1.0 Course Description

This two-semester course prepares the student for independent exegesis of the Hebrew text. It emphasizes techniques involved in the use of language tools, procedures in lexical word studies, and examination of grammatical and syntactical phenomena. Prerequisites: Hebrew Grammar I and II.

Course materials and assignments related to select Hebrew Bible texts include the study of the following subject areas relating to Hebrew exegesis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Exegesis I</th>
<th>Hebrew Exegesis II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• principles of translation</td>
<td>• literary analysis—OT literary devices, structure, and forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• syntactical analysis—Hebrew grammar and syntax</td>
<td>• ancient near eastern (hereafter, ANE) backgrounds (historical/political, social/cultural, geographical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• diagrammatical analysis</td>
<td>• exposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• textual analysis—OT textual criticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• lexical analysis—Hebrew philology, semantics, and lexicography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.0 Course Rationale

Exegesis is the primary task of the student of biblical literature. It is best learned by being exercised. Classroom reading, homework assignments, and discussion of selected texts will provide an atmosphere for learning the specific principles involved in exegeting the Hebrew Scriptures.
3.0 Student Learning Outcomes

This research course will engage the student with the text of the Hebrew Bible. The learning outcomes for this course are as follows:

1. The student will identify and define key grammatical elements in his chosen text from the Hebrew Bible.
2. The student will translate his chosen text from the Hebrew text in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.
3. The student will define and illustrate the principles of Hebrew exegesis in the treatment of his chosen text.
4. The student will produce a logical (block) diagram of his chosen text.
5. The student will interpret the *masorah parva* and the text critical apparatus of *BHS* within the context of his chosen text and will produce a preliminary text critical analysis of his chosen text.
6. The student will perform adequate lexical analysis of two key words in his chosen text.

4.0 Textbooks

4.1 Required Textbooks (*marks required reading*)


4.2 Recommended Textbooks


### 5.0 COURSE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENTS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction: “Course Syllabus” (all) and “Study Notes,” 1–5 <strong>Translation Principles and Practices:</strong> “Study Notes,” 6–37</td>
<td>Read Chisholm, 7–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Translation Principles and Practices</strong> (continued)</td>
<td>Read Chisholm, 19–29 <strong>Written Translation:</strong> Genesis 3:1–7 Choice of Text Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Translation Principles and Practices</strong> (continued) <strong>Syntactical Analysis:</strong> “Study Notes,” 38–62</td>
<td>Read Chisholm, 57–75 <strong>Written Translation:</strong> Genesis 3:8–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Syntactical Analysis</strong> (continued)</td>
<td>Read Chisholm, 75–94 <strong>Written Translation:</strong> Genesis 3:17–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Syntactical Analysis</strong> (continued)</td>
<td>Read Chisholm, 94–117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Syntactical Analysis</strong> (continued)</td>
<td>Read Chisholm, 119–42 <strong>Written Translation:</strong> 2 Samuel 8:1–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Syntactical Analysis</strong> (continued) <strong>Diagrammatical Analysis:</strong> “Study Notes,” 63–70</td>
<td>Read Chisholm, 142–86 <strong>Paper #1:</strong> Syntactical Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Diagrammatical Analysis</strong> (continued)</td>
<td>Read Chisholm, 187–220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Diagrammatical Analysis</strong> (continued) <strong>Text Critical Analysis:</strong> “Study Notes,” 71–77</td>
<td>Read Chisholm, 221–78 Read Brotzman, 17–62 <strong>Written Translation:</strong> Isaiah 42:1–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Text Critical Analysis</strong> (continued)</td>
<td>Read Brotzman, 63–106 <strong>Paper #2:</strong> Diagrammatical Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Text Critical Analysis</strong> (continued)</td>
<td>Read Brotzman, 107–32 <strong>Written Translation:</strong> Psalm 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Text Critical Analysis</strong> (continued) <strong>Lexical Analysis:</strong> “Study Notes,” 78–87</td>
<td>Read Brotzman, 133–70 <strong>Paper #3:</strong> Text Critical Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Lexical Analysis</strong> (continued)</td>
<td><strong>Paper #4:</strong> Lexical Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Syllabus reading assignments are recorded in the “Topic” column of this schedule.
6.0 Exegetical Papers

