

**A PENTECOSTAL STUDY OF DANIEL'S PRINCE OF PERSIA
(DANIEL 10:13)**

Submitted by
Elizabeth Denham Guntrip, B. Pastoral Theology, B. Min., M.A. (Theology)

A thesis submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of
Master of Philosophy

School of Theology
Faculty of Arts and Sciences

Australian Catholic University
Research Services
McAuley Campus
PO Box 456
Virginia QLD 4014
Australia

10th July, 2006

STATEMENT OF SOURCES

This thesis contains no material published elsewhere or extracted in whole or in part from a thesis by which I have qualified or been awarded another degree or diploma.

No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgement in the main text of the thesis.

This thesis has not been submitted for the award of any degree or diploma in any other tertiary institution.

E.D. GUNTRIP
10th July, 2006

ABSTRACT

A PENTECOSTAL STUDY OF DANIEL'S PRINCE OF PERSIA

(DANIEL 10:13)

AIM

C. Peter Wagner is a well-known missiologist. In the late twentieth century Wagner became interested in the means by which the devil, as the enemy of God, obstructs the spread of the Gospel. Based on his reading of Daniel 10:13 [20-21], a passage referring to the prince of Persia, he concluded that the earth is ruled by Satan's angels, whom he terms "territorial spirits." The same chapter mentions other supernatural beings, Michael, one of the chief princes and the prince of Greece. In Wagner's understanding Scripture reveals the existence of good and evil spirits having authority or control over specific geographical regions. Further, Wagner believed he had discovered why evangelism is ineffective in some locations - territorial spirits blind the minds of the populace and need to be bound spiritually to remove hindrances to the gospel's reception.

Wagner devised a prayer methodology called Strategic Level Spiritual Warfare (SLSW), to accelerate world evangelisation by strategically targeting designated cities or locations with aggressive prayer to disarm the spiritual powers of wickedness. SLSW depends for effectiveness on the associated practice of spiritual mapping," entailing foundational research into an area's historical and spiritual background preceding the prayer programme. Wagner believes SLSW to be both divinely revealed and empirically verifiable. The SLSW methodology spread with startling rapidity to many sectors of Christianity. SLSW became associated with Pentecostalism, and is now mistakenly assumed to be a Pentecostal teaching. This thesis aims to show this is inaccurate.

SCOPE

C. Peter Wagner, an Evangelical, is associated with Third Wave groups who deliberately distance themselves from the Pentecostal label. Classical Pentecostalism is differentiated historically from the later Charismatic Renewal Movement. Third Wave groups are a separate more recent spiritual movement, sometimes known as neo-charismatics. Neither Wagner's theological nor ecclesial location is Pentecostal, but this fact has not helped negate the mistaken assumption that his teaching originated within Pentecostalism.

In order to demonstrate the difference between Wagner's demonology and that of Pentecostalism, their respective interpretive methods need to be compared. This task was approached firstly by showing what comprises a Classical Pentecostal hermeneutic. Three distinctive principles were identified for a conventional Pentecostal reading of Scripture, namely: (1) the Protestant Reformation principle of *Sola Scriptura*, (2) a pneumatic approach to interpreting Scripture and (3) biblical revelation, not self-revelation, in the community of faith. In the past, Pentecostals depended on academic writings stemming from within Evangelicalism. This was a dependence of convenience, since historically Pentecostalism had no systematic theology, nor until comparatively recently a critically active academia. The disadvantage of this borrowing has been that Pentecostals have been obliged to filter out anti-Pentecostal bias evident in much Evangelical literature.

The text Daniel 10:13 was then exegeted using these principles. This narrow focus is based on Wagner's use of this text as the foundation of his demonology. Using a combined theological and literary approach, stances on reading the book of Daniel in general and Daniel 10:13 in particular were discussed. The relaxation of tensions between the factions which divided biblical scholarship for much of the twentieth century has allowed some cross-fertilization of ideas and methods, without reducing the ideological chasm separating the camps. The history of the text was recognised but meaning was sought more particularly from the form of the extant text. The results were tested against the principles of Pentecostal hermeneutics.

Finally, Wagner's writings on SLSW were appraised. His hermeneutical method was compared with the Pentecostal hermeneutical principles, the Pentecostal reading prepared from the exegesis, and the demonology of two Classical Pentecostal writers. Discussion of SLSW was confined to Wagner as the initiator of the concept. Wagner's specific contribution has been in relating a hypothetical demonic hierarchy according to their perceived function (not simply the degree of power they may possess). He is well aware that his theory stands or falls on the issue of whether demonic spirits can legitimately be seen as occupying territories.

CONCLUSIONS

Whilst some aspects of Wagner's demonology and hermeneutic are held in common with that of Pentecostalism, the mistaken identification of SLSW as Pentecostal has led to confusion. Notwithstanding Wagner's high view of Scripture and enthusiasm for evangelism, the hermeneutic employed in his interpretation of Dan 10:13 is not consistent with that of Classical Pentecostalism. The conclusion reached was that C. Peter Wagner's teaching on SLSW should not be labelled Pentecostal.

ABBREVIATIONS

AOG	<i>Assemblies of God</i>
DPCM	<i>Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements</i>
EDT	<i>Evangelical Dictionary of Theology</i>
JB	<i>Jerusalem Bible</i>
JPT	<i>Journal of Pentecostal Theology</i>
JPTS	<i>Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
OT	<i>Old Testament</i>
NASB	<i>New American Standard Bible</i>
NICOT	<i>New International Commentary on the Old Testament</i>
NKJV	<i>New King James Version</i>
NRSV	<i>New Revised Standard Version</i>
NT	<i>New Testament</i>
SLSW	<i>Strategic Level Spiritual Warfare</i>
REB	<i>Revised English Bible</i>
RSV	<i>Revised Standard Version</i>
TOTC	<i>Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries</i>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENT OF SOURCES	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABBREVIATIONS	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter 1	
PENTECOSTAL HERMENEUTICS: PRINCIPLES & METHODS	7
1. The Hermeneutical Task	7
2. Sola Scriptura	10
a. <i>Pentecostalism's Need for a New Experience-Based Theology</i>	
b. <i>Renewal Theology: Systematic or Biblical?</i>	
3. Pneumatic Approach to the Interpretation of Scripture	19
a. <i>A Lucan Hermeneutic</i>	
b. <i>Pentecostals and Spiritual Experience</i>	
4. Biblical Revelation not Self-revelation in the Community of Faith	27
a. <i>Theologies of Retrieval</i>	
b. <i>Reader-Oriented Postmodern Perspective</i>	
Conclusions	46
Interpretive Model Incorporating the Principles for a Pentecostal Reading of Scripture	53
Chapter 2	
READING DANIEL 10:13 WITH A PENTECOSTAL APPROACH	54
Part A: <u>Approaches to the Text</u>	54
1. Apocalyptic Genre: An Overview of the Pentecostal Position	54
a. <i>Recent Academic Trends</i>	
b. <i>Defining 'Apocalyptic'</i>	
c. <i>The Influence of Dispensationalism</i>	
2. The Pentecostal Position on Authorship, Dating and Sources	62
a. <i>Authorship and Canonicity</i>	
b. <i>Dating and Purpose</i>	
c. <i>Apocalypticism and the Prophetic Tradition</i>	

d. <i>Apocalypticism and Mythology</i>	
e. <i>Apocalypticism and The Origin of Evil</i>	
Part B: <u>Understanding the Text</u>	75
1. Reading Daniel 10	75
a. <i>A Theology of History</i>	
b. <i>The Role of the Wise</i>	
c. <i>Context and Structure</i>	
d. <i>The Interpreting Angel</i>	
2. Angelic Patrons of the Nations in Daniel	86
a. <i>The Concept of Tutelary Spirits</i>	
b. <i>The Holy Ones of the Most High</i>	
c. <i>Michael and Implications of the ‘Great War’</i>	
d. <i>The Prince of the Kingdom of Persia in Daniel</i>	
e. <i>The Nature of the Conflict</i>	
3. Pentecostal Interests in Daniel	101
a. <i>Contemporary Applications of Biblical Apocalyptic</i>	
b. <i>Pentecostal Eschatology and Links to the Final Antichrist</i>	
Conclusions	107
Comments on Aligning the Conclusions of the Exegesis with the Hermeneutical Principles for a Pentecostal Reading of Daniel 10:13	109
Chapter 3	
IS C. PETER WAGNER’S READING OF DANIEL 10:13 PENTECOSTAL?	117
1. C. Peter Wagner and Strategic Level Spiritual Warfare (SLSW)	117
2. Wagner’s Method and Classical Pentecostal Hermeneutics	119
a. <i>Wagner and Sola Scriptura</i>	
b. <i>Wagner and the Pneumatic Approach to Scripture</i>	
c. <i>Wagner and Biblical Revelation, not Self-Revelation, within the Community of Faith</i>	
3. Wagner’s Theories and Classical Pentecostal Demonology	138
a. <i>Linking Wagner to Pentecostal Demonology</i>	
b. <i>Wagner and Classical Pentecostal Demonology</i>	
c. <i>Wagner and Praxis Resulting from Reading Daniel</i>	
Conclusions	148

CONCLUSION	154
1. Reflections on: Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Principles and Methods	154
2. Reflections on: Reading Daniel 10:13 with a Pentecostal Approach	158
3. Reflections on: Is C. Peter Wagner's Reading of Daniel 10:13 Pentecostal?	162
Final Comments	163
GLOSSARY	166
BIBLIOGRAPHY	167

A Pentecostal Study of Daniel's Prince of Persia (Daniel 10:13)

INTRODUCTION

In the mid-1990s a missiologist by the name of C. Peter Wagner became interested in connections between missiology and demonology. His research on the topic led him to devise a prayer strategy known as Strategic Level Spiritual Warfare (SLSW), based on a demonology relying on his reading of Daniel 10:13 [20-21]. Before long the teaching had spread amongst several key leaders and has since been disseminated by a huge outpouring of book titles, magazine articles and videos, the staging of many seminars and conferences, and prolific networking. Subsequently, many contemporary Christians, not only Pentecostals, have become interested in the apocalyptic world projected by the text of Daniel 10:13 and the demonology it is understood to imply.

A foundational belief of SLSW is the existence of territorial spirits, both good and evil, deemed to have authority over or control of specific geographical regions. The prince of Persia and the prince of Greece as identified in the book of Daniel (10:13, 20-21) are the most frequently cited examples. The stated purpose of SLSW is to accelerate world evangelisation by strategically targeting designated cities or locations with aggressive prayer. Training is provided to ordinary Christians to fight the forces of darkness, trusting that victory is assured over Satan and his hordes by new warfare which is believed to be both divinely revealed¹ and empirically verifiable.² The aim is to bind the power of the enemy (the devil) with the intention of forcing the release of millions of unsaved souls now held captive. The intended effect of the aggressive prayer is that people's minds will no longer be blinded by the devil (2 Cor 4: 3-4), therefore they will be open and receptive to the Gospel.³ SLSW is to be construed as new warfare because of its detailed analysis of the enemy, his methods and weaknesses, which is fundamental to the development of a strategy to defeat him. Before the concerted prayer programme commences, a detailed analysis of the historical and spiritual background of an area is

¹ C. Peter Wagner, 'Introduction' in C. Peter Wagner (ed.), *Breaking Strongholds In Your City: How to use spiritual mapping to make your prayers more strategic, effective and targeted* (Ventura CA: Regal Books, 1993), unnumbered.

² C. Peter Wagner, *Warfare Prayer* (Crowborough UK: Monarch Books, [new edition] 1997), 35; 99-101; see also Chuck Lowe, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelisation? A biblical, historical and missiological critique of Strategic-Level Spiritual Warfare* (Sevenoaks UK: OMF, 1998), 11.

³ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 60-62.

conducted.⁴ Spiritual mapping is the term applied to the foundational research preceding SLSW. Considerable networking has been achieved and resources mustered with the stated purpose of disarming the spiritual powers of wickedness which hinder the spread of the gospel.

The subject of SLSW has become controversial. Wagner himself admits that questions have been asked as to whether it is biblical.⁵ Allegations have been made that it is a new demonology.⁶ In addition, SLSW is commonly understood to be a Pentecostal teaching.⁷ These are serious charges, particularly since Classical Pentecostals defend their doctrines as being orthodox. The testing of novel theology or Christian practices is consequently an essential part of authentic pastoral responsibility and has led to this study.⁸

In fact, Wagner does not stand within the Pentecostal tradition. His theological and ecclesial background is as an Evangelical,⁹ but one who has been influenced by a discrete spiritual movement following the Charismatic Movement in the second half of the twentieth century. He deliberately distanced himself from the Pentecostal label by coining the phrase Third Wave to describe the movement in which he has found himself a part.¹⁰

⁴ This is achieved through the study of public or personal records, monuments, cemeteries or any source which may identify what is deemed as spiritual strongholds in the enemy's camp, thereby enabling the development of a specific prayer strategy to defeat the devil.

⁵ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 12.

⁶ Lowe, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelization*, 12.

⁷ See Stephen F. Noll, *Angels of Light, Powers of Darkness: Thinking Biblically About Angels, Satan and Principalities* (Downers Grove IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 12. Also Harvey Cox, *Fire from Heaven: The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-first Century* (Reading MA: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1995), 281f.

⁸ This writer's denominational and theological orientation is Classical Pentecostal.

⁹ The useful definition by Hill and Walton of the term 'evangelical' is worthy of note here: "Evangelical is a term in vogue to describe those who acknowledge the authority of the Bible. While it is a bit more precise than conservative, it can represent a range of beliefs." See Andrew E. Hill and John H. Walton, *A Survey of the Old Testament* (2nd Ed.), (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 2000), 572. Bernard Ramm uses the term 'evangelical' flexibly to include the sweep from 'obscurantistic fundamentalist' to learned Reformed confessional theologian or the 'evangelical neoorthodox' and specifically mentions Pentecostals, "who, in spite of their emphasis on experience to the neglect of theology and biblical interpretation, nevertheless hold to the historic doctrines of the church." See *The Evangelical Heritage: A study in historical theology* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Books, 1973), 14. In this study reference to the Evangelical Movement (i.e. Evangelicalism) is signified by title case. Lower case is used when the term is intended to describe a common philosophical commitment to evangelism. The distinction is by no means consistent or clear in common usage. The same dilemma is encountered with the term 'Pentecostal'. Direct quotes replicate that author's usage of upper or lower case.

¹⁰ John Wimber, "Introduction," *Riding the Third Wave: What Comes After Renewal*, Kevin Springer (ed.) (Basingstoke UK: Marshall Pickering, 1987), 30. Wimber cites Wagner as writing in *Christian Life* magazine (January 1986) that "The Third Wave began around 1980 with the opening of an increasing number of traditional evangelical churches and institutions to the supernatural working of the Holy Spirit, even though they were not, nor did they wish to become, either Pentecostal or charismatic."

The Third Wave movement has been described as similar-but-different to the Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements. Counting Classical Pentecostalism (associated with the 1901-1906 revivals) as the first wave and the Charismatic Movement as the second, Wagner devised the phrase “The Third Wave” to describe the similar move of the Holy Spirit that became prominent in the 1980s. Despite speaking in tongues (*glossolalia*) and operating with other gifts of the spirit (*charismata*) Third Wave do not see themselves as either Pentecostal or Charismatic, though evidently the distinction is not as clear as they might hope. Clearly not Classical Pentecostals, they are sometimes known as neo-charismatics, a term applying to others who have remained in community rather than become separatists as well as independent groups which have since developed, such as Vineyard churches.¹¹ Emphasising that neo-charismatics have no formal connections to Classical Pentecostalism is central to this thesis.

The purpose of this thesis is to answer the accusation that Wagner’s new demonology is a standard Pentecostal teaching. Although some connections to Pentecostal theology may have been noted, mistakenly identifying it as Pentecostal has led to confusion. The contention is that for any interpretation of Scripture to be construed or classed as Pentecostal, it must adhere to certain major principles fundamental to a Classical Pentecostal hermeneutic. The focus of the thesis is narrow, being restricted to Daniel 10:13. This is motivated by Wagner’s use of this text as the foundation of his demonology. Although there are now a large number of SLSW proponents, Wagner originated the concept¹² and his understanding is seminal to the others. For this reason, only Wagner’s material will form the core of this study.

The methodology employed is to show first of all what comprises a Classical Pentecostal hermeneutic. The text Dan 10:13 is then exegeted in the light of the principles discussed. Finally, Wagner’s hermeneutical method is appraised and also compared with the

¹¹ This thesis attempts to maintain a convenient distinction between the three so-called waves by use of the terms Classical Pentecostal, Charismatics/neo-Pentecostals and neo-charismatics. This recognises the charismatic aspect of Third Wave without calling it Pentecostal. The main distinction between Classical Pentecostalism and other groupings is the understanding by the former that *glossolalia* is the “initial evidence” of being baptised in the Holy Spirit. For further discussion on this aspect, see Simon Chan, Chapter 2, “Glossolalia as ‘Initial Evidence’,” *Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Tradition: Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplementary Series* 21 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 40-72. See also B.C. Aker, “Initial Evidence, a Biblical Perspective,” in Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (hereafter *DPCM*) (Grand Rapids MI: Regency Reference Library, 1988), 455-459; and K. Kendrick, “Initial Evidence, a Historical Perspective”, *DPCM*, 459f.

¹² Wagner’s concept differentiates strategic-level spirits from ground-level and occult-level spirits. This will be taken up in Chapter Three.

Classical Pentecostal hermeneutical principles. It will be shown that the hermeneutics used by Wagner do not align with those of Classical Pentecostalism; consequently, his teaching should not be labelled Pentecostal.

At the commencement of the study three main principles of a conventional Pentecostal hermeneutic are proposed. These are established by an assessment of Pentecostal roots and contemporary methods. The principles by which Pentecostals read Scripture are encapsulated as follows: (1) the Protestant Reformation principle of *Sola Scriptura*, (2) a pneumatic approach to interpreting Scripture and (3) biblical revelation, not self-revelation, in the community of faith.

Chapter One shows that Classical Pentecostal doctrine is orthodox and Reformed in nature, as inherited from mainline Protestant denominations. Pentecostals are deemed fundamentalist regarding the authority and inspiration of the Scriptures and the Holy Spirit's role in inspiring Scripture. In the past, Pentecostals have depended on academic writings stemming from the Evangelical Movement. This was a dependence of convenience, since historically Pentecostalism has not had its own systematic theology, nor until comparatively recently a critically active academia. The disadvantage of this has been that Pentecostals have been obliged to filter out the anti-Pentecostal bias evident in much Evangelical literature. The particular style in which Pentecostals read Scripture has attracted academic attention recently. This is modelled on what is called a Lucan hermeneutic by Roger Stronstad. His book *A Charismatic Theology of Luke*¹³ posits the view that while Luke uses historical narrative, his intention is didactic. Stronstad's opinion provides a helpful explanation to contemporary trends in Pentecostal hermeneutics.

The Pentecostal tendency is to approach Scripture pneumatically and Stronstad rationalises the basis for this. He argues that Pentecostal hermeneutics have their own distinctives and that these are (a) non-cessationist (the charismata or gifts of the Spirit did not cease at the end of the Apostolic era), and (b) pneumatological (that in reading Scripture believers may be enlightened by the Holy Spirit), (c) modelled on a Lucan historiography (the understanding that Luke was actually teaching doctrine rather than merely narrating history in the Book of Acts) and (d) function within a non-dispensational ecclesiology (one that sees early Christians and the modern church on a vital continuum maintained by the Holy Spirit).

¹³ Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1984).

The question of how theology is to be addressed in a conventional sense is as important in today's postmodern environment as ever since the enlightenment. The recent revolution in biblical studies addresses the gap which developed between theology and biblical studies. Concurrently, literary criticism has moved to a new phase, involving readers as an essential ingredient, vital to what is known as the actualisation of the literature. The postmodern approach to literature is not essentially about epistemological questions but fosters the intention to relate to text-projected worlds.

Today, Pentecostal studies are advancing in a number of areas, including the tradition's history, doctrine and mission. The aim is to connect the postmodern community with their roots. The opportunity is presented in these widening studies for apocalyptic genre to be studied in tandem with contemporary hermeneutics. This study combines a theological and literary approach. Consideration of the nature and function of Scripture as read by Pentecostals does not ignore these developments. The point can be made that Pentecostals use the same exegetical methods as other evangelicals. Any claim made for special insight unavailable to non-Pentecostals is at best elitism and, at worst, a form of gnosticism and does not represent a genuine Pentecostal hermeneutic.¹⁴ Any contemporary interpretation of Dan 10:13 must withstand such scrutiny. In this way the hermeneutical principle of biblical revelation, not self-revelation, within the community of faith is upheld.

In Chapter Two, various stances on reading the book of Daniel in general and Daniel 10:13 in particular are discussed and a somewhat eclectic methodology has been utilised to exegete the text. The relaxation of tensions between the factions which divided biblical scholarship for much of the twentieth century has not gone unnoticed, nor has the fact that there is currently "some cross-fertilization of ideas and methods without reducing the ideological chasm that separates the camps."¹⁵ Propositional methodologies used by both critical and conservative scholars¹⁶ as dictated by their respective presuppositions about the text are appraised in the examination of the text. Nevertheless, this study tends towards more a contemporary synchronic or literary methodology than the diachronic historical-critical approaches. In other words, it

¹⁴ See Gordon L. Anderson, "Pentecostal Hermeneutics Part 1," *Paraclete* 28/1 (Winter 1994), 1-11.

¹⁵ Andrew E. Hill and John H. Walton, *A Survey of the Old Testament* (2nd Ed.), (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 2000), 571.

¹⁶ The terms are employed as broad distinctions between methodologies, not in any pejorative sense.

recognises that there is a history of the text, but seeks meaning more particularly from the form of the extant text.¹⁷

The task has been to consider how Pentecostals have traditionally approached the book of Daniel, and a reading of Dan 10:13 is suggested which is complementary not contradictory, paying particular attention to setting, history, context, and genre. The results are tested against the principles of Pentecostal hermeneutics.

Chapter Three focuses on the usage of Dan 10:13 in the writings of Peter Wagner.

There are many leaders and writers on the topic of spiritual warfare, often with slightly different emphases, beyond the scope of this thesis.¹⁸ The discussion of SLSW is restricted to Wagner as the initiator of the concept. In addition, reference into Wagner's interpretation of Dan 10:13 is limited to a small selection of his prolific writings on the topic, since the foundational teaching is reiterated with little variation. The point can be adequately made without exhaustive citation of all his books. Wagner claims the concepts of spiritual territoriality and the naming of the powers as a special province of his which had received little prior attention. Wagner's specific contribution has been in relating a hypothetical demonic hierarchy according to their perceived function (not simply the degree of power they may possess). Under the general label of territorial spirits, these are categorised by him as ground, occult and strategic level spirits. He is well aware that his theory will stand or fall on the issue of whether demonic spirits can legitimately be seen as occupying territories.¹⁹

Wagner's interpretation is appraised in relation to the three hermeneutical principles forming the basis of this thesis. This study concludes that despite Wagner's high view of Scripture and enthusiasm for evangelism, the hermeneutic employed by him in the interpretation of Dan 10:13 is not consistent with that of Classical Pentecostalism. On this basis, his teaching should not be considered Pentecostal.

¹⁷ The final (canonical) form of the book of Daniel has generated considerable contemporary comment. For a good discussion of contemporary debate see John N. Oswalt, "Recent Studies in Old Testament Apocalyptic," in David W. Baker, and Bill T. Arnold (eds.), *The Face of Old Testament Studies: A Survey of Contemporary Approaches* (Grand Rapids, MI: Apollos/Baker Books, 1999).

¹⁸ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 64. For examples of other popular Pentecostal writings affirming some form of SLSW see Ed Silvoso, *That None Should Perish: How to Reach Entire Cities for Christ through Prayer Evangelism*. (Ventura CA: Regal, 1993); John Dawson, *Taking Our Cities for God: How to Break Spiritual Strongholds* (Lake Mary FA: Creation House, 1989); and Cindy Jacobs, *Possessing the Gates of the Enemy: A Training Manual for Militant Intercession*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids MI: Chosen, 1994).

¹⁹ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 77.

Chapter 1

PENTECOSTAL HERMENEUTICS: PRINCIPLES AND METHODS

1. The Hermeneutical Task

Pentecostals comprise a Jesus-centred, witnessing community, whose culture has from the beginning been radical and alternative. All Pentecostals hold two main beliefs: (a) a commitment to the inspiration and authority of Scripture, and (b) a doctrine of the experiential nature of the believer's relationship with God. They emphasise a powerful, personal encounter with the God of the Bible, and they accept as normal that God is personal and knowable and will reveal Himself¹ to His people. Oral communication, reflected in testimonies (presented in a variety of media), is an important characteristic of Pentecostalism.

Over the past several decades a combination of factors led to serious effort being made by Pentecostal academics to formulate a renewal theology based on hermeneutics which do not impede the fundamental principles underlying Pentecostalism - that is, the primacy of Scripture, belief in the supernatural and the contemporary relevance of the gifts of the spirit (*charismata*). In the past, Pentecostals commonly made use of the academic writings of conservative Evangelicals who employed the historical-grammatical method, and sought authorial intent regarding the original audience, to guide their interpretation of Scripture. The adoption of this conservative Protestant method created tension with Pentecostalism's characteristic freedom-in-the-Spirit style and what were held to be spirit-inspired interpretations of Scripture.² The main issue is that Evangelicalism has a strong dependence on a dispensational paradigm and is shaped by a textualist theology,³ whereas Pentecostalism has its own distinctive heritage. No authentic Pentecostal hermeneutic could include any doctrines derived from the cessationist position that the *charismata* ceased at the end of the Apostolic era.

¹ Exclusive language regarding the Godhead will be adhered to as per the traditional Pentecostal position.

² Cf. Sam Hey, "Changing Roles of Pentecostal Hermeneutics," *Evangelical Review of Theology* 25:3 (2001), 212.

³ Also known as Princeton theology; the dissimilarities to Pentecostalism will be taken up later.

Pentecostal systematic theology texts have not been available until comparatively recently and exegetical commentaries are virtually unknown.⁴ Consequently, Pentecostal teachers adapted the scholarly writings of Evangelicals and filtered the material derived from a cessationist position when explaining the distinctives of Pentecostal theology. This process made way for their distinctly Pentecostal hermeneutic to function beyond the strictures of Evangelicalism. Long before the need for a Pentecostal experiential theology was addressed academically the challenge was being addressed on the practical level.

More lately, the need has been recognised for a methodology “not borrowed from the traditional theology of the past, but which sets the framework for theological discussion and epistemology from a renewal perspective.”⁵ While a valid Pentecostal framework is essential to the theological task, dialogue with the theological views of other traditions and historical theology is indispensable. Any theology claimed to be orthodox must have strong foundations in traditional theology, as will be discussed.

The intention of this study is to offer a reading of Daniel 10:13 based on hermeneutical principles and methods acceptable to Pentecostalism. The task in this chapter is to develop a hermeneutical framework for theological discussion and epistemology from a Pentecostal perspective and in the next chapter relate the specified text to the hermeneutical principles.

This thesis argues that Pentecostal hermeneutics are distinguished by three main features which both guard and guide their interpretation of Scripture: adherence to the Protestant Reformation principle of *Sola Scriptura*, a pneumatic interpretation of Scripture and that

⁴ See, for example, Kenneth J. Archer, “Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Retrospect and Prospect,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 8 (1996), 70. As late as 1996 Archer noted that scholarly contributions in two prominent Pentecostal journals, *Pneuma* and *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, were “responding to a general call to develop a hermeneutic with which to construct a theology worthy of the name Pentecostal.” Even the commentary *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* by Pentecostal scholar Gordon D. Fee (Grand Rapids MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1987) does not distinguish either the author or the contents as Pentecostal. The reader would have to become privy to the author’s denominational orientation by other means. The only avowedly Pentecostal (as discrete from the term Charismatic) commentary of which the writer of this thesis is aware (having been Librarian in a Pentecostal Bible College for twelve years) is the recently published one by Kevin J. Conner, *The Book of Daniel: An Exposition*. Vermont VIC: KJC Ministries Inc., 2004. For an example of the way doctrine was summarised rather than explicated by early Pentecostals, see Aimee Semple McPherson [in collaboration with George Stiffler (Th. D)] *The Foursquare Gospel* (USA: Echo Park Evangelistic Assoc. Inc., 1946), chapter VII.

⁵ Terry L. Cross, “Toward a Theology of the Word and the Spirit: A Review of J. Rodman Williams’s *Renewal Theology*,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 3 (1993), 129, fn 50.

biblical revelation, not self-revelation, is the basis of authority within the community of faith. These three principles will be briefly defined then discussed in more detail:

- i. *Sola Scriptura*: The doctrine of the primacy of the Scripture as the inspired Word of God is shared by all Pentecostals and charismatics, and has been a characteristic of the Pentecostal movement from its inception.⁶ The divine origin of Scripture gives it an authority above any source (whether reason, church traditions, councils or personal revelations) where there is variation or disagreement.⁷ Pentecostals strongly believe the Word of God is both relevant and authoritative to every facet of Christian life and practice.
- ii. *A pneumatic approach to the interpretation of Scripture*: Pentecostals approach Scripture, whether read or preached, with an expectation based on the words of Jesus (John 14:26; 16:12-13), that they will be enlightened by the Holy Spirit. Receiving supernatural insights is a standard spiritual expectation for ordinary believers. The ability to hear from God or receive revelation is not restricted, in practice or doctrine, to theological initiates or an ecclesiastical hierarchy.⁸ Similarly, the promise of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost was not limited to those present, but available equally to their children and “to all that are far off, every one whom the Lord our God calls to him” (Acts 2:39). For Pentecostals, this means not only that the gifts of the spirit did not cease at the end of the Apostolic era (i.e. a non-cessationist stance) but also that the Holy Spirit maintains a vital alliance between the early Christians and the modern church. (Termed a non-dispensational ecclesiology, this view will be considered in more depth below).⁹
- iii. *Biblical revelation, not self-revelation, as the basis of authority within the community of faith*: Pentecostals accept the authority of the Scriptures, but characteristically also expect that ordinary believers may be enlightened by the Holy Spirit. This immediately presents a problem, with the possibility of spurious or fanatical claims. A balanced approach is needed regarding public

⁶ See Stanley M. Horton (ed.), *Systematic Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective*, (Springfield MO: Logion Press, 1994) 46; also Gordon L. Anderson, “Pentecostals Believe in More Than Tongues,” in Harold B. Smith, (ed.) *Pentecostals From The Inside Out (Christianity Today Series)* (Wheaton IL: Victor Books, 1990), 5.

⁷G.W. Gilpin, “The Inspiration of the Bible,” in P.S. Brewster (ed.), *Pentecostal Doctrine* (Cheltenham UK: Elim Pentecostal Churches, 1976), 131.

⁸ Cartledge, *Apostolic Revolution*, 16. He goes on to explain: “The very fact of speaking in tongues immediately creates in the new Pentecostal an expectation of further supernatural and personal relation [without] need to be introduced to this possibility through teaching or indoctrination ... [thus] relationship with God is not restricted to the cognitive level ... and creative ideas can occur as a result” (p. 17).

⁹ Gordon L. Anderson, “Pentecostal Hermeneutics Part 1,” *Paraclete* 28/1 (Winter 1994), 2.

expressions which are claimed as prophetic inspiration. Doctrine must be based on a credible approach to interpretation of Scriptures as accepted within the community of faith, and not on subjective personal revelations. The plain understanding of Scripture is considered to be the measure of all teachings. As David Cartledge, a well-known Australian Pentecostal leader, argues, this must go hand in hand with submission and accountability to other leaders as a qualifying feature which speaks of a humble attitude when claiming to hear from God.¹⁰ In the past when questionable interpretations from factions gave rise to concern, this led to reaction and rejection by the major Pentecostal groups, rather than bringing correction.¹¹ Cartledge expresses the standard position, that “supernatural phenomena alone can never be the basis of making decisions or formulating doctrines.”¹²

These three main hermeneutical principles may be claimed as Pentecostal by their common usage within this tradition. This paper will now consider these principles in light of the Pentecostal interpretive methods historically employed and those perceptible in modern trends.

2. Sola Scriptura

The Protestant Reformation doctrine of the primacy of the Scriptures as the inspired Word of God, authoritative in all matters that pertain to salvation and Christian living, is shared by Pentecostals, charismatics, and mainline Evangelical Christians, as a doctrinal core.¹³ To Pentecostals, belief in the divine origin of the Scriptures gives the Bible an authority above reason and church traditions or councils, where these are at variance.¹⁴ In other words, they hold that ‘the Bible must be interpreted by the Bible.’¹⁵

¹⁰ Cartledge, *Apostolic Revolution*, 45.

¹¹ Cartledge notes that “By deleting a potentially troublesome factor from their churches, the Assemblies of God promoted the idea among their new Evangelical associates that they were ‘moderate.’ This assisted their acceptance in the mainstream of orthodoxy.” See Cartledge, *Apostolic Revolution*, 48.

¹² Cartledge, *Apostolic Revolution*, 46.

¹³ Horton, *Systematic Theology*, 46. This position is not simply one stated by Pentecostals, but well documented and recognised by Evangelical leaders such as Carl F.H. Henry and the late Harold J. Ockenga. Anderson elaborates that “The statements of faith produced by Pentecostal denominations are uniform in their articulation of a conservative understanding of the Word of God. The charismatics who are part of denominations which have historically taken a more liberal approach to the Bible tend to become more conservative when they accept Pentecostal teachings” (see “Pentecostals Believe in More Than Tongues,” 57).

¹⁴ Gilpin, “The Inspiration of the Bible,” 131.

¹⁵ Guy P. Duffield and Nathaniel M. Van Cleave, *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology* (Los Angeles CA: L.I.F.E. Bible College, 1987), 254.

