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GENERAL CLASS INFORMATION

Class Acronym: OTST520
Class Name: Introduction to Old Testament Theology
Semester & Year: Fall 2014
Class Location: Southwestern Adventist University Library
100 West Hillcrest
Keene, TX 76059
Class Dates: November 10–13, 2014 (Monday–Thursday)
Class Time/Day: Monday-Wednesday—8:00 am-12:00 pm; 1:00-6:00 pm
Thursday—8:00 am-12:00 pm; 1:00-5:30 pm; 7:00 to 9:00 pm
Credits offered: 3

INSTRUCTOR CONTACT DETAILS

Instructor: Jiří Moskala, Th.D., Ph.D.
Telephone: 269.471.3205
Email: moskala@andrews.edu
Secretary: Dorothy Show
E-mail: showd@andrews.edu

BULLETIN CLASS DESCRIPTION


OUTCOMES

MA in Pastoral Ministry (MAPMin)
Program Learning Outcomes (Final Exam: PO 1–3; 2 Book Reports: PO 1–3; Theological Paper/Sermon: PO 1–4)

1. Demonstrate proper biblical interpretation skills and application of biblical teachings.
2. Apply ethical principles in the context of the Seventh-day Adventist ministry.
3. Understand the historical-theological development of major SDA doctrines.
4. Prepare and deliver effective expository and prophetic sermons.
Student Learning Outcomes (Final Exam: SLO 2; 2 Book Reports: SLO 1–2; Theological Paper/Sermon: SLO 1–2)  

The student should be able to:  
1. Integrate the contents of OT Theology with personal experience.  
2. Make a practical application of class materials and personal research to pastoral ministry.

COURSE MATERIALS

Required Reading:  
A. Bible (Old Testament)  

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Class Requirements  
A. Regular attendance and participation.  
B. Study the elements provided in class.  
C. Required Reading  
   1. Pre-intensive: Hasel, Gerhard *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*  

E. Final Examination  
   A final exam will be given covering class lectures. **Date of the final exam: Thursday, November 13, 2014.**

D. Book Reaction Reports  
   Two written reading/reaction reports, each five to seven pages in length and typed (double spaced) on each required textbook.  
   • These reports will declare that all the materials related to the report have been read.  
   • Each report will present an evaluation of the reading. In this evaluation the student will address questions such as:  
     1) What is your overall impression of your reading—positive or negative?  
     2) What insights did you gain?  
     3) What areas did you find most helpful and why?  
     4) Which were disappointing and why?  
     5) What issues would you have liked to see the author(s) address?  
     6) What questions or difficulties arose from your reading?  
   • See reading/reaction report rubric on p. 5  
   • **The 2 reading/reaction reports are due by March 31, 2015.**

E. Sermon or Short Theological Paper  
   1. Sermon  
      Prepare a written 10–15 page (single spaced) sermon that will apply the theological message of any biblical text. Your sermon must contain at least one contemporary illustrations from real life. The sermon is due by **March 31, 2015.** See p. 7 for sermon rubric.
2. Research Paper
Prepare an 8–12 page theological research paper (single spaced) on a theological topic. Your topic must be approved by the instructor. The application of your main thought must be relevant. Your own position with reasons must be stated. Your research paper is due by March 31, 2015.

For the research paper, follow the step by step instructions provided (see p. 8 for “Guidelines for the Research Paper”). See p. 6 for research paper rubric.

---

**Credit-Hour Definitions**
For a three-credit course in a professional master’s program, the total hours of required work amounts to 135 hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Lectures</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Book Reports</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological Paper/Sermon</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Examinations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weighting of Course Assessment Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Item</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Book Reaction Reports</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological Paper/Sermon</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Examination</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grading Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100–94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>93–90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>86–82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>81–79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>75–71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>70–68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>89–87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>78–76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>67–60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assignment Submission**
E-mail the two reading/reaction reports (preferably in PDF format) and the sermon or short theological paper to Dr. Moskala (moskala@andrews.edu) and copy to his secretary Dorothy Show (showd@andrews.edu). Due date: March 31, 2015.

