
The Society for Old Testament Study

BULLETIN 2010

**85th WINTER MEETING
5th–7th January 2010
Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge
Professor Cheryl Exum presiding**

Professor Cheryl Exum (Sheffield)

Presidential Address: The Arts and the Exegete

The Bible has played an inspirational role in the arts for centuries, and the arts have, in turn, influenced the way the Bible is read. Examples were drawn from fine art, film, music and literature to argue that attention to the ways the biblical text has been rendered in the arts can make us better exegetes. Or, at the very least, can stimulate, sharpen or support one's interpretation of a biblical text. Consideration was given to biblical texts in which looking is represented (and the question was asked, How?) and to texts that avoid representing looking (where the question raised was, Why?).

Paintings of David watching Bathsheba bathing, it was argued, draw attention to the way the biblical narrator controls both content and mode of presentation in order to achieve a certain effect. Just what, or how much, can David see? Does Bathsheba know she is being watched? Paintings of the scene align the viewer with David's voyeuristic gaze, and help us recognize how the text similarly aligns the reader with his perspective. Adopting David's male subject

position means that women viewers—and readers—are asked to identify against our own interests, and to accept a view of woman as an enticement that can bring about a man's downfall. But why should exegetes blame Bathsheba, as many do, for appearing on the scene in the act of washing? Why not accuse the biblical writer who chose to portray her this way, and, by withholding her point of view, to leave her open to the charge of seduction in order to make David look better? Two major Hollywood films (Henry King's 1951 *David and Bathsheba*, starring Gregory Peck and Susan Hayward, and Bruce Beresford's 1985 *King David*, starring Richard Gere) make us even more aware than the paintings of how perspective and point of view are manipulated to align the viewer with the male point of view and encourage us to 'see' the woman as dangerous, a source of temptation.

The issue of the voyeuristic gaze (such as David's) versus the erotic look (where looking does not intrude upon that which is seen) was explored using the metaphorical descriptions of the body in the Song of Songs and some artistic representations of the text's unusual imagery. Unlike David's voyeuristic gaze at Bathsheba, looking in the Song is not detached. When, for example, the man looks at the woman's body and describes it for the text's readers, he is speaking to her—describing her to herself and inviting her to see herself through his eyes. A feature of the Song that renders our looking less voyeuristic, and our pleasure more aesthetic than erotic, is the use of densely metaphorical language to describe the body. Thus we might say that, unlike the narrator of the story of David and Bathsheba, the Song of Songs poet protects the woman from the voyeuristic gaze, while at the same time representing her as being looked at. That the woman looks too is essential to the Song's presentation of love as mutual delight and pleasure.

The expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael from Abraham's household shows how art helps us to see what the biblical writer does not want us to see. When artists visualize the expulsion, they offer viewers what the text withholds, Hagar's and Ishmael's point of view, with the result that the viewer, unlike the reader, is openly invited to feel sympathy for them. Viewers are likely to find Abraham's action difficult to comprehend, if not morally reprehensible, and a close reading reveals the complex narrative transactions the biblical writer had to resort to in order to justify the expulsion. Similarly, in the story of Lot and his daughters, the biblical narrator has repressed a version of the story that art helps us recover, a version in which the real issue

is the father's unconscious incestuous desire for his daughters. In the biblical version, the narrator's forbidden desire for incest with his daughters is fulfilled, but with distortions aimed at censoring its unacceptable content. In art, the father's complicity and active involvement are openly acknowledged.

The paper concluded with examples from music (Handel's *Esther*, where changes, such as the omission of any reference to how Esther became queen and simplifying the relationship between Esther and the king, were used to draw attention to ways modern exegetes treat, or fail to treat, these issues) and literature (Stephen Heym's *The King David Report*, which, among other things, invites us to speculate on the biblical writer's ideology by showing the dilemma of the author of the report).

Professor Ellen van Wolde (Nijmegen)

The verb ברא and the collocation תהו ובהו in Genesis 1:1–2:4a

Words are the vehicles of experience and thinking. They enable people to utter their most individual feelings, insights, discoveries and ideas. Words in the Hebrew Bible originated in ancient Near Eastern contexts and are, though fossilized in ancient texts, still understandable to modern people living in a completely different historical setting. How is this possible? How can we determine these Hebrew words' meaning? I propose to study words, language and texts in close relation to mental processing (cf. my recently published book *Reframing Biblical Studies. When Language and Text meet Culture, Cognition and Context*, Eisenbrauns, 2009).

