

**Society for the Study of Christian Ethics**  
**Annual Conference: Bible and Christian Ethics**  
**Westcott House, Cambridge: 8—10 September 2022**

| <b>Thursday 8 September</b> |             |  |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--|
| 12:00—16:00                 |             | Arrivals and registration  |
| 14:00—15:30                 |             | Postgraduate session   |
| 15:30—16:00                 |             | Refreshments   |
| 16:00—16:15                 |             | Welcome and introduction to the conference<br>Prof. Neil Messer (President, SSCE)  |
| 16:15—17:45                 |             | Plenary Session 1: ‘Rape Myths and Gospel Truths: The Bible and Sexual Violence.’<br>Speaker: Dr Katie Edwards<br>Respondent: Revd Dr Jennifer Moberly<br>Chair:   |
| 17:50—18:10                 | Chapel      | Evening Prayer   |
| 18:15—19:15                 | Dining Hall | Dinner   |
| 19:15—20:45                 |             | Short Paper Session 1<br><u>Track 1 (Chair:)</u><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Dallas J. Gingles: ‘Christ, Intrinsic Laws, and Guilt in Bonhoeffer’s “History and the Good II.”’</li> <li>b. Christopher Whyte: ‘Beyond Religion: Towards a Bonhoefferian Ethic of Social Care in Light of the Book of Acts.’</li> </ul> <u>Track 2 (Chair:)</u><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Jackie Turvey Tait: ‘Under Vine and Fig Tree: A Pragmatic Christian Realist Case for Reparations and Community-Based Practices to Restore Relational Integrity.’</li> <li>b. D. T. Everhart: “‘If My People Would Turn from Their Wicked Ways’’: Reparations as a Model of Communal Repentance.’</li> </ul> |
| 20:45—                      | Common Room | Social time (bar open until 21:30)   |

## Friday 9 September

|             |             |   |
|-------------|-------------|---|
| 07:30—08:45 | Dining Hall | Breakfast   |
| 08:30—08:50 | Chapel      | Morning Prayer  |
| 09:00—10:30 |             | Plenary Session 2: 'Does the Gospel Require Self-Sacrifice? Paul and the Reconfiguration of the Self-in-Relation.'<br>Speaker: Prof. John Barclay<br>Respondent: Dr Guido de Graaff<br>Chair:   |
| 10:30—11:00 |             | Refreshments  |
| 11:00—12:30 |             | Short Paper Session 2<br><u>Track 1 (Chair:)</u><br>a. Simeon Ximian Xu: 'Artificial Moral Agency: A Reformed Appraisal.'<br>b. Stephen Goundrey-Smith: 'The Myth of Bottled Virtue: Moral Enhancement and the Fruits of the Spirit.'<br><u>Track 2 (Chair:)</u><br>a. Stewart Clem: 'Moses and the Natural Law: Are the Ten Commandments for Everyone?'<br>b. Hendrik Weingärtner: 'Recourse to the Bible in the context of the renewal of German moral theology in the 20th century.' |
| 12:30—13:30 | Dining Hall | Lunch   |
| 13:30—15:00 |             | Free time   |
| 15:00—15:30 |             | Refreshments  |
| 15:30—16:50 |             | Annual General Meeting  |
| 17:00—18:30 |             | Plenary Session 3: 'Cities of Refuge: Considering the Inspiration of Sanctuary in the Hebrew Bible.'<br>Speaker: Dr Jayme Reaves<br>Respondent: Prof. John Berkman<br>Chair:  |
| 18:30—18:50 | Chapel      | Evening Prayer  |
| 18:50—19:30 |             | Drinks/Presentation of members' new books   |
| 19:30—20:30 | Dining Hall | Conference Dinner   |

