Dietmar Neufeld** (University of British Columbia)

“Dressing down criminals, deviants, and other undesirables”

► Fear of just censure and the sense of shame it produced kept Roman citizens from doing wrong (Cic. *Rep.* 5.6). Invective functioned socially as a strategy of social sanction. One among a number of commonly identified topics of accusation in the Roman tradition of ridicule was unusual appearance, clothing, or demeanour. Not surprisingly, John the Baptist emerges from the desert attired distinctly, demoniacs come out of the tombs so fierce that no one would pass by them (Matt 8:28), a man with an unclean spirit lives among the tombs and, even

though adorned with fetters and chains, cannot be controlled (Mark 5:15-20). Herod pretentiously puts on the royal robes and is eaten by worms and dies (Acts 12:21). Clearly, in each case, unusual appearance, clothing, and demeanour suggest a lapse from the appropriate, socially acceptable style of deportment and clothing. Oddities in dress and demeanour were equated with oddities in behaviour.

9:30-10:00 **Erin Vearncombe** (University of Toronto)

“Nakedness and the Abject, or Don’t Get your Coat!: the Naked or Semi-Naked Body in the Synoptic Gospels”

► Garments are a social obligation in a dressed society, and going without clothes is generally to risk social punishment or some degree of social exclusion; the common dream of appearing naked in public is interpreted as a nightmare. The contrast of nakedness and dress communicates some of the most basic differentiations of human experience: death and life, weakness and power, savagery and civilization. Naked bodies may be described in terms of Judith Butler’s category of the abject; without the social categorization of clothing, naked bodies are abjected, removed from codes of cultural intelligibility, yet still have the discursive power to disrupt. This paper will explore the notion of the discursive abject in the context of clothed and unclothed bodies in the synoptic gospels; examined within this framework of the abject, Jesus’ commands regarding the clothed/unclothed performance of the body have important unexplored social consequences.

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **Naftali Cohn** (Concordia University)

“Dressing on the Sabbath and Festivals: Women’s Adornment and Rabbinic Authority in the Mishnah”

► The early third century (male) rabbinic authors of the legal text known as the Mishnah were concerned with the regulated dress and adornment of the female body especially in relationship to the observance of traditional Judaeen festivals, including the Sabbath. Considering these festivals as temporal sites of Judaeen unity and distinctiveness, and taking account of the wider treatment of women in the Mishnah, this paper reads the varied attempts both to control and to display the female body as arguments for the authority of rabbis and their distinctive traditions –within both the variegated Judaeen and the larger Roman provincial societies.

10:45-11:15 Respondent: **K. Olson** (University of Western Ontario)

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

9:00-11:45 (EV1 4412)

SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM / JUDAÏSME DU DEUXIÈME TEMPLE

Chair / Président: **Ken M. Penner** (St. Francis Xavier University)

9:00-9:30 **Andrew R. Krause** (McMaster University)

“When We Were Performing Our Lawful Duties: Context and Significance of the Synagogue in Josephus’ *Vita* 271–303”

► Josephus is unparalleled in his presentation of raw literary data on first century CE synagogues. However, Josephus’ *tendenz* is too often ignored, as scholars ‘fact mine’ his works, treating the surrounding material as mere detritus. Thus, we will examine the Tiberian Crisis of *Vita* 271–303 in its literary and socio-historical context in order to ascertain what may reasonably be drawn from this passage in terms of the *realia* of ancient synagogues, arguing that while town assemblies, prayer, and meals are addressed, much of Josephus’ concern pertains to ethics of leadership and the relation of the synagogue to ‘ancestral customs’.

9:30-10:00 **Nathalie LaCoste** (University of Toronto)

“The Jewish Adoption of the Beneficent Nile? Changing Conceptions of the Nile Flood in Hellenistic Jewish Literature”

► For the ancient Egyptians the Nile flood was eternally beneficent. Despite occasional years of over or under flooding, it was their lifeblood and source of wealth. The Israelites in contrast sometimes looked with distain upon their Egyptian neighbours and subsumed the Nile’s inundations under the control of their God (Isa 37:25; Jer 46:7–8; Ezek 32:13–14). With the increased migration of the Jews to Egypt under the Ptolemies, a different attitude towards the flood emerged, reflecting a more appreciative view of the Nile by Jewish writers (Ben Sira 24; Artepanus). This paper investigates these changing attitudes towards the Nile flood preserved in Jewish literature from the pre-exilic to the Second Temple period. These developments reflect the settlement of the Jews in the land of Egypt under the Ptolemies and play an important role in the establishment of Jewish communities.