The aims of this paper were to examine the meaning of the verb ברא and of the collocation תהו ובהו in Genesis 1:1–2:4a (from now on Genesis 1)—words which are commonly understood as designating 'to create' in the sense of 'the act of bringing something new into existence' and 'desolate and void', respectively— and to describe the mental picture that Genesis 1:1-2 conveys.

Subsequent analyses of cognitive linguistic and textual data, and a comparative study of Babylonian and Egyptian material led to the conclusion that Genesis 1:1-2 describes the divine act of separation (cf. E. van Wolde in *JSOT* 34.1 [2009] 3-23), in which the start of God's separating activity evoked in v. 1 is specified in v. 2c: his breath or

wind executes this action. The process of separation by אלהים in order to make 'space' ('atmosphere') between the heaven and the earth started in v. 1 is duratively executed by the אלהים's circling around across the waters as described in v. 2c.

Dr Jonathan Stökl (Cambridge)

(No) Prophetesses in Ezekiel 13: Reconsidering 'the daughters of your people, who prophesy'

In this paper I suggest a new interpretation for the background of Ezek. 13:17-23. Until recently, most interpreters read the women in this pericope as witches and therefore evil; more recently a number of interpreters have stressed that it is only Ezekiel who regards these women as bad and that they should really be understood as female prophets who competed with Ezekiel. In contrast, I point out that the history of growth of the pericope has to be taken into account.

As the text stands, the women are accused of being false prophets, just as their male counterparts in vss 1-16. But in an earlier layer of the text which still shines through we find the women connected with some form of communication with the dead; this, in turn, fits with the *munabbiātu* found in some texts from Emar. Because of the biblical prophets they had been interpreted as female prophets as well, but the use of the verb *nubbû* in the context of caring/communicating with the dead suggests that they were religious specialists communicating with/caring for the dead. This and the openness with which they are addressed in the Emar material suggest that they were highly skilled specialists with considerable regard. It is likely that the Hebrew *mitnabbe'ot* originally had a similar function and therefore high social status. The textual history of the book of Ezekiel turned them into female prophets at odds with Ezekiel; reception history turned these women into witches. In their own life-times they were probably well regarded religious specialists.

Dr Susan Gillingham (Oxford)

Psalms 1 and 2 through the Centuries

Should Psalms 1 and 2 be read as a composite psalm, with their complementary themes of Torah and Messiah, in the manner of Psalms 19A and 19B, with their themes of Creation and Torah? The paper first countered this suggestion, arguing that not only are the structure and content of Psalms 1 and 2 entirely different, but also their *Wirkungsgeschichte*, unlike Psalm 19, shows how they have been received in very different ways: examples included illuminated manuscripts (the ninth century Utrecht Psalter and the twelfth century St. Alban's Psalter were used here) and musical compositions (Claude de Jeune on Psalm 1 and Handel on Psalm 2 were used, as well as Lazar Weiner on Psalm 1 and Bernstein on Psalm 2).

The paper then sought to answer the question, 'In what sense, nevertheless, might Psalms 1 and 2 be seen as *Zwillingspsalmen*?' Neither has a superscription, they have several linguistic correspondences, and, in terms of genre, both serve a didactic purpose, addressing the congregation rather than God. Their reception history shows how they have been frequently been read as a composite whole—in *4Q Florilegium*, the Psalms of Solomon, the New Testament (for example, in variant Western texts of Acts 13:33, Psalm 2 is referred to as 'the first psalm'); they are treated in this way by commentators as early as Justin Martyr and Hippolytus of Rome, the Babylonian Talmud Tractate *Berakoth 9b-10a*, and by medieval Jewish commentators such as Abraham ibn Ezra, and Reformation writers such as Erasmus and Luther. Jewish tradition primarily viewed them as 'two in one' by reading the first psalm through the lens of Moses and the second through David, whereas Christians read Psalm 1 as about the exemplary humanity of Jesus and Psalm 2 as about the divinity of Christ. The paper illustrated these readings through more examples from music and art.

The paper concluded that, nevertheless, over the last sixty years we have seen greater rapprochement between the two traditions, in that the first psalm has been read more generally as about an anthropocentric, pragmatic faith with obedience to God's law making sense of the present, and the second psalm as about a more theocentric faith, with God's dealings with the community of faith through a coming deliverer making sense of the future. The paper thus proposed that there is now more ecumenical scope in reading these two psalms as one unit rather than two; furthermore, as a Prologue to the Psalter,

this has an impact on how Jews and Christians together might perceive these two voices throughout the Psalms as a whole.

