1.0 Course Description

An exegetical analysis of the first eleven chapters of Genesis with emphasis on problems having interpretive and theological significance. Prerequisite: Hebrew Exegesis I.

2.0 Course Rationale

Exegesis is the primary task of the student of biblical literature. It is best learned by being exercised. This course will provide guidance in the process of exegesis. Classroom reading and discussion of Genesis 1–11 from the Hebrew Bible will provide an atmosphere for learning the specific principles involved in exegeting the Hebrew text. The primary goal of this course is to exegete the eleven chapters in their entirety.

3.0 Curriculum Statements and Learning Outcomes

3.1 TMS Curriculum Statement

*TMS exists to equip godly men to be pastors and/or trainers of pastors for service to Christ in strategic fields of Christian ministry through an educational program and an environment of spiritual fellowship and relationships which emphasize unreserved commitment to the worship of God, submission to the authority of the Scriptures, a life of personal holiness, the priority of the local church, and the mission of penetrating the world with the Truth.*

3.2 Master of Divinity Program

*The Master of Divinity Program is designed to provide a broad biblical theological understanding, personal growth, and professional preparation for church or mission vocations requiring ordination.*
In order to accomplish the M.Div. curriculum statement, the faculty has identified the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):

- **PLO #1:** As a future elder, pastor, missionary or educator, comprehend the significant areas of Biblical Interpretation, Biblical Languages, Christian Theology and Pastoral ministry.
- **PLO #2:** As a future elder/pastor, construct a personal philosophy of ministry with application to the desired vocational goals.
- **PLO #3:** As a future teacher of the Scripture, synthesize the input of Biblical languages, Bible backgrounds and theological constructs to preach and teach the Bible to varied age levels and abilities within any ministry context.
- **PLO #4:** As a future spiritual leader, exhibit the disciplines of holiness, prayer, and compassion required for ministry.

### 3.3 Division of OT Studies

*The Division of OT Studies is designed to advance critical thinking skills in linguistic, exegetical and apologetical aspects of Old Testament study and to promote growth in disciplined habits for ongoing independent study of the Old Testament.*

In order to accomplish the Division of OT Studies curriculum statement, the OT faculty has identified the following Division Learning Outcomes (DLOs):

- **DLO #1:** As a translator, demonstrate competency with vocabulary, basic grammar, and standard tools to translate simple biblical Hebrew texts.
- **DLO #2:** As a scholar, implement a sound research methodology to interpret the Hebrew Bible.
- **DLO #3:** As an exegete, produce an exegetical project reflecting accuracy in critical thinking and writing.
- **DLO #4:** As an expositor, write a sermon combining accurate translation and exegesis of the Hebrew text with reliable practical and theological implications.

* Th.M. Program Purpose Statement *

*The Master of Theology is designed to provide for more focused and specialized study in a facet of biblical or theological studies. The program provides the platform for a student to gain the research skills necessary for theological writing and teaching. Upon completion the student will be able to engage in a teaching or training program where a doctoral degree is not required and/or equip him to enter into a doctoral level program.*

In order to accomplish the Th.M. curriculum statement, the faculty has identified the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):

- **PLO #1:** As an advancing scholar, specialize in an area of biblical or theological studies, gaining facility in its literature and scholarship.
- **PLO #2:** As an advancing exegete, employ a more refined skill set in Hebrew and Greek translation, exegesis, and interpretation.
- **PLO #3:** As an advancing teacher, implement the skills of communication and effective teaching of course content.
- **PLO #4:** As an advancing contributor to the literature, demonstrate critical thinking, in-depth interaction, thorough research and excellence in writing.
* Division of OT Studies (ThM)*

The Division of OT Studies advances specialized academic opportunities to develop maturity in critical thinking skills related to exegetical and apologetical aspects of Old Testament studies, refinement of disciplined habits for ongoing independent study of the Hebrew Bible, and to write a thesis.

In order to accomplish the Division of OT Studies curriculum statement, the OT faculty has identified the following Division Learning Outcomes (DLOs):

- **DLO #1:** As an OT scholar, articulate a broad familiarity and understanding with the contents of the OT as seen against its historical and cultural backgrounds.
- **DLO #2:** As a translator, demonstrate an advanced ability in translating the Hebrew Bible in all its major literary styles.
- **DLO #3:** As an exegete, make a contribution to an area of OT studies by writing a thesis demonstrating competence in researching primary sources and dexterity in the use of sound exegetical methodologies.

