

Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary  
**OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY**

OT-720

3 Units

Fall 2006

E-mail: ljost@mbseminary.edu

Lynn Jost, Ph.D.

Office: 452-1791; Home: 559-433-3371

Thursday 1:00 – 4:00 p.m.

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

Old Testament Theology is the discipline that states, describes, and evaluates theology within the Hebrew Bible, using the Bible's framework and presuppositions. This course explores the central message of the OT, with focus on the viability of the OT synthesis in *God's Design*. Such specific interests as covenant faithfulness, holiness, justice, and creation-based peace will be pursued.

**COURSE OBJECTIVES**

1. To gain greater familiarity with OT Scripture, especially its theological themes, relating those to the Kingdom of God and the church.
2. To understand the issues, proposed solutions and methodological questions that surround the task of biblical theology, and to discuss those with sharp analysis while maintaining healthy interpersonal relationships.
3. To become acquainted with and to assess past attempts at synthesizing the OT.
4. To reflect theologically on contemporary personal, social and philosophical issues.
5. To learn the skills of "doing biblical theology" by working with a biblical book and/or
6. To practice using biblical theology for ministry: preaching, teaching, and mission.

**TEXT MATERIALS** [all on 2 hr reserve]

**1. Required texts:**

House, Paul. *Old Testament Theology*. Intersarsity, 1998. [H]

Martens, E.A. *God's Design: A Focus on Old Testament Theology*. Bibal, 1998. [M]

Ollenburger, B.C. (ed.) *Old Testament Theology: Flowering and Future*. Eisenbrauns, 2004.

[O]

Brueggemann's theology (see Supplemental Resources below) is accepted as a substitute for House. Brueggemann is more theologically demanding.

**2. Supplemental resources:** [all on 2 hour reserve]

Brueggemann, W. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Fortress, 1997. [B]

Scobie, C. H. H. *The Ways of Our God. An Approach to Biblical Theology*. Eerdmans, 2002.

**ASSIGNMENTS/LEARNING ACTIVITIES**

**1. Class Participation**

Attendance/participation/interaction in class sessions and learning groups is required. Learning groups will meet to process class lectures and student research. There is a grade reduction of 3% for each missed class that is not made up. Students are responsible for contacting the instructor about make-up work. Students missing more than 25% of classes risk course failure.

**2. Reading (10%)**

Submit a list indicating the extent and nature of readings for the course. Close reading is defined as reading for note taking at about 30-40 pages/hour; survey reading grasps the argument (about 60 pages/hour). See the course schedule for reading from Martens, House, and Bible; see assignment

#5 for required reading from Ollenburger; each student is to select one monograph; all other reading is to be chosen according to student interest. Reading for research is included in the total.

Biblical:	Close reading - 150 chapters	Survey reading - 100 chapters	
Textbooks:	Close reading - 1000 pp.	Survey reading - 200 pp.	1200
Collateral:	Close reading - 500 pp.	Survey reading - 200 pp.	700
Periodicals:	Close reading - 50 pp.	Survey reading - 50 pp.	<u>100</u>
		Total	2000

Comprehensive reading list with annotated bibliography is **due Dec. 14.**

Reading list should include author, title, and pages read with summative and comprehensive totals and academic annotation of 25-50 words per item—a bit more for longer readings is permitted.

### **3. Class Presentation #1: *God's Design* chapter (15%)**

Students will present a 20-30-minute introduction to assigned chapters from the Martens textbook. The presentation should include a 5-minute recap of content (strict limit for this); a 10-15 minute exegetical extrapolation of the concept (select a text that illustrates the chapter; sketch exegetical report including structural analysis, word study, textual logic, intertextual relations, and summary statement); a 5-10 minute synopsis of how this concept engages other scholarship/the contemporary world; 2 starter statements or questions to stimulate class discussion. Students are to use clear techniques to engage fellow learners. Power Point is recommended. Assignments will be made by the professor on Sept. 7. Students who wish to work with a particular classmate or to work alone should inform the professor by Sept. 5. A 2-page lesson outline is **due before the presentation.** The Power Point file is to be sent by email to the class within 24 hours of the presentation.

