

**AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND ASSOCIATION FOR  
BIBLICAL STUDIES  
20<sup>th</sup> ANNUAL MEETING  
Dec 4-5, 2017**

Monday 4 December

Venue: St David Seminar Room 3 and 4, St David Lecture Theatre Complex,  
University of Otago

SR3 = Seminar Room 3; SR4 = Seminar Room 4.

SR3

9:30 am – Arrival and let us know whether you’re coming for the dinner.

10:00 – Kevin Waldie – “Seeing and Hearing: a synoptic gospel/cinematic perspective.”

10:30 – Sarah Harris – “Reversing the Reversal in Luke’s Gospel.”

11:00 Morning Tea

SR3	SR4
11:30	Ben Hudson – “An inheritance among the Saints: ‘Οι Ἀγιοι in Ephesians 1:18 and Daniel.”
12:00	Deane Galbraith – “A Calculated Prediction: On Jesus’ use of Daniel and its Reception to Prophesy the End Times.”
12:30	Stephen Gerbault – “Pneumatic Hermeneutics: What are they, and what is the connection to Biblical Hermeneutics?”
	Ross Millar – “Spatial Elements of the Lord’s Prayer: Lessons from the Deaf Community.”
	Kevin Sarlow – “Change these Words: Rhetorical criticism and the sign on Jesus’ cross.”
	Aaron Geddes – “Israel’s rejection of Elijah and its impact on Jesus’ vocation in Matthew’s Gospel.”

1:00 LUNCH

SR3

2:00 – Tim Meadowcroft – “Aotearoa New Zealand Association for Biblical Studies Reconsidered, Twenty Meetings On.”

2:30 – Csilla Saysell – “Isaiah’s Suffering Servant: Individual or Collective?”

3:00 – AFTERNOON TEA

SR3

3:30 - John Barclay (University of Durham, UK) - Gift and Reciprocity in Paul

4:30 – Kathleen Rushton – “The Gospel according John in the Roman and Revised Common Lectionaries.”

5:00 AGM

6:30pm Dinner at Thai Fusion, 430 George St

Tuesday 5 December 2017

SR3

9:00 – Mark Keown – “A Biblical Assessment of Christianarchy.”

9:30 – Julia van der Brink – “‘Blessed are you among women’: An Intertextual Echo of Deuteronomy 28:3-4a in Luke 1:42.”

10:00 – Philip Church – “Hebews and Horticulture: Old Testament Allusions in Hebrews 6:7-8.”

10:30 – MORNING TEA

SR3

		SR4
11:00	Sarah Hart – “Texts of the Intertestamental Period on the <i>Mishkan</i> , the Tabernacle Tent.”	John Douglas – “Spiritual Reading: a Discipline in search of a Hermeneutic?”
11:30	Jeremy Baker – “Uncovering an Hermeneutic for the Biblical Care of the Broken.”	Jonathan Robinson – “Jonah’s Gourd and Mark’s Gethsemane.”

SR3

12:00 – Peter Carrell – “Reading 1 Timothy 2:12-15 in the light of 1 Corinthians 7 and 11.”

12:30 LUNCH

SR3

1:30 – John de Jong – “An early 19<sup>th</sup> century New England exegete abroad: Adoniram Judson and the Burmese Bible.”

2:00 – Judith McKinlay – “The Critical Matter of Interpretation, with a sideways glance at Huldah and Josiah.”

2:30 – AFTERNOON TEA

SR3

3:00 – James Unwin – “Recovering the Grotesque: Looking Again at Sites of Death in 2 Corinthians 2:14-16.”

3:30 – Grant Buchanan – “Human Agency and Identity.”

## ANZABS Conference 2017

### Abstracts of Papers – in Alphabetical Order

#### **Jeremy Baker, “Uncovering an Hermeneutic for the Biblical Care of the Broken.”**

At Settlers Health Centre we debate how to provide a continuing discipleship journey for clients when they make a decision for Christ. We focus on three areas of concern:

- The art of creating empathic and trusting therapeutic relationships
- Research into the hermeneutics of caring for the broken, with a focus on Psychological Biblical Criticism and Attachment Theory
- Acting as an educational resource and point of conversation for an effective church response

Key to the journey is understanding the place of emotions as these either enhance or hinder personal discipleship. We have identified how emotional responses invite intervention through biblical witness and counseling at key points.