**Late Submission**
Assignments received by due date: (possible A grade)
Delay up to 60 days: (no better than an A- grade)
Delay up to 90 days: (no better than a B+ grade)
Delay up to 120 days: (no better than a B grade)
Delay up to 150 days: (no better than a C grade)
# RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING READING/REACTION REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exceptional (5)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (2–4)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impression:</strong></td>
<td>Overall Impression fully introduced and explored. Clear evidence of in-depth reflection.</td>
<td>Overall Impression adequately introduced and explored. Adequate evidence of in-depth reflection.</td>
<td>Little evidence given for Overall Impression and not adequately introduced and explored.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helpful Areas:</strong></td>
<td>Helpful Areas fully introduced and explored. Clear evidence of in-depth reflection. Page numbers for areas cited noted.</td>
<td>Helpful Areas adequately introduced and explored. Adequate evidence of in-depth reflection. Page numbers for areas cited noted.</td>
<td>Little evidence given for Helpful Areas and not adequately introduced and explored. Lacking page numbers for areas cited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disappointing Areas:</strong></td>
<td>Disappointing areas fully introduced and explored. Clear evidence of in-depth reflection. Page numbers for areas cited noted.</td>
<td>Disappointing areas adequately introduced and explored. Adequate evidence of in-depth reflection. Page numbers for areas cited noted.</td>
<td>Little evidence given for Disappointing Areas and not adequately introduced and explored. Lacking page numbers for areas cited.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions Raised:</strong></td>
<td>Questions or Difficulties fully introduced and explored. Clear evidence of in-depth reflection.</td>
<td>Questions or Difficulties adequately introduced and explored. Adequate evidence of in-depth reflection.</td>
<td>Little evidence given for Questions or Difficulties and not adequately introduced and explored.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points (6–30)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Rubric for Assessing Theological Research Paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Category</th>
<th>Exceeds Standard (5)</th>
<th>Good (3)</th>
<th>Does Not Meet Standard (1)</th>
<th>Absent (0)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 % Introduction</strong></td>
<td>The introduction is engaging, states the main topic and clearly previews the paper.</td>
<td>The introduction states the main topic but does not adequately preview the paper.</td>
<td>Unclear and convoluted introduction.</td>
<td>Out of 5</td>
<td>Out of 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 % Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Clearly and concisely states the paper’s purpose in a single sentence, which is engaging, and thought provoking.</td>
<td>The purpose is stated but is not succinct, not very clear and has more than one sentence.</td>
<td>The purpose is not clearly stated or not understandable.</td>
<td>Out of 5</td>
<td>Out of 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50 % Content</strong></td>
<td>Balanced presentation of relevant information that clearly supports the purpose. Thoughtful, in-depth analysis of the topic. Reader gains important insight.</td>
<td>Information is only partly related to the purpose. Some analysis of the topic. Reader gains some insight.</td>
<td>Information is disconnected from the purpose. Analysis is vague or confused. Reader gains no insight.</td>
<td>Out of 5</td>
<td>Out of 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15 % Organization</strong></td>
<td>The ideas are arranged logically to support the purpose, flowing smoothly from one to another and clearly linked to each other. The reader can follow the line of reasoning.</td>
<td>The ideas are arranged in a somewhat logical way, although occasionally they fail to make sense together. The reader is fairly clear about the writer’s intentions.</td>
<td>The writing is not logically organized. Ideas frequently fail to make sense. The reader cannot identify a line of reasoning and loses interest.</td>
<td>Out of 5</td>
<td>Out of 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 % Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>The conclusion is engaging, restates the purpose, concisely summarizes the paper and states the main conclusions.</td>
<td>The conclusion does not refer to the purpose. The main ideas and conclusions are somewhat logically arranged.</td>
<td>The conclusion is confusing, does not re-state the purpose, is incomplete or unfocused, and introduces new information.</td>
<td>Out of 5</td>
<td>Out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 % Mechanics</strong></td>
<td>No errors in spelling, capitalization or formatting. Clear headings and subheadings.</td>
<td>Some errors in spelling, capitalization or formatting. Headings and subheadings are generally clear.</td>
<td>Numerous and distracting errors in spelling, capitalization and formatting.</td>
<td>Out of 5</td>
<td>Out of 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 % Citation</strong></td>
<td>All cited works are presented in the correct format with no errors.</td>
<td>Cited works are presented in a mostly correct format. Inconsistencies somewhat evident.</td>
<td>Few cited works with inconsistent formatting.</td>
<td>Out of 5</td>
<td>Out of 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 % Bibliography</strong></td>
<td>Presented in the correct format with no errors. Includes more than 10+ major references (books and articles) but no more than two internet sites. Evidence that most references were used in text.</td>
<td>Presented in the correct format with some errors. Includes 5-10 major references but no more than 2 internet site. It is clear that some references were not used in text.</td>
<td>Many errors in formatting. Fewer than 4 major references, with some listed as internet sites. References are mostly unrelated to the text.</td>
<td>Out of 5</td>
<td>Out of 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total (out of 100)**

