I. Course Description

Students who have completed at least one term of Greek are introduced to the tools and methods of exegesis. Attention is given to the history of the New Testament text (textual criticism), the bibliographic tools for exegesis and the method and procedures of interpretation. Students prepare exegesis papers on the basis of the Greek text. Students who have not had Greek may take this course only with the permission of the professor. M.Div. students must complete GL 502 before or during this course.

II. Course Relationship to the Curriculum

NT 502 is a required course for M. Div. students as well as students who are pursuing an M.A. in New Testament. This class assumes at least one term of Basic Greek but may be taken in conjunction with Basic Greek II. It further serves as a prerequisite for Greek exegesis classes.

III. Course Objectives (Note: The following course objectives all relate directly to both the first and second articles of the GCTS mission statement and thereby indirectly support the remaining articles of that statement.)

When the student has completed this course he/she will have:

1. Recognized the value of exegesis for discerning the meaning of biblical texts.
2. Demonstrated an understanding of the basic tools and methods of biblical exegesis.
3. Demonstrated an ability to exegete and apply a New Testament text.
4. Specifically, during the course the student will demonstrate:
   a. An understanding of the textual criticism and an ability to analyze textual-critical problems.
   b. An understanding of the issues involved in the study of words and concepts in the Greek New Testament and an ability carry out such studies.
   c. An ability to carry out a study of background issues related to New Testament texts.
   d. An ability to carry out a grammatical analysis of New Testament texts.
   e. An ability to analyze the semantic structure of a New Testament text.
   f. An ability to analyze and evaluate arguments in favor of opposing exegetical positions.
   g. An ability to synthesize the results of an exegetical study and present a coherent interpretation of a text which highlights those observations and exegetical decisions/insights which are most important for coming to a proper understanding and application of the text.
IV. Course Texts

A. Required texts:

(Note further required readings are indicated in the course outline)

B. Recommended Texts:
   Roy Ciampa, *Reference Charts for NT Textual Criticism*. PDF/Online.

V. Course Requirements and Grading
   Student evaluation will be based on the completion of the following course elements:
   1. An analysis of a text-critical problem (10%)
   2. A background study (10%).
   3. A grammatical diagram of a New Testament text (10%).
   4. A diagram of the semantic structure of a New Testament text (10%).
   5. A 10-12 page exegesis paper (60%).

VI. Academic Policies
   Due dates
   Due dates for most assignments are indicated in the Course Outline. Late work will not normally be accepted. In unusual circumstances (e.g., grave sickness) the professor may
elect to accept late work. Such work will be penalized according to the discretion of the professor in the light of the particular situation. The final paper is due by the seminary deadline for the submission of written work. Only the registration office can give an extension beyond that date.

**Intellectual property rights**
To protect the professor’s intellectual property rights with regard to classroom content, students are asked to refrain from audio and video recording of classes, as well as audio, video, and written publication (including internet posting and broadcasting) or live transmission of classroom proceedings. In cases where explicit special permission is granted to record a session such permission is extended on a temporary use only: Any recording made is for the private use of the student only and is to be deleted/erased within two weeks of the recording.

**Internet usage**
Students are asked to refrain from accessing the internet at any point during class sessions, unless otherwise instructed by the professor. “Surfing the web,” checking email, and other internet-based activities are distracting to other students and to the professor, and prevent the student from fully participating in the class session.

**Inductive Study**
The final paper must demonstrate the use of the tools/steps/methods taught in this course. A paper that primarily reflects a selection of insights from commentaries or other secondary sources will not be acceptable.

**Plagiarism**
All use of sources must be properly indicated. Read the document on plagiarism carefully and remember that use of authors’ words is indicated with quotation marks and a footnote and use of their ideas, but not their words, is indicated with a footnote.

**Elevating NT 502 (only for Biblical Studies Th.M. students)**
The student will complete the regular syllabus plus read the following book and write a summary of the main points of each chapter/essay (about 1/3 of a page on each essay).


Incomplete or unsatisfactory completion of this assignment may result in up to a full-letter grade reduction of the final grade for the course.