At the beginning of its history in the early twentieth century, Classical Pentecostalism¹⁶ stood as a fortress of conservatism, completely rejecting all European theology as modernism, making no discrimination between viewpoints.¹⁷ Convinced that since the Enlightenment an anti-supernatural worldview was inherent in biblical critical studies, Pentecostal leaders reasoned this would inevitably impact on both the resultant understanding and application of the Scriptures. Australian Barry Chant states that “The distinctives of Pentecostalism are not only firmly based on a conviction that the Bible is the Word of God, but they *require* such conviction.”¹⁸ As such, belief in the supernatural is a non-negotiable criterion of Pentecostalism.¹⁹

The neo-Pentecostal theologian J. Rodman Williams disputes the claim that Pentecostals are fundamentally anti-theological. Rather, he explains, they fear elevating formal or intellectualised doctrine to a place of primacy which subsequently fails to recognise the form or content of what they believe to be a God-given experience crucial to individual and church life.²⁰

The paucity of theologically educated people in Pentecostal ministry is being addressed and, as Hathaway points out, the mind-spirit tension has been a feature with which the movement has struggled for most of its life.²¹ This being said, a reasoned case may be made that Pentecostalism stands in need of a new experience-based theology.

¹⁶ “Classical Pentecostalism” is a term utilised with reference to those groups with traditional Pentecostal beliefs and worship forms, whose roots lie in the 1901-06 historical revivals. Throughout this study the three terms used to distinguish between groups, namely Classical Pentecostals, Neo-Pentecostals (also known as Charismatics) and Neo-Charismatics reflect the historical eras in which they had their beginnings. All the complexities of global Pentecostalism are not specified within the strictures of this study. For an excellent explanation of the beginnings and differences between Pentecostal groups, see Alan Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism* (Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004), Chapter 8 on “The Charismatic Movement and the New Pentecostals.” See also Barry Chant, *Heart of Fire* (Unley, South Australia: House of Tabor, 1984) which includes mention of various Pentecostal meetings prior to the better known 1901-06 revivals.

¹⁷ See Stanley M. Horton (ed), *Systematic Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective* (Springfield MO: Logion Press, 1994), 20. See also Walter J. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1972), 40.

¹⁸ Chant, *Heart of Fire*, 243. Chant reasons it would not be possible “to teach divine healing, and the gifts of the Spirit as contemporary phenomena, for instance, if you don’t believe those things really happened in the first place!”

¹⁹ Consistent with this still widely held attitude at popular level, particularly in opposition to cessationists, David Cartledge presses home the point: “Those who believe that all manifestations of power and the miraculous ceased with the death of the original apostles will apply this attitude to their interpretation of the scriptures.” See, *Apostolic Revolution* (Chester Hill NSW: Paraclete Inst, 2000), 167.

²⁰ J. Rodman Williams, *The Pentecostal Reality* (Plainfield NJ: Logos International, 1972), 60.

²¹ Malcolm R. Hathaway, “The Elim Pentecostal Church: Origins, Development and Distinctives,” in Keith Warrington (ed.), *Pentecostal Perspectives* (Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1998), 34.

a. *Pentecostalism's Need for a New Experience Based Theology*

Evangelicals are arguably a textualised community,²² whilst Pentecostals and charismatics are an oral/prophetic community. It is the very fact of textualisation that caused the rejection of fundamental aspects of Pentecostal experience, and formed the basis of their own exclusion and oppression by Evangelicals.²³ Pentecostals do not fit into conservative Evangelicalism for precisely the reason that the latter is based on a textualist theology, one that generates a fundamental conflict in any Pentecostal endeavour to work within their framework.²⁴

This issue is important because Pentecostals have been charged with a naïve borrowing of an Evangelical bibliology (or study of the Bible as the inspired Word of God), itself the product of a Princeton theology²⁵ commonly regarded as the epitome of textualisation.²⁶ Because a strong connection exists between Pentecostals being 'evangelicalised' (not a finished work, says Smith) and the process of textualisation, both the Pentecostal doctrine of continuing revelation and the doctrine of Scripture have been threatened. Pentecostal beliefs have not been easily integrated, and consequently have been undermined when rules established by what may technically be called a Reformed-Baptistic strain within Evangelicalism have been uncritically accepted by Pentecostals.²⁷

Certainly, over the last century, Pentecostalism's increasing credibility and acceptability have been aided by its adoption of the Evangelical theological framework. At the same time many Pentecostals are aware that the orality of their tradition is suppressed, or at best marginalized, by the use of Evangelical textualist theology. The point of contention

²² Explained by James K.A. Smith (citing B. Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983) as "a community which organizes its experience against the horizon of a text, the Bible" as the standard (*kanon*). See James K.A. Smith, "The Closing of the Book: Pentecostals, Evangelicals, and the Sacred Writings," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 11 (1997), 58.

²³ Notwithstanding that Pentecostals are considered part of the Evangelical Movement, in the broadest sense, since their inclusion in the National Association of Evangelicals in the 1940s. See Terry L. Cross, "A Proposal to Break the Ice: What Can Pentecostal Theology Offer Evangelical Theology?" *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 10:2 (2002), 48.

²⁴ Smith, "The Closing of the Book," 70.

²⁵ Old Princeton theology is represented by the works of Charles Hodge, Benjamin B. Warfield and J. Gresham Machen who, as professors at Princeton Seminary in the late nineteenth to early twentieth centuries, defended the inspiration, authority and inerrancy of the original autographs of the canonical Scriptures in what may be called a textualist theology.

²⁶ Smith, "The Closing of the Book," 59.

²⁷ Smith, "The Closing of the Book," 63.

remains the definitive Pentecostal belief in continuing revelation and prophecy.²⁸ If the trend continues and the oral and experiential nature of Pentecostalism is historicised in the process of absorption into Evangelicalism, Pentecostalism's demise as an entity in its own right will be ensured: "A Pentecostal evangelical theology is a house divided against itself."²⁹

Despite having in common with Evangelicalism a high regard of Scripture, Pentecostals should not be regarded as a textualist community. The fact that a community highly regards texts is not a sign of a textualist community *per se*. The means of determining the community's oral or textual position rests on the *status* accorded to texts:³⁰ Are the texts understood by the community as records, and therefore derivative, or are texts actual sites of authority?

In a textual community where loving God means loving the Bible, any intimation that experience has been placed above the text is deemed sacrilegious.³¹ In an oral community, the texts narrate the experience between God and His people. In their function as historical *testimony* the texts are, as such, derivative. Testimony, predominantly an oral occurrence, is quintessential Pentecostalism, the believer giving voice to experience of God.³² While in no way denying the actual authority of Scripture,

²⁸ For a discussion on Pentecostal practices involving prophetic revelations (in addition to Scripture) and the authority such revelations are thought to carry, see Richard D. Massey, "The Word of God: 'Thus Saith the Lord'," in Keith Warrington (ed.), *Pentecostal Perspectives* (Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1998), especially pages 73-4, 78-9.

²⁹ Smith, "The Closing of the Book," 59.

³⁰ Smith, "The Closing of the Book," 59.

³¹ Smith, "The Closing of the Book," 66. "Of course, this commitment to texts is never so blatantly stated as such; but it is manifested when a person or community is persecuted by Christians for making a distinction between God and the text, or is deemed heterodox for placing experience of God above the reading of Scripture." Smith points to a "classic example of this in the wrath of Evangelicals regarding Karl Barth's doctrine of Scripture." See *ibid*, n. 58.

³² The personal testimonies of three well-known classical Pentecostals are given here as examples of how Pentecostal believers actively engage with the words of Scripture and subsequently apply this to their lives: Australian Pastor Lloyd Averill, in the Preface of his autobiography, explains how he received a "personalised word from the Bible" at a time when he was "desperate to receive guidance." Averill took as a message to his heart a specific text, which provided direction for important life decisions (*Go North Young Man* (Springwood QLD: Lloyd Averill, 1992), 9). Ruth Ward Heflin discusses her changed attitude to worship styles after "the Lord spoke to me" and "showed me" a specific Bible verse, she said. This became so meaningful to her as to cause her to alter her attitude and behaviour (*Harvest Glory: I Ask for the Nations* (Hagerstown MD: McDougal Publishing, 1999), 75, and similarly at pages 93 and 190). W.F.P. Burton, pioneer missionary in the Congo, considered teaching African converts "the supreme authority of God's Word" a priority: "It was approached from various points, but the main thought was that we are responsible to study and to obey the Scriptures: that the rule of life of the Christian is not the teachings of men, but in the declarations of God's Word" (*God Working with Them* (London: Victory Press, 1933), 80). As a Pentecostal he fully expected to see signs and wonders attending the ministry (p. 80) and relates an incident where colleagues who had been deliberately poisoned pleaded "the promise of Mark 16:18" and survived (p. 35).

the text is not in itself believed to be a site of divine presence. Rather, Scripture has another vitally important purpose, that of standing as testimony to the imminence of God's power in the church.³³ For this reason biblical theology has historically been a favoured medium of Pentecostals.

The modern challenge is for Pentecostals to work to overcome the influence of textualisation, in particular, and to put aside the idea that any critique of the canon implies criticism of God. This fear can be put to rest by pursuing a better understanding of how the concept of canon actually works. Such pursuit would foster in Pentecostals a fresh appreciation of the relationship between Scripture and prophecy in accord with their emphasis on the continuity of Christ's relationship with the church through the Holy Spirit.³⁴

In the postmodern milieu, factual science no longer dominates over subjective religion. This means it is now possible for dialogue on faith and experience to take place in an academic forum without automatically raising insuperable epistemological barriers. The door is opening for the Pentecostal relational approach, but credibility will remain elusive unless there is an inner consistency and clarity to the methodology employed in working out "a clear understanding of revelation, authority and experience", as Terry Cross cautions.³⁵ Primacy of the Scriptures must be linked with dialectical method in accessing the knowledge of God, without divorcing the text from contemporary contextualisation and appropriation, but avoiding the extremes of both intellectualism and whimsical subjectivism.³⁶

³³ Smith, "The Closing of the Book," 66f. The early Pentecostal Donald Gee, well-known for his balanced approach, offered sensible advice on seeking guidance from Scripture based on sound study. He discouraged the practice of randomly selecting verses [a process known as bibliomancy] and applying them to one's situation. Gee explained the Bible is a book of principles as well as direct statements. He therefore cautioned against seeking guidance from isolated texts, "even though they may be picked upon with perfect sincerity and form an apparent basis of scriptural authority" (*This is the Way: Finding the Better Life Through Divine Guidance* (Springfield MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1936; originally entitled *Studies in Guidance*), 21; chapter 3 entitled "Guidance from the Bible" is particularly helpful in understanding the Pentecostal approach to seeking God's will from Scripture.

³⁴ Smith, "The Closing of the Book," 63. Smith (p. 70) goes on to explain: "If our theology is to be Pentecostal, I think it is crucial that we give up trying to be evangelical, or at least evangelical *theologians* [emphasis Smith's]. This is perhaps more critical than ever before as David Wells and Mark Noll set the agenda for evangelical theology, for this agenda is rooted in a textualism which precludes (and is at times vehemently opposed to) Pentecostal experience."

³⁵ See Cross, "Toward a Theology of the Word and the Spirit," 131f.

³⁶ Cross, "Toward a Theology of the Word and the Spirit," 133.

b. *Renewal Theology: Systematic or Biblical?*

J. Rodman Williams is prominent amongst those who have been engaged in the task of reclaiming various biblical affirmations previously neglected by the renewal community. His objective is to place a renewal accent on traditional theological categories.³⁷ He describes his book *Renewal Theology (Systematic Theology From a Charismatic Perspective)* as being on the full range of Christian truth from one positioned within the renewal context,³⁸ and specifies a threefold concern: for sound doctrine, the Christian community as a teaching community, and the study of the truth.

Williams makes a number of statements useful in clarifying theology from a Pentecostal perspective.³⁹ He defines theology as the servant of the Christian faith, and as an intellectual discipline.⁴⁰ He leaves the doctrinal topics largely within the traditional configuration and considers the content to be little different from what may be found in many books of systematic theology.⁴¹ Williams finds the term ‘systematic theology’ to be simply a description for the orderly exposition of theology, but concedes the expression is widely used to differentiate between biblical, historical and practical theology. He does make the distinction, however, that “while all dogmatic theology is

³⁷ J. Rodman Williams, *Renewal Theology. Systematic Theology from a Charismatic Perspective. Three Volumes in One* (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996), I:12. He clarifies that it is his “conviction that church tradition and theology have generally failed to treat adequately the aspect of the work of the Holy Spirit that may be called ‘pentecostal’ and ‘charismatic.’”

³⁸ Williams’ participation and background in the Charismatic Renewal Movement began in 1965. He is a Presbyterian scholar.

³⁹ Allan Anderson (citing Henry I. Lederle, *Treasures Old and New: Interpretations of ‘Spirit-baptism’ in the Charismatic Renewal Movement*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988, pp. 45-7) notes that neo-Pentecostal theology does not differ substantially from that of Classical Pentecostals and in many independent charismatic churches it is identical (see Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 192). The proposition of this paper is that the same cannot be said for Neo-charismatics, in particular the demonology of C. Peter Wagner.

⁴⁰ Williams, *Renewal Theology*, I:16. Less than ten years before Williams published Volume 1 of his *Renewal Theology*, C.F.H. Henry had this criticism to make: “The [charismatic] movement’s weakness lies in its lack of deep theological grounding in biblical revelation, and in its accepting psychic and mystical phenomena without adequately evaluating them. . . . In the absence of an articulate theology, the movement is moreover prone to a view of charismatic revelation and authority that competes at times with what the Bible teaches.” See *God, Revelation and Authority: God Who Speaks and Shows, IV* (Waco TX: Word Books, 1979), 500. It is therefore of particular interest that among the functions of theology such as “clarification, integration, correction, declaration, and challenge,” Williams is mindful of the role served in correcting departures from the truth and redressing imbalances, cautioning that the misinterpretation of a certain truth, however sincere, predictably will become more distorted with time and lead to heresy. See Williams, *Renewal Theology*, I:19f.

⁴¹ Williams, *Renewal Theology*, I:12. The three single volumes were published between 1988 to 1992.

systematic, not all systematic theology is dogmatic; it may be more biblical, or even more philosophical.”⁴²

Williams considers that orderly exposition of a doctrine must involve the articulation of relationships and connections with other doctrines, so the whole becomes comprehensible. For this reason, he holds that familiarity with church history is important, particularly the affirmations of church councils, creeds, confessions, and the writings of the early church fathers, recognised theologians and commentators of the church. He considers that, in the task of theology, overlooking the church’s 2000 years of history would be a grievous mistake.⁴³

Cross, in a critique of Williams’ *Renewal Theology*, calls it a first of its kind but argues that it is not truly a systematic theology (despite a traditional layout of doctrines) but rather that it qualifies more as a biblical theology.⁴⁴ Cross’ point is that a true systematic theology, being connected with the times in which it is delivered, directs practical theology from a doctrinal foundation. The distinctive difference, he says, is that a biblical theology allows explanation of the texts but does not integrate any reflection on their meaning for contemporary life.⁴⁵ In his defence, it should be said that Williams does use personal testimony (his own and that of others) to make clear a theological point. This acts to reinforce the position that the work of the Spirit in the first century is on a continuum through to the contemporary church, which is an important consideration to Pentecostals, colouring the way they read Scripture. Cross contends that Pentecostals have become good exegetes and produced some excellent biblical theology, but remain negative in their attitude to philosophy. This lack of engagement, he believes, helps isolate Pentecostal theology from the mainstream.⁴⁶ The nuances are not always clear-

⁴² Williams, *Renewal Theology*, I:17f. Paul Tillich’s *Systematic Theology* is cited by Williams (see n. 7), as an example of an “avowedly philosophical [or existentialist] orientation” whose basis, therefore, is not the Word of God.

⁴³ Williams, *Renewal Theology*, I:25.

⁴⁴ Cross, “Toward a Theology of the Word and the Spirit,” 114f, 118. Cross’ opinion is based on the paucity of theological reflection or interaction with theological opinion in Williams’ work. He considers doctrinal discussions to be wholly biblical and any academic citations are brief and apparently selected because they agree with the text. This has resulted in a text Cross considers to be “dogmatic and closed instead of dialogic and open” (see p. 119). Cross later observes (p.127, n. 46) that “Williams is not alone in Pentecostal and charismatic circles in stressing the primacy of Scripture to the exclusion or denigration of reflection.”

⁴⁵ Cross, “Toward a Theology of the Word and the Spirit,” 127.

⁴⁶ Cross, “Toward a Theology of the Word and the Spirit,” 117. Cross acknowledges that his own understanding of what constitutes systematic theology differs from that of Williams, who may have found traditional approaches too philosophically speculative and thus deliberately elected to work with the text itself. Williams is pointed out as speaking of philosophy in disparaging terms (see *Renewal Theology* I, 247). To be fair to Williams, the sentence reads, “Captivity to philosophy is captivity to deception” which

cut, however. Charles Arand considers that dogmatic theology can be a means of identifying a theology with the Bible as a descriptive and historical task, or alternatively, entail a more constructive task of expressing a modern theology in biblically compatible terms.⁴⁷ In this sense Williams' *Renewal Theology* may be categorised as dogmatic, which is in keeping with his own definition, noted above, of systematic theology.

Williams is completely in accord with the Pentecostal understanding of *Sola Scriptura* when he warns against going beyond Scripture in the search after truth, including any extrabiblical source,⁴⁸ but specifically any tradition, vision or new truth that might be construed as a private interpretation and distortion of Scripture.⁴⁹ Seemingly at odds with this is a remark by Cross that the assumption that Scripture alone can produce an adequate theology is an erroneous approach to the theological task because Scripture must be interpreted. He makes the point that many seem to think the theological task of grounding doctrine requires only the reiteration of Scripture, as opposed to engaging in careful biblical exegesis.

In the task of interpretation, personal bias may often go unrecognised by the hermeneutist. For which reason, Cross asserts that the role of the Spirit in illuminating the meaning and application of Scripture must be seen as a crucial component going hand in hand with the rigours and methods of the theological task. As John 16:13 implies and Cross states, guidance by the Spirit of Truth is a continuing venture.⁵⁰ Yet acceptance of the doctrine of continuing revelation in no way negates the insistence found in Scripture itself that all teaching alleging to come by divine revelation be tested. Scriptural conformity is the main test.⁵¹

is different to Cross' interpretation that he said "philosophy [is] captivity to deception" (see Cross, "Toward a Theology of the Word and the Spirit," 120).

⁴⁷ Charles P. Arand, "The Church's Dogma and Biblical Theology," in Michael S. Horton (ed.), *A Confessing Theology for Postmodern Times* (Wheaton IL: Crossway Books, 2000), 15.

⁴⁸ Williams does not advocate the total shunning of extrabiblical sources, but is adamant that sound doctrine cannot allow the elevation of other sources over Scripture. See Williams, *Renewal Theology*, I:24.

⁴⁹ Williams, *Renewal Theology*, I: 24. "Sad but commonplace is the vast number of private interpretations and distortions that parade under the name of "Bible truth", he says.

⁵⁰ Cross asserts this as a given. See "Toward a Theology of the Word and the Spirit," 128f, also fn 49. On the question of adopting a 'spiritual' model of education, Cheryl Johns talks of the pedagogical role of the Holy Spirit in the Pentecostal experience as being the epistemological key that "radically alters traditional forms of theological education.." See Cheryl Bridges Johns, "The Meaning of Pentecost for Theological Education," *Ministerial Formation* 87 (October 1999), 42.

⁵¹ E.g. 1 Cor 14:29-32; Gal 1:8; 1 John 4:1-3; 2 Pet 1:18-21.

Cross expresses his admiration of Clark Pinnock who, as a systematic theologian, refuses to allow his work to collapse into biblical theology.⁵² Pinnock's line of reasoning is that revelation is addressed not only to the intellect but to the whole person and is therefore not just external to the individual, but also internal. Cross adds that on the other hand truth is not private but an operation of the Holy Spirit within the community of faith, and that developments in theology and doctrine must be submitted to corporate scrutiny before being received. Humility and openness are factors in hearing the voice of the Spirit.⁵³ The proposal that truth is personal as well as propositional is contrary to the rationalistic trend of Evangelicalism. Nevertheless, for Pentecostals this view that revelation and truth is personal is fundamental. A dialectical relationship which understands revelation as both propositional and personal, but stresses neither, is seen as essential by Cross if there is to be a beneficial balance.⁵⁴

In brief, Pentecostalism's need for a new experience based theology is noted, as is the need to balance the subjective with the objective. As an oral/prophetic community, the influence of textualisation is to be overcome. Credibility for a Pentecostal relational approach will depend on an inner consistency and clarity to the methodology employed in understanding the relationship between revelation, authority and experience. The mind-spirit tension is acknowledged, the point having been made that a dialectical relationship must operate which appreciates revelation as both propositional and personal, but stresses neither. Features of Rodman Williams' work seen to be of particular value are as follows:

- i. The aim to clarify theology by adequate treatment of the work of the Holy Spirit that may be called Pentecostal and charismatic. Theology may still be an intellectual discipline whilst recognising the mind-spirit tension.
- ii. The overlap in distinctions between biblical, historical and practical theology facilitates a hermeneutic that combines these approaches in the following

⁵² Terry L. Cross, "A Critical Review of Clark Pinnock's *Flame of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit*," in *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 13 (1989), 6. Cross does not agree with all of Pinnock's theology, but cannot fault his method. Pinnock himself says he is not trapped into the "propositionalist/rationalist legacy of Reformed evangelicalism" – see Clark Pinnock, "A Bridge and Some Points of Growth: A Reply to Cross and Macchia," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 13 (1998), 53.

⁵³ Cross, "A Critical Review of Clark Pinnock's *Flame of Love*," 27.

⁵⁴ Cross, "A Critical Review of Clark Pinnock's *Flame of Love*," 27f, and n. 33. It is his conviction that because the work of the Holy Spirit in the church is present and continuing, truth will prevail over the human capacity to warp or hinder truth.

discussion on Daniel 10:13 in Chapter Two, yet leaves some flexibility in interpretational methods.

- iii. The functions of theology include: clarification, integration, correction, declaration, challenge, and redressing imbalances.

Williams' method provides an excellent example of marrying traditional theology with a renewal emphasis as an intellectual discipline, particularly in dialogue with the creeds, traditions and earlier writings in church history. It should, however, be borne in mind that the theological results are likely to appear more biblical than dogmatic. For it to remain Pentecostal, a pneumatic approach to the interpretation of Scripture should not be omitted, but rather be balanced with the necessary rigours and methods of the theological task as well as engaging with the scrutiny of the community of faith. This aspect will be dealt with next in more detail.

3. Pneumatic Approach to the Interpretation of Scripture

In an earlier book, *The Pentecostal Reality*,⁵⁵ in which Williams deemed it important to delineate certain aspects of Pentecostal spirituality with supporting biblical evidences, he drew on what he describes as a representative range of Classical and neo-Pentecostal sources. Relating their propositional and personal understanding of Scripture, he considered, allowed the Pentecostal witness to speak for itself.⁵⁶ Williams stresses that Pentecostalism is not pneumatocentric as such, despite a keen witness to spiritual experience which is personal and immediate.⁵⁷

This is an important distinction to Pentecostals, the majority of whom hold orthodox Protestant views of the major doctrines and in the broadest definition of the term are considered to be evangelical.⁵⁸ The sticking point between the early Pentecostal Movement and mainline Evangelicals was the belief of the former in what is termed the

⁵⁵ Op. cit.

⁵⁶ Williams, *The Pentecostal Reality*, 57f. Williams points out divergences between classical and neo-Pentecostal understanding.

⁵⁷ Williams, *The Pentecostal Reality*, 59. Cf. James J. Glass, who confirms Pentecostalism as Christocentric and sees calling it pneumatocentric as misguided; see "Eschatology: A Clear and Present Danger – A Sure and Certain Hope," in Keith Warrington (ed.), *Pentecostal Perspectives* (Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1998), 135f.

⁵⁸ Grant Wacker makes the point that "Contrary to stereotype Pentecostals are deadly serious about correct doctrine. They habitually define themselves in doctrinal terms..." See Wacker, "Wild Theories and Mad Excitement," in Harold B. Smith (ed.), *Pentecostals From The Inside Out (Christianity Today Series)* (Wheaton IL: Victor Books, 1990), 21f.

Baptism in the Holy Spirit, which does not accord with a cessationist view of the gifts of the Spirit.⁵⁹ This distinction remains today, with Pentecostals holding, in the words of David Harrell, “a more original theology of the Holy Spirit”, which sets them apart from other evangelical Christians.⁶⁰

Pentecostal churches seriously attempt to teach as the ideal of church life and conduct models based on the example of early Christians. Scripture is seen as prescriptive rather than merely descriptive.⁶¹ Pentecostals have a pneumatic attitude to Scripture, founded on Scripture itself (John 14:26; 16:12-13) that leads them to expect the Holy Spirit to show them within Scripture answers to everyday life.⁶² A somewhat literalistic interpretation is often applied, the obvious meaning of a passage being accepted as probably closest to the true meaning.⁶³ However, contrary to S. Schneiders’ contention that “the literalist must reduce the human author to a passive instrument, a scribe taking dictation from the divine speaker”,⁶⁴ Pentecostals and Evangelicals alike expressly deny the dictation theory.⁶⁵

⁵⁹ Non-cessationist in this context means the belief that the charismata did not cease at the end of the apostolic era. The term ‘full gospel’ then and now signifies a non-cessationist view; see Allan Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 211. Interestingly, the four major themes of full gospel Classical Pentecostalism - Christ as Saviour, healer, baptiser in the Holy Spirit and coming king - were and are all proclamations of an experiential Christology. The eschatological culmination of this, as Glass points out, is that “At the Second Coming, everyone would, in a sense, experience Christ whether they wished to or not.” See “Eschatology: A Clear and Present Danger,” 136.

⁶⁰ David Edwin Harrell, Jr., “Foreword”, in Harold B. Smith (ed.), *Pentecostals From The Inside Out (Christianity Today Series)* (Wheaton IL: Victor Books, 1990), 10. As Wacker notes, all Pentecostals, virtually by definition, share the one conviction that “conversion to Christ must be followed by another life-transforming event known as baptism, or filling, by the Holy Spirit.” See “Wild Theories and Mad Excitement,” 21.

⁶¹ Cartledge, *Apostolic Revolution*, 39.

⁶² Pentecostals are not alone amongst conservative Christians in approaching Scripture with the expectation of apprehending therein practical answers to life’s complexities. The language of Scripture is appropriated to express the living experience of the believer and the bond between them and God in continuous interaction with the biblical story. *Lectio divina*, developed in the Middle Ages and experiencing a minor resurgence of popularity, involves the deliberate development of a spiritual atmosphere by reading Scripture aloud, with the purpose of enhancing the likelihood that the reader will really hear God speak to them in heart, mind or conscience. *Lectio divina* is not Scripture reading as an intellectual pursuit, but as a means of seeking God. The firm expectation of a divine response in real terms parallels the position of Pentecostals. See James W. Sire, *Habits of the Mind: Intellectual Life as a Christian Calling* (Downers Grove IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000), 152-163. See also James M. Houston “Toward a Biblical Spirituality,” in Elmer Dyck (ed.), *The Act of Bible Reading: A Multi-disciplinary Approach to Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1996), 159-161.

⁶³ Duffield and Van Cleave, *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology*, 255.

⁶⁴ S. Schneiders, *The Revelatory Text: Interpreting the New Testament as Sacred Scripture* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1991), 33; see also The Pontifical Biblical Commission, *The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church* (Boston MA: St. Paul Books & Media, 1993), 73.

⁶⁵ For the specifically Pentecostal view, see John R. Higgins, “God’s Inspired Word,” in Stanley M. Horton (ed.), *Systematic Theology. A Pentecostal Perspective* (Springfield MO: Logion Press, 1994), 80f. Also F.L. Arlington, “Hermeneutics”, *DPCM*, 380. For the Evangelical view, see Donald G. Bloesch, *Holy Scripture. Revelation, Inspiration and Interpretation* (Downers Grove IL: IVP, 1994), Chapter 4 in general, but p.122 in particular. The subject has been thoroughly debated by scholars and Bloesch engages with various viewpoints. Contra Schneiders, divine dictation is not synonymous with verbal inspiration as

It is true that generally Pentecostals church members are less interested in what the biblical text meant to its original audience than what it means to them personally and how it should be applied today, guided by the Holy Spirit. It is when applying the Bible to their immediate circumstances that Pentecostals have tended to take it at face value with a literalistic interpretation, Kenneth Archer explains. Thus Scripture is not simply an historical description or static truth, but a source book for life by which the text can be re-experienced.⁶⁶ The Holy Spirit is emphasised as the source of multiple meanings of the text.⁶⁷ While it is this one aspect which allows Pentecostal interpretation of Scripture to be called pneumatic, this is individualistic practice and not applicable in the establishment of community doctrine. This will be discussed further under the heading Biblical Revelation, not Self-revelation, in the Community of Faith.

Pentecostals see the early Christians and modern believers as vitally connected through the continuity of the Holy Spirit's presence in the church.⁶⁸ Thus they bring to the process of interpreting the Bible the theological assumption described as a non-dispensational ecclesiology. This differs markedly from dispensational ecclesiology, which divides early church history into disparate eras or dispensations, apostolic and post-apostolic. Apostolic writings are interpreted according to whether authorial intent is to be viewed as descriptive or didactic. The Book of Acts is deemed largely descriptive by dispensationalists, hence the Baptism of the Spirit experiences depicted should be understood as historical events, confined to that era in which they had a particular function. In addition, the gifts of the spirit, by extension, are said to have ceased at the end of the apostolic era.

a fundamentalist position (see Schneiders, p. 54), nor is the infallibility of human authors upheld. Erickson points out in discussion on the dictation theory that "Although John Calvin and other Reformers used the expression *dictation* when describing inspiration, it seems unlikely that they meant what is actually denoted by this term." See Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1985), 207. Infallibility of the original autographs is upheld, not the human authors (Erickson, 239f). Schneiders (p. 54) clearly states that the position she argues is incompatible with the fundamentalist view of inerrancy, which she recognises as being "a conception of revelation as prepositional [sic]" and that holds "if propositions are to be authoritative, they must be true." In this she accurately describes the fundamentalist view. Erickson (p. 234) puts it this way: "Inerrancy pertains to what is affirmed or asserted rather than what is merely reported."

⁶⁶ Archer, "Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Retrospect and Prospect," 65.

⁶⁷ Hey, "Changing roles of Pentecostal Hermeneutics," 5.

⁶⁸ Brevard S. Childs notes that both Luther and Calvin retained by various means "a strong eschatological tension between the kingdom of God and the church." See *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments* (London: SCM Press, 1992), 625.

a. *A Lucan Hermeneutic*

The narrative of Acts 1 and 2 is viewed by Pentecostals as having contemporary relevance, as important today as to those who originally participated, because it is personally real. Historical passages of Scripture are used as the basis of doctrine. This can be seen in many popular books written from within the Pentecostal Movement which display a tendency to link theological elements of the gospel in (to use Donald Dayton's words) a "distinctively Pentecostal manner of appropriating the Scriptures."⁶⁹

Pentecostals reading the accounts in Luke-Acts believe the general pattern of the early Church's reception of the Spirit is to be replicated in the lives of individual believers despite the separation in time. Some believe this puts Pentecostalism in "a long tradition of a subjectivizing hermeneutic."⁷⁰ However, the Pentecostal position is not unreasoned. Williams, for example, in his considerations on the coming of the Holy Spirit, says he relies primarily on the Book of Acts because this is the only text depicting the event. Relative passages from the Epistles are not of less importance, but since they are brief and point backwards to a past event, Acts as the record of the event itself has primacy.⁷¹

Luke's emphasis on the Holy Spirit is in relation to grace giftings for service (Acts 1:8), while Paul's major concern is with salvation. Particularly at the initiation of Christian life (cf. Rom.8:9), Luke may be described as having a more charismatic and less soteriological emphasis on the Holy Spirit's work in comparison to Paul (which should not be taken as insinuating that Luke's writing is not evangelistic or soteriological).

The idea of a Lucan hermeneutic, based on the understanding that Luke was teaching doctrine rather than merely narrating history, was first proposed by I. Howard Marshall. Roger Stronstad and Robert Menzies expanded on this idea, laying the foundation for

⁶⁹ Donald W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Metuchen NJ: Hendrickson Publishers/Scarecrow Press, 1987), 23.

⁷⁰ Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, 23.

