

**THEO5951- Selected Topics on Biblical Studies II:  
Jesus' Personality Traits in the Gospel of Matthew  
Course Outline  
(BD 3-5, MTh, & DTh)**

---

Lecturer: Dr. Kanny Chou / choukanny@yahoo.com.hk  
Period: Summer Term: 14 May – 29 June (two meetings per week)  
Lectures: Tuesdays 6:30 pm - 9:15pm, WMY 407  
            Fridays 6:30 pm - 9:15pm, WMY 306  
Language: Cantonese plus articles in English

I. Aim of the course

The main purpose of the course is to help students become familiar with the Jesus' personality traits in the Gospel of Matthew. This course invites you to investigate the image of Jesus' humanity as crafted in the Gospel of Matthew. We will discuss and discover the frustrations, struggles and disappointments of Jesus in Matthew's narrative.

You are expected to read, discuss, and write about some related articles discussed among NT scholars nowadays. Learning takes place as you develop a passion for contemplating widely and deeply about the image of Jesus as a human according to Matthew's narrative. Participating students are expected to do some personal exegetical work with the aid of some of the major commentaries.

II. Learning Outcome

A) Knowledge Outcomes:

To give students a general understanding the text of the Jesus' personality traits in the Gospel of Matthew, the methods of studies and the issues involved.

B) Attitude Outcomes

To invite students' appreciation of the diversities of interpret the image of Jesus as a human. In addition, to develop students' ability to have a critical, yet sympathetic understanding of the Gospel of Matthew.

III. Learning Activities

A) Lectures:

There will be regular two lectures each week. Each lecture counts. Everyone is expected to contribute the discussion in a spirit of collaborative learning.

B) Presentations:

There will be class presentation by participating students, in which each student has the opportunity to give a presentation of a selected article. The exact schedule will be finalized in the third lecture after all participants will have confirmed their status of joining the class.

C) Tutorials:

Tutorials are used for discussing issues related to the reading assignments. Students are expected to participate actively. The last 40 minutes of each class will normally serve the purpose.

IV. Class Schedule

The lectures of the course are listed in the following table. Besides lectures, students are required to participate in tutorials, where they will discuss a selected article for presentation. Details of the class schedule are as follows:

Lecture	Date	Content (To be confirmed)	Tutorial: Reading Assignment RA #	Presentations
<b>1</b>	14 May	背景與簡介		
<b>2</b>	17 May	耶穌的出生敘事		
<b>3</b>	21 May	歷史耶穌		
<b>4</b>	24 May	耶穌的旅程一		
<b>5</b>	28 May	耶穌的旅程二	RA #: 1	Presentation 1
<b>6</b>	31 May	耶穌的教導	RA #: 2	Presentation 2
<b>7</b>	4 Jun	耶穌的神蹟奇事	RA #: 3	Presentation 3
-	7 Jun	端午節假期		
<b>8</b>	11 Jun	耶穌的性情特徵一	RA #: 4	Presentation 4
<b>9</b>	14 Jun	耶穌的性情特徵二	RA #: 5	Presentation 5
<b>10</b>	18 Jun	耶穌的人際關係一	RA #: 6	Presentation 6
<b>11</b>	21 Jun	耶穌的人際關係二	RA #: 7	Presentation 7
<b>12</b>	25 Jun	耶路撒冷事件	RA #: 8	Presentation 8
<b>13</b>	28 Jun	整合：一個有血有肉的耶穌	RA #: 9	Presentation 9

V. Reading Assignments (have pdf files available)

1. Wayne G. Rollins (羅林斯), "What is Psychological Biblical Criticism?," in *Soul and Psyche: The Bible in Psychological Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999, 91-114.
2. D. Andrew Kille (基爾), "Psychological Biblical Criticism: Questions, History, and Methods.," in *Psychological Biblical Criticism*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001, 5-37.
3. (A) Rudolf Bultmann (布特曼), "Is Exegesis without Presupposition Possible?" in

Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann, Schubert M. Ogden selected, translated and introduced. New York: Meridian, 1960. 197-200.

