

Canadian Society of Biblical Studies 2014 Complete Programme

(updated: May 22, 2014)

Sessions are located in the Matheson Learning Commons Building,
unless otherwise noted.

Friday, May 23

Friday 14:00-19:00 (Rm 238)
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Saturday, May 24

Saturday 8:30-11:45 (Rm 228)
SOCIAL WORLD OF ANTIQUITY
Presided by: **Dietmar Neufeld** (University of British Columbia)

8:30-9:00 **Jeffrey Keiser** (McGill University)

“Hero Christology in Asia Minor: Evidence from Pliny the Younger”

► According to Pliny the Younger, certain Christians whom he interrogated during his tenure as governor of Bithynia claimed to assemble before dawn to sing hymns to Christ “as to a God” (*Letter to Trajan* 10.96.7). Although Pliny wrote in the official language of Latin, the phrase “as to a God” sometimes appears in Greek writings in reference to sacrifices honouring heroes. A survey of this usage, combined with archaeological evidence for a renaissance of hero worship in Asia Minor, suggests that Pliny’s remark reveals a popular hero christology in the burgeoning Christian communities of Bithynia.

9:00-9:30 **Meredith Warren** (University of Ottawa)

“Tastes Like Heaven: Access to Other Worlds Through Performative Consumption”

► Access to other worlds is a prominent trope in religious texts from antiquity. One narrative tool which grants such access is the consumption of heavenly food. The trope of hierophagy, I propose, is a literary mechanism by which eaters gain access to divine knowledge, abilities, and locations. The paper I propose articulates the trope of hierophagy using three textual examples from across religious boundaries: the Greek myth of Persephone from the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* and Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*; the Jewish pseudepigraphal book of *4 Ezra*; and the

Christian martyrdom of *Perpetua and Felicitas*. Reading these three texts along side one another reveals not only a category of transformational eating that allows consumers to transgress boundaries to another world, but also a literary trope that transgresses supposed religious boundaries.

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

“More than the Miqva: Jewish Experiences with Water in Ptolemaic Egypt”

► The unearthing of Miqva’ot from the Second Temple period has peaked scholarly interest in Jewish religious practices involving water. Yet, this is only one small way in which Jews experienced water. This paper will examine how water was a part of mundane, commercial, and religious life for Jews in the Second Temple period. By focusing on several papyri and documentary inscriptions from Egypt, I will demonstrate not only why the study of water is valuable topic of research, but how a better understanding of Jewish experiences with water provide insights into Jewish life, literary production, and interactions with the “other.”

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **Richard Last** (Queen’s University)

“The Affiliations of Gospel-Writers within Local *Ekklēsiai*”

► Where did Gospel-writers live? The evidence is too fragmentary to answer confidently with respect to any specific Gospel-writer, but signs indicate that these authors inhabited some of the many cities or villages wherein local *ekklēsiai* were established by the mid-second century. This paper explores various possibilities for the type of affiliation authors might have had with local Christ-groups (e.g., patrons, regular members, occasional guests, entirely unaffiliated). It then addresses recent studies that hinder further exploration of this issue, including works that privilege trans-local author networks over the “social wholes” of small local cultic associations (Stowers 2011), that maximize the significance of supposed trans-local intended audiences (Bauckham 1998; Klink III 2010), and that deny that regional factors could recognizably shape the way authors edited, compiled, and created literature about Jesus (Hägerland 2003). Evidence from Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Strabo challenge the conclusions of these studies. Of particular relevance is the information Dionysius and Strabo provide concerning the relationship between the various local mythmakers and hero-cults of Herakles and Aeneas. This data helps to clarify how Greeks and Romans adapted mythology for usage in local cultic settings, and holds implications for Gospel research if Gospel-writers were at all affiliated with local *ekklēsiai*.

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

“You want answers, go to school! What Graeco-Roman schooling practices can tell us about early Jesus people.”

► When schools are mentioned in studies of early Jesus people, they are often philosophical or rhetorical schools, and are generally brought into the discussion to explain particular content of a Christian text. To be sure,

rhetorical style and philosophical content can tell us interesting things about the texts we study, but this is not all Graeco-Roman schools have to offer. This paper will examine the ways in which schooling (particularly more primary schooling) shaped early composers and consumers of texts about Jesus. In particular I will focus on 1) the social location of teachers and students, 2) the types of reading and writing students and teachers at different levels engaged in, and 3) the *παιδεία* (cultural capital) enjoyed by students and teachers. I will conclude by looking at the ways in which the Gospel of Thomas reflects some of these schoolish features.

11:15-11:45 **Brigidda Bell** (University of Toronto)

“Moved by the Spirit: discernment and signaling theory in ancient Mediterranean contexts of spirit possession”

► This paper examines how power is fostered and transmitted through ideas about the divine acting with, in, and through human bodies. It explores which bodily, environmental and cultural cues signal to observers that they should treat a person as authentically possessed or inspired by another being in the ancient Mediterranean. Studies of early Christianity that consider claims to the presence of the divine in individuals have not investigated how processes of discernment, being the epistemic judgments on the manifestation of the deity, are made partly on the basis of affective responses to phenomena. The study of the discernment of spirits involves careful attention to cultural imagination, embodied practice, and the affective dimensions of ritual.

Saturday 9:00-11:45 (Rm 211)

DEAD SEA SCROLLS I

Presided by: **Eileen Schuller** (McMaster University)

9:00-9:40 **Andrew B. Perrin** (Trinity Western University)

“From Lingua Franca to Lingua Sacra: The Scripturalization of Tobit in 4Qtob^c”

► In light of the consensus that the book of Tobit was originally penned in the Aramaic language, the fragmentary Hebrew copy 4Qtob^c (4Q200) may be considered a singularly unique literary artifact of Second Temple Judaism. While there is ample evidence to suggest that a cluster of other Aramaic works known from Qumran and elsewhere were read and received as authoritative scripture by at least some Jews at this time (e.g., Dan 2-7; the booklets of 1 Enoch, and the Aramaic Levi Document), Tobit alone was recovered from the common language of the ancient Near East into the traditional Israelite mother tongue. This paper describes an early episode from Tobit’s reception history by exploring how the shift in Tobit’s language from Aramaic to Hebrew informs our conception of the status and function of this composition in ancient Judaism. A preliminary conclusion of the study is that the linguistic overlay given to 4Qtob^c qualifies it as a literary edition in its own right.

9:40-10:20 **Carmen Palmer** (Emmanuel College)

“Here a Priest, There a Priest: Priestly Self-Identification in the Dead Sea Scrolls”

► Within the Dead Sea Scrolls affiliated with the Qumran community, priests figure in a number of texts. Sometimes various members among the group are identified as priests. On other occasions, the whole community is described in a priestly fashion. Scholarship has already weighed the evidence as to whether Qumran community members stem from a Zadokite priestly lineage and has found concrete findings lacking. Instead of such an external perspective assessment, this paper undertakes a different approach and assesses the Qumran community’s internal self-perception of its priestly identity. The paper proposes that the nature of the self-identification as a priest within a text varies depending upon the text’s attitude toward outsiders joining the group. Tentatively, priestly descent seems variably mutable.