⁷¹ Williams, *Renewal Theology*, II:182. In a footnote (n.4) he writes that "A proper methodology entails, wherever possible, giving priority to the narrational and descriptive over the didactic.... Acts is the actual record of this event, its narration is the primary place to gain perspective and understanding. Not all agree on that, I recognize. For example, John R. W. Stott writes that the "revelation of the purpose of God in Scripture should be sought primarily in its *didactic* rather than its *descriptive* parts. More precisely, we should look for it ... in the sermons and writings of the apostles, rather than in the purely narrative portions of the Acts. What is described as having happened to others is not necessarily intended for us" (*Baptism and Fulness*, 15). Such an approach, I submit, reverses the proper order of understanding. Actually, it is a combination of the two, the narrational or descriptive *and* the didactic, with the former having priority, that is the best hermeneutical procedure." Williams then points to Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*, 5-9, for a helpful critique of the position represented by Stott.

interpreting Scripture in a Pentecostal context. James Dunn sums up the reading of Luke-Acts supported by Stronstad, Shelton and Menzies (the latter in particular) as one that typically and prominently, if not totally, emphasises the Holy Spirit as “the charismatic spirit, the Spirit of prophecy.”⁷²

The finer issues are well debated elsewhere, but in broad terms, Stronstad sees Luke as using historical narrative, although with didactic intent. Descriptive passages become important revelations of God’s purpose, because they are seen to be teaching occasions. This being the case, says Stronstad, Luke’s teaching must be seen as a solid foundation for a doctrine of the Spirit with implications for the ongoing mission and religious experience of the church.⁷³ If the alternative approach (that Luke is merely relating history) is accepted, then much valuable teaching material cannot be used for instruction in the normal pattern of Christian life. Luke’s pneumatology is at the centre of the current contemporary hermeneutical reassessment, for it is here, says Menzies, that central issues unite, and how one reads Luke-Acts “will determine how one evaluates historic Pentecostal distinctives.”⁷⁴

Stronstad rationalises that the charismatic gift-conferring activity of the Spirit of God in the Old Testament is not random, but falls in five distinct periods, corresponding with politically and religiously critical phases.⁷⁵ In his view, as a theologian Luke adopts a charismatic theology continuous with the Old Testament, firstly in the life of Jesus, and then in the lives of His disciples. Central to the Old Testament historical narrative is the development of the nation of Israel. Theology and traditions are inherent in the story. Similarly, in the New Testament, Luke narrates the development of the church, the Holy Nation, the narrative functioning as a vehicle for his theology. Stronstad shows that Luke’s pneumatology is vocational, signifying that Luke’s teaching on the Spirit is the basis of authentic ministry.⁷⁶

⁷² Dunn observes in n.13 that “...Menzies is the most carefully and thoroughly argued, although Stronstad and Shelton are the more balanced.” See James D.G. Dunn, “Baptism in the Spirit: A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 3 (1993), 7. For a summary of the debate between the influential Evangelical scholar James Dunn and not only Classical Pentecostal scholars but also Charismatics and Third Wave, see Allan Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 192ff.

⁷³ Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*, 5-9.

⁷⁴ Robert P. Menzies, “James Shelton’s *Mighty in Word and Deed*: A Review Article,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 2 (1993), 105.

⁷⁵ Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*, Chapter 2.

⁷⁶ Roger Stronstad, “The Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts,” *Paraclete* (Spring 1989), 18 -26. See especially the section titled “Luke’s is an Old Testament Pneumatology,” 18-21.

James Shelton agrees that the foremost objective of the Holy Spirit is portrayed by Luke as empowerment for mission, principally with regard to effective witness,⁷⁷ and further, that based on a pattern in the historical narrative, the experience of Jesus is archetypal for believers.⁷⁸ Menzies strongly stresses that the Spirit in Luke-Acts is primarily the Spirit of mission, associated with the evangelising enterprise of the church and never presented as a soteriological agent.⁷⁹ To Pentecostals the narrative of Luke-Acts has normative value.⁸⁰ Archer remarks that Pentecostal identity is at stake in this debate, rather than whether Pentecostals have correctly exegeted the Lucan corpus according to traditional historical-critical methodologies.⁸¹

This methodology, of beginning with narrative rather than didactic texts, is often seen by those outside the movement as a major flaw of Pentecostal exegesis and hermeneutics.⁸² Pentecostal scholar Gordon Anderson agrees that not every occurrence in the early church should necessarily be viewed by the modern church as a model. He points out that being aware of this problem, Pentecostals do seek to avoid the excesses such an approach can produce. The crux of the problem for them, when reading historical narrative as normative, is in discerning what is an acceptable biblical model and what is to be considered excessive if implemented today.⁸³

⁷⁷ James Shelton, *Mighty In Word and Deed* (Peabody MA Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), 161.

⁷⁸ Shelton, *Might In Word and Deed*, 157.

⁷⁹ Robert P. Menzies, "The Spirit of Prophecy, Luke-Acts and Pentecostal Theology: A Response to Max Turner," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 15 (1999), 53. Shelton argues that Luke and Paul have fundamentally the same perceptions of the Spirit, their pneumatology representing different emphases rather than disparate theological perspectives. They are addressing different questions. Menzies sees Luke's pneumatology as different from Paul's, though complementary to it in the end, and considers that Shelton's approach is not so different from many non-Pentecostal/charismatic readings of Luke, in that the reception of the Spirit at Pentecost may still be seen in Pauline terms of conversion-initiation despite the prominence given by Luke to what has been called divine enabling. Menzies makes the point that "In this way, the universality (and missiological character) of the expectation for 'subsequent empowerings' – rooted in the Pentecostal promise – is undermined: all experience the soteriological dimension of the Pentecostal gift at conversion, but perhaps only a few receive missiological power. The full implications of Luke's pneumatology can be seen only when it is recognized that his narrative reflects a distinctive theological perspective. Then we may affirm that since Luke does not attribute soteriological functions to the Spirit, the Pentecostal gift and promise must be viewed exclusively in missiological terms." See Menzies, "James Shelton's *Mighty in Word and Deed*", 114-115.

⁸⁰ Loren Triplett boldly states in a recent handbook for Pentecostal Pastors: "According to Acts 1:8, to be Pentecostal is to be missionary", and thus it is no surprise to him that the early Pentecostal Movement "took on immediate missionary responsibilities and vision." See his article, "Back to Basics in Missions," in Thomas E. Trask, Wayne Goodall and Zenas J. Bicket (eds.), *The Pentecostal Pastor: A Mandate for the 21st Century* (Springfield MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1997), 461.

⁸¹ Archer, "Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Retrospect and Prospect," 63.

⁸² See John Stott, *Baptism and Fullness: The Work of the Holy Spirit Today* (Downers Grove IL: InterVarsity Press, 1976), 15.

⁸³ Gordon Anderson, "Pentecostals Believe in More Than Tongues," 57-58.

The past event of Pentecost lies behind the Pentecostal/charismatic present experience as noted above. The record of Acts is the essential biblical witness affecting their way of life as they are open to the activity of the Holy Spirit. The interpretation of Acts goes beyond traditional Protestant explanations of relating the text (2:1-4) to the beginning of the Christian faith and/or as an aspect of sanctification. Pentecostals also point to a dimension of the Spirit's activity, that of spiritual fullness, which facilitates witness to Christ and empowers the believer for service in that cause.⁸⁴ It is not in doubt that Pentecostalism is an experienced-based tradition;⁸⁵ however, questions arise as to exactly how the hermeneutical gap is bridged without violating foundational experience-based theology. It will be helpful here to explain the *milieu* in which such question must be answered.

b. *Pentecostals and Spiritual Experience*

Scott Ellington discovered that Pentecostal seminary students in America studying the inspiration and authority of the Bible persistently fell back on testimony of personal experiences to substantiate their beliefs in relation to the question 'How do you know the Bible is the Word of God?' In fact, he discovered, doubt could be cast on traditional proofs for infallibility and inerrancy without seriously challenging their core belief in the authority of Scripture, and without assailing the heart of Pentecostalism. This was because the central emphasis is not based first on doctrine, but on "a God who must be reckoned with in direct encounter."⁸⁶ It is true that this is a fundamental emphasis, influencing the daily life of adherents and affecting the way Pentecostals approach theology. It is not that Pentecostals are unable to think critically about theological issues or that doctrine is unimportant to them, but their understanding and use of doctrine is very different from the rationalistic models employed by other traditions. Ellington calls doctrine a verbalisation of "the experience of the community of faith."⁸⁷

⁸⁴ Williams, *The Pentecostal Reality*, 3 and 6.

⁸⁵ Scott A. Ellington draws attention to the fact that the modern Pentecostal movement is not unique. "All Christian churches have emphasized experience to a greater or lesser extent." See "Pentecostalism and the Authority of Scripture," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 9 (1996), 20.

⁸⁶ Ellington, "Pentecostalism and the Authority of Scripture," 17.

⁸⁷ Ellington, "Pentecostalism and the Authority of Scripture," 17f. Ellington extrapolates: "Formal doctrinal statements, which are deductive in nature, are, among Pentecostals, an attempt to organize and understand described experience and do not attempt to serve as proofs for those things which lie completely outside the realm of experience. Beliefs are not derived from understanding, but arise from intense individual and corporate experiences of the presence and action of God in the lives of Christian believers. Doctrine is descriptive of and, as such, arises out of experience." Ellington recognises with many other Pentecostal leaders the need to formulate a distinctly Pentecostal theology instead of uncritically accepting the doctrinal models of Evangelical Christians, but he makes the special point that

Seeking divine guidance in the interpretation of Scripture and doing so within the community of faith are dual aspects preventing relationship with God from becoming static. The Holy Spirit is the dynamic propelling the search to understand the connection between salvation history in the Bible and general church history, and how this further connects to the tradition and context of individual communities. However, because this occurs at the local level as an oral and experiential practice from the moment the new Christian becomes a believer, it necessarily involves the theologically immature. No specialist expertise is required in giving verbal testimony of one's active relationship with God. Testimony giving, in dialogue with Scripture and the Holy Spirit, is a vital part of Pentecostal fellowship and witness. Church governance may reside firmly in the grip of a few professional leaders and pastors, but access to God is open to all. "Because Pentecostal theologising is oral and experiential, all participate on an equal footing, with no particular advantage for those who have special training or superior education."⁸⁸

It must be firmly stated that while Pentecostal and charismatic communities emphasise the role of prophecy, they clearly consider contemporary prophecies as subservient to, and never on a par with the authority of Scripture. Contemporary prophecy or special revelation is termed "subordinate revelation" by Williams.⁸⁹ It is by its nature particular, temporal and subjective and may never contradict the text. Only Scripture is regarded by Pentecostals as universal, eternal and objective.⁹⁰ Problems arise when there are no external sources of authority that include universal absolutes, but this inherent danger is not ignored by Pentecostal leaders.⁹¹

Historically, the traditions of the community of faith provided the guard rails for untenable interpretation. At least as far as Pentecostals are concerned, credal tradition has been frequently overlooked,⁹² but, as Ellington highlights, creeds are the testimonies

because at the local church level theology is frequently oral in form, there is a need to exploit "the richness of testimony in the Pentecostal tradition" (p. 20), in devising a theology.

⁸⁸ Ellington, "Pentecostalism and the Authority of Scripture," 26f.

⁸⁹ Williams, *Renewal Theology*, I:43.

⁹⁰ Smith, "The Closing of the Book," 59.

⁹¹ Ellington, "Pentecostalism and the Authority of Scripture," 22.

⁹² Early in the Pentecostal Movement a Statement of Fundamental Truths was agreed upon, not as a creed, but, as reported at the time, "a basis of unity for a full gospel ministry"; see Donald Gee, *Wind and Flame* (Croydon, England: Assemblies of God Publishing House/Heath Press, 1967), 127f. McGee elaborates that this gathering of church leaders readily discarded the anticredal sentiments previously agreed on and drew "doctrinal boundaries to protect the integrity of the Church and welfare of the saints." See also Gary B. McGee, "Historical Background," in Stanley M. Horton (ed.), *Systematic Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective* (Springfield MO: Logion Press, 1994), 21f.

of the larger community and should be valued as such, and historical suspicion laid aside.⁹³ He seeks to place the Pentecostal concept of biblical authority in a relational and experiential setting within the community of faith, as opposed to the doctrinal setting usually favoured by Evangelicals. He leans towards the adoption of the Hebrew notion of *yada* or “knowing in active relationship” as a biblical mode for talking about knowledge of God.⁹⁴ This style proposed by Ellington, the *yada* model as he calls it, accords with Pentecostalism’s subjective nature and contests the objective basis of rationalism. Ellington contends that in relationships, subjectivism is both necessary and unavoidable and only negative when it becomes non-relational and self-serving. A valid Pentecostal theology may retain a relational approach, but must avoid the distortions of unmitigated subjectivism.

When discussing *Sola Scriptura*, the first hermeneutical principle, the importance of church history and writings of earlier theologians was noted. Attention was drawn to Cross’ assertion that truth is not private, but an operation of the Holy Spirit within the community of faith. The second Pentecostal principle, the pneumatic approach to the interpretation of Scripture, upholds a doctrine of continuing revelation, a non-cessationist attitude to supernatural giftings and a non-dispensational ecclesiology. The four components must be balanced: the individual, the Holy Spirit, the Scriptures and the community of faith. All these factors lead into the third hermeneutical principle. It is evident that in the process of reconciliation of theology and spirit, the academic community has already commenced the task of bridging the hermeneutical gap.

4. Biblical Revelation, not Self-revelation, in the Community of Faith

Mark Stibbe has briefly charted what he calls the betrothal of academic theology with Pentecostal spirituality, identifying three distinct phases since WWII which have progressively built up a profound relationship. The initial phase in the 1950s and 60s saw Pentecostal scholars restricted to academic writings devoid of Pentecostal emphases

⁹³ Ellington, “Pentecostalism and the Authority of Scripture,” 27f and n. 20.

⁹⁴ Ellington, “Pentecostalism and the Authority of Scripture,” 24f. ‘*Yada*’ as “knowing in active relationship” is a concept and terminology gleaned from Cheryl Bridges Johns in her book *Pentecostal Formation: A Pedagogy among the Oppressed* (JPTS, 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993). Ellington cites Johns as claiming “that it is in the process of ‘sharing our testimony’ that we confess our subjective preunderstanding and that we make our objective claim. Subjectivism is not denied, as is the case with some rationalist models, but rather expressly vocalized, so that it may then be evaluated within the equally subjective community of faith and in light of Scripture.” See Ellington, p. 28.

or perspectives. The Charismatic Movement⁹⁵ of the early 1970s saw the commencement of the second phase, with sociological and historical studies of the movement appearing. More recently, Pentecostal spirituality has found new scholarly focus in the third phase, in terms of critical research in all the theological sub-disciplines. Stibbe describes this as entirely new in the field of biblical studies.⁹⁶

In the first or post-WWII phase, Pentecostalism had by then spread to all stratas of society, and this social mobility fuelled the desire for better theological education within the movement. Bible colleges with courses oriented to biblical theology were set up to serve the movement, but it was not until 1955 that the first liberal arts degree was offered at Evangel College in Springfield Mo., the Assemblies of God (AOG) headquarters. Ten years later the distinctively Pentecostal Oral Roberts University was founded and began offering postgraduate degrees.⁹⁷ With increasing frequency Pentecostals considered contextualisation, authorial intent and historical-grammatical issues when interpreting Scripture.

A number of factors attributed to the second phase in Pentecostalism's reconciliation of theology and Spirit, which coincided with the Charismatic Renewal Movement. The phenomenal numerical growth of Pentecostals and charismatics worldwide led to a hunger for theological works related to the Holy Spirit. Charismatics, often known as neo-Pentecostals, are inclined to hold more liberal views than Classical Pentecostals, with some divergence from the hermeneutical methods of mainline Pentecostalism. Harrell considers the cross-pollination that occurred during the renewal movement of the 70s and 80s to have been a good thing.⁹⁸ He is convinced it was the Evangelical and

⁹⁵ The Charismatic Renewal of the late 1960s-70s displayed characteristics in its worship style which may have differed slightly from Classical Pentecostalism, but, as Gordon Anderson points out, "since these differences are not doctrinally substantive, all those who espouse a doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Spirit can be called Pentecostals." See Anderson, "Pentecostals Believe in More Than Tongues," 33, 54. Anderson's point should be qualified; it is valid where charismatics have left their previous denominations and formed new groups which could subsequently be termed neo-Pentecostal. It is not helpful to classify individual local churches from mainline denominations who have embraced a renewal philosophy under the blanket term Pentecostal (for example, charismatically inclined Anglicans or Baptists).

⁹⁶ Mark W.G. Stibbe, "The Theology of Renewal and the Renewal of Theology," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 3 (1993), 74-5.

⁹⁷ Vinson Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1997), 214. As Synan points out that early Pentecostals viewed liberal arts education with suspicion, a trend capable of cooling the revivalist ardour fundamental to the movement.

⁹⁸ Harrell is quite blunt in his reasoning for this: "Early Pentecostal theology was formulated by unsophisticated preachers who had a limited knowledge of historical Christian thought. Their theology of the Holy Spirit, with its emphasis on the 'initial evidence' of speaking in tongues, has been critiqued and

Catholic charismatics, embarrassed by certain Pentecostal extremists, who directed serious scholarship to the Holy Spirit, since that time effectively “grounding the Pentecostal experience in biblical scholarship and historical theology.”⁹⁹ As a result of these progressions, Harrell considers Pentecostalism to be a movement, only as concerns its common historical roots,¹⁰⁰ but such a claim appears exaggerated and difficult to test.

The infiltration of modern scholastic methods has been regarded with consternation by many Classical Pentecostal leaders who tend to look upon critical exposition as a threat to the vitality and freedom of traditional Pentecostalism. Contentious allegations have been made that the critical methods used by some Pentecostal scholars has created a virtually unbridgeable historical gulf between the experiences of modern-day and New Testament Christians.¹⁰¹ A situation in which the experiences described in the New Testament are considered so different from those of modern believers as to render them irrelevant is not readily reconciled with Pentecostalism’s non-dispensational ecclesiology. On the other hand, the publication in 1984 of Roger Stronstad’s book *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* with its openly charismatic viewpoint was considered a turning point, alerting many scholars to the growth of intellectually convincing Pentecostal theology.

The third and latest phase in Pentecostalism’s shift to a more academic stance may be linked to the worldview shift witnessed in the West, which is no longer as hostile to the supernatural as it was under the influence of the Enlightenment. With the deconstruction of scientific rationalism, postmodern thinking facilitates stories which involve the miraculous, a perspective which Stibbe terms a hermeneutic of faith.¹⁰²

A paradigm shift has occurred in Pentecostalism. At this point it will be helpful to focus briefly on some aspects of how Protestants have dealt historically with the need to change as a reflection of contemporary circumstances, and what Pentecostals can learn from the past.

discarded by a generation of charismatics, and by many second- and third-generation Pentecostals.” See “Foreword,” in *Pentecostals From The Inside Out*, 12.

⁹⁹ Harrell, “Foreword,” in *Pentecostals From The Inside Out*, 13.

¹⁰⁰ Harrell, “Foreword,” in *Pentecostals From The Inside Out*, 13.

¹⁰¹ Hey, “Changing Roles of Pentecostal Hermeneutics,” 212.

¹⁰² Stibbe, “The Theology of Renewal and the Renewal of Theology,” 78.

a. *Theologies of Retrieval*

The era of Protestant orthodoxy, during the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, was the time when their theology, with its exegetical insights, doctrine, apologetics, philosophy and methodology, was being structured both positively and negatively against the more distant medieval background and against Renaissance ideas. Richard Muller points to the late-sixteenth-century Reformed theologians as setting “the form of Protestant doctrinal systems in a fullness and detail available nowhere else.”¹⁰³ In the move from exegesis to doctrinal statement, the Reformers accompanied virtually all of their doctrinal formulations with an array of Scripture citations. Close examination of biblical commentaries of the times indicates usage of the best exegetical methods of the age and close cooperation between theologian and exegete. Scripture was affirmed as the final norm or theology, not merely by the citation of biblical texts but through “detailed exegesis in the original languages of Scripture as the basis for doctrinal formulation.”¹⁰⁴

The Reformers made clear distinction between the universal church (for which they utilised the term catholic)¹⁰⁵ and the hierarchy in Rome of their day, due to their disagreement with various doctrinal interpretations. On the assumption that their own brand of faith continued to stand within the historic catholic church, the Reformers believed that the best of tradition could rightly be appropriated. Scripture was the single absolute standard for theology, early Christian writings forming a secondary guide only, which still had to be considered against biblical exegesis.¹⁰⁶ In Muller’s words, Reformed orthodoxy was “the theology of a living church and not merely a carbon copy of the thought of the Reformers.”¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ Richard A. Muller, “Sources of Reformed Orthodoxy: The Symmetrical Unity of Exegesis and Synthesis,” in Michael S. Horton (ed.), *A Confessing Theology for Postmodern Times* (Wheaton IL: Crossway Books, 2000), 44. Muller puts it well: “Simply stated, the Reformed orthodox theology of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is far too rich and variegated in its sources and in its use of those sources to oblige the rather simplistic claims of the modern theological critics – namely, that it is dry, rigid, dead, deductive, speculative, metaphysical, decretal, predestinarian, legalistic, Aristotelian, biblicistic, proof-texting, rationalistic, and philosophical...” and certainly cannot be all these things at the same time! Indeed, says Muller, “the era of orthodoxy was a time of great exegetical, textual, and linguistic development in Protestantism...responsible for the major monuments of biblical scholarship.” (See also Muller, “Sources of Reformed Orthodoxy,” 45 and 46).

¹⁰⁴ Muller, “Sources of Reformed Orthodoxy,” 48.

¹⁰⁵ Generally, use of the term “catholic” in lowercase signifies it is synonymous with the expression “universal” to avoid confusion with the Catholic [Roman] Church.

¹⁰⁶ Muller, “Sources of Reformed Orthodoxy,” 51.

¹⁰⁷ Muller, “Sources of Reformed Orthodoxy,” 52.

After the Protestant Reformation, seventeenth-century pietists and rationalists argued for a return to a solely Bible-based theology distinct from complex ecclesiastical dogma. Consequently, as Arand observes, the biblical studies of modernity were conducted in the precincts of universities, detached from ecclesial perspectives.¹⁰⁸ Thus the rise of biblical theology (as a discrete field) was a simultaneous development, an alternative to the dogmatic/doctrinal theology produced by the church.

In recent times, an emerging ecumenism has been observed amongst confessing Evangelicals who are dedicated, says Michael Horton, to recovering the practice of systematic theology in a postmodern context.¹⁰⁹ As part of the search for consensual Christianity, the conversation between biblical theology and church dogma is the basis for renewed interest in historic or classical Christianity. Charles Arand has noted of this trend that “These theologians know that the present, without a past memory and tradition, is self-illusory and finally destructive.”¹¹⁰ Picking up on the terminology theologies of retrieval, Arand is in agreement with Horton’s view that preserving a Christian distinctive and finding a Christian harmony is the point to retrieving the resources of historic Christianity.¹¹¹ Because hermeneutics are chiefly occupied with internal cohesion, open sharing of convictions allows both unity and diversity within the ecclesiastical community, without necessarily sacrificing denominational distinctives. The pursuit of what Horton terms, a critical-constructive path enhances this.¹¹²

As Arand suggests, the first step for any denomination is to engage in the retrieval of its own theological heritage. He sees such back-tracking and correlation as necessary for two reasons, first, that the Protestant Reformers continually maintained their position was that of the orthodox ancient church, and cited the Church Fathers, as evidence they were saying nothing new. It is true that by the time the Reformation had become a popular movement (about 1521), Luther’s teachings were considered heretical by the Pope.¹¹³ In addition, the multiplicity of Reformers had led to diversity theological positions within the movement. Nevertheless, theologically, the Protestant Reformers confessed belief in the three ancient creeds and never questioned either the Trinitarian affirmation or the

¹⁰⁸ Arand, “The Church’s Dogma and Biblical Theology,” 15.

¹⁰⁹ Michael S. Horton (ed.), *A Confessing Theology for Postmodern Times* (Wheaton IL: Crossway Books, 2000), 10.

¹¹⁰ Arand, “The Church’s Dogma and Biblical Theology,” 23.

¹¹¹ Arand, “The Church’s Dogma and Biblical Theology,” 23.

¹¹² Horton, *A Confessing Theology for Postmodern Times*, 11.

¹¹³ Hans J. Hillerbrand, “Introduction” in Hillerbrand, Hans J. (ed.) *The Protestant Reformation*. (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968), xiv, xv.

christological definitions of the early church.¹¹⁴ They did, however, promulgate a fresh understanding of the New Testament, in which regard Hans Hillerbrand comments that “while this understanding had connections with the theological tradition of the Fathers, especially St. Augustine, it can justly be called new.”¹¹⁵ Alister McGrath clarifies that the Reformers attributed differences between their doctrine of grace and that of Augustine to the superior textual and philological methods to which they now had access, but which were unavailable in the patristic era.¹¹⁶ Arand’s second reason is based on the proposition that there is an increasing necessity for the present-day church to “define itself over against non-Christian religious options rather than ... other Christian traditions.”¹¹⁷ In his mind, this not only raises the question, ‘What is Christian?’ but also challenges groups professing Christianity to show overtly their stance within historic Christian tradition.

A corrective view has recently arisen amongst biblical hermeneuticians, that the Bible was a book written from within the church and for the church. This has brought with it the concomitant recognition that church members are to be taught the presuppositions and goals of the Scriptures, in order to appropriate them for themselves.¹¹⁸ An

¹¹⁴ Hillerbrand, “Introduction,” xxif. As Hillerbrand notes, common ground existed between the old and the new church, thus the Reformers “thought themselves in the authentic Catholic tradition from which, they argued, the papal church had departed.”

¹¹⁵ Hillerbrand, “Introduction,” xxii. The writings of Augustine of Hippo were particularly favoured by the Reformers, and McGrath writes of how “Luther drew heavily upon Scripture and the Fathers, supremely Augustine.” See Alister E. McGrath. *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*. (3rd Ed.) (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 13, 60. McGrath briefly discusses the Wittenberg reformer’s use of “an explicitly theological criterion in evaluating the Fathers: how reliable were they as interpreters of the New Testament?” See p. 61f. For examples of Luther’s engagement with Augustine on various issues, e.g. Luther’s understanding of the phrase “the righteousness of God” and his theology of the cross, see *Luther’s Works*, (55 vols.; St.Louis:Concordia/Philadelphia: Fortress, 1955-75), Volume 34: 336-338. Despite the limitations of his judgements coming under recent scholarly scrutiny, (for a discussion on this see Heiko A. Oberman. *The Reformation: Roots and Ramifications*. Trans. Andrew Colin Gow. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1994.) more than any other reformer, Melanchthon is recognised as having probed the writings of the Church Fathers in order to compile their testimonies as historical evidence of the reformation’s orthodoxy; see P. Fraenkel, *Testimonia Partum. The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon*. (Geneva, 1961), esp. 52-109. Melanchthon asserts in “Apology for the Augsburg Confession (1531)” [ArticleIV. Justification] that “We have proof for this position of ours not only in the Scriptures, but also in the Fathers. Against the Pelagians, Augustine maintains at length that grace is not given because of our merits.” Melanchthon then offers a direct quote from Augustine’s *Nature and Grace*, see Denis R. Janz, (ed.), *A Reformation Reader: Primary Texts with Introductions* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 141f. John Calvin was of the second generation of reformers. Similarly, numerous examples of Calvin’s familiarity with the writings of the Fathers are found throughout his writings. For a specific example, Calvin cites an admonition of Augustine’s in his debate on the False and True Church, see “The External Means or Aims by Which God Invites Us into the Society of Christ and Holds Us Therein,” Book IV:3 in Janz, *A Reformation Reader*, 272. Janz, pages 226-282 are published with permission from *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion*. 2 vols. (Library of Christian Classics). J.T. McNeill, (ed.) and F.L. Battles (trans). Philadelphia: Westminster, 1955.

¹¹⁶ McGrath. *Reformation Thought*, 143.

¹¹⁷ Arand, “The Church’s Dogma and Biblical Theology,” 24.

¹¹⁸ Arand, “The Church’s Dogma and Biblical Theology,” 16f.

opportunity thus arises for fresh interaction between dogmatic and biblical theology. Arand is adamant such studies are a necessary basis for any new biblical theology.¹¹⁹ In this regard, he puts forward various items from historic dogmatic theology that he sees as bringing worth to this venture. First, a framework of interpretational guidance to the church is set (the rule of faith or *regula fidei* of Irenaeus and Tertullian) and secondly, the entire sweep of Scripture (thus Athanasius) in its goal and purpose is drawn upon in the development of sound doctrine. Hence “the ancient orthodox church’s dogma provides a hermeneutical guide for reading Scripture in a theologically orthodox way” and tacitly includes a guard against “the repetition of rejected heresies.”¹²⁰

Biblical scholars aimed to free interpretation of the Bible from what they saw as the shackles of church and dogma. Inevitably this made way for a different set of presuppositions (e.g. the antisupernaturalism of Bultmann) to be imposed on biblical interpretation. It is here, in the examination of such assumptions, that dogmatics present the greatest challenge to biblical scholarship. Additionally, biblical studies sharply distinguished between Old Testament and New Testament theology and between the theologies of individual authors. Dogmatics again presents a challenge, on the premise of there being an overall theological unity, despite the identification of assorted theological stances. “Exegesis (mapmaking) will remain an ongoing activity that continually yields new and helpful insights”¹²¹ but dogma provides the unalterable boundaries that form the line of what is heretical, and were settled on for the very reason that such theology has been proposed before and found wanting by the insights of the church accumulated over a period of centuries.

In a *milieu* of cultural pluralism, some Christian leaders are talking in terms of Christianity rapidly reaching a post-denominational phase. This is a concern of Lutheran scholar J.A.O. Preus, because in his estimation, Christians are becoming increasingly eclectic in their religion, and identifying less with their denominational tradition or theological position. Contrary to popular opinion, he insists the matter of church identity is vitally important, because, when we are robbed of our past, the shape of the present is affected by depriving it of some of its purpose, inevitably affecting the future as well.¹²²

¹¹⁹ Arand, “The Church’s Dogma and Biblical Theology,” 17.

¹²⁰ Arand, “The Church’s Dogma and Biblical Theology,” 18.

¹²¹ Arand, “The Church’s Dogma and Biblical Theology,” 22f.

¹²² J.A.O. Preus III, “Sources of Lutheran Dogmatics: Addressing Contemporary Issues with the Historic Christian Faith,” in Michael S. Horton (ed.), *A Confessing Theology for Postmodern Times* (Wheaton IL: Crossway Books, 2000), 30.

A denomination's confessional heritage (whether creed or dogma) shapes not only its worship, but essentially its mission.

Preus, commenting on trends in biblical studies which appear to be rapidly dispensing with the old-style historical-critical method, sees the way forward for those within the confessional tradition as requiring a commitment to serious biblical theology. The period during which they defined themselves largely in opposition to liberal biblical critics is waning. The need now is to reassess themselves in terms of their traditional forms of worship. For example, Preus identifies abroad in his own Lutheran denomination an anti-sacramental mentality, foreign to Lutheran theology. This he sees as highlighting the crucial nature of re-evaluation, not least because of the a-historical tendencies of postmodernism regarding the nature of reality and historical texts. Preus' conservative position guards against any suggestion that biblical texts do not have their own meaning outside of that brought to the text by the individual reader.¹²³ Preus does not appear to be in favour of postmodern methods, but he makes an important point by drawing attention to eclectic trends in modern Christianity, and the inherent dangers these trends present to individual faith traditions maintaining pure theology. This issue will be considered in Chapter Three below.

This brief glance at the methods used by the Protestant Reformers, shows how a critical-constructive path may be pursued which allows for a living theology with contemporary relevance, while maintaining orthodoxy through an interpretational framework. Next we should consider the efforts of scholars closer to the Pentecostal Movement.

Undeniably, Barth and Brunner, neo-orthodoxy's foremost proponents, recognised the need to bridge the hermeneutical gap between exegesis and experience. This requirement, though currently the source of much discussion among contemporary Pentecostal academics, is therefore not new. In a book of Pentecostal doctrines published in the mid-1970s, G.W. Gilpin taught that Pentecostals should not begin with their experience and see how it fitted into what the Bible said, but should first enquire what the Bible taught and fall into line with those requirements in order (using typical Pentecostal terminology) "to inherit its blessings." In his opinion, the opposite method of biblical

¹²³ Preus III, "Sources of Lutheran Dogmatics," 36.

interpretation, which took experience as the key and standard then went to the Bible to interpret it, was “the great error of liberal thought and neo-orthodoxy.”¹²⁴

During the Charismatic Renewal, some thirty years ago, Francis Martin’s efforts to relate certain aspects of Pauline teaching on *soma*, address this issue. Writing from within the Catholic Renewal Movement, Martin was firmly convinced the renewal movement provided an ideal setting for “the cultivation and modification of hermeneutical methods precisely because it is a faith experience.”¹²⁵ It was evident to Martin that a disparity existed between the results of exegesis, (which is anchored to context) and the actual experience of pious people.¹²⁶ He considered the Church was faced with “not a crisis of exegesis, but a crisis of faith”¹²⁷ which carried with it pastoral responsibility. His intention was to seek the meaning of faith experience in light of normative New Testament prophetic teaching in conjunction with Pauline anthropology.

The basic paradigm of modern exegesis with its referential disciplines interprets the text within its textual, philological, historical, cultural, literary, and theological *milieux*. Martin’s study does not deny the validity of exegetical method, but sees difficulties coming into play when the shift is made from referential exegesis (the environment of the text) to referential hermeneutics (the contemporary environment).¹²⁸ Martin makes a valuable point: “Because exegesis purports to be the interpretation of a message composed in one horizon and received in another, exegesis itself ought to be seen as being hermeneutic.”¹²⁹ To achieve coalescence between these two horizons there needed to be a defined principle of continuity. Lack of some connection with tradition results in understanding becoming blurred if not completely lost, but on the other hand, as Martin puts it,

¹²⁴ Gilpin, “The Inspiration of the Bible,” 133f.

¹²⁵ Francis Martin, “The Charismatic Renewal and Biblical Hermeneutics,” in John C. Haughey, S.J. (ed.), *Theological Reflections on the Charismatic Renewal: Proceedings of the Chicago Conference October 1-2, 1976* (Ann Arbor MI: Servant Books, 1978), 1.

¹²⁶ Martin, “Charismatic Renewal and Biblical Hermeneutics,” 1.

¹²⁷ Martin, “Charismatic Renewal and Biblical Hermeneutics,” 2.

¹²⁸ Martin enumerates previous contributions: “The modern statement of this problem was elaborated, as is well known, by Delithey and Hegel; in this century, efforts to come to grips with this challenge are associated with names such as Bultmann, Fuchs, Ebeling, Robinson, and, in a larger context, those of Heidegger, Lonergan, and especially Ricoeur and Gadamer.” See “Charismatic Renewal and Biblical Hermeneutics,” 3.