Professor Hugh Pyper (Sheffield)

The Beginnings of the Bible

That the Bible begins ‘In the beginning’ is so obviously appropriate that it has been very seldom questioned. However, most of the world’s scriptures do not begin with an account of the beginning of things and this may lead us to wonder whether the seeming naturalness of the biblical beginning is in fact itself a testimony to the prevalence of biblical categories in Western culture. A.D. Nuttall in his study of literary beginnings contrasts the biblical/Hebraic concept of an absolute beginning with the classical/Greek option of beginning ‘*in medias res*’. On examining more closely the way that biblical books begin, this contrast is seen to collapse. The interest in ‘the’ beginning in Western thought owes more to Augustine and his neo-Platonic background as seen in his reading of Genesis than it does to the Hebrew Bible. Indeed, even Genesis 1 is not interested in some absolute beginning and giving an account of the natural order of things. Genesis starts ‘*in medias res*’ and the message could hardly be clearer that this is not a natural process, but an extraordinary and supernatural act. Rethinking biblical beginnings may wean us away from the understandable but one-sided concentration on narrative as the backbone of biblical literature.

Dr Hilary Marlow (Cambridge)

‘What am I in a boundless creation?’ An Ecological Reading of Sirach 16 & 17

This paper drew on insights from the field of ‘ecocriticism’ within literary studies to examine the creation poem of Sirach 16:26-17:14 from an ecological perspective. The text is significant for such a purpose because of its reuse of the Genesis creation accounts, in particular the notion of human beings as the image of God and with dominion over creation, which has caused some critics to label the biblical accounts as exploitatively anthropocentric. Preceding sections of Sirach include discussion of human significance ‘in a boundless

creation' and human free will and moral responsibility, and these themes are developed in the poem itself. The poem's description of the creation of humankind suggests both human finitude, a characteristic shared with other life forms, and the uniqueness of the divine image in human beings. These characteristics are set within the context of the cosmos as a stable and ordered whole, obedient to God, and of the responsibilities stipulated in the *Torah* to deal rightly with one's neighbour. Reading this text from an ecological perspective invites recognition of the ambiguity of human place in the world, transient yet earth-changing, and of the ethical challenges in caring for global 'neighbours' in the face of growing environmental pressures.

The following **papers** were also presented at the Winter Meeting: Professor David Chalcraft (Derby), 'The Bible Moves in Mysterious Ways: The Sociology of the Mobile Bible in Late Modernity'; Professor Martti Nissinen (Helsinki), 'Prophecy and Gender in the Ancient Mediterranean'. A **panel discussion** was held on the topic of 'The Bible and the Academy', with Professor David Clines (Sheffield), Ms Elizabeth Harper (Durham), Dr Paul Joyce (Oxford), and Dr Sarah Nicholson (Glasgow).

86th SUMMER MEETING
19th–22nd July 2010
with the Aileen Guilding Conference
22nd–23rd July 2010
University of Sheffield
Professor Cheryl Exum (Sheffield) presiding

Dr Martin O’Kane (Lampeter)
Biblical Art from Wales: Text and Context

The presentation reported on a three year project, funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, which focussed on highlighting the wealth of biblical art that exists throughout Wales, in the medium of painting, stained glass, and ceramic. The illustrated talk included a discussion of biblical images found in churches, synagogues, art galleries and private collections, demonstrating the pre-occupation that existed in nineteenth-century Nonconformist Wales with translating the biblical word into image in a way that safeguarded and prioritized the authority of the word. The presentation opened with the iconic image of Mary Jones receiving her Bible from Thomas Charles, an event that triggered the founding of the *British and Foreign Bible Society*, and concluded with the importance of the Bible as a source of inspiration for contemporary Welsh artists.

