Course Syllabus

WINTER 2016
PENTECOSTAL THEOLOGY
PENT 0505

5 FRIDAYS, 9:00 AM – 4:00 PM
JAN 22, FEB 5, FEB 19, MAR 4, and APR 8

INSTRUCTOR: DR. PETER NEUMANN
Assistant Academic Dean, Master’s Pentecostal Bible College
Email: peter.neumann@mcs.edu; pneumann@tyndale.ca

To access your course material, please go to http://classes.tyndale.ca. Course emails will be sent to your @MyTyndale.ca e-mail account. For information how to access and forward emails to your personal account, see http://www.tyndale.ca/it/live-at-edu.

I. COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is an examination of classical Pentecostal theology with references to the early evangelical influences that contributed to its formation. Attention is given to the manner in which various Pentecostal emphases have been appropriated and developed within different charismatic settings.

This course will explore theology within the Pentecostal tradition in both its earliest forms and more recent innovative constructions. It will investigate the ways in which Pentecostal experience of the Holy Spirit has led to a re-imagining and re-visioning of various aspects of Christian theology, bringing fresh perspectives and fruitful ways of engaging with biblical and contemporary issues. Students will investigate the ways in which early Pentecostals wrestled to articulate their experience in meaningful theological frameworks, including how they dealt with disagreements and controversies. Special attention will be given to theological interpretations of Spirit baptism and glossolalia (speaking in other tongues), since these issues are hallmarks of classical Pentecostalism. Finally, current constructive proposals emerging from pneumatically-conscious Pentecostal theologians will be explored, highlighting implications for such issues as hermeneutics, ecclesiology, the Spirit’s work in creation and culture (including world religions and the sciences), and philosophy.
II. LEARNING OUTCOMES

At the end of the course, students should be able to:

- Analyze key theological ideas found within early and contemporary Pentecostalism through readings and other course materials.
- Compare, contrast, and analyze the theological interpretations of the classical Pentecostal view of Spirit baptism and several non-Pentecostal perspectives by writing a comparative analysis paper on Spirit Baptism.
- Describe and discuss ways in which Pentecostalism has and/or is currently contributing to Christian theology through developing an extended paper on a particular aspect of Pentecostal theology.

III. COURSE REQUIREMENTS

A. REQUIRED TEXTS


B. REQUIRED ARTICLES/CHAPTERS/MEDIA

Required readings and/or media aside from the course texts are listed here and will be made available to students by the instructor.


C. **SUPPLEMENTARY / RECOMMENDED READING**


D. **ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING**

**General Expectations**

Each week of classes, students should come to class prepared by having read (or listened to) the assigned material in order to participate more fully in class discussions and/or activities. There are also several written assignments that will be completed outside of class time. Students should do their best to keep up with the readings and assignments, and anticipate spending about nine to ten hours on course work each week (and more time when larger assignments are coming due).

1. **Participation (10%)**

Interaction with course material through dialogue with other students and the instructor is important toward the learning process. Therefore this course will value an interactive classroom experience. Students are expected to regularly participate in class discussion and
activities in a meaningful way. Participation assumes that students will have carefully read the weekly assigned readings before coming to class, which will not only benefit their own learning, but will enable them to contribute to the learning experiences of others.

Best Practices:

- Be informed and reflective. Make sure that you have completed the readings so that you can contribute to the discussions and activities thoughtfully.
- Be respectful and honest. When interacting with others, make sure to do so in a way that respects the opinions shared (even if you don’t agree with it). At the same time, discussions provide an opportunity to help us learn to think better, and sometimes our ideas need to be challenged. So, don’t be afraid to say that you disagree with another person, but always do so in an informed way, and with a view to helping the learning process.
- Be as clear as possible. You may have a profound thought, but if no one else can understand your point it won’t be very helpful. Try your best to make it easy for others to understand you.
- Be focused and creative. Good participation does not always mean talking a lot (whether with the whole class or in groups). It’s best to try to allow everyone ample time to share their thoughts. It’s also a good idea to keep conversations on topic, and not to meander too far from the point being discussed. At the same time, it may be valuable to introduce outside relevant ideas into the discussion. So, if you think something outside the assigned material might enrich discussion, please share it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrated Level</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present; not disruptive; inadequate preparation responds when called upon but does not offer much; infrequent involvement</td>
<td>Adequate preparation but no evidence of interpretation or analysis; offers straightforward information; contributes moderately when called upon</td>
<td>Good preparation; offers interpretation and analysis; contributes well to discussion in ongoing fashion</td>
<td>Excellent preparation; offers analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of material; contributes significantly to ongoing discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Blog Responses to Readings (4 x 5% = 20%)**
   