---

*Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exceptional (5)</th>
<th>Proficient (3–4)</th>
<th>Satisfactory(2)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory(1)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method:</strong></td>
<td>The exegetical method and the information given in the lectures are well understood, well integrated in the sermon, and carefully applied.</td>
<td>The exegetical method given in the lectures are well understood; they are well integrated in the sermon; yet, they are not carefully applied.</td>
<td>The exegetical method given in the lectures are well understood; yet, they are not well integrated in the sermon, and not carefully applied.</td>
<td>The exegetical method given in the lectures are not understood, not well integrated in the sermon, and not carefully applied.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong></td>
<td>The sermon’s title is compact, attractive, relevant to Christian experience, and reveals what the sermon is about.</td>
<td>The title is long, but attractive, relevant to Christian experience, and clear about the contents of the sermon.</td>
<td>The title is long, relevant to Christian experience, but unattractive.</td>
<td>The title is long, unattractive, and unclear about the contents of the sermon.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction:</strong></td>
<td>Confined to approximately 10% of the sermon’s duration. Is purposeful, friendly, personal, creative, and prepares the audience to receive the message. Clearly proposes what sermon is about.</td>
<td>Confined to approximately 10% of the sermon’s duration. Is purposeful, personal, but lacks creativity.</td>
<td>Introduction is purposeful, personal, and takes steps to engage the audience, but it is too long or too short.</td>
<td>Introduction is abrupt, impersonal, and purposeless.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure:</strong></td>
<td>Sermon’s main idea is explained using key concepts from the text (e.g., verbs, adjectives, etc.). Ideas are exceptionally defined and transitions between key points are smooth.</td>
<td>Sermon’s main ideas are headed using key concepts from the text. Ideas are well defined and transitions between key points are included.</td>
<td>Sermon’s main ideas are explained by key concepts from the text. Ideas are fairly defined and transitions between some key points are included.</td>
<td>Sermon’s main points are not drawn from the text. Uses ineffective transitions. Sermon ideas lack unity.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content:</strong></td>
<td>Subject well defined, insightful, biblically supported by the selected text, and exceptionally illustrated. Outstanding knowledge on the subject.</td>
<td>Subject is insightful, biblically supported by the selected text, well-illustrated, and shows proficient knowledge on the subject.</td>
<td>Subject is biblically supported by the selected text. Use of illustrations is satisfactory. Evidence of basic knowledge on the subject.</td>
<td>Subject is not supported by concepts from the selected text. Superficial knowledge of the subject.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion:</strong></td>
<td>Qualities: (1) Summarizes main sermon tenets; (2) exhorts listeners to live the message; (3) is positive and encouraging; (4) fosters faith and hope; (5) last sentences are well chosen and carefully worded; (6) makes a direct appeal; (7) confined to approximately 10% of the sermon’s duration.</td>
<td>Misses 1 of the 7 qualities. Summarizes main sermon tenets; (2) exhorts listeners to live the message; (3) is positive and encouraging; (4) fosters faith and hope; (5) last sentences are well chosen and carefully worded; (6) makes a direct appeal; (7) confined to approximately 10% of the sermon’s duration.</td>
<td>Misses 2–3 of the 7 qualities. Summarizes main sermon tenets; (2) exhorts listeners to live the message; (3) is positive and encouraging; (4) fosters faith and hope; (5) last sentences are well chosen and carefully worded; (6) makes a direct appeal; (7) confined to approximately 10% of the sermon’s duration.</td>
<td>Misses 4 or more of the 7 qualities. Summarizes main sermon tenets; (2) exhorts listeners to live the message; (3) is positive and encouraging; (4) fosters faith and hope; (5) last sentences are well chosen and carefully worded; (6) makes a direct appeal; (7) confined to approximately 10% of the sermon’s duration.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points (6–30)**

100%
GUIDELINES FOR THE RESEARCH PAPER

1. **Title**—crucial choice; it gives the main thought and flavor to the paper and tells what a reader can expect and look for.