(B) Lesile J. Francis & Jeff Astley (弗朗西斯及阿斯特利), "The Quest for the Psychological Jesus: Influences of Personality on Images of Jesus" in Journal of Psychology and Christianity, Vol 16(3), 1997: 247-259.

4. Mark Allan Powell (鮑威爾), "The Magi as Wise Men: Reexamining a Basic Supposition" in New Testament Studies 46.1. January 2000: 1-20.
5. Bas van Os (巴斯車鐵), "Psychological Method and Historical Jesus: The Contribution of Psychobiography," in The HTS Theological Studies, vol. 63(1), 2007, 327-346.
6. Deirdre Good (古迪), 'The Verb ἀναχωρέω in Matthew's Gospel' in Novum Testamentum 32, 1 (1990), 1-12.
7. Jack Dean Kingsbury (金斯伯里), "The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Literacy-Critical Probe", in The Journal for the Study of the New Testament, 21 (1984), 3-36.
8. William McKinley Runyan (魯尼恩), "Introduction & Alternative Accounts of Lives" in The Life Histories and Psychobiography: Explorations in Theory and Method. Oxford: Oxford, 1982, 1-37.
9. David McCracken (麥克拉肯), "Character in the Boundary: Bakhtin's Interdividuality in Biblical Narratives," Semeia 63 (1993): 29-42.

#### VI. Assessment: (Based on the Grading Rubrics System in Appendix 2)

##### Lecture Participation:

- Presentation 20%
- Tutorial Participation 20%

##### Submitted Papers:

- Comparison Essay 20% (within 2 pages)  
Option A: Compare infancy narrative between Matthew and Luke  
Option B: Compare passion narrative between Matthew and John
- Term Paper Title 10% (within 1 page, due by noon 14 June 2019)  
With Table of Content, Introduction, Conclusion and Bibliography.
- Term Paper 30% (within 4,000 words, due by noon 12 July 2019)

\*Deduction of marks applies to late submission, each day 2 marks (out of 100).\*

##### Academic Honesty:

CUHK has a policy of zero-tolerance for plagiarism. At every step of your writing, distinguish between borrowed ideas/expressions and those of your own. Failing to do so may result in disciplinary actions. See:

<http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/policy/academichonesty/>

[http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/clear/tnl/acad\\_honesty.html](http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/clear/tnl/acad_honesty.html)

Term paper must first be turned in to VeriGuide before submission to the teacher, or it will not be marked.

[https://academic.veriguide.org/academic/login\\_CUHK.aspx](https://academic.veriguide.org/academic/login_CUHK.aspx)

\*\*Note. Grading Rubric assessment will be adopted in the course. Expectations on overall student performance for each grade in the assessment scale is detailed in the “Grade Descriptors.” The assessment criteria for each assessment component are laid out in the corresponding “Grading Rubric.” Please see Appendix 1 to 3 for details. \*\*

## VII. Bibliography Selected

- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic, 1981.
- Beilby, James K. & Paul Rhodes Eddy. Edited. *The Historical Jesus: Five Views*. NY: InterVarsity, 2009.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on The Infancy Narratives in The Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Die Geschichte Der Synoptischen Tradition*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, <sup>5</sup>1958 (= *The History of The Synoptic Tradition*. John Marsh translated. Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1963).
- Capps, Donald. “A Psychobiography of Jesus.” In *Psychology and the Bible: A New Way to Read the Scriptures*. Vol 4. J. Ellens & Wayne Rollins edited. Westport: Praeger, 2004: 58-70.
- Carter, Warren. *The Roman Empire and the New Testament: An Essential Guide*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2006.
- Charlesworth, James H. “Psychobiography: A New and Challenging Methodology in Jesus Research.” In *Psychology and the Bible: A New Way to Read the Scriptures*. Vol. 4. J. Harold Ellens & Wayne G. Rollins edited. Westport: Praeger, 2004: 21-56.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Davies, W.D. & Dale C. Allison, Jr. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vol. I-III. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988.
- Dunn, James D.G. *Jesus Remembered*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2003.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. New York: Oxford University, 1997.
- Hooker, Morna D. *Endings: Invitations to Discipleship*. London: SCM, 2003.
- James, William. *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature*. Lexington: Seven Treasures, 2009; original 1902.
- Kille, D. Andrew. *Psychological Biblical Criticism*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Kingsbury, Jack D. *Matthew as Story*. Philadelphia: Fortress, <sup>2</sup>1988.
- Malina, Bruce J. & Richard L. Rohrbaugh. *Social Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- McCracken, David. “Character in the Boundary: Bakhtin's Interdividuality in Biblical Narratives.” *Semeia* 63. 1993: 29-42.
- Miller, John W. *Jesus at Thirty: A Psychological and Historical Portrait*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.
- Perrin, Norman. *What is Redaction Criticism?* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
- Powell, Mark Allan. “The Magi as Wise Men: Reexamining a Basic Supposition.” In *New Testament Studies* 46.1. January 2000: 1-20.
- Powell, Mark Allan. *What is Narrative Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.