   Due at the beginning of class on each of the dates below

In order to better engage with the course readings and media, students are required to submit four blog-style responses based on selections from the course readings. Blogs should be approximately 300 words in length, and the content should be a combination of brief summary of and personal response/reaction to the particular reading (the latter receiving the most attention).

Blogs are due on the dates listed below, and a choice of readings is also listed for each blog.

- **Blog #1 (Due Fri., Feb. 5)**: Respond to one of the following: Jacobsen ch. 3 or ch. 4
• **Blog #2 (Due Fri., Feb. 19):** Respond to one of the following: Jacobsen ch. 5 or ch. 6 (pp. 286-290, 313-352 only)

• **Blog #3 (Due Fri., Mar. 4):** Respond to one of the following: Menzies and Menzies chs. 2-4; or Gordon Fee “Ch. 7, Baptism in the Holy Spirit”; or Simon Chan “Mother Church”

• **Blog #4 (Due Fri., Apr. 8):** Respond to one of the following: James K. A. Smith “Is There Room”; or Amos Yong “Ch.2, A Pneumatological Theology of Religions”; or Paul Lewis “Reflections of a Hundred Years”

Blog responses should generally focus on what idea/concept the student believes was particularly important from the readings, and how this idea/concept has impacted the student’s own thinking. For example, a blog may indicate that a particular theological theory was enlightening, or perhaps confusing (or disturbing!). While students are not required to post their blogs online, blogs should be written in a way that would try to engage (hypothetical) online readers. As a means to engage readers, it is often helpful for blogs to conclude with a thoughtful question intended to generate dialogue. Students are welcome to include images within the blog if these would enhance presentation and reader engagement.

Blogs are to be submitted in MS Word document (.doc or .docx) or PDF format. Blogs not submitted at the assigned due date and time will not be accepted.
3. Perspectives on Spirit Baptism – Comparative Analysis Paper (30%)
Due: Friday, February 19, 2016 (at beginning of class)

Students are required to read all of Perspectives on Spirit Baptism: Five Views, and the following chapters of Spirit and Power: chs. 1-4, 14-15 (chs. 5-6 recommended but not required), and then write a paper of approximately 3000 words comparing and contrasting the classical Pentecostal view of Spirit baptism (represented by Stanley Horton, and William and Robert Menzies) with two other viewpoints found in Perspectives on Spirit Baptism. One of the alternative views must be the Reformed view (Walter Kaiser). The second alternative view may be chosen by the student from the three other viewpoints offered. The paper should include the following elements:

- **Summary of three views:** A summary of the Pentecostal view (Horton and the Menzies), the Reformed view (Walter Kaiser), and any one of the other three views. The summary should highlight the thesis and/or main supporting points of the position, how this view is similar to or different from the others being discussed, as well as any significant weaknesses of the given position (critiques of positions offered in the Perspectives book
may be used here as deemed appropriate). This section should be approximately 2400 words.

- **Personal view:** After summarizing the positions, the student should indicate which position they find most convincing and provide sufficient reasons as to why. In this section other resources other than the assigned readings may be used to supplement the student’s viewpoint. This section should be approximately 600 words.

Chicago style must be used throughout the paper. Papers are to be submitted in MS Word document (.doc or .docx) or PDF format. Papers not submitted at the assigned due date and time will be deducted 5% per day, up to seven days, after which the paper will no longer be accepted.

**Alternative Comparative Assignment: Developments in Spirit Baptism Theology**

This option is only offered to students who have already taken the course, “The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke” with Roger Stronstad, and who may have already used the *Perspectives on Spirit Baptism* book in a way somewhat similar to what has been asked above.