### **3. Class Presentation #2: Monograph research presentation (MRP: 15%)**

Each student will present their reading of one monograph from the attached list. Students who wish to choose their own monograph should make arrangements with the professor by Sept. 5. Assignments will be made by the professor on Sept. 7. The student will prepare to engage in a 10-20-minute conversation with professor/classmates regarding the book. The context will be dialogical. Students should be prepared to answer the following questions: 1. What is the thesis of the book? 2. What is the theological perspective of the author? 3. How does this monograph inform the conversation with the corresponding chapter from *God's Design*? 4. What insights from the book are most helpful for developing your OT theology and for nurturing the church? 5. How do you wish to challenge the author? The book summary (using the sample Monograph Research rubric) is **due via email to all class members 48 hours before the assigned class period.**

### **4. Class Presentation #3: OT Theology summaries (15%)**

Each student will present a 10-15-minute overview of an assigned OT theology. The student will locate the theologian in the field of OT theology (consult Barr/Brueggemann/Perdue); outline the governing concept of the theology; identify significant supporting information; assess how this theology contributes to the contemporary situation; suggest contemporary theological issues for class discussion. Clear and appropriate presentation will assist classmates in giving attention to the summary. If students have not chosen a theologian, assignments will be made Sept. 14. Students who have elected the Brueggemann text are encouraged to identify themselves and choose to present that text. An outlined summary that follows the Theology Summary rubric is **due 48 hours before the class period** and is to be sent to all class members.

### **5. Essays (10%)**

Read the introductions to Parts 1-5 in Ollenburger, *OT Theology: Flowering* as assigned. In Parts 2-5 also select the excerpt of at least one theologian to read (e.g. Eichrodt on Covenant pages 39-56 in Part 2). Write five (5) 450-500-word essays (one on each introduction/theologian) which (1) summarize the purpose of the assigned reading; (2) identify key information and supporting data (with citations); and (3) analyze implications for OT theology either in the academy or the church (see the Essay Grading Rubric). At least four of the five essays must be completed on time with no less than a B- to earn a course credit. **Due per syllabus schedule.**

## **6. Final Paper (35%)**

A paper of 2800-3500 words following one of three options.

**Option 1:** Canonical theology: Reflecting the perspectives of Martens and House (Brueggemann), analyze the theology of one of the following: Gen. 12-50, Ruth, Hosea, Amos. Read the biblical text at least two times in order to get a sense of its structure and themes (including God, creation, Israel/Judah, the nations, judgment, salvation, ethics, worship, justice, shalom, wisdom, etc.). Using the theological textbooks as a base, synthesize a theological analysis of the text which includes the context into/from which the biblical text speaks, the basic structure of the text, significant passages for laying out the text's theology, rhetorical strategies of the text, major themes and issues, and relationship to the larger OT theology. Thesis statement must be approved by Oct. 19.

**Option 2:** Theological topic: Write a paper on a theological topic informed by research which includes the perspectives of Martens and House (Brueggemann). Topic must be approved by the professor by Oct. 19. The approach to and boundaries of the topical research should be defined (e.g., *synchronic study of rest in the Pentateuch* or *diachronic study of justice in the Deuteronomistic History*). Additional topic suggestions: fear, anger, divine emotions, divine jealousy, war.

**Option 3:** Analytical theology in practice:

A. Write and preach 1-2 exegetical sermons (20 minutes) OR design and teach 2-3 exegetical Bible studies for adults (35-40 minutes) from an OT text or set of texts. The sermon is to be submitted in manuscript form. The Bible studies are to be complete with lesson objectives, outline of the lesson plan, instructions/report on each part of the lesson (including how many minutes allotted to each), and exactly what instructions were given and responses were elicited (report of content).

Theological insight within the presentation should be explicit but not intrusively awkward.

B. Analyze the presentation by writing at least two theological critiques of the presentation, one from the Martens perspective of *God's Design* and the other from either House (Brueggemann) or the assigned OT theologian. The critique should be written in the voice of the OT theologian—probing the presentation for themes significant to the author. For example, the Martens perspective should examine at least two things: (1) how the text fits within the structure of his book and (2) how the four themes are developed. The analysis should be written as if Martens himself were writing the critique. Each analysis should be not less than 1000 words.