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **Catherine Sider Hamilton** (Wycliffe College)

“From Cain to the Flood: an Enochic Interpretation in Wisdom of Solomon?”

► Wisdom 10:1-4 departs in two major ways from the biblical history it catalogues (Gen 1-6) – or at least from the standard reading of it. Cain, and not Adam, is chief sinner, the “unrighteous man” (10:3). Further, Cain is responsible for the flood (10:4). Cain’s murder of Abel, that is, becomes in Wisdom 10 the world’s primordial sin and cause of the flood. This is not Paul’s reading of Genesis, nor (for instance) 4 Ezra’s. I Enoch, however, shares with Wisdom the connection between Cain and the flood: it is the blood that cries out from the ground with the voice of Abel that calls down God’s justice in the form of the flood (1 En 9-10). This paper traces in Wisdom 4, 10 and 14 reminiscences of 1 Enoch 6-11 to argue that an Enochic interpretation of Genesis informs Wisdom’s

reading of the primordial history and illuminates its interest in Cain, his killing, and the flood.

10:45-11:15 **Eric R. Montgomery** (McMaster University)

“The Knowledge of Good and Evil as God’s Gift to Adam”

► This paper examines a tradition in Second Temple Judaism in which God originally bestowed the first man, Adam, with the knowledge of good and evil. I begin with an investigation of the prevalence of this interpretive tradition in Second Temple Judaism and its use in some later Jewish, Christian, and Samaritan texts. This is followed by a brief consideration of how this tradition relates Adam’s reception of knowledge to his expulsion from the garden. Finally, I look at how texts that contain this Adamic tradition associate the acquisition of knowledge with a return to the primordial Edenic state.

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

13:30-15:45 (HH 373)

EARLY CHRISTIANITY / CHRISTIANISME DES ORIGINES II

Chair / Président: **Tony Burke** (York)

13:30-14:00 **John F. Horman** (Waterloo, ON)

“Why the Gospel of Thomas is not Likely to Have Been Written in Aramaic or Syriac”

► Since its discovery, many have proposed that the Gospel of Thomas was originally written in Aramaic. These proposals have ranged from the modest view that certain sayings in the Gospel of Thomas may reflect a separate translation of authentic Jesus sayings from Aramaic to more radical proposals involving extensive reconstructions of early Christianity. In this paper I will reflect on the evidence which has been brought forward to support such an origin, but also bring forward some other evidence, mainly linguistic in nature, which is incompatible with such an origin.

14:00-14:30 **Anna Cwikla** (University of Alberta)

“The Image of Mary in the *Dialogue of the Saviour*”

► Mary is one of three disciples in the Nag Hammadi text the *Dialogue of the Saviour*, who engages in a discussion with the Saviour. This Mary, often viewed as the most important disciple in *DialSav*, has been used to complement her image in other early Christian writings such as the *Gospel of Mary* in which she is the primary female character. This paper will problematize the ways in which Mary in *DialSav* has been portrayed by scholars and demonstrate what impact this has on her character in other Marian texts specifically within the context of gender imagery in these writings.

14:30-15:00 **Callie Callon** (University of Toronto)

“The Unibrow that Never Was (?) and the Not-So-Many Faces of Paul: A Proposal to Give the Physical Description of Paul a Makeover”

► The Acts of Paul and Thecla contain the earliest description of the physical appearance of Paul, which has in turn received various interpretations in scholarship, often through the lens of physiognomy. These have met with limited success, primarily because these identified character “types” attributed to Paul based on his characteristics do not cohere with how Paul is depicted elsewhere in the narrative. I suggest translating “meeting eyebrows” [*sunofrus*] in the sense of “unibrow” as previous scholars have done obfuscates the image the author sought to depict. Rather, if the alternative translation of “knitted brow” is employed, all of the other attributes can be seen as forming an intelligible whole, and one that fits well with not only how Paul is portrayed in this narrative, but also with other early literary and iconographical traditions: Paul as the consummate philosopher in general, and as Socrates in particular.

15:15-15:45 Questions and Discussion

13:30-16:45 (EV1 4408)

QUMRAN

Chair / Président: Cecilia Wassen (Uppsala University)

13:30-14:00 **Eugene Ulrich** (University of Notre Dame)

“Pre-Scripture,” Scripture (Rewritten), and “Rewritten Scripture”

► Recent scholarship recognizes three undisputed facts: (1) Virtually all the books now recognized as the Hebrew Scriptures did not begin as authoritative “Scripture” but were redacted from sources that were national or religious literature, thus “pre-Scripture.” (2) The biblical books experienced successive literary growth, even new updated editions, while already recognized as Scripture; thus all of Scripture is rewritten. (3) There were new, interpretive books that were composed using the Scriptures as their basis, but understood by the author as a new, non-scriptural, exegetical work, thus “Rewritten Scripture.” This paper will explore the three types to discern their distinguishing criteria and to suggest a correlation between “pre-Scripture” and “Rewritten Scripture.”