6.1 General

An exposition of a selected text of the HB will be produced by stages throughout the two semesters of this course. The student will be required to choose a text for this exposition and submit a written abstract (typed and double-spaced, but without footnotes or bibliography) in the second week of Hebrew Exegesis I. The abstract must:

1. identify the text,
2. specify at least one exegetical problem within the text,
3. indicate the theological or interpretative significance of the text, and
4. describe the expositional value of the text.

The student must choose one of the following texts for all papers in Hebrew Exegesis I and II:

- Genesis 4:5–7
- Leviticus 19:16–18
- Joshua 1:6–8
- Job 19:25–27
- Psalm 33:6–9
- Psalm 127:1–3
- Proverbs 16:30–33
- Ecclesiastes 3:9–11
- Isaiah 1:18–20
- Malachi 2:14–16

6.2 Paper Requirements

All papers (not including the abstract, above) must meet the following requirements:

- Instructions for each paper specify the page maximums.
- The bibliographies must be formal. The bibliographies should be accumulative and unified in one listing. Use bibliography entries in this syllabus as a guideline to style.
  - **Paper #1** will contain only those sources pertinent to its area of exegetical analysis.
  - **Paper #2** will contain its own sources as well as the sources of Paper #1.
  - **Paper #3** will contain its own sources as well as the sources for Papers #1 and #2.
Paper #4 will contain its own sources as well as the sources for Papers #1, #2, and #3.
- Every paper must begin with a working (i.e., tentative or provisional) translation of the chosen text.

6.3 Specifics about Each Paper

6.3.1 Paper #1: Syntactical Analysis (see “Study Notes,” 78–102 [esp., 89–98] and grading sheet and abbreviations for grading comments in “Course Syllabus,” 17–19)

- 20 pages maximum—including separate pages as follows: title page, revised translation page, and bibliography page(s).
- Write a brief introduction (cp. “Study Notes,” 89).
- Identify (includes parsing of verbs, gender and number of nouns, and classification of all Hebrew words) and discuss the exegetical significance of the syntactical elements within the chosen text. What are the interpretative implications of the syntactical elements? Answer the question, “So what?” (See sample in “Study Notes,” 89–98.) Be certain to cover all of the syntactical issues discussed in the Syllabus. Instead of repeating information for identical forms or words, refer back to your first treatment.
- Write a brief summary or conclusion (cp. “Study Notes,” 98).
- Conclude with your Bibliography that contains all sources collated in alphabetical order (by author). At minimum, you must utilize and cite Chisholm, Putnam, HALOT, and your Hebrew Grammar I/II grammar textbook.

6.3.2 Paper #2: Diagrammatical Analysis (see “Study Notes,” 103–10 and grading sheet in “Course Syllabus,” 20)

- 6 pages maximum—including separate pages as follows: title page, revised translation page, and bibliography page(s).
- If necessary, arrange the diagram in landscape mode instead of portrait mode, but keep rest of the paper in portrait mode. To do this, insert section breaks before and after the diagram.
- You may use colors and shapes in producing the diagram—in order to highlight emphases, parallels, or repetitions.


- 12 pages maximum—including separate pages as follows: title page, revised translation page, diagram page(s), and bibliography page(s).
- In chart form (see sample in “Study Notes,” 116–17), identify and translated all masora parva and all text critical apparatus entries for the verses assigned by the professor upon receiving your synopsis for choice of text.
• Write a brief set of preliminary observations regarding the exegetical significance of the textual variants for your approved text.

