

Bethel University

Spark

All Electronic Theses and Dissertations

2018

The Need to Equip Lutheran Congregations in Mission for Christ Church Planters for Spiritual Warfare

David John Heinrich
Bethel University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://spark.bethel.edu/etd>



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Heinrich, D. J. (2018). *The Need to Equip Lutheran Congregations in Mission for Christ Church Planters for Spiritual Warfare* [Doctoral thesis, Bethel University]. Spark Repository. <https://spark.bethel.edu/etd/282>

This Doctoral thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Spark. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Spark.

BETHEL UNIVERSITY
BETHEL SEMINARY ST. PAUL

THE NEED TO EQUIP
LUTHERAN CONGREGATIONS IN MISSION FOR CHRIST
CHURCH PLANTERS FOR SPIRITUAL WARFARE

A THESIS PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DOCTOR OF MINISTRY DEGREE
IN CHURCH LEADERSHIP

BY
DAVID J. HEINRICH
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

MAY 2018

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to my faculty advisor, Dr. Timothy Senapatiratne. Your patience, insights, and humorous stories encouraged me to stay motivated and focused throughout the DMin process. I would also like to thank Dr. Justin Irving his class on how to write a good thesis. Thank you, committee members, Dr. Katie Friesen Smith, Dr. Paul Eddy, and Dr. Timothy Senapatiratne for your helpful comments and suggestions. I also want to thank the Bethel Seminary faculty and administrative staff, especially Ceallaigh Anderson Smart and Julie Burns, for helping me navigate the administrative details of the program. It was your friendship, guidance, and expertise along with all your prayers that made this life-changing experience so pleasant. Thanks to my editor, Laurie Stephenson. Your help was invaluable. Moreover, thanks to David and Christy Grigor for your IT support and Ted and Stephanie Rossing for a much better computer.

Some special thanks for the prayers and support of all my family, Laura and Joe, Bruce, and Tomiko, Roger, and Lisa, Carolyn, and Jody. My kids, John and Jessica, Merry and Marc, Dave and Nadine, Cara and Josh. And my grandkids, Jayden, Ava, Chloe, Jude, Liberty, Ragean, Sabrina, Noah, Olivia and those who are still to make their appearance. Also to all my friends, too many to name, who have prayed and supported me throughout this educational experience. Most of all I want to express my sincere gratitude to the love of my life, Donna. Your constant love, encouragement, support, and editorial advice made this thesis possible. I could have never achieved this degree without you.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	5
DEDICATION.....	7
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	8
The Problem and Its Context	8
Settings of the Project.....	10
Importance of the Project.....	11
CHAPTER TWO: RELATED SPIRITUAL WARFARE RESEARCH.....	16
Three Views of Spiritual Warfare.....	16
A Comparison of Theologies.....	40
CHAPTER THREE: A THEOLOGY OF SPIRITUAL WARFARE.....	42
The Cosmic Battle	42
A Brief Exegesis of Psalm 110 and Its Use in Ephesians and the New Testament.....	47
CHAPTER FOUR: PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RESEARCH METHODS.....	62
Descriptive Sequential Mixed Methods Research Design.....	62
Overview of the Research Process.....	69
CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	74
Overview and Context	74
CHAPTER SIX: EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION.....	93
Introduction.....	93
Discoveries from Chapter Two.....	93
Discoveries from Chapter Three.....	97

	4
Discoveries from the Field Research	99
Conclusion	101
Strengths of the Research	105
Weakness of the Research	105
CHAPTER SEVEN: REFLECTION	107
Personal Background	107
Personal Growth	108
Spiritual Growth	108
Future Expectations	109
APPENDIX A: DOCTOR OF MINISTRY SURVEY	110
APPENDIX B: CHURCH PLANTERS PHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	112
BIBLIOGRAPHY	114

ABSTRACT

The goal of this research project was to address the need for spiritual warfare training and equipping for church planters to enable them to be more efficient in mission within the Lutheran Congregations in Mission for Christ (LCMC) movement. The goal was achieved by exploring spiritual warfare concepts in the Scriptures and writing a condensed theology. The researcher reviewed scholarly literature that dealt with spiritual warfare, with particular attention given to the works of Clinton Arnold, Hendrik Berkhof, and Rudolf Bultmann. The researcher showed that these three theologians set the foundational views of Christian spiritual warfare theology for the church in the twenty-first century. These three views and their implications form church orthodoxy and orthopraxis. The researcher designed a sequential mixed methods, quantitative, and qualitative approach to this research with LCMC church planters.

The research findings demonstrated that church planters were well educated, with 84 percent holding a Master of Divinity degree; of the church planters surveyed 96 percent did not receive any formal spiritual warfare training and equipping in seminary or Bible school; the spiritual warfare training environment preferred was hands-on activation workshops. The participants suggested topics of interest for training, which the researcher organized into four categories: discernment, strategies to stand firm, specific issues, and biblical bases for engaging the enemy. All of the participants agreed with Clinton Arnold's view that the devil and demons are real entities with an intellect and a

will who can intervene in the affairs of humanity, interrupt or obstruct God's will, and bother and torment God's people.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to the Christian men who took a special interest in me and gave their time to disciple me. Each one expressed their dynamic relationship with the Lord Jesus Christ in a unique way that helped me grow, mature, and develop my own relationship with Jesus and ministry skills to use and equip others.

Dick Lane, you taught me how to pray and that relationship with Jesus was real.

David Mobley, you taught me the Spirit-filled life and how to witness in a kind way.

Jeff Young, you taught me the Bible, leadership skills, and how to multiply disciples.

Nelson Parke, you modeled for me that Christianity can be fun and enjoyable.

Bill Pratt, you encouraged and walked with me as I was pursuing advanced education.

Paul Anderson, you see God's call on my life and give me opportunity to do it. My life has been radically changed by your love, friendship, and involvement in my life and ministry. I am eternally grateful for your investment.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The Problem and Its Context

Statement of the Problem

The problem this project addressed is the need for spiritual warfare training and equipping in order for church planters to be more effective in mission within the Lutheran Congregations in Mission for Christ (LCMC) movement. In response to this problem, the researcher explored spiritual warfare concepts in the Scriptures to develop a theology of spiritual warfare; reviewed scholarly literature that deals with spiritual warfare, particularly the works of Clinton Arnold, Hendrik Berkhof, and Rudolf Bultmann; surveyed LCMC church planters to explore their confidence levels about spiritual warfare and the needs of their congregations with regard to spiritual warfare training and equipping; and conducted interviews to arrive at possible solutions for better training and equipping in spiritual warfare for LCMC church planters and the church worldwide.

Definition of Terms

Equipping: Hands-on experience in the skill of praying for healing both physical and emotional, deliverance from demonic bondage, and use of authority and spiritual gifts found in 1 Corinthians 12:7-10.¹

Kingdom of Heaven/God: The rule and reign of God that invaded the kingdom of Satan, defeated it and will ultimately cast it out when Christ returns.

¹ Unless otherwise noted all biblical references are from the *New International Version (NIV)* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2011).

Mission: A popular term used in the LCMC for obedience to the Great Commission in all its forms.

Movement: A group of people banding together and planning a sequence of activities.

Paranormal: Recognizable phenomena that go beyond rational scientific explanation and considered supernatural.

Spiritual Warfare: The invisible war that God wages through his people “against the rulers, against the authorities, against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil” (Eph. 6:12), which can sometimes manifest in paranormal ways.

Training: Instruction, discipline, and drill to qualify and make proficient.

Delimitations of the Problem

The research was limited to the LCMC movement.

The research was limited to LCMC church plants within the last five years.

The research was limited to church plants on the United States mainland.

Assumptions

The first assumption was that the church plants had motivated mature leaders who have the gifts and calling needed to plant a church.

The second assumption was that the universal church is manifest in local churches planted by motivated, mature, gifted, and called leaders.

The third assumption was that the church planters were evaluated by the LCMC and deemed qualified for the task of church planting.

The fourth assumption was that the Bible was foundational for church planters in the development of their theology and practices of spiritual warfare.

Subproblems

The first subproblem was to explore spiritual warfare concepts found in the New Testament and develop a theology of spiritual warfare.

The second subproblem was to review scholarly literature that deals with spiritual warfare, particularly the work of Clinton Arnold, Hendrik Berkhof, and Rudolf Bultmann.

The third subproblem was to survey LCMC church planters to explore their personal confidence levels with regard to spiritual warfare and the needs of their congregations with regard to spiritual warfare training and equipping.

The fourth subproblem was to interview LCMC church planters to explore their personal demographics, thoughts, ideas, and opinions about spiritual warfare and the needs of their congregations with regard to spiritual warfare training and equipping.

Settings of the Project

The setting for the research was among LCMC church planters across the United States. The director of church planting for the LCMC identified 22 church planters who attended the LCMC National Convention in Minneapolis, Minnesota in October 2017 and invited them to participate in the research.

The LCMC describes itself as a movement as opposed to a denomination. It was formed in 2001 and has about 900 congregation members located in 16 countries. The movement defines their number one mission as sharing the gospel of Jesus Christ, both locally and abroad. The movement's focus is on strengthening the member congregations and planting new ones. They encourage a diversity of models in their church planting efforts in the belief that the Holy Spirit is very creative and that one size does not fit all.

Importance of the Project

Importance of the Project to the Researcher

The researcher has been personally involved in church planting and is convinced that planting new churches is one of the best ways to reach people for Christ. In this ever-changing multi-cultural society, new church plants can recognize and respond to the latest trends, which helps them to connect with people. New church plants have little or no tradition to restrain them from being creative. The people attracted to new church plants seem to be more teachable and understanding in dealing with the destructive nature of spiritual warfare in other people's lives and their own.

The researcher has been a part of four church plants. The researcher planted his first church in 1989 and saw firsthand the benefits of Holy Spirit power applied in spiritual warfare situations. The gifts of the Holy Spirit found in 1 Corinthians 12:7-10 can be used as weapons against spiritual forces. Some but not all people came to the researcher's church because of a healing or deliverance from demonic bondage or the ending of paranormal activity inside their home. Others came because they had experienced the power of the Holy Spirit in their past and desired to participate in a church that not only recognized this power but also equipped people to depend on the power of the Holy Spirit in their daily lives.

In August 2010, the researcher was part of an LCMC church planting launch team in Ramsey, Minnesota. A proactive effort was made to create a healing church, a church culture where the power of the Holy Spirit was expected and displayed to the glory of God. Sermons on the Book of Acts began early in the church's history. About 30 potential leaders were identified to help establish the church culture, and weekend equipping workshops were scheduled over the next six months. The focus of the weekend

workshops was to introduce potential leaders to the ministry of the Holy Spirit to “do the Book of Acts” and not just hear about it on Sunday mornings.

The training covered related topics such as the impact of worldview, the kingdom of God, how to introduce others to Christ, and how to pray effectively for distinct types of healing including healing of the spirit, healing of past hurts, healing of the body, healing of relationships, healing for those who need deliverance from demonic strongholds and bondage, and how to be empowered by the Holy Spirit.

The potential leaders developed skills over the course of time including confidence to pray for healing and deliverance with others. They also took leadership roles in other areas of the church plant. A dynamic ministry of the Holy Spirit for healing, deliverance, and prayer against paranormal activity became a customary practice in the day-to-day lives of many of the new members. Training and equipping classes are still held from time to time so people can learn how to function in the power of the Holy Spirit for daily living and to pray efficiently for others in a caring and compassionate way.

Members raised money and constructed a new building with a 500-seat auditorium in 2013. The church has grown to an average attendance of more than 1,000 with three services on the weekend.

The researcher believes that the development of a church culture that welcomes a ministry of healing and deliverance from demonic strongholds and bondage is attractive to people who are looking for a God who is active and interested in loving and helping them. Training and equipping the church to recognize and deal with spiritual warfare as a regular part of life from its beginning was one factor in the success of this church plant.

Importance of the Project to the Immediate Ministry Context

The researcher is an ordained deployed pastor in the LCMC movement. The leadership of the LCMC movement states on their website² that the movement's priority is missional communities and fulfilling the Great Commission. They do this by encouraging every member to share the Gospel of Jesus Christ both locally and abroad, and by focusing on strengthening the congregations they have and planting new ones.³

The researcher is committed and loyal to the LCMC and passionate about encouraging future missional expansion. An excellent way to do that is by planting culturally relevant healthy churches with leaders who are trained, equipped, and empowered by the Holy Spirit to be useful in healing, deliverance, and dealing with all different kinds of paranormal spiritual warfare matters.

Importance of the Project to the Church at Large

The researcher believes that this project will help the church at large to recognize the authority and power God has granted it and to be more efficient in the proclamation and demonstration of the kingdom of God. The researcher believes that the church at large is under attack and must recognize the reality that a personal spiritual "thief comes to steal, kill and destroy" (John 10:10). The thief wants to prevent God's people from fulfilling their calling and using their talents for God's glory.

The thief wants to steal, kill, and destroy all the blessings of God and will get away with whatever is unprotected. Unfortunately, the thief has for the most part gone unchallenged by the American church in the twenty-first century. The church is in decline

² LCMC, "We're All Working Together to Fulfill Christ's Great Commission to Go and Make Disciples of All Nations," accessed June 15, 2017, <http://www.lcmc.net/who-we-are>.

³ See the website above for the quote and other information on the LCMC movement.

but all the while the Holy Spirit patiently waits for her to once again draw upon God's power to take a stand against the thief and his activities. Rich Nathan poses the following question:

If Jesus is Lord and he has all power, and we have the Holy Spirit, and we have this powerful message called the Gospel, then why aren't we more successful than we are? Why are so many marriages, even among church-going, supposedly Bible-believing Christians, in such bad shape? And why do some Christian marriages end in divorce? Why do so many kids raised in Christian families end up barely connected to the church? Why are so many church-goers living double lives, hopelessly addicted, unhappy, unfulfilled?⁴

The church at large could use a wake-up call to be about its business of standing against and overcoming the gates of Hades. Jesus has called his church to engage in battle as good soldiers fighting the good fight. Every soldier needs to complete boot camp, trained and equipped to be a competent soldier in God's army.

Unfortunately, the church of the twenty-first century seems to be preoccupied and satisfied with building an audience rather than an army. In the researcher's opinion the church at large seems to be content with being civilians at a time of war.

The first century Christians seemed to have a relentless attitude about loving and serving others and sharing the gospel of the kingdom with others. They were making disciples and "teaching them all that I commanded you" (Matt. 28:20). They were trained and equipped to deal with the spiritual forces of the enemy, and they claimed that the empowerment of the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:8, 1 Cor. 12:7-11, Gal. 5:22-23) made the difference. It seems to the researcher that the Christian life was an authentic experience for believers in the first century. It was not a standard of performance to try and live up

⁴ Rich Nathan, *What Is the Kingdom of God?* (Anaheim, CA: Vineyard USA, 2014), 9.

to. Bill Bright, the founder of Campus Crusade for Christ International now known as Cru, exemplified this attitude in his life and summed it up well when he wrote:

Whether or not we are Christians, we are going to have problems in this life. Christian or not, we will one day die. If I am going to be a Christian, I want all that God has for me and I want to be all that He wants me to be. If I am to suffer at all, and one day die, why not suffer and die for the highest and best, for the Lord Jesus Christ and His gospel!⁵

This type of life has been modeled by many down through the halls of history.

The researcher hopes and prays that this project will propel others to do the same. When Jesus commissioned his apostles, he also commissioned his church through the centuries to be vigilant and victorious. This project hopes to motivate God's people to fulfill their calling.

This project focused on the need for spiritual warfare equipping among church planters by exposing potential weakness in the hope that changes can be made to prepare church planters here and around the world to fulfill their God-given calling.

⁵ Bill Bright, *The Christian and the Holy Spirit* (San Bernardino, CA: Campus Crusade for Christ, 1968), 18.

CHAPTER TWO: RELATED SPIRITUAL WARFARE RESEARCH

Three Views of Spiritual Warfare

This chapter presents three different theologians' views on the Pauline "powers and principalities." The three theologians are Clinton Arnold, Hendrik Berkhof, and Rudolf Bultmann. The term "spiritual warfare" is a popular term that covers three main battlegrounds found in the Scriptures. A concise Pauline account of these three battlegrounds is found in Ephesians 2:2-3. Paul describes himself and the Ephesians in their pre-converted condition as following the ways of the "world," following the "ruler" [the devil] of the kingdom of the air, and gratifying the cravings of our "flesh."¹ The researcher focused on the "ruler"—the devil and his demons represented by the Pauline terms "powers and principalities."

The ways in which these three twentieth-century theologians interpreted the Pauline powers and principalities have influenced twenty-first-century theologians, pastors, church members, and practitioners. In the researcher's estimation these three views represent a foundation for the ways theologians can teach their students, pastors can preach to their congregations, and practitioners can exercise their expertise. Church planters will also follow suit based upon their orientation to these foundational ways of interpreting spiritual warfare.

¹ For a succinct summary of these three battle fronts and a full array of sources, see James K. Beilby and Paul Rhodes Eddy, eds., *Understanding Spiritual Warfare: Four Views* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012), 32-35.

The order in which the theologians are presented below is based on their historical time of writing. Those who followed took note of those who went ahead and wrote before. As a result, Berkhof was influenced by Bultmann and Arnold's writings to some extent respond to both Bultmann and Berkhof's writings. Of the three, Bultmann created the most extensive body of writings about spiritual, offering much more to be researched and written about. Berkhof produced the least amount of material on this subject, and thus less writing was devoted to him.

Rudolf Bultmann (1884-1976)

The Background of Rudolf Bultmann

Understanding Rudolf Bultmann or any author for that matter in their life context can be helpful in grasping their ideas. Therefore, a little glimpse into Bultmann's background is in order. He was born in Germany, the son of a Lutheran pastor, and became a leading theologian and New Testament scholar in the twentieth century. Bultmann was "known for his program to 'demythologize' the New Testament—i.e., to interpret, according to the concepts of existentialist philosophy, the essential message of the New Testament was expressed in mythical terms."² He began a teaching career at the University at Marburg in 1912 and spent four years (1916 to 1920) at two other schools before returning to Marburg. Marburg happened to be located in West Germany after the country was divided at the end of World War II; Bultmann retired from Marburg in 1951.

According to Ian Henderson's personal insights into Bultmann's life, it is impossible to know Bultmann without understanding the influence of his family. Bultmann's relationships with his wife and children were significant for him, and "he is a

² Rudolf Bultmann, accessed August 30, 2017, <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Rudolf-Bultmann>.

man to whom personal relations have given much, and it is significant that when he applies the language of personal relations to God, he considers that he is speaking analogically not mythologically.”³ In other words, Bultmann’s language of personal relations with God is based on reason and historical validation rather than myth or legend.

Bultmann was no doubt influenced by the violence and tragedy of evil. He lost one brother in World War I and a second brother in a Nazi concentration camp. Bultmann supported the resistance of Nazi church policy and defended the political independence of the church and theological schools. Because Nazi law demanded the removal of all non-Aryan officials in the church and universities, Bultmann played it safe by avoiding direct political activity during Hitler’s regime.