As an alternative, in order to interact with new developments in Pentecostal theology on Spirit baptism, students are required to read *Perspectives on Spirit Baptism: Five Views*, and chapters 1-3 of Frank D. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology Spirit and Power*, and then write a paper of approximately 3000 words comparing and contrasting Macchia’s view with that of Stanley Horton, and either Walter Kaiser or Ralph Del Colle. The paper is intended to focus on interaction with Macchia’s perspective and should follow the following elements:

- **Summary of three views:** A summary of the views of Macchia, Horton, and Kaiser or Del Colle. The summary should highlight the thesis and/or main supporting points of the position, and briefly how this view is similar to or different from the others being discussed, as well as any significant weaknesses of the given position (critiques of positions offered in the *Perspectives* book may be used here as deemed appropriate). This section should be approximately 2400 words.

- **Evaluation of Macchia’s Contribution:** After summarizing the positions, the student should move to a more in-depth analysis and evaluation of Macchia’s expanded view of Spirit baptism in view of the other two positions being examined. Specifically: How is Macchia’s view supportive of and/or challenging to the classical Pentecostal view? What areas of continuity/discontinuity do you observe between Macchia’s view and that or Kaiser or Del Colle? In what ways might Macchia’s view help ecumenically (i.e., help overcome church division over Spirit baptism theology)? This section should be approximately 600 words.
## Comparative Analysis Paper Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Evaluation/ Demonstrated Level</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Reading Comprehension</strong></td>
<td>Writing shows less-than-adequate understanding of the main theses and supporting arguments of viewpoints.</td>
<td>Writing shows basic understanding of the main theses and supporting arguments of viewpoints.</td>
<td>Writing shows good understanding of the main theses and supporting arguments of viewpoints.</td>
<td>Writing shows very strong understanding of the main theses and supporting arguments of viewpoints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Comparative Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Makes many errors in identifying major similarities and differences. Does not get far beyond noting similarities and differences.</td>
<td>Makes some errors in identifying major similarities and differences. Isn’t clear about the significance of the comparison.</td>
<td>Selects similarities and differences for each viewpoint. Draws some thoughtful conclusions from the comparison.</td>
<td>Accurately selects all major similarities and differences for each viewpoint. Draws insightful and thoughtful conclusions from the similarities and differences, usually highlighting either one or the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Support of Chosen Position</strong></td>
<td>Identification with a particular position is unclear. Rationale and support for choosing this position is unclear. No reflection on possible areas of divergence from position (i.e., minor areas of disagreement).</td>
<td>Identifies with a particular position, but rationale and support for choosing this position is less than clear. Little to no reflection of possible areas of divergence from position (i.e., minor areas of disagreement).</td>
<td>Identifies with a particular position, providing adequate support. Possibly indicates areas of divergence from position (i.e., minor areas of disagreement).</td>
<td>Clearly identifies with a particular position, providing well-reasoned support, as well as indicating possible areas of divergence from position (i.e., minor areas of disagreement).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Unity &amp; Organization (Coherence)</strong></td>
<td>Writing is not unified through organized thought and sentences, and focus on the goal of this assignment (critical comparative analysis) is mostly missing.</td>
<td>Writing shows some unity and organization; but thoughts and sentences are often disconnected, and overall focus on the goal of this assignment (critical comparative analysis) is weak.</td>
<td>Writing is adequately unified, although thoughts and sentences could be better organized, and/or focused around the goal of this assignment (critical comparative analysis).</td>
<td>Writing is well unified through organized thoughts and sentences, and keeps strongly focused on the goal of this assignment (critical comparative analysis).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Grammar and Style</strong></td>
<td>Content rendered unclear and often incomprehensible because of numerous and reoccurring technical and/or grammatical issues.</td>
<td>Writing is fairly intelligible, but reoccurring technical and/or grammatical issues greatly impede clarity.</td>
<td>Writing style is generally good, with few technical and/or grammatical issues that impede clarity.</td>
<td>Style is clear, fluid and quite free of technical and/or grammatical issues that would impede clarity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Essay on Pentecostal Theology (40%), Due Friday, April 8, 2016

In order to explore more deeply a particular aspect of Pentecostal theology, students are to prepare a 3000-word essay on a topic of their choice related to the material and issues explored in this course. A list of possible broad topic areas is provided below, however, students may choose to write on an area not listed in consultation with the course instructor. It is advised that students consult with the instructor when narrowing down their chosen topic of interest.