The grade will be based on quality of the presentation (20%) and the theological critique (40% for each analysis). Papers must engage in critical theological analysis from two perspectives at the level of a B- to obtain a passing grade for the course. See the Final Project Evaluation rubrics.

For all three options: In addition to the customary essay requirements of accuracy, articulation, organization, format and English language usage the paper will be assessed on:

- 1) significance, clarity and focus of the topic or issue,
- 2) use of secondary resources (books *and* periodicals) and textbooks,
- 3) theological ability to weigh arguments or positions,

- 4) succinct style, clear organization, force and persuasiveness of the conclusion,
- 5) use of one consistent, standard style for citations of both quotations and ideas, and
- 6) originality of work.

**Dates: 50-word proposal outlining the project due Oct. 19**

**Option 3 sermon manuscript/Bible studies verbatim due Nov. 30**

**Option 3 theological analyses due Dec. 7**

**Final paper due for Options 1-2: Dec. 14; Option 3 paper revisions after Dec. 14 will be subject to a penalty for late work.**

**Note: A penalty of 10% will obtain on all late papers & book reviews. The final paper, if submitted after December 20, will be reduced by 20%.**

### Proposed CLASS SCHEDULE

<u>Date</u>	<u>Theme</u>	<u>Recommended Reading</u>	<u>Assignments Due at classtime</u>
<u>Intro to OTT</u> Aug 31	Defining OTT God's Design	M 357-69; H 11-57; B 1-60 M 341-69; O 3-29 M 3-33; Exod 1-15	Essay #1 on Ollenburger reading (3-29) OR House (11-57)
<u>Creation</u> Sept 7	Creation	M 317-28; H 58-71 Gen 1-11	MRP: Middleton Fretheim ( <i>God and World</i> )
<u>Pre-Monarchy</u> Sept 14	Ancestral Stories	M 29-33, 91-99, 113-24; H 71-86 Gen 12-50	MRP: Moberly
<b>Sept 21</b>	Covenant at Sinai Covenant Community	M 71-90; H 87-125 Exod 16-24	MRP: Harrelson Birch Wright ( <i>Living as the People of God</i> ) OTT: Eichrodt M Ch. 4 Essay #2: O: 33-38
<b>Sept 28</b>	Wandering – Law Knowledge of God/Land	M 91-137; H 126-96 Lev 1-7, 19, 25; Num 9-17, 20-25; Deut 1-12	MRP: Gammie Mettinger Trible OTT: von Rad Wright M Ch 5 M Ch 6
<b>Oct 5</b>	Salvation	M 37-70; H 197-226 Josh 1-6; 10-11; Judg 4-16	MRP: Lind von Rad, <i>Holy War</i> Anderson OTT: Zimmerli Kaiser Terrien M Ch 3 Essay #3: O 117-19 Reading Log #1
<b>Oct 12</b>	<u>Module Week</u>		<b><u>Final paper proposal due 10-19</u></b>
<u>Monarchy</u>	Deliverance	M 141-68; H 227-48	MRP: Brettler

