

ASSEMBLIES OF GOD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Continuing Education Course
Valley Forge Christian College Branch Campus
Phoenixville, PA
April 24-28, 2006
9:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.
Reynolds Conference Room, VFCC Campus

HISB 549 HISTORY OF MODERN REVIVALS
(3 Credits)

Michael Di Giacomo, Ph.D.

Spring 2006

COURSE SYLLABUS

COURSE DESCRIPTION

An examination of the historical, theological, and spiritual dimensions of revivals in the modern era.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

Upon successful completion of this course the student should be able to:

1. identify and describe the significant revivals of Christian history since the Reformation.
2. identify key individuals involved in the more significant revivals.
3. recognize the principles and concepts associated with revival, revivalism, renewal, revitalization, and awakening.
4. write an historical analysis of what went into the making of the modern revitalization movements
5. identify and review the major authors that have contributed to the theories and historiography of revitalization movements

METHODOLOGY

Lectures, class presentations and discussion, personal readings and assignments. The professor will be presenting his own research on revivals and awakenings.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Pre-Session

1. **Three book reviews due on the first day of class.**

Choose any three books in the following bibliography that incorporates at least 600 pages of reading. Write a brief review of each book that should include:

- a. Full bibliographical information including the number of pages.
- b. Identify the author by briefly saying who he/she is, what his/her position (i.e. professor of history at Harvard University), and, if possible, another important work written by the author.
- c. Briefly present the structure and layout of the book including its main theme as well as sub-themes.
- d. Give the author's main goal or thesis in writing the book and his/her motive for writing the book.
- e. Summarize the evidence the author presents in support of the thesis.
- f. Comment on the style of the book, whether it was easy to read, logical, the impact of examples, the strength of the arguments and supporting evidence.
- g. Did the author do what he/she set out to do? Did he/she achieve his goal? Did anything surprise you about the book and its content? If so, what?
- h. What questions did the author set out to answer? Was he successful? Did he/she leave you with questions? Without wishing he had written a book another subject, was there anything that the author should have addressed but did not?
- i. Personal comments

See "How To Do a Book Review" here below for further guidelines in writing a book review.

Each book review should be about 5 pages long, double-spaced with 12-point Times New Roman font and one inch margins. Each student will present his reviews in class at a time to be determined so that the whole class can benefit from the students' readings. To insure that no two students review the same book each student should obtain the professor's approval of their choice of books. The approval will be given on a first-come-first-served basis. Each book review will be worth 10% of the final grade. The oral presentations of the reviews will be worth 10%.

Books not in the bibliography may be chosen but subject to the approval of the professor.

2. A research essay of at least 20 pages, excluding table of contents and bibliography/works cited page, worth 50% of the final mark on any revival movement in Modern Christianity, that is, since the Protestant Reformation of the 16th century.

N.B. Sessions will be set aside for each student to present their ideas to the class regarding their research project to get suggestions and feedback. It is recommended that students begin thinking about their research paper before the beginning of class and to formulate a written research proposal.

Presentations of the research projects will be made toward the end of the week and therefore the student will have time to work on their proposal during the week of classes. The proposal should be no longer than two pages and should include the topic, the thesis statement or main question, and a preliminary outline of the paper. The guide below may be used for the preparation of the proposal. The proposal should also include on a third page of sources used in preparing the proposal. The list of sources should include full bibliographical data. The written proposal and oral presentation is worth 10% of the final grade.

Post-Session

The completed research paper must be received by the professor by **Friday 30 June, 2006** an e-mail attachment in Word or RTF format.

The bibliography in the completed research paper should include only those sources actually used for the paper. There must be at least 10 sources only two of which can be an internet source and at least two must be primary sources. The bibliography must be annotated. That means that it must include full bibliographical information including the number of pages, a brief synopsis of the resource, a brief description of the relevant material and a brief comment on why the resource was useful for your research paper (see <http://www.library.cornell.edu/okuref/research/skill28.htm> on how to prepare an annotated bibliography).