6.3.4 Paper #4: Lexical Analysis (see “Study Notes,” 118–27 and grading sheet in “Course Syllabus,” 22)
• 20 pages maximum—including separate pages as follows: title page, revised translation page, diagram page(s), and bibliography page(s).
• Select only 2 of the most significant key words utilized in your approved passage and perform context, lexicon, concordance, and theological dictionary research for each.
• Write a brief set of preliminary observations regarding the exegetical significance of each of the 2 word studies.

7.0 Translations

7.1 General Instructions
• Do not employ an English translation as a “pony” to aid in translating the passage. Work only with the Hebrew text and a lexicon (like Holladay, BDB, or HALOT).
• Avoid utilizing computer programs providing parsings.
• Excellence in translation involves the following factors:
  ➢ Accuracy—consistently reflective of the underlying Hebrew text and its grammar.
  ➢ Clarity—lack of ambiguity, redundancy, inconsistent tenses, and unidentifiable antecedents.
  ➢ Understandability—simple, proper English without torturous grammar or vocabulary.
  ➢ Readability—easily read aloud in public without creating any ambiguities, misunderstandings, or cultural faux pas.
  ➢ Contemporaneity—avoid literal translations of Hebrew idioms, overly technical vocabulary, and slang expressions.
  ➢ Appeal—attractive format reflecting paragraphing and literary genre (perhaps even literary devices).

7.2 Examples for Formatting (see below)
• Note that the first paragraph would normally be indented. The example on the following page is not indented only because that particular portion of the translation is actually a kind of heading in the text of Genesis 37.
Poetic Text Formatting

1 A Mikhtam of David.

Preserve me, O God, for I take refuge in You.

2 I said to the LORD, “You are my Lord;

I have no good besides You.”

3 As for the saints who are in the earth,

They are the majestic ones in whom is all my delight.

- Employ one of the following as the translation for יהוה: Yahweh or YHWH.
  The use of “Lord” will always be assumed to represent אדוניך. “LORD” will not suffice, since the hearer cannot distinguish between “Lord” and “LORD.”
- Use italics to show words added to the English translation to make sense that are not in the Hebrew text nor indicated by Hebrew grammar. For example, כיימהר יהוה אלהים אלהים, So YHWH God said, “The man being alone is not good.” The copula (“is”) is not in the Hebrew text, but is demanded by the grammar, so it is not italicized. Never use parentheses for supplying added words.

The following page shows formatting for the translation of narrative texts.
Genesis 37:1–11

[1] Jacob eventually settled in the land of his father’s sojournings, in the land of Canaan. [2] This is the history of Jacob:

Joseph was 17 years old. He was tending the flock with his brothers – he was a young man together with the sons of Bilhah and the sons of Zilpah, his father’s wives. One day Joseph brought a bad report about them to their father.

[3] Israel loved Joseph more than all his sons because he was a son of his old age so Israel had made a long-sleeved tunic for him. [4] Thus his brothers saw that their father loved him more than all his brothers, so they hated him and were not able to speak peaceably with him. [5] Then Joseph had a dream and revealed it to his brothers. As a result, they hated him all the more. [6] So he said to them, “Listen to this dream I had! [7] We were about to bind sheaves in the midst of the field when my sheaf arose and even stood upright. Then your sheaves gathered around and proceeded to bow down to my sheaf.”

[8] So his brothers asked him, “Will you really be king over us – if, indeed, you could rule us?” Thus they hated him all the more because of his dreams and his words.

[9] Then he had yet another dream and related it to his brothers. He said, “Look here, I have had a dream again. The sun, the moon, and eleven stars were bowing down to me.”