Bultmann’s idea of demythologizing biblical text generated international debate for decades. Both academic theologians and Christian laity were involved in this ongoing discussion.⁴ Ironically, “Bultmann was both condemned as a heretic who denied the Christian faith and praised as the foremost defender of faith in modern times.”⁵

The Theology of Rudolf Bultmann

Rudolf Bultmann’s theology and his understanding of the kingdom conflict with cosmic powers and their influence on humanity have significant ramifications. His view of supernatural divine intervention in Scripture was based on myth. Bultmann believed

³ Ian Henderson, *Rudolf Bultmann* (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1966), 2.

⁴ Svein Aage Christoffersen, “Rudolf Bultmann,” in *Key Theological Thinkers from Modern to Postmodern*, ed. Staale Johannes Kristiansen and Svein Rise (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013), 80-81.

⁵ Christoffersen, 81.

that myth evolved in ancient times through Persian and Babylonian influence.⁶ This early mythology predisposed Jewish thought and helped to shape a Jewish eschatology according to Bultmann's understanding.⁷ It was the Persian and Babylonian sources working through Jewish belief that gave Gnosticism both influence and language in early Christian thought.⁸ As a result, Gnosticism crept into Christianity.⁹ "It is Gnostic language when Satan is called "the god of this world, ... ruler of this world, ... the prince of the power of the air. ... Aside from the terms for mythological figures, the *terminology* in which dualism is expressed shows extensive Gnostic influence."¹⁰

As a result of Bultmann's worldview on history and the Gospel record, he confessed that "we can know almost nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus."¹¹ Bultmann placed a binary choice before interpreters: they must choose either mythology, which is not credible in a modern age according to Bultmann, or science, which is credible in this modern age.

Bultmann reiterates this theme when he states, "Humanity's knowledge and mastery of the world have advanced to such an extent through science and technology that it is no longer possible for anyone seriously to hold the New Testament view of the world—in fact, there is hardly anyone who does."¹²

⁶ Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), 172-173.

⁷ Bultmann, *Theology*, 172-173.

⁸ Bultmann, *Theology*, 172-173.

⁹ Bultmann, *Theology*, 172-173.

¹⁰ Bultmann, *Theology*, 172-173.

¹¹ Rudolf Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word* (New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926), 8.

¹² Rudolf Bultmann, *Kerygma and Myth* ed. Hans Werner Bartsch (London England: SPCK, 1953), 4.

Bultmann seemed to believe that the biblical writers were merely expressing in their non-scientific way what they observed. He maintained that because we have come into a scientific world, we no longer need myth to explain how the world works. We no longer need to think unscientifically or use unscientific terminology. Therefore, it is up to the interpreter to demythologize the supernatural powers and principalities existentially in the text.¹³ When this happens, the interpreter can get at the authentic deeper meaning of the author within their contemporary context.

Bultmann states, “By ‘demythologizing’ I understand a hermeneutical procedure that inquires about the reality referred to by mythological statements or texts. That presupposes that myth indeed talks about a reality, but in an inadequate way.”¹⁴ He goes on to say, “The real purpose of myth, is not to present an objective picture of the world as it is but to express humanity’s understanding of himself in the world in which he lives. Myth should be interpreted not cosmologically, but anthropologically, or better still, existentially.”¹⁵

Bultmann explains that “the real purpose of myth” is to acknowledge a greater power that controls humanity and the world but is hindered by language.¹⁶ Therefore the imagery of the New Testament mythology is not as important as “the understanding of existence.”¹⁷ He continues by questioning whether “this understanding of existence is

¹³ Existential interpretation for Bultmann was for the interpreter of the text to make a decision about one’s existence and how it relates to the text based on Martin Heidegger’s philosophy.

¹⁴ Rudolf Bultmann, *New Testament and Mythology and Other Basic Writings* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984), 155.

¹⁵ Bultmann, *New Testament*, 10.

¹⁶ Bultmann, *New Testament*, 11.

¹⁷ Bultmann, *New Testament*, 11.

true,” and follows up with the comment that “faith claims that it is,” but asserts that faith should stand independently from the imagery of New Testament mythology.¹⁸

Bultmann critic I.H. Marshall explains Bultmann’s usage of the term by arguing that some scholars, Bultmann included, believe that “myths ‘really’ express an understanding of humanity which must be released from its mythological expression (i.e., demythologized) and then re-expressed in other terms which will be intelligible to modern men and women who cannot believe in the supernatural.”¹⁹ Marshall maintains that myth is a literary genre and “there is no reason in principle why the Bible should not contain mythical material.”²⁰ He goes on to argue that a myth rooted in historical truth needs to be detached from its validity because like the parables, “myth may well be valid even though the story is fictitious.”²¹

According to George Ladd, “unlike Bultmann’s contemporary theologians Barth²² and Burkitt,²³ Barth accepted the powers and principalities and Burkitt rejects them, but Bultmann came up with a way to interpret them. He created a whole new school of

¹⁸ Bultmann, “New Testament,” 11.

¹⁹ I.H. Marshall says, “Myth is a confusing and slippery term in theology; it is used in so many ill-defined ways by individual theologians that it would be no bad thing if its use were prohibited.” I.H. Marshall, “Myth,” in *New Dictionary of Theology, Historical and Systematic*, eds. Martin Davie, Tim Grass, Stephen R. Holmes, John McDowell, and T.A. Noble (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2016), 600.

²⁰ Marshall, 601.

²¹ Marshall, 601.

²² During World War II in the years of 1940 and 1941 Karl Barth’s acceptance of the powers and principalities was “quite literal” and he believed that Hitler’s demonic state would be overcome by Christ according to Romans 13 and Colossians 2:15. Henderson, 21.

²³ Bultmann believed that Paul and the early church were greatly influenced by Gnosticism. “Burkitt does not consider Gnosticism as a rival religion to Christianity. He thinks of the Gnostics rather as Christians who tried to reconcile their religion with the advanced science of their day ... notably by the Ptolemaic astronomy and astrology.” Henderson, 22.

thought in how to interpret the scriptures.”²⁴ Bultmann explains his school of thought thus: “This method of interpretation of the New Testament which tries to recover the deeper meaning behind the mythological conceptions I call *de-mythologizing*—an unsatisfactory word, to be sure. Its aim is not to eliminate the mythological statements but to interpret them. It is a method of hermeneutics.”²⁵

Bultmann observes that “mythology is a primitive science.”²⁶ It was meant to explain things that were “strange, curious, surprising, or frightening” by using “supernatural gods or demons.”²⁷

He explains what he means when he uses the word myth and the need for him to de-mythologize supernatural occurrences in the Scriptures. “Myths speak about gods and demons as powers” and as a result humanity puts themselves under their influence, making life full of “riddles and mysteries.”²⁸

For Bultmann, “myth is the report of an occurrence or an event in which supernatural, superhuman forces or persons are at work.”²⁹ Thinking mythical is unscientific according to Bultmann because it opens the world to intervention by

²⁴ George Eldon Ladd, *Bultmann* (Chicago, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1964), 1.

²⁵ Rudolf Bultmann, *Jesus Christ and Mythology* (New York, NY: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1958), 18.

²⁶ Bultmann, *Jesus*, 18-19.

²⁷ Bultmann, *Jesus*, 18.

²⁸ Bultmann, *Jesus*, 19.

²⁹ Bultmann, *New Testament*, 95.

otherworldly powers.³⁰ In contrast, thinking scientifically closes the world into a natural system which works by cause and effect.³¹

Consequently, Bultmann must demythologize the interpretation in order to get to the deeper meaning the biblical authors intended. He admits that “scientific thinking does destroy the mythological world picture of the Bible, but in the war between science and myth, science wins.”³²

Norman Perrin weighed in on what he believes the motivation behind Bultmann’s proposal of demythologizing and using existential interpretation is all about. He believes that to make the gospel more meaningful to a congregation so that they can receive it, the preacher must put the message in the context of believable modern science.³³

Bultmann believed that his program of demythologizing was “essential if Western people in the second half of the twentieth century were to be able to hear it right”³⁴—in other words, so that modern scientific people would not reject faith in God because of the unlikely supernatural expressions found in the biblical text.

For Bultmann, myth seemed to be what is found in the Gospel record. He saw himself as a scientific historian; therefore, supernatural intervention could not have happened. George Ladd correctly grasps and comments on Bultmann’s understanding of history. Because Bultmann does not accept supernatural beings recorded in history, “the

³⁰ Bultmann, *New Testament*, 96.

³¹ Bultmann, *New Testament*, 96.

³² Bultmann, *New Testament*, 99.

³³ Norman Perrin, *The Promise of Bultmann* (Philadelphia, PA: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1969), 74.

³⁴ Richard Bauckham, “Dualism and Soteriology in Johannine Theology,” in *Beyond Bultmann: Reckoning a New Testament Theology*, eds. Bruce W. Longenecker and Mikeal C. Parsons (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014), 133.

Gospels, therefore, are not trustworthy historical records of what happened but a product of later Christian faith.”³⁵

Conclusion

Bultmann posed and then answered the question, “Can Christian preaching expect modern humanity to accept the mythical view of the world as true? To do so would be both senseless and impossible.”³⁶ The view of the world that allows for supernatural intervention has changed according to Bultmann. As a result, “humanity has then no alternative but to modify his view of the world or produce a new one.”³⁷ Bultmann did exactly that. His effort to demythologize the biblical text was undertaken in the hope of bringing the truth of the Scriptures into a new worldview with science as its paradigm so that modern humankind could accept God.³⁸

Bultmann saw outside influence, whether divine or demonic, as excuses for not taking personal responsibility. He made it very clear that “humanity bears the sole responsibility for their feeling, thinking, and willing. They are not, as the New Testament regards them, a victim of a strange dichotomy which exposes them to the interference of powers outside himself.”³⁹

Bultmann rightly seemed to fear that people who believe in spiritual beings would use the phrase “the devil made me do it” to excuse their behaviors. However, he wrongly saw them as victims, powerless to take responsibility for their actions.

³⁵ Ladd, *Bultmann*, 6-7.

³⁶ Bultmann, *New Testament*, 3.

³⁷ Bultmann, *New Testament*, 3.

³⁸ Bultmann, *Theology*, 258-259.

³⁹ Bultmann, “New Testament,” 6.

To summarize Bultmann's view, he believed that biblical writers used supernatural beings such as the devil and demons to describe evil in a pre-scientific world. Because we now understand the cause and effect nature of science, we can use psychological and sociological terms to explain all supposed supernatural forces of evil. Therefore, no supernatural evil being interferes with humanity.

Hendrik Berkhof (1914-1995)

The Background of Hendrik Berkhof

Hendrik Berkhof received B.D. and Th.D. degrees from the University of Leiden. He served as a minister in the Dutch Reformed Church and as Principal of the Theological Seminary of the Netherlands Reformed Church from 1950 to 1960. He was also a Professor of Dogmatics and Biblical Theology at the University of Leiden.⁴⁰ In addition to his academic tasks, Berkhof was active in the World Council of Churches, serving on its Central Committee from 1954 to 1975. Berkhof was also active with the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, and served as president of the Ecumenical Council of the Netherlands in 1975.⁴¹

As for Bultmann, the destruction of Europe during the two World Wars, the dividing of Germany into East and West, and the Cold War that followed were contributing factors for Berkhof's thesis about how to interpret the powers and principalities.⁴² He concluded that "the powers are the [Human] structures"⁴³ and named

⁴⁰ Hendrikus Berkhof, accessed September 12, 2017, <http://www.theopedia.com/hendrikus-berkhof>.

⁴¹ Robert Benedetto and Donald K. McKim, *Historical Dictionary of the Reformed Churches* (Toronto, Canada: Reformed Press, 2010), 38-39.

⁴² Hendrik Berkhof, *Christ and the Powers*, trans. Howard Yoder (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1977), 8.

them as “the state, politics, class, social struggle, national interest, public opinion, accepted morality, the ideas of decency, humanity, democracy—these give unity and direction to thousands of lives.”⁴⁴

Berkhof and some of his colleagues “found strong resonances of the NT’s principalities and powers in the turmoil of those years.”⁴⁵ According to Berkhof, “after the rise of Nazism some theologians began reading these texts with new eyes.”⁴⁶ The researcher could not find any personal tragedies from the wars that Berkhof may have experienced to shape his perception of evil as was the case for Bultmann.

The Theology of Hendrik Berkhof

Hendrik Berkhof’s theology and his understanding of the kingdom conflict with cosmic powers and their influence on humanity have significant ramifications. According to Berkhof, “when Hitler took the helm in Germany in 1933, the Powers of *Volk*, race, and state took a new grip on men. ... No one could withhold himself, without utmost effort, from the grasp these Powers had on Men’s inner and outer life.”⁴⁷ Berkhof goes on to describe Paul’s use of the phrase “the prince of the power of the air” as the Power that is in the atmosphere and affects everyone. He states, “While studying in Berlin (1937) I myself experienced almost literally how such Powers may be ‘in the air.’”⁴⁸

⁴³ Berkhof, 21.

⁴⁴ Berkhof, 32.

⁴⁵ Robert Ewusie Moses, *Practices of Power: Revisiting the Principalities and Powers in the Pauline Letters* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014), 26.

⁴⁶ Berkhof, 15.

⁴⁷ Berkhof, 32.

⁴⁸ Berkhof, 32.

The influence of Hitler and Nazism influenced Berkhof to think about the powers and principalities in an either/or way. “Either one read therein the confirmation of a conventional orthodox doctrine about angels and devils, or else they were seen as vestiges of antiquated mythology in Paul’s thought, with which more enlightened ages need waste no time.”⁴⁹ For Berkhof, the age of enlightenment clarified what was meant by the powers and principalities.⁵⁰

Berkhof maintained that the human structures were created for the good of humankind. However, the nature of humanity has polluted these structures. Instead of fully serving humanity they now oppress humanity. Berkhof observes that “apart from Christ man is at the mercy of these Powers [structures].”⁵¹

Humans do not totally corrupt the structures. However, Berkhof explains that “the Powers continue to fulfill one half of their function.”⁵² They still help humanity by keeping them from chaos, although the structures tend to keep humanity from God rather than close to him.⁵³

When Berkhof wrote about his personal experience in Berlin (1937) and his understanding of the apostle Paul’s phrase about “the prince of the power of the air” (Eph. 2:2 ASV), he clarified it by saying that people could feel it in the air.⁵⁴

⁴⁹ Berkhof, 15.

⁵⁰ Berkhof, 15.

⁵¹ Berkhof, 22.

⁵² Berkhof, 30.

⁵³ Berkhof, 30.

⁵⁴ Berkhof, 32.

The positive side of the powers for Berkhof is that “they keep men alive. ... Life under the Powers is tolerable, even good.”⁵⁵

The good was thought by Berkhof to be the fact that “certain powers give cohesion to life, fixing the path for the individual as well as for society. ... However pointedly the Bible teaches us to see this as slavery, we should not forget that it is still a part of God’s preserving mercy, holding life in line where humanity does not know Christ’s liberation.”⁵⁶

One of the weaknesses of Berkhof’s theology of Powers and human structures is that he does not detail how one differentiates between good and evil structures, except that the good structures help people draw close to God and the evil structures keep people away.⁵⁷ One chapter in his book *Crisis and Christianization of the Powers*⁵⁸ reveals that the “restoration of the Powers cannot be a solution,”⁵⁹ even though he proposes the “Christianization of the Powers.”⁶⁰ By this he meant to serve humanity in the way God intended.⁶¹

Contrary to Bultmann who took it upon himself to demythologize Paul’s use of powers and principalities for the contemporary world to understand, Berkhof believed that the apostle Paul had already demythologized the perception of the Powers and

⁵⁵ Berkhof, 34.

⁵⁶ Berkhof, 34.

⁵⁷ Berkhof, 30.

⁵⁸ Berkhof, 53.

⁵⁹ Berkhof, 57.

⁶⁰ Berkhof, 58.

⁶¹ Berkhof, 59.

Principalities so that the Gentiles could comprehend it.⁶² Berkhof conceded that Paul was undoubtedly expressing the view of his Jewish heritage, which had to be changed for the Greeks to accept it.⁶³ He acknowledged Jewish thought of the day when he said, “let us summarize what was essential to the view of the Powers found in the apocalyptic and rabbinic writings. Two things were always true of the Powers: (1) they are personal, spiritual beings and (2) they influence events on earth, especially events within nature.”⁶⁴ Berkhof then went on to dismiss any thought that the Powers are personal beings, having a will and intellect. He used Paul as his guiding light on this concept when he wrote with self-assurance that “one can even doubt whether Paul conceived of the Powers as personal beings.”⁶⁵

In his effort to make Paul’s message more understandable for contemporary life, Berkhof interpreted the powers and principalities as structures that humankind can influence on behalf of God. As a result, the structures can be redeemed and used for God’s glory.⁶⁶

Berkhof was confident that as a result of the cross and resurrection of Christ, in the future consummation of the age all of the structures will be reconciled.⁶⁷ They will be restored to a full relationship with God to serve His purposes to the fullest extent of their

⁶² Berkhof, 74-75.

⁶³ Berkhof, 74-75.

⁶⁴ Berkhof, 17.

⁶⁵ Berkhof, 24.

⁶⁶ Berkhof, 45.

⁶⁷ Berkhof, 41.

creation.⁶⁸ In other words, the Powers will no longer be used to separate humanity from God; they will be instruments of God used to connect God with his creation.⁶⁹ Berkhof clarified his idea of the ultimate end that the Powers will be reconciled when he wrote, “there [the Powers] function as instruments of God, given them in creation, which shall be fully restored in the new creation.”⁷⁰

Berkhof’s writings do shed some light upon the concept of human structures being used by God, for God, or against God. He did not see the personification of intellect and will in the structures. As a result, the researcher would put Berkhof’s battleground of structures in the area of the world and its systems rather than the battleground of the devil.

To summarize Berkhof’s views, he believed that human structures meant by God for the good of humanity have been hijacked and used for evil. Structures such as the state, politics, class, social struggle, national interest, public opinion, accepted morality, and ideas about decency, humanity, and democracy are what the Scriptures mean as the devil and or demonic. As a result, there are no supernatural evil beings that interfere with humanity.

Clinton E. Arnold (1958–present)

Clinton Arnold’s Background

Clinton Arnold is a New Testament scholar and dean at Talbot School of Theology. He holds a Ph.D. in New Testament exegesis from the University of Aberdeen Scotland. Arnold has researched the Pauline writings, the Book of Acts, Graeco-Roman

⁶⁸ Berkhof, 41.

⁶⁹ Berkhof, 45.

⁷⁰ Berkhof, 45.

religions, the rise of Christianity in Asia Minor, and the theology of sanctification (which includes the subject of spiritual warfare). In 2011 he was president of the Evangelical Theological Society.⁷¹

Clinton Arnold's Theology

Arnold's theology and his understanding of the kingdom conflict with cosmic powers and their influence on humanity have significant ramifications. He interprets the apostle Paul's "powers and principalities" as a factual reality, personal beings who influence people. Arnold defends what he calls a traditional view of powers against, as he says, "the many scholars [who] have 'demythologized the powers of darkness in an attempt to relate scriptural statements that refer to evil forces to modern life.'" ⁷² He also clarifies what he and like-minded scholars mean by the term "spiritual warfare." "We are suggesting that life is not just biology; there is a uniquely spiritual dimension to reality. There are unseen, personal forces that have an impact on day-to-day life."⁷³ Arnold uses the church father's interpretation as a defense for his understanding of "powers and principalities" against the effort to change the meaning because of changing times.⁷⁴ He says that "belief in the real existence of these powers continued through virtually the entire history of the church, including the Reformation."⁷⁵

⁷¹ Talbot Seminary, accessed January 9, 2018, http://www.talbot.edu/faculty/profile/clinton_arnold/.

