

**HISTORY OF SATAN**  
RELIGIOUS STUDIES 370B  
DEPAUW UNIVERSITY

**FALL 2016**  
**Location:** JSC 111  
**Day & Time:** MW 8:20-9:50  
**Course Website:** Moodle

**Professor:** Justin Glessner  
**Email:** justinglessner@depauw.edu  
**Phone:** 765.658.4375  
**Office Hours:** T 11a-12p; W 3-5p;  
R 10-11a and  
*also by appointment*  
**Office:** Harrison 320

## DESCRIPTION

Since antiquity, writers have attempted to understand and define the idea of evil by giving it a voice. This course investigates the origins, development and significance of personified evil—Satan—from earliest appearances in the Hebrew Bible, second-temple writings, early Christian and rabbinic literature, and the Qur'an and other early Islamic sources, through Medieval and Renaissance literature to our own day. Through temptation narratives, morality dramas, cultural satires, and Faustian dilemmas, explorations of “the Adversary” have yielded some of the most compelling stories and characters ever imagined. In this course, we will become familiar with the history and breadth of Satan’s role as a character (or merely background presence) in literature while developing close-reading techniques for literary analysis that can be applied across diverse eras, forms, and genres. You will be asked to strengthen your critical reading, speaking, listening, and writing skills and to consider how our class topic can help illuminate aspects of our present-day culture and its history.

## OBJECTIVES

This course is designed to provide upper-level students with a broad introduction to the cultural history and development of the character, Satan, and relevant critical scholarship, with a focus on cultivating and enriching transferable, critical academic skills. By the end of the semester you will be able to:

1. **Understand** and **interpret** pieces of literature (and other *Exhibits*) ranging across two millennia
2. **Demonstrate** knowledge of the history and culture of the places/times that produced said pieces
3. **Present** and **engage** with critical scholarship in a meaningful and ethical way
4. **Express** complex ideas through oral communication by (among other things) contributing to free-flowing classroom discussions, raising thoughtful questions about the ideas of peers, leading discussions of readings, making presentations before the class, and responding to questions and defending responses in a final, defense-style paper conference
5. **Listen** to, **respond** to, and **engage** with peers with an attitude of curiosity, openness, and appreciation of multiple interpretive perspectives, becoming better prepared to converse with and befriend people whose perspectives and convictions differ from one’s own
6. **Write** clear, precise papers that develop rigorous arguments and provide solid evidence for claims

## MATERIALS

The following REQUIRED book will be available for purchase at [Eli's Bookstore](#):

- Henry Ansgar Kelly. *Satan: A Biography*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. (ISBN-13: 9780521604024) [\$31.75 NEW at Eli's Bookstore].

All remaining REQUIRED readings for this course will be provided on Moodle (see **Schedule** for details, below), in lieu of a printed coursepack: this includes both *Argument/Background* sources (Beal, Herling, Awn, Russell) as well as all *Exhibit* sources.

## EVALUATION

The primary course **Requirements** will be a combination of written and oral assignments in which you will demonstrate critical thinking and engagement with the course's main texts and ideas. In order to pass the course, you must complete all of the assignments. The breakdown of final grade points is as follows:

I. Engagement	200 points total
Chats with the Professor	~
Preparation	100 points
Attendance	~
Participation~Discussion	50 points
Participation~Activities	50 points
II. Passage Analysis	100 points
III. Book Review	100 points
IV. Non-Literary Exposé	100 points
V. Conference Paper	500 points total
Prospectus	100 points
Exploratory Summary	100 points
Draft	~
Defense	100 points
Final Submission	200 points

The maximum number of points for the class is 1000, which can be translated into the following letter grades:

	1000-930 A	929-900 A-
899-870 B+	869-830 B	829-800 B-
799-770 C+	769-730 C	729-700 C-
699-600 D	599-000 F	

## REQUIREMENTS

### I. Engagement (200 points total)

**Chats with the Professor (~).** In order to facilitate building a strong learning community and so I can get to know all of you better, please sign up for and participate in *at least* two one-on-one chats with me during my office hours (one within Weeks 1-3 of the semester and one within Weeks 9-10). In our chats, I would like to hear something about your background, goals and ambitions, where you are in your program, courses you have taken or are taking, and something about your intellectual and personal acquaintance with the academic study of religion. I would also love to hear about your expectations for the class when you registered for it, and how those expectations may have changed after the first weeks of the class (and beyond). Finally, I'd also like to hear how you think the class is going and whether you think we are pitching the material and the pace of the class too high, too low, or just about right. I will have a Doodle sign-up site ready by the end of the first week of the class.

**Preparation (100 points).** The **Schedule** (see below) provides a list of the readings that you will be responsible for in any given week. The course will cover a fair bit of material in a short time period, so it will be important for you to stay current on the reading. Doing all of your assigned readings well in advance of class is important because our interactive lectures and in-class discussions all presume that you have the necessary background knowledge provided by these readings. While we will not always directly cover all parts of all of the assigned readings, we will discuss your responses to the readings as we clarify the main points.