Ms Elizabeth Harper (Durham)
Genesis 5:29: It’s all in the name

In Genesis 5:29, Lamech claims that his new born son Noah ‘will comfort us from our burdensome manual labour, from the soil which YHWH has cursed’. Two verses later Lamech dies and shortly after, except for Noah and his ark, all living things expire in the flood. Is it cold comfort, then, that Noah ends up bringing to ‘us’? Moreover the Noah stories never again talk explicitly of the cursed soil. Was Lamech deluded? Is 5:29 an anomalous fragment that has no place in the Noah stories? This paper suggested that the enigma of 5:29 went

even deeper. It pointed out how ambiguous and uncertain 5:29 is and then traced the riddle of 5:29 through the ebb and flow of the final-form flood narrative, discovering numerous echoes throughout the story. The flood story read through 5:29 takes on a rather different hue highlighting themes often overlooked (cleansing, the priority of the earth over Noah). By the end, 5:29 still remains an enigma, for none of the traditional answers are fully satisfactory (for example, 8:21, 9:20).

Dr Elzbieta Lazarewicz-Wyrzykowska (Cambridge)

Male Body, Masculine Honour: A Gendered Reading of the Samson Narrative

This paper provided a close reading of the Samson narrative (Judges 13-16), guided by an anthropological understanding of masculine honour, intrinsically connected with the male sexual body. It was argued that in the story of Samson's ill-fated marriage to the woman from Timnah, and in the resulting exchange of acts of violence between him and the Philistines (Judg. 14.1-16.3), his honour and masculinity are challenged. They are subsequently lost as a result of his defeat, humiliation and mutilation of his body (Judg. 16.4-25). Finally, they are restored in his act of vengeance, albeit at the expense of his life (Judg. 16.28-31). Such an approach helps explain the motives for the character's behaviour. Furthermore, it shows that the violent defence of honour, depicted as a means to fulfil God's plan for Israel, is employed in the ideology of war reflected in the book of Judges.

Dr Jenny Dines (Cambridge)

'What if the Reader is a She?' Biblical Women and Their Translators

Although women in the Hebrew Bible have received a good deal of attention from both feminist scholars and those interested in cultural reception history (retellings in painting, film, opera etc.), very little has yet been done on the Septuagint. From the perspective of a contemporary feminist reader, my paper examines how various translators treat some of the more lively female characters in their source-texts. Do they alter the women they encounter, either by enhancing or diminishing them by their characterization? What might

any differences reveal about the interests of the translators and their original readers? Particular attention is paid to texts which have come down in two distinct forms: the A and B texts of Judges (for Deborah, Jael and Bath-Jephthah), the LXX and Alpha texts of Esther, and Gk^I and Gk^{II} for Tobit (Anna, Edna and Sarah). The outcome will reveal considerable variety in translational treatment; the distinct differences in the case of each of the double recensions will prove especially significant.

Dr John Jarick (Oxford)

Imagining a *qōhelet* as an *ekklēsiastēs*

One of the most intriguing characters in the Hebrew Bible goes by the designation of *qōhelet*. We cannot be sure what this designation is meant to convey, since it is a feminine Qal participle of a verb not otherwise used in the Qal, though it presumably has something to do with the noun *qāhāl* ('assembly'). Is the sage a woman, functioning in a man's world and presenting herself more or less as a man? Or is the sage really a man, but taking on the persona of Wisdom, a feminized concept in Hebrew imagery? Or is he a eunuch, working in a royal court where the prerequisite for certain kinds of civil service was castration? In any event, under this enigmatic title the protagonist of the book of Qohelet imagines himself/herself as the greatest of all the kings of Jerusalem and proclaims as that personage that everything is vanity. In the Greek version of the book, the sage is designated as an *ekklēsiastēs*, which carries the clear meaning of 'assemblyman', a member of the *ekklēsia* ('assembly'). Thus the thoughts in the Greek version are presented as those of a common man, a citizen among citizens, and so when this individual imagines himself as a king it is analogous to the character Samippus (in Lucian's dialogue *The Ship*), who daydreams of being a great king of the east and concludes that it is not a happy business after all. Thus in the Septuagint book of Ecclesiastes we encounter an assemblyman acting as a king, drawing his readers into his imaginings and thereby entertaining and perhaps convincing them with his musings.

Dr John Tudno Williams (Aberystwyth)

The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship: *Guilding's Theory Revisited*

The paper offered a summary and critique of Guilding's theory as propounded in her book of 1960 and considered its reception at the time it was published. In particular, major problems remain regarding the dating of the Triennial Lectionary Cycle, which formed the basis of her theory. It was suggested that the theory's impact on subsequent discussions of the Jewish background of the Fourth Gospel was on the whole limited. However, it was noted that C.K. Barrett stood out as a major expositor of this gospel who had made most extensive and practical use of her work. Certainly, subsequent to her research, over the last fifty years much work has been expended on the festal and liturgical aspects of the gospel.