⁷² Clinton E. Arnold, *Powers of Darkness: Principalities & Powers in Paul's Letters* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 89.

⁷³ Clinton E. Arnold, *3 Crucial Questions about Spiritual Warfare* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1997), 26.

⁷⁴ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 169-170.

⁷⁵ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 169-170.

Arnold takes issue with the modern idea that supernatural personal forces have been reinterpreted. He believes that “the crux of the issue for all interpreters is the degree to which we should allow our Western scientific worldview to determine our conclusions.”⁷⁶ Arnold leans on Philip Johnson, a professor at the University of California–Berkeley, who points out the fallacies of scientific naturalism in this day and age by saying, “Scientific naturalism is a story that reduces reality to physical particles and impersonal laws, portrays life as a meaningless competition among organisms that exist only to survive and reproduce, and sees the mind as no more than an emergent property of biochemical reactions.”⁷⁷

According to Arnold the Enlightenment brought about an overly zealous reaction to supernatural phenomenon. In Western culture the Enlightenment that produced the scientific method has been misused to eliminate all things that are categorized as supernatural.⁷⁸ Arnold declares, “The new supremacy of a materialistic and rationalistic worldview” is skeptical of “miraculous and supernatural” records found in Scripture such as “demons and angels,” and regarded as “myth” to transmit “theological truth but devoid of any historical substance.”⁷⁹

This Western worldview devoid of the miraculous and historical substance is also found to be suspect by Gordon Fee, who agrees with Arnold on this matter. Fee commented on the supremacy of a materialistic and rationalistic Western worldview in a

⁷⁶ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 176.

⁷⁷ Phillip E. Johnson, *Reason in the Balance: The Case against Naturalism in Science, Law and Education* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1995), 197.

⁷⁸ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 170.

⁷⁹ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 170.

footnote in his commentary on 1 Corinthians 10:20, in which he called out Bultmann and his modern man. Fee states that “it is fashionable among modern scholars to ‘exonerate’ Paul at this point as being a man of his times recognizing demons versus Bultmann’s modern man who does not recognizes demons must demythologize the myth of the gospels.”⁸⁰ He goes on to say that “Bultmann’s ‘modern man,’ who cannot believe in such reality, is the true ‘myth,’ not the gospel he set out to ‘demythologize.’”⁸¹ Fee has spent most of his years in academic circles and observes, “The cloistered existence of the Western university tends to isolate Western academics from the realities that many Third World people experience on a regular basis.”⁸²

Arnold points out that former missionary to India and anthropologist Paul Hiebert concluded that “Western culture has a significant blind spot when it comes to the question of spirits and evil powers—a blind spot he has termed ‘the flaw of the excluded middle.’”⁸³ The “excluded middle” according to Hiebert was that most Westerners see the universe in two tiers, the invisible and the visible. The middle is where the two interact with each other. Unseen personal beings such as angels and demons interact with the seen personal beings, people.⁸⁴ In the researcher’s opinion, the flaw of the excluded middle which is a Western culture blind spot is an issue that needs to be addressed.

Christian education may be one place to address it.

⁸⁰ Gordon Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: New International Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1978), 472, note 49.

⁸¹ Fee, *Corinthians*, 472, note 49.

⁸² Fee, *Corinthians*, 472, note 49.

⁸³ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 180.

⁸⁴ Paul Heibert, “The Flaw of the Excluded Middle,” *Missiology* 10, no. 1 (January 1982): 35-47, accessed October 11, 2017, <http://ezproxy.bethel.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?>

Arnold uses Ephesians 2:1-2 as his starting point for defining how the powers work among people. “Satan is described as the ruler of a host of forces.”⁸⁵ He uses these forces to keep humanity in slavery to him by influencing them to disobey God and inciting them to commit sins. According to Arnold this passage suggests three distinct ways Satan accomplishes his goal: first “through direct and immediate influence,” second “by exploiting the inner impulse to do evil,” and third “by influencing the environment and social structures.”⁸⁶

Arnold maintains that the first way Satan accomplishes his goal is to secure a direct and immediate influence through a foothold (Eph. 4:26).⁸⁷ If unruly behavior goes unchecked, it can become a greater demonic influence in the life of a believer.⁸⁸ A foothold may indicate the relinquishment of control of one’s life to the demonic, according to Arnold.⁸⁹ The apostle Paul does not use “the terminology of demon-possessed” translated from the Greek rendition of *daimonizomenos* (meaning demonized), which is used in the gospels and Acts.⁹⁰ Instead, he uses the Greek word *topos*, translated foothold.⁹¹ This language may be Paul’s way of expressing an inroad into a Christian’s life.⁹²

⁸⁵ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 183.

⁸⁶ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 183.

⁸⁷ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 184.

⁸⁸ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 184.

⁸⁹ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 184.

⁹⁰ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 183.

⁹¹ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 184.

⁹² Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 184.

Arnold understands and teaches that Christians have an obligation and the ability to correct immoral behavior before the devil can gain a foothold.⁹³ This is done primarily through resistance and identity.⁹⁴ “The capacity to resist is an integral part of what it means to be a Christian.”⁹⁵ For Arnold resistance and identity are “experiencing forgiveness, ... peace with God, ... the new nature, ... oneness with the resurrected Jesus, ... the power of the new age and more.”⁹⁶ To summarize Arnold’s advice for Christians, they are to resist the devil and know their identity in Christ when they find themselves on the battleground with the Powers.

A second way Satan accomplishes his goal is by exploiting the inner impulse to do evil, taking advantage of humanity’s inclination to go against God.⁹⁷ Paul calls this inclination “the flesh” or “the old self,” which is able even without the support of Satan, to displease God.⁹⁸ The flesh is a vulnerable spot for humans. The devil is a supernatural opponent and seeks to take full advantage of a person’s situation to cause them to go against God and do evil. “People do not have the inherent ability to overcome such powerful enticement.”⁹⁹ Arnold clarifies the point when he says, “According to Paul unless a person is a member of Christ’s kingdom, that person is a member of Satan’s kingdom.”¹⁰⁰

⁹³ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 184.

⁹⁴ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 184.

⁹⁵ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 184.

⁹⁶ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 184.

⁹⁷ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 184.

⁹⁸ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 184-185.

⁹⁹ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 185.

¹⁰⁰ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 185

This concept reinforces Arnold's understanding that the two kingdoms and the influence they exert are in the realm of the excluded middle that Westerners for the most part seem to be unaware of, according to Hiebert.¹⁰¹ Arnold thinks that Christ performs a rescue mission and makes God's kingdom available to all those who receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.¹⁰² Yet Arnold believes that becoming a member of Christ's kingdom does not negate the impulse to do evil, nor does it deter the power that works to exploit it. The Christian now has the empowerment of the Holy Spirit to resist the evil influence, according to Arnold.¹⁰³

Sickness is believed to be caused by evil spirits in contemporary non-Western cultures, which is also characteristic of the New Testament according to Arnold.¹⁰⁴ He is quick to point out that even though evil spirits can cause sickness, God can also use evil spirits and sickness for His benefit as He did in the apostle Paul's life (2 Cor. 12:7-10).¹⁰⁵ Arnold goes on to say that "we cannot assume that God desires his kingdom to so invade the present evil age that sickness will be progressively eliminated."¹⁰⁶ The already not yet of the kingdom is a factor that must be taken into account.¹⁰⁷ Arnold continues, "Part of our existence is still rooted in the present age."¹⁰⁸ He argues that God may use sickness to

¹⁰¹ Hiebert, 35-47.

¹⁰² Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 185.

¹⁰³ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 185.

¹⁰⁴ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 186.

¹⁰⁵ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 186.

¹⁰⁶ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 187.

¹⁰⁷ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 187.

¹⁰⁸ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 187.

accomplish some “specific purpose” even when we don’t understand what that purpose may be.¹⁰⁹

A third way Satan tries to accomplish his goal is through the world’s structures. “While Satan may often work in a direct and immediate way in people, he also asserts his sway more indirectly through exploiting ‘the world’ and reinforcing the appetites of the flesh which is our inclination toward evil.”¹¹⁰ Arnold seems to perceive the devil as using a supernatural force to influence not only the flesh within an individual but also the world’s systems as well with varying levels of structures that include the environment, social life, and culture.¹¹¹

According to Arnold some theologians fear that people will not take responsibility for their actions and will use the justification that “the devil made me do it” if a supernatural being can be blamed.¹¹² Arnold clarifies the question about who is responsible when he states, “The entire testimony of Scripture ... always held people accountable for their decisions and actions.”¹¹³ He goes on to say that “Christians can resist Satan’s temptations.”¹¹⁴

To summarize Arnold’s views, he believes that the devil and demons are real supernatural beings with an intellect and a will. They try to derail God’s will and harass

¹⁰⁹ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 187.

¹¹⁰ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 188.

¹¹¹ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 188.

¹¹² Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 189.

¹¹³ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 190.

¹¹⁴ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 190.

and torment humanity. Supernatural beings cause evil and have a direct effect on humanity.

Rudolf Bultmann's Views

Bultmann built his understanding on the idea that “the world-view of the Scripture is mythological and is therefore unacceptable to modern man.”¹¹⁵ Modern man has been molded by a scientific worldview, a culture of cause and effect that brings him to say, “nobody reckons with direct intervention by transcendent powers.”¹¹⁶ The laws of nature discovered by human reason were enough for Bultmann. He continued this reasoning and concluded, “therefore, modern man acknowledges as reality only such phenomena or events as are comprehensible within the framework of the rational order of the universe. He does not acknowledge miracles because they do not fit into this lawful order.”¹¹⁷

Bultmann speaking on behalf of modern humanity believed that when a strange or marvelous accident occurs, modern humanity will not rest until a natural reason is found.

So, for Bultmann, there was no supernatural interaction within the world by demons or the devil. The historical facts of the biblical text are not history at all because they involve the supernatural. Bultmann ruled out everything that has a supernatural element. George Ladd makes the following observation:

“‘History’ as he [Bultmann] understands it knows nothing of divine beings. The gospels, therefore, are not trustworthy historical records of what happened, for ‘history’ cannot allow for the sort of events which the Gospels relate.”¹¹⁸ Everything for Bultmann

¹¹⁵ Bultmann, *Jesus*, 36.

¹¹⁶ Bultmann, *Jesus*, 36.

¹¹⁷ Bultmann, *Jesus*, 38.

¹¹⁸ Ladd, *Bultmann*, 6.

can be explained by natural causes and scientific reason. Finally, in Bultmann's own words, "It is impossible to use electric light and the wireless and to avail ourselves of modern medical and surgical discoveries, and at the same time to believe in the New Testament world of spirits and miracles."¹¹⁹ So, for Bultmann, the supernatural does not exist. All paranormal happenings can be explained in naturalistic terms. Humankind must look harder for the scientific answers. The powers and principalities are pre-scientific terms that can now be explained. We currently have doctors and medical technology to deal with so-called demon possessions.

For Bultmann, the solution for the cosmic war portrayed in the New Testament was education, science, and technology. Humankind has the answers to the problems of evil this world faces. For Bultmann, "to have faith in the victory of Christ means to have an authentic life, liberated from the bondage of fear, anxiety, and insecurity."¹²⁰

Hendrik Berkhof's Views

Hendrik Berkhof saw human structures as the "powers and principalities." He named these human structures that he believed were the powers as "the state, politics, class, social struggle, national interest, public opinion, accepted morality, the ideas of decency, humanity, democracy—these give unity and direction to thousands of lives." For Berkhof, these powers were impersonal structures and under the control of human beings. God meant them for the good of humanity; however, because of the nature of humans they separate rather than bring together God and humanity. Berkhof capitulated to the scientific and natural worldview that the supernatural does not exist for modern

¹¹⁹ Bultmann, "New Testament," 5.

¹²⁰ Jung Young Lee, "Interpreting the Demonic Powers in Pauline Thought," *Novum Testamentum* 12, no. 1 (January 1970), 68.

humanity. Humanity must be involved in redeeming these structures for God's use to bring men and woman closer to God through education, science, and technology.

Clinton Arnold's Views

Clinton Arnold holds to the view that the supernatural is real and that the powers and principalities are real threats to humanity. Early church fathers believed in the supernatural right up to and through the time of Luther and the Reformation, according to Arnold. He contends that this view was not forcefully challenged until the time of the Western Enlightenment. He believes that the devil and his demons are personal beings who have volition. They interact with humans both directly and indirectly, and influence choices and humans' behavior.

A Comparison of Theologies

The three theologies of Rudolf Bultmann, Hendrik Berkhof, and Clinton Arnold considering their views on the supernatural, the powers and principalities, and the effects they have on contemporary humanity, are foundational. They generate a presupposition for their thoughts regarding analyzation of a problem and the production of a practical solution that includes reasonable applications.

Bultmann and Berkhof had similar views about science, which was used to reject the historical accounts of supernatural phenomena recorded in the Scripture. According to Bultmann and Berkhof myth must lay at the root of supernatural phenomena. The natural scientific cause and effect world is the only reality there is. They tried to force interpreters of Scripture to make a binary choice between science and myth.

According to Bultmann and Berkhof science perceives no supernatural beings interfering with human agents to cause evil. Myth, on the other hand, sees supernatural

beings such as a devil and demons at work interfering with human agents by tempting them and causing them to do evil. Arnold does not go along with Bultmann and Berkhof's binary choice. He believes that the supernatural realm exists, and that the phenomena recorded in Scripture are a part of reality. Myth does not need to play a role.

Arnold perceives a supernatural entity the Scriptures call Satan and the devil who has an intellect and a will, along with his demon helpers who are at the center of all evil. The devil and his demons can influence people by temptation or invade them to temporarily take control. Bultmann and Berkhof saw no such supernatural entity. Bultmann distinguished between supernatural powers causing good and evil and the actions of human beings that are either good or bad and wisdom or stupidity. Berkhof expanded on Bultmann's understanding of no supernatural entities and simply placed humanity into structures where they cause good or evil.

According to Arnold, historical, scriptural phenomenology recorded about the devil and demons is accurate and does not need to be demythologized as Bultmann demanded. Berkhof believed that the apostle Paul has already demythologized the phenomenology recorded in the Scriptures by pronouncing the Powers to be God created human structures.

CHAPTER THREE: A THEOLOGY OF SPIRITUAL WARFARE

The Cosmic Battle

This chapter lays out a synopsis of the ongoing cosmic battle between the God of Heaven and the god of this earth and how it influences people. The researcher addresses the reality of spiritual warfare and its influence on humanity, followed by an explanation of Psalm 110, its use in the epistle to the Ephesians, and its general use in the New Testament.

Introduction to the War

The Old Testament portrays Yahweh as a warrior God with an army of angels to help wage war.¹ In fact “the culture of the Old and New Testaments” according to Gregory Boyd “exemplify a warfare worldview.”² This worldview is “engulfed by spiritual beings who are, at least at times, in conflict with one another.”³ Their behavior continues to “significantly [affect] our lives, for better or for worse.”⁴ Georgia Harkness

¹ Herbert Niehr, “Host of Heaven,” *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, Pieter W. van der Horst, eds. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 428.

² Gregory A. Boyd, *God at War: The Bible & Spiritual Conflict* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1997), 31.

³ Boyd, *War*, 31.

⁴ Boyd, *War*, 31.

argues that “the ‘principalities and powers’ confront God’s power.”⁵ But she reminds her readers that “God is never conquered by these forces.”⁶

According to these theologians there seems to be an invisible war taking place that humans may not be aware of. But this invisible war seems to have been understood by Paul and first century Jews.

Recognizing more recent scholarship regarding what seemed to be the central theological issue of first-century Jews, Boyd states: “the central concern of most first-century Jews was over how people could get free from the oppressive and destructive force of the cosmic powers that had seized the world.”⁷ Boyd continues the thought of Jewish first century concerns and how Christ’s cross solved the overriding issue, not by making sinners righteous as the Reformers saw it but by freeing them from the cosmic powers that kept them in bondage.⁸ Boyd goes on to say, “thus, as Scripture portrays the matter, the foundational reason Christ appeared was ‘to destroy the works of the devil’ (1 John 3:8), to disarm ‘the rulers and authorities’ (Col. 2:15), and to ‘destroy the one who has the power of death, that is, the devil’ (Heb. 2:14).”⁹ G.H.C. MacGregor explains that as “demonic spirits are essentially cosmic powers, so is the redemption which Christ wins cosmic redemption.”¹⁰ MacGregor further clarifies the scope of the cosmic redemption:

⁵ Georgia Harkness, *Understanding the Kingdom of God* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1974), 54.

⁶ Harkness, 54.

⁷ Gregory A. Boyd, “Christus Victor View,” in *The Nature of the Atonement: Four Views*, eds. James Beilby and Paul R. Eddy (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2006), 30.

⁸ Boyd, *Christus Victor*, 29-30.

⁹ Boyd, *War*, 241.

¹⁰ G.H.C. MacGregor, “Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul’s Thought,” *NTS* 1 (1954), 23.

“Not only is the individual saved from bondage to sin and death, . . . the entire creation is affected by the redemptive event.”¹¹ Boyd agrees with MacGregor when he states, “the consequence of this victory [Christ’s work on the cross] is that he is seated on his rightful throne.” Here Boyd refers to Psalm 110 in which Christ is seated at the right hand of Yahweh; it is the “passage most frequently cited by early Christian writers.”¹² Boyd continues to develop his thoughts about Christ’s victory, maintaining that “the whole cosmos is liberated from a tyrannical and destructive ruler, humanity is delivered ‘from the power of darkness and transferred . . . into the kingdom of his beloved Son’” (Col. 1:13).¹³ Here Boyd implies what Clinton Arnold claims, that “in Jesus’ teaching there are only two masters—God and Satan.”¹⁴ Boyd goes on to say, “all who accept it [the gospel] are thereby reinstated to the original position and responsibility of stewards of the creation that God had always intended for us.”¹⁵

This cosmic war that the church finds herself in is one of the reasons she exists. Jesus proclaimed, “I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not overcome it” (Matt. 16:18).¹⁶ In the researcher’s opinion Jesus made this announcement not only to the disciples but also to the ruler of the gates of Hades, who is the ruler of death (Job 38:17;

¹¹ MacGregor, 23.

¹² Clinton E. Arnold, *Power and Magic: The Concept of Power in Ephesians* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1989), 52.

¹³ Boyd, *War*, 241.

¹⁴ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 81.

¹⁵ Boyd, *War*, 241. This represents Boyd’s “Christus Victor” motif, which he argues in his book *Satan and the Problem of Evil* was the ruling paradigm for the atonement theory throughout the first millennium of church history,

¹⁶ M. Eugene Boring, *The New Interpreter’s Bible: Matthew* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1995), 346.