<b>Oct 19</b>		1 Sam 8-12, 16-18, 24-26; 2 Sam 7-12  <b>Final paper proposal due</b>	OTT: Jacob McKenzie Clements M Ch 7
<b>Oct 26</b>	Covenant Community	M 169-91; H 249-71 1 Kings 1-11, 17-21 2 Kings 17, 23-24; Jer 1, 7, 11, 30-33; Amos 1-7	MRP: Sakenfeld Janzen OTT: Westermann Schmidt Levenson Hanson M Ch 8 Essay #4: O 245-48
<b>Nov 2</b>	Knowledge of God	M 193-216; H 272-326; 402-38 Ps 8, 13, 23, 32, 51, 90, 102-104, 107, 117-119, 137 Isa 1, 6, 12, 24-27	MRP: Fretheim ( <i>Suffering of God</i> ) Ollenburger Brettler OTT: Gottwald Childs M Ch 9
<b>Nov 9</b>	Land	M 217-36; H 439-82 Job 1-5, 28; Prov 1-8; 14-16; 22-24	MRP: Baloian Lowery OTT: Brueggemann M Ch 10
<b>Post-Monarchy</b> <b>Nov 16</b>	Deliverance	M 239-62; H 327-401 Ezekiel 33-37, 40-48; Hos 1-3, Joel 2-3, Hab 1-3	MRP: Smith-Christopher OTT: Scobie M Ch 11 Essay #5: O 377-80
<b>Nov 23</b>	<b><u>THANKSGIVING</u></b>		<b><u>Sermons/Bible studies due 11-30</u></b>
<b>Nov 30</b>	Experience of God	M 281-97 Isa 40-42, 56-66 Ruth, Daniel 1-6, 9; Haggai	MRP: Balantine OTT: Goldingay M Ch 13 <b><u>Option #3 Sermons/Bible studies</u></b>
<b>Dec 7</b>	Covenant/Land	M 263-79, 299-313; H 512-38 2 Chron 2-8; Neh 9; Ezek 40-48; Dan 9	<b><u>Option #3 Analyses</u></b> MRP: Habel Rendtorff RUSSELL? OTT: Dempster M Ch 12/M Ch 14
<b>NT – OT</b> <b>Dec 14</b>	Interpretation Issues	M 341-55, H 539-59	Baker Enns Wright ( <i>Knowing Jesus Thru OT</i> ) OTT: Perdue M Ch 17 Reading Log #2 <b><u>Final paper Options 2-3 due</u></b>
<b>Dec. 20</b>			<b><u>Late papers final deadline</u></b>

1. Academic Policies. MBBS academic policies (as well as other school policies) are described at

<http://www.mbseminary.edu/fresno/policies/>. These policies provide guidance on academic integrity and plagiarism, incomplete course work, extensions, dates for changing registration, non-discriminatory and inclusive language, appeals, etc. Students are expected to be familiar with these policies and will be held responsible for adhering to them. If you have questions about how these policies relate to you or to a situation that you face in your studies, please speak to the professor or consult the Registrar.

2. Evaluation. Each of the assignments has specific grading criteria (see descriptions above).

All assignments must be completed to be eligible to earn a passing grade for the course.

Please note that “student work will be evaluated by two standards: a) by what is considered the appropriate level of graduate performance, and b) by comparison with work submitted in a given class” (see <http://www.mbseminary.edu/fresno/policies/grading>).

The letter grade conversions follow the MBBS Grading Template: A (100-94%), A- (93-90%), B+ (89-87%), B (86-83%), B- (82-80%), C+ (79-77%), C (76-73%), C- (72-70%), and F (69-0%) (see <http://www.mbseminary.edu/fresno/policies/grading>).

The performance expectations are as follows: “A ‘B’ grade is the baseline. A ‘B’ grade means the student is doing satisfactory work. The ‘B+’ or higher grade indicates that the student has exceeded the baseline performance standard. The ‘C’ grade indicates that the student has not achieved the baseline level” (see <http://www.mbseminary.edu/fresno/policies/grading>).

3. Formatting specifications. Any of the three standard citation styles is acceptable (Chicago, APA, MLA). Choose one and follow it consistently. Consult *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Hendrickson, 1999) which is in the Reference section of the *Hiebert Library* (Ref PN 147.S26) for examples of how to cite dictionary articles, journal articles, monographs, commentaries, books in series, websites, etc. An online version of the *SBL Handbook* is available at [http://www.sbl-site.org/Publications/Publications\\_PublishingWithSBL.aspx](http://www.sbl-site.org/Publications/Publications_PublishingWithSBL.aspx) (click on *Student Supplement for SBL Handbook of Style* under the “Resources” section). Slade’s, *Form and Style: Research Papers, Reports, Theses*, 11<sup>th</sup> ed. (Houghton Mifflin Company, 2000) is also a useful guide. The preferred documentation format is parenthetical citation style.

