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.)

Upon completion of the course, the student 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 and evaluate arguments in favor of opposing exegetical positions.
   f. 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

Required Texts:

**Greek New Testament, either UBS⁴ or NA²⁷**


**Recommended Texts:**


V. Course Requirements and Grading

Student evaluation will be based on the completion of the following course elements:

1. Observations and Outline (10%)
2. An analysis of a text-critical problem (10%)
3. A background study (10%).
4. An 8-10 page exegesis paper (70%).

VI. Academic Policies

Due dates
Due dates for most assignments are indicated in the Course Outline. Late work will be penalized 1 full grade-point per day (A > B, etc.). The due date for final papers is the last day of Summer I – June 12, 2009. Only the registration office can give an extension beyond that date.

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.

VII. Matters of schedule:
   a. No class: Mon, May 25

Course 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>Mon. May 18</td>
<td>Introduction, Boundaries, Translation</td>
<td>Introduction to NA(^{27})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metzer, 3-16, 250-271, 300-315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wed. May 20</td>
<td>Text Criticism and Greco-Roman Backgrounds</td>
<td>Submit assignment #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DeSilva, chs 2-3; Osborne, ch. 5; Bauckham, “The Relevance of Extra-Cannal Jewish Texts” (posted on CAMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fri. May 22</td>
<td>Jewish Backgrounds</td>
<td>Submit assignment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DeSilva, ch 4; Stein, <em>Synoptic Gospels</em>, 223-233 (on CAMS); Blomberg, “Form Criticism”, DPL (on CAMS); Stein, “Synoptic Problem”, DPL (on CAMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wed. May 27</td>
<td>Gospels (Synoptic Problem)</td>
<td>Osborne, ch 7; Webb, Part I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fri. May 29</td>
<td>Gospels and Acts (Narrative Texts)</td>
<td>Submit assignment #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snodgrass, 1-60, 145-178, 505-518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wed. June 3</td>
<td>Old Testament Backgrounds (Quotations, Allusions, Images)</td>
<td>Osborne, ch 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of Assignments:

Assignment #1 – Observations and Outline

Read 1 John through twice in one sitting. Then list 45 observations on 1 John 1:5: 15 observations on 1:5; 15 observations on the preceding context; 15 observations on the following context (the rest of the book). Be sure to make observations NOT interpretations. (Ask yourself: Could anyone conceivably object to this ‘observation’? If so, it is not an observation but an interpretation!) For the inspiration behind this, see http://www.bethel.edu/~dhoward/resources/Agassizfish/Agassizfish.htm.

Provide a detailed, one-page (or shorter) outline of 1 John.

Assignment #2 – Textual Criticism – Fellowship with “one another” or with “him”?

Based on the readings, and utilizing the charts and questions provided in the Reference Charts, analyze the question of the first variation unit found for John 1:18 in NA27. For help see: http://home.comcast.net/~rciampa/TextCrit.htm.

Assignment #3 – 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.

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.]
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.


*Advanced grammars include Robertson, Funk (BDF), Zerwick, Moulton and Howard, Wallace.*

**Criteria for evaluation of final papers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there spelling or grammatical problems?</td>
<td>Be sure to proof-read your paper!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the writing consistently clear and coherent?</td>
<td>If you need editorial help, get it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the paper paginated?</td>
<td>It should be!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the paper too long or short (correct margins/fonts)?</td>
<td>Do not change margins from 1 inch or use other than size 12 font (Times New Roman or equiv). Footnotes should be single-spaced with size 10 font (adjust Greek and Hebrew to be equivalent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it follow the SBL Style Handbook?</td>
<td>Check out style for footnotes, bibliographies, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are references to dictionary and journal articles properly formatted?</td>
<td>Titles of articles in journals are put between quotation marks, journal titles or abbreviations of same are italicized. Dictionary articles should cite author of the article and give the article title in quotes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the Bibliography in proper alphabetical order?</td>
<td>By last name. See SBL handbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the paper show familiarity with both primary and secondary sources (including advanced grammars and lexicons, periodical literature, monographs, theological dictionaries, and critical commentaries on the original texts)?</td>
<td>This is where you show the level of research you carried out. Ask the library staff for help in finding articles or monographs on your text/subject. When using commentaries, focus on those that discuss features of the original text (critical commentaries).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other technical issues: **Do not use authors’ words without quotation marks!**

Is the paper securely stapled with this sheet attached at the back and with your name and box number on the cover sheet? Please do not use special covers. They complicate things.

Be careful not to incorporate Greek words or phrases into English sentences improperly. To have a coherent sentence you may need to use infinitive or nominative forms of Greek words rather than those used by the author. For example, a sentence such as “Paul says we should βλέπω how we walk” makes no sense whatsoever!

**Be sure to acknowledge your sources! Always, in every section.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the discussion of boundaries and coherence mention specific linguistic evidence in favor of the proposed text division?</th>
<th>Do list those who divide the text one way or another. Give specific evidence for or against possible divisions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the translation overly free or overly wooden? Does it have inappropriate parentheses or brackets?</td>
<td>You must decide on the original text and whether to provide objects, etc., or translate “brother or sister.” Do not put things in parentheses unless you think the text makes a parenthetical comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do grammatical discussions show linguistic and sophistication?</td>
<td>Consult the advanced grammars. Careful about making statements about verbal aspect that are not properly supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do word studies reflect knowledge of primary and secondary texts, show lexicographical care and avoid word-study?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>fallacies?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do text-critical discussions provide brief but sufficient detail (primary support for each variant, perhaps in footnotes)?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are background and theological issues sufficiently investigated?</td>
<td>If your text cites the OT be sure to study that text in context and other ancient interpretations of the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the structure of the passage made clear?</td>
<td>SSA or a form-critical or narratological analysis, depending on the text and your training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Is there a clear conclusion discussing the Idea/Purpose/Relevance-Application of the text? | “The main idea of this text is that ....”  
“[Paul/Matthew] hoped that after this text was read the hearers would ....”  
Defend each, and explain why it was relevant then and now. |

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**COMPILLED BY PROF. CIAMPA**

Items marked with an asterisk [*] are of particular importance.

**Introduction**


**Textual Criticism**


**Lexical Analysis**


**Grammar**


**Semantic Structure Analysis**


**Historical-Cultural Background**


**Theology**


**Biblical Interpretation**