14:00-14:30 **Nick Meyer** (McMaster University)

“Adam’s Glory Meets Adam’s Dust: The Dichotomy between Human Destiny and Ontology in the Hodayot”

► Scholars have often remarked on the Hodayot’s deeply pessimistic anthropology. The Hodayot infuse the tradition of human creation from the earth with profoundly negative significance that includes not merely innate transience but also sinfulness and impurity. Scholars have also emphasized the Hodayot’s insistence that the elect have been destined to share in the immortal life and liturgy of the angels. What has been less explored is the anthropological quality of the latter motif and the tension that results between the tradition of *adamic* glory and *adamic* dust: The nature of humankind (dust) is mismatched with the divine intention for humankind (glory). Scholars who have noted this tension resolve it by appeal to the notion of the fall, or they might soften one half of the dichotomy,

typically its negative side. This paper will give full weight to the dichotomy and show its coherence as an expression of the deterministic divine plan.

14:30-15:00 **Sherry Coman** (Regis College, Toronto School of Theology)

“*The Spring of Understanding: An Investigation of ‘Spring’ as Wisdom Metaphor in the Hodayot*”

► The word “spring” is used approximately twelve times in the Hodayot in association with the presence or pursuit of knowledge and wisdom. In this paper, I will look at instances where the psalmist is presenting the word metaphorically to describe himself as a conduit of God’s wisdom to a community. I will do so by engaging the metaphor theory of Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner and in particular their understanding of conceptual blending. The paper will determine whether a position of leadership to the Qumran community is fundamental to the way the metaphor is engaged and will therefore include some discussion of examples which occur in columns attributed to the Teacher of Righteousness.

15:00-15:15 Break

15:15-15:45 **Sarianna Metso** (University of Toronto)

“Second Temple Legal Developments in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls”

► This paper examines the processes of generating, transmitting, and receiving legal traditions, focusing on material related to the book of Leviticus. The evidence from Qumran indicates that the text of the Book of Leviticus had achieved a relatively uniform state by the second half of the Second Temple period. This stands in contrast to, e.g., the Books of Exodus and Numbers which appear to have been still in a pluriform state and to display two or more literary editions. Nonetheless, the text of Leviticus served as a source for a great amount of interpretive scribal creativity, often going beyond the boundaries of the legal genre. Of the twenty-seven chapters of Leviticus, all but one are quoted in the non-scriptural scrolls, and as many as twenty-five non-scriptural works contain quotes from Leviticus. This large quantity of material paints a vivid picture of the centrality of the Leviticus traditions for Second Temple Judaism.

15:45-16:15 **Andrew B. Perrin** (McMaster University)

“Picking Up Where Levi Left Off: Dream-Vision Discourse and Priestly Tradition from the *Aramaic Levi Document* to *4QVisions of Amram*”

► This paper will explore how *4QVisAmram* extended the trajectory of the ‘priestly tradition genealogy’ presented in *ALD*. It will be argued that this literary process involved two strategies: (i) the priestly genealogy of *ALD* was augmented to encompass the Aaronide line within a holy, eternal, and perpetual priesthood, and (ii) the entire priestly line from Abraham forward was framed by the authentication of a celestial Melchizedek in a dream-vision. The author of *4QVisAmram* thus ensured the reliability and stability of the priestly channels of transmission from Melchizedek down through Aaron’s descendants. The study presents a fresh proposal regarding the literary relationship of two Qumran Cave 4 pseudepigrapha, a new interpretation of the dream-vision in *4QVisAmram*, as well

as provides a glimpse of the evolution of priestly rhetoric in some Second Temple literature.

16:15-16:45 **Carmen Palmer** (Emmanuel College, Toronto School of Theology)
 “The Perfect Partnership: Inter-Marriage Prohibition and Proselyte Inclusion in Jubilees, Tobit, and Ben Sira”

► Present among the Dead Sea Scrolls are extant fragments from three popular Second Temple Period texts, namely the books of Jubilees, Tobit, and Ben Sira. Each of these texts contains a common feature, which is an intermarriage prohibition between Jew and Gentile. The high frequency of this recurring theme among the Qumran community (or communities) literary corpus is not a surprise in and of itself. I will argue in this paper, however, that each of these texts also contains the common feature of foreigner inclusion. Such a sustained and curious pairing found within the DSS corpus suggests that these intermarriage prohibitions may not indicate one sole literary attitude of exclusion toward Gentiles, at both Qumran and beyond.