2. **Table of contents**—very important item which shows the flow of thoughts; it must flow straight like a river; more detailed content is better for understanding of the development of the argument (fully developed and written at the end of the writing process).

3. **Introduction**—it must contain:
   a. **Statement of the problem**.
   b. **Purpose** of the study (intention)—significant questions have to be asked what to expect and what should be accomplished.
   c. **Methodology**—how the study will be conducted to get the final results.
   d. **History of Interpretation** (major studies).
   e. **Delimitation** of the study.

4. **Main Body** of the Study—logical steps (not all items must necessarily be included):
   1. **Step**—Choice of the text (5–10 verses)—**delimitation** of the text (justify the beginning and end of the passage) **translation** of the text
   2. **Step**—**Historical background** of the chosen book or/and passage (authorship, main persons, events, places, dates, archaeology).
   3. **Step**—**Literary context**: larger (general) context and immediate context
   4. **Step**—**Literary structure** of the selected passage.
   5. **Step**—**Literary genre**—narrative, poetry, prophecy, genealogy, parable, prayer, dream, irony, hymn, song, irony, dialogue, speech, etc.
   6. **Step**—**Content and grammatical study** of the text: key words, unique vocabulary, frequency, sentences, syntax, sounds, patterns, plot, intention of the text, main thoughts, play words, concepts, ideas, allusions, puns, specific features, repetitions, parallels, inclusio, rhythm, accents, rhetoric, etc.
   7. **Step**—**Theology and message** (relevancy and application with illustrations).

5. **Intertextuality**—how the chosen biblical text is used in the rest of the Old Testament and then in the New Testament.

6. **Summary and Conclusion**—need to match with the introduction; summary of the study may be provided; clear answers must be given to the research introductory questions (unique contribution(s) may be mentioned).

7. **Bibliography**—books and articles with full data.

**Please Note:** An excellent paper is always supplied with appropriate **footnotes** which are like windows to support what was stated in the text and provide additional material for

---

**CLASS POLICIES**

**Classroom Policy**
No recording of the lectures will be allowed.

**Disability Accommodations**
If you qualify for accommodation under the American Disabilities Act, please contact Student Success in Nethery Hall 100 (disabilities@andrews.edu or 269.471.6096) as soon as possible so that accommodations can be arranged.

**Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary**
Examinations
“Credit is not granted in courses unless the required examinations are completed by the student. Students are expected to follow the published examination schedule. In cases where the schedule requires a student to complete four exams in one day, arrangements may be made with the dean to complete one of the examinations at another time” (AU Bulletin).

Class Attendance
“Regular attendance at all classes, laboratories and other academic appointments is required for each student. Faculty members are expected to keep regular attendance records. The syllabus notifies students of the attendance requirements. (AU Bulletin).

Teacher Tardiness
“Teachers have the responsibility of getting to class on time. If a teacher is detained and will be late, the teacher must send a message to the class with directions. If after 10 minutes no message has been received, students may leave without penalty. If teacher tardiness persists, students have the right to notify the department chair, or if the teacher is the department chair, to notify the dean” (AU Bulletin).

Class Absences
“Whenever the number of absences exceeds 20% (10% for graduate classes) of the total course appointments, the teacher may give a failing grade. Merely being absent from campus does not exempt the student from this policy. Absences recorded because of late registration, suspension, and early/late vacation leaves are not excused. The class work missed may be made up only if the teacher allows. Three tardies are equal to one absence.

Registered students are considered class members until they file a Change of Registration form in the Office of Academic records” (AU Bulletin).