Heb. 2:13-15).¹⁷ The implication is that the gates of Hades will not defeat the church of Jesus Christ.¹⁸

Kingdoms in Conflict

Scripture reveals two powerful kingdoms in conflict: the kingdom of heaven/God and the kingdom of Satan (Matt. 12:25-28).¹⁹ These kingdoms are not equal in authority or power.²⁰ However, although the battles are hard fought, Jesus and the kingdom of God will be victorious in the end.²¹

As told by the apostle John, Jesus called Satan “the ruler of this world” on three different occasions (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11). The word used for “ruler” is *archon*, meaning the highest ruler in a given area.²² A cosmic battle is taking place in the midst of everyday life according to the apostle Paul. He asserts that the schemes of the devil need to be withstood and that humans need not struggle [wrestle] against flesh and blood [other humans]. The real wrestling match for humanity is against invisible demonic spiritual forces of darkness.²³

¹⁷ Donald A. Hagner, *Word Biblical Commentary: Matthew* (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1995), 471-472.

¹⁸ Hagner, 472.

¹⁹ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 81.

²⁰ Arnold, *Power and Magic*, 51-57.

²¹ Arnold, *Power and Magic*, 51-57.

²² Arnold, *Power and Magic*, 60.

²³ William W. Klein, *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Ephesians-Philemon*, Temper Longman III and David E. Garland, eds. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006), 162-163.

The conflict between the devil and humanity officially began when God pronounced a curse on the devil, embodied as a serpent (Genesis 3:14-15).²⁴ Gordon Wenham points out that the grammar and context are important. “The imperfect verb is iterative. It implies repeated attacks by both sides to injure the other.”²⁵ Robertson puts it this way: “No word of blessing is addressed to Satan in these verses. He stands enveloped under the condemning curse of God.”²⁶ God put enmity [hostility]²⁷ between the devil and the woman. God continued the curse by putting enmity between the devil’s seed [offspring]²⁸ and the woman’s seed [offspring].²⁹ This “probably refers more generally to ongoing centuries of conflict between people and various sources of temptation.”³⁰ God promised that the seed of the woman would crush the head of the serpent.³¹ The third century B.C.E. Jewish interpretation understands that King Messiah will lead the victory over Satan.³²

Psalm 110 plays a key role in the believer’s understanding about the place of spiritual warfare in daily life. The apostle Paul closes his letter to the Romans with a

²⁴ Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15: Word Biblical Commentary* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 79-80.

²⁵ Wenham, 80.

²⁶ O. Palmer Robertson, *The Christ of the Covenants* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1980), 103.

²⁷ Wenham, 79.

²⁸ Wenham, 79.

²⁹ Wenham, 79.

³⁰ Terence E. Fretheim, *The Book of Genesis: The New Interpreter’s Bible* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1994), 363.

³¹ John H. Walton, *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary: Genesis* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009), 36.

³² Wenham, 80.

confident salutation: “The God of peace will soon crush Satan under your feet” (Rom. 16:20).³³ In the words of James Dunn, “Christians share with their fellow members of God’s election the confidence of a final triumph of good over evil.”³⁴ The researcher believes that this conviction is rooted in Psalm 110 as explained below.

A Brief Exegesis of Psalm 110 and Its Use in Ephesians and the New Testament

The researcher’s thesis is that Psalm 110:1 was written for David’s immediate monarch but ultimately refers to Jesus the Messiah along with the church he will establish. Working with Yahweh, the Messiah and the church will overthrow all the enemies. This psalm is the one most cited or alluded to in the New Testament.³⁵ First century believers must have found this psalm to be reassuring. As Leslie Allen says, “the apostles freely applied v. 1 to his [the Christ] post-resurrection exaltation in heaven and his victory over cosmic foes (e.g., Acts 2:34, 35; 1 Cor. 15:25; Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1; Heb. 1:3; 1 Pet. 3:22).”³⁶

Psalm 110:1 is translated by Allen: “Yahweh’s oracle to my master: ‘Sit at my right, until I make your enemies a stool for your feet.’”³⁷

Genre

The book of Psalms is considered to be Hebrew poetry and music,³⁸ among the oldest in the world.³⁹ “They express a personal relationship with God in a community

³³ James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 9-16: Word Biblical Commentary* (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1988), 907.

³⁴ Dunn, 907.

³⁵ Leslie C. Allen, *Psalms 101-150: Word Biblical Commentary* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 87.

³⁶ Allen, 87.

³⁷ Allen, 79.

context.³⁸ Psalm 110 belongs to a genre known as Royal Psalms⁴¹ based exclusively on its king/royalty motif.⁴²

Authorship and Time of Writing

The book of Psalms is believed to have been written by many different authors. The headings or superscripts attached to some of the Psalms, although thought to be additions made at a later time, indicate the tradition of various authors. According to the superscripts one psalm was written by Moses, 73 are attributed to David, 12 are ascribed to Asaph, 12 are credited to the Sons of Korah, Solomon has two under his name, Heman one, and finally Ethan is recognized as having one.⁴³

The authorship of Psalm 110 is debated on the grounds of the time frame in which it was written. Three different time frames have been proposed: pre-Israelite, post-exilic, and pre-exilic.

³⁸ Peter C. Craigie, *The Word Biblical Commentary*, Vol. 19, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 2004), 35-39.

³⁹ N.T. Wright, *The Case for the Psalms: Why They Are Essential* (New York, NY: Harper Collins Publishers, 2013), 2.

⁴⁰ Konrad Schaefer, *Berit Olam Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2001), xi.

⁴¹ Mark D. Futato, *Interpreting the Psalms: An Exegetical Handbook* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic & Professional, 2007), 181.

⁴² J. Clinton McCann, *The New Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. IV (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1996), 649.

⁴³ Derek Kidner, *Psalms 1-72: Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries* (Grand Rapids, MI: InterVarsity Press, 1973), 35-36.

Herbert Bateman refers to Patterson and Jefferson as scholars who hold the pre-Israelite theory. They cite Jebusite royal tradition and Canaanite vocabulary along with cultic parallels for their support. However, Mowinckel gives caution to this view.⁴⁴

Two of the post-exilic theory supporters are Treves and Pfeiffer according to Bateman's article. Offering some scholarly reasons why this theory may be suspect,⁴⁵ Bateman states that "most scholars view Psalm 110 as a pre-exilic psalm." He goes on to quote Kraus about some of the royal psalms: "There is no longer doubt that Psalms 2; 20; 21; 45; 72; 89; 101 and 110 belong to the historical epoch of the time of the kings."⁴⁶ Their time would be around the tenth century B.C.E. Mitchell Dahood is another scholar who supports a tenth-century date for the composition of Psalm 110.⁴⁷

Placing Psalm 110 in the pre-exilic time frame gives rise to three possible authors: Zadok with King David, a prophet, or David himself. The argument for Zadok and King David is very weak, according to Bateman's consideration of Rowley's work on Psalm 110. Rowley insists that it was written after David captured Jerusalem and confirmed Zadok's priesthood. Bateman quotes De Baux on Rowley's work, stating that it "is an interesting hypothesis, but without foundation."⁴⁸

The second possible author is the prophet who, as the writer/orator, may have been any court prophet or poet speaking at annual celebrations or enthronements, and

⁴⁴ Herbert W. Bateman, "Psalm 110:1 and the New Testament," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149, no. 596 (October–December 1992): 439.

⁴⁵ Bateman, 440.

⁴⁶ Bateman, 441.

⁴⁷ Mitchell Dahood, *The Anchor Bible: Psalms III, 101-150* (New York, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.), 112.

⁴⁸ Bateman, 442.

may have addressed the King of Israel (Gunkel, Mowinkel, Widengren, Cooke, Durham, and Eaton). It could also have been a New Year celebration (Bentzen, Porter), a covenant renewal celebration (Weiser), or a rainfall ceremony (Gammie).⁴⁹ Bateman concludes that “though examples of divine oracles spoken by prophets to kings and other prophets do exist (2 Sam. 12:1-13; 1 Kings 13:1-32; Jer. 28:1-17; etc.), there is another option.”⁵⁰

Some factors point to David as the author and/or speaker of Psalm 110. First, the tradition of the superscription supports this possibility. Even though it may have been added later, the support of tradition as recorded in the LXX does carry some weight in favor of David’s authorship. The superscription states, “Of David, A psalm.” Second, David is renowned for his ability to compose music and poetry. Some examples are 1 Samuel 16:15-23; 2 Samuel 1:17-27; 3:33; 6:5; 22:1-51; 1 Chronicles 23:5-6; Nehemiah 12:36; and Amos 6:5). A scroll found in cave 11 at Qumran claims that David composed 3,600 psalms.⁵¹ Josephus also gave David credit for composing songs and hymns and making musical instruments for the Levites.⁵² Third, the synoptic gospel writers quoted Jesus as giving credit to David for declaring Psalm 110:1 (see (Matt. 22:43-44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42-44). Matthew and Mark affirmed that David was inspired by the Holy Spirit when he spoke Psalm 110:1. Also, Luke recorded Peter as giving credit to David for the declaration in Acts 2:34. Therefore the author of this paper supports the pre-exilic dating and the Davidic authorship of Psalm 110:1.

⁴⁹ Bateman, 442.

⁵⁰ Bateman, 443.

⁵¹ J.A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11*, DJD vol. IV (Oxford, England: The Clarendon Press, 1965), 91, 92.

⁵² Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, vol. V, book VII, 305, (3) (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), 523.

Historical and Cultural Context

Psalm 110 appears to have been used in royal ceremonies composed for a Davidic monarch in Jerusalem.⁵³ The monarch who reigns at the right hand of Yahweh symbolizes the highest honor along with the power and authority of Yahweh.⁵⁴ God promised King David that He would raise up David's flesh and blood who would build a house for the Lord, and his flesh and blood would establish the throne of his kingdom forever (2 Sam. 7:12, 13, 16). The text seems to indicate that David understood that God meant his immediate son Solomon and a future generation to establish the kingdom and throne forever (2 Sam. 7:18-29).

Walter Kaiser has asked and answered the question when dealing with prophecy, "Must we then choose either an antique, historically bound OT word or a rejuvenated and recently unlocked NT fulfillment of Prophecy? ... It is clear that the one and same message of the OT writers often envisaged two or more audiences separately (and as we now know, widely separately) in time. ... Thus, we would conclude that the truth-intention of the present was always singular and never double or multiple in sense. Yet, by design that same prophetic word often embraces and encompassed an extended period of time by describing protracted events, giving characteristics that belonged to several periods of time, or, in the messianic line it would link a whole string of persons, who in their office, function, or person pointed to the last person in the series who shared those

⁵³ David M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1973), 19.

⁵⁴ Hay, 20.

same features specifically prophesied about the Davidic forerunners.”⁵⁵ So there seems to be an immediate and future fulfillment of this psalm.

Context in Light of the Book of Psalms

Psalm 110 is located in Book 5 of the Psalms and is part of the 108-110 group of psalms called by W. Dennis Tucker “The Opening Davidic Collection.”⁵⁶ Wilson observes that there are two groups of Davidic psalms (108-110) and (138-145), and that their placement at the beginning and end of book 5 suggests a purposeful editorial arrangement.⁵⁷ These two groups of Davidic psalms act as bookends for book 5 and are classified as the opening and closing of book 5. Psalm 110 comes last in the opening group with a promise of Yahweh’s deliverance from the enemies cited in the previous psalms.

Interpretation of Psalm 110:1

First a general look at the psalm and second a focus on verse one. Psalm 110 has messianic implications.⁵⁸ According to Luther, this is “the main one [psalm] to deal with our dear Lord Jesus Christ.”⁵⁹ The psalm is composed of two parts, v. 1-3 and v. 4-7. Both parts open with a declaration: “The LORD says (v. 1a)” and “The LORD has sworn (v. 4a).” These declarations affirm that Yahweh is alive and still active on behalf of his

⁵⁵ Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago, IL: The Moody Bible Institute, 1985), 70-72.

⁵⁶ W. Dennis Tucker, Jr. *Constructing and Deconstructing Power in Psalms 107-150* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2014), 68.

⁵⁷ Gerald H. Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 220-221.

⁵⁸ Barry C. Davis, *The Baker Illustrated Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books), 527.

⁵⁹ Martin Luther, *Luther’s Work’s Selected Psalms II*, vol. 13 (St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1956), 228.

people. Psalms 108 and 109 express some doubt about Yahweh whether will respond favorably or reject Israel's cry for deliverance from her enemies. But Psalm 110 makes the answer known—Yahweh is present and will deal with the enemies.

More specifically, in the first part of Psalm 110 Yahweh directs Adonai to sit with Him on the royal throne at His right hand. This is recognized as a position of authority and honor.⁶⁰ Luther saw the position as being king and equal with Yahweh.⁶¹ “Sitting on the throne” will continue until Yahweh makes Adonai's enemies a footstool for his feet. This indicates that “Yahweh promises that the enemies of the Davidic king, the anointed one, will be subject to him.”⁶² In the second part of the psalm Yahweh declares that Adonai is an eternal priest in Melchizedek's order. These two declarations combined indicate that Adonai will function as a king/priest who will rule as king, destroy the enemy, and serve as a mediator between Yahweh and the nations. All who reject Yahweh's king and priest would be considered enemies.

The first verse of the psalm has King David speaking as a prophet and by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit according to Jesus (Matt. 22:33; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42). David seems to understand the significance of his dynasty. Therefore, David was speaking of Solomon's inaugural ceremony in the immediate context and of the eschatological messiah whose kingdom will never end in the future setting (2 Sam. 7:19). Yahweh shares his throne immediately with an imperfect human king (1 Chron. 28:5; 29:23), but in the future Yahweh will share his throne with a perfectly divine/human king

⁶⁰ John H. Walton, Victor H. Matthews, and Mark W. Chavalas, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 552.

⁶¹ Luther, 233.

⁶² John W. Hilber, *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Background Commentary*, vol. 5 (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009), 418.

(Eph. 1:20).⁶³ This goes on while⁶⁴ Yahweh makes the Messiah's enemies (Eph. 1:21-22) a footstool.⁶⁵ The passage depicts Yahweh in the process of defeating the messiah's enemies; however, the messiah is seen as a ruler with volunteer troops to deal with the enemy in v. 2-3.⁶⁶ New Testament writers confirm this view of Jesus as Messiah the "Lord over his opponents" (1 John 3:8b; Acts 10:38).⁶⁷ In conclusion Psalm 110:1 has relevance both in its historical setting and in a future context. The gap between the two environments turns out to be about 1000 years. David understood the immediate and future fulfillment of 2 Sam 7. It gives an essential insight for understanding Ps 110 in a similar light. Because of the authors objective, 2 Sam 7 will not be explored.

Opposing Views

McCann cites Josephus as representing a marginalized group of Jews who claimed that the Jewish messianic hope was fulfilled in the Roman Emperor Vespasian⁶⁸ while other Jews held out for the Messiah to overthrow the Romans. Aage Bentzen sees it from more of a global perspective and in light of preparation for ritual combat, arguing that "we must take it [Ps. 110] that enthronement, investiture, the proclamation of the divine sonship of the king and his priesthood ... are placed *before* the ritual combat, as a

⁶³ Peter T. O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), 138-141.

⁶⁴ The Hebrew conjunction that is usually translated "until" is not compatible with the image the Psalm is picturing according to Hossfeld and Zenger. A better alternative would be "while" or "as long as," which refers to the course of events accompanying the enthronement. Hossfeld and Zenger, p. 141. See also Allen, who translates the conjunction "while," p. 109.

⁶⁵ O'Brien, 141-144.

⁶⁶ Kidner, 391-392.

⁶⁷ Dale A. Brueggemann, "The Evangelists and the Psalms," in *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches*, eds. Philip S. Johnston and David G. Firth (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2005), 268.

⁶⁸ McCann, 1131.

preparation for it.”⁶⁹ Kidner sees no association with any human king, except in an eschatological and messianic sense.⁷⁰ One reason for such a diversity of views about the setting of this psalm is a consequence of the uncertainty about the psalm’s age, as mentioned before.

Psalm 110 Used in Ephesians

The prophetic declaration by David that the Messiah would share the throne with Yahweh is a concept that the apostle Paul applied in his circular letter to the church at Ephesus. The city⁷¹ with a population of 250,000 was known for its temple of Artemis, which was one of the seven wonders of the ancient world. The Artemis cult included up to 50 other gods and goddesses in their worship.⁷²

The exegete agrees with Arnold’s proposal and believes that one motivating factor for writing this letter was that Paul wanted to help the Ephesian Christians understand how they could deal with pagan spirits in confidence and without fear.⁷³ The Ephesians lived in a demonically charged area within the Roman Empire.⁷⁴ They knew firsthand the influence of sorcery, the paranormal, and demonic powers because they used them for their bidding and protection. Once they heard about and saw the power of

⁶⁹ Aage Bentzen, *King and Messiah* (London, England: Lutterworth Press, 1955), 24, 25.

⁷⁰ Kidner, 392.

⁷¹ Clinton E. Arnold, *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary, vol. 3* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002), 301-303.

⁷² Arnold, *Bible Backgrounds*, 303.

⁷³ O’Brien, 53-55.

⁷⁴ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*.

the kingdom of God they abandoned their trust in these powers of darkness and placed it in the Lord Jesus Christ (Acts 19).⁷⁵

When Paul first entered the city of Ephesus it was the third largest in population and influence in the Roman Empire behind Rome and Alexandria.⁷⁶ He immediately had to deal with spiritual problems. Luke's record of the account appears in Acts 19.⁷⁷ Paul's teaching about the kingdom of God, the Holy Spirit, and the miracles Paul performed made an impact on the city and the whole province of Asia. As a result, people throughout Asia Minor heard the word of the Lord (Acts 19:20). Many of the people confessed that they had practiced sorcery and burned their scrolls [books] together in public. If these scrolls were like other sorcery scrolls of their time that archeologists have found, they were undoubtedly filled with the names of demons, spells, and incantations to manipulate people and events.

Artemis was worshiped throughout the region of Asia Minor and beyond. Ephesian craftsmen made their living by constructing silver idols and shrines of Artemis for local citizens and travelers. But Paul's ministry was so compelling that the craftsmen were fearful of losing their work making idols. As a result, the craftsmen organized a protest against Paul and his teachings that were diminishing Artemis' credibility as a divine goddess. The whole city turned out for the demonstration, gathering in the theater. The demonstration was so confusing that it nearly turned into a riot. The city clerk arrived and restored order by threatening citizens with the charge of rioting, warning them

⁷⁵ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 33-34.

⁷⁶ Arnold, *Bible Backgrounds*, 301-303.

⁷⁷ Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 33-34.

that if they had a grievance they had to use legal means by pressing charges to be settled in court (Acts 19:23-41).⁷⁸

Luke informs his readers that believers in Ephesus who practiced sorcery burned their magical scrolls when a demon attacked the seven sons of Sceva as the result of a failed deliverance (Acts 19:18-19).⁷⁹ Ephesus was a city very accustomed to using spiritual power through rituals, incantations, and invocations.⁸⁰ Magic, shamanism, and the occult arts were involved in just about every area of the life and culture of the people.⁸¹ There are nations of the world today who practice these demonic activities.⁸² Even in Western countries, some people use astrology, zodiac signs, fortune telling, and tarot card readings to govern their daily activities and relationships.

Paul recognized the demonic influence in the city in the worship of Artemis and all the magic and spiritual power that went with it. This is a contemporary problem that the church must take to heart and handle using the power and authority God has given her.⁸³ Unfortunately, God's people are more prone to discount spiritual warfare than to engage the enemy.⁸⁴ Paul takes a different tack by hitting the problem head-on. First, he reassures the Ephesian believers about their identity in Christ and what they possess

⁷⁸ Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014), 2866-2944.