The following **papers** were also presented at the Summer Meeting: Dr Carly Crouch (Cambridge), 'Sit Down upon the Dust: A Talionic Approach to Warfare in Deutero-Isaiah'; Dr Florentina Badalanova Geller (Royal Anthropological Institute), 'The Akedah: Ethno-hermeneutic Interpretation'; Professor Nicolas Wyatt (Edinburgh), 'The Griffin in the Ideology and Iconography of the Levant'; Dr Yvonne Sherwood (Glasgow), 'The Persistence of Blasphemy: The Bible as a Public Edifice in the "Secular" State'; Professor Michael Fox (Madison), 'Job's Tale'. A Career Development **workshop** was also led by Dr Stuart Weeks (Durham) and Dr James Aitken (Cambridge).

In addition to those summarized above, the following papers were also presented at the Aileen Guilding Conference: Professor Steve Moyise (Chichester), 'Quotation and Allusion in Paul: The Minor Prophets as Test Case'; Professor George Brooke (Manchester), 'The Influence of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Modern Interpretations of Jewish Traditions in the New Testament'; Dr James Aitken (Cambridge), 'Translating Social Status in the Septuagint'. A celebratory **banquet** closed proceedings.

MEMBERSHIP NEWS

Among **honours** received by members of the Society: Dr Sebastian Brock had been awarded the British Academy's Leverhulme Medal for Humanities and Social Sciences, and Professor Ernest Nicholson had been awarded the British Academy's Burkitt Medal for Biblical Studies. Professor Geza Vermes had received an honorary PhD from the Central European University of Budapest and had also been given a Tribute of Congratulation for lifetime achievement by the United States House of Representatives. Professor John Barton had been awarded a Leverhulme Major Research Fellowship.

The Society learned with regret of the **deaths** of Revd John Davis, Professor Michael Goulder (a former President), the Very Revd J.D. Hutchinson, Revd Professor Noel King, Professor Avraham Malamat, Professor Jacob Milgrom, and Revd Geoffrey Parke-Taylor, Revd Dr Phillip Tindall, Professor Donald Wiseman (a former President), and Professor Erich Zenger.

The following have been elected to membership of the Society. At the Winter Meeting: Mr Ben Johnson, Rabbi Deborah Kahn-Harris, Revd Dohyung Kim, Dr Paul Kissling, Mrs Karalina Matskevich, Dr Madhavi Nevader, Revd Dr Krzysztof Sonek, Dr Joan Taylor, and Dr William Tooman. At the Summer Meeting: Dr Hilary Elder, Revd Peter William Goodman, Mr Seong Whan Tim Hyun, and Revd Dr Diana F. Sanders.

The current **Honorary Members** are Professors Bertil Albrektson (1983), Athalya Brenner (2002), Walter Brueggemann (1997), Frank Moore Cross (1988), Norman Gottwald (2009), Menahem Haran (1981), Sara Japhet (1999), Otto Kaiser (1992), Bernhard Lang (1997), Tryggve Mettinger (2003), Johannes de Moor (2004), Eduard Nielsen (1988), Kirsten Nielsen (2000), Rolf Rendtorff (2006), Helmer Ringgren (1973), Rudolf Smend (1979), and Jan Alberto Soggin (1992).

MISCELLANEOUS NOTICES

The **Winter Meeting 2011** will be held on 4th–6th January at Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge, and the **Summer Meeting 2011** will be held on 18th–21st July at St Hilda's College, Oxford. Both meetings will be under the Presidency of Professor John Sawyer. At the Summer Meeting, the Society will meet with the British Association for Jewish Studies for a day of papers and other events.

Plans for the Society's **centennial projects** are underway. These include the creation of a SOTS 'Wiki' website for the display of reliable information on the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, and a museum exhibition, to be accompanied by public lectures or a conference, on 'The Fall of Jerusalem, 587 BCE'.

Members are reminded that the Programme Sub-Committee is pleased to receive **proposals for papers** — particularly for shorter papers (25 minutes), though longer papers (50 minutes) may also be proposed — as well as for workshops and other sessions. All proposals should be sent to the Secretary by the end of November (for the forthcoming Summer Meeting) or by the end of June (for the forthcoming Winter Meeting).