|                              |             |   |
|------------------------------|-------------|---|
| 20:30—21:00                  | Dining Hall | After-dinner speech: Prof. David Ford [Title TBA]   |
| 21:00—                       | Common Room | Social time (bar open until 21:30)  |
| <b>Saturday 10 September</b> |             |   |
| 07:30—08:45                  | Dining Hall | Breakfast   |
| 08:30—08:50                  | Chapel      | Morning Prayer  |
| 09:00—10:30                  |             | <p>Short Paper Session 3</p> <p><u>Track 1 (Chair:)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Richard A. Davis: ‘David’s Protection Racket and God’s Revelation of State Violence in 1 Samuel 25.’</li> <li>b. Edward A. David: ‘Should we admire the shrewd steward (Luke 16:1-8)? Christian ethics and exemplarist moral theory.’</li> </ul> <p><u>Track 2 (Chair: )</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Matthew Puffer: ‘The Development of Augustine’s Doctrine of the Image of God.’</li> <li>b. Robert W. Heimbürger: ‘Food in the Book of Acts: division, community, and thanksgiving in the wake of the Spirit.’</li> </ul> |
| 10:30—11:00                  |             | Refreshments  |
| 11:00—12:30                  |             | <p>Plenary Session 4: ‘The ethical challenge of decolonisation and the future of New Testament studies.’</p> <p>Speaker: Prof. David Horrell<br/> Respondent: Hannah Malcolm<br/> Chair:</p>  |
| 12:30—12:45                  |             | <p>Closing Remarks</p> <p>Neil Messer</p>   |
| 12:45—13:45                  | Dining Hall | Lunch   |

## Abstracts

### Plenary papers

**Dr Katie Edwards: 'Rape Myths and Gospel Truths: The Bible and Sexual Violence.'**

[Abstract to follow.]

**Prof. John Barclay: 'Does the Gospel Require Self-Sacrifice? Paul and the Reconfiguration of the Self-in-Relation.'**

The popular notion of Christian self-sacrifice, reinforced in Pauline scholarship by the concept of 'cruciformity', requires careful scrutiny. It has been shaped in Western modernity by a self-other antithesis (egoism vs. altruism, selfish vs. selfless), but Paul leads us in a different direction. Through study of a number of Pauline texts, we will find that, on both Christological and social terms, the competitive self is renounced, but the renewed self ('self-with') is placed in a matrix of reciprocal relations characterised by shared benefit and eschatological fulfilment.

**Dr Jayme Reaves: 'Cities of Refuge: Considering the Inspiration of Sanctuary in the Hebrew Bible.'**

The Cities of Refuge as detailed in the Deuteronomic witness in the Hebrew Bible has served as the inspiration and model for the practice of providing sanctuary for many throughout the centuries, namely with the most recent Sanctuary Movements in the US and the UK in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. And yet, the biblical witness as to its implementation and effectiveness is practically silent. Using methods of biblical studies via liberation hermeneutic and theological ethics from both the Jewish and Christian traditions, the following questions will be explored: What were the cities of refuge? How were they to be set up? What are the theological and ethical questions at play in the biblical witness as to their use? What relevance, if any, do they have for us today?

**Prof. David Horrell: 'The ethical challenge of decolonisation and the future of New Testament studies.'**

The challenge to decolonise academic disciplines has been pertinent for many decades, but it has recently come to a new level of prominence, with vigorous discussion of what responding to this challenge might entail. This paper explores what it might mean in the discipline of New Testament studies, specifically in terms of the ethics of the discipline. Taking examples from exegetical and interpretative practice, the paper critically assesses the formative influence of the discipline's European origins, and considers how it might be reshaped in response to the decolonial challenge. Such reshaping might suggest both parallels for the discipline of Christian ethics, and also implications for the nature of the relationship between biblical studies and Christian ethics.

### Short papers

**Dallas J. Gingles: 'Christ, Intrinsic Laws, and Guilt in Bonhoeffer's "History and the Good II"'**

By 1942 Dietrich Bonhoeffer had been “involved in a conspiracy to kill Hitler and overthrow the Third Reich” for over two years (Michael DeJonge, *Bonhoeffer on Resistance: The Word Against the Wheel*, 129). Without suggesting that Bonhoeffer’s *Ethics* manuscripts are “an epiphenomenon of his resistance” (Clifford Green, “Foreword,” *Ontology and Ethics: Bonhoeffer and Contemporary Scholarship*, Adam C. Clark and Michael Mawson, eds., vii) work, it is fair to say that this context deeply informs how readers interpret some of the more provocative arguments in *Ethics*. Among the most celebrated and criticized of these provocative arguments is Bonhoeffer’s reflection on the relationship between responsible action and guilt in “History and the Good II.” In what is often taken as a summary of the argument, Bonhoeffer claims, “because Jesus took the guilt of all human beings upon himself, everyone who acts responsibly becomes guilty” (*Ethics*, 275). In this paper I offer a new interpretation of this famous argument by showing how the Christology of the first clause is crucially important for understanding the second.