A bibliography with class materials is available on the website. Note: Students are strongly advised to acquaint themselves with E.A. Martens’ *Old Testament Theology* 1BR Bibliographies #13 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997), esp. pp. 73-87 which list OT Theologies along with annotations.

## Evaluating Papers

### A

Excellent overall, no major weaknesses

Grasps what biblical and theological thinking is

Strong evidence of original thinking

Clear, precise, well-reasoned with obvious capacity to analyze, synthesize, evaluate, discern, justify and elaborate

Clear authorial voice demonstrated by a well-defined thesis, effective body, and summative conclusion

Clear analysis and formulation of information

Good organization

Meticulous concern for documented evidence

Recognizes key issues, assumptions, questions consistently

Identifies points of view

Breadth

### B

Very good overall, no major weaknesses but some discernible ones

Grasps what biblical and theological thinking is

Evidence of some original thinking with clear writing plan

Clear, precise, well-reasoned with occasional lapses; satisfactory critical and analytical capacity

Minor errors of documentation do not detract from clarity

Usually demonstrates clear analysis and formulation of information

Recognizes most key issues, assumptions, questions

Frequently identifies points of view

Breadth

### C

Good overall, mixture of weakness and strengths

Modest grasp of biblical and theological thinking

Uses some terms correctly but makes some mistakes

Lapses in reasoning at times

Needs to develop clarity and precision and use of key concepts

Shows inadequate evidence of having read the material

Presence of grammatical, stylistic, and/or documentation errors which detract from clarity

Lacks breadth

### D

Poor overall

Minimal grasp of biblical thinking

Little evidence of reasoning; lack of effort to pull together ideas, concepts, information

Organization flawed, difficult to follow

Lacks evidence of reading material

Failure to document clearly

## ESSAY GRADING RUBRIC

### CONTENT

- \_\_\_\_\_ 20 Summarize main purpose of reading
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Identify the point of view, perspective, of reading
- \_\_\_\_\_ 30 Identify most important supporting information, arguments
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20 Analyze implications for OT theology either in the academy or the church

### STYLE

- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Meets criteria of assignment (length, etc.); documentation follows style guide
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Style and syntax are clear, proper grammar, spelling

## Class Presentation #1: *God's Design* Chapter Grading Rubric

### CONTENT

- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Content recap is accurate, identifies issues of significance
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ 30 Exegetical presentation (5 points each)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ text is appropriate and illuminating
  - \_\_\_\_\_ structural analysis
  - \_\_\_\_\_ word study informs audience theologically
  - \_\_\_\_\_ textual logic reveals clear exegetical analysis
  - \_\_\_\_\_ intertextual relations fit, support, inform
  - \_\_\_\_\_ summary statement is concise, precise, clear
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20 Synopsis of engagement with scholarship/world
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20 Starter statements/questions stimulate thoughtful discussion
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Lesson outline/Power Point is timely, comprehensive, clear

### STYLE

- \_\_\_\_\_ 5 Clarity, appropriateness, engagement
  
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5 Meets time limits; gives evidence of planning and freedom of presentation

Students will present a 20-30-minute introduction to assigned chapters from the Martens textbook. The presentation should include a 5-minute recap of content (strict limit for this); a 10-15 minute exegetical extrapolation of the concept (select a text that illustrates the chapter; sketch exegetical report including structural analysis, word study, textual logic, intertextual relations, and summary statement); a 5-10 minute synopsis of how this concept engages other scholarship/the contemporary world; 2 starter statements or questions to stimulate class discussion. Students are to use clear techniques to engage fellow learners. Power Point is recommended. Assignments will be made by the professor on Sept. 7. Students who wish to work with a particular classmate or to work alone should inform the professor by Sept. 5. A 2-page lesson outline is **due before the presentation**. The Power Point file is to be sent by email to the class within 24 hours of the presentation.