So, you are expected to come to class *prepared* to speak to the substance of the assigned reading material—as indicated by your having completed all of the assigned weekly readings *prior* to the beginning of each week (i.e., by the beginning of class on Mondays) and by keeping an up-to-date **Double-Entry Notebook** (I'll provide these for you), as follows:

For each of the *Exhibit* or *Argument/Background* source readings highlighted in gray on the **Schedule** (see below), you will write at least two pages in your double-entry notebooks. The first page will be a restatement of the text's **argument** in your own words/visual representation. You can write a summary, make an outline, draw a graphic organizer, flowchart or a diagram of the reading, or simply take careful notes. The purpose of this page is to help you understand as fully as possible the structure and details of the text's **argument**. This page should help you recall the import of the reading in some detail several weeks later. Your next page is to be your own personal reflections on or reactions to the reading. Analyze it, illustrate it through your own experience, refute it, get mad at it, question it, believe it, doubt it, go beyond it.

Every class period, I will roll a d20, with the following outcomes: if I roll 1-8, I *won't* collect your notebooks; if I roll 9-20, I *will* collect your notebooks. If/when I collect your notebooks, I will only read THAT DAY'S ENTRY with interest, awarding points according to the following scale:

- 0 - did not complete on time (no entry for current date)
- 1 - entry missing either **summary** or **response**
- 2 - **summary** shows evidence of some understanding of the reading and **response** demonstrates some preparation to engage in discussion
- 3 - *either* **summary** demonstrates a strong understanding of the reading *or* **response** demonstrates significant preparation to engage in discussion (but not both)
- 4 - *both* **summary** demonstrates a strong understanding of the reading *and* **response** demonstrates significant preparation to engage in discussion

However, the remainder of the points for the **Preparation** portion of your grade will be awarded at the end of term and will be based on the percentage of notebook entries you completed overall and the overall quality of your summaries and responses.

**Attendance** (~). Attendance at (the 24 scheduled) class meetings will be monitored. You will be allowed to miss up to **two (2)** class meetings without penalty. I make no distinction between excused and unexcused absences—I fully expect that you will occasionally (i.e. up to two times) be unable to attend class for one reason or another, so it is not necessary to apologize or provide any excuse for your absences. Those of you who are involved in campus activities (sports, newspaper, theater, etc.) may need to use your absences for commitments in those areas. That's fine, but you are not afforded more absences in addition to extracurricular-related absences. Unsanctioned late arrivals and early departures will be tallied as half an absence. *Every successive absence beyond your first two (2) will result in the deduction of two percentage points from your final overall grade.*

**Participation~Discussion (50 points)**. Active participation in class discussions is one of the keys to happiness and success in this course. Participation is not so much an issue of the *number* of comments (quantity), but primarily the *substance* of those comments (quality). Dominating discussion and/or not being sensitive to the direction of the discussion are just as problematic as not saying anything at all. When you have something important to contribute, *speak up and without reserve*—each one of you has something unique and worthwhile to bring to our discussion (especially if you've been keeping up with your notebooks!)—and *address each other when speaking*, rather than directing comments to me (unless, of course, you are referring to something I said or want to direct a comment or question specifically to me). There are different kinds of contributions you can make to discussion, *all of which you are expected to work on over the course of the semester*. None of these are really possible without coming to class each session (**Attendance**) having read, summarized, and responded to the assigned readings (**Preparation**):

- Attentively listening to your colleagues, in order to build on what has already been said;
- Asking colleagues to clarify unclear contributions;
- Summarizing key ideas that have emerged during the discussion;
- Articulating an answer to a posed question;
- Raising questions that help advance discussion and/or draw quiet(er) colleagues into the discussion;
- Offering an original idea related to the topic of discussion;

- Drawing on evidence (background/exhibit/argument sources, personal experience, popular culture) to either support or challenge ideas;
- Constructively critiquing an idea offered in the readings or by a class member (including me!);
- Pointing out how various comments complement each other or are at odds;
- Playing “devil’s advocate”

I will evaluate discussion participation and award points on a weekly basis (typically on Thursday mornings, during **Weeks 3-12**), according to the following scale:

- 0 - you show various degrees of disinterest during class discussion (chatting, moving, yawning audibly, exiting the classroom, checking gadgets, dozing off, making snarky comments or other noises, booing, etc.)
- 1 - you listen politely (none of the above) and nothing else
- 2 - you listen carefully and show evidence of interest (take notes, nod, pay close attention), but do not respond
- 3 - in addition to 2, you ask follow-up or clarification questions
- 4 - in addition to 3, you provide input, make suggestions regarding
- 5 - in addition to 4, you raise important points, ask meaningful questions in terms of content, make important comments relating to the readings, authors, or works studied, and express yourself accurately and gracefully

You may also be called on to provide verbal constructive feedback to your colleagues oral presentations (3 presentations total, see details below) using the rubrics I provide in class, or you may be selected on presentation days as one of the 2-3 students required to provide immediate verbal feedback directly after one of your peers presents. In either case, your involvement, engagement, and contributions in giving your peers feedback on their presentations will be assessed and rolled into my overall evaluation (0-5) of your participation for that week.