10:20-10:35 Break

10:35-11:15 **James M. Tucker** (Trinity Western University)

“Of Syntax, Scribes, and Scrolls: An Assessment of How Syntactical Variants Illustrate Textual Development”

► The biblical Dead Sea Scrolls have offered significant insights for current theories of textual transmission. Scribal culture has slowly influenced, as the evidence permits, the predominate theories. However, a close examination of syntactical variation witnessed in the scrolls has yet to influence our understanding of concepts such as ‘authority’, ‘biblical,’ and ‘non-Biblical.’ In this paper, a case is made for the need to analyze the so-called biblical scrolls with other contemporary witnesses, using the insights offered by proto-type theories of Cognitive Linguistics. Once the semantic frame of the Masoretic Text is removed—an anachronistic measure at the least—what emerges is an enhanced methodology for accessing *fortschreibung* in the intricate and detailed process of scripturalization of the Hebrew Bible.

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

Saturday 9:00-11:45 (Rm 230)

GENESIS

Presided by: **Ellen White** (Göttingen)

9:00-9:30 **Marina Hofman** (University of Toronto)

“Dream Type-scene in the Old Testament: A Case Study of Genesis 20”

► This paper argues for the presence and importance of a biblical dream type-scene in the Old Testament and will use Genesis 20 to show how studying the narrative as a type-scene provides a greater understanding of the meaning and significance of the passage. Specifically, the paper will show how identifying the type-scene characteristics at work within a particular scene enables the reader to find fresh insight and meaning in the passage by observing how each characteristic is presented. It will also suggest that identifying the biblical dream type-scene provides criteria to

distinguish dream narratives from other Old Testament narratives and provides a context in which the narrative may be understood by creating particular narrative expectations.

9:30-10:00 **Mary L. Conway** (McMaster Divinity College)

“Subdue the Earth? A Re-evaluation of the Use of כָּבַשׁ in Genesis 1:28.”

► The traditional translation of כָּבַשׁ in Gen 1:28 as “fill the earth and *subdue* it” has created concern among environmentalists who seek to avoid any biblical justification for irresponsible exploitation of the earth’s resources. This paper uses Neumann-Gorsolke’s article, “‘And the Land Was Subdued before Them...’? Some Remarks on the Meaning of כָּבַשׁ in Joshua 18:1 and Related Texts,” as a starting point for a reevaluation of the lexeme in the Genesis context since Neumann-Gorsolke advocates a non-violent translation of “to set foot on the land.” Through a critical evaluation of lexicons and an analysis of the meaning of the word in context, this paper argues that neither the environmentally exploitative interpretation nor Neumann-Gorsolke’s non-violent suggestion is adequate, and advocates for a third option that makes better sense of כָּבַשׁ in the context of Gen 1:28.

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **J. Richard Middleton** (Northeastern Seminary)

“Unbinding the Aqedah from the Straightjacket of Tradition: How Abraham Lost His Son”

► Traditional Jewish and Christian readings of Genesis 22 hold Abraham up as a paradigm of virtue. By contrast, this paper will question whether Abraham’s unquestioning obedience to the divine command to sacrifice his son is meant to be either morally or religiously exemplary. Since any self-aware interpreter must wonder whether such an alternative reading is a function of contemporary sensibilities or is intrinsic to the narrative itself, the paper will mine salient details of Genesis 22, while reading the Aqedah in the context of the broader Abraham story, especially Abraham’s earlier conversation with God over Sodom’s fate (Genesis 18) and clues in the later narrative concerning his relationship to Isaac, and Isaac’s relationship to his sons. The paper will suggest that what is being “tested” in Genesis 22 is not Abraham’s obedience, but his discernment of YHWH’s “way” (18:19) and will examine the consequences of Abraham’s (failed) discernment of God on his family, especially Isaac.

10:45-11:15 **P.J. Sabo** (University of Alberta)

“Borders and Blurred Boundaries in the Lot Story”

► This paper will discuss the issue of borders and boundaries in the Lot story (focusing on Gen. 19, particularly vv.30-38). My thesis is that the story simultaneously creates borders and then blurs these boundaries. This subversive tendency is exemplified in the character of Lot, who does not fit nicely into any of the dichotomies that the text establishes. These dichotomies include: rural versus urban life, and the difference between being part of Abraham’s household versus participating in Sodomite

culture; legitimate versus illegitimate relations, primarily revealed in the blurring of sexual and kinship boundaries; and righteousness versus wickedness, revolving around the issues of judgment and salvation.

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

LUNCH FOR ALL STUDENTS AND NEW MEMBERS (12:00-12:30; Thistle 259)

SPECIAL SESSION ORGANIZED BY STUDENTS (12:30-13:45; Thistle 259)

Topic: Pedagogical Perspectives: Developing a Teaching Philosophy

As the job market and grant competitions become more competitive, graduate students and faculty are increasingly being asked for a statement detailing their philosophy of teaching. Such statements are usually submitted alongside a teaching dossier, or teaching portfolio, similar to a curriculum vitae that focuses specifically on your teaching beliefs and practices. A well-developed philosophy will set you apart from your peers and clearly communicate what you believe about students and how you create conditions that optimize student learning and growth. However, the process of developing such a document is often challenging and nebulous for beginners. Please join us for a special student session devoted to developing your teaching philosophy.

Presiding: C. Hiltunen (McMaster)

Panelists:

- ▶ Ken Penner (Assistant Professor, St. Francis Xavier University)
- ▶ Robert Holmstedt (Associate Professor, University of Toronto)
- ▶ Edith Humphrey (Pittsburg Theological Seminary)

Saturday 14:00-15:20 (South Block 216)

STUDENT ESSAY PRIZES

Presided by: **Mark Boda** (McMaster Divinity)

14:00-14:30 *Jeremias Prize Paper*: **Michelle Christian** (University of Toronto)
“Money and the construction of value in Mt 10:29-31//Lk 12:6-7”

14:30-14:40 Questions

14:40-15:10 *Founders Prize Paper*: **John Screnock** (University of Toronto) “On the Overlap of Translation and Transmission: Intralingual Translation in the Transmission of Hebrew Bible Manuscripts”

15:10-15:20 Questions

Saturday 15:30-17:00 (South Block 216)

CSBS ANNUAL MEETING

Presided by: **Mark Boda** (McMaster Divinity)

Saturday 17:15-18:15 (South Block 216)

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Presided by: **Mark Boda** (McMaster Divinity)

- ▶ “A Deafening Call to Silence: The Rhetorical Role of Human Address to the Deity in the Book of the Twelve”