In this paper I argue that the guilt to which Bonhoeffer refers in this passage is of a particular kind. In this passage, Bonhoeffer is not describing a generic category of guilt, but rather the guilt that comes from breaking what Bonhoeffer calls the “intrinsic law” of state. Bonhoeffer’s account of this intrinsic law is deeply tied to a long Christological argument that precedes it. While the literature on “History and the Good II” is vast and growing, I know of no one who has made this point. Understood this way, Bonhoeffer’s argument is much more cautious and careful than traditionally understood by either his supporters or critics.

I proceed by, first, locating the logic of Bonhoeffer’s position in “History and the Good II” within his overall account of the moral life in *Ethics*. In a second move, I offer a close reading of the first half of “History and the Good II” to explain the kind of guilt Bonhoeffer presupposes in the second half. Third, I show that Bonhoeffer’s reflections on situations of ostensible tragedy, related to “intrinsic laws” are located not strictly within the immediate context of morality, but rather within the larger context of Christ’s work of reconciliation. This is crucial for understanding the Christological rationale for “taking on guilt.” In a brief final section, I explore the normative implications for this reworked account of Bonhoeffer’s position.

### **Christopher Whyte: ‘Beyond Religion: Towards a Bonhoefferian Ethic of Social Care in Light of the Book of Acts.’**

Dietrich Bonhoeffer, in his *Ethics*, deliberated on when and how the church should care for the needs of the world. He described this work as “preparing the way,” acts of care which remove difficulties that might inhibit the hearing of the church’s proclamation of the gospel. However, Bonhoeffer was committed to the idea that the church should only engage in such work until the barriers to the gospel are removed. For social needs, generally, Bonhoeffer was clear that social care beyond that goal should be accomplished by humanitarian organizations so that the church would not be distracted from its primary work of gospel proclamation. This raises a problem, especially considering his reflections on “religionless Christianity” at the end of his life. Within those reflections, he wrestled with the challenge of following Jesus in a world without a paradigm for religion in which Christ is “really the Lord of the world.” This seems to undermine our ability to demarcate where the social action of the church ends and humanitarian service begins. Glen Kinoshita’s work on the Book of Acts may provide a means for navigating such tension. He argues for a far blurrier boundary between social care and the gospel based on the witness of the Book of Acts with regard to the ministry of reconciliation. Kinoshita argues for a social ethic in which the church’s ability to overcome social fragmentation was itself a form of gospel proclamation that was both

impressive and confronting to the surrounding non-Christian world. Kinoshita's engagement with Acts, and the manner in which he subsequently frames the boundaries of what counts as gospel, may prove fruitful for applying a Bonhoefferian ethic of care to a world in which the boundaries between the church-community and its surrounding contexts are far blurrier than in Bonhoeffer's day. For this paper, I shall consider Kinoshita's framing of the gospel in light of Acts, and consider how Kinoshita's claims might nuance Bonhoeffer's ethical mandates and point forward to the church's task in an age of "religionless Christianity." This paper will identify potential avenues of consideration for developing an ecclesiological social ethic for a day in which social fragmentations are ubiquitous and what is deemed church and what is deemed the world is far more difficult to parse.

**Jackie Turvey Tait: 'Under Vine and Fig Tree: A Pragmatic Christian Realist Case for Reparations and Community-Based Practices to Restore Relational Integrity.'**

*'Everyone will sit under their own vine and under their own fig-tree, and no one will make them afraid.'* Micah 4:4

In response to the #RhodesMustFall movement, Nigel Biggar has argued that we should not allow our imperial history to be rubbished, as this would erode the moral authority of the West. This paper argues that imperial conquest is in itself inherently harmful, regardless of any alleged benefit to the subjugated peoples, and that rehabilitating our moral standing in the world necessitates repentance, reparations and commitment to establishing institutions that give vulnerable groups, including ethnic minorities and asylum seekers, equal access to justice.

Extending Rosemary Kellison's feminist analysis of unrecognised harms suffered by civilian victims of war, I argue that colonialism inflicts analogous harms on subjugated peoples. Wide power disparities increase risks of injustice and oppression, causing harms that often persist across generations. Marginalisation in social contexts exhibiting high levels of violence, deprivation, isolation and poor social cohesion exacerbate vulnerability and exposure to further harm. As Kellison shows, a rights-based analysis inadequately describes the resultant loss and damage, which impacts cultural identity and relational integrity similarly to moral injury seen in combat veterans.