[10] Then he related it to his father and his brothers. But his father rebuked him and asked him, “What is this dream which you have had? Will I, your mother, and your brothers really come to bow down to you on the ground?” [11] Therefore, his brothers were jealous of him, but his father kept the matter in mind.
8.0 Bibliography

**A PRELIMINARY BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR HEBREW EXEGETICAL METHOD**

8.1 Books


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The best Bible atlas for studying the individual biblical events involving movement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Especially helpful for biblical battles and travels.—WDB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| See the review in MSJ 19, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 107–9.—WDB |


| An analysis of selected parables in the Gospel of Luke emphasizing literary structure and cultural setting. Each study concludes with a listing of the theological motifs of the parable. Although this book is about the NT, it provides valuable insight into the role of ANE studies in exegesis.—WDB |


| See the review in MSJ 11, no. 2 (Fall 2000): 239–42.—WDB |


In this study of Leviticus 26, Chapter 2 is an example of text-critical analysis and chapter 3 is an example of exegetical analysis. The structural analysis of Lev 26:43 (153) and the syntactical analysis of Lev 26:14–45 (161) present alternatives to the more conventional method of diagrammatical analysis.—WDB


UBS hopes to eventually employ a reduced selection from this material to produce the equivalent of Bruce M. Metzger’s *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1971) for the OT.—WDB


Brotzman produced the most helpful basic introduction to OT textual criticism. It is especially informative because he includes an examination of all of the major textual problems in the Book of Ruth.—WDB


Carson’s volume should be required reading for every seminary student before he is allowed to begin any classes.—WDB


Not only are these volumes beautifully illustrated with full-color photos (both satellite and non-satellite), they are accompanied by a very useful CD-ROM with a 3-D user-controlled projection of Palestine.—WDB


[See the review in *MSJ* 19, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 111–14.—WDB]


Although chiastic structures are legitimate literary devices in the Hebrew bible, Dorsey sometimes identifies their presence in much too subjective a fashion.—WDB


Even-Shoshan’s concordance is the best Hebrew concordance available.—WDB


[See the review in *MSJ* 8, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 116–17.—WDB]


Barrick, Hebrew Exegesis I: Course Syllabus


[See the review in MSJ 11, no. 2 (Fall 2000): 252–54. —— WDB]


[Keiser presents logical/block Hebrew diagramming with parallel English homiletic outline as a valuable means of viewing and understanding the text. —— WDB]


[“GKC is still the only exhaustive research grammar of classical Hebrew in the English language. It is out of date in many areas and is a translation and revision of the German edition edited by Emil Kautzsch.” —— WDB]


[“This limited study demonstrates the significance of archaeological evidence in OT exegesis. By using the epigraphical evidence, Keel is able to provide the reader with visible illustrations.” —— WDB]

No handier volume is available for the interpretation of the minor masorah in BHS. It is held on reserve in the library for Paper #3.—WDB

“Although Page Kelley (1924–1997) died shortly before the completion of this book, his collaborators—Daniel Mynatt (Anderson College) and Timothy Crawford (Bluefield College)—were able to “complete the volume without his guiding hand” (p. xiv), since the bulk of the work, which represents the fruit of more than a decade of study in a graduate seminar, was done.”—Frederic Clarke Putnam, *JETS* 44, no. 1 (March 2001): 135.


[Of special interest is chapter 8, “Prolegomena to Exegesis.”—WDB]


See, also, the works by William W. Hallo and K. L. Younger, Jr., as well as Victor H. Matthews and Don C. Benjamin, Jr., above, and John H. Walton, below.—WDB


See the review in *MSJ* 17, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 126–28.—WDB


This annotated bibliography of commentaries is of greater value to the student of exegesis than the bibliography produced by Longman.—WDB


In 1998 I saw paperback reprints of this volume in Jerusalem. It is the best firsthand descriptive historical geography available in the English language. Smith has a way of making the reader visualize exactly what the setting looks like that is only conveyed in modern geographies and atlases by means of color photographs.—WDB


A resource for ready reference to define terms in the field of biblical interpretation. There is no other reference which would make this information available under one cover.—James Mays


See the review in *MSJ* 18, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 136–37.—WDB


This is the premier volume on its subject. It is the required textbook for TMS’s ThM course in OT textual criticism.—WDB