Saturday 19:00-23:00

CSBS ANNUAL DINNER

Amici's Banquet and Conference Centre

2740 Merrittville Hwy

Sunday May 25

Sunday 8:30-11:45 (Rm 228)

EARLY CHRISTIANITY

Presided by: **Ronald Charles** (University of Toronto)

8:30-9:00 **Beth Stovell** (St. Thomas University)

“Love One Another and Love the World: The Love Command and Jewish Ethics in the Johannine Community”

► The development of the “love command” in Jesus’ teaching and its implementation in the early Christian community as a social boundary marker has been the topic of much discussion. Many locate this development within the Johannine corpus, particularly in the Johannine epistles, and argue that the “love command” functions in an exclusive fashion, reinforcing group identity. Yet one may ask whether these formulations have adequately considered the social context of the perpetuation of the “love command” in the Johannine community, particularly in relation to the ethics of the Jewish mission. Using conceptual mapping theories developed by Giles Fauconnier and Mark Turner, this paper examines the conceptions of love, the Law, and boundary line formation in Jewish literature of the Second Temple period to understand the social phenomenon occurring in the early Johannine community depicted in the “love command” in Johannine literature.

9:00-9:30 **Tyler Smith** (Yale University)

“Minds, Genre, and Characterization at the Samaritan Well”

► Genre generates expectations about narrative texts. These expectations, *inter alia*, condition how readers construct and maintain representations of the minds of characters that populate narrative storyworlds. This paper will draw on insights from the interdisciplinary field of cognitive narratology to offer some preliminary reflections on genre and characterization in John 4:4-26, Jesus’ encounter with the Samaritan Woman, attending especially to the consequences of genre-conditioned expectations for the representation of mental states.

9:30-10:00 **Christine Cos** (Wycliffe College)

“Re-examining Sarah as a Faithful Woman in Genesis and Hebrews”

► The covenant theme in Genesis contains an element of endangerment in the form of barren wives, where the principal wife of each patriarch is childless for the majority of their marriage. This motif highlights God’s sovereign ability to fulfill his covenant promise of children, namely ‘seed.’

Unlike Abraham, Sarah is not associated with “*faith*” in the book of Genesis. However, she is mentioned as a model of faith in Hebrews 11:11. Commentators and translators will argue that Abraham is the subject this verse. I will provide a meta-analysis examining the gamut of interpretations and identify that which best fits the biblical text and context.

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **David M. Miller** (Briercrest College and Seminary)
“Deuteronomy 18:15 and Torah Ethics in the Book of Acts”

► Scholarly discussion about the role of the Law in Acts centres around the claim that Luke depicts Jewish Christ-believers as Torah observant. Some scholars respond that the Law, according to Acts, has been superseded by the message of Jesus. Others conclude that Luke’s conflicting statements about Torah show that the topic was of comparatively little interest to the author, or unresolved in his mind. This paper will contribute to the debate by exploring what Luke’s presentation of Jesus as an authoritative prophet like Moses implies about the continuing authority of Torah for Christ-believing Jews, about its function as an ethical standard for both Jewish and Gentile Christ-believers, and about its role in the author’s construction of early Christian identity.

10:45-11:15 **Gregory Fewster** (Hamilton, ON)
“Nomina Sacra and Multimodal Semiosis in Early Christian Material Culture”

► Larry Hurtado’s recent effort to situate the *nomina sacra* in “an emergent material and visual culture in ancient Christianity,” is a productive direction in *nomina sacra* research. However, this proposal could benefit from a robust exploration of what an emergent material and visual culture entails and how this might relate to the *meaning* of the practice itself. Theories of “multimodality” explore the interface of correlative communicative modes (e.g., linguistic and graphic modes) of meaning-making practices, allowing for a more pointed analysis of early *nomina sacra* in their material context. *Nomina sacra* reflect an interesting combination of material and abstract symbolic resources for meaning-making among early manuscripts and other relevant artifacts.

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

Sunday 8:30-11:45 (Rm 211)

APOCRYPHA – A Co-Sponsored Session with the Canadian Society of Patristics

Presided by: **Timothy Pettipiece** (Carleton University)

8:30-9:00 **Anna Cwikla** (University of Toronto)

“The *Dialogue of the Saviour* and the Synoptic Gospels”

► Other than the *Gospel of Thomas*, Nag Hammadi texts are rarely considered in scholarship concerning the literary relationship to the Synoptic Gospels. The initial work on the *Dialogue of the Saviour* in the 1970s argued that it shows no certain dependence on any NT writings.

Although this thesis has slowly fallen out of favour, the initial literary outline proposed by Helmut Koester and Elaine Pagels continues to obscure more in-depth source criticism. By shifting away from these artificially imposed gridlines, previously unexplored parallels to the Synoptic Gospels become evident, thus making the case that *DialSav* should receive more attention in this discourse.

9:00-9:30 **Callie Callon** (University of Toronto)

“Physiognomy as a component of characterization in the *Acts of Peter*”

► Ancient physiognomic thought held that the body and soul were intrinsically related, and that observation of a subject’s physical appearance provided insight into his or her character. Beyond being a diagnostic tool, however, physiognomy could also be used as a strategy of persuasion to bolster or malign an individual’s character to an author or speaker’s audience. The use of physiognomics to praise or denigrate was not restricted solely to actual personal interactions, but, as Elizabeth Evans has demonstrated, was often employed by authors of narrative works to aid in their characterizations of their story’s protagonists and antagonists. I propose that much like contemporaneous narratives in antiquity the *Acts of Peter* utilizes physiognomic commonplaces to reinforce its positive portrayal of Peter and its negative depiction of Simon.

9:30-10:00 **Bradley N. Rice** (McGill University)

“Jesus the Gadfly: Introducing the *Dialogue of the Paralytic with Christ*”

► The *Dialogue of the Paralytic with Christ* offers one of the most provocative portrayals of Jesus outside the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*. Unflinching in its depiction of Jesus as a wayward troublemaker and intractable disbeliever, *Dial. Paralytic* was unknown to scholars of Christian apocrypha until relatively recently. In my paper I will offer an introduction to the Armenian and Georgian versions of *Dial. Paralytic*, which I am presently preparing for the forthcoming *More Christian Apocrypha* volume (ed. Tony Burke and Brent Landau). I will then explore the textual relationship that *Dial. Paralytic* seems to share with the *Armenian Infancy Gospel* in order to shed light on the obscure origins of this singular apocryphon.