Drawing on Glen Stassen's ethics of just peace-making, I outline the Biblical and theological basis for Christian community-based practices that build trust and foster the interpersonal harmony essential to human flourishing and exercise of cooperative relational integrity in situations of ongoing power disparity.

In addition to Stassen's pragmatic case, based on empirical evidence of their efficacy in reducing conflict within and between societies, I argue from Germain Grisez's treatment of restorative justice that such community practices are normative within a Christian moral realist framework. The West can have no credible moral authority to challenge other nations' aggressive imperialism until we have repented of and made reparations for our own historical wrongdoing, committing ourselves in concrete peacebuilding practices to a vision of society that shields the vulnerable from injustice and exploitation.

**D. T. Everhart: "'If My People Would Turn from Their Wicked Ways": Reparations as a Model of Communal Repentance.'**

This paper aims to offer a possible model of communal repentance which draws on prophetic literature in the Hebrew Bible and the Gospels. Following my previous work on systemic sin which posits that systemic sins like racism require corporate actions of repentance and resistance for reconciliation, I offer an exegetical analysis of instances in the prophetic literature wherein God promises to restore Israel to covenant relation if they would turn from their wickedness and repent. By comparing those instances when the community did in fact return to God with instances in which Israel continued to reject God, I identify several corporate actions that count as repentance for the sake of restoring the relationship between God and the covenant community. My analysis concludes that the sorts of actions which we see Israel undertake as a community to restore relation to God often include reparative elements that restore or rectify the distorted status quo of broken relationships. I then extend this analysis into the New Testament, analyzing John the Baptist's call to all of Israel to repent in baptism. By analyzing the effects of a baptism for repentance on the individual and the community, I can further clarify the relationship between individual actions and how they can contribute to communal repentance. I thus argue that reparations can constitute a communal act of repentance, but that the way reparations can function in this way relies heavily on the kinds of relationships that make up the community that is repenting and that community's relationship to the offended party. I conclude the paper by reflecting on the implications of such a model for reparations and repentance for racial injustice.

### **Simeon Ximian Xu: 'Artificial Moral Agency: A Reformed Appraisal.'**

This paper seeks to address a contentious question in the field of artificial intelligence (AI) research: In what sense can AI be viewed as a moral agent? I will draw on the Reformed notions of archetype and ectype to develop a constructive account of AI's moral agency through engagement with variants of the idea of moral agency used by AI scholars.

In the Reformed tradition, archetype (ἀρχέτυπος) literally means the ultimate exemplar or pattern, and ectype (ἔκτυπος) literally refers to a copy, replica, or reflection of the ultimate pattern. Developed in the post-Reformation era, the notions of archetype and ectype were originally used to draw the qualitative distinction between the Creator and creatures. Some Reformed theologians also describe the human being as the ectype of God who is the archetype. In this light, the archetype-ectype thinking implies an ontological chasm. From this vantage point, I will argue that AI can be viewed as a moral agent in the sense that it is the ectype of the human moral agent. As such, AI's moral agency is partial.

I will first examine theories of artificial moral agency articulated by AI researchers and philosophers of technology. By and large, these theories can be categorised into three groups. The first group is composed of scholars who maintain that AI has the same moral agency as humans. The second group includes those who object to connecting artificial moral agency to human agency insofar as artificial agency should be defined on its own terms. The third group takes a *via media*, arguing that AI has partial moral agency. By avoiding an either-or situation, this middle way opens up a way to mediate human morality to AI without blurring the boundaries between humans and AI.

I move on to deploy the archetype-ectype thinking to construct a theological account of artificial moral agency. Implied in the notions of archetype and ectype is an ontological chasm rooted in God's *creatio ex nihilo*. In turn, this ontological apparatus points us to the limitation of human creative work. Following this, we can work out a syllogism:

- (1) the major premise: human moral agency is the consequence of God's creation;

- (2) the minor premise: AI's moral agency is the consequence of human creative work;
- (3) the conclusion: artificial moral agency must differ from human moral agency due to the ontological difference between divine and human creative work.