### 3.4 Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

In this course the student will encounter the text of Genesis 1–11 in the Hebrew Bible through translation, commentaries, periodical literature, lectures, discussion, research, and writing. The learning outcomes for this course are as follows:

- **SLO #1:** The student will be able to identify potential solutions for the problems of Mosaic authorship of Genesis 1–11. (See DLO #2.)
- **SLO #2:** The student will be able to translate Genesis 1–11 from the Hebrew text in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. (See DLO #1.)
- **SLO #3:** The student will be able to identify potential solutions for a variety of interpretive problems within the Hebrew text of Genesis 1–11. (See DLO #2.)
- **SLO #4:** The student will be able to discuss the role of ancient near eastern studies in the exegesis of Genesis 1–11. (See DLO #2.)
- **SLO #5:** The student will be able to produce an exegetical paper on a passage in Genesis 1–11 in the form of a running verse-by-verse commentary that exhibits sound research primarily in primary sources (e.g., the Hebrew Bible) together with supporting secondary sources (e.g., commentaries and periodical literature). (See DLO #3.)

### 4.0 Course Alignment Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SLO 1</th>
<th>SLO 2</th>
<th>SLO 3</th>
<th>SLO 4</th>
<th>SLO 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worksheets and</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translations</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook Reading</td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exegetical Paper</td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 Required Textbooks


The following assignments do not apply to the Online Course.
*Providing this information merely helps the online student to understand what kind of requirements/assignments were expected of students in the traditional classroom setting.*

6.0 Course Requirements

6.1 All assignments must be submitted by the date due. 10% will be deducted from the paper for each class session it is past due. (For example: An assignment due on a given date will be reduced 10% if submitted the same day, but after the class. An additional 10% will be subtracted at the beginning of the next day’s class.)

6.2 Translation: All of the Hebrew text of Genesis 1–11 will be discussed in class. Students are expected to participate in that discussion with an awareness of the Hebrew grammar and vocabulary. Each student will be called upon for oral translation a minimum of six times throughout the semester. The professor will grade oral translation for Genesis 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10. The course requires written translations of Genesis 4, 6, and 11. These written translations must adhere to the following guidelines:

1. Typed, double-spaced.
2. Verse numbers inserted in the proper places (at the beginning of verses).
3. Paragraph format—in accordance with normal English usage.
4. Use smooth English fit to be read publicly.
5. Utilize correct punctuation (e.g., double quotation marks around direct discourse, question mark concluding questions, etc.).
6. Note accents, mood, context, and idiomatic phraseology.
7. Omitted text and incomplete translations will be graded harshly.
8. Grading emphasizes accuracy and coherence.
The following are examples of idioms in classical Hebrew:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Literal Translation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בן שבע שנים</td>
<td>a son of seventeen year</td>
<td>seventeen years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אני</td>
<td>behold me</td>
<td>I’m ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בֶּן שֶׁבֶן</td>
<td>lord/master of the dreams</td>
<td>Dreamer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הבַּעַל</td>
<td>on a horn of a son of oil</td>
<td>on a fertile hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הַמֹּאָב</td>
<td>in the fields of Moab</td>
<td>in the country of Moab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֶחֶם</td>
<td>they took for themselves</td>
<td>they married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בָּהֶם</td>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֶחֶם</td>
<td>they lifted their voice and wept</td>
<td>they wept loudly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לֶחֶם</td>
<td>[I am old] from being for a man/husband . . . I will be for a man/husband</td>
<td>[I am too old] to have a husband . . . I were married</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rubric for Translation Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacking basics.</td>
<td>Adequate, but more is expected at this level.</td>
<td>Well-informed and skillfully executed.</td>
<td>Worthy to be imitated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehension</strong></td>
<td>glosses. Substantial confusion of</td>
<td>confusion of similar terms.</td>
<td>Virtually no confusion of similar terms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation</strong></td>
<td>cannot discern proper relationships between words and phrases. Inaccuracy in parsing. Skips several words in each sentence.</td>
<td>Discerns most relationships between words and phrases. Most parsing is accurate. Skips only an occasional word.</td>
<td>Accurate discernment of relationships between words and phrases. Accurate parsing. No skipping of words. But, translation lacks smoothness and is overly literal.</td>
<td>Accurate discernment of relationships between words and phrases. Accurate parsing. No skipped words. Full, smooth, idiomatic, and accurate translation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following notations will be employed in grading the translation:

- **A** = Ambiguous or unclear.
- **B** = Misleading.
- **C** = Culturally objectionable.
- **D** = Unnatural English.
- **E** = Requires refinement in English style.
- **F** = Fails to maintain the historical, geographical or cultural facts of the original event in its setting.
- **G** = Incorrect punctuation.
- **H** = Hard to understand.
- **I** = Inaccurate.
- **J** = Inconsistent with the immediate context.
- **M** = Idiom mistranslated
- **P** = Plagiarized from a published translation
- **R** = Redundant
- **S** = Hebrew accents misunderstood or not considered
- **T** = Followed textual critical error
- **W** = Word order misconstrued
- **?** = Questionable or debatable translation.
- Circled text = Questionable or bad translation.