Suggested topic areas:
- An in-depth study of one of the early or contemporary Pentecostal theologians being studied, focusing on a particular aspect of their theology
- Pentecostal theology and world religions
- Pentecostal theology and spiritual formation
- Pentecostal theology and worship
- Pentecostal theology and experience of the Spirit
- Pentecostal theology and the doctrine of tongues as initial evidence
- Pentecostal theology and the role of tradition and/or ecumenism (relationship to other church traditions)
- Pentecostal theology and the sciences
- Pentecostal theology and higher education
- Pentecostal theology and music and/or art
- Implications of Pentecostal theology for the doctrine of God (or other area of theology, e.g., eschatology, soteriology, ecclesiology, anthropology, etc.)
- A Pentecostal evaluation of Word-Faith theology

Chicago style must be used throughout the paper. Papers are to be prepared in MS Word document (.doc or .docx) or PDF format. Papers not submitted at the assigned due date and time will be deducted 5% per day, up to seven days, after which the paper will no longer be accepted.
### Essay Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Evaluation/ Demonstrated Level</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research &amp; Use of Sources</td>
<td>Selection and use of sources includes several not relevant to topic and/or not of sufficient academic quality. Little to no variety of perspectives consulted. Little to no evidence of using sources to support and enhance overall argument.</td>
<td>Selection and use of sources is adequate, includes one or more not relevant to topic and/or not of sufficient academic quality. Inadequate variety of perspectives consulted. Sources inadequately used to support and enhance overall argument.</td>
<td>Selection and use of sources is good, relevant to topic, indicates some variety of perspectives, and generally appropriate for academic level research. Sources are used adequately to support and enhance overall argument.</td>
<td>Selection and use of sources is very relevant to topic, from a variety of perspectives, and appropriate for academic level research. Sources indicate an above-average breadth of knowledge of the topic, and are used very effectively to support and enhance overall argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Thesis &amp; Argumentation</td>
<td>Main thesis and purpose of essay is unclear. Main points and arguments do not coherently support thesis. No indication of dealing with alternative viewpoints and little effort to respond. Conclusion missing or very unclear.</td>
<td>Main thesis and purpose of essay is poorly introduced and presented. Thesis is not sufficiently supported by well-reasoned arguments. Demonstrates little knowledge of alternative viewpoints and little effort to respond. Conclusion inadequately summarizes essay.</td>
<td>Main thesis and purpose of essay is adequately introduced and presented. Thesis is supported by fairly well-reasoned arguments. Demonstrates some knowledge of alternative viewpoints and shows some attempt to respond. Conclusion adequately summarizes essay.</td>
<td>Main thesis and purpose of essay is very clearly introduced and presented. Thesis is supported by exceptionally well-reasoned arguments. Demonstrates firm knowledge of and provides compelling responses to alternative viewpoints. Conclusion cogently summarizes essay and identifies possible future directions for study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unity &amp; Organization (Coherence)</td>
<td>Writing is not unified through organized thoughts and sentences, and focus on the goal of supporting the thesis is missing.</td>
<td>Writing shows some unity and organization, but thoughts and sentences are disconnected, and overall focus on the goal of supporting the thesis is weak.</td>
<td>Writing is generally unified, though thoughts and sentences could be more focused and organized around the goal of supporting the thesis.</td>
<td>Writing is very unified through organized thoughts and sentences, and keeps strongly focused on the goal of supporting the thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grammar and Style</td>
<td>Content rendered unclear and often incomprehensible because of numerous and reoccurring technical and/or grammatical issues.</td>
<td>Writing is fairly intelligible, but reoccurring technical and/or grammatical issues greatly impede clarity.</td>
<td>Writing style is generally good, with few technical and/or grammatical issues that impede clarity.</td>
<td>Style is clear, fluid and quite free of technical and/or grammatical issues that would impede clarity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN WORK**

For proper citation style, consult the Chicago-Style Quick Guide (Tyndale e-resource) or the full edition of the Chicago Manual of Style Online, especially ch. 14. For citing scripture texts, refer to sections 10.46 to 10.51 and 14.253 to 14.254.
Academic Integrity
Integrity in academic work is required of all our students. Academic dishonesty is any breach of this integrity, and includes such practices as cheating (the use of unauthorized material on tests and examinations), submitting the same work for different classes without permission of the instructors; using false information (including false references to secondary sources) in an assignment; improper or unacknowledged collaboration with other students, and plagiarism. Tyndale University College & Seminary takes seriously its responsibility to uphold academic integrity, and to penalize academic dishonesty.