At the same time, we can derive another syllogism:

- (1) the major premise: the human being is the ectype of God and thus imitate God's creation;
- (2) the minor premise: God's creation is coupled with the mediation of moral qualities;
- (3) the conclusion: human creation of AI must be concomitant with the mediation of morality.

These two syllogisms entail a corollary that qualifies AI's moral agency as partial. As such, the archetype-ectype thinking and the *via media* held by the third group of AI scholars open up a moral vista for the future research on the relationship between AI and humans.

### **Stephen Goundrey-Smith: 'The Myth of Bottled Virtue: Moral Enhancement and the Fruits of the Spirit.'**

Can the essence of morality be distilled, preserved and subsequently consumed by any person, to be available in any situation? I will explore this question in relation to moral enhancement, the use of medical interventions to facilitate a person's moral reasoning and develop their moral agency, and discuss how this relates to the ethical implications of the fruits of the Spirit teaching in Galatians.

Moral enhancement proposals focus largely on pharmaceutical interventions, and two drug groups have been cited as potential moral enhancement agents – firstly, selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), for example Prozac (fluoxetine); and secondly, psychedelics, for example LSD and psilocybin (magic mushrooms). I will restrict the discussion in this paper to the first drug group, SSRIs and explain my reasoning, and then discuss reports of potential use of these drugs for moral enhancement by Kahane and Savulescu and MacPherson et al.

There have been strong philosophical arguments in favour of moral enhancement. I will describe and critique Thomas Douglas's classic argument that moral enhancement is possible, beneficial and desirable, despite objections to other types of enhancement. I will then re-evaluate Adam Willows' analysis of moral enhancement mechanisms from a perspective of Aristotelian virtue theory, and describe the ways in which moral enhancement differs from the development of virtue by other means.

I will then discuss the history of interpretation of the fruits of the Spirit in Galatians 5 from a virtue ethics perspective, and will compare and contrast the sanctifying work of the Spirit with the acquisition of virtue and moral agency via biomedical technology. I will show that, because of the organic and systemic nature of the Spirit's work, the fruits of the Spirit as virtues are not equivalent to the acquisition of virtue through biomedical interventions. I will then propose an ethical application of Galatians 5v16-26 that accounts for the possibility of moral enhancement biotechnologies.



### **Stewart Clem: 'Moses and the Natural Law: Are the Ten Commandments for Everyone?'**

The Ten Commandments have traditionally been of central importance in Christian catechetical and moral instruction. Theologians, however, have frequently disputed the Decalogue's status within Christian moral thought. While some have argued that each of the Ten Commandments reflects a universal moral principle, others have argued that the commandments are time-bound and context-specific. In the biblical account, God gives the commandments through Moses, and God prefaces the commandments by reminding the Hebrew people, "I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery" (Exodus 20:2). From the beginning, the Decalogue has been closely tied with Jewish identity. This has created difficulties for many Christian theologians. Martin Luther, in his 1525 sermon, "How Christians Should Regard Moses," tells his congregation that the law of Moses "is in no way binding on us, because the law was given only to the people of Israel." As he goes on to explain, "We [Christians] will regard Moses as a teacher, but we will not regard him as our lawgiver—unless he agrees with the New Testament and natural law." This ambivalence about the Decalogue can still be found in the writings of many contemporary Christian ethicists, who are concerned to highlight the uniqueness of Jesus' teachings and the moral vision found in the New Testament.

In this paper, I defend the view—shared by Thomas Aquinas, among others—that the entire Decalogue can be interpreted as an expression of the natural law. I address some of the challenges to this claim, namely the fact that the first few commandments describe obligations toward God, and in particular the commandment to "remember the Sabbath day, and keep it holy" (Exodus 20:8). I draw upon Jewish thinkers—including from Philo of Alexandria in the first century to David Novak in the twentieth century—who share the belief that these commandments express the natural law, and I argue that the nuances of their views have been overlooked. I also consider Aquinas's claim that the precept to love God can be known through natural reason. To support this claim, I turn to the virtue of *religio* to sketch an account of natural religion that can illuminate the overall coherence of the Decalogue. I argue, moreover, that this understanding of *religio* enhances the connection between the moral virtues and the first table of the Decalogue. I suggest that this approach has the upshot of preserving the integrity of the Decalogue as a Jewish text while also upholding unequivocally the importance of the Decalogue in the Christian moral life.