### 6.3 Worksheets:

The “Study Notes” for this course include the worksheets that each student must complete in accord with the course schedule. Worksheets must be submitted for Genesis 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10. Utilize the following guidelines:
(1) Always include references to a minimum of three commentaries. Use Mathews and Collins as two of the three in the first four worksheets. Starting with Genesis 5, use Mathews and two others. Rotate through a variety of commentaries, so that you display an acquaintance with a broad scope of commentary work on Genesis 1–11. Steer clear of purely devotional commentaries and emphasis the exegetical commentaries.

(2) References are to be in-line in the following style:
The genealogy of Shem in 11:10–26 follows the same pattern except for the third element which summarizes the patriarch’s life (Wenham, 121).

(3) Use brief bullet-point type of remarks and observations similar to the following:
- The text describes Enoch as one who walks with God. As a result, God takes him away. As the 7th member of the genealogy, he receives special emphasis (Mathews, 313).
- Lamech’s statement regarding the pain of the cursed ground refers back to Gen 3 where God cursed the ground because of man.

### Grading Rubric for Worksheets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-line References</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackng basics.</td>
<td>Inaccurate,</td>
<td>Adequate, but more is expected</td>
<td>Adequate, well-informed</td>
<td>Flawless accuracy; complete;</td>
<td>_/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6 points or less]</td>
<td>incomplete,</td>
<td>at this level.</td>
<td>and skillfully executed.</td>
<td>always complete; superb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inconsistent</td>
<td>[7 points]</td>
<td>[8–9 points]</td>
<td>consistency in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>formatting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>formatting. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>errors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concise Comments</strong></td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Comments and observations</td>
<td>Comments and</td>
<td>Insightful comments and</td>
<td>_/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comments and</td>
<td>reflecting average</td>
<td>observations reflect</td>
<td>observations reflecting</td>
<td>x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>observations</td>
<td>thinking and</td>
<td>careful thinking and</td>
<td>skilled thinking and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reflecting</td>
<td>observing.</td>
<td>thoughtful observation.</td>
<td>observation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>poor thinking</td>
<td>Adequate length.</td>
<td>Acceptable length.</td>
<td>Perfect length.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and observing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overly short</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or overly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>long.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Identification and Solution(s)</strong></td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Average identification of</td>
<td>Acceptable identification</td>
<td>Insightful and complete</td>
<td>_/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identification</td>
<td>interpretive problem(s) and</td>
<td>interpretive problem(s)</td>
<td>identification of interpretive</td>
<td>x 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of interpretive</td>
<td>of potential solution(s).</td>
<td>of potential solution(s).</td>
<td>problem(s) and of potential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>problem(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>solution(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>solution(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>Fails to</td>
<td>Sometimes provides</td>
<td>Very good provision of</td>
<td>Superb statement of</td>
<td>_/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provide</td>
<td>personal conclusions or</td>
<td>personal conclusions and</td>
<td>personal conclusions and</td>
<td>x 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal</td>
<td>reasons.</td>
<td>reasons.</td>
<td>reasons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or reasons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Commentaries</strong></td>
<td>1 or less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>_/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The professor reserves the right to refuse any paper that has not been written in accord with the principles of sound Christian scholarship:

1. Graduate level research—periodical literature and commentary research must be significantly evident in the content, footnotes, and bibliography.
2. Honest and accurate use of sources.
3. Original thought and expression.
4. Consistent logic.
5. Scriptural methods of interpretation.

The following pages present the grading rubrics for the required exegetical paper described above.