***Participation~Activities (50 points).*** Every class period will also include opportunities for you to personalize course material, to reflect on or apply course concepts, or practice key tasks and processes. For some class meetings this may include a **Pop Quiz** on assigned material. For other class meetings this may either involve writing a short in-class response to a prompt based on material we are working with that day or participating in an in-class exercise.

**In-class short, written responses** are designed to give you practice retrieving/rehearsing key course concepts and to assist you in building your own connections between course material and everyday life outside of the classroom. I may, for example, ask you to summarize the position a selected reading is arguing against, to identify an author’s thesis and main argument, to paraphrase a passage from a selected reading, to provide an example to illustrate a key idea, or to describe how and why issues in the text apply to your life.

**In-class exercises** are designed to give you practice with key tasks and processes you will need to successfully accomplish the learning goals of the higher-level assignments for this course. I may, for example, ask you to practice writing essay introductions or to proof-read and/or comment on your peers’ writing.

In-class responses and exercises are just that, *in class*: you may not make them up if you are absent. Submittables may be submitted through **Moodle** (so feel free to bring your laptops to class).

In-class written responses and submittable material from participation in in-class exercises are low-stakes assignments. I will not give detailed feedback on either, but I will award points according to the following scale:

- 0 - did not complete the in-class writing or exercise
- 1 - completed the in-class writing or exercise
- 2 - completed the in-class writing or activity and demonstrated deep engagement with the material

## **II. Passage Analysis (100 points) ~ in class sometime in Weeks 3-7**

This assignment requires you to present a short segment (roughly 20-30 lines) of an assigned *Exhibit* (primary source/text) reading (see **Schedule**, below) to the rest of the class. Your passage should be relatively self-contained and your analysis of it must move beyond plot summary and address the literary elements. Your analysis should take about 20 minutes to complete and should have several components:

- A brief summary of the day’s reading in general. What happens in today’s reading assignment? Where does your selected passage fit into this literary context?
- Your analysis. What is striking or unusual about this passage? Why did you select it? How does it fit into your general reading of the text as a whole? How are you analyzing it; what is your approach? This is where you would attend to linguistic, lexicological, and literary features—vocabulary, grammar, voice, rhythm, perspective, diction, imagery, trope, characterization, space, rhetoric, theme, citation, allusion, etc. Don’t feel like you have to explain everything—that’s what the discussion questions are for (see below)! Ideally, some of your analysis should come out as you lead your peers through the passage.
- Four “response” or discussion questions. These questions should be based on what the passage made you think about. They can have any structure you like and can relate to any part of the passage, but here are some samples: “How does this passage fit with the section we read last class...?” “How does Augustine’s characterization of Satan fit with our recent discussions of the construction of ideas about legitimate power and access to knowledge?” “Let’s look more closely at ‘Attār’s use of X in this line. Why would he choose this word/literary device/character representation instead of...?”

Don’t be afraid if you don’t completely understand that day’s reading, or even everything in your own passage. That’s part of the purpose of the subsequent discussion—to clarify what was initially unclear. Try to choose questions that facilitate open discussion rather than questions that have a clear answer or that ask for a yes/no or “I liked”/“I didn’t like” response. This is a *discussion-based* assignment. You may use paper handouts if you like (containing important quotes from primary texts, for example), and it is **REQUIRED** that you bring printed copies of your discussion questions for the rest of the class, but this assignment should be largely a “verbal/oral” presentation in which you facilitate a *discussion*—please no PowerPoint, Prezi, etc.

*Logistics:* passage analysis presentations will take place in class sometime during **Weeks 3-8** (1-3 passage analyses/week) according to the following schedule. I will take volunteers for specific presentation slots on a first-come, first-served basis and assign the remaining slots randomly.

- Week 3 - Satan’s roots in Jewish apocalypticism (3 passage analyses): Dan, Kinsey, John
- Week 4 - Satan and his roles in early Jesus movements (3 passage analyses): Lis, Ian, Jara

Week 5 - Developments in Satan's story in the first centuries (3 passage analyses): Rose, Johnny, Ned

Week 6 - Satan in the Church Fathers I (2 passage analyses): Rudy, Andi

Week 7 - Satan in the Church Fathers II (3 passage analyses): Sarah, Annie, Emily

Week 8 - Satan in Judaism and Islam (1 passage analysis): Carrie

### **III. Book Review (100 points) ~ draft due on Friday, September 30 (end of Week 6); final submission due on Friday, October 7 (end of Week 7)**

Imagine that you have been solicited to review Timothy K. Beal, *Religion and its Monsters* (New York; London: Routledge, 2002) for an upcoming issue of the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. To complete your review, among other things, you will need to take stock of your role, your audience, the format of writing, and the task as specified in the (book review) writing guidelines of this journal (found [here](#)): “*Good reviews contribute to scholarly discussion and, therefore, are free of purely personal polemics or rejoinders. Your assessment should provide an even-handed account of the book, both its values and limitations. You should give an accurate and balanced description of the book’s relevant content and its method of treatment, together with a critical evaluation of its significance to the field. Please remember the diverse readership of the JAAR. Helpful reviews relate the book to the general study of religion, as well as to concerns of a sub-division in the field.*”

Think of this assignment as something like an extended entry in your double-entry notebooks, the difference being that you will be summarizing and responding to an ENTIRE book. Your review should take the form of an (4-6 page, double-spaced) essay, which includes:

- (2-3 page, double-spaced) **Summary** [S] of the book (“*an even-handed account of the book... an accurate and balanced description of the book’s relevant content and its method of treatment*”), including:
  - [S1] an explanation of the book’s **title** in terms of its subject, purpose, and thesis; and
  - [S2] a summary of the basic **argument** (flow and structure) of the book which explains how the author builds up this argument throughout the chapters, and how the parts fit together into a whole as one part leads on and connects with another
- followed by a (2-3 page, double-spaced) **Critical Analysis** [A] of the book (“*an even-handed account of... its values and limitations... together with a critical evaluation of its significance to the field.*”), including:
  - [A1] an evaluation of the author’s **style** of writing (clarity, organization, logic, sufficiency, and balance);
  - [A2] a discussion of the author’s **methods**, theoretical lens or approach
  - [A3] an evaluation of the types of **evidence** the author uses to support his points in light of our work in this course;
  - [A4] an overall assessment of the **strengths** and **weaknesses** of the book (how well do you think the author provided insight into the subject and achieved the stated purpose? does the author achieve what he sets out to do? is the argument convincing or not, and in what ways? where do you agree or disagree with the author’s assessment of the evidence and why? how might the book have been improved or made more understandable?); and

[A6] a final **discussion** addressing how the book relates to our ongoing work in this class—the ways in which the book has aided your fuller understanding of the cultural history and development of the figure of Satan (examples of how the book encourages the way you might think about the subject or about debated issues: “*a critical evaluation of its significance to [OUR] field*”).

IMPORTANT: only Beal’s “Introduction” and “Part One: Religion and Its Monsters” (chapters 1-6) are assigned *directly* as readings in the **Schedule**, below (these opening chapters will form some of the basis for our in-class discussions up through Week 4). However, you will need to make sure that you **read the book in its ENTIRETY**—including “Part II: Monsters and Their Religion” (chapters 7-12)—in order to be able to both summarize [S1-S2] and analyze [A1-A6] the book in its ENTIRETY.

The review paper should have a clear thesis statement (concerning your overall evaluation of the book) which is supported throughout both [S] and [A] paragraphs. The paper should be clearly written and structured with no spelling or grammatical errors. Be succinct and do not exceed the prescribed length. Cite concrete examples (citing relevant page numbers in parentheses) from the book to illustrate your summary and analysis. Scaffolding for this assignment will include one draft, one peer review, and one revision. I will only grade the final submission.

#### **IV. Non-Literary Exposé (100 points) ~ in class sometime in Week 13**

This assignment requires you to do something similar to the Passage Analysis, except instead of focusing on a small section of text, you will be having us look at one non-literary *Exhibit* source (painting, sculpture, architecture, music, film clip, graphic novel/comic book, video game, etc.) relevant for the time period of any literary work we discussed in class. You will be expected to reproduce the *Exhibit* source in class (so, please do bring your laptop on the day of your presentation) and guide a brief discussion on your selection.

The basics:

- Select one non-literary *Exhibit* source that features the character of Satan
- Reproduce that selection in class via laptop/projector and explain why you selected it
- Guide a roughly 10-minute discussion based on your selection, in dialogue with any/all other literary *Exhibit* sources (primary texts) that may be connected to your selection in some way

Your “discussion” can be based on whatever structure you like: you can use discussion questions (as in the Passage Analysis assignment), or a brief writing prompt that you give your peers at the start of the Presentation, or perhaps a guided group assignment. The choice is up to you. The minimum expectations are (a) connect your selected non-literary *Exhibit* source to **at least one** literary *Exhibit* source (primary text) assigned in this course; and (b) lead us through a productive examination of the non-literary *Exhibit* source that lasts roughly 10 minutes.

## **V. Conference Paper (500 points total)**

You woke up this morning with the absolutely BRILLIANT notion that you'd like to write an academic paper to submit to the Undergraduate Students Section of the upcoming *American Academy of Religion's* MidWest Regional Conference that will take place on March 2-4, 2017 at Ball State University in Muncie, IN. Though the actual Call for Papers for this conference will be announced sometime in the Fall 2016, the deadline for proposal submissions will be sometime, mid-January 2017. So you have some time: Great! But you've also got some work to do in the meantime, right?! Among other things, you will need to complete the following steps...

***Decide on a focus/topic/direction.*** To narrow things down, you've decided to write an in-depth (8-10 pages, double-spaced), academic conference paper that integrates one central, critical article/work (***Method/Theory source: A1 OR A2***) as the theoretical anchor for addressing *one interpretive problem/question* (see below) in a selected literary text (***Exhibit source: B***):

### **A1 (any one work by any of these pre-approved Theorists)**

Tal Asad  
Peter Berger  
Homi Bhabha  
Judith Butler  
Emile Durkheim  
Mircea Eliade  
Edwards Evans-Pritchard  
Michel Foucault  
Sigmund Freud  
Clifford Geertz  
William James  
Carl Jung  
Bronislaw Malinowski  
Karl Marx  
Friedrich Nietzsche  
Rudolph Otto  
Edward Said  
Ninian Smart  
Jonathan Z. Smith  
W.C. Smith  
Melford E. Spiro  
Paul Tillich  
Victor Turner  
Max Weber