¹²⁹ Martin, “Charismatic Renewal and Biblical Hermeneutics,” 3.

The rupture in “tradition” offered by prophetic interpretation of that tradition comes about because the principle of continuity has become the principle of conformity. In this sense, all narrow conservatism is, at its root, a lack of faith.¹³⁰

Acknowledging past efforts to elaborate on the nature of the principle of continuity,¹³¹ Martin believes that these attempts sought to go beyond referential interpretation to achieve a correct hermeneutical role in reconciling the message of the text with a modern audience. More importantly, the historical disciplines continue to have a singular function in guaranteeing positive awareness and respect for the original textual viewpoint. However, simply describing what the text is saying in phenomenological terms does not go far enough in relaying meaning, and it is here Martin sees the charismatic renewal playing its part as a faith experience, by facilitating the merging of the New Testament authors’ scope with that of the modern reader.¹³²

Martin uses as an illustration Juan Luis Segundo’s work *The Liberation of Theology*.¹³³ He notes that a basic methodology for Liberation theology was built on discrepancies between real life in Latin America and the ideals of the dignity of man being sought. For a believer like Segundo, the way in which Scripture was read was essentially a faith experience.¹³⁴ Martin is not suggesting that the lack of exegesis in the treatment of Scripture is acceptable. He believes the historical disciplines maintain a balanced perspective, important in spite of inadequate access to scientific tools. His point is that the rationale behind the seeking of a new hermeneutic in Liberation theology can be mirrored. He perceives that an exegetical suspicion has been generated by the charismatic-faith-experience in the attempt to rehear the word of God, and it is necessary that a methodology be found to apply biblical data to address the questions raised.

It is crucial in constructing a new hermeneutic that appropriate rules are observed. If such is not the case and the application of data is unrestricted, the hazard becomes that the word of God may be forced into a horizon not respecting that of its original

¹³⁰ Martin, “Charismatic Renewal and Biblical Hermeneutics,” 31 n.12.

¹³¹ Particularly in New Testament exegesis, Martin notes as examples Bultmann, Fuchs and Ebeling.

¹³² Martin, “Charismatic Renewal and Biblical Hermeneutics,” 4.

¹³³ See Juan Luis Segundo, *The Liberation of Theology* (New York: Orbis, 1976), 9.

¹³⁴ Martin, “Charismatic Renewal and Biblical Hermeneutics,” 5. He continues, “There are other faith experiences as well, both modern and ancient, which have provided the basis for ‘ideological suspicion’ of the status quo. Regardless of whether or not they were professional theologians, all the saints achieved an ‘interpretation by sympathy,’ since they were reading the sacred text ‘in the spirit in which it was written.’ Not all of these interpretations were genuine exegeses, however. Concentrating as they did on the text as ‘means’ rather than ‘object,’ our predecessors often ignored what I have called the ‘referential’ aspect of exegesis.”

transmitters. Martin warns against the methodological error of plundering the Bible for proof texts, whether in the name of objective exegesis or subjective hermeneutics, when the real goal is to seek a coalescence of interpretive horizons.¹³⁵ Pentecostalism's pneumatic approach to reading Scripture does allow for multiple dimensions of meaning. Generally, the practice is one of interpreting the Bible as applying directly to the immediate context.¹³⁶ However, notwithstanding their distinctive pneumatology, Pentecostalism's overall doctrinal position (particularly its Christology) is consistent with evangelical Christianity. Archer believes this "produced a stabilization and limitation to the multiple dimensions of meaning."¹³⁷

In the search for new modes suitable to the needs of Pentecostalism, we must now go beyond theological issues to look briefly at how literary criticism has impacted biblical studies and how reader-oriented postmodern perspectives suit Pentecostalism's hermeneutical stance.

b. *Reader-Oriented Postmodern Perspective*

Some of the newer literary methodologies, such as narrative criticism and reader oriented perspectives, have attracted attention amongst Pentecostals and charismatics. Sam Hey attributes the failure of historical-critical methods to satisfy the needs of Pentecostal communities as the reason other methodologies are being sought to support Pentecostal beliefs.¹³⁸ What has become apparent is that certain similarities between Pentecostal and Charismatic approaches to the Bible and these newer methods are allowing renewal theological perspectives more room to develop.¹³⁹ Hey believes there is growing perception that the continuity of traditional Pentecostalism is more sustainable with

¹³⁵ Martin, "Charismatic Renewal and Biblical Hermeneutics," 7. Within the hermeneutical circle Martin has under discussion in his article, he observes James Cone's failure to complete all the steps in the process of constructing such a circle. As a result, Martin maintains that Cone's study is not "a true *biblical* hermeneutics [sic]." He writes: "The difficulty I have expressed refers to the functioning of this approach, not its basis. We are speaking of a circular *process* [emphasis his] when we speak of the hermeneutical circle: it is a delicate and reciprocal activity by which two faith experiences stimulate, modify, and shed light on one another. The process begins with a faith judgement – I would say a prophetic judgement – regarding contemporary experience; endowed with this horizon, we must seek enlightenment, modification, and confirmation in the word of God; and this in turn more sharply focuses our faith understanding of what we experience. Unless the process is reciprocal, the result is either an irrelevant exercise in textual analysis or an arbitrary consultation of the sources of revelation exclusively in the light of immediate preoccupations." See "Charismatic Renewal and Biblical Hermeneutics," 7f.

¹³⁶ Archer, "Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Retrospect and Prospect," 65.

¹³⁷ Archer, "Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Retrospect and Prospect," 68.

¹³⁸ Hey, "Changing Roles of Pentecostal Hermeneutics," 212.

¹³⁹ Stibbe, "The Theology of Renewal and the Renewal of Theology," 78.

postmodern modes than with historical-critical methods. Theoretically, hermeneutical solutions may validly be sought in postmodern methods, because in common Pentecostalism, emphasis is on “immediacy of the text and multiple dimensions of meaning.”¹⁴⁰

Whilst postmodernists may recognise the limitations of reason and rationalism, modernity has not been completely shrugged off, and the core remains essentially pro-critical. Hey points out that Paul Ricoeur’s methodology has shown that “objectivity and subjectivity need not be considered as opposites, but as two aspects of the one paradigm.”¹⁴¹ Ricoeur combines historical-critical methods with a self-critical acknowledgment of multiple interpretations.¹⁴² In his analysis of Ricoeur’s method, Byrd writes affirmingly of how this approach allows the application of the Bible’s message by the interpreting community to contemporary needs, challenges reader awareness of projecting their own views into the text so as to balance the creative and the analytical, and promotes awareness of the range of meanings possible to different reading communities because of the creative effect of symbols, metaphors and narratives on succeeding generations of readers.¹⁴³ This last aspect alone, Hey considers, ought to positively influence subsequent reading communities in acknowledging the ways beliefs alter and in bringing greater tolerance for different interpretations.¹⁴⁴

Literary criticism was built on concepts well utilised in the study of other literature but for the majority of the twentieth century, literary analysis of the Bible was not usual.¹⁴⁵ In fact as recently as 1990 it was still considered relatively new. Literary criticism relies on the reading or hearing of the text and no methodology in the field of biblical criticism presents an obstacle to this, as Mark Powell shows. His concise enumeration of the major differences between literary criticism and historical criticism¹⁴⁶ focuses on

¹⁴⁰ Hey, “Changing Roles of Pentecostal Hermeneutics,” 216.

¹⁴¹ Hey, “Changing Roles of Pentecostal Hermeneutics,” 214f.

¹⁴² J. Byrd, “Paul Ricoeur’s Hermeneutical Theory and Pentecostal Proclamation,” *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 15:2 (Fall 1993), 211.

¹⁴³ Byrd, “Paul Ricoeur’s Hermeneutical Theory and Pentecostal Proclamation,” 211.

¹⁴⁴ Hey, “Changing Roles of Pentecostal Hermeneutics,” 215.

¹⁴⁵ Mark Allan Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis MN: Fortress Press, 1990), 1.

¹⁴⁶ Powell sets the scene to explain these differences: “The relationship between modern literary approaches to the Bible and traditional historical-critical methodology is somewhat ambiguous. On the one hand, the literary approaches may be viewed as logical developments within and extensions of form and redaction criticism. On the other hand, these newer literary approaches incorporate concepts derived from movements in secular literary criticism that repudiate the significance of historical investigation for the interpretation of texts.” See, *What is Narrative Criticism?*, 6f.

developments in biblical studies from the four main perspectives argued by literary critics (as clarified by Powell),¹⁴⁷ in that literary criticism:

- i. *Focuses on the finished form of the text.*¹⁴⁸
- ii. *Emphasises the unity of the text as a whole.* Individual passages are to be interpreted in terms of their contribution to the story as a whole.
- iii. *Views the text as an end in itself.* The immediate goal of understanding the narrative accepts that any insight acquired will be found “in the encounter of the reader with the text itself...apart from consideration of the extent to which it reflects reality.”¹⁴⁹
- iv. *May be based on communication models of speech-act theory.*

Powell makes clear that literary criticism is not about questioning the legitimacy of historical inquiry, but rather focuses on the text as literature. When the task is related to Scripture, it begins without presuppositions of the biblical text as either absolutely historical or as a collection of unscientific myths.¹⁵⁰

Roman Jakobson’s model of “every act of communication” is proposed as one of the most simple, yet most profound,¹⁵¹ and is illustrated schematically as follows:

Author -----→ Text -----→ Reader

This horizontal model differs radically from the historical-critical evolutionary vertical model, diagrammed thus:

¹⁴⁷ Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?*, 7-8.

¹⁴⁸ Powell observes this is also true of *canonical criticism*, but in some respects the latter approach continues to investigate the usual historical issues. See, *What is Narrative Criticism?*, fn 28, 7.

¹⁴⁹ Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?*, 7f; contra Preus, noted previously.

¹⁵⁰ Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?*, 7.

¹⁵¹ Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?*, 9. Powell draws attention to the fact that different schools of thought exist regarding the precise way the components are thought to interact, but that all literary theories “understand the text as a form of communication through which a message is passed from the author to the reader.”



The philosophical bases of two such differing models will obviously produce contrasting, but not necessarily contradictory insights, so there is potential for distinct but complementary use of the two models.¹⁵² Of the four most dominant forms of literary criticism (author-centred, reader-centred, text-centred and mimetic critique of reflected truth) the first three types correspond to the communication model, whilst the fourth is designated as evolutionary. Reader-response criticism tends to keep in focus all three elements of literary criticism, namely, author, story (or text) and reader.

In biblical studies two main factors are considered to shape a reader's responses - reader *over* the text and reader *with* the text, both of which are pragmatic approaches. The emphasis of reader *over* the text faces the danger of leaving the meaning largely subjective, lack of constraint ultimately spelling lack of authority, a position which conservative scholars believe must be avoided.

The most significant criterion by which various interpretations may be judged as misreadings has already been suggested by Stanley Fish, that of interpretive communities. These he defines as preexistent to critical consensus.¹⁵³ He describes one style of 'reader *with* the text' in which no lone reading of a given text is the right one because the consensus which occurs within the interpretive community centres on the reading strategy. This is the agreed rule by which readings may be judged as acceptable or out of accord.¹⁵⁴ There is more than one model for interaction of text and reader. Fish's example is a sequential line-by-line reading, but the common purpose is to seek consistency. This factor functions as an inbuilt restriction against unsustainable

¹⁵² Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?*, 10.

¹⁵³ Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?*, 17.

¹⁵⁴ Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?*, 17.

interpretations, balanced against the creative role of the reader who subjectively fills in gaps or undefined elements in the text.¹⁵⁵

The reader-oriented perspective postmodernism has brought to literary criticism is related to a reader's attitudes, values and responses to the information obtained by the process of approaching the text. This does not make the reader autonomous; rather reader and text are interdependent.

Critical scholars approach the text presupposing their own objectivity and disinterest in the expectation of acquiring provable information by utilising various scientific approaches. A radical reader-oriented criticism, according to Edgar McKnight, challenges that assumption.¹⁵⁶ He does not suggest returning to a precritical or uncritical view, but rather to be postcritical by remaining in dialogue with modernist assumptions in a relativised approach.¹⁵⁷ In proposing a reader-oriented postmodern use of the Bible, McKnight speaks of focusing biblical study and theological construction via metacritical schemata (not foundations).¹⁵⁸ In the new situation, some might emphasise contextual contingency and historical situatedness, others explanatory systems.

Reader-response can have two significant effects: (i) it may enlarge the reader's horizon, that is, be a transforming event; and/or (ii) engender the development of a new hermeneutic (ideally, as McKnight sees it, in conjunction with the interdisciplinary studies which have been developing over the last two decades). Transforming biblical reading or engagement with the text is one anticipated effect of hermeneutical inquiry. Postcritical attentiveness to the effect differing worldviews have on the way things are perceived leads to the adoption of a metacritical level of reflection to force a new awareness on Bible reading.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁵ Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?*, 18.

¹⁵⁶ Edgar V. McKnight, "A Defense of a Postmodern Use of the Bible," in Michael S. Horton (ed.), *A Confessing Theology for Postmodern Times* (Wheaton IL: Crossway Books, 2000), 68.

¹⁵⁷ McKnight, "A Defense of a Postmodern Use of the Bible," 69. McKnight recommends that, alongside methodological studies which attempt to explain historical data, it should be emphasised that such studies do not and cannot comprise "the gatekeeper of all truth."

¹⁵⁸ McKnight, "A Defense of a Postmodern Use of the Bible," 68.

¹⁵⁹ McKnight, "A Defense of a Postmodern Use of the Bible," 71. It is from Thiselton that McKnight embraces the concept that "a metacritical level of reflection accompanies the transformation of biblical reading" (see p. 70).

McKnight advocates a poetic and sectarian approach, one that “attempts to correlate the local and universal, the time bound and the timeless.”¹⁶⁰ His use of the term sectarian is reference to the Radical Reformation in the mid-sixteenth century,¹⁶¹ as compared with prevailing Catholic and Protestant theologies. Admitting that he is using overly simplistic terms, McKnight contrasts, on the one hand, the Roman Catholic reading of the Bible, “constrained by the church as a known, extrinsic institution,” together with the Protestant reading, “constrained by particular doctrines that served as foundational beginning and ending points,” over against that of the radical reformers. The latter, although they were also concerned with both church and doctrine, saw themselves as ‘church’ in a way that influenced their reading of the Bible and their view of doctrine. Their existence as ‘church’ had great immediacy for them, which, when held in tension with an awareness of themselves as “the primitive *and* the eschatological community,” (as McKnight notes) lent the Bible contemporary, not simply historical, relevance.¹⁶²

In the postmodern model inspired by the radical reformers that McKnight proposes, doctrine essentially remains the bridge between the beliefs and practices of likeminded groups who see their role in terms of primitive and eschatological community. “The reading of Scripture has to do with faith and practice, and that faith and practice have essentially to do with mission, liberty, discipleship, and community.”¹⁶³ Certainly this is dissimilar to the critical approach which aims to produce quite different results.

Now to sum up McKnight’s two approaches, the sectarian and the poetic. In the sectarian approach, insights gained from Bible reading impinge on practice, but are coloured by a tentative or provisional quality allowing for correction as a result of further Bible reading and insight. The church should not remain static, but continue to “grow in grace and the knowledge of God” (2 Pet 3:18), for the end is not yet. The poetic

¹⁶⁰ McKnight, “A Defense of a Postmodern Use of the Bible,” 73.

¹⁶¹ The Anabaptists, a loose grouping of movements, were the radical element in the Protestant Reformation. Initially disciples of the Reformer Zwingli, they split from the Zürich community in 1525, becoming the first free church of modern times. They were fiercely persecuted by both Protestant and Catholic authorities, climaxing in the Münster rebellion in 1534. Anabaptist beliefs about the nature of the church were very distinctive, subject to primitivism, and, in deciding matters of doctrine, Scripture was interpreted by the consensus of the local gathering. See John. H. Yoder and Alan Kreider, “The Anabaptists,” in Tim Dowley (ed.), *The History of Christianity* (Oxford UK: Lion Publishing, 1990), 401-405. For primary sources of Anabaptist writings, see *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers (Library of Christian Classics)* edited by George H. Williams and Angel M. Mergal (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957); also *Early Anabaptist Spirituality: Selected Writings* edited and translated by Daniel Liechty (New York: Paulist Press, 1994).

¹⁶² In this, says McKnight, they might be likened to the Qumran community who read the Bible as referring to them and their lives in the present. See “A Defense of a Postmodern Use of the Bible,” 74.

¹⁶³ McKnight, “A Defense of a Postmodern Use of the Bible,” 74.

perspective as advocated by McKnight, though seemingly foreign to the modern scientific approach, recognises the creative contribution readers must make: “Contemporary readers are not engaging in a foreign practice. They are recapitulating the creative activities of the early evangelists.”¹⁶⁴

Certain merits for adopting a postcritical approach have already been mentioned, but this needs some clarification for it is becoming increasingly popular amongst a broad spectrum of Christian and Jewish thinkers.¹⁶⁵ Also known as postliberalism, narrative theology or Yale theology, it emphasises biblical realism or the plain sense in reading Scripture.¹⁶⁶ From a Pentecostal viewpoint this cannot but meet with approval. Not surprisingly, it is at the same time inevitably accused of fideism (or irrationalism) and historical insensitivity by liberal scholars.¹⁶⁷

These scholars have in common their acceptance that the way certain traditions practise hermeneutics will lead to an understanding of the intent of the text which is apparent only within the individual tradition-believing communities. Nevertheless, the intention of postcritical scholars is to avoid the errors of reductionism and interpret the plain sense of the Scriptural narrative for a normative community of Christian interpreters in a manner that stands up to critical investigation and the rule of faith.¹⁶⁸ The disciplined practice of philosophical, historical and textual/rhetorical criticism is not rejected as the means by which these dimensions may be clarified.¹⁶⁹ Valuable rules of reasoning continue to be utilised in theoretical debate and as such, biblical traditions are not considered irrational, rather postcritical rules of action are utilised to interpret not only the traditions themselves, but their primary texts (Scriptures). The postcritical rules emerging are built

¹⁶⁴ McKnight, “A Defense of a Postmodern Use of the Bible,” 74.

¹⁶⁵ Ochs makes clear that the scholars contributing to the volume he edited do not necessarily consider their work as part of any larger (postcritical) movement. See Peter Ochs, *The Return to Scripture in Judaism and Christianity. Essays in Postcritical Scriptural Interpretation* (Muhwah NJ: Paulist Press, 1993), 5.

¹⁶⁶ James Callahan, “The Bible Says: Evangelical and Postliberal Biblicism,” *Theology Today*, Vol.53, No. 4 (Jan, 1997), 4449f.

¹⁶⁷ See Maurice F. Wiles, “Scriptural Authority and Theological Construction: The Limitations of Narrative Interpretation,” in Garrett Green (ed.), *Scriptural Authority and Narrative Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 42-58; also David J. Bryant, “Christian Identity and Historical Change: Postliberals and Historicity,” *The Journal of Religion* 73 (January, 1993), 31-41.

¹⁶⁸ Ochs, *Return to Scripture in Judaism and Christianity*, 3-4. He explains that “Unlike strictly modernist interpreters, they thereby practise what the semiotic philosopher Charles Peirce [sic] would call a three-part hermeneutic: claiming that the *text* (the first part) has its *meaning* (the second) *for a normative community* (the third), rather than identifying the meaning of the text for some historical or cognitive “sense” that is available to any educated reader.”

¹⁶⁹ Ochs, *Return to Scripture in Judaism and Christianity*, 3.

on dialogue between premodernity and postmodernity.¹⁷⁰ This means of leading the church back and forward by admitting to a consensual manner of reading the Bible is viewed as a characteristic of postliberalism.¹⁷¹

The postcritical method makes a case that questions of truth must be dealt with only by means of the exegetical practices of a normative community (that for which Scripture reading enjoins certain meaningful rules of conduct) which do not maintain *a priori* stances regarding the differing assertions of other normative communities. Callahan, in dubbing these new paradigms postliberal biblicism, evidently distances himself from this attitude.¹⁷² The point is to promote dialogue among those of other traditions regarding their Scriptural practices and theoretical structures. By establishing a common language of discourse, textual sources may be shared and mutual practice and layers of meaning examined. In particular, many postcritical Christian scholars have a specific interest in the exegetical practices of rabbinic Judaism, seeing the midrashic method as a classic model for their own developing exegetical methods.¹⁷³

An intratextual approach to reading and interpreting the Bible by the normative community means coming to an understanding within a system of literary signs. The Bible is to be held, not as an external reality, but a reality in itself whose text is meaningful in the whole biblical context and in relation to the [postcritical] interpretive community.¹⁷⁴ The literal sense is that which the community of readers takes to be the plain, primary and controlling signification of a text. Postliberals include both the historical and contemporary Christian community in interpreting the Bible, their concern being that access to Scripture by both the individual and the community be unitive, not individualistic and divisive.

¹⁷⁰ Ochs recounts various interpretive methods from scholars considered leaders in the postcritical approach, (e.g. Hans W. Frei's realistic *sensus literalis* recovery of Scripture, George Lindbeck's cultural-linguistic approach, Moshe Greenberg's holistic method of interpreting texts and Michael Fishbane's intra-scriptural midrash study), and at the time he wrote (1993) whilst there was no generally recognised terminology, a paradigmatic set of rules was being isolated. See Ochs, *Return to Scripture in Judaism and Christianity*, 3 and 5. Relevant works by Hans Frei include: *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (Hew Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1974); *The Identity of Jesus Christ: The Hermeneutical Bases of Dogmatic Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975); the chapter "The "Literal Reading" of Biblical Narrative in the Christian Tradition: Does it Stretch or Will it Break?" (Abridged and edited by Kathryn Tanner), in Ochs, *Return to Scripture in Judaism and Christianity*. An important work by George Lindbeck is *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postbiblical Age* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984).

¹⁷¹ Callahan, "The Bible Says," 450.

¹⁷² Callahan, "The Bible Says," 450.

¹⁷³ Ochs, *Return to Scripture in Judaism and Christianity*, 3-4.

¹⁷⁴ Ochs, *Return to Scripture in Judaism and Christianity*, 20.

George Lindbeck notes that charismatic communities, being generally fundamentalistic and precritical in their hermeneutics, need to recover the classical pattern,¹⁷⁵ which means a return to the neglected tradition of Bible reading in Protestant churches. In doing so, classical theological interpretative practices need to be reenergized by an open and charitable alliance with historical-critical awareness under a new critical and ecclesial model. It is this feature in Lindbeck's consensual manner of reading the Bible as canonical narrative which has most appeal to Pentecostals.

In summary, as consideration has been given to biblical revelation, and not self-revelation, as the basis of authority within the community of faith, it has become apparent that literary criticism accords with Pentecostalism's principle of *Sola Scriptura* in that it: focuses on the finished form of the text, emphasises the unity of the text as a whole, and sees the text as an end in itself. In addition, a horizontal model of communication, in which understanding the narrative occurs in encounter with the reader, creates a nexus with the normative Pentecostal method of reading narrative as didactic.

Although the horizontal model contrasts philosophically with the evolutionary historical-critical model, insights gleaned from either model need not be contradictory. It is as important that new formulations of experiential theology do not become isolated from reflection as for the reverse, where reflection becomes isolated from experience. They need to complement each other. Of the pragmatic approaches adopted in biblical studies, reader *with* the text is the preferable approach because the critical consensus of interpretive communities guards against unsustainable interpretations, also the dangers of subjectivity and hermeneutical anarchy. The creative contributions of contemporary readers may be seen as repeating similar activities of the early evangelists; nevertheless the reader is not autonomous. Reader and text are interdependent.

Opportunities for fresh interaction between dogmatic and biblical theology have been noted and that dogma should function as an interpretational guide to the church. When coupled with the rule of faith, understanding may be drawn from the entire sweep of Scripture, thus ensuring the maintenance of orthodoxy and setting apart the heretical. In

¹⁷⁵ George Lindbeck, "Scripture, Consensus, and Community," in Richard John Neuhaus (ed.), *Biblical Interpretation in Crisis* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 101.

postcritical studies of Scripture dimensions of meaning may be sought through believing communities and traditions, whilst avoiding the errors of reductionism. Rules of action and rules of reasoning allow dialogue between critical disciplines whilst continuing to ensure the text has meaning for a normative community.

Conclusions

Pentecostals admit there is as yet no fully developed Pentecostal theology but the task has been commenced. A positive factor is the demonstrable openness by academics to critically examining their own movement.¹⁷⁶ It has been shown in the discussion on the didactic intent of Lucan narrative that contemporary Pentecostals are able to label their hermeneutical stance by identifying Scriptural precepts and precedents, thereby defending the pejorative label that they are little more than experientialists.¹⁷⁷

A number of scholars are engaged in the interpretation of Scripture in the Pentecostal context, using what has been called a submodern hermeneutic.¹⁷⁸ The connection between narrative criticism and the strong Pentecostal reliance on narrative as a source of teaching is plain, but this mode of literary criticism has additional acceptability to Pentecostals because it focuses on the finished form of the text (as is also true of canonical criticism)¹⁷⁹ and is not restricted to questioning the legitimacy of historical inquiry. This affords a good entry point for the Pentecostal viewpoint.

For Pentecostals the Bible has contemporary, not simply historical, relevance. The connection Pentecostals feel with the primitive Church of Luke-Acts readily engages them in repeating the creative activities of the early evangelists. They feel a strong sense of identity with the experiences and practices of the first century Christians that leads to a Christ-centred and mission oriented hermeneutic.¹⁸⁰ Pentecostalism should confirm the

¹⁷⁶ Douglas Petersen, "Changing Paradigms: An Introductory Overview," in Murray W. Dempster, Byron D. Klaus and Douglas Petersen (eds.), *The Globalization of Pentecostalism: A Religion Made To Travel* (Oxford: Regnum Books International, 1999), 3.

¹⁷⁷ Williams, *The Pentecostal Reality*, 60.

¹⁷⁸ Frank D. Macchia, "The Struggle for Global Witness: Shifting Paradigms in Pentecostal Theology," in Murray W. Dempster, Byron D. Klaus and Douglas Petersen (eds.), *The Globalization of Pentecostalism: A Religion Made To Travel* (Oxford: Regnum Books International, 1999), 12.

¹⁷⁹ Stibbe draws attention to a helpful study of the compatibility of narrative criticism and a Pentecostal-charismatic hermeneutic by M.B. Down, "Contours of a Narrative Pentecostal Theology and Practice" (paper presented to the 15th Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, 1985). See "The Theology of Renewal..." p. 78, n. 15

¹⁸⁰ Steven J. Land, "A Passion for the Kingdom: Revisioning Pentecostal Spirituality", *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 1 (1992) 39.

place of historical theology in their reading of Scripture. (Whilst Pentecostals rarely use the terms primitivist and restorationist of themselves, it is undeniably their aim to return to early church foundations when using words like revival or renewal). Pentecostals already see reading Scripture as a transforming event. An eschatological mindset, comparable to that of the radical reformers,¹⁸¹ facilitates a postmodern paradigm which displays an awareness of differing worldviews. The radical reformers saw themselves as church in a way that influenced their reading of the Bible and their view of doctrine. Pentecostal assemblies today would see themselves in much the same light, as primitive and eschatological community, identifying strongly with a reading of Scripture which has essentially to do with mission, liberty, discipleship, and community.¹⁸²

By placing the Pentecostal concept of biblical authority in a relational and experiential setting within the community of faith, as opposed to the doctrinal (textualist) setting favoured by Evangelicals, the Hebrew notion of *yada* or knowing in active relationship provides a biblical pattern or mode for talking about knowledge of God. Divine guidance of Scriptural interpretation takes place within the community of faith. The method of Rodman Williams (*Renewal Theology*) has been discussed as an example of a methodology founded on the primacy of the Scriptures, in which knowledge of God may be accessed without divorcing the text from contemporary contextualisation, yet, at the same time, demonstrating a dialectical relationship which understands revelation as both propositional and personal. Scott Ellington's *yada* model builds into this in that it allows for personal knowledge of God to enter the interpretive process.

Pentecostals are seen by some as having a unique vantage point in the current hermeneutical debate in biblical studies, being positioned as they are between the liberal-critical tradition and the conservative Evangelical tradition. Both approaches seem to limit interpretation to the reader and the text, whether in terms of an open and merely human process or conversely as a closed divine deposit. Accepting Ellington's *yada* mode which incorporates the individual, community and the ongoing voice of the Holy Spirit in the process, allows Pentecostals to come to the Scriptures with

a view of interpretation which can appreciate both the necessary place of human subjectivity in a dynamic process (seen to be at work in the interpreting

¹⁸¹ See Archer, "Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Retrospect and Prospect," 67.

¹⁸² Cf. Allan Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 215, who says "This central missiological thrust was clearly a strong point in Pentecostalism and fundamental to its existence."

community *and* in the biblical text), as well as the place of the final authority of God manifested in and through the process.¹⁸³

Because the literary units of the Bible arguably grew out of the many ways that biblical authors experienced the revelation of God as related to the historical experiences of the people of God, a reader-oriented literary approach to Scripture allows the significance of these experiences to be reviewed by modern audiences. Although the fixed literary form remains historical data, through present-day appropriation the modern reader can experience the sacred.¹⁸⁴ Within a non-dispensational ecclesiology the Scriptures remains the community's story, not simply a collection of accounts of individuals. For Pentecostals, encounter with God is the starting point and doctrine is the product of experiences of revelation and encounter.¹⁸⁵

Reader-response criticism tends to keep in focus all three characteristics of literary criticism, namely author, story (text) and reader, and for this reason seems the most appropriate method for the task. The fear expressed by some scholars that extreme attention to the role of the reader in determining meaning could result in hermeneutical anarchy is valid. However, a danger foreseen can be guarded against. Subjectivism must not be allowed to leave the text with no universal or correct meaning within the interpretative community, but on the other hand, as Moshe Greenberg observes, "The theological [axiom] maintains that without insight gained from faith in the divine origin of Scripture, its message cannot be understood."¹⁸⁶

The call has been made for Pentecostalism's more subjective, intuitive ways of hearing the text speak to be re-examined and the viability of culturally relevant meanings of the text to be reconsidered.¹⁸⁷ At the same time, plurality of interpretations have led to misinterpretations and excesses. This may be addressed by establishing norms of good

¹⁸³ Rick D. Moore, "Canon and Charisma in the Book of Deuteronomy," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 1 (1992) fn 1, 75f. "Such an approach draws dismissals from both sides – as a relativizing of divine authority from the conservative Evangelical side and as an absolutizing of human process from the liberal-critical side."

¹⁸⁴ McKnight, "A Defense of a Postmodern Use of the Bible," 80-81. McKnight points out Schneiders' comparison of the New Testament with the sacrament of the Eucharist using Roman Catholic concepts and vocabulary "to affirm a radical-reformation appreciation of the Bible as an authoritative text overflowing with meaning, capable of matching the needs and capacities of different generations." See S. Schneiders, *The Revelatory Text: Interpreting the New Testament as Sacred Scripture* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1991), 40.

¹⁸⁵ Ellington, "Pentecostalism and the Authority of Scripture," 31.

¹⁸⁶ Ochs, *The Return to Scripture in Judaism and Christianity*, 5.

¹⁸⁷ T.B. Cargal, "Beyond the Fundamentalist-Modernist Controversy: Pentecostals and Hermeneutics in a Postmodern Age," *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 15:2 (1993), 174.

exegesis in Pentecostal communities, by which proposed ‘deeper meanings’ can be carefully evaluated.¹⁸⁸

Classical Pentecostalism was not a credal movement. For most contemporary Pentecostals and charismatics, encounters with God provide a basis for their faith. Formal Statements of Faith produced by Pentecostal denominations may outline basic doctrinal commitments, but in the past they were intentionally not creeds or systematic theologies.¹⁸⁹ The tide has turned, and many people from non-confessional backgrounds are beginning to engage in dogmatics, and as Michael Horton notes, apparently coming to confessional convictions.¹⁹⁰

If Pentecostals are to devise theologies of retrieval, the first step is to delve into their own theological heritage, as Arand suggests. The memory and tradition in their movement’s history is comparatively recent and definitely intrinsic to their self-interpretation. The catholicity of Protestant Reformation theology is affirmed by its conscious placing of itself within the wider tradition of historic Christian theology.¹⁹¹ Pentecostals, especially early on in their history, had a similar concern. They set about to achieve this by showing that their Christology, in particular, accorded with the historic Christian faith.

Personal history, experience, worldview and culture, are inevitably incorporated into the process of hermeneutics, whether intentionally or inadvertently, but Pentecostals do so not only consciously, but intentionally and critically, with both personal and historical experience receiving prominence. Anderson sees this as one of the strengths of

¹⁸⁸ Gordon D. Fee, *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 39. Fee is a Classical Pentecostal, a well known New Testament scholar and Assemblies of God minister. See Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 193.

¹⁸⁹ For examples of various historical Pentecostal Statements of Faith, see Chant, *Heart of Fire*, 353-364; see also McPherson, *The Foursquare Gospel*, chapter VIII. For contemporary examples, see General Council of the Assemblies of God, *Statement of Fundamental Truths*, the official delineation of the (American) Assemblies of God’s 16 doctrines (claimed as “non-negotiable beliefs that all Assemblies of God churches adhere to”), accessed 19 December 2006, available from <http://www.creeds.net/Misc/AOGtruths.pdf>, Internet. These may be compared with the beliefs of the Assemblies of God in Australia, accessed 22 December 2006, available from <http://www.aog.org.au/AboutUs/WhatWeBelieve/tabid/109/Default.aspx>, Internet.

¹⁹⁰ Horton, *A Confessing Theology for Postmodern Times*, 10.

¹⁹¹ Preus argues that the Apology to the Augsburg Confession particularly sought to show how its doctrine stood in continuity with early church theology. He notes that “the confessors were throughout intent on refuting the charge of sectarianism.” See “Sources of Lutheran Dogmatics,” 33. Muller adds to this that the “faithfulness to its sources is surely the heart of the lesson that seventeenth-century orthodox Reformed theology holds for the church in the present age.” See “Sources of Reformed Orthodoxy,” 60.