#### **Grant Buchanan, “Human Agency and Identity.”**

Christian identity is one of the primary theological emphases in Galatians and, Paul argues, is whole purpose of God’s work in Christ. According to Galatians 3:26 and 4:4–5, the outworking of the Christ-event is the establishment a new community of *vioi θεοῦ*. For Paul, this new community is no longer made up of slaves, controlled under the enslaving regime of Sin/Flesh, but instead it is born in freedom, into the eschatological realm of the Spirit. This change of status is not merely a relocation of the self under a new regime, however. Those in Christ and ‘of’ the Spirit are to *actively choose* to live differently, as *vioi θεοῦ*, towards others. In other words, the work of Christ and the Spirit-transformation of the believer, carries with it an expectation of faithful response from the believer. This human agency is unpacked throughout in Gal 5–6 where Paul’s language and argumentation places the responsibility of living as *vioi θεοῦ* clearly in the lap of the believer and believing community. In these chapters they are challenged to act or not, or respond or not, to their new identity. This paper explores Paul’s use of imperative and hortatory subjunctive verbs in Galatians 5–6, highlighting how these present a vision of appropriate praxis and human agency, indicative of the new identity already articulated in Galatians 1–4.

#### **Peter Carrell, “Reading 1 Timothy 2:12-15 in the light of 1 Corinthians 7 and 11.”**

The prohibition in 1 Timothy 2:12 remains both embarrassing for some and prescriptive for others. A hermeneutic of mercy asks of difficult texts whether they can be read differently with principal reference to other, mitigating readings in Holy Scripture. Within the Pauline corpus (understood in its broadest sense), 1 Corinthians 11 provides both a reading similar to 1 Timothy 2:12 and a reading at odds with it, which 1 Corinthians 7 supports. In turn this raises the question whether 1 Timothy was composed by a (partial) interpreter of Paul or by the Apostle (at odds with himself or responding to an unknown, special circumstance in Ephesus).

#### **Philip Church, “Hebrews and Horticulture: Old Testament Allusions in Hebrews 6:7-8.”**

Hebrews 6:1-12 is one of the strongest warnings against apostasy in Hebrews. It comprises four parts. First there is an exhortation in the first person plural for the readers to progress in their faith along with the writer. This is followed by a third person description of the impossibility of restoration for those who fall away. The final part of the pericope is a second person expression of confidence in the readers and an appeal to persevere. Between the third and fourth parts is a horticultural parable: well-watered ground that produces a useful crop receives a blessing from God, while if it produces thorns and thistles it is worthless and close to a curse; its fate is to be burnt. This example supports in some way the claim of the impossibility of restoration of those who fall away. In this paper I will examine the Old Testament allusions in the parable so as to clarify its contribution to the argument of the pericope.

**John de Jong**, “An early 19<sup>th</sup> century New England exegete abroad: Adoniram Judson and the Burmese Bible.”

Adoniram Judson’s 1840 translation of the Bible remains the Burmese version used by most Protestant Christians in Myanmar. Judson was an early product of the New England biblical studies movement, which began at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. He was theologically conservative but an adventurous translator, frequently departing from traditional English translations and following the LXX over the MT if he felt it was warranted. He used the best exegetical resources available at the time, both English and German. His translation both represents and, in some cases, preserves the biblical scholarship of this period. Locating him in this movement explains some of his interpretive decisions which may strike modern readers as odd.