⁷⁹ Keener, 2848-2859.

⁸⁰ Arnold, *Bible Backgrounds*, 303.

⁸¹ Arnold, *Bible Backgrounds*, 303.

⁸² The researcher has firsthand experience with some of these practices in Brazil, Guyana, Taiwan, and China.

⁸³ Mark I. Bubeck, *The Satanic Revival* (San Bernardino, CA: Here's Life Publishers, 1991) 11-12.

⁸⁴ Bubeck, 46.

(Eph. 1:14). He goes on to pray for them, recognizing the hope of God's calling, the glorious wealth of God's inheritance in the saints, and finally the tremendous power of God in "us," including himself in the mix with all believers (v. 15-19). God is the source of spiritual power that believers can depend on. Paul goes on to teach them about that spiritual power and how it was demonstrated when God "raised Christ from the dead and seated him at his right hand in the heavenly realms, far above all rule and authority, power and dominion and every name that is invoked, not only in the present age but also in the one to come. And God placed all things under his feet" (Eph. 1:20-22).⁸⁵

The apostle seems to be emphasizing the power of God by employing additional synonymous terms for various aspects of power. "Paul has piled up equivalents because he wants to convince his readers that God's power working on behalf of believers is incomparable and able to bring them to final salvation."⁸⁶

Paul refers to Psalm 110:1 to give evidence that Jesus Christ is placed above all other names and therefore is more powerful than Artemis and all their demon gods and goddesses.⁸⁷ Not only did God put Christ Jesus above all things but God also put all things under the feet of Jesus Christ. Paul is emphasizing the point that this includes Artemis and all other demon gods and goddesses throughout the world, for this age and the coming age.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (London, England: Pickering & Inglis Ltd., 1961), 40-43.

⁸⁶ O'Brien, 137.

⁸⁷ Arnold, *Power and Magic*, 167.

⁸⁸ O'Brien, 142-143.

The Relationship between Resurrection and Exaltation

“The resurrection is related to Christ’s messiahship and the inauguration of his lordship.”⁸⁹ This concept prepares the way for the teaching that believers have been raised with Christ (Eph. 2:6). “The exaltation of Jesus was God’s act of raising Jesus on high by granting him that position of unparalleled honor and universal authority which is epitomized in the name ‘Lord.’⁹⁰ This concept prepares the way for teaching believers that they are seated with Christ (Eph. 2:6). “The Resurrection proclaims, ‘He lives—and that forever’; the Exaltation proclaims, ‘He reigns—and that forever.’ Yet he lives as a ruler” (Rev. 1:5).⁹¹

Paul does not stop with the fact that Christ has been raised from the dead and that God has seated Christ at his right hand in the heavenly realms, but also asserts that God has raised “us” [all believers] up with Christ and seated “us” [all believers] with Christ in the heavenly realms.⁹² Believers share in the mission of Jesus to the extent that Jesus delegated power and authority to his disciples and all believers.⁹³ That authority was given to Jesus by God the Father (Matt. 28:18-20). The implication is that all believers are co-workers with Christ in God’s service (Eph. 2:10; 3:10; 1 Cor. 3:9; Phil. 2:13).

The apostle Paul’s prayer:

I pray that the eyes of your heart may be enlightened in order that you may know the hope to which he has called you, the riches of his glorious inheritance in his holy people and his incomparably great power for us who believe. That power is

⁸⁹ Murray J. Harris, *Raised Immortal: Resurrection & Immortality in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983), 85.

⁹⁰ Harris, 85.

⁹¹ Harris, 85.

⁹² O’Brien, 170-172.

⁹³ O’Brien, 170-172.

the same as the mighty strength he exerted when he raised Christ from the dead and seated him at his right hand in the heavenly realms, far above all rule and authority, power and dominion and every name that is invoked, not only in the present age but also in the one to come (Eph. 1:18-21).

First, the hope to which God has called believers is both a general and a specific hope and calling. Hope is a future desire that has yet to be fulfilled. The general calling is for all Christians to be Christ-like towards one another (Eph. 4:1-6). The specific calling is based on the talents, gifts, and personality God gives each believer. Christians are uniquely created to be and do specific things for the war effort (4:10) since Christ ascended higher than all the heavens, even beyond all 50 gods and goddesses including Artemis. These general and specific callings all work together for the benefit of all God's children (Eph. 4:11-16).

Second, the rich and glorious inheritance God sees in his believers; They are his people set apart. Although God needs nothing from His family, He is anticipating their presence with Him as an honored possession. The heir of an estate will take extra care of it when they know it is to become their inheritance. This is God's attitude towards believers.

In conclusion, Paul's prayer seems to be building towards something significant. He starts with his desire for believers to know that God has a hope and calling for them. That is why he made them the way he did. Then he wanted them to understand how valuable they are to God, a prized possession. And finally, the third thing Paul wants believers to know and understand is that God has incomparably great power for all who believe. It is power that cannot be compared to anything, empowerment that is beyond anyone's imagination, empowerment to wrestle with powers and principalities and win.

Psalm 110 Used in the New Testament

“These two sentences in Psalm 110 (vs 1 and 4) are among the Jewish scriptural texts most often quoted or alluded to by early Christian writers. Thirty-three quotations and allusions are scattered through the New Testament.”⁹⁴

When Jesus sent the disciples out, “he gave them power (the ability to act) and authority (the right to act on his behalf) to drive out all demons and to cure diseases and to proclaim the kingdom of God (Luke 9:1-2).”⁹⁵ The disciples continued to demonstrate this spiritual power over demons and diseases after Jesus ascended into heaven. The Book of Acts documents acts of spiritual power and often gives credit to God or Jesus the Messiah (Acts 2:4, 14-22; 3:6, 16; 8:6-7). This same spiritual power is available to his present-day disciples in the opinion of the researcher. He has promised to be with them until the end of the age as they continue to make new disciples (Matt. 28:18-20). God is in the process of placing the enemies of Jesus under his feet. The Lord’s present-day disciples are cooperating with God and have been given power and authority to accomplish this task around the world while energizing his troops to the end of the age.

⁹⁴ Hay, 15.

⁹⁵ R. Allen Culpepper, *The New Interpreter’s Bible: Luke & John*, vol. IX (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1995), 193-194.

CHAPTER FOUR: PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RESEARCH METHODS

Descriptive Sequential Mixed Methods Research Design

A descriptive sequential mixed methods research design of both qualitative and quantitative research was employed. The researcher believed this type of research to be the best strategy of inquiry to collect the desired data by applying survey, phone questionnaire with narrative, and phenomenological designs. The researcher used John Creswell's factors for selecting a research design.¹

Creswell's Factors for Selecting a Research Design

According to Creswell the decision for using a particular research design should be based on six factors.² The factors include worldview assumptions which the researcher brings to the study;³ the procedures of inquiry called strategies;⁴ the specific methods of data collection, analysis, and interpretation;⁵ the research problem or issue;⁶ the researcher's personal experience; and the audience for the study.⁷

¹ John W. Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Los Angeles, CA: SAGE, 2009), 209.

² Creswell, 3.

³ Creswell, 3.

⁴ Creswell, 3.

⁵ Creswell, 3.

⁶ Creswell, 3.

⁷ Creswell, 16-19.

Researcher's Worldview

Philosophical ideas influence the practice of research and should be acknowledged.⁸ One of the first things considered when deciding to use this type of research was the researcher's pragmatic worldview.⁹ "Pragmatism as a worldview arises out of actions, situations, and consequences."¹⁰ Applications that work in the real world as opposed to the philosophical world were the researcher's aim for this study. The researcher understands that this study cannot make changes because change lies in the hands of those with the authority to make needed changes. However, data collection and interpretation are offered to those in authority with the hope that needed changes will result.

Strategy of Inquiry

The nature of the research problem addressed is a critical issue in the effectiveness of church planting. Therefore, the strategy of inquiry deemed to be the most beneficial for this study was sequential mixed methods. The research began with a quantitative survey for numeric evaluation and was followed up with qualitative interviews for both narrative and phenomenological analysis.¹¹ This strategy brought an overall strength to the study because of the use of both approaches.¹² Mixed methods research collects multiple forms of data, statistical, text, and phenomenological

⁸ Creswell, 5.

⁹ Creswell, 10.

¹⁰ Creswell, 10.

¹¹ Creswell, 12-14.

¹² Creswell, 4.

analysis.¹³ Data interpreted across databases and qualitative quotes can support statistical results.¹⁴

The Methods

Methods involved the forms of data collection, analysis, and interpretation.¹⁵ The researcher chose the descriptive sequential mixed methods research design because the researcher believed “that either the quantitative or qualitative approach by itself [was] inadequate to understand the research problem best.”¹⁶ The greatest understanding would be brought to light by the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative research.¹⁷ A survey with Likert-scale and open-ended questions was used in Phase I of the research, and the phone questionnaire used in Phase II of the study included both close-ended and open-ended questions. Participants were recorded, and their responses then converted to text and coded for narrative and phenomenological research.¹⁸

The Research Problem

The researcher believed that the best way to address the research problem of the need for spiritual warfare equipping for church planters was to use surveys and interviews of church planters. These individuals work in the field and experience the effects of spiritual warfare and could potentially shed some light on the topic. The

¹³ Creswell, 14-15.

¹⁴ Creswell, 14-15.

¹⁵ Creswell, 15.

¹⁶ Creswell, 18.

¹⁷ Creswell, 18.

¹⁸ Creswell, 16.

researcher “first surveyed a large number” of church planters and “then [followed] up with a few participants to obtain their specific language and voice about the topic.”¹⁹

The Researcher’s Personal Experience

The personal experience of the researcher “enjoys the structure of quantitative research and the flexibility of qualitative inquiry.”²⁰ The small bits of numerical statistics that quantitative research provides can be turned “into interesting and reasonable conclusions.”²¹ The personal interviews with participants in qualitative research show a more personal side to the research by exploring ideas, feelings, and opinions that bring greater depth and understanding of the statistics.²²

The Audience That Will Accept the Research

The final reason for choosing the descriptive mixed methods research design was to bring a more valuable, comprehensive study to the audience. The researcher believed that the audience would appreciate the strengths of both qualitative and quantitative research.²³ The problem is “the need for equipping church planters for spiritual warfare within the Lutheran Congregations in Mission for Christ Movement.” The researcher foresaw an audience of denominational officials and seminary and academic decision makers. They were the ones anticipated to evaluate and hopefully implement educational

¹⁹ Creswell, 19.

²⁰ Creswell, 19.

²¹ Nancy Jean Vyhmeister and Terry Dwain Robertson, *Your Guide to Writing Quality Research Papers for Students of Religion and Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2014), 196.

²² Vyhmeister and Robertson, 41.

²³ Creswell, 18.

changes to equip church planters, pastors, and the church at large for spiritual warfare. Descriptive research is known for its use in the mission fields and church planting.²⁴

Descriptive Research

Descriptive research is used “to make reality known” because it describes a “concrete and concise depiction of reality.”²⁵ When a detailed and concise depiction of the real world is known, conclusions and decisions can be made for changes to be carried out.²⁶ Descriptive research is used in everyday life—for example, finding out the demographics of the users of a product, the audience of a TV show for advertisers, or whether a new school will need to be built for future students.²⁷ It is believed that John Howard may have been the first person to use descriptive research in 1773 to document the need for changes in prison living conditions in Bedford, England.²⁸ Howard proved his concerns about the needed changes by traveling around and visiting jails and prisons throughout England. He kept notes on the precise number of prisoners, what crimes they were imprisoned for, the surroundings in which they were detained, and other matters concerning the prison system.²⁹ Once he completed his descriptive study, he used it to give a “detailed and precise report” to the House of Commons that became the foundation for necessary prison improvements.³⁰ The study and report Howard made did not solve

²⁴ Edgar Elliston, *Introduction to Missiological Research Design* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 2011), xxi.

²⁵ Vyhmeister and Robertson, 30.

²⁶ Vyhmeister and Robertson, 30.

²⁷ Vyhmeister and Robertson, 30-31.

²⁸ Vyhmeister and Robertson, 31.

²⁹ Vyhmeister and Robertson, 31.

³⁰ Vyhmeister and Robertson, 31.

any problems, but they provided the evidence and knowledge for the needed prison reforms to happen.³¹

John Howard through his creative insight brought change to the prison system in England. He observed and experienced first-hand the dreaded prison conditions and believed that he could make a difference for change to happen. Howard needed a way to communicate reality and the need for change to those who could do something about it. As a result, he developed the descriptive research strategy. Descriptive research was used in this project in the hope of bringing change to church planting strategies.

Sequential Strategy

Sequential or concurrent strategies are the two primary options when conducting a mixed methods approach to research.³² Either choice is helpful for researchers who are using a mixed method approach.³³ The researcher for this project chose to use the sequential option because it gave the opportunity to collect and evaluate the data from the quantitative survey before creating the qualitative questionnaire. The quantitative data collection and analysis followed by the qualitative data collection and analysis were done separately but in a connected way.³⁴ Interpretation of each method was completed independently before the two methods were combined. According to Creswell, one of the strengths of this design is a straightforward investigative process.³⁵ However a weakness

³¹ Vyhmeister and Robertson, 31.

³² Creswell, 209.

³³ Creswell, 211.

³⁴ Creswell, 211.

³⁵ Creswell, 211.

of this design is the amount of time invested by the researcher in the data collection because of its two separate phases.³⁶

Mixed Methods Quantitative and Qualitative Research

Mixing two different methods of research was first performed by Campbell and Fisk in 1959 to study “validity of psychological traits.”³⁷ Campbell and Fisk encouraged other researchers to use multiple approaches to collect data.³⁸ Mixing methods was originally thought to bring a neutralizing effect to biases by seeking a convergence.³⁹ However, in the early 1990s data collection moved from seeking convergence to “actually integrating or connecting the quantitative and qualitative data.”⁴⁰

Quantitative and qualitative methodologies are two different approaches to research.⁴¹ To some extent they are used to answer distinct kinds of questions.⁴² Quantitative research tends to focus on amounts or quantities; numerically measuring these quantities is the researcher’s desire.⁴³ The aim of a quantitative researcher is to “seek explanations and predictions that will generalize to other people and places.”⁴⁴ The qualitative researcher “seeks a better understanding of complex situations.”⁴⁵ Qualitative

³⁶ Creswell, 211.

³⁷ Creswell, 14.

³⁸ Creswell, 14.

³⁹ Creswell, 14.

⁴⁰ Creswell, 14.

⁴¹ Paul D. Leedy and Jeanne Ellis Ormrod, *Practical Research: Planning and Design* (Indianapolis, IN: Pearson Education, Inc., 2013), 95.

⁴² Leedy and Ormrod, 95.

⁴³ Leedy and Ormrod, 95.

⁴⁴ Leedy and Ormrod, 96.

research requests participants' in-depth perspectives on particular issues, behaviors, and values.⁴⁶ Qualitative research is in contrast to quantitative research, which seeks to observe and obtain numerical values.⁴⁷

Overview of the Research Process

This descriptive sequential mixed methods research design process took place in two distinct phases. Phase I was primarily quantitative research while Phase II was mostly qualitative research.

Phase I: Quantitative Data Tool Creation and Collection

The researcher contacted the National Coordinator for Church Planting Development in the Lutheran Congregations in Mission for Christ (LCMC) movement in August 2017. This was done in the hope of gaining access to the church planters. Permission to do so was granted along with an offer to support and encourage the research project among church planters. The researcher was allowed to meet with a group of church planters at the LCMC's 17th Annual Gathering and Convention held in Minneapolis, Minnesota October 8-11, 2017.

Second, the researcher decided to use the group meeting of church planters to conduct an anonymous quantitative survey. The survey provided a numeric description of attitudes and opinions of a random sample of the church planters within the LCMC.⁴⁸ A simple five-question survey was created⁴⁹ using four closed questions and one open

⁴⁵ Leedy and Ormrod, 96.

⁴⁶ Leedy and Ormrod, 95.

⁴⁷ Leedy and Ormrod, 270.

⁴⁸ Vyhmeister and Robertson, 35.

⁴⁹ Vyhmeister and Robertson, 37-38.

question.⁵⁰ The first three questions used the Likert-scale⁵¹ and the fourth question was a binary YES or NO question that asked for more details as follow-up to a YES answer. The last question asked for suggestions. The researcher tested the survey by asking several people to read and evaluate it, first to find out if it made sense and second to find out if the instructions were easy to follow. The researcher then made minor adjustments to the survey before use. The survey used in the study is included in Appendix A.

Phase I: Implementing the Data Collection Tool

On the first night of the convention, Sunday evening October 8, 2017, at approximately 8:45 the researcher met with fifteen LCMC church planters in the Hilton Hotel in downtown Minneapolis. With everyone seated in a circle, the LCMC National Coordinator of Church Planting Development had everyone except the researcher introduce themselves to the group. After the church planters shared their names and where they were planting a church, the Coordinator introduced the researcher by creating a context and a need for spiritual warfare equipping. Before he shared anything about the research, he posed three questions to the group. First, “when did the devil first try to wipe out Jesus?” A few people answered, “just after his birth.” Nodding heads around the circle suggested that all agreed. The next question was “when did the devil first try to wipe out Moses?” Again a few people answered, “just after his birth,” and heads nodded in agreement for the second time. Finally, the Coordinator asked, “when do you think the devil will try to wipe your church plant out?” The response was dead silence for a few seconds, then voices could be heard saying, “oh,” “yah,” “we get it.” The Coordinator

⁵⁰ Vyhmeister and Robertson, 38-39.

continued, “the devil tries to wipe out churches before they can have too much of an impact on a community.” He then introduced the researcher and the research project. The researcher explained his background and introduced the research. He described why he was doing the study and its potential benefits, then gave instructions for completing the survey. The surveys were distributed to the participants, who returned them to the researcher when completed.

The Church Planting Coordinator asked to take some additional surveys for other church planters who were coming in later that night or the next day. He met with seven latecomers and asked them to complete a survey. The researcher collected the additional seven surveys and added them to the original 15. At the end of the conference, a total of 22 surveys were collected.

Phase I: Data Analysis and Interpretation

“Numbers are meaningless unless we analyze and interpret them.”⁵² The researcher used several steps to analyze and interpret the data collected. He recorded the answers to the Likert-scale questions on a simple spreadsheet, calculated the percentages, and compared them with the final two open questions, looking for relationships and contrasts.

One contrasting observation was that participants ranked themselves high overall in confidence in their biblical and theological knowledge. However, their confidence was lower when it came to discern the devil’s work (question two). When question three asked about their confidence to equip their people effectively in spiritual warfare strategies their confidence was even lower.

⁵² Leedy and Ormrod, 270.

One correlation observed was the low confidence level to equip people and the lack of any formal spiritual warfare training in the church planter's educational background. There seems to be a cause and effect situation in terms of the lack of education creating the lack of practical application to equip people for spiritual warfare.

Phase II: Qualitative Data Tool Creation and Collection

A follow-up questionnaire was developed based on the data collected from the survey. The researcher and faculty advisor held a brainstorming session to generate a multitude of questions. Eleven of the questions were selected by the researcher and tested on a few people for clarity. Questions were then re-worded to make sure they were clear and concise.