**VII. Course Outline (Proposed Schedule – Subject to change at professor’s discretion)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reading/Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wed. Sept 11</td>
<td>Introduction to the course and overview of biblical exegesis</td>
<td>Fee, 1-40 (read ahead for next class).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wed. Sept 11</td>
<td>Brief historical context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wed. Sept 18</td>
<td>Brief discussion of questions regarding Unit Delimitation</td>
<td>Watch (and review if necessary) Camtasia presentation on Unit Delimitation. Take notes and write down questions you would like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wed. Sept 25</td>
<td>Textual Criticism (cont.)</td>
<td>Watch (and review if necessary) the Camtasia presentation on Translation. Take notes and write down questions you would like addressed in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13 Wed. Oct 30 |       | Semantic Structure Analysis                | **Submit assignment #3** (first class day after sentence diagramming explanation concluded)  
| 15-16 Wed. Nov 6 |       | Review (or catch-up)                        | Work on SSA and exegesis paper           |
| Nov 11 – 15 | Reading Week |                                           | **Submit assignment #4** (week after SSA explanation concluded)  
Robinson, *Expository Preaching*, chapters 2 & 5 |
| 17 Wed. Nov 20 |       | Exegetical Idea                             |                                            |
| 18 Wed. Nov 20 |       | Author’s Purpose                            |                                            |
| 21-22 Wed. Dec. 4 |       | Theological Analysis                        | **Osborne**, chs. 15-16; Ciampa, “The History of Redemption” |
| 23-24 Wed. Dec. 11 |       | Relevance & Application                     | **Fee**, 133-154; Osborne, chs. 17-18; Ciampa,  
“Ideological Challenges for Bible Translators”; Greidanus, *The Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text*, 157-184. Be prepared to discuss  
Greedanuss’s chapter in class.  
Recommended: Ciampa, “Confronting the Bible’s Double Life”  
| Dec. 17     | Last day to submit written work (Dec. 6 for graduating students) | **Submit Exegesis paper**                  |                                            |
Note: Before the first class on Textual Criticism the student should:

1. Read Fee, 59-70, the introduction to NA28; Ciampa, Reference Charts, ii, 1-4 (scan rest for sense of what will be found there); and Metzger and Ehrman, The Text of the New Testament (see “Key Issues in Metzger and Ehrman” under “Resources” in Course Documents).

2. Study the critical apparatus of the 28th edition of the Nestle-Aland text for 1 John 1:5-7 until you have understood every item it contains (the introduction to that text will be of most help).

Overview of Assignments:

Assignment #1 – Textual Criticism – What was the fifth word of the Greek text of 1 John 1:5 (that is, what word followed the nominative feminine article)?

Based on the readings, and utilizing the charts and questions provided in the Reference Charts, analyze the question of the second variation unit found for 1 John 1:5 in the 28th edition of the Nestle-Aland text of the New Testament. Was it ἀγγελία, ἐπαγγελία, ἀγάπη τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, or something else? There is an example of such an assignment in the Interp handouts. For help see: http://www.viceregency.com/TextCrit.htm.

Assignment #2 – Jewish Backgrounds– Following the orientation given in class, 1) study and summarize the differing positions on a Jewish husband’s legal grounds for divorce as understood by Philo, Josephus, Shammai and Hillel, and the Qumran community, citing the most helpful texts for establishing the view of each one, and indicate what OT text(s), if any, each one seems to use as the basis for their view. This should not normally be any more than three pages long (papers exceeding four pages in length will not be accepted).

1. Search phe and joe in BibleWorks for >.divorc*< and study the texts of Philo and Josephus that are discovered.


3. Read the Mishnah tractate Gittin (I recommend Danby’s translation but Neusner’s may also be used) to discover the views of Hillel and Shammai.

4. Remember, you are only to report on the grounds for divorce, not the ins and outs of the acceptable and unacceptable procedures used to secure a divorce (e.g., do not focus on who can write the bill of divorce or how it has to be delivered, etc.).

5. List all the .divorc* texts of Philo and Josephus as well as any relevant texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls but only comment on the ones that shed light on the question of their view of proper grounds and/or any scriptural basis for their view. Summarize the contrasting views of Instone-Brewer and the Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls in one sentence for each. Cite the most important text(s) in m. Gittin for the views of Hillel and Shammai and any scriptural text they may have used for their basis. See the posted document for a suggested outline for this paper.

Assignment #3 – Sentence Diagram: Following the orientation given in class (and the course handouts) prepare a sentence diagram of the Greek text of 1 John 1:5-7. You are
Assignment #4 – Semantic Structure Analysis – Following the orientation given in class and in the readings (and the examples provided by the professor), prepare a semantic structure analysis of 1 John 1:5-7 (you are forbidden to consult anyone else’s SSA of the passage).

Final Paper: Before the end of the last day for submitting written work the student should submit a 9-10 page exegesis paper on a passage of the student’s choice (to be approved by the professor).

In that paper the student should reflect the following steps with steps 1-5 carried out in an introductory section of the paper, steps 6-10 in the main body of the paper in commentary style (along the lines of Harpers [or Black’s] NT Commentary Series [see the posted sample exegesis papers]), and steps 11-12 left for a concluding section of the paper.