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **John Horman**

“Translation Matters”

► Our Coptic translation has skewed our understanding of the Gospel of Thomas. Because it was found in a collection of documents translated into Coptic, and because at first its relation to three papyri fragments was not at first recognised, it became customary to refer to it as the “Coptic Gospel of Thomas” as if the accidental fact of its having been translated into Coptic was part of its very essence. This, however, as Goodacre notes, falsifies our understanding of Thomas. I will in this paper probe this falsification under several headings. First, literary relationships are obscured. For example, when in Th. 4:2 the Coptic translator omitted the

words “and the last first”, he obscured the fact that for this saying Thomas has a literary relationship with Mark and not with Q. Second, Thomas’ meaning is concealed. In the introduction, the Coptic translator has introduced a copula where very probably none was intended. In Th. 68, the translator has repositioned a negative, making what was originally a clear statement into mystifying nonsense. Third, relations between sayings are garbled. For example, the translator has obscured the connection between Th. 36 and Th. 37, and between Th. 7 and 8. Fourth, in some cases the translator simply had no idea what the Greek text was about. For example, in Th. 2, he replaced a carefully constructed sentence with a Stoic platitude. In Th. 60 he simply gave up and wrote “this is about the lamb”. Finally, much of Thomas has been omitted by the translator. For example, the translator has omitted the bulk of Th. 30 and Th. 36.

10:45-11:15 **Robert A. Kitchen** (Knox-Metropolitan United Church)
“The Syriac History of Philip”

► The text is notable in its title as it is an apocryphal history of the apostle Philip, not a gospel. It is a translation into Syriac (manuscript dated 1569) from a Greek text which has not been preserved. The History begins at the moment Philip lands in Azotus, transported from the wilderness road in Acts 8:40. The author/translator relies on motifs from Acts and the Old Testament prophecies and interpretations of the Messiah. Christ once again appears to Philip in a vision with a commission to go to Carthage and remove a satanic ruler, which he will effect simply by crossing himself as he enters the palace. Philip and company are transported to Carthage on a ship via almost-warp speed, a dolphin and a talking ox are employed for divine service, and an unusual resurrection. Essentially, the History is an anti-Jewish polemic in which a Jewish bystander, Hananya, is successively the anti-hero, convert, martyr and resurrected one. The sermons and testimonies are replete with anachronistic knowledge of Christian Messianic interpretations, as well as prophetic condemnations of unfaithful Israel. This paper will focus upon the function of this early Greek text in a later Syriac environment.

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

Sunday 9:00-11:45 (Rm 230)

DEAD SEA SCROLLS II

Presided by: **Carmen Palmer** (Emmanuel College)

9:00-9:30 **Joshua M. Matson** (Trinity Western University)

“The Council of the Holy Ones: Heavenly Council Themes Portrayed in Councils at Qumran”

► By means of literary analysis, this paper examines the nature and function of councils described in the Qumran Sectarian Scrolls, focusing primarily on how the exiled community at Qumran viewed their councils as earthly portrayals of the biblical heavenly council. Building upon the work of Dr. James VanderKam and others, this paper seeks to further the theory that the Qumran community was impelled by the sacred texts of the

Hebrew Bible and sought to construct their community as a literal fulfillment of scripture. The implications of this understanding that the Qumran community shaped their sectarian practices to portray type-scenes from the Hebrew Bible are far reaching.

9:30-10:00 **Ken Penner** (St. Francis Xavier University)

“Qumran Hebrew Verb Form Semantics”

► This paper clarifies the significance of verb form selection in the Qumran sectarian texts by determining the extent to which the semantic value of the Hebrew finite verb is temporal, aspectual, or modal in the selected corpus. Standard grammars claim Hebrew was aspect-prominent in the Biblical period, and tense-prominent in the Mishnaic period. But the semantic value of the verb forms in the intervening period, the period in which the Qumran texts were written, remains highly debatable. This study contributes to the resolution of the question of Qumran Hebrew verb form semantics by examining all the verbs from the Serakhim, Pesharim, Hodayot, MMT, and Temple Scroll, using an empirical method of statistical correlation between form and meaning.

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **Michael B. Johnson** (McMaster University)

“Insights from Superscriptions: A New Consideration in the Relationship of the *Community Rule* and the *Rule of the Congregation*”

► A significant question in Dead Sea Scrolls studies is the relationship between the *Community Rule* (1QS) and the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa). Both compositions are on the same scroll, but it is unclear whether they should be read independently or as two parts of a larger composite work. The format of biblical superscriptions can indicate whether the following composition is literarily subordinate or independent of the previous material. This study applies this observation to the superscriptions of the *Rule of the Congregation* to shed light on the relationship between these two foundational Qumran texts.

10:45-11:15 **Frank Clancy** (Kitchener, Ontario)

“DSS and Others: Invalid Claims”

► Ryland Papyrus 458 is said to be the oldest evidence of the translation of a Biblical book into Greek – in this case, Deuteronomy. However, I do not see evidence of the Book of Deuteronomy and the claim seems to be invalid. There are two fragments among the DSS assigned to Chronicles but is this claim valid? How should we look at the two DSS texts assigned to the book of Joshua? There are a number of claims about ancient texts that seem to be based on unwarranted assumptions. Another look at several of the claims concerning the oldest Biblical texts seems warranted.

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

Sunday 12:00-13:30

WOMEN SCHOLARS' LUNCH

- ▶ Those interested in gathering should meet at Room 230 (Learning Commons) at 11:50am (after morning sessions). Everyone will walk together somewhere to have lunch.

Sunday 12:00-13:00, Rm 231

NEW SEMINAR SOUNDINGS –

- ▶ “Early Christianity, Early Judaism and the Study of Religion”
Stephen Wilson (swilson@connect.carleton.ca) will host a conversation about a potential new Seminar. The seminar will explore ways in which early Christianity and Judaism and the wider study of religion might fruitfully interact. It will consider issues from both sides of the divide: first, how approaches to religious phenomena in general might illuminate, destabilize and refocus the study of early Christianity and Judaism; and second, how data drawn from the latter might generate new insights into the more general study of religion. Interrogation and, where useful, reformulation of familiar categories will in all cases be encouraged.

Sunday 13:30-16:45 (Rm 228)

SOCIAL WORLD AND THE HISTORICAL JESUS

Presided by: **Richard Ascough** (Queen's University)

13:30-14:00 **David Goicoechea** (Brock University, Emeritus)

“The Different Conceptions of *Agape* in Q1, Q2 and Q3 (How Matthew follows Q2 and Luke Q1)”

- ▶ In my paper I will show how the historical Jesus of Q1 taught and practised a new unconditional love for all persons. But his followers were persecuted by the Jews, as was he, until the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. The Christ of Q2 promised the punishment of those persecutors and anyone who would turn away from Christ. The Son of God of Q3, after the Jews stopped persecuting the Christians, showed more mercy than did the Christ of Q2. Matthew, who wrote his gospel for the Jews to show how the Christian *agape* was the fulfilment of Jewish *Hesed and Ahava*, has a judgmental tone. Luke, who wrote for the Gentiles and spoke of Jesus as coming to save all flesh (Luke 3:6) has much more the tone of the all loving Jesus of Q1.