Excused Absences
“Excuses for absences due to illness are granted by the teacher. Proof of illness is required. Residence hall students are required to see a nurse on the first day of any illness which interferes with class attendance. Non-residence hall students should show written verification of illness obtained from their own physician. Excuses for absences not due to illness are issued directly to the dean’s office. Excused absences do not remove the student’s responsibility to complete all requirements of a course. Class work is made up by permission of the teacher” (AU Bulletin).

Academic Integrity
“In harmony with the mission statement (p.18), Andrews University expects that students will demonstrate the ability to think clearly for themselves and exhibit personal and moral integrity in every sphere of life. Thus, students are expected to display honesty in all academic matters.

Academic dishonesty includes (but is not limited to) the following acts: falsifying official documents; plagiarizing, which includes copying others’ published work, and/or failing to give credit properly to other authors and creators; misusing copyrighted material and/or violating licensing agreements (actions that may result in legal action in addition to disciplinary action taken by the University); using media from any source or medium, including the Internet (e.g., print, visual images, music) with the intent to mislead, deceive or defraud; presenting another’s work as one’s own (e.g. placement exams, homework, assignments); using material during a quiz or examination other than those specifically allowed by the teacher or program; stealing, accepting, or studying from stolen quizzes or examination materials; copying from another student during a regular or take-home test or quiz; assisting another in acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., falsifying attendance records, providing unauthorized course materials).

Andrews University takes seriously all acts of academic dishonesty. Such acts as described above are subject to incremental discipline for multiple offenses and severe penalties for some offenses. These acts are tracked in the office of the Provost. Repeated and/or flagrant offenses will be referred to the Committee for Academic Integrity for recommendations on further penalties. Consequences may include denial of admission, revocation of admission, warning from a teacher with or without formal documentation, warning from a chair...
or academic dean with formal documentation, receipt of a reduced or failing grade with or without notation of the reason on the transcript, suspension or dismissal from the course, suspension or dismissal from the program, expulsion from the university, or degree cancellation. Disciplinary action may be retroactive if academic dishonesty becomes apparent after the student leaves the course, program or university” (AU Bulletin).

INSTRUCTOR PROFILE

Jiří Moskala is professor of Old Testament exegesis and theology and dean of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary on the campus of Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. He joined the faculty in 1999.

Born in Český Těšín, Czech Republic, Moskala received a master of theology in 1979 and a doctor of theology in 1990, all from the Comenius Faculty of Protestant Theology (now Protestant Theological Faculty of Charles University), Czech Republic. His dissertation was entitled: “The Book of Daniel and the Maccabean Thesis: The Problem of Authorship, Unity, Structure, and Seventy Weeks in the Book of Daniel (A Contribution to the Discussion on Canonical Apocalyptic)” and was published in the Czech language.

In 1998, he completed his doctor of philosophy from Andrews University. His dissertation is entitled: “The Laws of Clean and Unclean Animals of Leviticus 11: Their Nature, Theology, and Rationale (An Intertextual Study)” and has been published under the same title.

Prior to coming to Andrews, Moskala served in various capacities (ordained pastor, administrator, and teacher) in the Czech Republic. At the end of 1989, after the Velvet Revolution when the Communist regime fell, he established the Theological Seminary for training pastors and became the first principal of the institution.

Dr. Moskala has served as a speaker in many important Bible conferences and Theological symposia in all thirteen divisions of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and has lectured in many leading SDA universities and colleges around the world.

He is a member of various theological societies (Adventist Society for Religious Studies, Adventist Theological Society, Chicago Society of Biblical Research, Society of Biblical Literature, and Society of Christian Ethics). Dr. Moskala has authored or edited a number of articles and books in the Czech and English languages. In addition, he has participated in several archaeological expeditions in Tell Jalul, Jordan.

Dr. Moskala enjoys listening to classical music, visiting art and archaeological museums, hiking, swimming in the world’s crystal-clear waters, and reading books on a variety of topics.

He is married to Eva Moskalova. They have five grown children (Andrea, Marcela, Petra, Daniel, and David), three sons-in-law (Michael, Jonathan, and Grigoriy), one daughter-in-law (Katie), two granddaughters (Zasha and Luccia), and two grandsons (Grigoriy IV and Darius).

RECOMMENDED BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR INTRODUCTION TO OT THEOLOGY