13:30-16:45 (EV1 4412)

HEBREW BIBLE / BIBLE HÉBRAÏQUE III

Chair / Président: **Lissa M. Wray Beal** (Providence Theological Seminary)

13:30-14:00 **John Van Seters** (North Carolina)

“The Itinerary from Egypt to the Jordan River: A Study in J’s Historiography”

► A recent trend in Pentateuchal studies rejects the notion of the Yahwist as a continuous historical narrative from Genesis to Numbers and fragments it into numerous redactional pieces. In keeping with the view that the Yahwist is a historian of Israel’s origins, I will argue that a prominent feature of such works in both Near Eastern and Greek historiography is the use of itineraries to arrange and integrate a large body of diverse events and traditions. Based upon such comparative examples, I will show how J’s many itinerary notices from the Israelites departure from Egypt to their arrival at the Jordan River are used to fit together all of the major events of the journey into a unified sequence.

14:00-14:30 **Ehud Ben Zvi** (University of Alberta)

“Monogynistic Tendencies, Memories and Imagination in Late Persian/Early Hellenistic Yehud”

► As per its title, this paper deals with monogynistic tendencies, memories and imagination in Late Persian/Early Hellenistic Yehud including—though, of course, not restricted-- to the construction of YHWH as the husband of only one wife (Jerusalem/Israel). Among others, it will explore some monogynistic tendencies in constructions of the heavenly and earthly worlds of social memory evoked by the literature of the period, notice both differences and similarities, discuss matters of systemic preferences and dis-preferences for memories of monogynistic relations, associate them and the resulting memories along with the horizon of imagination that they create with matters of social mindscape within the historical community at the time, and touch on the potential value for

historical studies of socio-historical explanations that associate increased male, horizontal, social cohesion with monogynistic tendencies (cf. the Greco-Roman world).

14:30-15:00 **Ian Douglas Wilson** (University of Alberta)

“The Song of the Sea within Post-Monarchic Prophetic and Historical Discourses”

► The Song of the Sea (Exod 15), which recounts and praises Yhwh’s fantastic victory over Pharaoh and Israel’s crossing at the Reed Sea, was clearly a monumental literary construction in the mental landscape of biblical literature (e.g., Josh 24:5-7; Isa 11:15-16; Pss 77; 106). Yhwh’s separation of the mighty waters and his crushing of the enemy signify at once both the deity’s sovereignty over the Sea (and water in general) and Israel’s emergence from the Sea as a new nation. In this paper I will explore the Song’s place and function in post-monarchic discourses, namely, historical discourses within prophetic literature. The memory of these events at the Sea becomes increasingly polyphonic in post-monarchic contexts, as the Judean community both struggled with and affirmed its identity as Yhwh’s chosen people (cf., e.g., Isa 63:7-14).

15:00-15:15 Break

15:15-15:45 **Jeaman Choi** (McMaster Divinity)

“The Invasion of Sennacherib during the Reign of King Hezekiah”

► The story of Hezekiah in the book of Kings is nearly identical with the story in Isaiah. However, the Hezekiah account in Chronicles is quite divergent in many ways. This paper will examine each of these three Hezekiah accounts in order to explicate the unique intentions of each text. It will be shown that the book of Kings has chiefly political concerns, while Isaiah focuses on Hezekiah as an ideal king. Furthermore, Chronicles concentrates on the role of God as the one who responds to Hezekiah’s faithfulness.

15:45-16:15 **Peter Sabo** (University of Alberta)

“Isaiah: Blind Prophet, Blind Text and Blind Readers”

► The topoi of blindness and insight run throughout the book of Isaiah. In a seminal essay Robert Carroll uses the term “blindsight” to understand the relation between these two themes and how they relate to the visionary book of Isaiah. He borrows the term from experimental psychology and uses it in a poetic way arguing that the book of Isaiah calls for blind readers and writers. In this essay I will elaborate further some of Carroll’s unexplored points, such as what exactly it means to be a blind reader and writer in regard to Isaiah. Moreover, I will use the work of Derrida, particularly his book *Memoirs of the Blind*, as a key intertext.

16:15-16:45 Questions and Discussion

The End