14:00-14:30 **David R. Herbison** (Trinity Western University)

“Before and After: Retrospective Memory of Jesus in John's Gospel”

- ▶ John's gospel presents multiple texts in which the meaning of an event in Jesus' life is only realized by his disciples after his resurrection, with each of these later realizations being recorded in terms of remembrance. These passages are examined in this paper as part of a larger remembering motif in John, arguing that John connects remembrance of Jesus with understanding the significance of the events of his life. This investigation incorporates findings from social and collective memory theory, evaluates the role of the Spirit/Paraclete in John, and proposes how these passages

may have functioned in the Johannine community. This analysis finds that John presents remembering Jesus' life as active reinterpretation of past experience, resulting in deepened understanding in light of later events.

14:30-15:00 **Alan Kirk** (James Madison University)

“Whatever Happened to the Eyewitness Memories?”

► Recent attempts informed by research in experimental psychology to find traces of eyewitness testimony in the synoptic tradition have failed. This confirms the judgment of the form critics that the synoptic tradition is phenomenologically distinct and autonomous from individual memory. Nevertheless, the intuition—affirmed by the form critics—that eyewitness memory must have had some not insignificant part in the emergence of the tradition is surely a sound one, and it has rightly persisted. Recent work by cognitive scientists analyzing the interface of cognition with culture, in particular the phenomenon of “cognitive-cultural coupling,” makes it possible now to give an economical explanation of the complete absence of even residues of eyewitness testimony from the tradition. Tradition, properly understood as a mediated cultural artifact that emerges at the cognitive-cultural interface, is neurally assimilated such that it displaces individual eyewitness memory: tradition becomes the cognitive framework for individual recollection. This displacement effect has been observed in empirical studies.

15:00-15:15 Break

15:15-15:45 **Jordan Ryan** and **Jonathan Bernier** (McMaster University)

“Imagining Jesus: Applying R.G. Collingwood’s Philosophy of History to the Quest for the Historical Jesus”

► Current academic discussions in historical Jesus research have been frustrated by methodological disagreements and impasses. This paper proposes a historiographical approach which makes use of R.G. Collingwood’s philosophy of history re-situated within a Lonerganian critical-realist epistemological framework as an alternative to both traditional criteria and current social memory based methods. A Collingwoodian approach to history emphasizes both the constructive and critical aspects of history as well as the nature of the relationship between history and evidence. These emphases speak to the task set before students of the historical Jesus, which is to engage in historiography, to write history. Collingwood’s philosophical concepts of the historical imagination, the relationship between history and evidence, scissors-and-paste, historical inference, and question and answer will be considered and brought into the current academic discussions concerning historiography and hermeneutics in historical Jesus research. Insights drawn from these Collingwoodian principles will then be applied to a historiographical test case dealing with Jesus’ multiple festal pilgrimages to Jerusalem.

15:45-16:15 **James Magee** (Trinity Western University)

“Cinematic Childhood(s) and Imag(in)ing the Boy Jesus: An Analysis of Luke 2:41-52 in Popular Jesus Films”

► There has been a growing interest among biblical scholars in exploring the intersections of history, film and fiction in the person of Jesus and the impact of cinematic portrayals of the Christ figure within popular culture and contemporary faith communities. Little attention has been paid, however, to cinematic depictions of Jesus as a boy, this despite a parallel growing interest among scholars in the insights of children’s and childhood studies and their applications to biblical texts. In this paper I will bring these various lenses together in an analysis of Luke’s story of the boy Jesus in the temple as dramatized in three popular Jesus films: *Jesus of Nazareth* (1977), *The Jesus Film* (1979), and *Jesus* (1999). I will show how each film negotiated its theological and historical interests – imagining Jesus as both divine child and first-century Jewish boy – in light of varying social constructs of children and childhood in the last quarter of the twentieth century.

16:15-16:45 Questions and Discussion

Sunday 13:30-16:45 (Rm 211)

PERSPECTIVE CRITICISM

Presided by: **Mary Conway** (McMaster Divinity College)

13:30-14:00 **Stanley Porter** (McMaster Divinity College)

“Interpersonal Dynamics: Providing a Linguistic Foundation for Perspective Criticism”

► Perspective criticism has grown out of a variety of types of literary criticism, especially those that focus upon the point of view. Point of view is one of the areas that especially formalist criticism, and some types of narratology, have included in their analytical repertoire, but without developing the category much beyond discussions of authorial person (first and third) and levels of knowledge (omniscient, limited, etc.). This paper attempts to re-conceptualize perspective criticism linguistically, positioning it within a linguistic framework and theorizing as to the various realizations of such perspectival parameters. Examples from the New Testament will be used to illustrate the various linguistic realizations.

14:00-14:30 **Gary Yamasaki** (Columbia Bible College)

“An Inside Look into ‘Inside Views’ as a Perspective-Critical Matter”

► In theory, “inside views” (narrator incursions into a character’s inner life) are recognized as having the capacity to contribute toward leading readers into adopting that character’s point of view, but this recognition has not been accompanied by consideration of some preliminary matters that need to be addressed before a methodology for analyzing inside views can be established. This paper will address some of these matters, including the crucial issues of what qualifies as a inside view in the first place, and whether single isolated inside views are significant to perspective-critical analyses.

14:30-15:00 **Keith Bodner** (Crandall University)

“Shifting Point of View in 2 Kings 6-7: The Aramean Attack of the Northern Kingdom”

► In recent days scholars are paying increased attention to the rich variety of literary techniques in the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament, with numerous publications devoted to the analysis of irony, intentional ambiguity, specificities of direct speech, the complex role of the narrator, use of motifs and type-scenes, verbal repetition, and categories of intertextuality to name a few. One such technique that is common to virtually every biblical narrative or poem is point of view, and in this presentation I will explore the modulations in point of view in 2 Kings 6-7, several episodes that are temporally located during the last days of the tyrannical Omride dynasty in the northern kingdom of Israel.

15:00-15:15 Break

15:15-15:45 **Steve Black** (Vancouver School of Theology)

“The Point of Entry of the Virtual Self: A Perspective on Perspective Criticism”

► In narratives the implied author determines not only what data the implied reader will have access to, but also what angle or interpretive lens through which that data will be experienced. In other words, the reader has a particular point of entry into any given narrative vis-à-vis the various aspects of that narrative. This is a crucial narrative aspect of stories that, at least in respect to biblical studies, has not garnered the attention it deserves. I will explore how this dynamic.

15:45-16:15 **Calogero A. Miceli** (Concordia University)

“Narrative Time and Perspective in the Story of Jesus Healing the Hemorrhaging Woman (Mark 5:24-34)”

► In the story of Jesus healing the hemorrhaging woman (Mark 5:24-34) the reader is given background information about the history and motivation of the woman. Rather than following Jesus, the focus of the story is on the secondary character and her unsuccessful attempts over the years to find a cure for her ailment. Using the tools of Perspective Criticism, the following paper argues that this privileged information, which is achronological to the narrative time of the pericope, has been purposefully inserted by the omniscient narrator in order to elicit empathy from the reader with the woman. The focus on Jesus is set aside in order to present the audience with the point-of-view of the woman, her tragic struggle and her inner thoughts so as to create an emotional connection between the audience and the character of the hemorrhaging woman.