- Reimarus, Hermann Samuel. „*Von dem Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger*“, Braunschweig: 1778 (= *The Goal of Jesus and His Disciples*, Introduction and translation by George W. Buchanan, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970).
- Rollins, Wayne G. *Soul and Psyche: The Bible in Psychological Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
- Runyan, William McKinley. *The Life Histories and Psychobiography: Explorations in Theory and Method*. Oxford: Oxford, 1982.
- Sanders, E. P. & Margaret Davies. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*. London: SCM, 1989.
- Sanders, E. P. *The Historical Figures of Jesus*. London: Penguin, 1995.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Psychiatric Study of Jesus*. Charles R. Joy translated. Boston: The Beacon, <sup>2</sup>1948; German original 1913.
- Schweitzer, Albert. Von Reimarus zu Wrede: Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung, Tübingen: Mohr, 1906 (= *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: First Complete Edition*. William Montgomery translated. John Bowden edited. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001).
- Tatum, W. Barnes. *In Quest of Jesus*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1999.
- Theissen, Gerd. *Das Neue Testament: Geschichte, Literatur, Religion*, Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2002 (= *The New Testament: History, Literature, Religion*. John Bowden translated. London: T&T Clark, 2003)
- 鄧雅各(James Dunn)著。周健文譯：《耶穌新觀－尋索歷史耶穌的盲點》。香港：香港中文大學崇基學院神學院，2007。

Others 其他參考書目：

- Aland, Kurt. Edited. *Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek-English Edition of the Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, on the Basis of the Greek Text of Nestle – Aland 27th Edition and Greek New Testament 4th Revised Edition, the English Text is the 2nd Edition of the Revised Standard Version. Stuttgart: German Bible Society, <sup>12</sup>2001.
- Benner, David & Peter Hill. Edited. *Baker Encyclopedia of Psychology & Counseling*. Grand Rapids: Baker, <sup>2</sup>1999.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, <sup>9</sup>1984, 1948 (= *Theology of the New Testament: Complete in One Volume*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955).
- Ferguson, E., M. P. McHugh & F. W. Norris. Edited. *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. New York & London: Garland, 1990.
- Freedman, David Noel, Gary A. Herion, David F. Graf & John David Pleins. Edited. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