### **Hendrik Weingärtner: 'Recourse to the Bible in the context of the renewal of German moral theology in the 20th century.'**

Within German-language moral theology in the 20th century – both before and after the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) – there was a lively debate about reforming academic moral theology. Josef Georg Ziegler (1918-2006) divides this debate during the 20th century into three phases: the period of fundamental debates from 1900 to 1930, the epoch of newly conceived moral manuals from 1930 to Vatican II and the breakthrough of self-critical basic research since Vatican II.<sup>1</sup> In the first phase, there seems to be a lack of an intensified and conceptually significant recourse to the Bible, which does not simply take it as one of the sources of moral theology and, with regard to the question of the law of God, refers to the Old and New Testaments. Joseph Mausbach (1861-1931) exemplifies this in the manual „Catholic Moral Theology“.

In contrast, attempts to present the subject matter of moral theology according to a uniform, biblically based moral principle can be seen in the manuals of the second phase.

Here, individual biblical topoi are used as the basis for the structure of moral theology in the sense of a structural principle. For example, while Fritz Tilmann (1874-1953) conceived of moral theology as a practical science in the form of following Christ in the handbook he initiated, Johannes Stelzenberger (1898-1972) conceived it as a "scientific presentation of the moral doctrine of the kingly rule of God"<sup>2</sup>. Both Tilmann and Stelzenberger, a look at the structure of their publications reveals a deeper reflection on the biblical themes underlying their structural principle.

After 1965, a completely different reception of the Bible becomes apparent within the discipline. Within the framework of Alfons Auer's (1915-2005) fundamental concept of "autonomous morality" – which has had a lasting influence on German-language moral theology up to the present day – ethical statements derived from the Bible are recognised as dependent on time and culture, and consequently a reevaluation of the relationship between the Bible and ethics is undertaken. Ethical statements in the Bible, which are not to be understood as revelation, reflect a historical ethos, the significance of which for contemporary ethics can only be revealed after critical exegesis and rational reflection. Furthermore, the significance of revelation itself for theological ethics is not a logic of justification but a practical one of action.

This paper attempts to trace the recourse to the Bible in German moral theology by way of example to show what significance was attached to the Bible in the individual stages of the 20th century. It is intended as an impulse from outside to enrich the conference on "The Bible and Christian Ethics" with a view to the historically developed specialist culture within Germany.

#### *References:*

Auer, A., *Autonome Moral und christlicher Glaube*, Düsseldorf <sup>2</sup>1984.

Hilpert, K. (Hg.), *Christliche Ethik im Porträt. Leben und Werk bedeutender Moraltheologen*, Freiburg i. Br. 2012.

Mausbach, J., *Katholische Moraltheologie*, 3 Bde., Münster 1914-1918.

Stelzenberger, J., *Lehrbuch der Moraltheologie. Die Sittlichkeitslehre der Königsherrschaft Gottes*, Paderborn <sup>2</sup>1965.

Tilmann, F., *Die Idee der Nachfolge Christi (Handbuch der Katholischen Sittenlehre Bd. III)*, Düsseldorf 1934.

Ziegler, J. G., *Die Moraltheologie*, in: Vorgrimler, H./Vander Gucht, R. (Hg.), *Bilanz der Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert. Perspektiven*

1 Cf. Ziegler, J. G., *Die Moraltheologie*, in: Vorgrimler, H./Vander Gucht, R. (Hg.), *Bilanz der Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert. Perspektiven, Strömungen, Motive in der christlichen Welt. Band III*, Freiburg i. Br. 1970, 316-360.

2 Stelzenberger, J., *Lehrbuch der Moraltheologie. Die Sittlichkeitslehre der Königsherrschaft Gottes*, Paderborn <sup>2</sup>1965, 17.

**Richard A. Davis: 'David's Protection Racket and God's Revelation of State Violence in 1 Samuel 25.'**

This paper revisits the politics of 1 Samuel 25, which here is a continuation of God's revelation about the nature of the state begun in 1 Samuel 8. An overlooked text, 1 Samuel 25 tells the story of David's protection racket in the desert, prior to him beginning King of the United Kingdom of Judah and Israel. In some recent political theology which is sceptical of the state and its violence the state has been compared to a protection racket.