16:15-16:45 Questions and Discussion

Sunday 13:30-16:45 (Rm 230)

HEBREW BIBLE

Presided by: **John McLaughlin** (University of St. Michael's College)

13:30-14:00 **W. Derek Suderman** (Conrad Grebel)

“From Dialogic Tension to Social Address: Reconsidering the Rhetoric of Lament”

► In *God in the Dock* Carleen Mandolfo argues that many lament psalms reflect “dialogic” elements where the voice of the psalmist is interrupted by a distinct, didactic one. This paper provides an alternative reading of Ps. 4, Mandolfo’s paradigmatic example. Contrary to her portrayal of “dialogic tension,” focusing on grammatical shifts in address within the psalm clarifies the psalmist’s address to both divine and human audiences, which makes the introduction of additional voices unnecessary. Where Mandolfo describes such social address as “unusual,” it proves common within and even characteristic of individual laments.

14:00-14:30 **Robert D. Holmstedt** (University of Toronto)

“הַ סִּינַי in Judg 5:5 and Ps 68:9, the Syntax of הַ, and Principles of Hebrew Philology”

► The sequence הַ סִּינַי in Judg 5:5 and Ps 68:9 is often analyzed as a remnant of the proto-West Semitic d-series “determinative-relative” and to take the הַ as a marker of the genitive, resulting in either “Yhwh, Him of Sinai” (Judg 5:5, cf. the NJPS) or “Yhwh, the One of Sinai” (cf. the NRSV), or even simply “Yhwh, (the one) of Sinai” (Allegro 1955; Huehnergard 2006; Pat-El 2010, 2012). In this paper I will demonstrate the unlikely nature of this analysis within the poetic contexts of Judg 5:5 and Ps 68:9. I suggest instead that in both verses הַ begins סִּינַי the second poetic stich and that סִּינַי is appositive to the demonstrative הַ. I will conclude with a discussion of the principles of philology, including the critical role of literary sensitivity.

14:30-15:00 **Ellen White** (Göttingen)

“Delving into the Divine Realm of Exodus: A Literary Analysis of the Verbs and Adjectives Used of Divine Beings in the Book of Exodus”

► The way in which one speaks about someone reveals what the person believes about that being. Thus exploring the vocabulary used in association with divine beings provides insight into the theology of the ancient Israelites. The book of Exodus contains both narrative and legal material and due to its historical import it provides a good platform for this literary investigation. Ultimately, the results of this study have an impact on one’s understanding of YHWH versus the other divine beings, and through this makes a contribution to the ongoing debate regarding textual monotheism, monolatry, and polytheism.

15:00-15:15 Break

15:15-15:45 **Ehud Ben Zvi** (University of Alberta)

“The ‘Capable Wife’ of Prov 31 as a Window to Economy and Society in the Late Persian/early Hellenistic Period”

► Obviously, the imagined, utopian (from the perspective of the readers) ‘capable’ wife of Prov 31:10-31 does not provide a representative portrayal of the activities of an average wife/woman in the period. This said, it may provide hints at what the ideal economy (and to some extent society) was construed to be within the world of the literati of the time and thus may indirectly contribute to a better understanding of the economic circumstances of the period.

15:45-16:15 **Mark Leuchter** (Temple University)

“Ezra’s Priesthood in Rabbinic Memory”

► The rabbinic traditions regarding the figure of Ezra consistently avoid mentioning his priestly lineage or function, despite their prominence within the biblical sources that the Rabbis used. The present study examines how the memory of Ezra’s priesthood informs the rabbinic traditions into which he figures, and the degree to which the non-mention of his priestly heritage is a matter of deliberate rhetorical strategy. Following an evaluation of three test cases, the study concludes that the Rabbis were well aware of Ezra’s priesthood, but approached it with caution in order to create a hermeneutical model that provided a way to reframe the biblical sources, cultural memories and oral traditions they inherited.

16:15-16:45 **Ian Douglas Wilson** (University of Alberta)

“Chronicles and Utopia, Likely Bedfellows? Kingship as a Test Case”

► In recent years a number of scholars have utilized concepts and theories of “utopia” to study 1-2 Chronicles and Chronistic historiography. In this line of inquiry, scholars such as Joseph Blenkinsopp, for example, have understood Chronicles to have been an “ideal counterreality” to the Judean literati’s perceived sociohistorical reality in the fourth century BCE. From a heuristic standpoint, this is an interesting and perhaps fruitful approach to certain types of literature in the Bible. In this paper, using Israelite kingship as a test case, I will assess the use of utopia as a concept specifically for historical-critical studies of Chronicles and Yehudite historiography. I will argue that, although thinking with “utopia” is probably helpful for studies of prophetic literature or other types of texts, it has less import for studies of Chronistic historiography in ancient Yehud. Doubtless, Yehudite literati read Chronicles alongside the authoritative books of Samuel-Kings, and this, I submit, ultimately problematizes understandings of Chronicles as utopian historiography; the obvious (and necessary) intertextual and counterbalancing relationship between Chronicles and Samuel-Kings, especially with regard to the monarchy and kingship, precludes seeing Chronicles as a truly utopian work in its primary sociocultural context.

Monday 8:30-11:45 (Rm 228)

SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

Presided by: **Alex Damm** (Wilfrid Laurier University)

8:30-9:00 **Ronald Charles** (University of Toronto)

“Traveling Sons: Tobias and the Prodigal Son in motion”

► The purpose of this paper is to read the figure of the traveling son in Tobit in close parallel with that of the traveling son in Luke 15:11-32. The aim is to indicate not solely similarities and contrasts between the two narratives but to show how Tobit might have been used as a source for the Lukan composition. This paper is divided in the following way: 1) Exploring the figure of the son in both Tobit and Luke 15 by highlighting their relationship with the paternal figures depicted in both stories; 2) Highlighting how Tobit might play the role of a source for the Lukan rendering.

9:00-9:30 **Duncan Reid** (Tyndale Seminary)

“Q and the Embassies of Luke 7:1-10: A Matthean Omission or a Lukan Addition?”

► The Centurion’s servant is the most elaborate of only two Matthew-Luke double tradition miracle narratives assigned to Q. Despite high verbatim agreement in the speech material of Luke 7:1-10 and Matt 8:5-13, however, significant differences exist between the two accounts. Among the most striking are the two Lukan embassies in place of Matthew’s direct contact between Jesus and the centurion. While various explanations essentially point to either a Lukan addition or a Matthean omission, the editors of the critical edition of Q chose to omit the embassies thus implying a Lukan addition. This paper will explore the implications of this decision and will re-examine the strengths and weaknesses of various hypotheses about the Lukan embassies in light of Matthean and Lukan redactional tendencies toward miracle tradition as detected elsewhere upon the assumption of Markan priority.