## Appendix 1: Grade Descriptors<sup>1</sup>

A / A-	<p><b>Introspective performance:</b> <i>Outstanding</i> performance on all (or almost all) learning outcomes. Students demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>thorough</i> understanding and <i>critical</i> interpretation and application of the course material;</li> <li>- <i>substantial</i> evaluation of ideas or theories from multiple perspectives with the support of relevant information;</li> <li>- <i>well-informed</i> judgment/personal views</li> <li>- <i>perceptive</i> reflections on issues concerned and <i>active engagement</i> with differences</li> </ul>
B+ / B / B-	<p><b>General performance:</b> <i>Substantial</i> performance on some learning outcomes. Students demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>adequate</i> understanding and <i>appropriate</i> interpretation and application of the course material;</li> <li>- <i>good</i> evaluation of ideas or theories from multiple perspectives with the support of relevant information;</li> <li>- <i>informed</i> judgment/personal views</li> <li>- <i>unbiased</i> reflections on issues concerned and <i>evident attempts</i> to appreciate differences</li> </ul>
C+ / C / C-	<p><b>Inconsistent performance:</b> <i>Satisfactory</i> performance on some learning outcomes with a few weaknesses. Students demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>basic</i> understanding of the course material;</li> <li>- <i>attempts</i> to evaluate ideas and theories but with <i>omissions of some crucial perspectives and information</i>;</li> <li>- <i>inadequately supported</i> judgment/personal views on most occasions, and</li> <li>- <i>tendentious</i> reflections on issues concerned and <i>some attempts</i> to appreciate differences</li> </ul>
D+ / D	<p><b>Incompetent performance:</b> <i>Barely</i> satisfactory performance on a number of learning outcomes. Students demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>limited</i> evidence of comprehending the course material;</li> <li>- <i>major difficulties</i> in evaluating ideas and theories from appropriate <i>perspectives</i> and identifying appropriate <i>information</i>;</li> <li>- <i>mostly unfounded</i> judgment/personal views;</li> <li>- <i>superficial</i> reflections on issues concerned; and</li> <li>- <i>minimal</i> attempts to appreciate difference</li> </ul>
F	<p><b>Failed performance:</b> <i>Unsatisfactory</i> performance on the majority of learning outcomes, OR failure to meet specified assessment requirement. Students demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>confusion</i> over or <i>fundamental misrepresentation</i> of the course material;</li> <li>- <i>very little or no intention</i> to evaluate different ideas or theories;</li> <li>- <i>very little or no attempt</i> to formulate personal views; and</li> <li>- <i>very little or no attempt</i> to reflect on issues concerned; and</li> <li>- <i>very little or no attempt</i> to appreciate differences.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Grade Descriptors and Grade Rubric of Appendix 1 to 3 are based on the Criterion-referenced assessment developed by General Education office, CUHK.

**Appendix 2: Grading Rubric for Essay/Term Paper:**

		A / A-	B+ / B / B-	C+ / C / C-	D+ / D	F
<b>Thinking &amp; Reasoning (70%)</b>	<b>Understanding &amp; Interpretation</b>	<b>Excellent understanding</b> of the course material; <b>fully</b> aware of the complexities and multiple ways of interpreting in relation to the question	<b>Adequate understanding</b> of the course material with no major omission; <b>adequately</b> aware of the complexities and multiple ways of interpreting in relation to the question	<b>Insufficient understanding</b> of the course material with minor omissions; <b>weakly</b> aware of the complex and multiple ways of interpreting	course material read from <b>one received perspective only</b>	<b>No</b> evidence of understanding of the course material; <b>lacks</b> sense of purpose
	<b>Contextualization</b>	<b>All</b> contexts relevant to the question carefully evaluated	Awareness of <b>all or most</b> of the contexts relevant to the question	Awareness of <b>some</b> of the contexts <b>with omissions</b>	Answer based on <b>one</b> context with <b>serious omissions</b>	<b>Not</b> addressing the question
	<b>Analysis &amp; Synthesis</b>	Presents a <b>focused</b> topic; synthesizes <b>relevant</b> evidence to contribute to the understanding of the topic; draws a <b>fully logical and specific</b> conclusion	Presents a <b>fairly</b> focused topic; synthesizes <b>relevant</b> evidence to contribute to the understanding of the topic; draws a <b>basically logical and specific</b> conclusion	Topic identified but <b>inadequately</b> explained; deals with <b>some relevant</b> evidence but fails to examine their inter-relation; draws a <b>weakly supported</b> conclusion	A topic <b>barely</b> identifiable; presents <b>irrelevant</b> information that barely substantiate as evidence; draws an <b>unsupported</b> conclusion	<b>No</b> attempt to tackle the question; conclusion <b>illogical</b>
	<b>Attitude</b>	Explores a topic <b>in depth</b> , showing <b>intense</b> curiosity and interest	Explores a topic with <b>some depth</b> , showing <b>some</b> curiosity and interest	Explores a topic only at the <b>surface</b> showing <b>mild</b> interest	<b>Little</b> evidence of curiosity and interest	<b>No</b> evidence of curiosity and interest
<b>Language &amp; Format (30%)</b>	<b>Language</b>	<b>Distinctively</b> clear and fluent	<b>Generally</b> clear and fluent	<b>Occasional</b> lack of fluency and clarity	<b>Persistent</b> lack of fluency and clarity	Language <b>barely</b> communicates
		<b>Free from or a few</b> errors in grammar	<b>Minor</b> errors in grammar	<b>Some</b> errors in grammar and word usage	<b>Riddled with</b> errors in grammar and word usage	<b>Many</b> errors that form a series of obstacle to the reader's comprehension
	<b>Format</b>	<b>Excellent</b> control of diction	<b>Good</b> control of diction	<b>Fair</b> control of diction	Diction <b>careless and inaccurate</b>	<b>Almost no</b> attention to diction
		<b>Excellent</b> organization; ideas and argument elaborated in a <b>systematic way at all time</b>	<b>Good</b> organization; ideas and argument elaborated in a <b>mostly systematic</b> way	<b>Fair</b> organization; ideas and argument elaborated <b>with some errors</b>	<b>Little</b> attention to organization; ideas and argument elaborated but <b>with major errors</b>	<b>Almost no</b> attention to organization; ideas and argument are listed but <b>not elaborated or related</b> to focus
		Clear and accurate citations <sup>1</sup>	Adequately accurate and clear citations on most occasions	Some citations are incomplete or inaccurate	Many citations are incomplete and/or inaccurate	On most occasions citations are missing