Include with the research paper on a separate sheet of paper a bibliographic reading report noting down books/journals/websites/etc. read and the number of pages read in each source (200 words on a web page equals one page of text). At least 900 pages of reading should be incorporated for this research project.

SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 1. Three Reviews | 30% (due on the first day of class) |
| 2. Presentation of Reviews | 10% (due date TBD) |
| 3. Research Proposal | 10% (due date TBD) |
| 4. Research Paper | 50% (due <u>Friday 30 June, 2006</u>) |

NOTE: A \$30.00 fee will be charged to the student's account for every grade change even if the instructor has approved an extension for completing the work. Any exception to the policy will be made by the registrar.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armstrong, Maurice W., *The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia 1776-1809*, Hartford: American Society of Church History, 1948, 141p.

Blumhofer, Edith L. and Randall Balmer, eds. *Modern Christian Revivals*, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1993, 232p.

Boles, John B., *The Great Revival, 1787-1805: The Origins of the Southern Evangelical Mind*, University Press of Kentucky, 1972, 236p.

Conkin, Paul Keith, *Cane Ridge, America's Pentecost*, Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990, 186p.

Cox, Harvey. *Fire From Heaven: The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-first Century*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1995.

- Dieter, Melvin E., *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*, Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1980, 356p.
- Edwards, Jonathan, *A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God*, Grand Rapids, Mich. : Baker Book House, 1979, 101p.
- Evans, Eifion, *Fire in the Thatch: The True Nature of Religious Revival*, Wales: Evangelical Press of Wales, 1996, 234p.
- Finney, Charles G., *Principles of Revival*, Minneapolis, Minn.: Bethany House Publishers, 1987, 216p.
- _____, *Revivals of Religion*, Fleming H. Revell Co. (originally published as *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*, New York, 1835), n.d., 534p.
- _____, *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*, New York : F. H. Revell, 1868, 445p.
- Goen, C.G. (ed.), *The Great Awakening*, in "The Works of Jonathan Edwards," vol. 4, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972, 595p.
- Koch, Kurt E., *The Revival in Indonesia*, Winona Lake, Ind.: Spanish-World Gospel Broadcasting, 1970, 310p.
- Lambert, Frank, *Pedlar in Divinity : George Whitefield and the Transatlantic Revivals, 1737-1770*, Princeton University Press, 1994, 238p.
- Lloyd-Jones, David Martyn, *Revival*, Westchester, Ill.: Crossway Books, 1987, 316p.
- Long, Kathryn, *The Revival of 1857-58 : Interpreting an American Religious Awakening*, New York : Oxford University Press, 1998, 256p.
- Martin, Larry. *The Topeka Outpouring of 1901: Eyewitness Accounts of the Revival that Birthed the Twentieth Century Pentecostal/Charismatic Movements*. Joplin, Mo.: Christian Life Books, 1997.
- McLoughlin, William G., *Revivals, Awakenings, and Reform: An Essay on Religion and Social Change in America*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978, "Chicago History of American Religion" series, edited by Martin E. Marty, 239p.
- _____, *Modern Revivalism: Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham*, New York: Ronald Press, 1959, 551p.

- Murray, Iain Hamish, *Revival and Revivalism: The Making and Marring of American Evangelicalism 1750-1858*, Edinburgh : Banner of Truth Trust, 1994, 455p.
- Orr, J. Edwin, *Evangelical Awakenings in the South Seas*, Bethany House Publishers, 1981, 245p.
- _____, *Event of the Century*, Richard Owen Roberts Publishers, 1989, 383p.
- Phillips, Thomas, *The Welsh Revival: Its Origin and Development*, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1989, 147p.
- Pratney, Winkie, *Revival: Principles to Change the World*, Springdale, PA. : Whitaker House, 1983, 320p.
- Rawlyk, George, *Ravished by the Spirit: Religious Revivals, Baptists and Henry Alline*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1984, 176p.
- _____, *Wrapped Up in God: A Study of Several Canadian Revivals and Revivalists*, Burlington: Welch, 1988, 168p.
- Riss, Richard M., *A Survey of 20th-Century Revival Movements in North America*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988, 202p.
- Stark, Rodney, *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival, and Cult Formation*, University of California Press, 1985, 571p.
- Willis, Avery T., *Indonesian Revival: Why Two Million Came to Christ*, South Pasadena, Calif. : William Carey Library, 1977, 263p.