The first four questions on the questionnaire were demographic. Question five was a closed question asking the participants to choose one view among the three presented that resonated most with them. Questions six through eleven were open-ended questions designed to gather participants' opinions, ideas, and feelings.

Phase II: Implementing the Data Collection Tool

In the phase II questionnaire, the researcher conducted phone interviews as a follow-up to gain a better understanding of the phase I survey. The researcher selected the phone interview participants from those who had attended the LCMC Annual Convention and completed the survey. The researcher asked the LCMC church planting coordinator to identify the church planters who had participated in the convention. A list of church planters was provided to the researcher and phone calls were made to ask permission to conduct a phone interview. The random sample of those interviewed included those who answered the phone and consented to participate. The phone

interviews were conducted with six church planters December 1-4, 2017 and took 30 to 45 minutes each. The questionnaire was read verbatim to each participant. Participants gave permission for the researcher to record the interview, knowing that the results would remain nameless. The first four questions were demographic; the fifth question was closed, with a follow-up question to modify or express a different view; and the last five questions were open, looking for ideas, attitudes, and opinions from the participants.

Phase II: Data Analysis and Interpretation

The researcher used several steps to analyze and interpret the data collected. First, the participants' answers to the first four demographic questions were used to find the range of education, years of experience in ministry, and whether this was their first, second, or third church plant. The researcher recorded the responses on a spreadsheet, then calculated percentages and exported them to a graph for comparison. Similarities, correlations, and contrasts were observed and recorded on a spreadsheet.

Question five asked participants to choose one of three popular views and question six asked whether they had a fourth view. Similarities, correlations, and contrasts were observed and recorded on a spreadsheet. Tables were created to understand, clarify, and communicate the observations.

The researcher coded questions seven through eleven to better understand the range of unique answers given. Next the researcher read through the responses, taking notice of common themes, words, and ideas expressed by the participants. Categories became evident and helped the researcher to understand and communicate the observations. The researcher gathered all the questions and created differentiated groups.

A copy of the questionnaire used for the interview is included in Appendix B.

CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Overview and Context

The researcher used standard analysis tools consisting of spreadsheets, percentages, tables, and coding to observe similarities, correlations, and contrasts. These were combined to create statistics, narrative, and phenomenological findings.

According to the LCMC website,¹ 49 churches have begun the process of being planted within the past five years in the continental United States. These church plants are located in 25 different states. The researcher's five-question survey of 22 church planters serving 20 church plants at the annual LCMC conference represented 40 percent of the LCMC church planters. Two had spouses who participated in the survey, and one of the two spouses also had a Master of Divinity degree and was considered a pastor. Of these 22 church planters the researcher chose six at random and conducted a phone interview with their consent using an eleven-question questionnaire. The balanced number of three men and three women represented five different states.

Phase I Survey Analysis

To contextualize the survey the researcher wrote a brief biography included at the top of the survey, along with an introduction and explanation of the research topic.

Surveys were then distributed to the participants. The introduction and questions below

¹ Lutheran Congregations in Mission for Christ, accessed January 3, 2018, <http://lcmc.net/church-plants>.

appear precisely as they did in the survey that was given to the church planters. The original survey given to the church planters is included in Appendix A.

The survey's introduction clarified the specific type of spiritual warfare the researcher was interested in studying.

Introduction: Scripture describes spiritual warfare taking place on three battlefronts, 1) the world, 2) the flesh, and 3) the devil. The researcher asked for the participant's confidence level in their knowledge and understanding of only the third battlefront, the devil's work.

The Likert-scale gave five possible confidence levels for the participants to choose from. The italicized words represent the categories the researcher employed in the Likert-scale. A reproduction of the survey questions follows.

Question 1. I feel confident in my biblical and theological knowledge of the devil and his work against my church plant.

Table 1. Biblical and Theological Knowledge of the Devil

<i>Little Confidence</i>	<i>Somewhat Confident</i>	<i>Confident</i>	<i>Very Confident</i>	<i>Extremely Confident</i>
0%	4.5%	59%	32%	4.5%

Question 2. I feel confident in my ability to discern practical dealings with the devil and his work against my church members.

Table 2. Discern Practical Dealings with the Devil

<i>Little Confidence</i>	<i>Somewhat Confident</i>	<i>Confident</i>	<i>Very Confident</i>	<i>Extremely Confident</i>
0%	50%	36%	14%	0%

Question 3. I feel confident in my ability to equip my church effectively in spiritual warfare strategies.

Table 3. Equip Church in Spiritual Warfare Strategies

<i>Little Confidence</i>	<i>Somewhat Confident</i>	<i>Confident</i>	<i>Very Confident</i>	<i>Extremely Confident</i>
9%	50%	27%	14%	0%

In Table 1 the biblical and theological knowledge placed 95 percent of the participants in the *confident to extremely confident* categories. These church planters believe that their knowledge of the devil and his work against their church plant is strong from a biblical and theological perspective. In contrast, Table 2 reveals that the

participant's ability to discern practical dealings with the devil and his work against church members is lacking. Fifty percent of the participants placed themselves in the *somewhat confident* category. This statistic points out that half of the church planters believe that their ability to discern the devil's work needs improvement. The other half felt *confident* and *very confident* in their ability to discern the devil's work. Table 3 shows a move from the *confident* and above category of 41 percent of participants to 59 percent of participants in the *somewhat confident* and *little confidence* to equip their church in spiritual warfare strategies.

Isolating the middle category of *confident* in all three tables shows a downward trend in confidence from question one regarding theology at 59 percent, question two regarding discernment at 36 percent, and finally question three regarding equipping at 27 percent. The *confidence* starts high for knowledge, then drops to a middle range for discernment and finishes lower for equipping. Of the church planters who are *confident* and well-informed in terms of biblical and theological expertise, 50 percent are only *somewhat confident* and even 9 percent have *little confidence* in the practical arena of equipping, as Table 3 suggests. The significance of these statistics is that the church planters' confidence in their knowledge about the devil and his work against their church plant is high, but their confidence drops significantly with regard to their ability to equip their church in spiritual warfare strategies. The researcher believes that this lack of confidence shows the need for spiritual warfare equipping.

The combined analysis of survey question 3 in Table 3 and questions 10 and 11 in the phone interview regarding helpful Scripture and resources for dealing with demonic influences are telling. The interviews helped the researcher to understand and interpret

Table 3, which indicates a lack of knowledge about available resources. These questions also reveal that a more comprehensive understanding of Scripture would be helpful to understand spiritual warfare strategy.

Question 4. Have you ever had any formal training in the 3rd front of spiritual warfare, explicitly dealing with the devil's works? Please circle YES or NO. If you circled YES, please indicate where and what topics were covered in training.

Of the 22 participants, four (18%) circled YES and 18 (82%) circled NO.

This statistic can also explain why such a gap exists between biblical and theological knowledge and equipping. Knowing about the devil and his works among humanity is one thing but doing something about it is another. Knowledge and its application are an entirely different realm of reality in the day-to-day world.

The four church planters who specified that they had received formal training indicated the following: They thought Women's Aglow Fellowship weekly study gathering using a manual entitled, *Spiritual Warfare, Strategy for Winning*, provided that formal training. Another participant took a seminary class called Dynamics of the Holy Spirit. This course dealt in part with how to handle demonic issues. Two other participants answered YES to the question about receiving formal training. However, their answers are questionable because neither of them named a specific a class, seminar, or workshop they attended but gave a book title instead. One participant only wrote "Deliverance and *Prayer Shield*," but named no author. The researcher knows that *Prayer Shield* is a book by Peter Wagner. Deliverance could be a book. However, the only Deliverance book on Amazon was one written in 1970 which became the movie Deliverance. [awkward] Another participant named a book or seminar *Setting the Captive Free* but named no author, and some books go by this title on Amazon. No indication of any formal training was given except the answer to the question, YES.

It was interesting to note that one participant who circled NO for question four, indicating that they had not received formal training, wrote “Although, I did go extensively through much of Neil Anderson’s material.” Neil Anderson is a popular speaker and author of many books on spiritual warfare including *Victory over the Darkness* and *The Bondage Breaker*. He also created a training course called Steps to Freedom in Christ. This participant’s answer could mean that the participant wanted the researcher to know that they had not received formal training but were able to learn on their own as indicated on their survey. This particular participant felt *Extremely Confident* about their biblical and theological knowledge, *Very Confident* about their discernment, and *Confident* about their ability to equip God’s people in strategies for spiritual warfare. They scored themselves the highest of anyone on the survey and was the only one to use the *Extremely Confident* category (given in response to question one). In question two they and two other participants scored themselves *Very Confident* and on question three they and five other participants scored themselves in the *Confident* category.

Based on the self-evaluation survey only two participants were able to identify some type of formal training. One referred to a seminary class and the other mentioned a course taught by a national parachurch Christian women’s organization. These two survey participants seemed to be the most credible because they listed courses they had taken. The other two identified titles of known books that may have also been titles of courses, workshops, or seminars they attended. However, because of the absence of anything identifiable other than known book titles the researcher is skeptical about formal training. The participants may have been confused by the question. The researcher should

have defined formal training as a seminary or Bible school course, and another category could have been created to include seminars, conferences, workshops, or published Bible studies on spiritual warfare.

The assumption that church planters received very little if any spiritual warfare training in their formal education was the basis for this research. The answers to survey question four affirm the researcher's theory. Only 4.5 percent of the participants received formal/seminary training. Another 4.5 percent of the participants received training through a parachurch study. Nine percent of the participants indicated having done what the researcher considers self-study by reading books or other means. The majority of the participants (82%) indicated that they had not received any formal training. Perhaps self-study, parachurch courses, and Steps to Freedom courses are filling a needed gap in Christianity. The researcher considers these courses better than nothing, but inadequate for professional ministers and church planters.

Question 5. The fifth and final question of the quantitative survey was open-ended to allow the church planters to suggest topics of interest. The question was: What would be a spiritual warfare topic of interest that you would like to learn more about?

Just over half of the church planters (55%) answered this question, which means that 45 percent did not bother to answer. The researcher wonders whether they didn't know enough about the topic even to suggest one.

The researcher coded many diverse answers, and after a thoughtful examination created four categories based on grouping similar responses, concepts, or ideas together. They include Discernment, How to Stand, Specific Issues, and Biblical Basis. The first category, Discernment, has to do with how to identify and distinguish the devil's work from God's work and recognizing some potential threats of the devil. The second category, Standing Firm, has to do with equipping—teaching the “nuts and bolts,” as one

participant put it; ways to do combat to push back the darkness. The third category, Specific Issues, included family/generational curses, suicide, resentments that affect others, and idols. The fourth and final category, Biblical Basis, has to do with how to apply the cross of Christ in spiritual warfare and how to stop fear from keeping people from dealing with demonic situations. One of the participants answered, “all the above,” suggesting that training in the areas of biblical and theological knowledge, discernment, and effectively equipping the church in spiritual warfare strategies would be helpful.

Analysis: Only twelve church planters out of the 22 or 55 percent of survey participants answered question five. The researcher believes the high number of 45 percent who did not answer may indicate a lack of knowledge about the subject, not knowing what they do not know. This fact is evident in the high number (82%) who admitted that they had not received formal training on the subject of spiritual warfare. The essence of this question also appeared in question eight of the qualitative questionnaire in phase II of the research.

Phase II Questionnaire Analysis

When contacted by the researcher six church planters consented to be interviewed over the phone. The first four questions were demographic.

Question 1. Is this your first church plant?

All six participants answered yes. This question was important because it helped the researcher evaluate whether the participants had had any previous experience planting a church and, if so, whether that could be a factor in how the church planter responded to spiritual warfare issues. The researcher was interested to see whether any correlation

could be made between multiple church planting experiences and spiritual warfare knowledge, discernment, and equipping.

Analysis: The researcher found no significant correlation between the number of churches planted because this was the first church plant for all participants.

Question 2. How long have you been planting churches?

All were under five years, ranging from just getting started to four and a half years. This question was important because for evaluating whether the amount of time planting a church made any difference. The researcher was interested to see whether any correlation could be made between the age of the church plant and spiritual warfare knowledge, discernment, and equipping.

The researcher found no significant correlation in this potential variable. Three of the participants had been at their present church plant for four years or more, while three had been planting for two and a half years or less.

Question 3. How long have you been in ministry?

This question was intended to help the researcher evaluate any correlation or relationship between the duration of ministry experience and spiritual warfare knowledge, discernment, and equipping. Three of the participants had been in professional ministry for 18 years or more and another church planter for 11 years. One church planter had four years of experience and another planter was just getting started in professional ministry at the same time as the church planting launch.

The researcher found no significant relationship between years of experience and how the church planters dealt with spiritual warfare issues.

Question 4. What type of degree do you have?

All but the newest church planter had received a Master of Divinity degree. This question was important to evaluate any correlation between the years of education and type of education the church planter received and their confidence in their spiritual warfare knowledge, discernment, and equipping.

The researcher found no significant relationship between the demographic information and spiritual warfare knowledge, discernment, or equipping that made any difference to this study. However, the fact that he found no significant relationships does not mean they do not exist. The questions posed on this qualitative questionnaire did not expose any relationships, but different questions could be used to identify correlations or relationships and would be a profitable study in the future.

Question 5. There seems to be three dominant Christian views about what the devil and demons are in the Scriptures and the influence they have on humanity. I'm going to read a summary of these three views. Please choose the one that resonates closest to your understanding of Scripture.

The fifth question was unique in that the participants were asked to identify one of three Christian views about the devil and his influence. The researcher summarized the of the three theologians discussed in chapter two: Bultmann, Berkhof, and Arnold, and read their views to the participants. However, the researcher did not reveal the names of the theologians to the participants, to eliminate any potential bias. The researcher read the following three paragraphs to the participants:

First, the view that the biblical writers used supernatural beings such as the devil and demons to describe evil in a pre-scientific world. Since we now understand the cause and effects of science we can use psychological and sociological terms to explain all supposed supernatural forces of evil. As a result, there are no supernatural evil beings that interfere with humanity.

Second, the view that human structures, which God meant for the good of humanity, have been hijacked and used for evil. Structures such as the state, politics, class, social struggle, national interest, public opinion, accepted morality,

the ideas of decency, humanity, democracy are what the Scriptures mean as the devil and/or demonic influences. As a result, there are no supernatural evil beings that interfere with humanity.

Third, the view that the devil and demons are real supernatural beings that have intelligence and a will. They try to derail God's will and harass and torment humanity. As a result, there are supernatural beings that cause evil and have a direct effect on humanity.

Which of these three views resonates closest to your understanding of Scripture and why?

All six of the church planters who responded to the questionnaire chose the third view, which was defended by Arnold. When asked why they chose the third view, participants referred to the way the Scripture seemed to portray the devil as a real personality.

This question was important to the researcher's understanding of the participants' underlying theology. In the researcher's opinion these three theologians—Bultmann, Berkhof, and Arnold—were the primary scholars who helped shape what and how twenty-first century Christians think about spiritual warfare. Therefore, what and how church planters think about spiritual warfare will play an important role in discernment and equipping strategies about how to deal with the devil and demonic influence.

The finding that all church planters identified with the third view represented by Arnold was important to the researcher. It means that all the church planters interviewed possessed a similar theological foundation. They all believed in the reality of a devil with intelligence and a will that can harass and torment humanity. The researcher hopes to use this study to create training material for church planters and pastors in the LCMC. Knowing that the presuppositions of the church planters relate to the third view will aid in the development of the training. Starting on common ground with the LCMC church planters will help streamline some of the training. However, the researcher takes note that

outside of the LCMC not all church planters and pastors will hold similar biblical and theological presuppositions.

Question 6. Could you suggest a fourth view? If so, how would you explain it?

Four out of six church planters (67%) indicated a belief that the second view had some relevance, not in the sense that the devil is the structures (as Berkhof proposed) but in the sense that the devil works in and through individuals within the human structures to carry out evil deeds.

The researcher's understanding of spiritual warfare combines a facet of the second view with the third view. Combining Berkhof's structures with Arnold's personal devil creates a fourth view. This is not surprising because the participants and the researcher are involved in the same Lutheran movement and share the views attributed to Luther's belief in a personal devil² and embedded theology.³ The fact that the devil is personal and works in and through people can influence structures through people. People lead structures such as government and education and are therefore susceptible to the devil's influence.

Knowing a lot of common ground exists between the researcher and the LCMC church planters will aid in developing spiritual warfare training. The researcher will build on the similar presuppositions and embedded theology of the LCMC church planters.

Question 7. Has there been anything in your church plant that you would identify as demonic? If so, please explain.

² John Warwick Montgomery, *Principalities and Powers* (Minneapolis, MN: Bethany Fellowship Inc., 1973), 186.

³ Embedded theology is the "understanding of faith disseminated by the church and assimilated by its members in their daily lives." Howard W. Stone and James O. Duke, *How to Think Theologically* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2013), 137.

Five categories were created from the data to communicate the findings. The first category was Character Issues such as lying, disobedience, dishonesty, rebellion, control issues, trustworthiness, selfishness, putdowns, and not keeping commitments. (One church planter commented that not one member of the original launch team had continued with the church plant.) The second category was Emotional Issues such as depression and discouragement, and how that affects other members of the church. The third category was Family Issues such as dysfunctional systems, addictions, and enabling. The fourth category was Spiritual Issues such as nightmares, dreams, prank/scary phone calls in the night, personal attacks on family, unexplainable bad timing and troubling circumstances when outreaches are scheduled, or when significant progress is being made by the church plant. (One participant combined rebellion with witchcraft according to 1 Samuel 15:23, and another believed that a house purchase that fell through was spiritual warfare directed towards his family to hinder their planting effort.) The fifth category was Electronic Equipment that works perfectly before the church service or event and then malfunctions for no apparent reason.

Analysis: Much of what the interviewees identified as spiritual warfare seems to be normal and ordinary problems caused by the world and the flesh. The researcher places the world and the flesh into secondary influences by the devil. The primary influence behind the world and the flesh is the devil. The researcher recognizes that the devil uses the world's systems of human structures and the flesh within the human heart to cause problems, sin, and death. The researcher observed that none of the participants listed sickness, demonization, or any other physical ailments attributed directly to the devil in the New Testament. The closest physical issues named were addiction and

depression. The participants' worldview seems to have a gap between physical phenomenological manifestations and direct demonic attacks as found in the New Testament. (One participant did mention physical healing in answer to question eight.)

Question 8. Based on your ministry experience, what areas of training and equipping would be helpful for you?

This question implies some understanding of spiritual warfare, which was the context of the questionnaire. The researcher created four categories based on the data received. The first category was leadership and management in the areas of vision, prayer, healing, and evangelism. (One participant used the biblical concept to ask, "how do we build with gold, silver, and precious stones?") The second category was people conflicts and dealing with family, church members, and overall change. (One church planter commented that "people don't like change." This comment may be an indirect spiritual warfare issue.) The third category was spiritual health. ("How can we stay spiritually healthy so that we are not so vulnerable?" asked one participant. They continued, "Is there preventative spiritual warfare?" Another person asked about the potential dangers of demonic influence and how that might impact personal spiritual formation?) Fourth, ministry competency to recognize, resist and know how to deal with demonic attacks.