9:30-10:00 **Emily Laflèche** (University of Toronto)

“Synoptic and Apocryphal Portrayals of the Disciples”

► The synoptic gospels disagree on the portrayal of the disciples within their narratives. The *Gospel of Mark* offers a collectively negative view of the disciples while on the 2DH the gospels of *Matthew* and *Luke* soften this negative portrayal. Using apocryphal sources, such as the *Gospel of Mary* and *Gospel of Thomas*, for comparison with *Mark*, I will be able to see whether the collectively negative portrayal of the disciples in *Mark* is also seen in apocryphal texts. If there is evidence of this it could help support the 2GH, in showing that Mark’s portrayal of the disciples is more similar to other portrayals in the early to mid-second century.

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **G. Alistair Wier** (Huron University College; emeritus)

“The Meaning of Luke 2:2”

► As commonly understood, Luke 2:2 places Jesus’ birth during Quirinius’ governorship of Syria, which commenced in 6 C.E. A difficulty with this is that both Matthew (2:1-19) and Luke elsewhere (1:5) place the birth a decade earlier, under Herod the Great (died 4 B.C.E.). Agreeing with Winandy, I argue that *egeneto* means “became,” and that the verse says, “During Quirinius’ governorship of Syria, this became the First Census,” because now there was a second census, widely known (Acts 5:37; Josephus, A.J. 18.1-3). Luke 2:2 is not inconsistent with Luke 1:5.

10:45-11:15 **Catherine Sider Hamilton** (Wycliffe College)

“‘The Wife of Uriah’ (Matt 1:6): Innocent Blood, David’s Sin, and the Problem of Exile in Matthew’s Genealogy”

► Is the omission of Bathsheba’s name in Matthew’s genealogy significant? Current scholarly consensus finds, in the phrase “the wife of Uriah,” an interest in the gentiles. Davies and Allison (cf. Carter 2002) point also, without elaboration, to “the sin of David, who had Uriah killed.” This paper traces commonalities between Matthew’s interest in David and the wife of Uriah, and the rabbis’ interest in David and “the blood of Uriah,” to argue that Matt 1:6 is key: it locates the birth of Jesus, David’s son, in relation to Israel’s fate and Israel’s hope, raising the spectre of “innocent blood” and the problem of exile.

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

Monday 8:30-11:45 (Rm 231)

SEPTUAGINT

Presided by: **David M. Miller** (Briercrest College and Seminary)

8:30-9:00 **Brendan Youngberg** (McMaster Divinity College)

“Lost in Translation: How the Old Greek Betrays the Chronicler’s Craft as Seen In the Narrative of King Josiah”

► The contention is often made as to the tendentious nature on the part of the Chronicler. However, the Deuteronomistic History evidences its own tendentiousness, especially in the treatment regarding King Josiah. In the narrative of King Josiah, the Old Greek text of 2 Chron 35:19 evidences a four verse plus over the Hebrew text (MT). This plus portrays affinities towards 2 Kings 23:23 -27. By utilizing a narrative critical approach, the OG text is shown to be a unique literary edition compared to both the MT of Chronicles and 2 Kings. On account of the harmonization by the translators of the OG, this study will seek to prove that the literary features of Chronicles should have negated the entrance of such a harmonization. Among the elements of the plus, my analysis will especially focus on the usage of the *Shema* leading up to the reign of King Josiah as well as the characterization of Manasseh within Chronicles.

9:00-9:30 **Spencer Jones** (Trinity Western University)

“Evidence from Greek Numbers for the Copulative Function of Mh /)wh”

► Although Takamitsu Muraoka has recently denied the copulative function of הוּא/הֵם in Biblical Hebrew (as well as Aramic and Syriac), this paper disputes these claims. Greek Numbers, with high consistency, translates הוּא/הֵם in both bipartite and tripartite nominal sentences with a form of εἶμι. This translational convention suggests that הוּא/הֵם is properly conceived of as a copula in nominative sentences, as it was by the translator of Numbers.

9:30-10:00 **Dirk Buchner** (Trinity Western University)

“Reflections on The Translation Technique of the Pentateuch in the light of Recent Scholarship”

► Since work of Soisalon-Soininen and his students Sollamo and Aejmelaeus, some recent studies have appeared that carry forward their work with increased sophistication. The NETS project and its daughter, the SBL Commentary on the Septuagint in some respects builds upon this work, but also stands in contrast with it, in that it regards the Septuagint not as a freestanding corpus but only comprehensible as far as “meaning” is concerned, in relation to its parent texts. It is the aim of this paper to showcase some instances in recent studies on translation technique, in which the translational model followed by SBLCS has been appreciated but also misunderstood and misconstrued. As a way forward for Septuagint studies, some suggestions will be made of how those who work within this model may seek ways to bridge the scholarly divide. This will be done by means of a piece of commentary from Leviticus.

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **Meghan D. Musy** (McMaster Divinity College)

“It’s All Greek to Me: Reading Ezra 7 in the MT and OG Traditions”

► Ezra 7, in the Masoretic Text (MT), opens in Hebrew (vv. 1–11), presents an Aramaic document (vv. 12–26), and closes with a Hebrew prayer (vv. 27–28). The Old Greek (OG), on the other hand, does not feature this code-switching, this mixing of languages. This paper will not focus on text critical issues but rather on the rhetorical effects of final forms of the text within the MT and OG traditions. Although most variants between the two traditions can be attributed to the translation process, divergences in the appellations of God and brief exegetical deviations contribute the overall effects of these respective texts.

10:45-11:15 **John Screnock** (University of Toronto)

“Is Rewriting Translation? Situating the Process of Rewriting within the Paradigm of Intralingual Translation”

► When the process referred to as “rewriting” is considered from the perspective of Translation Studies, we find significant overlaps between rewriting and intralingual translation. Intralingual translation, or “rephrasing,” is the transfer of meaning from a source text to a target text within the same language. Research in the field of Translation Studies

(e.g., Zethsen 2009) provides a robust model of intralingual translation and argues that intralingual translation and *inter*lingual translation (what the term “translation” commonly refers to) are essentially the same. In this paper, I apply the concept of translation to the idea of rewriting in ancient Hebrew texts. I explore how the various aspects of rewriting fit within the concept of translation (and intralingual translation in particular). Texts like Chronicles and Jubilees, as well as manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible, contain many aspects of intralingual translation as defined by scholars in Translation Studies. There are several implications. The old, neat categories of biblical manuscript, rewritten text, and translation are not so simple and in fact overlap substantially. Translations like the Old Greek should not be marginalized, since all Hebrew texts similarly contain translation. Translation should be a category used when considering ancient texts; it is more robust than *ad hoc* concepts like rewriting. Finally, the concept of translation provides a different angle on the concept of authorship: ancient Hebrew texts are not *ex nihilo* creations; rather, their creators transfer already existing ideas into new contexts, adopting and reshaping the ideas of previous texts.