Pentecostalism, in that they are “not unnerved by the search for a theological explanation for a divine act that has been experienced but not understood.”¹⁹²

The reconciliation of theology and spiritual experience by Pentecostals, although first of all based on a recognition that the authors of Scripture were inspired by the Holy Spirit, does not necessarily mean a total rejection of studies produced from either the historical-critical or historical-grammatical blocs.¹⁹³ The perception that all those avowing a fundamentalist interpretations of the Bible are led to “a naively literalist interpretation... which excludes every effort at understanding the Bible that takes account of its historical origins and development” is inaccurate.¹⁹⁴ It is true that historically Pentecostals have rejected all theological conclusions arising from an anti-supernatural premise. For this reason the use of the historical-critical method has popularly been opposed. However, it is a mistake to assume that the use of all scientific method was or is totally resisted. The use of the historical-grammatical method has been widespread amongst Evangelical scholars and Pentecostals, lacking adequate resources from within their own tradition, have made a habit of accessing Evangelical material as a major resource. More recently the research of historical-critical scholars has been increasingly utilised despite not being whole-heartedly embraced.¹⁹⁵

This openness has mainly been in academic circles,¹⁹⁶ but at the same time experience and testimony have remained valid means of faith expression and *Sola Scriptura* the inviolable interpretational paradigm. The postmodern emphasis is on contextual contingency and historical situatedness, that is, an explanatory system with metacritical

¹⁹² Anderson, “Pentecostals Believe in More Than Tongues, 58.

¹⁹³ Many Classical Pentecostals today study in Evangelical Bible colleges and do postgraduate work with universities. Cheryl Bridges Johns is a prime example. Described as a noted representative of the Wesleyan-Pentecostal faith, her post-graduate qualifications are listed as: M.A., Wheaton College, 1976 and Ph.D Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1987 (*Directory for Church of God Theological Seminary*, accessed 19 December 2006 available from http://www.cogts.edu/directory/cb_johns.html, Internet). Various personal examples within Australia are known to this writer, including Pastor John Coulson (AOG) who completed his M. Th. with Bible College of Queensland in 2005. Articles by contemporary Pentecostal scholars appear in significant publications such as *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, although there are a number of other academic journals now available. See also Walter J. Hollenweger, “Biblically ‘Justified’ Abuse: A Review of Stephen Parsons, *Ungodly Fear: Fundamentalist Christianity and the Abuse of Power*,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 10:2 (2002) 134.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Pontifical Biblical Commission, *Interpretation of the Bible in the Church*, 72f.

¹⁹⁵ This shift has been aided by increasing understanding in Pentecostal Bible Colleges that all biblical scholars are positioned somewhere on a spectrum between the extremes of maximalist and minimalist acceptance of biblical historicity. This is far less restricting than classifying scholars as either liberal/conservative, critical/orthodox. Such labels have an alienating effect rather than encouraging profitable research to the point of stressing the primacy of Scripture to the exclusion or denigration of legitimate reflection.

¹⁹⁶ For a brief discussion of Pentecostals and Academic Theology see section in Chapter 13 - Pentecostal Education and Ecumenism, in Anderson, *Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 243ff.

reflection in counter-balance to modern-critical methods, but one which allows for constructive interaction. Thus critical scholarship *per se* presents no bar to Pentecostals accessing such material. There is no reason why valuable historical data and illuminating insights not in conflict with the Pentecostal position cannot be appreciated and used to enhance the understanding of Scripture, whatever their source.¹⁹⁷

The cycle of doctrinal investigation (theologies of retrieval) will no doubt involve biblical theology, which is standard in Pentecostalism. The most useful contributions to be made would be in continuing to build a Pentecostal systematic theology, in which objective exegesis has not been avoided nor data ignored that could influence the interpretation of a given text, provided these remain in accord with the teaching of canonical Scripture.

Canonical narrative criticism (using these terms informally) facilitates the particular emphases of all three hermeneutical principles initially posed as Pentecostal. It allows for the basis of authority in theological reflection (Scripture, Holy Spirit, Community, individual reader) to balance the objective-subjective split in epistemology, without denigrating either. At the same time, considerations of the supernatural or metaphysical are not rejected out of hand.

From the foregoing discussion and in recognition that (a) the theological task of grounding doctrine requires more than the reiteration of Scripture, but must also engage in critical biblical exegesis; (b) personal bias often colours interpretation and must be guarded against, and (c) the role of the Spirit in illuminating the meaning and application of Scripture go hand in hand with the rigours and methods of the theological task, a hermeneutic that combines the following approaches has been rationalised:

- a. **Biblical Theology** - In an oral community, the texts narrate the experience between God and His people, functioning as historical testimony and testifying to the imminence of God's power in the church. The Pentecostal viewpoint remains

¹⁹⁷ For further discussion on the variety of corporate contexts in which the task of interpretation belongs, see John Goldingay, "The Corporateness of Scriptural Interpretation," *Models for Interpretation of Scripture* (Carlisle UK: Paternoster Press, 1995). Goldingay discusses the nexus between confessional and academic communities, individual interpreters in the context of society, the universal church as community and general implications in the universal human context.

largely an expression of biblical theology (i.e. explaining the texts) with some reflection on their meaning for contemporary life.¹⁹⁸

- b. **Historical Theology** – Familiarity with church history, the writings of earlier church fathers, recognised theologians and commentators of the church.
- c. **Historical-Grammatical Method** - The search for authorial intent regarding the original audience.¹⁹⁹
- d. **Historical-Critical Sources** – These are accessed within the framework set up in this study, i.e. (i) not elevating intellectualised doctrine to a place of primacy; (ii) recognising the form or content of God-given experiences in Scripture as capable of informing contemporary church life and individuals; and (iii) interacting with a variety of theological opinions (not only those which agree with the text) in an attempt to be dialogic and open rather than dogmatic and closed.
- e. **Contemporary Hermeneutical Methods** – Postmodern literary methods allow for dialogue with faith and experience to take place in an academic forum without automatically raising insuperable epistemological barriers.

The way is opened for the discussion of the specified text, Daniel 10:13. Presented below is a list of the three basic principles posited as representing an authentic Pentecostal hermeneutic. These have been shown to be fundamental to Classical Pentecostalism and compatible with contemporary Pentecostal hermeneutical trends. Various interpretations of Daniel 10:13 will be evaluated in the next chapter and tested against these principles and a Pentecostal reading of the text proposed that takes genre into consideration.

¹⁹⁸ It has been argued earlier that this may overlap with dogmatic theology, which can be a means of identifying a theology with the Bible as a descriptive and historical task, or alternatively, entail a more constructive task of expressing a modern theology in biblically compatible terms.

¹⁹⁹ With due awareness that Evangelicalism's dispensational paradigm and textualist theology at some points affect understanding of the text from a Pentecostal viewpoint.

Interpretive Model Incorporating the Principles for a Pentecostal Reading of Scripture²⁰⁰

- a. **Sola Scriptura**, the Reformation principle that Scripture is the inspired Word of God and authoritative in all matters pertaining to salvation and Christian living above reason and church traditions or councils, where these are at variance. Pentecostals are an essentially oral community. They consider canonical texts to be records or historical testimony and therefore derivative, yet without diminution of the universal, eternal and objective authority of Scripture.
- b. **A pneumatic approach to the interpretation of Scripture** means acceptance of the principle that understanding is guided by the Holy Spirit. A doctrine of continuing revelation is upheld. All theological conclusions arising from an anti-supernatural premise are rejected. Incorporated in this understanding are (a) the Pentecostal non-cessationist belief, that the gifts of the spirit did not cease at the end of the apostolic era; and (b) a non-dispensational ecclesiology, one that sees a uniform continuity of God's relation to the church along with a strong sense of identity with the experiences and practices of the first century Christians. This means a Christ-centred and mission oriented hermeneutic. Experience and testimony are not excluded as valid means of faith interpretation.
- c. **Biblical revelation, not self-revelation, is the basis of authority within the community of faith.** Subordinate revelation is held to be particular, temporal and subjective and may never contradict the text. The community of faith is the forum and community testimony the means, to ensure the maintenance of orthodoxy within the faith tradition. Coupled with the rule of faith, the resources of historic Christianity should act as an interpretational guide to the church. The critical consensus of the interpretative community guards against unsustainable interpretations and continues to ensure the text has meaning for that community. A balanced approach comprises four components: the Scriptures, the Holy Spirit, the community of faith and the individual

²⁰⁰ Some aspects are held in common with mainline Evangelicals.

Chapter 2

READING DANIEL 10:13 WITH A PENTECOSTAL APPROACH

It has been mentioned that in the past Pentecostals filtered what they read in academic sources so their preaching and teaching reflected Pentecostal theology.¹ This study follows essentially the same practice, except that the reasons for rejecting or accepting a particular view have been qualified against the Pentecostal hermeneutical principles discussed earlier. This chapter is divided into two parts. Part A explains some factors affecting the Pentecostal approach to Daniel,² particularly the effects of Scofieldian dispensationalism and the Pentecostal position on authorship, dating and sources. Usage of the term apocalyptic is also discussed. Part B is an exegetical analysis of Dan 10:13, beginning with the purpose of the book and immediate context. The Scriptural focus is deliberately narrow because of interest which has been generated by the popular teachings on prayer and spiritual warfare topics by C. Peter Wagner and the use he has made of the text.

Part A: Approaches to the Text

1. Apocalyptic Genre: An Overview of the Pentecostal Position

a. Recent Academic Trends

In the mid-twentieth century a revitalised academic interest was directed to the question How was apocalypticism³ related to the emergence of Judaism and Christianity? Consequently, valuable new research in apocalyptic studies was undertaken. Ernst Käsemann and Wolfhart Pannenberg were in the forefront in the late 1950s, important because of their rejection of the dominant Bultmannian view which denies a relationship

¹ This practice, of course, was/is not unique to Pentecostals.

² For the purpose of clarity, the book of Daniel in this essay always refers to the text in its extant form.

³ John Collins admits there has been some semantic confusion over the use of this word as a noun. Hence the term apocalypse is now commonly used with reference to literary genre and apocalyptic as a historical movement, apocalypticism as a social ideology and apocalyptic eschatology as the ideas or themes having a commonality with other genres. See John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature, Second Edition* (Grand Rapids MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1998), 2.

between Christian eschatology and Jewish apocalyptic.⁴ They were not the only voices being raised in the inquiry of relating prophecy to apocalyptic,⁵ but they have been credited with organising the thoughts of many others. This in turn stimulated additional academic interest in apocalyptic genre.⁶

The question above, which engaged the academic community, is of interest to Pentecostalism because of the attention they accord primitive Christianity and eschatology. Pentecostal praxis is modelled on a perception of how early Christians lived out their faith.⁷ Their perspectives on eschatology,⁸ or end times, are heavily dependent on the books of Daniel and Revelation, both universally acknowledged as apocalyptic genre. However, few Pentecostal groups in the mid-twentieth century would have considered critical reflection on eschatology as a vital enough task in which to engage because they favoured ministry over intellectual reflection. They were satisfied with simply summarising doctrine for use as a teaching tool in Bible Colleges, which was often the limit of the theological task.⁹ Pentecostals left academic research to others, content to access the material of Evangelical scholars as need be, without producing their own. Specific facets of the current debates were gleaned from those sources, insofar as they were of direct interest to Pentecostalism, and only when these supported a

⁴ Oswalt in his chapter, "Recent Studies in Old Testament Apocalyptic", surveys these trends, citing the following sources: E. Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology" (trans J.W. Leitch), *Journal for Theology and the Church* 6 (1969), 40; also W. Pannenberg, "Redemptive Event and History," in *Basic Questions in Theology: Collected Essays*, trans. G.H. Kehm, 2 vols (Philadelphia: Fortress Press; London: SCM, 1970-71), 1:15-80.

⁵ Cf. H.H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (New York: Association Press; London: Lutterworth, 1944; 3rd ed. 1963); S.B. Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origins and Growth* (London: Epworth, 1952); G.E. Ladd, "Why Not Prophecy-Apocalyptic?," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 76 (1957), 192-200; O. Plöger, *Theocracy and Eschatology*, trans. S. Rudman (Richmond: John Knox; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968); D.S. Russell, *Apocalyptic: Ancient and Modern* (Philadelphia: Fortress; London: SCM, 1978). Around this time Gerhard von Rad also commented on the origins of apocalyptic, but he saw connections in wisdom rather than prophecy; see *Old Testament Theology*, trans. D.M.G. Stalker, 2 vols (New York: Harper & Row; Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962-65), 2:301-15.

⁶ See Oswalt, "Recent Studies in Old Testament Apocalyptic", 369f. In this Oswalt is disagreeing with the conclusion of Klaus Koch in *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, trans. M. Kohl, SBT2/22 (Naperville, Ill.: Allenson; London: SCM, 1972), 14. Oswalt concedes that the contributions of Käsemann and Pannenberg may have crystallised the trend away from Wellhausen's hold on Old Testament thought, but did not create it.

⁷ See David Petts, "The Baptism in the Holy Spirit: The Theological Distinctive," in Keith Warrington (ed.), *Pentecostal Perspectives* (Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1998), 103.

⁸ For an overview of Pentecostal eschatology, see Chapter Six, "Eschatology: A Clear and Present Danger," in Keith Warrington (ed.) *Pentecostal Perspectives* (Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1998), in which James J. Glass gives a compact yet balanced discussion.

⁹ Macchia, "The Struggle for Global Witness," 10, also 8. Myer Pearlman and Aimee Semple McPherson are good examples of those who produced summarised doctrines; see page 60, n. 35 and page 8, n. 4 respectively in this study for publishing details of their books; page 8, n. 4 also points to more up-to-date academic resources. See also the substantial article by W.E. Warber, "Publications," *DPCM*, 742-751.

supernaturalist position.¹⁰ Any refutation by Evangelical scholars of antisupernatural views (for example, those of Bultmann and Wellhausen who are considered by them to be anti-supernaturalists) would have been viewed as a positive aspect by Pentecostals.¹¹

Klaus Koch is author of the well-known work *Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*. He stresses that apocalyptic is an essential component in any discussion of the history of dogma and theology from the moment the question of Christianity as a wide-ranging influence is raised. This is because the foundational question of what the Christian faith has given humanity regarding historical perceptions, futurist mindsets, and behavioural ethics is so embodied in apocalyptic that he believes it cannot be avoided, even in systematic theology. The theories of Pannenberg and Moltmann impressed Koch as protests against the confines of a Protestant theology that concerned itself overly with the individual as related to conscience, salvation and justification. The questions these new generation theologians were asking concerned “God’s workings in the decisive forces of our time,” questions which would require responses in relation to “social responsibility and the modification of the world.” It is at this point, as Koch notes, that either a past or a future mind set is adopted.¹²

Most, but not all, Pentecostals hold to a premillennial, futurist eschatology. In this model, the Kingdom of God remains in the future until the *parousia*. History will be disrupted at that point. This results in a dualistic two-age model of the present and the future.¹³ Serious study in apocalyptic is an appropriate course of action for Pentecostals seeking to establish their own distinctive theological position. A sense of spiritual immediacy characterises Pentecostalism and central to this is the belief in God’s workings as a decisive force of our time. The practical responses of the movement are increasingly directed towards social responsibility and the political modification of the world.

¹⁰ The second hermeneutical principal proposed as vital to a Pentecostal reading of Scripture, as listed at the end of Chapter One above.

¹¹ Hathaway, “The Elim Pentecostal Church: Origins, Development and Distinctives,” 33; also Cartledge, *Apostolic Revolution*, 168; for the corroborative conservative Evangelical view see Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel (TOTC)* (Downers Grove IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1978), 14.

¹² Koch, *Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 130.

¹³ More recently, there has been some shift away from dispensationalist and futurist views. For a concise overview of Pentecostal eschatology, see Glass, “Eschatology,” 120-146.

b. *Defining Apocalyptic*

Pentecostal literature contains little information under the heading of apocalyptic literature. In the Pentecostal tradition, the two biblical apocalyptic books, Daniel and Revelation, have been read as eschatology or prophecy. Most Pentecostal reference books do not use the term apocalyptic.¹⁴ Stanley Horton gives a glossary entry, but this casts no light on the Pentecostal position on interpretation of the genre:

Apocalyptic. (Gk. *Apocalupsis*, “revelation,” “disclosure.”) The literature that uses rich symbolism to describe the coming kingdom of God and the events leading up to it. The visions of Daniel and Revelation are examples.¹⁵

Hence the book of Daniel has not been approached as apocalyptic genre with an attendant set of principles guiding its interpretation, but rather has been considered a key to the study of prophecy.¹⁶

However, no discussion on apocalyptic genre should begin without clarifying the meaning of the term. It appears that scholars approaching the task of defining what constitutes apocalyptic were challenged by the lack of historical information of the relative period. It was unclear who in particular used much of the original literature and how widespread its impact. Consequently, scholars did not always agree on the precise characteristics of what comprises apocalyptic.¹⁷ Despite the fact that no single example meets all the criteria generally agreed as embraced within the term apocalypse, Daniel is commonly referred to first when attempts are made to characterise the genre.¹⁸ The standard feature is the angelic being (or *angelus interpres*) who is interpreter or guide.¹⁹

¹⁴ The *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* is a good example, with “Apocalypse, Book of the” being the only entry which approaches this topic and it is almost entirely given over to discussion of Pneumatology of Revelation and The Millennium. See article by R.F. Martin, *DPCM*, 11-13. The indexes of J. Rodman Williams’ three-volume *Renewal Theology* yield even less. Again the reader must search for references to specific theologies or subjects, such as Angels, or Spiritual Beings. See Williams, *Renewal Theology*, op.cit.

¹⁵“Glossary,” in Horton, *Systematic Theology*, 640.

¹⁶ S.M. Horton, “Daniel, Book of”, *DPCM*, 237; also John F. Walvoord, *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation* (Chicago: Moody, 1971), 27; Walvoord adds that Daniel is “a major element in premillennialism, and is essential to the interpretation of the book of Revelation.” Walvoord is not Pentecostal, but his premillennialist eschatology made his writings attractive to Pentecostals.

¹⁷ The complex and multifarious debates are entered into elsewhere. For a brief overview of the current main players and bibliography, see Oswalt, “Recent Studies in OT Apocalyptic.”

¹⁸ Oswalt, “Recent Studies in OT Apocalyptic,” 371f. In fact, says Collins, “The book of Daniel contains the only full-blown example of apocalyptic literature in the Hebrew Bible.” See *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 85.

¹⁹ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 5.

The following definition, agreed upon in 1979 by a Society of Biblical Literature seminar devoted to the study of apocalyptic, has been described as having “the virtue of being broad enough to include all the various literatures that have been designated apocalyptic, and yet specific enough to be useful.”²⁰ Thus, an apocalypse is defined as:

a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.²¹

Much recent debate over definition of the genre has related to opinions over function, which differed markedly from those held by scholars in earlier studies. Previously it was generally accepted that apocalyptic writings were intended for the consolation of a group in crisis, but as Collins indicates, such a specific setting does not fit all apocalypses. As a result, Collins agrees with the suggested emendation of the definition (attributed to Adela Yarbro Collins) that “an apocalypse is ‘intended to interpret present earthly circumstances in the light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behavior of the audience by means of divine authority’.”²²

This definition reflects the research and viewpoints of major scholars of apocalyptic genre, including conservatives.²³ As it stands, it contains nothing antagonistic to the Pentecostal position. In fact, the wording of Yarbro Collins’ emendation is particularly serviceable in a Pentecostal interpretation of Daniel (and Revelation).

The content of the apocalyptic writings of Judaism in the first Christian centuries is considered by scholars to be distinctive, especially when compared to Ben Sira, 1 Maccabees, Josephus and the Mishnah. Collins believes that as a minimum requirement, therefore, distinctions must be made between historical apocalypticism such as Daniel

²⁰ Oswalt, “Recent Studies in OT Apocalyptic,” 372.

²¹ The results were published in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, J.J. Collins (ed.), (*Semeia* 14; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979). The definition is cited by Collins in *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 5.

²² John J. Collins, “Genre, Ideology and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism,” in *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series* 9, John J. Collins, and James H. Charlesworth (eds.) (Sheffield UK: JSOT Press, 1991), 19. See also Adela Yarbro Collins, “Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism,” *Semeia* 36 (1986), 7.

²³ Cf. Ernest C. Lucas, *Daniel* (Leicester: Apollos, 2002), 273. Lucas is Vice-Principal and Tutor in Biblical Studies at Bristol Baptist College, England.

and Revelation and the more cosmic orientation of the heavenly ascents.²⁴ Pentecostal interest in apocalyptic writings is usually restricted to the canonical books, which alone are considered authoritative.

c. The Influence of Dispensationalism

The fundamentalist movement amongst theologically conservative Protestant churches in the 1920s arose out of a rejection of higher criticism. The connecting factor amongst fundamentalists was their belief in the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture.²⁵ Since Pentecostals share this belief with Evangelical biblicists, it explains why in the past they have been counted as both evangelical and fundamentalist, broadly speaking.

In the late nineteenth century interest in futurism, in the form of dispensationalism, escalated amongst Protestant Evangelicals.²⁶ The teachings of J.N. Darby (1800-1882),²⁷ and through him C.I. Scofield (1843-1921), are said to have set “the agenda for a major segment of American fundamentalism.”²⁸ It is not an exaggeration to say that eschatology was demonstrably and fervently espoused in the 1901 (Topeka) and 1906 (Azusa Street) Pentecostal revivals, so it was perhaps inevitable Pentecostals would be affected by the fundamentalists and adopt various aspects of its futurist eschatology.²⁹ Charles Parham,³⁰ leader of the Topeka revival,³¹ recognised that “the prevailing mood

²⁴ Collins, “Genre, Ideology and Social Movements,” 16. This distinction having been made, further discussion will be confined to Daniel.

²⁵ For further details see H.V. Synan “Fundamentalism,” *DPCM*, 324 -7; also C.T. McIntire “Fundamentalism,” in Walter A. Elwell (ed.) *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* [hereafter *EDT*], (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1984), 433-5.

²⁶ C.C. Ryrie, “Dispensation, Dispensationalism,” *EDT*, 322.

²⁷ W.A. Hoffecker, “Darby, John Nelson,” *EDT*, 292f.

²⁸ W.N. Kerr, “Scofield, Cyrus Ingerson,” *EDT*, 988.

²⁹ See Peter T. Weiler’s conclusion in “Readings In Hyperspirituality: Postmodern Allusions in Contemporary Popular Pentecostal Literature” (St Lucia, QLD: University of Queensland, 2000), who argues that it is not a shared theology or worldview that Pentecostals have in common with fundamentalists and/or dispensationalists, but rather their approach to reading Scripture.

³⁰ Parham, George Russell (Elim) and the Williams brothers (Apostolic) were all historical premillennialists, hence it is considered by some to be more accurate to say Pentecostalism was birthed in a historicist framework; see C.V. Taylor, “Notes on History of Views on Revelation” (Unpublished, 1991), 4.

³¹ For an overview of Pentecostal origins see Vinson Synan, *The Century of the Holy Spirit: 100 Years of Pentecostal and Charismatic Renewal, 1901-2001* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001), Chapter 3 “The Azusa Street Revival: The Pentecostal Movement Begins in America.”

of premillennialism was at the very heart of early Pentecostalism.”³² Premillennialism remains the majority view among Pentecostals. Nevertheless, dispensational eschatology was not integral to Reformed and Wesleyan theological traditions and initial Pentecostal teachings were not tied directly to it.³³

A second major difference between a Pentecostal interpretation of Scripture and that of dispensationalists is the latter's view of the people of God in the Old Testament as completely unrelated to the church in the New Testament. According to them, Old Testament believers functioned under a dispensation of law and New Testament believers under a dispensation of grace, the very nature of their schema resulting in disparate dispensations. Schofield was aware that historical Protestant teaching held to the doctrine of one people of God.³⁴ Myer Pearlman, an early Pentecostal expositor wrote a book outlining the doctrines of the Bible.³⁵ Although Pearlman's exposition of eschatology corresponds with some aspects of dispensationalism, he does not make the same sharp division between Israel and the church.³⁶ However, various other classical Pentecostal writers, undiscerning of the issues which undermined their own position, have shown a dependence on a dispensational posture in both eschatology and ecclesiology.³⁷ The more authentically Pentecostal view is that of a nondispensational premillennialism.³⁸ The three major American Pentecostal denominations (Church of God

³² F.L. Arrington, "Dispensationalism," *DPCM*, 247. Edward Irving, a Scottish Presbyterian pastor, who although he never experienced glossolalia himself, believed and taught this to be a part of early Christian spirituality, therefore desirable. He had significant numerical responses to his viewpoint. He died 67 years before the generally accepted date for the commencement of the Pentecostal Movement i.e. 1901, but his importance in Pentecostal historiography is when historical precedents are sought for revivals with emphasis on the charismata, especially glossolalia. Irving is of additional interest, in this context, because like the Pentecostals who were to follow in his wake, he also held strong millenarian and apocalyptic views (see D.D. Bundy, "Irving, Edward (1792-1834) in *DPCM*, 470-1).

³³ Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 217ff gives a brief description of Pentecostalism's absorption with premillennial and dispensational eschatology of J. N. Darby. It should be noted that the hermeneutic of dispensationalism is cessationist regarding the charismata. As discussed in Chapter One, this position is inconsistent with basic Pentecostal supernaturalism.

³⁴ See his comments in the introduction of a book by Lewis Sperry Chafer, *The Kingdom in History and Prophecy* (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1915), 5.

³⁵ Pearlman's book, *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible* (Springfield MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1937) was a standard early Pentecostal textbook. See G.W. Gohr, "Pearlman, Myer," *DPCM*, 684.

³⁶ Arrington, "Dispensationalism," *DPCM*, 247.

³⁷ E.g. George L. Britt, Ralph M. Riggs, E.S. Williams, A.A. Ledford and Ray H. Hughes; see Arrington, "Dispensationalism," *DPCM*, 248, citing *Ages and Dispensations* (1949).

³⁸ See G.B. McGee, "Horton, Stanley Monroe," *DPCM*, 446f. Horton, described by McGee as "premier theologian" of the AOG "at a time when only a few were professionally trained at the graduate level in theology and the biblical languages," is said to have profoundly influenced the course of AOG theology over the past forty years. Horton is firmly committed to a nondispensational premillennialism. Interestingly, Kelso Glover, principal of the first Pentecostal Bible College in Australia, the Victorian Bible Institute (1925-1926), held to the historicist approach regarding the second coming of Christ (see page 59, n. 30 of

(Cleveland, Tenn.), Pentecostal Holiness Church, and AOG) in their Statements of Faith commit to premillennialism, but not necessarily dispensationalism. The Statement of Beliefs for the AOG in Australia states simply: “We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is coming back again as He promised,” which is not a specific commitment to premillennialism. However, in Queensland, an updated AOG statement of doctrinal beliefs affirms “the return of the Lord Jesus Christ to set up his millennial reign on this earth.”³⁹ In America the AOG have not altered their theological basis since its inception, as is evident from scrutiny of the Statement of Fundamental Truths agreed to in 1924 and approved in 1994.⁴⁰

Because the Pentecostal position is that the Old Testament prophets did see a relationship between historical Israel and the church⁴¹ a non-dispensational ecclesiology (as discussed in Chapter One) is a principle for an authentic Pentecostal reading of Scripture.⁴² Dispensationalist resources were prolifically disseminated and Pentecostals have used them (often indiscriminately) as a convenient method of organising biblical history.⁴³

In summary, Pentecostals had little interest in the academic studies on apocalyptic writings of the 1950s. Any data they did receive was filtered through the writings of Evangelical scholars, although eschatology was and continues to be of major interest to them. The genre of the book of Daniel is consistently classified as apocalyptic by both critical and conservative scholars.⁴⁴ The book of Daniel is judged as a historical-type, lacking many features included in other apocalypses, and in that respect is not to be

this study re earlier Pentecostal historicists). His views were opposed at the time by other church leaders, notably Frederick Van Eyk. See Chant, *Heart of Fire*, 96, 112, 263. Similarly, Kevin Conner considers the dispensationalist position on Israel as faulty, but maintains a premillennial view of end times (which he calls Christian millennialism to distinguish it from dispensationalism); see Kevin J. Conner, *Interpreting the Book of Revelation* (Vermont, Vic.: KJC Publications, 1995), 53, 55ff, 60, 126f. As a Pentecostal, Conner’s writings on Daniel will be referred to later in this chapter.

³⁹ See Alec Spence (ed.), “Doctrine,” *Assemblies of God National Minister’s Manual*, 3rd Edition, Assemblies of God Australia Queensland Conference State Executive, 2000.

⁴⁰ (Cf. page 49, n. 189 of this study for details of other Statements of Faith by Pentecostals). See William Kay, “Assemblies of God: Distinctive Continuity and Distinctive Change,” in Keith Warrington (ed.), *Pentecostal Perspectives* (Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1998), 55.

⁴¹ Arrington, “Dispensationalism,” *DPCM*, 247. See also Myer Pearlman, *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible* (Springfield MO: Gospel Pub. House, 1937), 348-9.

⁴² As a mixture of charismatic and Evangelical, Wagner’s position on the dispensationalism question is ambivalent. He appears not to have addressed the issue formally.

⁴³ Arrington, “Dispensationalism,” *DPCM*, 247f. Arrington also notes other recent Pentecostal scholars such as R. Hollis Gause who maintain a premillennial stance, but are not dispensational. Gause affirms “progressive revelation that does not make the dispensational divisions of biblical history.”

⁴⁴ Cf. Baldwin, *Daniel*, 46.

considered typical.⁴⁵ The academic definition of apocalyptic (plus emendation) contains nothing opposed to the Pentecostal theological position.

The Pentecostal Movement holds mainly to premillennial beliefs, though millennial viewpoints are held to be a matter of individual understanding, not a mandatory doctrine affecting personal salvation. The one factor which is held to be immutable, however, is that Jesus Christ will come again to this earth in His glory. Scofieldian dispensationalism, with its convenient schema of world history and view on the inerrancy of Scripture, was popular among Pentecostals despite its being opposed to fundamental Pentecostal doctrines.

2. The Pentecostal Position on Authorship, Dating and Sources

For Pentecostals, implicit in acceptance of Scripture as the inspired Word of God is that its historicity is reliable. The dating of Daniel has long been the focus of scholarly debate involving technical information and arguments about literary style, historical accuracy and various linguistic features. Opinions are polarised, resulting in two broad positions. Strong critical arguments beginning in the eighteenth century led many scholars to accept a second century BC dating, whilst the older traditional view of a sixth century BC date of writing continues as the majority conservative option.⁴⁶ The respective arguments are well documented elsewhere and this study gives only a brief overview.⁴⁷

a. Authorship and Canonicity

The question of the authorship of Daniel is inextricably linked with the dating of the text. The life setting of a historical Daniel would have been between 602 BC (when Nebuchadnezzar was known to have taken many prisoners from Syro-Palestine; cf. Dan. 1:1) and at least 537 BC, based on the last dated event mentioned in the text

⁴⁵ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 12.

⁴⁶ For a balanced conservative interpretation see Raymond B. Dillard, and Tremper Longman III, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994), 329-352. See also John J. Collins, *Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature: The Forms of the Old Testament Literature Volume XX* (Grand Rapids MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1984), 24-38; also Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 611-613.

⁴⁷ It is not the purpose of this study to defend the Pentecostal position, merely to state it and in some measure explain its stance.

(10:1).⁴⁸ Taken as the work of the exilic Daniel, he would have been approaching ninety years old and close to the end of his life when the book was written.⁴⁹ By the end of the second century BC the book was accepted as trustworthy and authoritative by Jewish communities.⁵⁰ In the tradition of the synagogue and early church, the exilic Daniel was considered the author, and on this criterion the book was admitted to the canon.⁵¹

Pseudonymity is counted by many scholars amongst the characteristics of apocalyptic literature, but the theory of the pseudonymity of the book of Daniel is rejected by those holding the traditional view. Attributing one's own writing to a great figure of earlier history may have been an accepted and respectable convention in the era when apocalyptic writing peaked in popularity and be considered an acceptable convention for non-canonical apocalypses. However, Jesus himself apparently believed Daniel the prophet was the author of the book (Mt. 24:15), and any suggestions that Christ deliberately accepted human limitations, leading him to make a false statement about the book, are totally discarded.

To fundamentalists, the pseudonymity theory tends to brand the book at best as a fiction, at worst as a forgery.⁵² If Daniel was not the author, the rationale for the book's acceptance into the canon is suspect and the contents of the book lack divine authority.⁵³ The traditional view holds that the witness of Jesus is borne out by the claims of the book itself, with Daniel speaking in the first person and claiming to have been the recipient of the divine revelations. This is the accepted Pentecostal view. They could seek no

⁴⁸ Pentecostals Hayford and Curtis give the date of the final vision as 538 BC. See Jack W. Hayford and G. Curtis, *Until the End of Time: Revealing the Future of Humankind: A study of Daniel and Revelations* [sic]. *Spirit-Filled Life Bible Discovery Guides* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1994), CD-ROM.

⁴⁹ Baldwin, *Daniel*, 35; see also John E. McKenna, "Daniel," [Chapter 43] in William Sandford LaSor, David Allan Hubbard Jr., and Frederic Wm. Bush, Jr., *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament*. 2nd Edition (Grand Rapids MI/Cambridge UK: Eerdmans, 1996), 574.

⁵⁰ Collins, *Daniel*, 72. 1 Macc 2:59-60 makes reference to Daniel in the lion's den and although no mention is made of the prophecies in Daniel 7-12, this does not mean, as Collins points out, that 1 Maccabees rejected that section as a forgery.