**John Douglas**, “Spiritual Reading: a Discipline in search of a Hermeneutic?”

Reading, reflecting, ruminating, and responding through the practice of spiritual reading is more than method. It is a discipline. Spiritual reading, both general and adjectivised as “Christian” is a burgeoning and broadly practiced spiritual discipline. It is an historic and contemporary engagement, a personal and communal means in forming and nurturing spirituality (Chandler, 2015). Since Christian spirituality is framed, or at least informed by some level of engagement within the Judeo-Christian Scriptures’ biblical text; interpreting and engaging the text calls for a hermeneutic—a working (and workable) theory of interpretation, in achieving understanding in one’s reading (Foster, 2008). The paper’s titlequestion will engage in a case-study-styled reflection of the *Unitas Fratrum*/Unity of the Brethren (Moravians). The Moravians, who grew from roots in the life, preaching and martyrdom of John Hus (1369-1415), formally “organised” in 1457 became a dynamic and missional community (1727), today (2017) exist and function as an active international Christian church within the protestant biblical tradition.

**Deane Galbraith**, “A Calculated Prediction: On Jesus’ use of Daniel and its Reception to Prophesy the End Times.”

The leading explanation for Jesus’ failed prophecy of the end times in Mark 13 *et passim* assumes that, in predicting the imminent end of the age, he was influenced by contemporary apocalyptic expectations within Judaism. While this explanation for Jesus’ own expectations is correct as far as it goes, this paper argues that Jesus would have relied also on a precise calculation (or rather, precise *miscalculation*) of the year in which the end of the world would arrive. Such a conclusion is made probable by Jesus’ reliance on Daniel in contexts in which he discusses the timing of the end, interpreted in light of Daniel’s *Rezeptionsgeschichte* to Jesus’ day.

**Aaron Geddes**, “Israel’s rejection of Elijah and its impact on Jesus’ vocation in Matthew’s Gospel.”

The following paper is a high-level presentation of a large part of my master’s thesis in Matthew’s Gospel. The argument below is based upon two relatively uncontroversial points which I didn’t have space to argue for in this paper. They are 1) that in Matthew’s Gospel John the Baptist is explicitly the eschatological Elijah from Malachi 4:5-6. Then 2) that Israel rejected John the Baptist and his message and therefore Elijah from Malachi 4:5-6. The argument of this paper has three parts to it. First, that Jesus’ identity is intertwined with the identity of John the Baptist. Second, that Jesus is presented to us as the Lord who was to come after Elijah. Finally, that Israel’s rejection of Elijah shaped Jesus’ vocation.

**Stephen Gerbault**, “Pneumatic Hermeneutics: What are they, and what is the connection to Biblical Hermeneutics?”

This paper proposes to discuss the growing interest in Pneumatic hermeneutics. They are also known as Spirit hermeneutics, and have a strong connection with Pentecostal hermeneutics.

This discussion will begin with a brief historical overview starting with Howard Ervin’s 1981 article “Hermeneutics: A Pentecostal Option”, and moving through to Craig Keener’s 2016 *Spirit Hermeneutics: Reading Scripture in Light of Pentecost*. This brief overview will be followed by an equally brief discussion on the various ways of understanding what is meant when people talk about Pneumatic hermeneutics. I understand there to be three options or aspects to the notion of Pneumatic hermeneutics: an awareness of references to the Holy Spirit in the text; recognising the Holy Spirit as the hermeneut/exegete of the text, and the outworking of that; and thirdly, how all this might relate to Pentecostal hermeneutics.

**Sarah Harris**, “Reversing the Reversal in Luke’s Gospel.”

This paper argues that the pervasive idea of reversal in Luke’s Gospel is inaccurate. Scholars have long held to the idea that Luke presents an *eschatological reversal* where the fortunes of the poor and lowly are reversed; in the ministry of Jesus this happens “now” and in the eschaton this reversal will be completed. This is typified in Mary’s song where the lowly are lifted up and the powerful are brought down from their thrones; where the hungry are filled with good things and the rich sent away empty. Scholars also look to the Blessings and Woes in Luke’s Ethical Sermon where they point to the stark antitheses as an outworking of the Lukan Jesus’ ministry. I disagree that this is as clear as it seems, and this paper will argue that for Luke it is a matter of “realignment” and not “reversal;” we have our language and picture wrong. The Lukan Jesus does not seek to create a new poor or a new rich which is what reversal ultimately brings; he does not want a new hungry or a new well-fed. The Lukan Jesus’ ministry is about humanity’s realignment with the character and will of God where their centre is Theological and which forms the ethical outworking of the Kingdom of God.