**Rubric for Exegetical Paper—Content (60% of Grade)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Unacceptable Lacking basics. [6 points or less]</th>
<th>Basic Adequate, but more is expected at this level. [7 points]</th>
<th>Proficient Well-informed and skillfully executed. [8–9 points]</th>
<th>Exemplary Worthy to be imitated. [10 points]</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation</strong></td>
<td>Does not discern proper relationships between words and phrases. Inaccuracy in parsing. Skips several words in each sentence.</td>
<td>Discerns most relationships between words and phrases. Most parsing is accurate. Skips only an occasional word.</td>
<td>Accurate discernment of relationships between words and phrases. Accurate parsing. No skipping of words. But, translation lacks smoothness and is overly literal.</td>
<td>Accurate discernment of relationships between words and phrases. Accurate parsing. No skipped words. Full, smooth, idiomatic, and accurate translation.</td>
<td>(_{/10} x 2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammatical Analysis and Synthesis</strong></td>
<td>Inaccurate analysis of grammatical elements. Very little understanding of the significance of the grammar.</td>
<td>A basic grasp of grammatical elements. Some understanding of the significance of the grammar.</td>
<td>Good grasp of grammatical elements. Accurate understanding of the significance of the grammar.</td>
<td>Superb awareness of grammatical elements. Outstanding understanding of the significance of the grammar.</td>
<td>(_{/10} x 4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exegetical Implications and Application</strong></td>
<td>Exhibits a very limited understanding of exegetical significance of the grammatical elements.</td>
<td>Displays some understanding of the exegetical significance of the grammatical elements.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an accurate understanding of the exegetical significance of the grammatical elements.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an exceptionally accurate understanding of the exegetical significance of the grammatical elements.</td>
<td>(_{/10} x 4 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grading Rubric for Exegetical Paper—Writing (40% of Grade)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacking basics.</td>
<td>Adequate, but more is expected at this level.</td>
<td>Well-informed and skillfully executed.</td>
<td>Worthy to be imitated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[6 points or less]</td>
<td>[7 points]</td>
<td>[8–9 points]</td>
<td>[10 points]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Style and Format</td>
<td>Regular and widespread violations of the Style Guide. Poor sentence and paragraph construction.</td>
<td>Largely adheres to the Style Guide, a few minor errors. Writing is essentially correct grammatically with good construction.</td>
<td>Well executed in terms of style. Grammar and syntax commensurate with graduate level work. Varied vocabulary and use of technical terms.</td>
<td>Well executed in terms of style. Excellent grammar, superior vocabulary and use of technical terminology.</td>
<td>__/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Graduate or Post-Graduate Research</td>
<td>Uses only the most basic resources, evidencing only rudimentary research.</td>
<td>Good use of basic research tools, but largely nothing beyond basics. Little evidence of a probing research ethic.</td>
<td>Clear evidence of probing research. Excellent use of periodical literature and other front line materials.</td>
<td>Obviously thorough and detailed research. Excellent use of materials from all genres which are pertinent to the paper.</td>
<td>__/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of Material and Argumentation</td>
<td>Poorly organized, structure lacks clarity.</td>
<td>Generally a clear structure. Not detailed, but material and arguments are reasonably organized.</td>
<td>Clear and detailed structure, follows a logical flow; cogent arguments are well laid out and reasonably supported.</td>
<td>Excellent and detailed structure of material. Argumentation is presented in a solid, logical manner, well documented and insightful.</td>
<td>__/10 \times 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Interaction with Opposing or Differing View(s)</td>
<td>Little or no interaction; does not represent opposing view fairly or with evidence of nuance of position.</td>
<td>Acknowledges and grasps opposing view(s) and arguments and makes an attempt at interaction.</td>
<td>Clearly understands opposing views and arguments. Clear interaction with material.</td>
<td>Firm grasp of all views on the topic. Clear, insightful, and detailed interaction with all views while defending the paper.</td>
<td>__/10 \times 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence and Logic of Conclusion(s)</td>
<td>Conclusions presented are self-evident or lacking evidence of thought or conviction. Logical fallacies are evident in the conclusion.</td>
<td>Generally a clearly presented but unremarkable conclusion. Minimal problems of logic or coherence.</td>
<td>A clear and coherent presentation. A thoroughly thought-out and logically presented conclusion.</td>
<td>Demonstrates compelling grasp of material makes an excellent presentation. Makes a clear and compelling conclusion.</td>
<td>__/10 \times 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the Topic or Field</td>
<td>Fails to fully summarize or contribute insights to the topic or field of study.</td>
<td>Provides a good summary of views within topic or field. Minimally advances the discussion.</td>
<td>Has points of contribution, with refinement could have chapters worthy of publishing.</td>
<td>Significant, insightful contribution to the discussion; a paper worthy of publication in all or in part.</td>
<td>__/10 \times 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5 Class Participation: The student will be expected to contribute to the class in the following ways:

(1) Oral translation of scheduled passages.
(2) Class discussion of scheduled passages and any assigned worksheets.
(3) Class discussion of assigned textbook reading.