### **A2 (in consultation with me and by approval, one work by any Theorist treating one or more of the following categories)**

Class  
(Post)Colonialism  
Environment  
Ethnicity  
Gender  
Queerness  
Race  
Science  
Sexuality and the Body  
Violence

### **B (Exhibits)**

Dante, *Inferno* (1300s)  
*Malleus Maleficarum* (late 1400s)  
Marlowe, *Dr. Faustus* (late 1500s)  
Milton, *Paradise Lost* (late 1600s)  
Cazotte, *The Devil in Love* (1772)  
Blake, *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* (late 1700s)  
Goethe, *Faust* (1800s)  
Hogg, *Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (1824)  
Nikolai Gogol, "Christmas Eve" OR "The Portrait"  
Baudelaire, *The Flowers of Evil* (1857)  
Twain, *No. 44: The Mysterious Stranger* (1908)  
Lewis, *The Screwtape Letters* (1942)  
O'Connor, *The Violent Bear It Away* (1960)  
Bulgakov, *The Master and Margarita* (1966)  
Duncan, *I, Lucifer* (2003)

**Decide on an interpretive problem/question.** Early in your research process (say, by the end of Week 6) you must identify within your topic area *one problem, question, or controversy* that requires from you a contestable thesis statement supported by your own critical thinking. One basic interpretive problem related to the content of this course may be stated as simply as: “How are we to regard the character/role of Satan in X (specified *Exhibit* source)?” But there are certainly other, more specific, and perhaps more interesting, questions to pursue. We will spend some time together in class practicing asking interpretive questions about *Exhibit* sources, but a couple other possibilities might look something like...

- What role does Satan (or demons or harmful spirits) play in the worldview and actual life of the person(s) that produced Z literary text (specified *Exhibit* source)?
- How does Z literary text (specified *Exhibit* source) link X group of people to Satan at Y moment in time in order to demonize, silence, and/or marginalize them? Who is silenced/marginalized? Why? What points of view are silenced/suppressed in this text? What is conveniently left out?
- How does the character, Satan, in Z literary text (specified *Exhibit* source) reflect the author’s class, gender, ethnicity, or sexual orientation? What assumptions or biases does it treat as ‘natural’ or ‘universal’?
- How is the character, Satan, construed to serve X ideological purpose at Y moment in time, as evidenced in Z literary text (specified *Exhibit* source)? What is the ideological vision of this text? How does it support/contest a certain social order?
- How is the character, Satan, in Z literary text (specified *Exhibit* source) implicated in the construction of binaries/oppositions (good/evil, male/female, master/servant, city/country, nature/culture, old/young, beautiful/ugly, chaste/lustful)? How does the text create a hierarchical value system that privileges or marks as superior one pole of the binary while devaluating the other? How can this value system be revealed as socially constructed as opposed to ‘universal’ or ‘natural’? How do certain gaps, lacunae, or problematic passages in the text work to deconstruct the text’s primary binaries?
- How can the same passages in Z literary text (specified *Exhibit* source) featuring the character, Satan, be read in opposing ways?
- How does any consistent reading or interpretation of the character, Satan, in Z literary text (specified *Exhibit* source), depend on an interpretive frame that can be shown to be culturally constructed? How can the critic deconstruct this frame and thus undermine the reading?

**Prospectus (100 points) ~ due on Friday, October 14 (end of Week 8).** Submit a plan/prospectus for your academic conference paper that indicates your selected literary text (**Exhibit source: B**) and theorist (**Method/Theory source: A1 OR A2**) and includes a working title (we will workshop these in class), a working/preliminary bibliography (attached to the end), and a two-page (double-spaced) preliminary statement of purpose and direction that addresses the following questions with regard to your paper:

- What interpretive problem or question do you intend to address? Explain the problem/question, showing how it arises from your selected literary text (**Exhibit source: B**).
- Why you are personally interested in and invested in this problem/question?
- What makes your problem problematic? What disagreements among scholars, gaps in knowledge, or complexities or inconsistencies in the literary text characterize the problem?
- What's at stake in addressing this problem? Why is it significant? To whom does it matter?
- How will solving it advance the conversation? How does your small problem connect to some larger problem?
- In addition to your selected literary text (**Exhibit source: B**), what other sources do you envision using to develop your own argument? Specifically, which theorist (**Method/Theory source: A1 OR A2**), other critics (**Argument sources**), and/or contextual materials (**Background sources**), are most relevant to your interpretive problem? Why?

You are encouraged to seek out and use additional *Background* sources ('noncontroversial', shared facts/information used to provide context) and/or *Argument* sources (work of other scholars/commentators who have studied your same exhibit/question); however, you are also welcome to use Kelly and/or Beal (as *Background* and/or *Argument* sources).

**Exploratory Summary (100 points) ~ in class sometime in Weeks 10-11.** Before finalizing a draft of your academic conference paper (at the end of Week 13, see below), sometime in class during Weeks 10-11 you will present a 10-minute first-person narrative account of your research process (essentially combining the genres of annotated bibliography, narrative reflection, and formal research presentation), tracing the evolution of your thinking, requiring that you keep your research problem open, delay closure, and hence explore your issues in greater depth.