⁵¹ The question of the canonicity of Daniel is complex, however, for an overview of the topic Text and Canon, see Baldwin, *Daniel*, 68-72. Baldwin concludes with an observation from the conservative view: "If Daniel had been accepted into the canon already in Maccabean times it ceases to be remarkable that the Qumran community found it authoritative or that it was so evidently regarded as Scripture in the time of Jesus."

⁵² E.g. J.B. Payne calls late date views "a deception and a fraud." See "Daniel, Book of," in Merrill C. Tenney (Gen. Ed.), *Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary* (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1967), 199.

⁵³ Edward J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964), 361.

greater basis of authority than that Jesus Himself affirmed Daniel the prophet as the author (Mt. 24:15).

It has been widely held by critical scholars as unlikely that Daniel was written in Babylon in the sixth century BC, or was intended as a historical account of the time of the exile. In the first place, it is alleged that the book contains erroneous historical data,⁵⁴ and various such errors point, in their view, to a writer separated in time (and probably also geographically) from sixth-century Babylon. Also, the belief in resurrection as expressed in Daniel is seen by some scholars as developed theology and post-exilic. The point is made that the writer appears far better informed regarding the period 300-165 BC than the exile.⁵⁵ The prophecies in Daniel 7-11 are unusual in the extent of the details given of historical events. The third century Neo-Platonic philosopher Porphyry⁵⁶ was one of the earliest to argue that Daniel was not an exilic writing, but of later Maccabean origin. He based his line of reasoning on the predictions in Daniel being accurate up to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes but not beyond it.

The dating of the literature is based on the time when it ceased to be historically accurate because it really was prediction.⁵⁷ The death of Antiochus Epiphanes is therefore seen as the defining event, because Daniel 11:45 is taken as predicting it would take place in the Holy Land, when he actually died in Persia in 168 BC. Thus, on the basis of the prophecies being *vaticinia ex eventu* (or prophecies after the event), a late dating of Daniel, in whole or part, is accepted by many, the Porphyrian argument considered to have stood the test of time.⁵⁸ When the conventions of the genre are taken into account, Collins argues, then pseudonymity and *ex eventu* prophecy are no longer theological problems, but indicators of the nature and function of the book.⁵⁹ In short, Collins does

⁵⁴ E.g. that Belshazzar was the son of Nabonidus, not Nebuchadnezzar, and was never actually king of Babylonia.

⁵⁵ Raymond Hammer, *The Book of Daniel: The Cambridge Bible Commentary* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 4. See also Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel. Anchor Bible Vol. 23* (New York: Doubleday, 1978), 276.

⁵⁶ Porphyry's work is no longer extant, portions known to us only through Jerome's *Commentary on Daniel*, which, ironically, was meant to refute Porphyry's criticism of the historicity of Daniel.

⁵⁷ J.N. Schofield, *Law, Prophets, and Writings: The Religion of the Books of the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1969), 337.

⁵⁸ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 87.

⁵⁹ Collins, *Daniel*, 34.

not see the issue regarding *ex eventu* prophecy to be a dogmatic rejection of predictive prophecy so much as a calculation of probability.⁶⁰

Goldingay, an Evangelical scholar, is one of the few who holds a middle line between the critical and conservative positions (Daniel's visions cannot be actual prophecies versus God cannot have inspired a mixture of fact and fiction), believing that the omniscient God of Israel is capable of inspiring Scripture to be written however he deems fit, whether as history, fiction, prophecy, quasi-prophecy, allowing authorial identification or otherwise. The fact that pseudonymity is rarely utilised nowadays as a literary device, particularly in religious writings, should not be a limitation placed on God, especially when the text derived from a different culture and a long-gone age. He argues that whether God has actually elected to do so should be determined not *a priori* but from actual study of the Scriptural text,⁶¹ and observes that regardless of whether the critical or the conservative opinion is embraced, it makes surprisingly little difference to the book's exegesis: "One understands the book on the basis of what it says; there are points where its meaning is unclear, but not because of uncertainty over the alternatives just listed."⁶²

Other Evangelical scholars offer copious and well-documented counter-arguments against perceived historical inaccuracies which it is claimed a sixth century BC writer ought to have known about. In broad terms, Pentecostals approach apocalyptic literature in a simple way: what is Scripture and what is not. To them the first criterion in understanding Daniel is its canonicity. Acceptance of the book in early Christian tradition is an important factor. Pentecostals accept the conservative arguments, in agreement with Baldwin, who concludes the writer had access to information not presently available and where categorical verification is absent, he should be given credit for reliability.⁶³

As for Porphyry, his argument leaves him with little to contribute to Pentecostals, except perhaps for his unambiguous recognition that "if an unknown person wrote under the

⁶⁰ See *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 86-8. Collins concludes that the second-century date for the visions in chapters 7-12 is accepted as "beyond reasonable doubt by critical scholarship," but goes on to acknowledge the continuing tradition of conservative scholarship that holds to the exilic date.

⁶¹ Goldingay, *Daniel*, xxxixf.

⁶² Goldingay, *Daniel*, xl.

⁶³ Baldwin, *Daniel*, 29.

guise of Daniel's name, this unknown person was a deceiver."⁶⁴ In this regard, Young quotes the well-known words of Pusey: "The book of Daniel is especially fitted to be a battle-ground between faith and unbelief. It admits of no halfway measures. It is either Divine or an imposture."⁶⁵

b. *Dating and Purpose*

The conservative argument is for an early or exilic dating by a single author. However, because the book of Daniel is comprised of two parts, the dissimilarity between them has caused some to posit more than one author, at least one said to be writing in the post-exilic and/or Maccabean periods. One of the more prominent instances of dissimilarity is in Dan 10:1 where Daniel is introduced in the third person, and referred to as Belteshazzar. It is the only place in the second half of the book his Babylonian name is used, whereas it is used seven times in chapters 1-6.⁶⁶ Baldwin accepts the book in its entirety as the work of one writer. In upholding the unity of the book, she argues that if the first part of the book can be shown to come from an earlier period, this leaves a Maccabean dating untenable.⁶⁷ Even Collins, who prefers a later dating, admits an ideological gulf exists between the "militant ethos of 1 Maccabees and the apocalyptic quietism of Daniel."⁶⁸ More recently there has been increasing agreement by critical scholars in favour of the book being considered a unity, albeit a secondary unity, achieved through the integration of older tales which represent the continuity of a tradition, namely the theme of Jewish relations to Gentile kings which runs through the whole book.⁶⁹

⁶⁴ Edward J. Young, *Daniel (Geneva Commentaries)* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1972/First pub. 1949), Appendix VIII, 317-320. Also Young, *Introduction to the OT*, 362f.

⁶⁵ Citing E. B. Pusey, *Daniel, the Prophet*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Parker, 1869), 75.

⁶⁶ With a direct identification with Daniel 5 times, in common with 10:1, the use of his Babylonian name is considered by some as strengthening the link with the earlier material. See Andrew Reid, *Kingdoms in Conflict: Reading Daniel Today* (Sydney NSW: AIO Press, 2000), 208. Hartman and Di Lella see the name Belteshazzar as a later clarifying addition (based on 1:7) on the assumption that the apocalypse in chapters 10-12 "once circulated as an independent unit" before annexation to older stories about Daniel (now 1-6); see Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 262.

⁶⁷ Baldwin, *Daniel*, 40. Also Young, *Introduction to the OT*, 361.

⁶⁸ Collins, *Daniel*, 72.

⁶⁹ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 90. Collins believes the overlap between Hebrew and Aramaic was a device to tie the two halves of the book together as a whole, the traditional tales intended to serve as an introduction to the visions. See Collins, *Daniel*, 15-16.

Sufficient to say, Pentecostals would support Baldwin's conclusions, loath to give credence to the theory of a redactor impinging on the doctrine of divine inspiration of Scripture. It is beyond the scope of this paper to present the technicalities of the counter argument here, but the point is made that the man Daniel is well portrayed in the early chapters, and although he appears only briefly in the later chapters, he is recognisable as the same person, a detail which functions as a link between the two sections. When the book is viewed as a unit, the message of the first part is so dynamic that it tends "to dominate the exposition of the remainder of the book and thus to alter the entire approach to the later chapters."⁷⁰

Dating the book is important for a second reason, for without doubt, it is a determining factor which reflects on the interpretation. For instance, Daniel is sometimes seen as a tract, possibly written by one of the Hasidim in the Maccabean persecution and as such, intended to convey particular truths and lessons. One such lesson is that God understood the plight of the persecuted, who could be comforted by stories of the triumph of piety in the face of similar suffering. Louis Hartman felt this book was intended as non-violent resistance literature to console and strengthen the religious fidelity of those persecuted by Antiochus IV Epiphanes, climaxing with the promise of resurrection in the new age.⁷¹

To Wallace, who takes an opposite view, the message of the whole book is directed to people in a settled, albeit alien, culture and not principally to those suffering deadly persecution, that is, a Babylonian not Maccabean situation. He believes that the response being elicited in that environment is the quest for righteous living within the Mosaic tradition, in co-operation with the controlling powers as far as conscience permits, and in spite of some opposition to the practise of their religion.⁷²

Some do see a mediating position. In the conservative understanding the phrase "sealing of the words until the time of the end" (cf. 12:9) indicates that the book was not fully comprehended by the Babylonian exiles for whom they believe it was originally written. It has also been suggested that it is not unreasonable to assume the book was current in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, as a genuine word for God's people for all time to

⁷⁰ Ronald S. Wallace, *The Lord is King: The Message of Daniel: The Bible Speaks Today Series* (Leicester UK: Inter-Varsity Press, 1979), 21.

⁷¹ Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 71; also 276.

⁷² E.g. Esther 3, Daniel 3, etc.

come from the tradition in Babylon.⁷³ In fact, some conservative scholars do not object to the idea that if the book of Daniel was being applied to the circumstances of Antiochus' day, it may have passed through a fresh recension.⁷⁴ The ongoing relevance of the message of God's control and foreknowledge of human history allows the book fresh bearing to later readers. This fits with Yarbrow Collins' previously cited definition of the normal purpose of apocalyptic genre, i.e. as serving "to interpret present, earthly circumstances in light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behavior of the audience by means of divine authority."⁷⁵

Regardless of the stance taken on the dating of Daniel – as exilic, Maccabean or as a fresh version – there is substantial agreement regarding the motif of the book. The conservative position on the purpose and teaching of Daniel may be summed up by Young as (a) seeking to show the superiority of Israel's God over the idols of the heathen nations; and (b) God's people will suffer times of persecution, but in the latter days His Messiah will establish an indestructible kingdom.⁷⁶ Baldwin summarises the one main theme, which she sees as underlining the unity of the whole book, as "the cost but final vindication of witness in a hostile society."⁷⁷ Di Lella identifies the thematic emphasis as being on the God of Israel as "master and guide of human history" who can reveal the future and cause His kingdom of chosen people ultimately to triumph over unholy nations and world powers.⁷⁸ Daniel has been understood similarly by many in the fundamentalist tradition who read the book as prophecy.⁷⁹ Passed on as Scripture, the truths which were important to the Babylonian Jewish community (and subsequently Maccabean and Roman) remain applicable to any generation of believers who may find themselves facing persecution or tribulation before the return of Christ.⁸⁰

⁷³ Wallace, *The Lord is King*, 22.

⁷⁴ E.g. Wallace, *The Lord is King*, 22; also Reid, *Kingdoms in Conflict*, 10-11. Cf. John E. Goldingay, *Daniel: WBC30* (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989), 326. Whilst not specifically dating Daniel, F.F. Bruce seems to indicate that the writing was after the events; see *Israel and the Nations* (Exeter UK: Paternoster Press, 1963), 124, 133, 141 n. 1. Brevard Childs claims that "the final redactional stamp was almost universally regarded as Hellenistic." See *Introduction to the OT as Scripture*, 613.

⁷⁵ Yarbrow Collins, "Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism," *Semeia* 36, 7.

⁷⁶ Young, *Introduction to the OT*, 372.

⁷⁷ Baldwin, *Daniel*, 63.

⁷⁸ Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 9. Before his death Hartman completed the translation, text-critical apparatus and explanatory notes of all 12 chapters as well as the commentary on chapters 1-9. Di Lella wrote the commentary on chapters 10-12, the whole Introduction and compiled the Bibliography.

⁷⁹ Goldingay compares Daniel's trepidation and sense of unworthiness as paralleling features of prophetic call narratives, thus implying the revelation has prophetic authority; see *Daniel*, 287.

⁸⁰ See, for example, closing comments by H.A. Ironside, *Lectures on Daniel the Prophet (with chart)* (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, Pubs., 1920), 246: "To the Christian, the book of Daniel must ever be a precious

For Pentecostals, the concept of the message is accessible to the people of God for all time. It is compatible with the Classical Pentecostal view that there is no sharp division between Israel and the church as the people of God.⁸¹ Stephen Land, a Pentecostal, whilst not actually talking of textual revisions, does consider that the apocalyptic movement during the intertestamental period “sought to recapitulate the concerns of the priests, prophets and sages, for cultic, social and personal holiness within their eschatological horizon of hope and cosmic transformation.”⁸² The case he makes is one in support of ongoing contemporary interpretation and application of the text.⁸³

c. Apocalypticism and the Prophetic Tradition

Apocalypticism is commonly equated with end-of-history scenarios, particularly in historical-type apocalypses like Daniel. Oswalt remarks on how the Old Testament recognises the importance of this world as the arena in which God not only revealed His salvation but explained it in terms of human experience. He adds that the inadequacy of experience to reveal the whole scope of God’s salvific intent became evident, hence the employment of eschatological prophecy as a projection or extension of those lessons, onto a broader plane.⁸⁴ This is helpful in explaining the explaining the use of apocalyptic as a literary device.

Intrinsic to apocalypticism is the desire to escape current circumstances, hope resting in eternal salvation that will dawn with a new age. The origin of apocalyptic and its relationship to prophetic eschatology has consumed the interest of scholars dedicated to distinguishing precise differences between the eschatologies in both these genres. The crux appears to be whether ordinary life and the futurist vision can be integrated, or whether a complete break with history is indicated before the new age is revealed. The

and soul-stirring record of the love and care of our gracious God, who always watches over His own for blessing, no matter how dark the night, and who has given us the sure word of prophecy as a light shining in the gloom, until the day dawn and the Day-star arise in our hearts.”

⁸¹ Cf. Pearlman’s teaching cited earlier.

⁸² Land, “A Passion for the Kingdom,” 46.

⁸³ Land, “A Passion for the Kingdom,” 46. He concedes that although Pentecostals may be rough-hewn and deemed theologically immature, they are passionate, have a common, urgent expectation of the coming of Jesus Christ and may serve in this century as a similar reminder “of the apocalyptic power and force of the gospel of the kingdom and to prepare the world for the end.”

⁸⁴ Oswalt, “Recent Studies in OT Apocalyptic,” 377-8.

debate stems from the question of whether apocalypticism is the true descendant of prophecy and is an additional aspect relating to the dating of the book of Daniel.

Daniel has often been accepted as a precursor to other apocalypses, and R.H. Charles, H.H. Rowley and D.S. Russell all looked primarily to the Old Testament for the source of apocalyptic language. There has long been awareness in academic circles that the language in Daniel is earlier than the second century.⁸⁵ Recent research into the origins of apocalyptic looks for pointers in Daniel (and *Enoch*) as to the matrix of the traditions, with both Babylon and the eastern Diaspora as the likely original *milieu*.⁸⁶ The suggestion of a common matrix in early Jewish apocalypticism is seen as having great potential significance.⁸⁷ Collins agrees that on the face of it, the Babylonian setting of Daniel 1-6 makes a Mesopotamian background for Daniel plausible.⁸⁸ The view that Daniel formed the bridge between prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic eschatology⁸⁹ was challenged after the discovery at Qumran of third century BC portions of *1 Enoch* and debate continues as to whether the relationship between prophecy and apocalyptic is a mutation rather than a direct development.⁹⁰

Studies have been organised around the points of agreement and differences between prophecy and apocalyptic, and with what might be seen as transitional features distinguishing between the beliefs of the old and new ages.⁹¹ J.N. Schofield sees the apocalyptic movement in late post-exilic Judaism as having roots deep in Hebrew prophecy (i.e. Isaiah 24-27; 33, Ezekiel 38f, Zechariah 9-14) and also that its eschatology

⁸⁵ LaSor, Hubbard & Bush, *OT Survey*, 574. See F. Delitzsch, "Daniel," in J.J. Herzog, ed. *Realenzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* 3 (Hamburg: 1855): 273; J.A. Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, ICC (Edinburgh: 1927), 13-22.

⁸⁶ Collins, "Genre, Ideology and Social Movements," 25.

⁸⁷ Noting current opinions on dating of Daniel and *1 Enoch*, Goldingay concedes Daniel is more likely to have been dependent on *1 Enoch* than vice versa, but that for many of the parallels interdependence is not required as the situations are different. See Goldingay, *Daniel*, xxviii.

⁸⁸ Collins, "Genre, Ideology and Social Movements," 27, 31f. He adds: "While many of the tenets of the old *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* have been discredited, the religious traditions of the Near East and Hellenistic world remain indispensable for the understanding of apocalypticism."

⁸⁹ Cf. Rowley, *Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 37ff. The distinction between apocalyptic eschatology and prophetic eschatology is much debated and different types of apocalyptic eschatology have been noted by scholars.

⁹⁰ For further debate on this see J.G. Gammie, "Review of P.D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*," in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1976) 654; also W. Roth, "Between Tradition and Expectation: The Origin and Role of Biblical Apocalyptic," *Explor* 4 (1978), 10.

⁹¹ See L. Morris, *Apocalyptic* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; London: Inter-Varsity, 1972); W. Schmithals, *The Apocalyptic Movement: Introduction and Interpretation*, trans J.E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975); G. Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, trans. D. Green (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968; London: SPCK, 1970).

envisaged a clear-cut division between this age and the age to come.⁹² Collins concedes the apocalyptists may indeed have utilised prophecy as their single most important source.⁹³ Collins points to notions of retribution after death as a major difference in the eschatology in Daniel to that of the prophets,⁹⁴ and says the use of biblical material in apocalypses should not be seen as primarily exegetical, but rather as a significant factor. The direct interpretation of Jeremiah's prophecy in Daniel 9 is an obvious example.⁹⁵ Moltmann, though not specifically arguing this view, insists that "the entire Old Testament was eschatological in that it looked to the fulfilment of greater and greater promises."⁹⁶ Moltmann's point is that both apocalyptic and prophecy interpret the whole cosmos in the light of truth learned from God's revelation in Israel's history. This position, as Oswalt sees it, makes credible the idea that apocalypticism and its eschatology come from the prophets and means they have the same basic orientation, albeit on different levels.

Daniel is generally viewed as prophecy by Pentecostals but accepting the Moltmann/Oswalt view that apocalyptic and prophecy have the same basic orientation, fine distinctions need not be considered an issue.

d. *Apocalypticism and Mythology*

Collins, despite agreeing prophecy may have been the apocalyptists' single most important source, warns that the tendency to incorporate apocalyptic literature into a prophetic setting may jeopardise the importance that should be attached to the "stranger mythological and cosmological components."⁹⁷ However, suggestions that biblical apocalypses use mythological motifs continue to excite widespread disagreement, not just from fundamentalists. This point is raised in anticipation of discussions on the text in Part B dealing with the origin of the concept in Daniel of angelic patrons over nations.

⁹² See Law, *Prophets, and Writings: The Religion of the Books of the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1969), 338 and 337.

⁹³ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 15.

⁹⁴ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 11-12.

⁹⁵ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 18. He points to many instances where use of older texts is only by way of "a phrase that brings a biblical passage to mind without claiming to interpret it in a definitive way."

⁹⁶ Oswalt, "Recent Studies in OT Apocalyptic," 375. See J. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, trans. J.W. Leitch (New York: Harper & Row; London: SCM, 1967), 124, 126.

⁹⁷ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 15.

Gunkel vigorously proposed the significance of Near Eastern mythology for understanding apocalyptic literature, seeking parallels in the Babylonian material available at that time. Subsequent scholarship has proposed that the Persian impact was significant and more recently the Canaanite-Ugaritic myths are looked to, especially in the case of Daniel. The Israelites are believed to have domesticated Canaanite motifs from early times, and contemporary resistance to accepting this, according to Collins, is based on misconceptions:

The Ugaritic texts come from the middle of the second millennium BC, more than a thousand years before the earliest apocalypses. However, no one would claim that the authors of Daniel or Enoch had before them the exact texts we now have. We have very little documentation of the Canaanite religious tradition. The Ugaritic myths provide examples of a tradition that is largely lost.⁹⁸

Such theories do not find total acceptance and Collins blames this on a misunderstanding of the word myth, deeming an explanation of the word essential. In the context of apocalyptic literature the connotation ought not to be seen as that which is false or pagan, he explains, but primarily as referring to the motifs and patterns derived from the religious stories of the ancient Near East and the Greco-Roman world.⁹⁹ Despite Collins' rationalisation of the term, theological opposition to the idea that biblical apocalypses use mythological motifs remains.¹⁰⁰

e. Apocalypticism and the Origin of Evil

An interesting approach to apocalypticism emerged within Italian scholarship in the late 1970s, in which the concept of evil is identified as independent and actual. The source material in the *Book of the Watchers*, the oldest Enochic book, had five different strata identified by Paolo Sacchi, implying a very long redactional process, reaching back to the fifth century BC.¹⁰¹ The significance of Sacchi's research, says Gabriele Boccaccini, is in showing that "The apocalypses witness to not only a form but a content; they are the

⁹⁸ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 18-19.

⁹⁹ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 18.

¹⁰⁰ Within the Evangelical school, however, Goldingay's stance is uncommon, in that he does see mythic motifs included in Daniel 10-12 and also refers to the prophetic passages as quasi-predictions. See Goldingay, *Daniel*, 282f.

¹⁰¹ Gabriele Boccaccini, "Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Contribution of Italian Scholarship," in *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 9*, John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth (eds.) (Sheffield UK: JSOT Press, 1991), 34.

vehicles of a definitive ‘world-view’.”¹⁰² The factor which holds the apocalyptic worldview together, despite all the differences, is the recognition of a core peculiarity in identifying the concept of evil as an autonomous reality - one which predates even the ability of human beings to choose, the result of an original sin that has irremediably corrupted creation. The origin of evil is taken as the underlying problem of the *Book of Watchers*, and Sacchi sought to track its effect from the oldest apocalypse on through the developing tradition with its distinctively apocalyptic solution - the cataclysmic intervention of God.

To Boccaccini, this concept of evil is “not simply one of so many ‘apocalyptic’ ideas; it is the generative idea of a distinct ideological tradition of thought, the corner-stone on which and out of which the whole ‘apocalyptic’ tradition is built.”¹⁰³ He sees this as having implications for our understanding of historical theology, particularly that of the Second Temple period, enriching our comprehension of Jewish thought on the eve of the Christian era. Theological concerns relating to such topics as knowledge, freewill, salvation, and the origin of evil were not simply the result of Hellenistic influences, but “open questions within Judaism itself” with “alternative solutions, each deeply rooted in the religious experience of the Jewish people” which had lasted for centuries and would continue to impassion and divide generations.¹⁰⁴

Sacchi’s work is acknowledged as having been influential in European scholarship, his diachronic approach to the development of apocalyptic traditions being considered highly innovative. The motif of original sin can be clearly seen in the Enoch corpus and elsewhere, including influences in the Dead Sea Scrolls,¹⁰⁵ but to Collins, whilst highlighting an important motif is to Sacchi’s credit, the genre cannot be identified with a single theme, nor the *Book of Watchers* regarded as normative for all apocalypses. Other themes, he says, are no less important.¹⁰⁶ Elsewhere he notes, “The origin of evil is not a primary concern of Daniel.”¹⁰⁷

¹⁰² Boccaccini, “Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition,” 35.

¹⁰³ Boccaccini, “Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition,” 37.

¹⁰⁴ Boccaccini, “Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition,” 37.

¹⁰⁵ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 11; see F. Garcia Martinez, “Les traditions apocalyptiques à Qumran,” in C. Kappler, ed., *Apocalypses et voyages dans l’au-delà* (Paris: Cerf, 1987), 201-35.

¹⁰⁶ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 11.

¹⁰⁷ Collins, “Genre, Ideology and Social Movements,” 22.

Sacchi's research had the effect of narrowing the gap between the conservative dating of Daniel and the second century BC dating by critical scholars. However, Boccaccini has drawn attention to the fact that Sacchi's definition actually puts Daniel outside his framework of what constitutes apocalyptic.¹⁰⁸ This is not totally a negative factor for Pentecostals, who are more concerned with whether the text is canonical than any genre analysis. Sacchi bases his research on the Enochic corpus, which to Pentecostals at large could be problematic in proving anything about Daniel, due to its extracanonical status. Such sources are never looked to as exerting influence on the authors of Scripture. On the other hand, Jude's use of Enoch cannot easily be ignored, particularly because it is related to a topic common to Daniel – the archangel Michael. In this instance (and others where secular sources have been used),¹⁰⁹ it is argued these were co-opted to God's cause under divine inspiration and now have authority only because they have become part of the canon of Scripture. Despite the reservations expressed by Collins, Sacchi's concept of evil as an autonomous reality adds a new facet to understanding the dreams and visions in Daniel, beyond their immediate context or setting. As a worldview on the eve of the Christian era, New Testament usage of the imagery and thought forms of apocalyptic preserving full harmony with Old Testament ideas is also explained.

To sum up Part A, it has been noted that despite impressive counter-arguments, for Pentecostals there is little ground for any mediating opinion between the two positions on dating Daniel. They accept the traditional view of the historical Daniel as the author of the whole book, adhere to an exilic (or early) dating and accept the historical authenticity of the material. This is usually read as a combination of narrative and prophecy. The rationalisation for pseudonymity or substitutionary authorship is rejected, also any suggestions the prophecies are *ex eventu*, or derive from Ancient Near East myths. Having discussed the Pentecostal approach to apocalyptic literature, it becomes necessary to examine the various interpretations and reasoning of commentators on Daniel 10:13.

¹⁰⁸ See G. Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 126-60.

¹⁰⁹ E.g. Jude 9 or Acts 17:28.

Part B: Understanding the Text

1. Reading Daniel 10

In general, Pentecostals do not believe they have a monopoly on understanding truth¹¹⁰ and demonstrably have not been averse to making use of the theological resources of other traditions, as a result of their own eclectic origins. Evaluating various interpretations against accepted hermeneutical norms within the community of faith has already been discussed in the previous chapter. Accordingly, non-Pentecostal sources considered valid in deriving a Pentecostal interpretation of Dan 10:13 include:

- i. Conservative scholars sharing the same view of Scripture as Pentecostals, and whose textual insights and observations are therefore largely acceptable (e.g. Baldwin, Fyall, Goldingay, Longman, Lucas, Wallace, Young, McConville);
- ii. Scholars holding a comparable eschatology and/or being cited in Pentecostal references (e.g. Gleason Archer, Ironside);¹¹¹
- iii. Textual observations of critical scholars (e.g. Hartman and Di Lella, Collins, Kratz) for dialogic contrasts and insights.

Before analysing the passage Dan 10:13, establishing a general background will be helpful.

a. *A Theology of History*

The early stories in chapters 1-6 of the book of Daniel are remarkably optimistic. They show how it is possible for Yahweh's people to live in a heathen environment without compromising their own faith, and how even though Gentiles might stand in temporal

¹¹⁰ This statement is predominantly true, notwithstanding the extremist views of a few atypical factions, such as "oneness" Pentecostals. For further information on both the history and theological issues which distinguish "Oneness Pentecostals" from others of Pentecostal persuasion, see Gregory A. Boyd, *Oneness Pentecostals and the Trinity (A worldwide movement assessed by a former Oneness Pentecostal)* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1992). Another useful resource is *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement* by Douglas Jacobsen (Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 2003). In addition to material on the Classical origins of Pentecostalism, Jacobsen includes chapters entitled "Oneness Options" and "Theology at the Boundaries of the Pentecostal Movement."

¹¹¹ E.g. *DPCM* where numerous dispensational Premillennialists are cited as sources for the "Daniel" entry. A revised and expanded edition of *DPCM*, now entitled *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, was published in 2002. Unfortunately articles on books of the Bible included in the original volume have been omitted to provide room for new historical entries, meaning a more up-to-date list of Danielic studies accessed by Pentecostals is not available.

political supremacy, God in heaven controls the world and its time frames. Gentile kings will come to acknowledge Yahweh, and the proud will be humbled. The stories tell of Daniel as a man who receives revelations and dreams, portraying him as a skilled interpreter of the mysteries entailed. Though the mood of the revelations in the second half of the book is very different, they show an essential continuity with the first part, both in form and content. The main difference is that initially Daniel interprets the dreams of others; in the second section Daniel himself is the dreamer, while an angelic being becomes the interpreter.

Nebuchadnezzar's dream (Daniel 2) is a key matter implying "a theology of history" (Collins' terminology) which portrays God as sovereign of a managed universe that includes pagan peoples. A sense of determinism prevails. It portrays God as having an overall plan, able to save His faithful people in even the most extreme personal danger. With the flow of events already predetermined, it is progressively revealed to the reader that the wise individuals are those who understand and align their position accordingly.¹¹²

The most important feature is not history itself, but the preeminence and supremacy of Daniel's God over all the false gods implicit in the worship of idols.¹¹³ Daniel's elucidation of the meaning of the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream affirms God's power to destroy the whole image, that is, the dominant nations represented there (and throughout the book). God's authority to destroy world powers is contiguous with His ability to reveal all mysteries.¹¹⁴

Within the Danielic theology of history, pagan rule is patently part of God's plan and is not being rejected, as the text makes evident (2:20-23). The ordered progression of the four kingdoms in Daniel 7 implies a managed world. Empires rise and fall according to God's timetable. Daniel's subservient position to the various kings is not incompatible with his religious beliefs, rather his character and God-given abilities are a major dynamic in enhancing his service. God's sovereign control of the fate of all peoples (or the 'kingdom of God' theme) runs through the whole book and is a unifying factor. The

¹¹² Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 92.

¹¹³ This is highlighted later by Daniel's words to Belshazzar in 5:23.

¹¹⁴ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 97-98.

persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes adds a new perspective: Gentile kingdoms are “no longer seen as potential servants of God.”¹¹⁵ The combination of the historical and the mystical (as opposed to mythical) is integral to all apocalyptic literature.¹¹⁶

A sense of the miraculous is stirred in the early stories, and the companion theme of faithfulness even in the face of death could be seen as the key to advancement and as an example to be taken up by the reader. The apocalyptic revelations, however, are less sanguine. Resting on dreams and visions, they require belief in a supernatural world populated by angels. It is in this supernatural dimension that answers to human dilemmas must be sought, but the final outcome, by book’s end, is resurrection and exaltation in an afterlife, not miraculous preservation from death (Dan. 12:2).¹¹⁷

To sum up, in Daniel 1-6 Yahweh’s people could live in a heathen environment without compromising their own faith. Despite temporal political supremacy, Gentile kings will finally acknowledge Yahweh. The apocalyptic mood of the second half, though less sanguine, displays a unity in form and content with the early stories. The theology of history implicit in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream (Daniel 2) portrays God as sovereign of a managed universe which includes pagans and an overall plan: He is able to save His people in any circumstance, destroy world powers and reveal all mysteries. The apocalyptic section reveals a supernatural world in which dimension answers to human dilemmas may be sought. Faithfulness in the face of death is emphasised, but resurrection and exaltation in an afterlife is the finale of history, and the wise align themselves with God’s plan. Before narrowing the focus to discuss the context and structure of Daniel 10, more should be said on the role of the wise ones in Daniel.

b. *The Role of the Wise*

The behaviour epitomised by Daniel and his companions is a constant message throughout the book, crystallised in the final chapter by the *maskilim*, or wise ones:

Those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the sky, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars forever and ever (12:3 NRSV).

¹¹⁵ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 98.

¹¹⁶ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 13.

¹¹⁷ Collins, *Daniel*, 38.

The circumstances of the apocalyptic chapters are confrontational with regards to ungodly heathen nations, with no indication of conciliation with the kingdom of God. Without suggestion of militant resistance, the wise ones are willing to lay down their lives to remain faithful to Yahweh.¹¹⁸ Force of arms is not a solution since the situation is in God's hands, the outcome pre-empted: the persecutor will be defeated, Michael their prince will fight on their behalf and be victorious. Finally, the dead will be resurrected, some to everlasting life, some to everlasting contempt. However, for the present their hope, which corresponds directly with their persecution, must rest on the assurance that the appointed time is coming.¹¹⁹ This perspective would encourage faithful Jews of future generations to endure and provide the rationale for laying down their lives in the face of vicious persecution.¹²⁰

The task of the wise ones is to bring enlightenment to the masses (*rabbim* or many). Goldingay writes of how the verb translated by him as enlighten (בִּיַן), is common in Daniel.¹²¹ It generally denotes insight into the meaning of dreams, visions, or prophecies, suggesting thus “the ministry of the discerning is not teaching in general, or exhortation to faithfulness, but the interpretation of the prophetic scriptures.”¹²² This was necessary as the supernatural framework and meaning of Daniel's revelations was not open and plain (12:4).

These non-combatants are depicted as the true heroes of the persecution, effectively martyrs who fall by sword and flame and thereby are refined and cleansed, but who will be especially honoured at the resurrection (11:32-35; 12:3). The group which forsakes the covenant (11:30, 32) is contrasted sharply with the wise ones, signalling that not the whole community will be saved.

¹¹⁸ In this framework, Collins sees Daniel's message as displaying more than a trace of pacifism, See *Daniel*, 6, 38. The ideology of this group of non-militant wise teachers is opposite to the mood of 1 Maccabees, but Jewish tradition was not restricted to one response to the Antiochene crisis.