## **Class Presentation #2: Monograph Research Grading Rubric**

- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Follows the rubric categories and submits work on time
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20 Analyzes the book's thesis in a way that is concise, well-defined, complete
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Correctly identifies the author's theological perspective
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Engages in discerning dialogue re. connection to corresponding chapter in M.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 30 Discerns thoughtful insights for developing OT theology
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Discerns insights useful for contemporary mission/church life
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Evaluates book's limits/challenges author's conclusions with fair analysis

Each student will present their reading of one monograph from the attached list. Students who wish to choose their own monograph should make arrangements with the professor by Sept. 5. Assignments will be made by the professor on Sept. 7. The student will prepare to engage in a 10-20-minute conversation with professor/classmates regarding the book. The context will be dialogical. Students should be prepared to answer the following questions: 1. What is the thesis of the book? 2. What is the theological perspective of the author? 3. How does this monograph inform the conversation with the corresponding chapter from *God's Design*? 4. What insights from the book are most helpful for developing your OT theology and for nurturing the church? 5. How do you wish to challenge the author? The book summary (using the sample Monograph Research rubric) is **due via email to all class members 48 hours before the assigned class period.**

**Model Monograph Review for “Old Testament Theology,” MBBS, Lynn Jost**

**Middleton, J. Richard. *The Liberating Image: The Imago Dei in Genesis 1*. Brazos, 2005. 304 pages.**

**Area: Creation**

**Thesis:** *Image of God* as used in Genesis 1 and the Hebrew Bible shatters ancient and contemporary rhetorical expectations. God is a generous creator, sharing power with humanity and other creatures. God takes the risk of inviting creatures to participate in the creative and historical process. (296-97)

**Structural Analysis:** Middleton develops his thesis in three parts. In Part 1 he reviews the traditional interpretations of *image of God* and identifies their weak points, lays out his interdisciplinary, subjective hermeneutics of mutuality, then exegetes Genesis 1:27 with careful word studies and intertextual analysis. Part 2 identifies *image of God* in Genesis 1-11 as a subversive ideological critique of ANE mythology, with analysis of Egyptian and especially Mesopotamian literature. Part 3 weighs the possibility that the Hebrew Bible uses the myth of creative violence in Job and the Psalms, then returns to Genesis 1 to reconsider the notion that Genesis 1 establishes a perfectly symmetrical order for creation.

**Evaluation:** Middleton has written a book which is smart, accessible to the nonscholar, engaging, yet stretching, demanding, given to meticulous detail and argument. As an online critic says, “Middleton is one of a group of biblical scholars who combine deep grounding in traditional scholarship, profound awareness of the effects of postmodernism on culture and thought, and are unafraid to name openly their faith commitment that informs and shapes their scholarship. . . . Middleton is working to rethink some ancient questions in light of today's intellectual, social and economic contexts.” (“Reviews Written by Wes in Issaquah.” Amazon N.P. Cited 20 July 2006. [http://www.amazon.com/gp/cdp/member-reviews/A10QPVDDVWMWY4/ref=cm\\_cr\\_auth/104-4585166-6901567?ie=UTF8](http://www.amazon.com/gp/cdp/member-reviews/A10QPVDDVWMWY4/ref=cm_cr_auth/104-4585166-6901567?ie=UTF8))

The book's strength lies in its postmodern biblical exegesis with careful attention to a biblical subversive approach to imperial ideology. It would be strengthened by stronger, clearer development of the contemporary implications of this reading.

**Helpful Insights:** “. . . *imago Dei* refers to humanity's . . . role as God's earthly delegates . . . to extend “God's rule on earth through ordinary communal practices of human life.” (60)

God's relationship to creation is illuminated by images of kingship, covenant, kinship, artisanship, one who fashioned the world as a cosmic sanctuary (as the emphasis on sevens substantiates [83]). Human responsibility for creation in God's name is both *representational* and *representative* of God (88) as humans imitate God's creativity (89).

Genesis 1 challenges “the Mesopotamian notion of king as image of a god . . . with the claim that all humanity was made in God's image” (145). Rather, God granted a royal-priestly identity . . . to all humanity. . . . This democratization . . . [dignifies] the human race with a noble status in the world, analogous to that of royalty in ANE” (204).

Israel's distinctiveness may lie less in theological claims about God's historical action and more in the social order these claims generate (193), resulting in internal debate in Israel (195).

“Genesis 1 constitutes a normative framework by which we may judge all the violence that pervades the rest of the Bible” (269).