Members are also reminded that the Society is able to award each year a number of **conference grants** ('bursaries') to assist those who would otherwise be unable to attend a Meeting. You should bear in mind that grants are for members or for persons who are seriously considering membership rather than for occasional guests, that they are intended to meet cases of genuine need (and so are not normally available to those who are in full-time employment), and that they are intended to 'top up' resources rather than meet all costs associated with attending a Meeting (and so the normal maximum for a grant is the package price minus the booking fee). An application form is available on the SOTS website, or alternatively applicants may write to the Secretary at least one week before the cut-off date for discount-price bookings for the relevant Meeting.

Members are further reminded that they may submit to the Committee (via the Secretary or President) the name of any person thought appropriate to be considered for office in the Society or for Honorary Membership of the Society. Each year sees the election of a new President-elect, as well as two new Committee members, and in most years there is also need for a new Programme Sub-Committee member and/or a new Publications Sub-Committee member.

INFORMATION FOR NEWCOMERS

The following 'Information for Newcomers' has been prepared as a means of informing potential first-time attendees about aspects of SOTS Meetings, and is now displayed on the Society's website. Existing members of the Society are encouraged to draw the attention of prospective newcomers to this information.

Newcomers are very welcome at SOTS meetings. SOTS is a friendly group with newcomers always present, and everyone will be glad to get to know you. To help in navigating your first visit, the following information may provide a few answers to common questions.

Format: The Society meets twice each year for Summer and Winter meetings. The format of these meetings is different from a very large conference, since there are no parallel sessions, so everyone is generally at everything at the same time. After delivering a paper, each speaker normally takes questions. The question time is usually fairly short because time is limited, but speakers will be only too pleased to discuss any further questions at another time. The programme of papers is circulated in advance, and is available on the SOTS website.

Meals are taken together and provide a good opportunity for mixing, so please sit wherever you find a space and introduce yourself to someone unfamiliar; they will be glad to meet you. There is usually at least one drinks reception sponsored by academic departments and/or publishers, and a bar in the evenings, which also provide opportunities to put names to a wider circle of faces. There is also the opportunity during the Summer Meeting to spend more time with fellow participants at an organised outing to a place of local interest; these outings are usually well attended.

Dress: There is no strict dress code. As at any professional gathering, people tend to wear the sort of work clothes they might wear for teaching.

Membership: You are welcome to attend a meeting or two as the 'guest' of a member of the Society before deciding if you would like to become a member yourself, though equally you do not have to have attended a previous meeting before seeking membership. It is not difficult to become a member: there is a short form to fill in,

downloadable from the SOTS website, which requires the support of two members of the Society. The annual membership fee is modest, and the benefits of membership include useful mailings, discounts on books and journals, and the chance to write reviews for and receive the annual *Book List*.

Papers: Any member of the Society is eligible to present a paper at a meeting, and proposals are particularly welcome from new members. The procedure for proposing a paper is to write to the Secretary, giving a title and brief summary of the proposed paper, by the end of June (for the forthcoming Winter Meeting) or by the end of November (for the forthcoming Summer Meeting).

A special word for postgraduate students: Postgraduate students in Hebrew Bible and cognate fields are also very welcome at SOTS meetings, and can enjoy a reduced price for accommodation and meals in return for minor duties (such as assisting with bookstalls, registration, or the distribution of handouts) at the meeting. As with other newcomers, you can if you wish attend a meeting or two simply as the ‘guest’ of a SOTS member (normally your supervisor) in order to see what the meetings are like before deciding on whether to seek membership; then, when you do apply for membership, your supervisor would normally be one of your two ‘supporters’. You do not need to have completed your doctorate to become a member of the Society; nor, once you have taken up membership, do you need to have completed your doctorate to propose a paper for a forthcoming meeting.

Further information: The SOTS website (www.sots.ac.uk) has useful information on the Society and its meetings, as well as other resources for biblical studies. If you have further questions relating to your attendance at a forthcoming meeting, the best person to contact is Elizabeth Harper, the Hospitality Secretary (e.a.harper@dur.ac.uk).