<sup>1</sup> All sources are included in a list of references and/or footnotes; demonstrates full awareness of the credibility of such sources.

**Appendix 3: Grading Rubric for Presentation / Tutorial Participation:**

**Grading Rubrics for Presentation**

	<b>Grade A</b>	<b>Grade B</b>	<b>Grade C</b>	<b>Grade D</b>	<b>Grade F</b>
<b>Articulation and Communication</b>	Arguments and views are clearly and fluently articulated	<i>Most of the time</i> arguments and views are clearly and fluently articulated	Some arguments and views are identified but shows difficulties in articulating them	Some arguments and views are <i>occasionally</i> identified but shows difficulties in articulating them	Shows serious difficulties in articulating arguments and views, and the meaning is <i>rarely</i> clear
<b>Intellectual Performance</b>	<i>Consistently</i> demonstrates a <i>thorough</i> understanding of course materials	Shows a <i>sufficient</i> understanding of course materials	Shows <i>basic</i> understanding of course materials	Shows <i>limited/minimal</i> understanding of course materials	Does not attend class, or demonstrates <i>little or no</i> understanding of course materials

**Grading Rubrics for Tutorial Participation**

	<b>Grade A</b>	<b>Grade B</b>	<b>Grade C</b>	<b>Grade D</b>	<b>Grade F</b>
<b>Articulation and Communication</b>	Attentively listens to others' presentation, as indicated by comments that build on others' views; and <i>always</i> initiates contributions	<i>Most of the time</i> attentively listens to others' presentation; and <i>occasionally</i> initiates contributions.	<i>Occasionally</i> distracted from the discussion	<i>Frequently</i> distracted from the discussion; <i>occasionally</i> involved with side activities disruptive to the discussions	Does not listen or pay attention when others are presenting; <i>frequently</i> involved with side activities disruptive to or obstruct the discussions
<b>Intellectual Performance</b>	<i>Always</i> provides insightful analyses; raises new perspectives and/or critical points that advances and deepens discussions	<i>Occasionally</i> provides new insight and raises new perspectives and/or critical points that advances and deepens discussions	Comments are reasonably constructive	Paraphrases relevant concepts only; <i>occasionally</i> makes attempts to provide comments	<i>No intention</i> to give contribution