[See the review in *JSJ* 19, no. 1 (Spring 1998): 120–23.—WDB]


[See the review in *JSJ* 18, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 140–42.—WDB]


Yamauchi puts into proper perspective the nature and value of archaeological evidence to the interpretation of the Bible. Reading Chapter 4 (“Fragments and Circles: The Nature of the Evidence”) is a necessity for serious Bible students. — WDB


Reprinted articles from *Biblitheca Sacra* on major issues in OT studies. — WDB

### 8.2 Periodical Articles & Essays


Barrick, Hebrew Exegesis I: Course Syllabus


Barrick, Hebrew Exegesis I: Course Syllabus


Crim, Keith R. “Hebrew Direct Discourse as a Translation Problem.” Bible Translator 24, no. 3 (July 1973): 311–16.


Excellent example of the application of ANE backgrounds to the interpretation of the biblical text.—WDB


A brief survey of some of the archaeological contributions to OT Hebrew philology.—WDB

“Despite their small extent, the surviving Early Hebrew inscriptions serve as a constant reminder of how limited a picture the vocabulary of the Old Testament gives us of the range that the spoken language must have had.” (43)


Too often both translators and exeges ignore figures of speech and linguistic plays. The exegete must identify and explain these elements of the text if he wishes to understand it fully and if he wishes to convey it accurately to others.—WDB


The waw-consecutive/conversive controversy does affect exegesis. No matter what theory one holds on this issue, it is incumbent upon the exegete to give attention to the consecution/relation of tenses throughout a passage. Finley’s study should be considered a serious contender for a solution.

See article by Sasson, below.—WDB


Apart from minor editorial differences, this essay is substantially the same as the article in Bibliotheca Sacra 137, no. 548 (October–December 1980): 327–39. Geisler presents one of
the key areas of discussion regarding the nature of biblical truth: correspondence vs. intention. Must reading.—WDB


Goerling, Fritz. “Psalm 1: Analysis and Interpretation.” Notes on Translation 14, no. 3 (2000): 51–60. A superb example of a careful analysis of Psalm 1 that pays attention to all the nuances of the Hebrew text. The analysis of verse 1 is especially noteworthy.—WDB


Lawlor’s study of the narrative of 2 Samuel 10–12 on the basis of a structural analysis is a fitting companion article to Wendland’s on Habbakkuk.—WDB


When exegeting Isaiah 53, do not neglect this article.—WDB


This article illustrates a methodology of exegesis claiming to place emphasis upon the contextual analysis.—WDB


A concise study of Psalm 110.—WDB


Bible translations are reflective of the translator’s hermeneutics and theology. See Arichea’s article, also.—WDB


A good example of the detail involved in textual criticism. An excellent chart giving a hypothetical reconstruction of the corruption and preservation of Ps 22:17b is included in the article.—WDB


Wendland’s structural analysis of Habakkuk is an excellent model for the analysis of the Hebrew text preparatory to preaching. Such contextual/structural analysis is a vital part of the exegetical procedure.—WDB

Exegesis is a critical explanation or interpretation of a text, particularly a religious text. Traditionally the term was used primarily for work with the Bible; however, in modern usage biblical exegesis is used for greater specificity to distinguish it from any other broader critical text explanation. Exegesis includes a wide range of critical disciplines: textual criticism is the investigation into the history and origins of the text, but exegesis may include the study of the historical and how to say exegesis in Hebrew. What's the Hebrew word for exegesis? Here's how you say it. Hebrew Translation. פֵּרוּשׁ. More Hebrew words for exegesis. noun פֵּרוּשׁ. interpretation, commentary, explanation, construction, reading. I read a lot of comments on forums and other blogs, and have received emails from people asking questions about the difficulty of Semitic languages like Arabic and Hebrew. I’ve also shared the best available resources for learning various dialects here and here as well as the awesome audio content in Rocket Arabic (see my review here) for spoken Egyptian.