**Sarah Hart**, “Texts of the Intertestamental Period on the *Mishkan*, the Tabernacle Tent.”

I claim that Exodus 24:15—Numbers 10:18 invites its audience to worship YHWH by entering into a virtual temple—the tabernacle tent or *mishkan*. Exiled Judeans living in Babylonia had no temple to YHWH where they could worship so instead of a temple of wood and stone a temple of the word was created, building on memories of the First Temple and customary practices. This paper explores texts of the intertestamental period to test the claim “the *mishkan* as an Ersatz worship space for Diaspora Israelites”.

**Ben Hudson**, “An inheritance among the Saints: Oi ἄγιοι in Ephesians 1:18 and Daniel.”

In Ephesians 1:18, Paul prays that his readers would know God’s ‘inheritance among the Saints.’ Both the nature of this ‘inheritance’ and the identity of *oi ἄγιοι* (the Saints) has been widely debated among Ephesians scholars. This paper will argue that there is a strong echo in this passage (Eph 1:18-21) of the Son of Man vision in Daniel 7, and that exploring this intertextual possibility has the potential to shed light on the meaning of Ephesians 1:18.

There is a high degree of thematic coherence between the two texts and a range of supporting lexical links, including *oi ἄγιοι*. At the heart of both texts is an apocalyptic revelation of a heavenly enthronement, given by God to a representative figure, issuing in universal sovereignty over hostile enemies that is everlasting and for the benefit of his people.

Identifying this echo enriches the interpretation of *oi ἄγιοι* and their inheritance in Ephesians 1:18, illuminating the covenantal and eschatological significance of *oi ἄγιοι* as a designation for believers. To call Christ-believers ‘Saints’ is to identify them with eschatological Israel, emphasising both their continuity with the covenant people of God and declaring that the age of eschatological inheritance has arrived in Christ.

**Mark Keown**, “A Biblical Assessment of Christianarchy.”

In my Auckland church, there are two passionate young men who have enthusiastically embraced the doctrine of Christianarchy. Their version of this idea envisages current society without governments, views enforced taxation as violence, repudiates all Christian engagement in the state as compromised Statism, and a violation of the call to non-violence in Christ’s teaching. Their views are causing real tension as others reject what they consider their extreme ideas, even if sympathetic to some of their ideas. This paper will first explore the idea Christianarchy (Christian-archy) and give a brief overview of its history including its increasing present popularity. Its core ideas will then be assessed with regard to the biblical witness in dialogue with historic views of the State in Christian thought.

**Judith McKinlay**, “The Critical Matter of Interpretation, with a sideways glance at Huldah and Josiah.”

This paper takes its cue from two recent statements, the first by Esther Fuchs describing “the field of biblical studies” as “in crisis,” and the other by Louis Stulman, “that a good number of scholars would make the case that critical interpretation functions best as a dispassionate enterprise,” which he himself counters. This leads to a discussion about both the nature of the texts, and how we, as interpreters, undertake our task. The Huldah/Josiah narrative in 2 Kings 23 provides a brief illustration of some of the challenges. The crux would seem to be the matter of difference.

**Tim Meadowcroft**, “Aotearoa New Zealand Association for Biblical Studies Reconsidered, Twenty Meetings On.”

ANZABS was founded and held its inaugural annual meeting in October 1998 at St Johns College, Auckland. It has met annually in some form ever since, making the 2017 meeting the 20<sup>th</sup>. At the inaugural meeting I delivered a short paper entitled ‘The New Zealand Association for Biblical Studies, A Rationale’ (note that the first General Meeting of the new association determined that we should be ‘Aotearoa New Zealand’). The paper was in support of the proposal to form an association. At the tenth meeting in 2007 I offered a reprise of that earlier paper to consider progress. At this, our twentieth meeting, I propose to

revisit both those earlier papers. After all, nobody else will remember them if I don't. In doing so, I consider again the nature and significance of our task as a group of biblical scholars gathered in this association, our challenges and achievements, and some comment on future directions for the Aotearoa New Zealand Association for Biblical Studies.