**Response:** I am beginning to move from prioritizing *deliverance* as a theme of OTT to recognizing the priority if not primacy of *creation*. M. also reinforces my growing sense that one faithful reading of the Bible recognizes it as a subversive text that deconstructs imperial ideology. M.'s colleagues Walsh and Keesmaat have written a smart book entitled *Colossians Remixed* which uses a similar strategy but includes more application.

### **Class Presentation #3: OT Theology Summary Grading Rubric**

- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Identifies the author's theological location with insight, including relationship to other theologians
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Outlines the governing concept or theological center clearly, concisely
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Reports and analyzes the written organization/structure
- \_\_\_\_\_ 30 Synthesizes significant supporting information, data, detail
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Assesses contemporary contribution of theologian
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Suggests significant contemporary issues for discussion
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Completes work on time, uses time well, engages class appropriately
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Distributes summary rubric that is written well and follows guidelines

Each student will present a 10-15-minute overview of an assigned OT theology. The student will locate the theologian in the field of OT theology (consult Barr/Brueggemann/Perdue); outline the governing concept of the theology; identify significant supporting information; assess how this theology contributes to the contemporary situation; suggest contemporary theological issues for class discussion. Creative presentation will assist classmates in giving attention to the summary. If students have not chosen a theologian, assignments will be made Sept. 14. Students who have elected the Brueggemann text are encouraged to identify themselves and choose to present that text. An outlined summary that follows the Theology Summary rubric is **due 48 hours before the class period** and is to be sent to all class members.

One or two page summary should use this format

Bibliographic entry, student presenter's name

Theologian's location in the field (*list may include denomination, relationship to critical perspectives, etc.*)

Theological center or governing concept (*brief thesis statement—about 40 words*)

Structural organization (*may be in outline form*)

Supporting information (*written text, occasional quotation, see also monograph sample—at least 250 words*)

Assessment (*written text of several sentences including personal response of student—at least 100 words*)

Discussion issues (*1-3 sentences; succinct*)

## Final Paper Grading Rubric

### Option 1

#### CONTENT

- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Defines topic of significance with clarity and focus
- \_\_\_\_\_ 70 Theological analysis (10 points each)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Originality
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Synthesis of perspectives of Martens/House (Brueggemann)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Analysis of Context
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Analysis of textual structure and rhetorical strategies
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Discernment of significant passages
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Identification and elaboration of major themes and issues
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Synthesis of relationship to overall OT theology

#### STYLE

- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Meets deadlines and specifications (2800-3500 words), documents according to norms
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Writes with clear voice, organization, and English grammar; gives evidence of careful proofreading

**Option 1:** Canonical theology: Reflecting the perspectives of Martens and House (Brueggemann), analyze the theology of one of the following: Gen. 12-50, Ruth, Hosea, Amos. Read the biblical text at least two times in order to get a sense of its structure and themes (including God, creation, Israel/Judah, the nations, judgment, salvation, ethics, worship, justice, shalom, wisdom, etc.). Using the theological textbooks as a base, synthesize a theological analysis of the text which includes the context into/from which the biblical text speaks, the basic structure of the text, significant passages for laying out the text's theology, rhetorical strategies of the text, major themes and issues, and relationship to the larger OT theology. Thesis statement must be approved by Oct. 19.

## Final Paper Grading Rubric Option 2

### CONTENT

- \_\_\_\_\_ 20 Defines topic of significance with clarity and focus
- \_\_\_\_\_ 70 Theological analysis (10 points each)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Originality
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Synthesis of perspectives of Martens/House (Brueggemann)
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Structure of argument follows clear rhetorical logic
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Analysis of biblical text(s) gives evidence of thorough exegesis
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Elaboration of topic demonstrates theological synthesis
  - \_\_\_\_\_ Discernment of relationship to overall OT theology

### STYLE

- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Meets deadlines and specifications (2800-3500), documents according to norms
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10 Writes with clear voice, organization, and English grammar; gives evidence of careful proofreading

Option 2: Theological topic: Write a paper on a theological topic informed by research which includes the perspectives of Martens and House (Brueggemann). Topic must be approved by the professor by Oct. 19. The approach to and boundaries of the topical research should be defined (e.g., *synchronic study of rest in the Pentateuch* or *diachronic study of justice in the Deuteronomistic History*). Additional topic suggestions: fear, anger, divine emotions, divine jealousy, war.