Among other things, your account should include a summary and critique of your theoretical anchor article/work (**Method/Theory source: A1 OR A2**) and a description of how you plan to use said anchor to make your argument in your academic conference paper. Though different in content, this assignment will follow the format of a formal research presentation—visual aids like handouts and PowerPoint are encouraged, and although we will have time for questions from the class at the end, this is not a discussion-based assignment.

**Draft ( ~ ) ~ due on Friday, December 2 (end of Week 13).** Submit a **complete** (!), finished draft of the paper that you plan to submit to the Undergraduate Students Section of the upcoming *American Academy of Religion's* MidWest Regional Conference. You may assume that your audience has NOT read the details of this assignment and will attend your conference session because your title hooked their interest. Your introduction should explain the problem-at-issue before presenting your thesis. Because this is an academic paper in Religious Studies, follow the manuscript form of the *Chicago Manual of Style* and Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*. We will discuss my comments on your draft during your (final) defense-style paper conference during the last week of class (see below).

**Defense (100 points) ~ in my office sometime in Week 14.** Our final week of classes will be devoted to defense-style presentations of your final paper to an audience of one (me!)—as such, there is NO CLASS on December 5 or 7. Sign up for an individual 30-minute time slot (I will have a Doodle sign-up site ready by the middle of the term). We will meet in my office, and you will present your paper for about 15-20 minutes, followed by about 10-15 minutes for questions and discussion (including discussion of my feedback and comments on your draft). Your final papers will then be amended based on my feedback and comments before final submission (see below).

**Final Submission (200 points) ~ due on Friday, December 16 (end of Finals Week).** Just submit the damn thing already...

## POLICIES

### Reading

In order to do well at any of the above requirements it is imperative that you do all of the readings required for each class. Note that much of the reading consists of *Exhibit* sources, which must be read s-l-o-w-l-y! Since *Exhibit* source reading is difficult reading, plan your time accordingly. It will be harder to read, so find a quiet place with few distractions. Read with a pen (or pencil) in hand to underline material you find interesting or puzzling. Jot notes/questions in the margins. Enjoy the exploration.

### Academic Integrity

Plagiarism and academic dishonesty constitute serious offenses that undermine your education and violate DePauw policy on academic integrity and may result in penalties ranging from a lowered grade to course failure or expulsion. All work submitted in this class must be your own, and must be completed specifically for this class. You may not turn in work previously written for another class. Any use of another's work without proper attribution constitutes plagiarism and will be dealt with severely. Plagiarism ranges from copying someone else's work word for word, to rewriting someone else's work with only minor word changes (mosaic plagiarism), to summarizing work or borrowing ideas without acknowledging the source. To learn more about DePauw's academic integrity policies please see: <http://www.depauw.edu/handbooks/academic/policies/integrity/>

In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of this class are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, and respect. Laptops and tablets are welcome in class, under the condition that they are used for taking notes, accessing course-related resources, and submitting in-class responses. There is no reason for you to text, chat, post, skype, tweet, surf, shop, blog, etc. during class. Please turn ringers off during class. Arriving late or leaving early without prior arrangement, and talking or otherwise being disruptive during class, are behaviors that are both discourteous to others and distracting to the instructor. Seriously. Not good.

### Schedule Conflicts

If you have any time conflicts with any classes or assignments, you must notify me by the end of Week 2 (**September 2**). Arrangements can be made to accommodate for religious observances, DePauw sponsored extracurricular events (such as if you are an athlete), etc. But again, you must notify me by September 6 to make arrangements. See also *Attendance*, above.

### **Late Work**

All assignments are due on the dates indicated on the syllabus. Unexcused late assignments will lose 1/2 grade point per day late. For example, a “B” paper turned in two days late will be marked down to a “C+”.

### **Special Accommodations**

It is the policy and practice of DePauw University to provide reasonable accommodations for students with properly documented disabilities. Written notification from Student Disability Services is required. If you are eligible to receive an accommodation and would like to request it for this course, please contact Student Disability Services. Allow one week advance notice to ensure enough time for reasonable accommodations to be made. Otherwise, it is not guaranteed that the accommodation can be provided on a timely basis. Accommodations are not retroactive. Students who have questions about Student Disability Services or who have, or think they may have, a disability (psychiatric, attentional, learning, vision, hearing, physical, medical, etc.) are invited to contact Student Disability Services for a confidential discussion in Union Building Suite 200 or by phone at 658-6267. After receiving your official letter of accommodations, please share it with me so that we can make appropriate arrangements for this course to be a successful learning experience for you.

### **Course Schedule Changes**

This syllabus represents the master plan of how instruction and learning for this course will proceed. All information **ABOVE** this notice (including objectives, assignment details and point values, due dates, policies, etc.) **WILL NOT CHANGE**: this is my pledge to you.

However, all information **BELOW** this notice (the following **Schedule**: topics, readings, etc.) is **SUBJECT TO CHANGE** at my discretion and only after consultation with you all. You are welcome to suggest changes to the course schedule at any time, which may be negotiated for implementation, although there is no guarantee that suggested changes will be implemented. If any major changes will be introduced into the **Schedule**, I will promptly notify all of you.