**Ross Millar**, “Spatial Elements of the Lord's Prayer: Lessons from the Deaf Community.”

Arranging signs in signspace is important for the Deaf using NZSL. Locations, characters and pronouns are positioned in signspace and movements occur with direction. Examination of both the Greek text and signed interpretations by Deaf church leaders offers an opportunity to explore the spatial elements inherent in the Lord's Prayer.

**Jonathan Robinson**, “Jonah's Gourd and Mark's Gethsemane.”

Following Philip Cary's original proposal regarding Jonah 4 as a parable of the messianic line of Zerubbabel, this paper will argue for the presence of a deliberate reference to Jonah 4 in Mark's account of Gethsemane that also engages this particular messianic motif. If demonstrated this would support Cary's otherwise unattested reading. The paper will then briefly discuss lines of interpretation potentially opened up by recognising Jonah's Gourd in Mark's Gethsemane.

**Kathleen Rushton**, “The Gospel according John in the Roman and Revised Common Lectionaries”

This paper attempts to clarify my approach to writing an accessible book for the educated, but not necessarily academic reader, on the passages from gospel according to John found in the Roman and the Revised Common Lectionaries from the perspective of hearing “both the cry of the earth and the cry of the poor” (L.S. 49). In the three year cycle, these readings are allotted, in the main, to the principal Christian feasts and their seasons (Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost and especially at the end of Lent and most of Easter). Arguably, the lectionaries follow John theologically in linking creation, incarnation and the Spirit in the prologue with the death-resurrection of Jesus and in the gospel which follows.

**Kevin Sarlow**, “‘Change these words!’ Rhetorical criticism and the sign on Jesus' cross.”

The chief priests swayed Pilate who condemned Jesus to death. They should have been pleased as Pilate's sentence had affirmed them. However, they were disgruntled the sign on Jesus' cross that Pilate had ordered, and they requested that he change it.

The most appropriate method to determine the significance of the chief priests' discomfort is by using rhetorical criticism. This method identifies and explains the irony and rhetoric of a passage. Using rhetorical analysis this research finds and documents eighteen examples of rhetoric in 19:19-22. They are:

Dble meaning: The word stem *NZR* means “royal crown” and “Nazareth”.

Dble meaning: Pilate both proclaims Jesus' true identity and mocks his authority.

Dble meaning: Pilate knowingly treats chief priests contemptibly, yet unaware of Jesus' identity.

Pun: On the sign in Hebrew, the word stem *NZR* (Nazarene) sounds like *NSR* (Branch).

Reversal: Sign reads: King of ‘the Jews’. He wasn't their king, but he was.

Reversal: Jesus was handed over by *Ioudas* (18:2-3), but is proclaimed king of *Ioudaios/oi* (pun).

Reversal: Sign's message raises conflict between Jewish kingdom and Jesus' kingdom (18:36).

Reversal: Chief priests would have preferred to give allegiance to Caesar (19:15) than to Jesus.

Reversal: Pilate proclaims a king other than Caesar!<sup>1</sup>

Sarcasm: Sign treats chief priests with contempt. They want it changed.

Sarcasm: Pilate treats the chief priests with contempt, yet acts unaware of Jesus' identity.

Dbl Standard: Pilate protests Jesus not guilty (18:38; 19:4, 6), but affirms Jesus guilt in the sign.<sup>2</sup>

Dbl Entendre: Sign reads: King of 'the Jews'. He wasn't their king, but he was.<sup>3</sup>

Dbl Entendre: Pilate probably picked up the double meaning and used it for his advantage.

Dbl Entendre: Sign stays as is. Pilate acts unaware of Jesus' identity, yet knows he is king.