## Final Paper Grading Rubric Option 3: Analytical theology in practice

### PRESENTATION

\_\_\_\_\_ 10 Sermon demonstrates careful exegetical preparation (one way to demonstrate this is by including clearly legible exegetical notes)

\_\_\_\_\_ 10 Sermon is characterized by clear structure and clear communication using rhetorical logic (this may be clarified by adding explanatory notes within the body of the sermon explaining strategic moves OR by adding a preface or summary piece that briefly outlines the rhetorical strategy; neither of these strategic explanations should count in the total words of the project)

OR

\_\_\_\_\_ 10 Bible studies demonstrate careful exegetical preparation (may be demonstrated by appending legible exegetical notes)

\_\_\_\_\_ 10 Study plan includes attention-grabbing introduction, exegetically attentive biblical study, relevant cultural analysis and application demonstrated in a plan that outlines input and instructions by study leader as well as responses by participants. Includes plans for materials, use of time, learning methods and approaches.

### THEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

#### Martens Analysis

\_\_\_\_\_ 10 Demonstrates how this text fits into structure of Martens

\_\_\_\_\_ 10 Analyzes relationship to the four themes of Exod 6:6-8

\_\_\_\_\_ 20 Evaluates sermon's theological development *from Martens' perspective*

#### House (Brueggemann) Analysis

\_\_\_\_\_ 10 Demonstrates how this text fits into the emphasis of House

\_\_\_\_\_ 10 Analyzes relationship to the corresponding chapter in House

\_\_\_\_\_ 20 Evaluates sermon's theological development *from House's perspective*

### STYLE

\_\_\_\_\_ 10 Meets deadlines and specifications, documents according to norms

\_\_\_\_\_ 10 Writes with clear voice, organization, and grammar, and careful proofreading

A. Write and preach 1-2 exegetical sermons (20 minutes) OR design and teach 2-3 exegetical Bible studies for adults (35-40 minutes) from an OT text or set of texts. The sermon is to be submitted in manuscript form. The Bible studies are to be complete with lesson objectives, outline of the lesson plan, instructions/report on each part of the lesson (including how many minutes allotted to each), and exactly what instructions were given and responses were elicited (report of content).

Theological insight within the presentation should be explicit but not intrusively awkward.

B. Analyze the presentation by writing at least two theological critiques of the presentation, one from the Martens perspective of *God's Design* and the other from either House (Brueggemann) or the assigned OT theologian. The critique should be written in the voice of the OT theologian—probing the presentation for themes significant to the author. For example, the Martens perspective should examine at least two things: (1) how the text fits within the structure of his book and (2) how the four themes are developed. The analysis should be written as if Martens himself were writing the critique. Each analysis should be not less than 1000 words.

The grade will be based on quality of the presentation (20%) and the theological critique (40% for each analysis). Papers must engage in critical theological analysis from two perspectives at the level of a B- to obtain a passing grade for the course. See the Final Project Evaluation rubrics.

For all three options:

2800-3500 words

In addition to the customary essay requirements of accuracy, articulation, organization, format and English language usage the paper will be assessed on:

- 1) significance, clarity and focus of the topic or issue,
- 2) use of secondary resources (books *and* periodicals) and textbooks,
- 3) theological ability to weigh arguments or positions,
- 4) succinct style, clear organization, force and persuasiveness of the conclusion,
- 5) use of one consistent, standard style for citations of both quotations and ideas, and
- 6) originality of work.

**Dates: 50-word proposal outlining the project due Oct. 19**

**Option 3 sermon manuscript/Bible studies verbatim due Nov. 30**

**Option 3 theological analyses due Dec. 7**

**Final paper due for Options 1-2: Dec. 14; Option 3 paper revisions after Dec. 14 will be subject to a penalty for late work.**