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

Monday 9:00-11:45 (Rm 230)

THEOLOGY OF THE HEBREW BIBLE

Presided by: **Lissa Wray-Beal** (Providence Theological Seminary)

9:00-9:30 **Shannon E. Baines** (McMaster Divinity)

“Reconsidering Boundaries of the Blind and Lame in the Old Testament”

► This paper will examine the various literal and figurative uses of the terms ‘blind’ and ‘lame’ in the Old Testament to expand the boundaries beyond their description of the physical conditions, and establish patterns of usage including continuity and discontinuity throughout the corpora. While some passages use the terms literally, others apply them figuratively in the announcement of future divine judgment within the prophetic literature. In the theme of restoration, God’s redemptive plan includes the blind and the lame in the remnant that will return to the land and provides hope for their physical healing.

9:30-10:00 **Marion Taylor** (Wycliffe College)

“Classic Responses to Ruth and Orpah”

► Part way into their journey to Bethlehem, Naomi demands that her daughter’s-in-law go back to their respective mothers’ houses. After some deliberation, Orpah kisses Naomi and goes back to her people and her gods, whereas Ruth clings to Naomi, committing herself to follow Naomi, her God and her people. In this paper, I will survey interpretations of Ruth and Orpah’s responses to Naomi’s demand, focusing especially on nineteenth-century women’s interpretations, and I will raise the question that faces each reader of how to interpret the contrasting figures of Ruth and Orpah.

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-10:45 **Jeehoon Kim** (Wycliffe College)

“YHWH as Gardener in Psalm 104”

► The aim of the present study is to investigate Psalm 104 as a whole and to determine its biblical-theological contribution to Israelite thinking of creation. I argue that the psalmist uses not only images that are reminiscent of the sun-god and storm-god of the ancient Near East but also images that reflect an ancient garden or park. Thus, the thesis of this study is that Psalm 104 portrays creation as a garden and YHWH as the royal gardener who creates it and oversees its care. As ancient gardens were built and maintained in order to reflect creation with a diversity of plants and animals, the provision of water, and ecological order, the psalm portrays creation by using images that allude to an ancient garden.

10:45-11:15 **Paul Evans** (McMaster Divinity College)

“A Typological Reading of the Conclusion to the book of Kings: How Allusions to the Joseph Narrative Function in the Jehoiachin Pericope of 2 Kgs 25:27-30”

► As is well known, the concluding pericope in the book of Kings, which describes the release of Jehoiachin from prison, is a crux of interpretation. Some have interpreted this as a pessimistic ending to Israel’s monarchy, others as a note of hope for the Davidic dynasty, and still others as holding out hope for the exiles in general, but not the Davidic monarchy in particular. This paper will suggest that through allusions to the Joseph story, the Jehoiachin pericope functions typologically for the Deuteronomist holding out hope for a new Exodus, the return from Babylonian exile, as foretold in such terms by Second Isaiah (e.g., Isaiah 40).

11:15-11:45 Questions and Discussion

Monday 1:30-4:45 (Rm 228)

PAUL

Presided by: **John A. Bertone** (Niagara Falls, ON)

1:30-2:00 **Bruce Worthington** (Wycliffe College)

“Romans 13:1-7, with an Eye to Global Capital”

► Romans 13:1-7 contains the cyclical whole of ideology—ideology’s own theological justification (and its lack), a necessary appeal to violence, and our cynical submission to the ruling ideology (pay your taxes). It is the repetitive nature of this abusive cycle which conditions the “interpellated subject” towards seeing the ideological constellation as natural, and alienates its constituents from any rational position of dissent. In articulating a new ideological reading of Romans 13:1-7, this paper asks a very important question: in an age dominated by the ubiquitous universality of global capital, can we still agree with Paul’s notion that “the authorities that exist have been established by God”?

2:00-2:30 **Christopher D. Land** (McMaster Divinity College)

“‘And It’s Not Like Moses Put a Veil Over His Face...’ (2 Cor 3:13): A Hypothesis Regarding Paul’s Understanding of Exodus 34”

► This paper will explore the possibility that a hitherto unrecognized grammatical construction is being used in 2 Cor 3:13 (i.e. καὶ οὐ καθὼς/καθάπερ, ‘And it’s not like...’). First, I will explain how this hypothesis makes good sense of Paul’s wording and his argument. Second, I will examine typological and corpus evidence in order to determine whether it is plausible to hypothesize the existence of the Greek grammatical construction in question. Third, I will explain how my hypothesis would resolve a number of longstanding issues surrounding Paul’s understanding and application of Exodus 34.

2:30-3:00 **Edith M. Humphrey** (Pittsburgh Theological Seminary)

“‘Who will ascend or descend?’ The Apostle and Spatial Apocalyptic Strategies”

► Käsemann is famously known for his dictum that “apocalyptic is the mother of Christian theology.” Most have understood Käsemann’s emphasis upon apocalyptic in terms of eschatology alone, thus rendering “apocalyptic” a synonym for teaching about last things. Of implicit importance, however, in Kasemann’s reading of the apostle Paul is his recognition of the cosmic element, as well as the temporal element, of those things revealed. This paper will reclaim, from key passages in Paul’s undisputed letters, elements and strategies that are plotted along the “spatial” axis by contemporary scholars who read apocalypses (John Collins, Adela Yarbro Collins *et al*), showing that these are as significant to Paul’s theological and pastoral perspective as his hope for future vindication and renewal. Awareness of the unseen worlds that impinge upon the human arena is as formative for the apostle as remembrance of God’s faithfulness and expectation of the parousia.

3:00-3:15 Break

3:15-3:45 **John A. Bertone** (Niagara Falls, ON)

“Fellowship of the Spirit”: Embedded In Community (2 Cor 13:14 and Phil 2:1)

► Most interpreters understand the phrase “fellowship of the Spirit” in the context of Paul’s appeal for unity among the members of the Early Christian movement. If we are to understand why he can make this appeal with reference to their common experience of the Spirit, we must interpret it in light of the societal values of community oriented personality and honor and shame associated with the first century Mediterranean world. Paul understood that each of those who experienced the Spirit were embedded within the Early Christian movement and furthermore, the collective actions of the members reflected the honor of the movement as a whole.

3:45-4:15 **Jin hwan Lee** (Wycliffe)

“Methodological Fallacies in studying 1 Thess 2:13-16”

► New Testament scholarship has employed several methodologies to verify the nature of 1 Thess 2:13-16 because the passage presents debatable issues regarding authenticity. Historical and theological

analysis, form critical or structural analysis, the case against Paul's anti-Judaism, manuscript evidence, and rhetorical analysis are often used. A careful examination of each methodology, however, discloses methodological problems, no matter if the case is for or against authenticity. This examination reveals that a new methodology for discerning the nature of 1 Thess 2:13-16 is required.

4:15-4:45 Questions and Discussion



The End