Dbl Entendre: Pilate treats 'the Jews' with contempt, knows Jesus is king, but acts unaware.

Parody: Intent of the sign is to mock Jesus' true authority, but the sign mocks the mockery.<sup>4</sup>

Paradox: The sign declares Jesus as the world's king, but his kingship is not of this world (18:36).

The paper shows that Pilate's words for the sign on Jesus' cross were not just offensive to the chief priests, they also indicate issues of identity and power. These words raised the very same issue over which the chief priests wanted Jesus killed: his identity as king and messiah. The evangelist explores the irony and rhetoric brought about by the drama played out by those who do and don not follow Jesus. The end result is that rhetorical analysis helps the real reader realise the true identity and authority of Jesus, even if it comes through the violence of the cross.

#### **Csilla Saysell, "Isaiah's Suffering Servant: Individual or Collective?"**

Scholars have long been divided over the identity of the famous 'Suffering Servant' passage in Isa 52:13-53:12. Does the prophet describe an individual or a collective? Typically, Jewish commentators tended to interpret the servant as either Israel or the righteous remnant, i.e. as a collective. On the other hand, Christian scholars emphasise the individual aspects of the text, since they see its fulfilment in Jesus. The division of scholarly opinion suggests perhaps a deliberate ambiguity that admits both interpretations. This is in line with other Servant passages in Isaiah that carry both individual and collective connotations and with Dan 7, where there is a similar interplay of the two in the Son of Man language. There is also a continuation of this idea in the NT. Jesus in the gospels is at times portrayed as a representative of Israel, re-living the nation's past and there is a close parallel established between the individual Jesus and the collective of his followers who share the same path, fate and ministry. In this paper then I explore the possibility of how the ambiguity in Isa 52:11-53:12 may enrich the theological understanding of the Servant's role.

#### **James Unwin, "Recovering the Grotesque: Looking Again at Sites of Death in 2 Corinthians 2:14-16."**

Paul's processional imagery in 2 Cor 2:14-16 provides material for a comparative analysis with the pompa triumphalis and Roman spectacles more generally. Paul's exhibition of spectacle imagery emerges in an ancient landscape dominated by spectacle art and architecture. Following the recent trend to retreat from the insight of Peter Marshall on Paul's depiction of himself as a figure of social shame in 2 Cor 2:14, this paper will attempt to recover this important reading through a broader comparative analysis of spectacle, which will prompt questions about Paul's social and political status. Paul emerges from this

<sup>1</sup> Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels* (2 vols), 2: 966.

<sup>2</sup> Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (2 vols) (Garden City: Doubleday, 1966), 2: 901.

<sup>3</sup> Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985), 136.

<sup>4</sup> Marcus, "Crucifixion as Parodic Exaltation", *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 125 (2006): 78.

comparison embracing the grotesque, images of death, and the ideological features that inevitably shape any spectacle image.

**Julia van den Brink**, “Blessed are you among women”: An Intertextual Echo of Deuteronomy 28:3-4a in Luke 1:42.”

In Luke 1:42, Elizabeth exclaims to Mary “Blessed are you among women and blessed is the fruit of your womb.” The first of these two blessings is generally compared to Deborah’s blessing of Jael in Judges 5:24 and Uzziah’s blessing of Judith in Judith 13:18a, as both are blessed among women. However, in this paper, I will argue that it is more likely that both blessings in Luke 1:42 echo the blessings in Deuteronomy 28:3-4a, introducing the covenant blessings and curses into the background of Luke’s narrative.

**Kevin Waldie** – “Seeing and Hearing: a synoptic gospel/cinematic perspective.”

Looking critically at the synoptic gospels it is obvious that each evangelist casts the person of Jesus in a certain light. We see him perform set actions and hear him speak well-chosen words, all arranged according to its author’s creative bent. Thinking about a parallel experience had at the cinema I believe we can learn something useful for gospel study and teaching based on how we see and hear in contemporary film. I therefore suggest that in comparing film and gospel we could come to receive the narratives of the synoptic Jesus with eyes and ears made new.