SPECIFIC DATA

Syllabus prepared by Michael Di Giacomo February 1, 2006.

Evaluating the Research Papers

Richard Marius, *A Short Guide to Writing About History*. (3d or 4th edition. New York: Longman, 1999/2002) is strongly recommended as a resource book for the research paper. The review and the research paper should be double-spaced, written with 12-point Times New Roman font, with one-inch margins. Please do not use bold text except occasionally for emphasis. Points will be deducted for spelling and grammar. Papers will be marked on the correct use of research methods, the relevancy of sources, clear and logical argumentation, and originality of the work. (source: web.uvic.ca/~gradean/ta7.html)

A Paper

A paper of this level displays a mastery of the information and the theoretical context in which it is presented. It contains original thought expressed fluently and written with a style distinguished by its freshness and clarity. The argument is sound, substantive, organized, introduces other points of view and uses proper sources effectively. One is impressed by the author's contribution to the understanding of the topic and where the subject is going.

B Paper

The author demonstrates a substantial knowledge of the information and theoretical concepts associated with the subject. The paper is well written and presented with no serious flaws, a good use of sources and a clear thesis. The argument is above average in organization and analysis and brings in points to support the thesis. There is an awareness of different points of view. The conclusion is sound but not original. Generally, the paper is competent but not extraordinary.

C Paper

The author demonstrates an acceptable grasp of the material and awareness of the sources and general theory. The organization is logical and the style follows proper form, although there may be some lapses in each aspect. The paper would be best described as descriptive because it lacks any substantial analysis, and demonstrates a modest ability to work with the material critically. One senses the author does not fully understand the issues of the subject because the ideas are shallow, undeveloped, and tend to stray from the subject.

D Paper

The author shows a familiarity with the subject, but not an understanding of it. He or she lacks the writing or communication skill to intelligibly relate what knowledge has been comprehended. The paper is disorganized, lacks structure, and the ideas are undeveloped. There is no evidence of substantial thought.

F Paper

The author is without any writing skill. Grammar and spelling errors dominate and disguise the lack of organization. The ideas are unrelated to the subject and reveal a complete misunderstanding of the task.

Evaluation Grid for Research Papers

Papers are evaluated on the correct use of research methods, the relevancy of sources, clear and logical argumentation, and originality of the work. The following evaluation grid is used.

15% for general presentation (title page, table of contents, grammar, cleanliness, quality of sources)

15% for the introduction (presentation of the subject, good thesis statement or main question, clarity and precision of the research problem)

10% for the quality of reasoning (the chapters, paragraphs, and ideas follow in logical order)

50% for the content (development, clarity, coherence of the argument, the relevancy and use of sources, originality, difficulty of subject matter)

10% for the conclusion

N.B. One percentage point will be deducted for every five spelling mistakes. A paper with an *excessive* number of spelling or grammar mistakes will receive a 0 grade.

Research Paper Proposal

The following questions may be used as a guideline in preparing a research paper proposal.

1. What is your topic and tentative title?
2. What is your goal, or main question, or thesis statement?
3. Why are you interested in the topic?
4. Why is the topic worth researching and writing about?
5. Outline how you are going to develop your argument in order to prove your thesis statement.
6. Justify your outline or plan and your line of reasoning.
7. What are the sources that you will use in developing your paper?