Analysis: The answers to this question lead the researcher to see that a more focused and less general question should be asked in the future. Many of the answers of the participants came with a struggle to articulate training and equipping needs. The church planters seemed to be uncertain about what to ask for. I believe this further identifies the problem of a lack of spiritual warfare education. Spiritual warfare training and equipping did not seem to be on the radar of the church planters. Question eight

related to question five on the survey completed by the church planters at the convention. Both questions asked for training suggestions. In the survey almost half (45%) left the question blank even though the survey was brief and had no time limit. The researcher believes that if the church planters had an idea of what they needed they would have written it down, and that the lack of knowledge about spiritual warfare leaves some church planters not knowing what to ask for.

Question 9. What type of delivery system or format would be most helpful to equip you and your church?

Based on the data the researcher created three categories. The first category was live with lecture and lab. The lab is an experiential learning time found in a workshop. (The church planters who mentioned this format expressed their disapproval of online training that is difficult to experience.) The second category was video/internet and social media. The third category was a combination of the first two, using video/internet or a CD to convey information but meeting with a group of people who could experience some hands-on workshop type of training.

The participants gave pros and cons regarding why they preferred one format over another. Two church planters suggested live training with a lab time to experience training along with the teaching. They had a history of bringing speakers to their church plant to do a weekend training for leaders and church members. Two others did not mention any need for experiential training and felt that video and internet teaching would be fine although very impersonal. Two participants suggested a combination of the first two formats: meeting with a group of people and watching the video/internet together, then doing a hands-on experiential training with one another. All three of these suggestions seemed to be viable options to be explored by the researcher.

Question 10. What Scripture verses do you rely on when dealing with demonic influences personally, with others and your church?

The participants' responses to this question were noticeably lacking in Scripture references. Church planters identified chapters of Scripture without giving verse references and some summarized the story or concept without specifying any chapter or verse. Ephesians 6, which talks about the armor of God, was the only Scripture mentioned by two different church planters. Ephesians 4 ("do not give the devil a foothold") and Psalm 91 (Yahweh's protection) were the other chapters mentioned. Only one church planter cited chapter and verse, Philippians 4:4, quoting verse four and summarizing the rest through verse six: "Rejoice in the Lord. ... Do not be anxious." One phrase was mentioned without reference: "resist and the devil and he will flee from you." This is from James 4:7; the church planter thought it was somewhere in Hebrews.

Seven different biblical stories with no Scripture references were also included among the answers to this question. The narratives given were: "Jesus is a role model in the Gospels of casting out and power over demons and healing"; "Balaam can't curse Israel and the Moabite women"; "Peter's sifting, the last supper, Peter and others in prison and escaped in the Book of Acts; and lastly the men in the fiery furnace.

Metaphors were also used to answer this question: "we don't live in a playground but a battlefield" and "anything that has to do with resting in Jesus and allowing him to do it. ... I don't want to be digging under every rock [for demons], I just want to battle from a place of rest."

This question was important for helping the researcher learn what biblical and theological bases the church planters used when dealing with spiritual warfare. After

trying to code these answers, the researcher decided not to use coding but to allow them to stand independently because they were so diverse.

One observation made by the researcher was the lack of Scripture verses referenced. Narratives were described and sometimes chapters were given, but very few Scripture verses were given. Therefore the researcher concluded that the church planters were not aware of spiritual warfare verses. This may be due to the lack of formal training, or that the subject matter has not been on their radar for day-to-day ministry. Scripture was probably not consulted very often since the Scripture verses were not known. However, the researcher is aware that internet concordances are readily available by cell phone. Memorizing Scripture may now be obsolete with technology, but one problem with only knowing a phrase or part of a verse is the potential to misunderstand the phrase out of its context. A good example of misunderstanding was the phrase given by one of the church planters, “resist the devil and he will flee from you.” Although this statement is an exact quote from James 4:7, it leaves out an important declaration. The whole verse states, “Submit yourself then to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.” There are two imperative sentences in this verse, not just one.

A second observation was that Scripture narratives were used in place of quoting or referring to Scripture verses. Stories are easy to remember and offer powerful examples of victory over the devil. These were used to motivate and give confidence to the church planters who found themselves in spiritual warfare. Based on what the researcher learned from the responses to this question, narrative and phenomenological details should be part of the equipping process. Biblical and personal stories should be

placed in high regard for those who teach because stories were meaningful to the church planters who used them.

The researcher's third observation was that an overly confident attitude may exist among church planters who think they know more about spiritual warfare than they really do. It may be a matter of not knowing what one doesn't know. The suggestions regarding what training and equipping topics they would like to see (question eight above and question five on the survey) seem to indicate a teachable attitude among those who responded. However, only 55 percent offered suggestions; 45 percent did not.

Question 11. Are there any resources or authors who you have found helpful in dealing with demonic influences?

The reason this question was relevant was to recognize resources that church planters found beneficial. The researcher created four categories based on the type of resource named: Books, Studies, Classes, and Speakers.

The books named included *The Bait of Satan* by John Bevere, *God at War* by Greg Boyd, *Pigs in the Parlor* by Frank Hammond, and *Prayer Shield* by Peter Wagner. Two studies were named: *Spiritual Warfare Strategy for Winning* by JoAnne Sekowsky, a Women's Aglow Fellowship Series, and *The Invisible War* by Chip Ingram. Classes that were suggested included: The Theophostic Course, the Aldridge Institute, the Cleansing Streams course, and a seminary Spiritual Formation course. One speaker was mentioned: Graham Cook.

Spiritual warfare training and education is diverse and individualistic when left to the church planter's discretion to fill the void. The books, studies, classes, and the speaker mentioned cover the theological spectrum of Evangelical, Third Wave, Charismatic, and Pentecostal. A miscellaneous mixture of theology and ministry models

are represented in these resources. The range of training and education mentioned by these church planters is basic at best. Only one scholarly book was mentioned; the other three were anecdotal and focused on the practical. These church planters seem to need a more scholarly approach to spiritual warfare. Overall, when the survey and questionnaire are brought together, it shows the church planters hold to right orthodoxy but have a limited orthopraxy.

Conclusion

Meeting with some of the church planters at the group meeting during the conventions in October was helpful. They were bright, friendly, and eager to be a part of the research. Their willingness to help made the research project go better than expected.

A gap exists between the church planters' biblical, theological knowledge and their discernment, equipping ability. The biblical, theological knowledge topped out on the Likert-scale with 95 percent indicating that they were *confident* to *extremely confident*. In contrast, 50 percent of the participants scored themselves below the *confident* level regarding their ability to discern practical dealings with the devil and his work. Similarly, 60 percent of participants scored themselves below the *confident* level in their ability to effectively equip their church in spiritual warfare strategies. By their own admission the church planters need spiritual warfare training and equipping. With such training, the researcher believes the church planters would be more confident in discernment and could effectively equip their church members in spiritual warfare strategies.

The church planters were well educated; 83 percent of those interviewed held a Master of Divinity degree, but only 5 percent had received seminary level spiritual

warfare education and equipping. The researcher hopes that this research project will help change the current lack of spiritual warfare education in seminaries and Bible schools.

The researcher believes that a scholarly education and equipping for spiritual warfare would be beneficial not only for church planters but also for pastors and ministers around the world.

The church planters demonstrated a tendency to overlook some of the works of the devil and his demons identified in Scripture. Examples include the devil blinding the minds of unbelievers (2 Cor. 4:4) and living under Satan's power (Acts 26:18). These are direct references to the devil's ability to hinder evangelism.

The participants' preferred delivery system for training and equipping in spiritual warfare was a live, in-person speaker with experiential workshop time. All participants mentioned social media formats such as webinars and videos as a given. But most expressed a desire to connect with people for the experiential learning opportunity.

CHAPTER SIX: EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The problem this project addressed is the need for spiritual warfare training and equipping to enable church planters to be more efficient in mission within the Lutheran Congregations in Mission for Christ (LCMC) movement. In response to this problem, the researcher explored spiritual warfare concepts in the Bible to develop a theology of spiritual warfare; reviewed scholarly literature that deals with spiritual warfare, with particular attention given to the works of Clinton Arnold, Hendrik Berkhof, and Rudolf Bultmann; surveyed LCMC church planters to explore their confidence levels about spiritual warfare and the needs of their congregation in relationship to spiritual warfare training and equipping; conducted interviews to arrive at possible solutions for better training and equipping for spiritual warfare among LCMC church planters and the church worldwide.

Discoveries from Chapter Two

The researcher compared the theologies of Clinton Arnold, Hendrik Berkhof, and Rudolf Bultmann in terms of their views regarding the supernatural, the Powers and Principalities, and the effects they have on contemporary humanity. These three twentieth-century theologians have shaped the way twentieth-first century Christians comprehend and apply spiritual warfare strategies.

Bultmann and Berkhof had similar views about the supernatural. Both saw scientific understanding as ruling over the historical accounts of supernatural phenomena

recorded in the Scripture. In other words, because supernatural events were recorded but modern science only recognizes natural physical events, they must be myths and as such reinterpreted. Therefore, on the grounds of science Bultmann and Berkhof rejected the historical accounts of miracles and entities such as angels and demons. Arnold, on the other hand, considers the accounts of miracles and entities such as angels and demons recorded in the Scriptures to be true and accurate. He sees no need to rely on de-mythology to explain supernatural phenomena when reliable eyewitnesses support historical accounts. According to Bultmann and Berkhof, myth rather than reliable witnesses must lay at the root of recorded supernatural phenomena. The way to understand supernatural phenomena according to Bultmann and Berkhof is by scientific cause and effect. Therefore, they forced interpreters of Scripture to make a binary choice between science and myth. Arnold rejects the choice between science and myth and believes in the reality of both a supernatural spiritual world and a natural scientific world exist together; one does not need to cancel out the other.

In Bultmann's view the Powers and Principalities should be taken seriously, but a new way was needed to explain them. For Bultmann myth did not mean that the Powers and Principalities were not a reality, only that people recorded supernatural phenomenology in the pre-scientific worldview of the first century. Bultmann feared that contemporary scientific humanity would reject the outdated supernatural worldview of the Bible.

Bultmann's hermeneutic was not looking for what the author meant within the historical and cultural context of the writings, instead Bultmann sought for meaning in his own cultural context. In doing so Bultmann distorted the original intention and meaning

of the text by looking for the deeper meaning behind the myth (assuming there was one). None of the LCMC church planters interviewed agreed with Bultmann's theological view of the supernatural, Powers, and Principalities and their non-effect on humanity.

Berkhof perceived that no supernatural beings interfere with human agents to cause evil. Myth, on the other hand, sees supernatural creatures such as a devil and demons at work interfering with human agents by tempting and causing them to do evil. Arnold does not concur with Bultmann and Berkhof's binary choice as stated above. He believes that the supernatural realm exists, and the phenomena recorded in Scripture are a part of reality. Myth does not need to play a role to interpret them.

Arnold perceives a supernatural entity who the Scriptures call Satan and the devil, with an intellect and a will along with his demon army, at the center of evil. The devil and his demons can influence people via temptation or invade individuals and temporarily take control. Bultmann and Berkhof saw no such supernatural entity. Bultmann distinguished between perceived supernatural powers causing good and evil and the actions of human beings who cause either good or bad. Berkhof expanded on Bultmann's absence of supernatural entities by just placing humanity into structures where they can produce either good or evil.

Historical phenomenology, according to Arnold, maintains that those who wrote about the devil and demons recorded it accurately in Scripture and do not need to be demythologized as Bultmann demanded. Berkhof claimed that the apostle Paul had already demythologized the phenomenology recorded in the Scriptures by articulating that the Powers are God-created human structures.

The researcher has demonstrated that the theologies of Arnold, Berkhof, and Bultmann helped shape the twenty-first century church, her doctrine on evil, and its influence on humanity. All the variations in beliefs and applications about spiritual warfare in the twenty-first century church can be traced back to Arnold, Berkhof, or Bultmann. One segment of the church believes Bultmann's theology that supernatural evil does not exist and therefore has no influence on humanity. Another portion of the church believes Berkhof's theology that evil is caused by humanity alone and works in and through the structures of society. Yet another segment of the church believes Arnold's theology and would say that supernatural evil does exist and is personified in the devil and his demons. This group believes in a real devil who harbors evil intent against God and his people. The devil tries to influence humankind through their thoughts and activities.

All of the church planters interviewed agreed with Arnold's view, and half accepted a modified view of Berkhof, believing that God created structures such as government, education etc. can be used for evil intent by people who oversee the structures but reject the idea that the Powers and Principalities are the structures.

The researcher finds Arnold's view most compatible with historical and cultural exegesis as put forth by Gordon Fee¹ and Michael J. Gorman.² The researcher also believes that Jesus gave his church, the men and women of his kingdom, power and authority to stand against the evil forces of the devil and his influence on humanity.

¹ Gordon D. Fee, *New Testament Exegesis* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 96-111.

² Michael J. Gorman, *Elements of Biblical Exegesis* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2009), 70-74.

Significance of Chapter Two

It is the conviction of the researcher that critical comparison of Arnold, Berkhof and Bultmann's theologies be made by the church to identify the real enemy. How the church interpreted the Powers and Principalities and their potential effects on humanity, is crucial for defeating evil. It is the church's responsibility to identify the enemy and engage in a strategy to defeat the enemy's schemes. The thesis of the researcher for the need to train and equip LCMC church planters in spiritual warfare strategies is rooted in the perceived failure of the church to do so. Church planters who have not adequately prepared for spiritual battle are at risk of failure or are marginalized to be effective in their calling.

Discoveries from Chapter Three

Spiritual warfare was a significant part of the ministry of Jesus and the early church. When Jesus sent out the disciples "he gave them power (the ability to act) and authority (the right to act on his behalf) to drive out all demons and to cure diseases and to proclaim the kingdom of God" (Luke 9:1-2).³ The disciples continued to demonstrate this spiritual power over demons and diseases after Jesus ascended into heaven. The Book of Acts documents acts of spiritual power and often gives credit to God or Jesus the Messiah (Acts 2:4,14-22; 3:6,16; 8:6-7). This same spiritual power is available to his present-day disciples, in the opinion of the researcher, because Jesus inaugurated the kingdom of God in his first coming. Jesus trained and equipped his disciples to announce and demonstrate the kingdom of God. Jesus commanded his disciples to make new disciples and to teach them everything he taught them, including spiritual warfare. He

³ R. Allen Culpepper, *The New Interpreter's Bible*, Vol IX, Luke & John. (Nashville TN., Abingdon Press. 1995. 193-194

also promised to be with them until the end of the age as they continued to make new disciples (Matt. 28:18-20). God is still in the process of placing the enemies of Jesus under his feet (Ps. 110:1) as the church steps out in faith using the power and authority Jesus gave her.

Significance of Chapter Three

Every time Jesus sent his disciples out to proclaim the kingdom of God as recorded in the gospels and the Book of Acts he also commanded them to demonstrate the kingdom of God. Jesus did this by giving his disciples power and authority for spiritual battles they would encounter (Matt. 10:1, 7-8; Mark 6:6, 12; Luke 9:1-2, 6; 10:1, 9, 17; 24:49; John 20:21-22; Acts 1:4-8). If Jesus found it necessary to equip his apostles (sent ones) for spiritual battles, so too the church must equip church planters (sent ones) for spiritual battles. The results of the research project indicated that the church planters surveyed and interviewed had very little training and equipping for spiritual battle. Therefore, the act of discerning spiritual attacks and equipping their churches in spiritual warfare strategies was limited.

The New Testament confirms that Jesus and his church are waging a spiritual war against the devil and his troops. In Matthew 22:44 Jesus quotes Psalm 110:1 and points out that Yahweh was speaking to David's Lord, who has been invited by Yahweh to sit at Yahweh's right hand, conferring upon David's Lord power and authority. David's Lord was more significant than David according to Acts 2:34 "for David did not ascend to heaven." Also, David's Lord was greater than the angels according to Hebrews 1:13 "to which of the angels did God ever say, 'sit at my right hand until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet?'" The Lord Jesus Messiah will figuratively have his feet upon his

enemies. The apostle Paul used similar imagery in his letter to the Romans. He assured the Christians that “the God of peace will soon crush Satan under your feet” (Rom. 16:20).

Jesus began his ministry in the wilderness by battling Satan (Matt. 4:1-11; Mark 1:12-13; Luke 4:1-13). The apostle John explained that one of the purposes of Jesus’ coming was “to destroy the works of the devil” (1 John 3:8b). Church planters are likewise in a spiritual war with the enemies of the Lord Jesus Christ. God the Father gave Jesus all power and authority, and Jesus delegated that power and authority to his church. The researcher hopes that church planters will be trained and equipped to use the power and authority that Jesus gave them.

Discoveries from the Field Research

The field research showed that a gap exists between the church planters’ biblical, theological knowledge and their discernment and equipping ability. The biblical, theological knowledge topped out on the Likert-scale at 95 percent, indicating that they were *confident* to *extremely confident*. In contrast, 50 percent of the participants scored themselves below the *confident* level in their ability to discern practical dealings with the devil and his work. Similarly, 60 percent of participants scored themselves below the *confident* range in their ability to effectively equip their church in spiritual warfare strategies. The church planters admitted that they need spiritual warfare training and equipping. If they had spiritual warfare training, the researcher believes the church planters would be more confident in discernment and could effectively equip their church members in spiritual warfare strategies.

The field research showed that the church planters were well educated; 83 percent of those interviewed held a Master of Divinity degree, yet only 5 percent received seminary level spiritual warfare education and equipping. The researcher is hopeful that this research project will help to rectify the current lack of spiritual warfare education at seminaries and Bible schools. The researcher believes that a scholarly education along with spiritual warfare training would benefit not only church planters but also pastors and ministers around the world.

Another discovery was the tendency to overlook some of the works of the devil and his demons identified in Scripture; for example, the devil blinding the minds of unbelievers (2 Cor. 4:4) and living under Satan's power (Acts 26:18). These are direct references to the devil's ability to hinder evangelism.

The participants' preferred delivery system for training and equipping in spiritual warfare was a live speaker with experiential workshop time. All mentioned social media such as webinars and videos. Sixty-seven percent of interview participants expressed a desire to connect with people for the experiential workshop.

Finally, when asked about spiritual warfare Scripture that they relied on when dealing with demonic influences personally, with others, and with their church, the church planters shared a few verses but mentioned Bible narratives. They more readily remembered Bible stories than exact verse numbers. Stories seemed to be more significant than propositional truth, which serves as a clue to the researcher to use stories during training and equipping opportunities.

Significance of the Field Research

The field research confirmed that church planters in the LCMC could be better prepared in spiritual warfare strategies to discern, train, and equip themselves and their churches. Some church planting writers indicate that up to 70 and 80 percent of church plants fail within five years.⁴ The researcher believes that in many cases, spiritual warfare training would improve the success rate of church plants.

The researcher will use this field research to create a course that includes an experiential workshop for church planters, pastors, and ministers. The church planters who participated in the phone interview were enthusiastic for spiritual warfare training and equipping. They recommended the topics of interest and the methods to use for training and equipping course. Based on that, the researcher will create a course with a combination of media, live speaker, and experiential workshops. Stories will play a role in the course, along with specific Scripture verses to give clarity and confidence for dealing with demonic influence.