Students should consult the current Academic Calendar for academic polices on Academic Honesty, Gender Inclusive Language in Written Assignments, Late Papers and Extensions, Return of Assignments, and Grading System. The Academic Calendar is posted at http://tyndale.ca/registrar.

F. SUMMARY OF ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

Evaluation is based upon the completion of the following assignments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog Responses to Readings</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Baptism Comparative Analysis Paper</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay on Pentecostal Theology</td>
<td>40 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grade</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. COURSE EVALUATION

Tyndale Seminary values quality in the courses it offers its students. End-of-course evaluations provide valuable student feedback and are one of the ways that Tyndale Seminary works towards maintaining and improving the quality of courses and the student’s learning experience. Student involvement in this process is critical to enhance the general quality of teaching and learning.

Before the end of the course, students will receive a MyTyndale email with a link to the online course evaluation. The evaluation period is 2 weeks; after the evaluation period has ended, it cannot be reopened.

Course Evaluation results will not be disclosed to the instructor before final grades in the course have been submitted and processed.
IV. COURSE SCHEDULE: CONTENT AND READING SCHEDULE

Friday, January 22

Introduction: Pentecostal Theology? What and Who

Unit One: Theology, Experience, and the Forming of the Pentecostal Imagination

Lecture 1 – Experience and Theology: Bridging an Uneasy Relationship

Readings:
- Neumann, *Pentecostal Experience*, “Introduction” (1-20), Ch. 1 (21-38 only)

Lecture 2 – Theological Antecedents and Emerging Pentecostal Theologies:
  Charles F. Parham and Richard G. Spurling

Readings:
- Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, Ch. 1 (16-56)

Friday, February 5

Unit Two: Early Pentecostal Imagination

Lecture 3 – Revival Pentecostalism: William J. Seymour, George F. Taylor, and David W. Myland

Readings:
- Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, Ch. 2 (57-133)

Lecture 4 – The Finished Work Controversy: William H. Durham and Joseph H. King

Readings:
- Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, Ch. 3 (134-193)

Lecture 5 – Oneness Visions: Garfield T. Haywood and Andrew D. Urshan

Readings:
- Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, Ch. 4 (194-259)

Friday, February 19

Unit Three: Spirit Baptism and the Pentecostal Imagination

Lecture 6 – Spirit Baptism and Glossolalia: Classical Pentecostal Articulations

Readings:
- Neumann, Pentecostal Experience, Ch. 2 (100-124 only)
- Horton, Ch. 2 “Spirit Baptism: A Pentecostal Perspective,” In Perspectives on Spirit Baptism: Five Views, (47-104)
- Menzies & Menzies, Spirit and Power, chs 7-9 (109-144), chs. 14-15 (189-208)

Lecture 7 – Spirit Baptism and Glossolalia: Fresh Perspectives

Readings:
- Neumann, Pentecostal Experience, Ch. 3 (162-195)

Friday, March 4

Unit Four: Current Pentecostal Imagination and Theological Innovation

Lecture 8 – Pentecostalism, the Academy, and Hermeneutics

Readings:
- Neumann Pentecostal Experience, Ch. 2 (124-161 only)
- Menzies & Menzies, Spirit and Power, Chs 2-4 (37-68)

Lecture 9 – Ecclesiology and Tradition

Readings:
- Neumann Pentecostal Experience, Ch. 4 (218-249 only)
Friday, April 8

Lecture 10 – The Spirit in Creation: Religion, Culture, and Science

Readings:
- Neumann *Pentecostal Experience*, Ch. 5 (273-309 only)

Lecture 11 – The Future of Pentecostal Theology

Readings:
- Neumann *Pentecostal Experience*, “Conclusion” (331-337)