ACCOUNTS FOR 2009

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT for year ended 31st October 2009

	<i>Bursaries</i>	<i>Book</i>	<i>Confer-</i>	<i>General</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>2008</i>
	£	List	ences	Fund	£	£
Income						
Subscriptions and donations	833	—	—	9546	10379	10728
Income tax recovered	—	—	—	855	855	854
Book List sales	—	14	—	—	14	26
Conference income	300	—	57347	—	57647	28807
Dividends, interest and royalties	308	—	—	638	946	3706
Gain on disposal of investments	—	—	—	—	—	—
Legacies	—	—	—	10000	45000	45000
Total income	1441	14	57347	21152	79954	89214
Expenditure						
Printing and stationery	—	—	—	3485	3485	571
Postage and administration	—	392	—	1538	1930	1214
Equipment	—	—	—	761	761	—
Book List production	—	—	—	—	—	3000
Committee costs	—	—	—	890	890	475
Conference costs	—	—	58235	503	58738	37571
Accountancy	—	—	—	575	575	546
Bursaries	1885	—	—	—	1885	2211
Bank charges	—	—	—	583	583	379
Total expenditure	1885	392	58235	8335	68847	45967
Net surplus/(deficit)	(444)	(378)	(888)	12817	11107	43247

BALANCE SHEET at 31st October 2009

	<i>2009</i>	<i>2008</i>
	£	£
Assets		
Debtors	2060	2857
Bank accounts (note 1)	119539	107606
	121599	110463
Liabilities		
Sundry creditors and reserves	(575)	(546)
	121024	109917
Represented by		
Accumulated surpluses and reserves (note 2)		
General fund	62252	60701
Bursary fund	228	216
Legacy fund	59000	49000
	121024	109917

NOTES TO THE ACCOUNTS for year ended 31st October 2009

1. Bank accounts	2009	2008
Barclays Bank plc: Current Account	98	103
Business Premium Account	119441	107503
	119539	107606

2. Accumulated surpluses and reserves	<i>General</i>	<i>Bursary</i>	<i>Legacy</i>	
	<i>Fund</i>	<i>Fund</i>	<i>Fund</i>	<i>Total</i>
At 1st November 2009	60701	216	49000	109917
Surplus/(deficit) for the year	1551	(444)	10000	11107
Transfers	—	—	—	—
At 31st October 2009	62252	(228)	59000	121024

PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The accounts have been prepared under the historical cost convention.

The principal accounting policies of the Society are substantially unchanged from the previous year and are set out below.

Subscriptions and donations received: these represent amounts received during the year and no account is taken of any subscriptions due but unpaid at the date of the balance sheet.

Income tax recoverable: no account is taken of any income tax recoverable but not yet received in respect of subscriptions under Gift Aid or investment income received during the year.

Stocks: no account is taken of unused stocks of book lists or general stationery.

Fixed assets and depreciation: fixed assets that have no resale value are fully written off in the year of purchase; depreciation on other assets is calculated on a straight line basis and aims to write down the cost of fixed assets over their expected normal lives; the rate applicable is 20% per annum.

Accumulated surpluses and reserves: the recognition of separately designated funds is primarily for the purpose of administration and control, and any accumulated surpluses shown are part of the general reserves of the Society and, as such, are unrestricted in application.

ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT

We have prepared the accounts and notes for the year ended 31st October 2009 without audit. We confirm that the accounts are in agreement with the books and information supplied to us.

Hardcastle Burton
90 High Street
Newmarket CB8 8FE

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES FOR 2011

President: Professor John Sawyer, Via della Pallotta 16, 06124 Perugia PG, Italy (tel. +39 075 372 2402, e-mail john.sawyer@libero.it).

Retiring President: Professor Cheryl Exum, Department of Biblical Studies, University of Sheffield, 45 Victoria Street, Sheffield S3 7QB (tel. 0114 222 0503, e-mail j.c.exum@sheffield.ac.uk).

President-elect: Professor George Brooke, Religions and Theology, Samuel Alexander Building, The University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, England (e-mail george.brooke@manchester.ac.uk)

Treasurer: Dr Janet Tollington, Westminster College, Cambridge CB3 0AA (tel. 01223 741091, e-mail jet40@cam.ac.uk).

Secretary: Dr Francesca Stavrakopoulou, Department of Theology and Religion, University of Exeter, Amory Building, Rennes Drive, Exeter EX4 4RJ (tel. 01392 7264290, e-mail f.stavrakopoulou@exeter.ac.uk).

Secretary for Honorary Members: Professor David Clines, Department of Biblical Studies, University of Sheffield, 45 Victoria Street, Sheffield S3 7QB (tel. 0114 222 0505, e-mail d.clines@sheffield.ac.uk).