1. Briefly explain the introductory issues (especially the occasion) of the book in which your passage is found.
2. Establish the coherence and boundaries of the passage.
3. Explain the role of your passage within the framework of the argument of the book and/or section in which it is found.
4. Establish the original text. (This is to be done early on but the discussion of textual issues should be reserved for footnotes to the text within the commentary section of the paper, along with steps 6-10. Especially important textual issues may merit some discussion in the body of the paper.) (1-3 charts should be supplied in an appendix.)
5. Prepare a translation of the text that reflects the results of the exegesis.
6. Discuss complex, unusual or particularly important features of the grammar of the passage (any diagrams should be attached as appendices).
7. Explain important aspects of the historical and literary context.
8. Explain important or unusual words and concepts including scriptural and/or cultural backgrounds that inform them.
9. Explain the Semantic Structure of the passage (with a chart or diagram as an appendix).
10. Discuss rhetorical features of the passage.
11. Propose and defend your understanding of the author’s exegetical idea and purpose.
12. Discuss the relevance of the text in its original context and its relevance/application to the context(s) of (post? -) modern readers.

The exegesis paper should also:

1. Include a bibliography (in alphabetical order) of at least 15 works cited in the footnotes, including advanced grammars, theological dictionaries, scholarly commentaries, articles from theological journals, and scholarly monographs. [Note: dictionary articles should be listed under the name of the author of the article, not under the name of the editor of the dictionary. Note also: Study Bibles are not appropriate sources for academic papers.]
2. Be typed, double-spaced (except extended quotes and footnotes), in Times New Roman font size 12, with pagination, one-inch margins, footnotes, bibliography and proper
recognition given to all sources of words or ideas found in the body of the paper. **Read the material on plagiarism that is attached to the end of this syllabus.**


The following two pages are to be attached as the last (uncounted) pages of your exegesis paper.
Statement of Compliance to Certain Academic Integrity and Protocols

Note: Papers that do not include a properly checked and signed copy of this form will not be given a passing grade.

I hereby declare that (check all that apply):

☐ I have read the document on plagiarism and have written this paper in a way that complies with it, and, in particular, all places where I have used information derived from sources I have consulted are properly footnoted.

☐ Also in compliance with the provided standard regarding plagiarism, all places where I have used the words of other authors those words are clearly marked by quotation marks or block quotation formatting and places where sources are used without footnoting reflect a thorough rewording and not merely a restructuring and substitution of equivalent words or phrases.

☐ I did not consult the BibleWorks sentence diagrams or other sentence diagrams of my passage (or receive input from someone who did consult such diagrams) before preparing the first draft of my sentence diagram, which I have submitted along with the final revised version.

☐ I have not looked at any one else’s SSA diagram of my passage (or received input from someone who did consult such a diagram).

____________________________________

Sign on the line
# Exegesis Paper Evaluation
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Name: ____________________________

For help on these issues, see [http://www.viceregency.com/ExegesisOrientation.htm](http://www.viceregency.com/ExegesisOrientation.htm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there spelling, grammatical or stylistic problems?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the writing consistently clear and coherent?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the paper paginated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the paper too long or short (correct margins/fonts)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the bibliography and footnotes formatted according to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the SBL Handbook of Style?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the Bibliography in proper alphabetical order?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the paper show familiarity with both primary and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary sources (including advanced grammars [Wallace/Blass-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrunner], lexicons [BDAG/EDNT], periodical literature, monographs,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theological dictionaries, and the best serious commentaries)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the paper overly dependent upon secondary sources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the discussion of text delimitation mention specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linguistic evidence in favor of the proposed text division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not just an outline)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do text-critical discussions (preferably in footnotes) provide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brief but sufficient detail (including primary support for each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variant) and mention internal evidence where appropriate (i.e., not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merely refer to the appendices)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the translation overly free or overly wooden? Does it have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnecessary parentheses or brackets?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do grammatical discussions show linguistic care and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophistication (&amp; cite advanced grammars)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do word studies reflect careful study of primary and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary texts and avoid word-study fallacies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper attention given to background &amp; theological issues?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the structure of the passage made clear?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a clear conclusion discussing the Idea (with explicit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identification of the subject &amp; complement)? Is the idea formed by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the most direct and simplest joining of the subject and complement?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you defend your proposal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there discussion of the author’s purpose (“so that his readers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would…” as well as of the Relevance-Application of the text?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments: Note: check marks (✓) in the margins indicate parts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I particularly appreciated. If you desire more feedback on your</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paper than I have already provided please bring it back to me and I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will look at it again and comment further.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This paper is marked by:**

- Superb research/exegesis and extraordinary insight
- Solid research and credible conclusions
- Adequate/basic level research/exegesis
- Insufficient research, analysis or proofreading
- Occasional or frequent logical errors or exegetical fallacies
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