Conclusion

The researcher set out to address the need for LCMC church planters to be equipped with spiritual warfare strategies to be more effective in mission. In response to this problem, the researcher explored spiritual warfare concepts in the Scriptures and developed a theology of spiritual warfare; reviewed scholarly literature that deals with spiritual warfare, with particular attention given to the works of Clinton Arnold, Hendrik Berkhof, and Rudolf Bultmann; surveyed LCMC church planters to explore their

⁴ Edward Stetzer and Warren Bird, "The State of Church Planting in the United States: Research Overview and Qualitative Study of Primary Church Planting Entities," Lifeway Research and Leadership Network, accessed January 1, 2018, <http://www.christianitytoday.com/assets/10228>, 43, note 4. These are published statistics that do not include documentation.

confidence levels about spiritual warfare and the needs of their congregation with regard to spiritual warfare training and equipping; and conducted interviews to arrive at possible solutions for better training and equipping in spiritual warfare among LCMC church planters and for the church worldwide.

Spiritual warfare concepts in the Scriptures illustrate both narrative and propositional statements. Jesus and his disciples displayed narratives in the gospels (Matt. 10:1, 7-8; Mark 1:21-28; Luke 8:26-56; 9:1-2, 6; 10:1, 9, 17). Paul displayed propositional statements in his epistles (Eph. 1:19-21; Rom. 16:20). Luke records Paul's words in Acts: "I am sending you to them to open their eyes and turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God" (Acts 26:17-18). Psalm 110:1 shows that power and authority were given to the Lord Jesus Christ at the right hand of the Father with his feet on his enemies, using them for a footstool. Luke recorded Peter's explanation of Psalm 110:1 to the crowd that Jesus was "exalted to the right hand of God" (Acts 2:33), and that "God has made this Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Messiah" (Acts 2:36). Peter continued by appealing to the crowd with a proposition, saying, "You know ... how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and power, and how he went around doing good and healing all who were under the power of the devil, because God was with him" (Acts 10:37-38). The Scriptures show that Jesus, his disciples, and Paul battled with spiritual beings identified as the devil and demons. It was a war between good and evil waged against the enemy for the hearts and minds of Jews and Gentiles. The researcher believes this war continues to this day, and that Jesus has given his church power and authority to win the battle against his enemy.

The researcher reviewed scholarly literature and paid specific attention to Clinton Arnold, Hendrik Berkhof, and Rudolf Bultmann in the belief that their influence shaped the present day understanding of the supernatural and spiritual warfare. Precisely what they believe about the devil and demons and the impact they have on humanity was summarized in a paragraph and placed in the order of their historical influence.

Bultmann's view was that the biblical writers used supernatural beings such as the devil and demons to describe evil in a pre-scientific world. Because we now understand the cause and effects of science, we can use psychological and sociological terms to explain all supposed supernatural forces of evil. As a result, there are no supernatural evil beings that interfere with humanity.

Berkhof's view was that human structures, which God meant for the good of humanity, have been hijacked and used for evil by people. Structures such as "the state, politics, class, social struggle, national interest, public opinion, accepted morality, the ideas of decency, humanity, and democracy" are what writers of old considered as being directly influenced by the devil and demonic forces. Today we know that man is the culprit, and that there are no supernatural evil beings that interfere with humanity.

Arnold's view is that the devil and demons are real supernatural beings with an intellect and a will. They try to derail God's will and harass and torment humanity. As a result, there are supernatural beings that cause evil and have a direct effect on humanity.

These three views about the devil, demons, and their influence on humanity characterize the broad spectrum of Christian thought. This information is essential because the researcher believes that church planters' views will directly impact their

spiritual warfare strategies. All six of the church planters were interviewed by phone, and all identified with Arnold's view.

Based on a survey of 22 participating LCMC church planters using the Likert-scale, 96 percent rated themselves *confident* and higher in biblical and theological knowledge about the devil and his work. However, when asked about their ability to equip their church with spiritual warfare strategies effectively, levels dropped to 60 percent below the *confident* level. This drop in the *confident* level indicates that a practical application of knowledge is needed for our church planters to be more effective in spiritual warfare strategies. Only one church planter (4.5%) identified formal training in a seminary or Bible school course that included spiritual warfare strategies. Three church planters (13.6%) recognized parachurch training, Bible studies, or books they read. These statistics show a need for formal education in spiritual warfare strategies among church planters. See Appendix A for a copy of the original survey used with the church planters.

The researcher conducted phone interviews with six LCMC church planters. Five out of six (83%) held a Master of Divinity degree. This statistic shows that the church planters' biblical and theological knowledge is on the *confident* and higher levels on the survey. The phone interviews also acknowledged that hands-on experiential workshops were desired for spiritual warfare equipping. The interview revealed some of the issues church planters identified as spiritual warfare including discouragement, temptation, disobedience, rebellion, witchcraft, a Jezebel prophet, getting sidetracked from God's call, and founding leaders leaving the church. Some of the training topics suggested were evangelism, prayer, envisioning members, and how to become a healing church.

Strengths of the Research

One of the strengths of this project was the use of a full range of theological perspectives. Arnold, Berkhof and Bultmann's theological views were explored and presented as options for church planters to choose which one most closely resonated with their understanding of the Scriptures. Another strength was the sequential mixed methods approach the researcher used for the project. Both open- and closed-ended questions on the surveys and in the interview process were strengths. The collection of both quantitative and qualitative forms of data were separate but connected with analysis was also a strength of the research project. Statistics from the Likert-scale survey yielded significant numbers to interpret. Phenomenological data from an extensive phone interview revealed human experiences described by participants. An important factor was the narrative data gathered from church planters which provided stories about their lives. All these factors together made this a strong research project.

Weakness of the Research

One area of weakness in the research project was the wording of survey question four. The question seemed straightforward when the researcher wrote the question and tested it with a few individuals. However, the ambiguity of the question came to light after the researcher observed some of the responses. The words *formal training* were meant to mean seminary or Bible school but were interpreted in different ways because formal training was not defined. Responses included Bible studies, books read, and a seminary class. The researcher should have defined the term formal training. A better question would have been, "What school provided the training and what topics were covered"? would have been more explicit. Another weakness was the small number of

participants involved in the study. The research included twenty-two LCMC church planters who participated in the survey and six of those participated in the phone interview. Time was a limiting factor in the number of participants.

CHAPTER SEVEN: REFLECTION

Personal Background

In my freshman year of college, I took an English course with a requirement to write a research paper. To my surprise, I found out that I enjoyed doing research. I enjoyed learning on a deeper level, discovering some of the whys behind the whats and hows. For as long as I can remember, I have enjoyed the challenge of solving problems. I found that observing and asking questions are proper beginning steps to solve problems. I have always been inquisitive and analytical, with a desire to understand the real issues beneath the surface.

When I became active in my faith during my final years of college, researching the Bible became a passion. I loved to teach others what I discovered, and without knowing it I became a resource for other students who were exploring Christianity. I was growing spiritually and learned how to share my faith. I began to see friends receive Christ and grow in their relationship with him. I have continued to be a resource for those who desire to grow in their Christian faith.

I pursued a Doctor of Ministry degree so that I could become a better learner, researcher, and teacher of the Bible and the Christian faith. My involvement in the DMin process has helped me to become a better learner by understanding how to evaluate sources and process information. I have become a better researcher by gaining experience in professional level research and learning how to design a research project. I have become a better teacher by learning about available resources and profoundly

understanding the Scriptures. Based on the research project I acquired new insights on how to connect with my audience.

Personal Growth

The journey of pursuing a DMin degree affected the core of my being. The challenges of class reading assignments and book reports were eye-opening. I learned that adrenaline and stress are linked together and became aware that I was an adrenaline junkie. Classroom lectures, discussions, and projects helped to reorder my life. I realized that I needed to learn the art of stress management. I took a proactive stance to put margins in my daily and weekly routines. Without guilt I can now relax, take time to smell the roses so to speak. When I am scheduled to speak at a weekend conference, I automatically schedule the following two days to unwind. I cooperate with my body to get the sleep I need to feel refreshed and energized. I now feel much more eager and alert to take on the challenges of life and ministry.

Other areas of personal growth included handling conflict, becoming more self-differentiated, and learning how to be assertive rather than reactionary. My communication skills were enhanced by understanding different strategies of persuasion—a practical matter for me, as I have a ministry and calling to travel nationally and internationally training and equipping the body of Christ.

Spiritual Growth

I experienced a deepening dependence on the Lord and the ministry of the Holy Spirit throughout the DMin program. The class on Psalms was a highlight. Connecting with the hearts of the psalmists and exploring the poetic art from a theological perspective was enjoyable. Dr. Howard used scholarship and practical application mixed

with the right amount of humor to make the class impactful. I have felt freer to express my highs and lows to the Lord after understanding the context and emotional range expressed by the book of Psalms.

God used every class to help me take a look into my soul. I found that there was always room for improvement. I have become more appreciative of others, especially my wife and children. Since I have slowed down from my stress-filled days, I can take in and enjoy more profound gratitude for family relationships. I especially noticed this past holiday season that I was different, experiencing more deeply the interactions with all the relatives. I felt more at ease and not stressed about all the activities. The Lord has used the Bethel DMin program to help the fruit of the Spirit mature a little more in my life.

Future Expectations

The DMin research project was enlightening for me and how it could help me improve what I do. One night as I was coding the data from the phone interviews, I also noticed some overlapping data from the responses to the survey. They seemed to be telling a story. It was then that I realized that I could research every conference with every audience. What a valuable resource I have at my fingertips. I may be able to share my finding with those in the body of Christ who would benefit from the information. I might be able to publish an article or two, write a book or two based on research projects. Wow! Research has exciting potential to open new perspectives on what people think and do. I look forward to applying what I have learned through this DMin program in my future ministry.

APPENDIX A: DOCTOR OF MINISTRY SURVEY

A Doctor of Ministry survey for the thesis project report of Dave Heinrich on Spiritual Warfare and LCMC Church Planting, Bethel Seminary, St Paul, Minnesota.

Scripture describes spiritual warfare on three battlefronts, 1) the world, 2) the flesh and 3) the devil. Please circle how confident you are in your knowledge and understanding of the 3rd battlefront, the devil's work.

SURVEY

1. I feel confident in my biblical and theological knowledge of the devil and his work against my church plant.

Little Confidence	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident	Extremely Confident
1	2	3	4	5

2. I feel confident in my ability to discern practical dealings with the devil and his work against my church members.

Little Confidence	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident	Extremely Confident
1	2	3	4	5

3. I feel confident in my ability to equip my church effectively in spiritual warfare strategies.

Little Confidence	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident	Extremely Confident
1	2	3	4	5

4. Have you ever had any formal training in spiritual warfare, specifically in dealing with the devil's work?

Please circle YES or NO. If you circled yes, please indicate the school, class or seminar or any other place of instruction and the topic covered.

5. What would be a spiritual warfare topic of interest that you would like to learn more about?

APPENDIX B: CHURCH PLANTERS PHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Is this your first church plant?
2. How long have you been church planting?
3. How long have you been in ministry?
4. What type of degree do you have?
5. There seem to be three dominate Christian views about what the devil and demons are in the Scriptures and the influence they have on humanity. I am going to read all three and then ask which of the three resonate with you to be the closest to your understanding of Scripture.

First, the view that the biblical writers used supernatural beings such as the devil and demons to describe evil in a pre-scientific world. Since we now understand the cause and effects of science, we can use psychological and sociological terms to explain all supposed supernatural forces of evil. As a result, there are no supernatural evil beings that interfere with humanity.

Second, the view that human structures that God meant for the good of humanity have been hijacked and used for evil. Structures such as, the state, politics, class, social struggle, national interest, public opinion, accepted morality, the ideas of decency, humanity, democracy are what the Scriptures mean as the devil and or demonic. As a result, there are no supernatural evil beings that interfere with humanity

Third, the view that the devil and demons are real supernatural being that has intellect and a will. They try to derail God's will and harass and torment humanity. As a result, there are supernatural beings that cause evil and have a direct effect on humanity.

Which of these three views resonates closest to your understanding of Scripture and why?

6. Could you suggest a fourth view? If so how would you explain it?
7. Has there been anything in your church plant that you would identify as demonic? If so, please explain.
8. Based on your ministry experience, what areas of training and equipping would be helpful for you?
9. What type of delivery system or format, would be most helpful to equipping you?
10. What Scripture verses do you rely on when dealing with demonic influences personally with others and your church?
11. Are there any resources or authors whom you have found helpful in dealing with demonic influences?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Leslie C. *Psalms 101-150: Word Biblical Commentary*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983.
- Ankarloo, Bengt and Stuart Clark, eds. *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe, Ancient Greece and Rome*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999).
- Arnold, Clinton E. *Powers of Darkness: Principalities & Powers in Paul's Letters*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992.
- _____. *Power and Magic: The Concept of Power in Ephesians*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1989.
- _____. *3 Crucial Questions about Spiritual Warfare*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1997.
- _____. *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary*. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002.
- Bateman, Herbert W. "Psalm 110:1 and the New Testament." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149, no. 596 (October–December 1992): 439.
- Bauckham, Richard. "Dualism and Soteriology in Johannine Theology." In *Beyond Bultmann: Reckoning a New Testament Theology*, edited by Bruce W. Longenecker and Mikeal C. Parsons. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014.
- Beilby, James K. and Paul Rhodes Eddy, eds. *Understanding Spiritual Warfare: Four Views*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Benedetto, Robert and Donald K. McKim. *Historical Dictionary of the Reformed Churches*. Toronto, Canada: Reformed Press, 2010.
- Bentzen, Aage. *King and Messiah*. London, England: Lutterworth Press, 1955.
- Berkhof, Hendrik. *Christ and the Powers*. Translated by Howard Yoder. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1977.
- Betz, Hans Dieter, ed. *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*. Vol. 1: Text. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Boring, M. Eugene. *The New Interpreter's Bible: Matthew*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1995.

- Boyd, Gregory A. "Christus Victor View." In *The Nature of the Atonement: Four Views*, edited by James Beilby and Paul R. Eddy. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2006.
- _____. *God at War*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1997.
- Bright, Bill. *The Christian and the Holy Spirit*. San Bernardino, CA: Campus Crusade for Christ, 1968.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Letter to the Ephesians*. London, England: Pickering & Inglis Ltd., 1961.
- Brueggemann, Dale A. "The Evangelists and the Psalms." In *Interpreting the Psalms: Issues and Approaches*, edited by Philip S. Johnston and David G. Firth. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2005.
- Bubeck, Mark I. *The Satanic Revival*. San Bernardino, CA: Here's Life Publishers, 1991.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Jesus and the Word*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.
- _____. *Jesus Christ and Mythology*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- _____. *New Testament and Mythology*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984.
- _____. "New Testament and Mythology." In *Kerygma and Myth*, edited by Hans Werner Bartsch. London, England: SPCK, 1953.
- _____. *Theology of the New Testament*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, (1951).
- Christoffersen, Svein Aage. "Rudolf Bultmann." In *Key Theological Thinkers from Modern to Postmodern*, edited by Staale Johannes Kristiansen and Svein Rise. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2013.
- Craigie, Peter C. *The Word Biblical Commentary*. Vol. 19. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 2004.
- Creswell, John W. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE, 2009.
- Culpepper, R. Allen. *The New Interpreter's Bible: Luke & John*. Vol. IX. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1995.
- Dahood, Mitchell. *The Anchor Bible: Psalms III, 101-150*. New York, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Davis, Barry C. *The Baker Illustrated Bible Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

- Dunn, James D. G. *Romans 9-16: Word Biblical Commentary*. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1988.
- Fee, Gordon. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Fretheim, Terence E. *The Book of Genesis: The New Interpreter's Bible*. (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1994.
- Futato, Mark D. *Interpreting the Psalms: An Exegetical Handbook*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic & Professional, 2007.
- Graf, Fritz. *Magic in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Word Biblical Commentary: Matthew*. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1995.
- Harkness, Georgia. *Understanding the Kingdom of God*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1974.
- Harris, Murray J. *Raised Immortal: Resurrection & Immortality in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983.
- Hay, David M. *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1973.
- Hiebert, Paul. "The Flaw of the Excluded Middle." *Missiology* 10, no. 1 (January 1982): 35-47. Accessed October 11, 2017, 35-47.
<http://ezproxy.bethel.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?>
- Henderson, Ian. *Rudolf Bultmann*. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1966.
- Hilber, John W. *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Background Commentary*. Vol. 5. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009.
- Johnson, Phillip E. *Reason in the Balance: The Case against Naturalism in Science, Law and Education*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1995.
- Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities*. Vol. V, book VII, 305, (3). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New*. Chicago, IL: The Moody Bible Institute, 1985.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*. Vol. 1-4. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012-2015.

- Kidner, Derek. *Psalms 1-72: Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries*. Grand Rapids, MI: InterVarsity Press, 1973.
- Klein, William W. *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Ephesians-Philemon*, edited by Temper Longman III and David E. Garland. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006.
- Ladd, George Eldon. *Bultmann*. Chicago, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1964.
- Lee, Jung Young. "Interpreting the Demonic Powers in Pauline Thought," *Novum Testamentum* 12, no. 1 (January 1970): 68.
- Leedy, Paul D. and Jeanne Ellis Ormrod. *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. Indianapolis, IN: Pearson Education, Inc., 2013.
- Luther, Martin. *Luther's Work's Selected Psalms II*. Vol. 13. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1956.
- MacGregor, G.H.C. "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought." *NTS* 1 (1954-55), 17-24.
- McCann, J. Clinton *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. IV. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1996.
- Montgomery, John Warwick. *Principalities and Powers*. Minneapolis, MN: Bethany Fellowship, 1973.
- Moses, Robert Ewusie. *Practices of Power: Revisiting the Principalities and Powers in the Pauline Letters*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014.
- Nathan, Rich. *What Is the Kingdom of God?* Anaheim, CA: Vineyard USA, 2014.
- Niehr, Herbert. "Host of Heaven." *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.
- O'Brien, Peter T. *The Letter to the Ephesians*. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 1999.
- Ogden, Daniel. *Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A Sourcebook*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Perrin, Norman. *The Promise of Bultmann*. Philadelphia, PA: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1969.
- Robertson, O. Palmer. *The Christ of the Covenants*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1980.
- Sanders, J.A. *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11*. DJD Vol. IV. Oxford, England: The Clarendon Press, 1965.

- Schaefer, Konrad. *Berit Olam Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2001), xi.
- Stetzer, Edward and Warren Bird. "The State of Church Planting in the United States: Research Overview and Qualitative Study of Primary Church Planting Entities." Lifeway Research and Leadership Network. Accessed January 1, 2018. <http://www.christianitytoday.com/assets/10228>.
- Stone, Howard W. and James O. Duke. *How to Think Theologically*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2013.
- Tucker, W. Dennis, Jr. *Constructing and Deconstructing Power in Psalms 107-150*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2014.
- Walton, John H. *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary: Genesis*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009.
- Walton, John H., Victor H. Matthews, and Mark W. Chavalas. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: Old Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 1-15: Word Biblical Commentary*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Wilson, Gerald H. *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Wright, N. T. *The Case for the Psalms: Why They Are Essential*. New York, NY: Harper Collins Publishers, 2013.