Membership Secretary: Mrs Vivienne Rowett, The New Vicarage, Beck Hill, Barton-upon-Humber DN18 5EY (tel. 01652 632202, e-mail vivrowett@aol.com).

Hospitality Secretary: Ms Elizabeth Harper, Flat 4, 69–70 Crossgate, Durham DH1 4PR (tel. 0191 375 7091, e-mail e.a.harper@dur.ac.uk).

Book List Editor: Dr Deborah Rooke, King's College, Strand, London WC2R 2LS (tel. 020 7848 2393, e-mail deborah.rooke@kcl.ac.uk). Books for review should be sent to her c/- Regent's Park College, Pusey Street, Oxford OX1 2LB.

Information Officer: Dr James Aitken, Faculty of Divinity, West Road, Cambridge CB3 9BS (e-mail jka12@cam.ac.uk).

Committee: The above Officers of the Society plus Dr Eric Christianson, Dr Katharine Dell, Dr Charlotte Hempel, Dr Ann Jeffers, Dr Hilary Marlow, Professor Hugh Pyper, Dr Jonathan Stökl, and Dr Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer.

Programme Sub-Committee: The President, President-elect, Secretary, and Secretary for Honorary Members; plus Professor David Chalcraft, Ms Elizabeth Harper, and Dr Stuart Weeks.

Publications Sub-Committee: The *Book List* Editor (Convener), Dr Margaret Barker (as Monographs Editor), Dr Adrian Curtis (as Guides Editor), and Professor Hugh Williamson (as SOTS representative on the OTS Board); plus Professor Robert Gordon, Professor Lester Grabbe, and Dr Anselm

Hagedorn.

Editorial Board of the SOTS monograph series: Dr Margaret Barker (Editor), Mr Edward Ball, Dr Eryl Davies, Dr Katharine Dell, and Dr Paul Joyce. (Proposed manuscripts for the series should be sent to Dr Barker at The White House, 24 Gordon Road, Borrowash DE72 3JX.)

PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE SOCIETY

1917-19 William Bennett	1965 Frederick Bruce
1920 Archibald Kennedy	1966 Gwynne Henton Davies
1921 Robert Kennett	1967 Donald Coggan
1922 George Buchanan Gray	1968 Matthew Black
1923 George Box	1969 John Schofield
1924 Arthur Peake	1970 Arthur Herbert
1925 Stanley Cook	1971 Edward Ullendorff
1926 William Stevenson	1972 Peter Ackroyd
1927 David Simpson	1973 James Barr
1928 Theodore Robinson	1974 Dafydd Ap-Thomas
1929 Henry Wheeler Robinson	1975 Eileen de Ward
1930 Claude Montefiore	1976 Douglas Jones
1931 William Oesterley	1977 Ronald Williams
1932 William Lofthouse	1978 William McKane
1933 William Wardle	1979 John Emerton
1934 Adam Welch	1980 Donald Wiseman
1935 William Emery Barnes	1981 Raphael Loewe
1936 John Battersby Harford	1982 Norman Whybray
1937-38 Godfrey Driver	1983 Roy Porter
1939-40 Herbert Loewe	1984 Wilfred Lambert
1941-45 Henry Wheeler Robinson	1985 Ronald Clements
1946 Theodore Robinson	1986 Barnabas Lindars
1947 Cuthbert Lattey	1987 Robert Murray
1948 Edward Robertson	1988 Ernest Nicholson
1949 Christopher North	1989 John Rogerson
1950 Harold Rowley	1990 William Johnstone
1951 Samuel Hooke	1991 Anthony Gelston
1952 John Barton	1992 Andrew Mayes
1953 David Winton Thomas	1993 Richard Coggins
1954 Norman Porteous	1994 John Gibson
1955 Alfred Guillaume	1995 Gwilym Jones
1956 Aubrey Johnson	1996 David Clines
1957 Norman Snaith	1997 Rex Mason
1958 Leonard Elliott-Binns	1998 Margaret Barker
1959 John Mauchline	1999 Robert Carroll
1960 Cuthbert Simpson	2000 Joseph Blenkinsopp
1961 Jacob Weingreen	2001 Michael Goulder
1962 Hedley Sparks	2002 John Bartlett
1963 George Anderson	2003 Robert Gordon
1964 Bleddyn Roberts	2004 Hugh Williamson

2005 Graeme Auld
2006 Robert Hayward
2007 Philip Davies
2008 John Barton
2009 Lester Grabbe
2010 Cheryl Exum