Here the political aspects of the story come through the intersection of the two separate discourses. The first comes from commentary on this narrative that described David as operating a "protection racket" at the marginal spaces between farms and the wilderness. The second discourses comes from the understanding of the state, specifically those who understand the state as acting like a protection racket. Does this story teach anything about the state or is it just an interlude in the story without much relevance for political theology? The hypothesis is that David's early protection racket can be read as a part of the progressive biblical revelation of the nature of Kingship and the state.

This research, therefore, will consider the reception history of 1 Samuel 25 from the Old Testament, with the story of David running something of a protection racket. David went on to become King. In doing so, this research will draw on existing scholarship on these biblical texts. This research will highlight state violence in the Bible, which is often obscured in theology. A question here is to what extent obscuring state violence helps to legitimize the state. Such an emphasis on state and political violence is an important correction to the mainstream theological focus on divine or individual human violence.

A part of the research project will investigate how the Bible can shed light on the origins of the state and its violence. This is not a retreat from the interdisciplinary nature of political theology, but rather how reading political philosophy and political sociology can bring new questions about violence to Christian texts, for a better understanding of the nature of the state and its violence.

### **Edward A. David: 'Should we admire the shrewd steward (Luke 16:1-8)? Christian ethics and exemplarist moral theory.'**

Moral exemplarity is a long-standing feature of theological virtue ethics. But, more recently, attempts have been made to position moral exemplarism as a stand-alone moral theory. Focussing upon the pioneering work of philosopher Linda Zagzebski, I critically engage with that development, doing so with reference to one of the more challenging biblical exemplars – the shrewd steward in Luke 16:1-8. I make two central claims. First, along with other critical commentators, I argue that the emotion of admiration – which is central to the identification of exemplars on Zagzebski's account – is insufficiently reliable. Indeed, even the shrewd steward's master exhibits a misplaced admiration. This interpretive point suggests that an exemplarist moral theory requires foundational moral *concepts* (such as divine command or human flourishing) to operate alongside, or be prior to, its emphasis upon admiration of *persons* (i.e., exemplars). Second, I argue that an exemplarist moral theory must account not only for the saint, the hero and the sage (three classic types discussed by Zagzebski) but also for what I call the *novice* – that is, the exemplar who merits admiration precisely because they are willing to be (re)formed in virtue. Expanding the classic typology in this way may give hope to sinners (or 'shrewd stewards') everywhere: for even the imperfect imitation of exemplars may be exemplary in itself.

### **Matthew Puffer: 'The Development of Augustine's Doctrine of the Image of God.'**

This essay traces developments in Augustine's understanding of the image of God through attention to his scriptural exegesis. It argues two main points regarding the emerging account of the image of God across Augustine's corpus. First, Augustine's understanding of the image of God develops in seven distinct respects over the course of his writing career. Following this development paints a significantly more nuanced picture than is apparent in previous scholarship. Second, each of the seven developments in Augustine's understanding of the image of God can be traced to re-interpretations of nine particular biblical texts. As he repeatedly returns to these texts, shifts in Augustine's expositions of the image of God are especially evident in the way that he reinterprets distinctions and redeploys metaphors that he draws from one or more of this small selection of texts. In summary, this paper retraces the development of Augustine's understanding of the image of God, attending to his reimagining of this term over time as it emerges in conversation with and in response to his theological expositions of scripture.

**Robert W. Heimburger: 'Food in the Book of Acts: division, community, and thanksgiving in the wake of the Spirit.'**

In a world turned upside, in a ruined world restored, what role do non-human creatures play? The Book of Acts seems to say little about the non-human world, but closer attention shows the repeated appearance of plants and non-human animals as food for human beings. In this paper, I will explore the significance of non-human creatures have as food in Acts. I will look at instances where breaking bread unites the Jerusalem community (Acts 2) and sustains despairing seafarers (Acts 27). I will also look at two occasions where food has divided communities but in the Jesus movement, begins to bring them together in equality and fellowship: the Hellenists and Hebrews in Jerusalem (Acts 6) and Jews and Gentiles (Acts 10–11). I will reckon with the paring back of Jewish food prohibitions and the decisions of the Jerusalem Council (Acts 10–11, 15). I will argue that non-human creatures matter in Acts as occasions to gather across human divisions and to express thanks for God's abundant provision of food.