## SCHEDULE

---

Week 1: Aug 24 INTRODUCTION/ORIENTATION

---

**August 24**  
**Course Overview**

**Readings**

- Course Syllabus
- *Argument/Background*
  - Herling, chapters 1-4

---

Week 2: Aug 29/31 **I. ANCIENT ROOTS OF PERSONIFIED EVIL ~  
MESOPOTAMIA, PERSIA, AND ISRAEL  
(FROM 3000 BCE)**

---

**DUE: Chats with the Professor I**

**ongoing through Week 3**

**August 29**  
**Introduction to the Academic Study of Satan and Personified Evil**  
**Historical Importance of Satan**  
**Key Terms and Concepts**

**Readings**

- *Argument/Background*
  - Kelly, Introduction
  - Kelly, chapter 1
  - Beal, Introduction

**August 31**  
**Satan's Predecessors from the Ancient Near East ~**  
**Mesopotamian Chaos-Monsters, Zoroastrian Dualism, Ancient Israel**

**Readings**

- *Exhibits*
  - Mesopotamia: "Anzu"
  - Persia: "Verses from Yasna 30"; Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris*, sections 369-370
  - Israel: Psalm 74.12-17; 89.5-18; Job 1-2; Numbers 22; Zechariah 3.1-2; 1 Chronicles 21.1; 2 Samuel 24.1
- *Argument/Background*
  - Beal, chapters 1-2

---

Week 3: Sep 5/7

---

**DUE: Chats with the Professor I**

**ongoing through Week 3**

**Passage Analysis**

**ongoing through Week 8  
(Dan, Kinsey, John)**

**September 5**

**Satan's Roots in Jewish Apocalypticism ~  
Fallen Angels in 1 Enoch (ca. 225 BCE)**

***Readings***

- *Exhibits*
  - Genesis 6.1-8
  - 1 Enoch 1-16
- *Argument/Background*
  - Kelly, chapter 2

**September 7**

**Satan's Roots in Jewish Apocalypticism ~  
Mastema in Jubilees and Beliar in the Dead Sea Scrolls (ca. 100 BCE)**

***Readings***

- *Exhibits*
  - Jubilees (selections)
  - Rule of the Community (selections)
  - War Scroll (selections)
  - Testament of Job (selections)
- *Argument/Background*
  - Beal, chapters 3-4

DUE: Passage Analysis

ongoing through Week 8  
(Lis, Ian, Jara)

September 12

Satan and his Roles in the Early Jesus Movements ~  
The Devil and Beelzebub in Early Biographies of Jesus (70-100 CE)  
Internal Functions of the Rhetoric of Satan in Paul (ca. 50-110 CE)

*Readings*

- *Exhibits* [readings that are in **bold** should take priority]
  - Gospels
    - **Mark 1.12–13; 3.22–27**; 4.15; 8.28–34; 12.22–45
    - **Matt. 4.1–11**; 5.37; 6.13; 9.34; 10.25; 12.24–29; 12.43; 13.39; 25.41
    - **Luke 4.1–13**; 8.12; 10.18; 11.15–19; 13.16; 22.3; 22.31–32
  - Paul
    - **1 Cor. 5.1-5; 7.1-5**
    - **2 Cor. 2.11; 4.4; 11.14; 12.1-10**
    - Rom. 16.20
- *Argument/Background*
  - Kelly, chapters 3-4

September 14

Satan and his Roles in the Early Jesus Movements ~  
Internal Functions of the Rhetoric of Satan in John and Other Writers (ca. 50-110 CE)  
A Satanic Empire in John's Apocalypse (ca. 80-100 CE)

*Readings*

- *Exhibits* [readings that are in **bold** should take priority]
  - Gospels
    - **John 8.44**; 12.31; 13.2; 13.27–30; 14.30; 16.11
  - Other writings
    - 1 Tim. 1.20; 3.6–7; 5.15
    - 2 Tim. 2.26
    - Heb. 2.14
    - James 4.7
    - 1 Pet. 5.8
    - 1 John 3.8
    - Jude 1.9
  - **John's Apocalypse (Revelation) 9.1–2; 12.1–13.18; 19.17–20.15**
- *Argument/Background*
  - Kelly, chapters 5-7
  - Beal, chapter 6

---

Week 5: Sep 19/21

---

**DUE: Passage Analysis**

**ongoing through Week 8  
(Rose, Johnny, Ned)**

**September 19**

**Developments in Satan's Story in the First Centuries ~**

**Jealous Satan, the Image of God, and the Serpent in *The Life of Adam and Eve***

**Readings**

- *Exhibits*
- *The Life of Adam and Eve* (selections), which re-tells and expands Gen 2-3
- *Argument/Background*
- Kelly, chapter 8.1-8.2

**September 21**

**Developments in Satan's Story in the First Centuries ~**

**The Jealous Creator and the Serpent of Wisdom in Gnosticism (2nd century CE)**

**Readings**

- *Exhibits*
- *On the Origin of the World* (selections), which reinterprets Gen 1-7
- *Hypostasis of the Archons* (selections), which reinterprets Gen 1-6 [ \* ]