¹¹⁹ “The repetition of מוֹעֵד (“set time,” 11:27, 29, 35; cf. 12:7) underlines the divine control and purpose at work even in the abominations and the suffering of the Antiochene period... the idea of wrath being “complete” (11:36) implies that it cannot go on without limit.” Goldingay, *Daniel*, 294.

¹²⁰ Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 284.

¹²¹ Frequently the word is rendered in some form of the verb to understand; see Dan 8:27; 9:2; 10:1; 12:8; for understood; Dan 1:4, 17, 20; 2:21; 4:34; 5:11, 12, 14 etc. for understanding (cf. 11:33 understanding in NRSV, but instruct in KJV); Dan 10:11, 12, 14; 9: 13, 23, 25; 12:10 for understand.

¹²² See Goldingay, *Daniel*, 303.

The Book of Truth (10:21)¹²³ is depicted as containing details of God's future purposes in the world and is a symbol of his control of history on a cosmic level. The nations and the powers behind them may threaten to thwart God's purposes, even appearing victorious at times (cf. 8:9-12). However, the scroll of destiny will stand as evidence that the Lord is sovereign and almighty, not only able to order history, but able to bring it to its conclusion. No threat to him, his purposes, or his people will withstand his inevitable climax.¹²⁴

This feature of the wise conveying understanding to the many is of interest in view of the alleged esotericism of apocalyptic literature, particularly as the whole purpose of the revelation in Daniel is to bring understanding to the masses. Collins considers that it is the apocalyptic perspective (that is, the metaphysical backdrop, rather than the historical prophecy), which is not publicly accessible.¹²⁵ The theme of understanding begins as early as 10:1 and 10:14 where the real conflict is the one being fought between the angelic princes. Its course and outcome are predetermined, but resolution comes when not a human victor but Michael arises (12:1): "Since this angelic activity is not immediately obvious in history it is especially crucial to the revealed understanding."¹²⁶

The role of the wise, then, is exemplified by Daniel, his companions and the *maskilim*. The wise ones are discerning leaders submitted to Yahweh. Having pondered his ways in history and Scripture, they comprehend he will ultimately triumph. In his cause they are willing both to enlighten the many regarding the prophetic Scriptures in their supernatural framework and to lay down their own lives to remain faithful to him.

Understanding the theology of history in Daniel and the role of the wise is helpful as the general background. The passage Dan 10:13 is found in an apocalyptic vision in Daniel 10-12. Some discussion on context and structure is needed as the focus narrows. The

¹²³ Goldingay calls this the "reliable book" and distinguishes it from the other books mentioned in Daniel, i.e. the Book (12:1) in which is written the names of those who belong to God's people or "the citizen list of the true Jerusalem," in addition to other books (7:10) which record the basis for God's past judgements. Goldingay, *Daniel*, 306. Cf. the scroll in Revelation 5.

¹²⁴ Reid, *Kingdoms in Conflict*, 214; also Hammer, *Book of Daniel*, 103.

¹²⁵ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 111f. He regards the command of the angel to seal the book (12:4) as a consequence of pseudonymity and a suitable explanation of why the apocalyptic chapters of Daniel were not in circulation before the Maccabean era.

¹²⁶ Collins, *Daniel*, 102.

basis of understanding begins in the broader context of chapters 7 to 12, because many elements within these apocalyptic portions are entwined.¹²⁷

c. Context and Structure

The vision in Daniel 7 is a core apocalypse, involving a schema of four kingdoms,¹²⁸ closely resembling that of Daniel 8. Chapter 8 in turn sets the stage for chapter 10. Dan 8:27 (the transitional verse between chapters 1-8 and 9-12) reads (NRSV):

So I, Daniel, was overcome and lay sick for some days; then I arose and went about the king's business. But I was dismayed by the vision and did not understand it.

Chapters 10-12, the longest single section, concern one revelation (notwithstanding the points of contact with chapters 7 and 9), and go well beyond recapitulation of earlier material.¹²⁹ Although almost every verse of chapter 8 reappears in identical or similar form in 10-12, clear-cut particulars to understanding chapter 8 are offered,¹³⁰ and identification of the prince of Greece (10:20) may be seen as completing the four-kingdom sequence.¹³¹ The involvement of angelic princes and the explicit account of resurrection characterises chapters 10-12 as apocalyptic,¹³² and the only segment dated to the reign of Cyrus.¹³³ As is continually noted by scholars, they should be considered as

¹²⁷ Daniel is consistently considered to be in two parts: (a) 1-6 stories, (acknowledging that Dan.2:13-45 is an apocalypse). (b) 7-12 four apocalypses or visions. Collins notes that "Daniel 10:1-12:4 is in itself a complete 'Historical' Apocalypse in the form of an Epiphany with an Angelic Discourse." See *Daniel*, 99 with formatting of citation as per original. Hartman and Di Lella point out chapters 1-9 as each being nine individual, logical sections and 10-12 the tenth, making it a unique biblical feature. As each unit is discrete, in their opinion they could have existed independently without appreciable loss of intelligibility. This indicates to them the possibility of a redactor/compiler who was not the author of the whole. See Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 12.

¹²⁸ The connection between the dream-vision of Daniel 7 and Daniel 2 is well noted by scholars.

¹²⁹ This is evident as chapter 9 containing the interpretation of an older biblical text (i.e. Jer 25:11-12; 29:10 re Jeremiah's prophecy of seventy weeks), does not appear in 10-12.

¹³⁰ See Goldingay, *Daniel*, 283f; also Reinhard G. Kratz, "The Visions of Daniel," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, Volume I, John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint (eds.) (Boston/Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, Inc., 2002), 105; and Collins, *Daniel*, 343.

¹³¹ Collins, *Daniel*, 12.

¹³² Collins, *Daniel*, 99.

¹³³ Cyrus the Persian, known biblically by a number of titles, amongst them king of Persia (2 Chron 36:22) and king of Babylon (Ezra 5:13), is previously mentioned by the writer only in passing, with the information that the first year of his reign was the extent of Daniel's ministry (1:21; cf. 6:28). Although the Septuagint, consistent with 1:21, has first year, the Hebrew has third year. Di Lella sees this as an attempt to harmonize 10:1 with 1:21, notwithstanding his position that the date is fictitious. He considers it to be given because events it implies bear on the date given in 11:1. See Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 262. Interestingly, the release of the Jewish exiles is not mentioned, although Cyrus' "edict of restoration"

a single vision, with the first segment (10:1-11:1) providing the setting for the revelation that follows (11:2-12:4).¹³⁴

Although based on the chapter 7 apocalypse, the historical information contained in this final, longest and most complex apocalypse is generally regarded as by far the most important.¹³⁵ The length and location give chapters 10-12 a special emphasis. The narrative falls readily into three parts:¹³⁶ prologue, revelation and epilogue, i.e.:

- i. Prologue (10:1-11:1): the appearance of an angel to Daniel¹³⁷ and their initial conversation about a war in heaven;
- ii. Revelation (11:2-12:4): a disclosure of the future in a limited survey of history involving four kings; and
- iii. Epilogue (12:5-13): a closing scene with the angel's last words for Daniel.

The seer has twice previously encountered an angelic being, but in chapters 10-12 an imprecise number of celestial beings is involved, heightening the metaphysical backdrop to the revelation.¹³⁸ The timeframe is established immediately (10:1 NRSV):

In the third year of King Cyrus of Persia a word was revealed to Daniel, who was named Belteshazzar. The word was true, and it concerned a great conflict. He understood the word, having received understanding in the vision.

The word revealed to Daniel (10:1) is paralleled with the vision in the same verse, apparently encompassing the whole revelation, which begins with the angelic epiphany.¹³⁹ Daniel's understanding of the vision may more plausibly be taken as retrospective, rather than his preliminary response.

was issued in the first year of his reign (2 Chron.36:22). Clearly, Daniel did not return to his native land with the first wave of returnees.

¹³⁴ Collins, *Daniel*, 99; Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 275; Hammer, *Book of Daniel*, 101f; et al.

¹³⁵ Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 275.

¹³⁶ Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 275.

¹³⁷ An angelic epiphany (or vision of a single supernatural figure) in chapter 8 acts as a precedent to that in Daniel 10. An epiphany is not as full as a dream-vision, therefore not construed as an apocalypse without additional forms. The visionary's reaction to the epiphany is depicted, then an angelic discourse follows, giving the content of the revelation, rather than an interpretation. See Collins, *Daniel*, 8. Collins (p. 9) explains an angelic discourse as "a revelation delivered as a speech by an angel. It may follow an epiphany as in Daniel 10-11 or be reported without visual elements as in *Jub.* 2:1ff."

¹³⁸ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 289.

¹³⁹ Collins, *Daniel*, 99, 372.

Daniel's companions do not share the vision (10:7), (nor are they mentioned as joining him in fasting), emphasising the privileged nature of his access and the momentous character of his experience.¹⁴⁰ Di Lella highlights the meaning of the Hebrew word *mar'ah* (used in 10:7 as distinct from *mar'eh* used in 10:1 and both translated as vision), as indicating "a real, though unusual, external manifestation, and not simply an internal impression of the imagination."¹⁴¹ Were it purely internal, he argues, Daniel's companions would not have reacted as they did and the angel could not have been prevented by the prince of Persia from appearing to Daniel for the twenty-one days.

Surprisingly, Daniel's lengthy prayer in chapter 9 is a prayer of confession on behalf of his nation, rather than a request for clarification, as one might have expected (based on the transitional verse cited above). Scholars draw attention to the traditional Deuteronomic theology of the prayer (prayer and repentance will reverse punishment). To Collins at least, this theology of prayer jars with its apocalyptic framework since the text makes evident that the angel was dispatched as soon as Daniel began praying, that is, without waiting to hear his prayer. To him the depiction of the angel's behaviour speaks of a revised theology, in which events will follow their predetermined course irrespective of prayer and repentance. This serves to highlight the determinism of the apocalyptic view. Pentecostals have a strong view of God responding to the prayers of believers and would find such a conclusion confining. Collins concedes that although in apocalyptic the course of events is seen as predetermined, there does remain a place for human freedom: though the course of events may not alter, personal reactions remain the province of the individual.¹⁴²

Daniel's inability to understand the vision of chapter 8 (8:27) is usually connected with his decision to fast (10:2) and the reason insight is granted (9:2, 22-23; 10:1, 11, 12, 14). The dating of the three-week fast (10:4) is significant, occurring across the festivals of Passover and Unleavened Bread (Exod 12:1-20). Nuances of the Passover message, the deliverance of Israel from bondage in Egypt, are noticeable in this context.¹⁴³ Literally in mourning (10:2), Daniel's self-affliction or humbling of himself (cf. 10:14) contains

¹⁴⁰ For parallel in life of Moses see Exod 20:18 and Deut 4:12.

¹⁴¹ Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 264.

¹⁴² Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 108f.

¹⁴³ Hammer, *Book of Daniel: CBC*, 102; see also Collins, *Daniel*, 373. However, at Passover only one week of fasting was necessary.

shades of Hebrew mourning rites for the dead.¹⁴⁴ The reference to fasting involves great personal struggle and a lack of attention to his personal appearance, indicated by his decision to refrain from anointing himself with oil. The savoury food from which he abstained, literally bread of pleasantness or delightfulness, is contrasted to bread of affliction (unleavened bread as per Deut.16:3), mandatory for Passover.¹⁴⁵ Kratz, says Chapters 10-12 are thus “a peshet not only to chapter 8, but latently also to several predictions of older prophets that were highly relevant for the author.”¹⁴⁶

In summary, Daniel 10-12 is a single vision and the most important, although based on chapter 7. Traditional theology of prayer is noted in Daniel’s prayer and the tension with apocalyptic determinism. The personal involvement of God with his people and nuances of the Passover and deliverance from bondage are helpful contributions to a prayer theology for Pentecostals. Daniel’s experience was real but privileged, not shared by his companions. The point has now been reached to consider the immediate circumstances of the vision in chapter 10 in which Daniel receives a visit from a supernatural being.

d. *The Interpreting Angel*

Daniel’s fast (10:3), prompted by his lack of understanding of one vision (10:12), precipitates another vision (10:7). This time Daniel is beside the river Tigris (10:4).¹⁴⁷ It is not clear from the text whether he sees a battle scene (10:1) in the vision or only an angel who gives an oral revelation.¹⁴⁸ One might have expected that since Daniel had “set his mind to understand,” (9:23; 10:12) the first vision would be repeated or at least an explanation given. Instead, the interpreting angel (or *angelus interpres*)¹⁴⁹ is now the

¹⁴⁴ Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 262.

¹⁴⁵ Hammer, *Book of Daniel: CBC*, 102; see also Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 262.

¹⁴⁶ Kratz, “The Visions of Daniel,” 109.

¹⁴⁷ Syriac has “the Euphrates” where MT has “the Tigris.” However, the term the great river has previously only referred to the Euphrates (Gen 15:18; Deut 1:7; Josh 1:4). For this reason, Di Lella considers this a gloss. See Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 263.

¹⁴⁸ Collins, *Daniel*, 99.

¹⁴⁹ The *angelus interpres* is depicted now with features reminiscent of Ezekiel’s writings (see Kratz, “The Visions of Daniel,” in *Book of Daniel*, 107), which are echoed in Revelation 1:13-15 (thus Collins, *Daniel*, 99; also Hammer, *Book of Daniel: CBC*, 102). The latter adds that “The parallels with Isaiah 6 claimed by Nicol are on a more general level and of doubtful significance.”

focus, and the first vision remains unexplained. Daniel's reactions to the interpreting angel undergo perceptible changes with each encounter.¹⁵⁰

Though looking at a man clothed in linen¹⁵¹ (10:5), Daniel is aware this is a supernatural being in human form, an understanding which underlines the supernatural authority and significance of the following revelation.¹⁵² The unnamed angel is most often considered to be Gabriel, based on features in common with earlier Gabriel episodes.¹⁵³ Others have argued that the effect of the angel on Daniel in chapter 10 was so profound by comparison with the previous encounters as to suggest a supernatural being superior to either Gabriel or even Michael, both of whom are carefully identified by the writer. With a display of great respect, Daniel addresses the unnamed angel as my lord ('*adoni*') (10:16).¹⁵⁴ Certainly awesome terms are used to describe this being, but this does not necessarily identify him as Yahweh or Messiah.¹⁵⁵ Rather, as Goldingay suggests, exegesis must preserve the allusiveness often characterised in vision reports and experiences, thus heightening the awesomeness of the occasion.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁰ E.g. at first Daniel takes the initiative and moves towards the spiritual being (7:16), but on their second meeting, the angel approaches Daniel, who reacts by falling on his face (8:17), and the words Daniel hears spoken have a strong physical effect on him (8:18-19; 10:9, 15ff). Cf. Saul on the Damascus Road (Acts 9:3-4; 22:6-7). See also Dan. 8:16-18; Josh 5:14; Ezek 1:28; Rev 1:17; 1 Enoch 24: 24. Hartman and Di Lella suggest such conduct is based on the OT belief that no man could see God and live (cf. Exod 3:6, 19:21; 33:18-20; Isa 6:5); see *Book of Daniel*, 281.

¹⁵¹ "[T]he angelic being in Ezek 9:2,3,11; 10:2,6,7 is also dressed in a linen garment which distinguishes him from the six others whom he accompanied. Linen, considered a ritually pure fabric, was also worn by the priests in the Old Testament (cf. Lev 6:10), and in the Book of Revelation by the angels (Rev 15:6), the Lamb's Bride (Rev 19:8), and the armies of heaven (Rev 19:14)." Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 263, 279; also Hammer, *Book of Daniel: CBC*, 102.

¹⁵² Goldingay, *Daniel*, 287.

¹⁵³ Such as calling Daniel greatly beloved (10:11, 19), literally, a man of loveliness. Cf. also 10:11, 13-14, 19, 21 and 8:15-16; 9: 21-23; see Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 279; also 243, note to 9: 23

¹⁵⁴ Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 285; Di Lella notes (p. 280) that comparative descriptions in Revelation (1:13-16; 2:18) led early Christian commentators to decide the being was Jesus.

¹⁵⁵ See Kevin J. Conner, *The Book of Daniel: An Exposition* (Vermont VIC: KJC Ministries Inc., 2004), 247f. Interpreting the figure as Messiah Jesus, as Conner does, is theologically problematic for we then have (in 10:13) Messiah unable to overcome by himself the prince of the kingdom of Persia, one less than Satan himself, without the assistance of Michael. Identification of the figure is not vital to the interpretation of the text and would not diminish the authority of Scripture in any way. On the contrary, such specific identification adds what was not there and serves to undermine messianic superiority. Conner, an Australian Pentecostal, is unequivocal that this is an example of a theophany or christophany. He gives a full-page description of The Vision of Christ in Daniel 10, followed by a comparison of the visions of Ezekiel and John to confirm this is a theophany or Christophany. Conner associates the description of the being in 10:3-6 with those given of Christ in Revelation 1 and Matt. 17:2, but recognises the angel in verses 10-12 as Gabriel; see 250. Wallace takes the mediating view, writing of the especially important one mentioned in the midst who seems to be higher than any other; see *The Lord is King*, 178f.

¹⁵⁶ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 291; he extrapolates later that the heavenly beings were so impressive and awesome that the overwhelming effect was as though God himself were present. (cf. the name Michael means 'who is like God'); this agrees with Reid's opinion that the man dressed in linen was *sent* by someone else and brought a message, therefore was not God Himself. See *Kingdoms in Conflict*, 209.

Daniel's prayer and penitential attitude are the primary reason for the angel appearing to him. Even though the angel was sent by God, opposition from the prince of the kingdom of Persia is able to detain him, interestingly, for the precise duration of Daniel's fast (cf. 10:2 and 13).

But the prince of the kingdom of Persia opposed me twenty-one days. So Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me, and I left him there with the prince of the kingdom of Persia, and have come to help you understand what is to happen to your people at the end of days. For there is a further vision for those days (10:13-14 NRSV).

At this point, where Michael takes his place, the first angel is temporarily released to complete his original commission. Goldingay points out that significance of the interlude is highlighted later by the "nevertheless" of v 21, which indicates that "the messenger is prepared to delay resuming his battles in order to deliver the revelation that follows."¹⁵⁷

The writer entwines remarks on the messenger's purpose with the conflict (10:20a, 21 and 11:2) in an a-b-a-b-a arrangement.¹⁵⁸ This literary device again underlines the importance of the message by tying its delivery on earth to the reality of the heavenly clash. The obstructing tactics of Prince of Persia not only explain why the angel was delayed in coming to Daniel, but expose the manoeuvre as a ploy to prevent the divine revelation from being irrevocably accessible.¹⁵⁹ The description of the conflict which occupies Daniel 11 is much longer and in that sense more vital, yet the delivery of the message in the interim takes precedence. The messenger tells Daniel he will be returning to the fight to ensure that Persia continues to be restrained from adversely affecting God's purpose and introduces the notion that yet another nation, Greece, will threaten that purpose.

Collins believes Persia and Greece are opposed to Israel simply because Israel happens to be in the way. He does not see here the indication of imperial nations standing as God's agents for punishment of Israel that is taken for granted elsewhere in Scripture. He sees

¹⁵⁷ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 293.

¹⁵⁸ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 292.

¹⁵⁹ James A. Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel (The International Critical Commentary)* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927/1989), 411.

the conflict at hand as political, not religious. If wholly accepted, this view has the effect of reducing the awesome quality of the great war being described. As Goldingay says, it is the purpose of God which unites the common interest of the messenger and Michael in “the heavenly correspondents of these earthly powers.”¹⁶⁰

To summarise, the interpreting angel is unnamed but most often identified with Gabriel. The prince of Persia detains the angel for the duration of Daniel’s fast until Michael takes his place, enabling completion of the original commission. The text does not state the exact nature of the conflict nor why the messenger could not defeat the prince. The writer entwines the messenger’s purpose with the conflict, linking both the importance of delivering the message on earth to the reality of the heavenly clash. Obstruction by the Prince of Persia not only explains the angel’s delay in coming to Daniel, but more importantly, indicates a scheme to prevent the divine revelation from becoming permanent. The fight which threatens Yahweh’s purpose is ongoing and the messenger will return to the fray. Political facets are recognisable but the supernatural battle is portrayed in cosmic rather than local dimensions, a view which accords well with Pentecostal eschatology.

Mention has now been made of the princes of Persia and Greece and of Michael as Israel’s prince (Dan 10:13, 21). These titles are frequently taken as indicating a belief in tutelary spirits over different nations. This leads to a discussion of the concept of tutelary spirits.

2. Angelic Patrons of the Nations in Daniel

a. The Concept of Tutelary Spirits

Throughout the Old Testament, Yahweh is a man of war - He is the Lord of hosts. Nevertheless, the celestial warfare still appears as an exotic feature in Daniel, only becoming unexceptional in later apocalyptic literature.¹⁶¹ Collins describes the supernatural setting central to Daniel’s concept of history as embedded in the supposition

¹⁶⁰ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 292f.

¹⁶¹ Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 70.

that what occurs on earth is “a reflection of a celestial archetype.”¹⁶² This concept has appeal for Pentecostal eschatology. The idea of different gods for different nations is considered to have been a common belief in the ancient Middle East. Tutelary gods were believed to stand behind every city-state, nation or empire and do battle on behalf of their people, the more momentous conflict really being contests between their gods.¹⁶³

The idea that ancient polytheistic theology, rooted in Canaanite mythology, was adapted into Israelite thinking is commonly accepted by various scholars.¹⁶⁴ In this process of adopting the myths into Scripture, the biblical authors are considered to have eliminated polytheistic elements offensive to monotheism.¹⁶⁵ Despite the editing efforts of biblical authors, vestiges of polytheistic beliefs are considered discernible in the Bible. As such, Yahweh is the God of Israel¹⁶⁶ and one of the sons of God (i.e. an angel) presides over every other nation. Collins presses the point that early Israel did not disagree with the existence of other gods, only denying “that they had efficacy or power.”¹⁶⁷ The princes of Daniel 10 are a clear adaptation of this concept, he says.¹⁶⁸ Their significance in that setting, he explains, is that they add an apocalyptic dimension to the record of events, i.e. they illustrate that the “course of history is not in human hands but is determined by forces beyond our control.”¹⁶⁹ This description sits well with the Pentecostal worldview and eschatology, but his view that early Israel did not disagree with the existence of other gods, only denying their efficacy or power, is contentious.

Di Lella also writes of the intention of the author of Daniel to preserve the orthodox monotheistic position. He sees traces of the tradition in Psalm 82 and Isa 24:21 and considers that by the 2nd century BC, the era in which he judges Daniel to have been written, belief in national guardian angels was surely widespread and wholly orthodox. It

¹⁶² Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 110.

¹⁶³ For example, the Rabshakeh’s taunt to Hezekiah may be seen as founded on the man’s belief in national deities (2 Kgs 18:35; cf. Isa 36:20).

¹⁶⁴ E.g. Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 273; Collins, *Daniel OTM 15*, 100. However, scholars remain uncertain about the time and circumstances of this transformation of belief.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Deut. 4:19 (cf. Deut. 29:26), Deut 32:8 and Psalm 82; for actual warfare see also cf. Josh 24:15; Jud 5:19-20; 2 Sam 5:22-24; Isa 24: 21; 36: 18-20; 2Kgs 18:32-35. These Scripture references are usually cited as evidence of Israel having absorbed such beliefs into their own religion.

¹⁶⁶ Sirach 17:17, written in a period comparatively close to the time that critical scholars consider Daniel was written, states: “He appointed a ruler over every nation, but Israel is the Lord’s own portion,” reiterating Deuteronomy 32 (cf. *Jub* 15:31-32).

¹⁶⁷ Collins, *Daniel*, 100.

¹⁶⁸ Collins, *Daniel*, 101, 374.

¹⁶⁹ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 110.

was at this point, he says, that the tradition of heavenly battles between angelic beings achieved clear expression.¹⁷⁰ Di Lella's late dating of Daniel leads to this conclusion. Pentecostals might not agree with his reasoning, but they certainly see the same thing in the received text as him – the clear expression of the supernatural battle. Di Lella continues that in the process of biblical writers guarding monotheism, these guardian angels were made “subject to God's supreme authority, exercising their functions either by defying the divine will... or by acting explicitly as God's agents.”¹⁷¹

Deut 32:8 is the biblical example most frequently cited by many scholars as an earlier witness than Daniel of each nation having its own guardian angel:

When the Most High (Heb. *Elyon*) divided their inheritance to the nations,
When he separated the sons of Adam,
He set the boundaries of the peoples
According to the number of the children of Israel.

The last line in the passage is textually doubtful and variously rendered in English, depending on which early source is preferred. The most common translations are “children/sons of Israel” (AV, NKJV, NIV) based on the received Hebrew text and “sons of God” (RSV, REV, JB) following the Greek reading, which now has supporting evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹⁷²

Hammer designates God as the initiator, stating that according to Deut 32:8-9 “God is seen as assigning to each nation its own subordinate deity, later identified with an angelic being.”¹⁷³ Such an interpretation is unacceptable to Pentecostal theology on two counts: first, it has the God of creation setting up His people for idolatry; Hammer co-opts Deut 29:26 as the solution to this, saying, because of this verse, “Israel was not really in a

¹⁷⁰ He cites as confirmation the same extra-canonical sources on this point as other scholars, i.e. Sir 17:17; Jub 15:31-32; 1 Enoch 20:5; 89:59-67.

¹⁷¹ Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 283.

¹⁷² 4QDeut^f reads *bene elohim* or “sons of God” instead of “sons of Israel” as in the Masoretic text; 4QDeut^g has *bene el*, but is only partly legible, and may also have had the fuller *elohim*. See J.G. McConville, *Deuteronomy (Apollos Old Testament Commentary)* (Leicester, UK/Downers Grove, IL: Apollos/InterVarsity Press, 2002), 448; also Collins, *Daniel*, 100; and Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 273. Tremper Longman III concurs, calling this the majority view of modern scholars since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls; see *Daniel: The NIV Application Commentary* (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1999), 250, n. 12. For a brief history of the doctrine of guardian angels for nations, see D.S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), 244-249.

¹⁷³ Hammer, *Book of Daniel*, 102f.

position to worship other gods as they were not assigned to Israel.”¹⁷⁴ Second, designating God as the originator of the concept would be to admit the ontological existence of other gods (as opposed to lesser supernatural beings who are either good or fallen angels). To Hammer, no such problem exists; this is simply another way of emphasising that the destiny of nations is determined in heaven not on earth. He agrees that monotheistic thinking led to substitution of angels for earlier reference to deities.¹⁷⁵

Pentecostals believe the devil is a created yet fallen spiritual being, who led others with him when he fell from grace.¹⁷⁶ In his challenge of Almighty God, the devil is the one responsible for having led human beings to believe in and worship false gods. False gods are in fact demons and any manifestations purporting to come from false gods are demonic expressions. The existence of polytheism is linked to the existence of cosmic wickedness, the doctrine of the fall of Adam and the problem of evil. The weighty theological argument behind each place further discussion beyond the scope of this study.

J.G. McConville also discusses the veto of dangerous polytheistic elements in Deut 32:8, but offers an historical interpretation of the passage. He considers that if an original “sons of Israel” has been changed to “sons of God”, it is harder to account for how a polytheistic element was being eliminated. Thus, in taking the Hebrew “sons of Israel” as original, “it might be read simply as a statement that Yahweh apportioned land to Israel, in the context of the creator’s distribution of land to all nations, according to their size and need.”¹⁷⁷

McConville’s view is accessible to the Pentecostal view of Scripture due to its emphasis of Israel and election. He sees Deut 32:8 as placing the choice of Israel by Yahweh in the context of the creation, in such a way that God’s sovereignty and plans are shown to encompass not only past ages but all the nations.¹⁷⁸ This is emphasised by the title *Elyon* or Most High. This is its only use in Deuteronomy, although this title is also used in

¹⁷⁴ Hammer, *Book of Daniel*, CBC, 102f.

¹⁷⁵ Hammer, *Book of Daniel*, CBC, 102f.

¹⁷⁶ See Carolyn Denise Baker and Frank D. Macchia, “Created Spirit Beings,” in Horton, Stanley M. (ed.) *Systematic Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective*. (Springfield MO: Logion Press, 1994), 197-198.

¹⁷⁷ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 448.

¹⁷⁸ See McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 453. McConville is Senior Lecturer in OT at University of Gloucestershire, UK.

Canaanite religion.¹⁷⁹ It is within this broader context of the allocation of international boundaries that Israel's election and placement in Canaan, in McConville's words, "is set within a purpose of God for the whole world."¹⁸⁰ He notes the opinions of other commentators who sometimes see these verses in Deut 32:8 as an endorsement of the belief that the High God assigned nations and territories to the "sons of God" in a plan which included Yahweh along with other national gods such as Chemosh and Milcom. However, he points out how the passage ends by affirming Yahweh's special love for Israel, a significant deuteronomistic theme, and reminds that the application of the name *Elyon* to Yahweh is not restricted to the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32) in the process of domesticating Canaanite polytheism to Yahwistic theology. He concludes:

The present passage is best interpreted in the context of that process. It is the one God, Elyon-Yahweh, who has primeval purposes for the whole world as well as a special attachment to his people Israel. This fits with the strong mono-Yahwistic theology of Deuteronomy.¹⁸¹

McConville says that even on the assumption that the Hebrew "sons of Israel" is a post-exilic adjustment against polytheism, the idea of divine-council was well known and understood non-mythologically.¹⁸² A possible reflection of the idea that the seventy descendants of Jacob who went down to Egypt (Gen. 46:27; Ex 1:5) matched the seventy nations recorded in Genesis 10 is noted by him. Duane Christensen adds to this line of reasoning,¹⁸³ saying the Table of Nations "originally had seventy names, and later tradition (see *1 Enoch* 89:59) supports the conclusion that there were thought to be just seventy nations, and therefore seventy angels over them."¹⁸⁴ Thus Christensen observes that it is according to the Hebrew text that God separated the nations in relation to Israel's numbers. This being so, the number of angels appointed is first connected directly to the Hebrews and only secondarily to other peoples.

¹⁷⁹ Craigie notes that, as with the present context, previous Pentateuch uses of this title are associated with Gentiles (cf. Gen 14:18 (Melchizedek) and Num 24:16 (Balaam), and he contrasts this with God being called Yahweh or Lord (Deut 32:9) by his own people; see *Book of Deuteronomy*, 379.

¹⁸⁰ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 454.

¹⁸¹ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 454-455.

¹⁸² McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 454.

¹⁸³ He notes that "seventy" is actually inserted in the text of *Tg. Ps.-Jonathan* after "the number", strengthening the connection with Genesis 10 (and also Gen 46:27); see Duane L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12 (Word Biblical Commentary)* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2002), 785. Also, citing P. W. Skehan, Christensen draws attention to the *aleph-pe* pattern in the macrostructure of Song of Moses on the basis of which sixty-nine verses can be counted. He says for Skehan, sixty-nine verses "is the Author's way of writing a "seventy-line" poem. See also P.W. Skehan, "The Structure of the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy (Dt 32:1-43)," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 13 (1951) 153-63.

¹⁸⁴ Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 785-786.

In summary, the belief of tutelary gods standing behind different nations and battling on their behalf was common in the ancient Near East. Much discussion centres on the phrase “the number of the sons of Israel/God” in Deut 32:8, and the consensus is that any editing was to avoid even the appearance of polytheism. Fundamentalists do not agree that a Canaanite myth had been adopted, rather that mythic beliefs were being resisted. Exactly how and when the editing occurred is uncertain, as Di Lella concedes¹⁸⁵ and the precise meaning of the phrase “according to the number of the sons of God” is difficult to establish. The princes of Daniel 10 are generally understood to signify a concept of tutelary spirits. The creation context of Deut 32:8 for the election of Israel and allocation of international boundaries as displaying God’s sovereignty and plans for all the nations (McConville) is acceptable to Pentecostal theology.

Scripture states categorically of Yahweh that “besides me there is no god” (Isa. 44:6), regardless of whether some reprobate Israelites believed in national deities like the surrounding nations. If Yahweh is not the only god and monotheism not real and actual, then polytheism is. The only other option is that there is no supreme spiritual being at all. Pentecostals admit no middle ground, that these are simply stories of what ancient peoples believed at certain points in history. If Scripture does not reflect spiritual realities, it leaves faith foundationless and pointless.

b. *The Holy Ones of the Most High*

The identity of the “holy ones of the Most High” (7:18) is much debated by scholars. Although the expression in the Hebrew Bible refers to angels or supernatural beings in the majority of occurrences, the evidence is sufficiently inconclusive to cast doubt in the mind of some scholars, particularly because in Dan 7:21, the “horn” makes war on the holy ones and triumphs over them (cf. also 7:25). Similarly, Dan 11:36 describes the behaviour of the villainous northern king, as one who shall “exalt and magnify himself above every god and speak astonishing things against the God of gods.” The little horn (in the parallel passage of 8:10) “grew great, even to the host of heaven; and some of the host of the stars it cast down to the ground and trampled upon them,” i.e. the horn quite

¹⁸⁵ Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 283.

explicitly is fighting with the heavenly host. As Collins reminds us, in Israel and in other parts of the ancient Near East, stars were commonly identified with angels or gods.¹⁸⁶ This causes him to conclude, in the light of Dan 8:10, that objections to interpreting the holy ones in 7:21 and 25 as referring to angels are unsustainable.¹⁸⁷

In his persecution of the Jews, Antiochus did prevail for a time, but the real issue, Collins argues, is how the conflict was conceptualised and symbolised. Understanding rests on seeing the relationship between the heavenly and earthly worlds in ancient Near Eastern thought, where earthly affairs were regarded as reflections of the greater reality. A correspondence exists between “the holy ones of the Most High” in 7:18 and “the people of the holy ones” in 7:27, points out Collins, one that connects the Jews and these holy ones:

But the holy ones of the Most High shall receive the kingdom and possess the kingdom forever – forever and ever (Dan 7:18 NRSV).