How To Do a Book Review

(Source: Richard Marius, *A Short Guide to Writing History*. 3d edition. Reading, MA: Longman, 1999, pp.175-7)

Reviewing books is an essential part of the historian's profession. Reviewing books is also a good way to train yourself in understanding how the discipline of history works. Before you begin, look at journals that carry book reviews about the period and the region you are studying. Almost all journals in history carry book reviews, some of them long essays. An hour or two spent in the periodical room of your library reading reviews will help you understand the form and imitate it in your own review. If you find several scholarly reviews of the book you are reviewing yourself, you may learn a great deal about the book and its author, and you will also see issues you might choose to write about.

Remember! Fundamental honesty requires you to say so if you take something from a review that someone else has written of the book you are reviewing for your course.

Here are some pointers that will help you write good reviews.

1. Always give the author's major theme, his or her motive for writing the book. You will most often find that motive expressed in the preface, which you should always read. It is a good idea to read the preface, the introduction, and the last chapter of a book before you read the complete work. By reading the last chapter, you see where the author is heading as you read the rest of the book. One of my students once pounded the table and shouted "NO," when I said he should read the last chapter first. I told him history books are not novels, and he seemed mollified.
2. Summarize briefly the evidence the author presents.
3. Identify the author, but don't waste time on needless or extravagant claims about him or her. It is a cliché to say that the author is "well qualified" to write a book.
4. Avoid lengthy comments about the style of the book. It's fine to say that the style is good, bad, interesting, or tedious. If a book is especially well written or if it is incomprehensible, you may quote a sentence to illustrate a good or bad style, but don't belabor the point.
5. Avoid generalizations such as, "This book is interesting," or "This book is boring." If you do your job in the review, readers can tell whether you find it interesting or boring. And remember, if you are bored, the fault may be in you rather than the book. I still recall my Ancient History professor at the University of Tennessee, who, when I said reading Plutarch bored me, declared sternly, "Mr. Marius, you have no right to be bored with Plutarch." He was right.
6. Avoid passionate attacks on the book. Scholarship is not always courteous, but it should be. Reviewers who launch savage attacks on books usually make fools of themselves. They may even win friends for the book they seek to demolish.
7. Don't feel compelled to say negative things about the book. If you find inaccuracies, say so, and if you disagree with the writer's interpretation here and there, say that, too, giving your reasons in a civil tone. Remember that petty complaints about the book make you

look foolish or unfair. Don't waste time pointing out typos unless they change the meaning the author intends.

8. Judge the book- the author has written. You may wish the author had written a different book-. You might write a different book yourself. But the author has written *this* book. If the book did not need to be written, if it adds nothing to our knowledge of the field, if it makes conclusions unwarranted by the evidence, say so. But don't review the book as if it should be another book.
9. Always remember that every good book has flaws. The author may make some minor errors in fact or some questionable judgments. Even so, the book may be extremely valuable. Don't condemn a book outright because you find some mistakes. Try to judge the book as a whole.
10. Try to bring something from your own experience - your reading, your thoughts, your reflections, your recollections - to the book. Try to make use of a broad part of your education when you review a book. If you have read other books in other classes that are relevant to this class, say something about those books in your re-view. If you know facts the author has overlooked, say so.
11. Avoid writing as if you possess independent knowledge of the author's subject when in fact you have taken all you know from the book itself. Don't pretend to be an expert when you are not. Be honest.
12. Quote selectively but fairly from the book you are reviewing. Quotations give some sense of the tone of the book. They may express thoughts in a sharp and pungent way. The prose of the author you review may help spice up your own review.
13. Avoid long chunks of quotation. You must show your readers that you have absorbed the book you review. If you give them too many long quotations, they may suppose you are asking them to do the reflection and analysis you should have done yourself.
14. Read the book. That may be the most important advice about writing a book review. Now and then even professional historians don't read the books they review in journals. You can see their errors when outraged authors write to protest. Don't let that happen to you!