---

Week 6: Sep 26

---

**Note: Wednesday, Sep 28, DePauw will be suspending *all* classes for a community-wide forum diversity, difference, and the ways in which we create a robust, more inclusive community at DePauw; there is no scheduled class meeting for this day.**

**DUE: Passage Analysis**

**ongoing through Week 8  
(Rudy, Andi)**

**Book Review (draft)**

**Friday, September 30**

**Sep 26**

**Satan as Instigator of Idolatry ("Paganism") and Heresy (150-430 CE and beyond)**

**Satan's Demons and the Greco-Roman Gods in the Church Fathers**

**Readings**

- *Exhibits*
- Isaiah 14
- Origen, "On Rational Natures"
- Justin Martyr, *2 Apology* 5
- Tertullian, *On the Apparel of Women*
- *Argument/Background*
- Kelly, chapter 9

---

Week 7: Oct 3/5

---

**DUE: Passage Analysis**

**ongoing through Week 8  
(Sarah, Annie, Emily)**

**Book Review (final)**

**Friday, October 7**

**October 3**

**Augustine and the “Classical View” ~  
Satan as Father of Lies and Heresy in the Church Fathers**

***Readings***

- *Exhibits*
  - Augustine, *Enchiridion* (selections)
- *Argument/Background*
  - Kelly, chapter 10.1-10.2

**October 5**

**Augustine and the “Classical View” (continued)**

***Readings***

- *Exhibits*
  - Augustine, *The City of God against the Pagans* (selections)

---

Week 8: Oct 10/12

**III. IMAG(IN)ING SATAN IN LATE ANTIQUITY  
AND THE MIDDLE AGES (312 - 1500 CE)**

---

**DUE: Passage Analysis**

**ongoing through Week 8  
(Carrie)**

**Prospectus**

**Friday, October 14**

**October 10  
Satan in Rabbinic Judaism**

***Readings***

- *Exhibits*
  - Baba Batra 16a
  - Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer 13-21
- *Argument/Background*
  - Beal, chapter 5

**October 12  
Satan in Islam**

***Readings***

- *Exhibits*
  - Qur'an 2.30-39; 7.11-31, 15.31-60, 26.69-104
  - Rumi, *Satan's Apology* (selections)
- *Argument/Background*
  - Kelly, chapter 8.3
  - Awn, *Satan's Tragedy and Redemption: Iblis in Sufi Psychology* (selections)

---

Oct 17/19

**FALL BREAK ~ NO CLASS**

---

**Note: Monday-Friday, Oct 17-21, DePauw is closed for the *Fall midterm break*; there are no scheduled class meetings for this week.**

---

Week 9: Oct 24/26

---

**Medieval Perceptions of Satan I  
Visualizing Hell's Torment and Satan**

**Readings**

- *Exhibits*
  - Dante, *Inferno* (selections)
- *Argument/Background*
  - Kelly, chapter 10.3

---

Week 10: Oct 31/Nov 2

---

**DUE: Exploratory Summary**

**ongoing through Week 11**

**Medieval Perceptions of Satan II  
Popular Religion, Heresy, Witchcraft, and Internal Battles of the Reformations**

**Readings**

- *Exhibits*
  - Menno Simons, "The Church: An Instructive Comparison Whereby the Church of Christ and That of Antichrist May be Known"
  - *Malleus Maleficarum* (selections)
- *Argument/Background*
  - Kelly, chapter 11

---

Week 11: Nov 7/9

---

**IV. MODERN RE-CONFIGURATIONS OF  
PERSONIFIED EVIL (c. 1500 - PRESENT)**

**DUE: Exploratory Summary**

**ongoing through Week 11**

**From Traditional (Evil) Satan to Modern (Ironic) Mephisto**

**Readings**

- *Exhibits*
  - Marlowe, *Dr. Faustus* (selections)
  - Milton, *Paradise Lost* (selections)
  - Goethe, *Faust* (selections)
- *Argument/Background*
  - Kelly, chapter 12

---

Week 12: Nov 14/16

---

**Imag(in)ing Satan in the Modern World**

**Readings**

- *Exhibits*
  - Blake, *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* (selections)
  - Baudelaire, *The Flowers of Evil* (selections)
  - Hogg, *Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (selections)
  - Twain, *No. 44: The Mysterious Stranger* (selections)
  - C.S. Lewis, *The Screwtape Letters* (selections)
  - Duncan, *I, Lucifer* (selections)
- *Argument/Background*
  - Kelly, chapters 13-14

---

Nov 21/23

**THANKSGIVING RECESS ~ NO CLASS**

---

**Note: I will be away for a conference on Monday, Nov 21, and Wednesday-Friday, Nov 23-25, DePauw is closed for the *Thanksgiving recess*; there are no scheduled class meetings for this week.**

---

Week 13: Nov 28/30

---

**DUE: Non-Literary Exposé  
Conference Paper (draft)**

**ongoing in Week 13  
Friday, December 2**

---

Week 14: Dec 5/7

---

**DUE: Defense**

**ongoing in Week 14**

---

Finals Week

---

**DUE: Conference Paper (final)**

**Friday, December 16**