Grading Rubric for Class Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lacking basics.</td>
<td>Adequate, but more is expected at this level.</td>
<td>Well-informed and skillfully executed.</td>
<td>Worthy to be imitated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[6 points or less]</td>
<td>[7 points]</td>
<td>[8–9 points]</td>
<td>[10 points]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance/ Promptness</td>
<td>Late to class three or more times and absent more than twice.</td>
<td>Late to class two times and absent only twice.</td>
<td>Rarely late to class and absent only once.</td>
<td>Always prompt and regular in attendance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Engagement in Class</td>
<td>Never contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions. Does not participate in discussion of worksheets.</td>
<td>Rarely contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions. Rarely participates in discussion of worksheets.</td>
<td>Proactively contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions at least once per class. Intentional participation in discussion of worksheets.</td>
<td>Proactively contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions more than once per class. Enthusiastic and thoughtful participation in discussion of worksheets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Skills</td>
<td>Does not listen when others talk. Often interrupts when others speak.</td>
<td>Does not listen when others talk.</td>
<td>Listens when others talk.</td>
<td>Always listens when others talk. Incorporates or builds off of the ideas of others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Almost never prepared for class with reading and fulfillment of assignments.</td>
<td>Rarely prepared for class with reading and fulfillment of assignments.</td>
<td>Usually prepared for class with reading and fulfillment of assignments.</td>
<td>Always prepared for class with reading and fulfillment of assignments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.0 Grading

The grading for the course will proceed as follows:

- Class Participation: 5%
- Textbook reading assignments: 5
- Translations: 25
- Worksheets: 30
- Exegetical Paper: 35

100%
# 8.0 COURSE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENTS</th>
<th>TTL. PP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Introduction Genesis 1 | Read Collins, 1–100  
Read Mortenson & Ury, 5–51 and 131–62 | 179 |
| 2    | Genesis 1 (cont.) | Read Mathews, 21–176 | 156 |
| 3    | Genesis 1 (cont.) | Read Mortenson & Ury, 53–78, 163–92, 211–49, 373–97 | 146 |
| 4    | Genesis 2–3 | Read Collins, 101–88  
Read Mathews, 176–264 | 177 |
| 5    | Genesis 4 | Read Collins, 189–220, 249–67  
Read Mathews, 264–94  
**Written translation: Genesis 4** | 82 |
| 6    | Genesis 5 Worksheet for Genesis 5 | Read Collins, 221–47, 269–78  
Read Mathews, 295–320  
Read Mortenson & Ury, 193–210, 283–313 | 112 |
| 7    | Genesis 6 Worksheet for Genesis 6 | Read Mathews, 320–70  
Read Mortenson & Ury, 347–71  
**Written Translation: Genesis 6** | 76 |
| 8    | Genesis 7 Worksheet for Genesis 7 | Read Mathews, 370–82  
Read Mortenson & Ury, 79–129, 251–81  
**Oral Translation** | 95 |
| 9    | Genesis 8 | Read Mathews, 382–97  
Read Mortenson & Ury, 315–46  
**Oral Translation** | 48 |
| 10   | Genesis 8 (cont.) | Mortenson & Ury, 425–57 | 33 |
| 11   | Genesis 9 Worksheet for Genesis 9 | Read Mathews, 397–425  
**Oral Translation** | 29 |
| 12   | Genesis 9 (cont.) | Read Mathews, 427–66  
**Exegetical Paper** | 40 |
| 13   | Genesis 10 Worksheet for Genesis 10 | Read Mathews, 466–500  
**Oral Translation** | 35 |
| 14   | Genesis 10 (cont.) | **Written Translation: Genesis 11** | |
| 15   | Genesis 11 | | Total 1,208 |
Gilgamesh Epic (Tablet 11)
Assyrian version found at Nineveh; 7th cent. B.C. 12 tablets—11th gives Utnapishtim’s account of the flood. Other versions date to the 3rd millennium. A 14th cent. fragment was found at Megiddo. 6 inches high.
Sumerian King List

Eight-inch clay prism dating to approx. 2000 B.C. Ten “great men” ruled before the flood with reigns between 43,200 and 18,600 years. Time spans are substantially reduced in the post-flood period.
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