The kingship and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the holy ones of the Most High (Dan 7:27 NRSV).

Collins sums up that “Dan 7:27 complements 7:18, where the holy ones receive the kingdom. In view of the homology between the people and the holy ones, a kingdom that is given to one is given to both.”¹⁸⁸ In Daniel 10 this co-relationship is again made explicit, the struggle on earth being viewed as a war between angelic patrons.

What is evident from chapter 10 is that Michael represents the Jewish people to the degree that when he prevails, they experience the victory. Similarly, when the horn makes war on the saints and prevails over them in Daniel 7 (as mirrored in the battle with the prince of Greece), the idea is of the correspondence between a heavenly and earthly conflict. Thus on earth Antiochus matches the power of the beast when it triumphs over the angelic counterparts of the Jews, but just as the defeat of the angelic host is only temporary, so is the triumph of Antiochus.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Num 24:17; Jud 5:20; Job 38:7; Isa 14:12; Amos 5:26.

¹⁸⁷ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 105.

¹⁸⁸ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 105f.

In summary, a correspondence exists between the Holy Ones of the Most High and the people of the Holy Ones of the Most High. The celestial warfare in Daniel 10-12 is unambiguous, making explicit the co-relationship between the struggle on earth and the war amongst angelic patrons. This stands as sufficient biblical evidence to Pentecostals that angelic battles were fought in a spirit world where Satan, as “prince of the kingdom of the air,” is temporary ruler.¹⁸⁹

c. *Michael and Implications of the Great War*

Daniel is the only book of the Old Testament in which angelic figures are named,¹⁹⁰ with Dan 10:13 being the first time Michael is mentioned. The designation “one of the chief princes” suggests there are others.¹⁹¹ Clearly angels are not sentimental figures, but “figures whose very names draw attention to the uniqueness and the might of God, which they mediate.”¹⁹² Michael is the only archangel mentioned in canonical Scripture,¹⁹³ corresponding with the title “great prince” in Dan. 12:1.¹⁹⁴ His role is that of heavenly warrior,¹⁹⁵ and Collins conjectures that when Michael is said to arise (12:1), this may signify his victory in the heavenly battle.¹⁹⁶ Michael, the great prince, having charge or

¹⁸⁹ Thomas E. Trask and Wayde I. Goodall, *The Battle: Defeating the Enemies of Your Soul* (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1997), 38. Both are pastors with many years experience in Pentecostal ministry.

¹⁹⁰ Gabriel (Dan 8:16; 9:21) and Michael (10:13, 21; 12:1).

¹⁹¹ Edward J. Young agrees that Michael’s designation (a not uncommon Old Testament name) “seems to indicate an arrangement of degrees among the angels.” See *Daniel* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1949), 227. According to 1 Enoch 9.1, Gabriel is also a senior angel together with Sariel and Raphael in the oldest extant list of four archangels, as well as in the list of seven archangels in 1 Enoch 20.

¹⁹² Goldingay, *Daniel*, 313.

¹⁹³ For Pentecostals, this excludes the Apocryphal books. See Jude 9; cf. 1 Enoch 9:1 and 71:3.

¹⁹⁴ Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 70. The designation of Gabriel as an archangel is a later Christian tradition. Collins notes that Michael is one of four said to be archangels (1QM 9:15-16 (cf. the specific authority he is given in 1QM 17:6-7), and frequently identified by scholars with the prince of light and with Melchizedek at Qumran, “a figure with three names who is contrasted with the prince of darkness.” See *Daniel*, 375.

¹⁹⁵ Paralleled in Rev 12:7. The unidentified angel in Daniel 10 (possibly Gabriel) is also a warrior, whereas in 8:16 and 9:21 the duty Gabriel discharges is that of “revealer,” similar to the role in the infancy narratives of Luke 1:19, 26.

¹⁹⁶ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 101. “According to rabbinic tradition, the names of the angels were brought back from Babylon. The names themselves, which are mostly compounded with ‘El, are, however, West Semitic (Hebrew or Canaanite) in origin.” Collins, *Daniel*, 337. The combatant imagery is reinforced in the Septuagint (Papyrus 967) version of 10:21 which may be said to have elaborated on the Masoretic Hebrew Text which has “Michael, your prince.” Instead the Septuagint (as transliterated by Di Lella) reads: *Michaēl ho aggelos ho stratēgos ho dynatos ho hestōs epi tōn huiōn tou laou*. He translates this as reading: “Michael the angel, the powerful commander [or general], who has been placed [or stands] over the sons of the people.” Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 285.

protection¹⁹⁷ over Daniel's people (i.e. Israel) is an idea which occurs in Scripture for the first time in Dan 12:1,¹⁹⁸ marking a departure from earlier tradition. In Josh 5:14-15, an unnamed angelic commander (which may be Michael) or prince (*sar*) leads the Lord's army. According to Isa 63:9 "It was not a messenger, nor an angel, but his own Presence saved them."¹⁹⁹ Collins does not consider the title of "prince" necessarily indicates less than divine status, but remains vague as to whether or not the Michael figure is divine. His interest is the crossover of roles between the Lord and the national patron angel that to him seems to have occurred in Hebrew thought by the time Daniel was written.²⁰⁰ What is clear from Dan 12:1 is "that Israel has a powerful protector in the heavenly court."²⁰¹

The reality of the word revealed to Daniel (10:1) has already been discussed, but discovering the nature of this vision is more complex. The Hebrew words *wesaba' gadol* (10:1) are obscure and difficult to translate, and rendered differently in various English translations: "the time appointed was long,"²⁰² "the service/ task/ obligation/charge" was great,²⁰³ or as relating to "a great war/conflict."²⁰⁴ Robert Fyall sees a combination of the last two shades of meaning: firstly, the profound weight experienced by Daniel in

¹⁹⁷ "Literally, "he who stands over the sons of your people." For the late Hebrew idiom, *amad al*, literally, "to stand over," in the sense of "to protect, to defend," cf. Esther 8:1; 9:16. See Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 273.

¹⁹⁸ Collins notes that a slightly earlier non-canonical occurrence may be found in *I En* 20:5; see *Daniel*, 376.

¹⁹⁹ Thus NRSV and New American Bible. RSV, AV and NKJV have "the angel of his presence saved them," and New Century "He sent his own angel to save them." Collins elaborates on various non-canonical parallels: "Close to the time of Daniel Jub 15:31-32 affirms that 'over Israel he did not appoint any angel or spirit, for he alone is their ruler.' Nonetheless, *Jubilees* also assigns a prominent role to the Angel of the Presence, who thwarts Mastema in the sacrifice of Isaac (*Jubilees* 18) and again at the Exodus (*Jubilees* 48). In the Qumran *War Scroll*, God appoints the Prince of Light to come to the support of Israel (1QM 13:10), although the scroll goes on to ask rhetorically what angel or prince is like to God (13:14)." See *Daniel*, 376.

²⁰⁰ Collins, *Daniel*, 374 -5. The title is also used for the chief angelic powers at Qumran, i.e. the prince of lights (1 QS 3:20; CD 5:15; cf. 1QM 13:10) and the prince of the dominion of wickedness (1QM 17:5-6).

²⁰¹ Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 282. Di Lella, in a note on Dan 4:32 regarding "the army of heaven," designates this a reference to angels "as in Luke 2:13 (*stratia ouranios*). Aramaic *hel semayya* corresponds to Hebrew *seba hassamayim*, which ordinarily refers to the stars or astral deities (Deut 17:3; Isa 34:4; Jer 8:2; 19:13; etc.), but may also refer to the angels of Yahweh's heavenly court (I Kings 22:19 = II Chron 18:18)." See Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 173.

²⁰² AV, NKJV, Rashi and Calvin.

²⁰³ Collins, Charles, Bevan, Montgomery, etc. Collins presumes the service is that of Daniel in receiving the vision; see *Daniel*, 372.

²⁰⁴ NAB, New Century, RSV, NRSV, NIV, Driver, Hartman and Di Lella, Goldingay, etc. Against the AV, Hartman and Di Lella take the literal rendering to be "and a great army" but concede as possible "and great service/labour," but seem to prefer best "it concerned much warfare." See *Book of Daniel*, 262. Similarly Collins takes it to be "great conflict" or, alternatively "a great host"; see *Daniel*, 99.

receiving such a drastic message (10:15-18),²⁰⁵ but secondly as referring to the wars in heaven mentioned in this chapter (10:20) and their earthly counterparts in Chapter 11.²⁰⁶ The great war of Daniel's vision, a clue to the cosmic nature of the struggle between God and the forces of evil, is best indicated in the angel's account of opposition from the prince of Persia (10:12-14).

The Daniel 7 representation of the coming crisis is supplemented by three parallel, but not identical, revelations of the same events. This feature is elaborately drawn on in the book of Revelation. As a characteristic of apocalyptic literature, it is a key to understanding apocalyptic language. Daniel's imagery was able to be so powerfully reused in the book of Revelation, Collins says, because the technique employed in Daniel 7 of assimilating the crisis to (what he calls) a primeval mythic pattern which easily allows it to transcend its historical situation. Every generation thus has its "beasts which rise from the sea and those who hope for a "son of man" to bring deliverance where none is humanly available."²⁰⁷ Hammer calls the practice in Daniel, of using symbolic imagery, no novelty conveying "the truth about God's determining hand in history."²⁰⁸

In summation, the great war which engages the heavenly warrior Michael indicates the cosmic nature of the struggle between God and the spiritual forces of evil. Symbolic language is an expected feature. In Pentecostal traditions, the concept of a heavenly conflict affecting what takes place on earth (as portrayed in Revelation 12 and which is dependent on Daniel 7) is of vital significance to Christian life and practice. Aspects of this will be taken up in the final chapter.

d. The Prince of the Kingdom of Persia in Daniel

Focus on the prince of the kingdom of Persia is central to this thesis. The background has been established, and we may now move on to discuss the nature and function of the prince of Persia mentioned in a reading of Dan 10:13. The text twice mentions this figure (reduced to the prince of Persia in 10:20). One of three perspectives are generally

²⁰⁵ This is also a feature of previous experiences cf. 7:28; 8:27.

²⁰⁶ Robert Fyall, *Daniel* (Fearn, UK: Christian Focus Publications, 1998), 152.

²⁰⁷ Collins, *Daniel*, 83. In the NT context, he considers the Roman Empire is to be seen as the beast and Christ is the saviour.

²⁰⁸ Hammer, *Book of Daniel*, 14.

adopted by scholars – that the prince of Persia is: (a) not a real spiritual being, (b) a spiritual being but not evil and (c) not only a spirit being but an evil one. In addition, this figure has sometimes been connected with a specific historical figure (e.g. King Cyrus or Cambyses), and at others considered a composite symbolic persona representational of a several Persian kings (as Calvin and most of the Reformers).

Collins is one who believes none of the Danielic princes really exist, either as human or heavenly persons, but that they are merely symbolic representations of their nation. He accepts that the people in antiquity may have thought the princes were actual beings more powerful than humans. The factor he stresses is that the manner in which the princes are portrayed cannot be separated from the countries they stand for, in that they are a projection (i.e. personification) centred on human political affairs. As such, the heavenly princes symbolise the good or evil “surplus of power and meaning, over and above what is rationally controlled.”²⁰⁹ The prince of Greece (10:20), for example, denotes the total impact of Hellenistic civilization, not just the temporary sway held by Antiochus Epiphanes. Similarly, the imagined figure Michael was psychologically effective as a resource for the persecuted Jews. Collins concludes that consistent with the author’s apocalyptic determinism, the ground is prepared for a resolution not dependent on human action and with the course of history predetermined - all that remains is for humans to align themselves wisely with the right side.

W. Wink espouses the second view, that the supernatural leaders are not idealised personifications of their nations but correspond to “the actual spirituality and possibilities of actual entities,”²¹⁰ yet he does not believe these heavenly leaders are demonic opponents of God. Adopting a less dualistic position, he affirms that whilst they are somehow under God’s control, they are not simply obedient servants. “The job of the leader of Persia is to represent Persian interests in a world in conflict, having “the right to contest for the best interests of the Persian empire narrowly defined.”²¹¹ Similarly, Young calls the prince of Persia the guardian angel of Persia to signify “the supernatural

²⁰⁹ Collins, *Daniel*, 101.

²¹⁰ See W. Wink, *Unmasking the Powers* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 89.

²¹¹ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 313.

spiritual power standing behind the national gods,²¹² and Fyall talks of “the powerful figure who guides the destinies [sic] of Persia.”²¹³

In the third category, Longman calls the gods and idols of the nations demons, an understanding he sees as expanded in Daniel to lend awareness to the nature of the spiritual powers behind the nations.²¹⁴ To him the prince of Persia is a supernatural being who fights on behalf of that human kingdom.²¹⁵ Gleason Archer calls the prince of Persia a satanic agent delegated the sponsorship and control of the Persian realm. The supernatural emissaries of Persia and Greece are plainly demons, but he considers their powers limited to obstruction and rebellion in a manner consistent with the exercise of freewill authorised by the Lord of heaven.²¹⁶ Ironside, too, is unequivocal that the prince of Persia is an evil angel delegated by Satan seeking “to influence the hearts of the Persian kings against the people of God.”²¹⁷

It is this last view to which most Pentecostals adhere, as shall be demonstrated. As very few wholly Pentecostal dedicated texts on Daniel have been published, this study has relied on a recently published commentary by Australian Pentecostal Kevin J. Conner²¹⁸ and a Bible Guide on Daniel and Revelation by Jack Hayford and G. Curtis.²¹⁹ Appeal is also made to the opinions of Thomas Trask and Wayde Goodall, both high office-holders with the American Assemblies of God.²²⁰ This source is popular theological literature, but, as Weiler argues, it is at this level that Pentecostal/charismatic theology is at its most genuine, in the absence of academic sources.²²¹

²¹² Young, *Daniel*, 227 [citing Keil].

²¹³ Fyall, *Daniel*, 156f.

²¹⁴ Tremper Longman III, *God is a Warrior* (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1995), 143; i.e. the monstrous beasts representing empires in Dan 7:2-8. He adds “there is evidence that Paul shared this perspective with other Jews of his era.”

²¹⁵ Longman, *Daniel*, 250.

²¹⁶ See Gleason L. Archer, “Daniel,” in *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary: Daniel and the Minor Prophets* (Vol. 7), Frank E. Gæbelein (ed.) (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1985), 125, 127. He cites Job 1:12 and 2:6 as indicating that “the malignity of Satan is never allowed to go beyond the due limit set by God.”

²¹⁷ Ironside, *Lectures on Daniel the Prophet*, 176.

²¹⁸ Conner, *Book of Daniel*; op. cit.

²¹⁹ Jack W. Hayford and G. Curtis, *Until the End of Time: Revealing the Future of Humankind: A study of Daniel and Revelations* [sic]. *Spirit-Filled Life Bible Discovery Guides* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1994), CD-ROM.

²²⁰ Thomas E. Trask and Wayde I. Goodall, *The Battle: Defeating the Enemies of Your Soul* (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1997).

²²¹ Weiler, “Readings in Hyperspirituality,” 3.

Conner names these spiritual entities as princes of Satan's kingdom of this world: the princes of Persia and Greece (he has Grecia) refer to "those principalities and powers who influenced the earthly kings of these kingdoms."²²² He attributes to satanic princes the spiritual opposition behind various world kingdoms which opposed the restorative work of God in Jerusalem and holds that Satan continues to control the world system by influencing the minds and wills of earthly rulers. Conner does not take the concept of satanic princes being in control of specific territories in Daniel and make it all-encompassing. To Jack Hayford the demonic world appears to be extremely active in the dealings of nations and national issues and although the conflict is in the spiritual realm, "it is *expressed through* political, military, and other realms."²²³ Elsewhere, he describes the prince of Persia as heading "the spiritual forces marshaled on behalf of sinful Persia, especially in relation to its destructive interaction with God's people."²²⁴ Trask and Goodall are particularly cautious, making the point that this Scripture "seems" to indicate Satan assigning demons to sundry locations in the world.²²⁵ The question of demonic activity and geographic locations will be pursued in more depth in Chapter Three as this aspect is of particular pertinence to Wagner's theory relating to SLSW.

Michael was designated one of the chief princes who had charge over "your people," not territory (12:1). At that time, (based on the traditional dating of Daniel), the Lord's people were in exile, not in their own land. Michael's authority was not over real estate, but on behalf of God for His people, wherever they were. The princes of Persia and

²²² Conner, *Book of Daniel*, 250. Although Conner's book is one of the few avowedly Pentecostal studies on Daniel I have been able to discover, it does not have the usual appearance of a commentary, its design being more a popular exposition and devotional in character. The brief bibliography contains very few up-to-date independent resources, though a number of his own writings are listed. The two most authoritative sources are Gleason L. Archer, *Expositor's Bible: Daniel*, published in 1985 (op. cit.), and E.B. Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet* (Minneapolis MN: Klock & Klock Christian Publishers, Reprint 1978). A 2nd ed. of Pusey was published in 1869 therefore by supplying only the reprint date. Conner is unhelpful in not indicating the actual date of the material.

²²³ Hayford and Curtis, *Until the End of Time*, CD-ROM (their emphasis). Hayford is Chancellor of The King's College and Seminary in Van Nuys, CA., and Senior Pastor of The Church on the Way for 30 years. He is highly respected amongst Pentecostals internationally as a sound teacher of Scripture. Jack Hayford and Oscar Cullmann were amongst those who in February 1990 attended the first meeting of a Post-Lausanne II group called "The Spiritual Warfare Network," as noted by Wagner, see *Warfare Prayer*, 45. Hayford contributes an article on the subject of spiritual warfare in a volume edited by Wagner, but the nature of Hayford's material is very general and quite unlike the SLSW concepts of other contributors; see chapter by Hayford in *Engaging the Enemy*.

²²⁴ Jack Hayford (ed.), *Spirit-Filled Life Bible, New King James Version* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1991), 1250, note on Daniel 10:13.

²²⁵ Trask and Goodall, *The Battle*, 38. Trask was elected as General Superintendent of the American Assemblies of God in 1993, a position was still in that position in December 2006. Goodall previously served as head of the Ministerial Enrichment Department for the General Council of the Assemblies of God in Springfield, Missouri.

Greece likewise represented nations in a political, not geographical, sense. Both these empires were expansionist and, arguably these titles relate to the political situations of ancient times. Also, the three occasions in which the Old Testament talks about princes of nations in a supernatural sense (Tyre, Persia and Greece) concern direct interaction with Israel.

To summarise, the titles princes of Persia and Greece are generally accepted as dualistic references primarily pointing to a supernatural tutelary spirits of earthly kingdoms.²²⁶ (This includes Collins, though he reasons from a literary perspective). Pentecostals view the princes as actual demonic entities. Apocalyptic determinism in Daniel should not be read as inferring that human freewill is impeded by God or other spiritual beings. Significant for this study is that none of these scholars, including the Pentecostals, discusses the princes as having a territorial imperative, but only their control of or influence on national rulers. This point is important to the thesis.

e. The Nature of the Conflict

The vision Daniel has is of warfare in heaven. The supernatural beings involved point to Yahweh's angels battling evil angelic patrons of earthly nations. Persia is mentioned first, then Greece (10:13, 20-11:1), because each in turn will have power over God's people, but it is not stated whether the nature of the conflict is (a) verbal/legal (e.g. Zechariah 3 and Job 1-2), (b) a metaphysical military struggle between supernatural armies,²²⁷ or (c) a single warrior intent on preventing delivery of a message. Despite the fact that only individuals are referred to in the text (10:5-6, 13, 20-21), the perception that the princes were accompanied by supporting armies is not uncommon.²²⁸

The prince of Persia hampered the revelation being delivered to Daniel. Various scenarios are rationalised by scholars as to why, but most lack internal evidence. The opposition appears to relate to the coming vindication of Israel and the ending of their

²²⁶ See Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 282. Childs provides a bibliography of the History of Exegesis of Daniel, see *Introduction to the OT as Scripture*, 622f.

²²⁷ Di Lella draws attention to the graphic account of a vision in II Macc 5:1-4, of a mid-air cavalry charge between presumably angelic horsemen, which he sees as suggesting "warfare does take place in heaven." See Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 284.

²²⁸ J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*, *Harvard Semitic Monographs*, no. 16 (Missoula, Mont: Scholars, 1977), 135.

exile, as prophesied by Jeremiah (cf. 9:2).²²⁹ A connection seems to exist between the act of avoiding the declaration of the message and preventing its implementation. In other words, effective delivery of the message stands as the catalyst instigating the fall of the Persian Empire and the end of the era.²³⁰ Regardless of whether the events are legal or military, defeat and victory on the heavenly side dictate the fortunes of the earthly counterpart.

In Dan 12:1, the author writes:

Now at that time Michael, the great prince who stands guard over the sons of your people, will arise. And there will be a time of distress, such as never occurred since there was a nation until that time; and at that time your people, everyone who is found written in the book, will be rescued (NASB).

The term “that time” is used three times, underlining that the time of trouble coming into greater focus is a continuation of the concerns just mentioned in Dan 11: 40-45.

Goldingay points to this as “a resumptive summary reference to the troubles ... not a new event... [but] a second further scenario of affliction.”²³¹

Michael, as the representative of God Almighty, is by implication the most powerful of the supernatural beings mentioned in the fray, but this supremacy in the heavenlies is not replicated on earth, for Israel is under the dominion of Persia and will soon fall into the clutches of the next world power.²³² The difference is that the destiny of the faithful in Israel is guaranteed: “your people will escape” (11:41). To Pentecostals, the text is to be read as prophecy, not apocalyptic determinism. Supernatural powers may share in shaping earthly history, but God is sovereign and there is no suggestion in Daniel of a dualism of ultimate powers,²³³ or that the behaviour of humans makes no difference to what occurs. The retributive theology of Deuteronomy and the fact of the exile make this evident. Notwithstanding the effects of human decisions in an open universe which function in concert (as portrayed in apocalyptic literature) with the unseen spirit realm, God’s purposes are worked out in history.

²²⁹ Reid, *Kingdoms in Conflict*, 211.

²³⁰ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 292.

²³¹ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 306.

²³² Baldwin, *Daniel*, 181.

²³³ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 312.

In summary, the warfare in heaven involves world powers who in turn will have power over God's people. The text does not make clear the exact nature of the supernatural conflict. A metaphysical battle is not explicit and in other biblical examples the altercation is legal/verbal. Only a few individuals are nominated, but the presence of supporting armies is a common notion. Defeat and victory on the heavenly side dictate the fortunes of the earthly counterpart. The picture painted in Daniel of the rise and fall of kings contributes to familiar patterns of history, yet kings who have power to do as they will can only prosper within pre-established parameters (11:3, 16, 36).²³⁴ As a final comment, the common acceptance by scholars across the spectrum should be noted, that the idea of the heavenly conflict involving Michael in Daniel, is transformed in the book of Revelation (12:7-9) to a momentous battle between good and evil angels.²³⁵

3. Pentecostal Interests in Daniel

The conclusions reached so far in this chapter for a Pentecostal reading of Dan 10:13 will be weighed against the hermeneutical principles. Before doing so, it would be beneficial for three further issues of interest to Pentecostals to be mentioned, as they relate to reading apocalyptic literature today.

a. Contemporary Applications of Biblical Apocalyptic

Significant changes that occur in the book of Daniel are not easily ignored. Firstly, it begins by portraying a single world empire at variance with the kingdom of God. This awareness broadens to world powers and international politics, with mounting emphasis on heavenly mediation. The interest has become theological rather than historical, as history in each succeeding chapter becomes "ever more unbearable", says Kratz.²³⁶ Secondly, the initial stories are set in the dispersion of the sixth century BC. The revelations regarding future events in chapters 7-12 are recorded cryptically and centre on Jerusalem, arguably to do with the Hellenistic period. This gives the book a double focus.²³⁷ Thirdly, Daniel 10-12 clarifies the eschatological dimensions of all the visions, to the point that the kingdom in chapter 7 is seen in a new light: not just an altered

²³⁴ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 288.

²³⁵ See Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 284; Collins, *Daniel*, 83; Veldkamp, *Dreams and Dictators*, 10; Hammer, *Book of Daniel*, 14; Wallace, *The Lord is King*, 24, et al.

²³⁶ Kratz, "The Visions of Daniel," 111f.

²³⁷ Goldingay, *Daniel*, xxv.

political situation because the beast has been destroyed or even a totally restored religion, but a whole new and eternal order which the faithful community will share with the heavenly holy ones.²³⁸ The book itself takes the reader beyond the immediate story.

The climax of the book is the striking revelation (11:2-12:3) brought by the messenger to Daniel concerning a great war, not simply the skirmish with the prince of Persia, but a future cataclysmic event.²³⁹ As Collins observes, “Since life is thus bounded by a supernatural world, the revelation mediated by the angels acquires crucial importance.”²⁴⁰ The writers of apocalyptic were purportedly unveiling the concealed goal of history which they interpreted in the light of their own difficult times. Pentecostals read biblical apocalyptic literature with the same attitude.²⁴¹ The final battle of the ages involving Michael and the evil one, as mentioned in the book of Revelation, finds a ready framework in which to seek understanding.

Based on their reading of Scripture, modern-day millenarianists believe contemporary events indicate we are currently living in the last days. Evidence of such beliefs throughout history is not uncommon.²⁴² Goldingay notes that in nineteenth-century Britain particularly (concurrently with the development of the critical approach in Germany), leading churchmen, theologians, radicals and socialists, who could not be discounted as “a mere lunatic fringe,” saw events of their day as fulfilling Danielic and other biblical prophecy.²⁴³ Nevertheless, Goldingay cautions against over simplistic interpretations of chapters 7-12 resulting in a belief that the study of Scripture confirms events of contemporary history in the light of Daniel’s prophecies. At the same time, he defends the right of interpreters to garner theological insights when they sense the relevance of the visions to days long after Daniel’s. The hazard is in claiming the book directly refers to events of one’s own day or as “the key events on which one’s own faith

²³⁸ Collins, *Daniel*, 104.

²³⁹ That battle was still in progress, (as the unnamed angel made clear), for although the Persian oppressors were less terrible than the Babylonians, they were still evil and their control must be cast off. Cf. Longman, *Daniel*, 253; also 251, n.13.

²⁴⁰ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 114.

²⁴¹ However Collins grants that the popular association of apocalyptic with fanatical millenarian groups, and their frequent use of Daniel and the book of Revelation to substantiate their views, is at the root of modern critical scholarship’s disinclination “to admit that such material played a formative role in early Christianity.” He calls it a deeply ingrained prejudice and, in his opinion, the slighting attitude of Wellhausen and Schurer is still widespread today amongst academics. See Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 1.

²⁴² See Goldingay, “Introduction,” in *Daniel*, xxxviii-xl.

²⁴³ Goldingay, *Daniel*, xxxvii.

is based,” for while it is possible such interpretations may be correct, the value of the history of interpretation is in being able to compare the previous use of the same interpretative techniques which proved false and allow for the same possibility now.²⁴⁴

Hayford and Curtis show how Pentecostals regard Daniel 10-12 as one great unit of prophecy revealing world history in advance, but also with a more immediate and narrower purpose. Daniel’s final vision was given two years after the issue of the decree by King Cyrus to allow some of the Jewish exiles to return to Jerusalem (2 Chron 36:22, 23; Ezra 1; Isa 44:28). It stands as a divine forewarning of the opposition and resistance to be faced in rebuilding the temple.²⁴⁵ Goldingay points out that Daniel’s chief concern was not futuristic speculation, but to offer an assurance that the predetermined period of Gentile sovereignty was coming to an end.²⁴⁶

Parallels to the spiritual opposition (depicted through similar apocalyptic symbolism) in the book of Revelation are pointed out by Hayford and Curtis. Just as reconstruction of the Second Temple would be obstructed by enemies of the Lord’s work under Nehemiah, so would be the building of the church of Jesus Christ as the temple of the Holy Spirit.²⁴⁷ In the book of Revelation, as in Daniel, the battle escalates in the last days and involves Michael. Hostilities between earthly powers and the people of God have their counterpart in the heavenly realm. Given the political setting which Revelation addresses, it is not difficult to understand why the author so easily picks up on the Daniel theme, advocating prayer and endurance in persecution until the end (or set time) comes. The book of Revelation recognises that believers will die for their faith (Rev. 17:6). The message of Daniel stands as encouragement to harassed people of God - that the forces of evil will inexorably be overcome by God and his heavenly host. Daniel offers a worldview and a model to support those who may be martyred for their faith in any era of history, not only during the Maccabean revolt. By extension, contemporary application of the message of Daniel and the book of Revelation becomes accessible to the modern reader.

²⁴⁴ Goldingay, *Daniel*, xxxix.

²⁴⁵ Hayford and Curtis, *Until the End of Time*, CD-ROM.

²⁴⁶ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 109.

²⁴⁷ Hayford and Curtis, *Until the End of Time*, CD-ROM.

Although Pentecostals read much of Daniel as prophecy, this does not exhaust the contemporary relevance of the book. The early Daniel stories (given their exilic setting) are readily viewed as the struggle to come to terms with a hostile culture.²⁴⁸ The theme of divine control that is the uniting factor between the court narratives and the apocalyptic section depicts the all-powerful God who rules in politics, history and the supernatural world. In both sections this worldview of the sovereignty of the God of Israel “is hidden in the present but revealed to the wise.”²⁴⁹

Daniel may therefore be considered relevant to modern readers in a variety of ways, including:

- as an example in the struggle to come to terms with a hostile culture, whether spiritual or physical, without compromising faith in Yahweh;
- by fostering confidence in Almighty God who controls politics, history and the supernatural world;
- as encouragement to any harassed people of God that the forces of evil will inexorably be overcome by God and his heavenly host;
- providing a worldview/model to support those who may be martyred for their faith;
- being an example of prayer with fasting to facilitate the purposes of God.

To summarise, the theological significance of the apocalyptic message of Daniel is seen as a coming world crisis being given increasing prominence and, by many, as the culmination of history. A number of changes occur in the book, leading the reader from history to theology, from the present to the future, from the exile to Jerusalem, from the old community to a new eternal order. Parallels may be observed in the book of Revelation. At the same time, the writings of Daniel undoubtedly have contemporary relevance to readers and not solely futuristic interpretations. The simplistic application of prophetic Scripture to contemporary events can be hazardous and caution needs to be exercised in both reading and offering such interpretations, particularly when apocalyptic genre is involved.

²⁴⁸ Longman, *Daniel* 20.

²⁴⁹ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 114f.

b. *Pentecostal Eschatology and Links to the Final Antichrist*

Eschatology is a major interest of Pentecostalism. ‘End-time’ concern about world powers at variance with the kingdom of God and the imminence of the return of Jesus Christ has been a driving factor in their mission and evangelism. However, interest in eschatology is one thing, but how this ties in with SLSW needs to be established. The imagery and language of Daniel have strong appeal to Pentecostals because of connections seen with the book of Revelation. This is heightened by the fact that Jesus²⁵⁰ alluded to Daniel in his explanation of the signs of his coming and the close of the age (Matt 24:3, 15; cf. Mk 13:4, 14).

Therefore when you see the ‘*abomination of desolation,*’ spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place (whoever reads, let him understand)... (Matt 24:15 NKJV)

The words of Jesus are taken seriously by Pentecostals and the identity of the abominator is seen as important because connections are perceived with the Antichrist.²⁵¹ This persona (the one who will cause the great desolation) has been linked historically with both Antiochus IV and Titus.²⁵² The reason for the interpreting angel’s mission is plainly stated as bringing understanding of what will happen to Daniel’s people in “a time yet to come” (10:14). The language suggests two readings: fulfilment at a point just before the end of history as we know it or a decisive turning point in history, but not the end.²⁵³ Neither interpretation is mutually exclusive. Hayford notes that classical

²⁵⁰ It may even be said that the developing apocalyptic outlook, as grounded in the Old Testament prophetic writings, found favour with Jesus himself. See Wallace, *The Lord is King*, 24.

²⁵¹ Cf. Glass, “Eschatology,” 130; Archer, “Daniel,” 118f, 139, 156f; S.M. Horton, “Daniel, Book of,” in *DPCM*, 237. Premillennial beliefs in a time of great tribulation are bolstered by Matt. 24:21 and 30 since they are taken directly from Dan. 12:1 and 7:13 respectively.

²⁵² Footnote on Matthew 24:14, 15, *Life Application Bible: New King James Version* (Wheaton IL: Tyndale House, 1993), 1731. For further discussion on the identification of temporal leaders with the angelic figures mentioned in Daniel 10, see Tim Meadowcroft, “Who are the Princes of Persia and Greece (Daniel 10)? Pointers Towards the Danielic Vision of Earth and Heaven,” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 29.1 (2004) 99-113.

²⁵³ Longman (citing S.R. Miller, *Daniel: New American Commentary*, Nashville: Broadman, 1994, 286f) notes that it is usual for the Hebrew term *be’abarit hayyamim* to be rendered “in the latter days.” However, (citing Collins, *Daniel*, 161), Longman notes that the term is also used to refer to an exceptional or momentous impending change that is not the end of the ages; see *Daniel*, 252, n.14. Lucas similarly recognises the dual usage of the term in Scripture but favours the sense here as not end of history, but a decisive turning-point in history; see *Daniel*, 276f; also Baldwin, *Daniel*, 181.

interpretation allows for biblical prophecy to have multiple levels of fulfilment in contrast to the dispensationalist view.²⁵⁴

Hammer, for example, reads into this situation that the *Hasidim* expectation was for the eschatological event to occur at a future time with the reestablishment of worship in Jerusalem. This would bring history as previously understood to an end and see the kingdom of God ushered in. He considers the writings of Daniel as fitting in with this hope.²⁵⁵ Collins sees the faithful community sharing with the holy ones in a new order as meaning the Jews having power and dominion on earth as their angelic counterparts do in heaven.²⁵⁶ This is a view which would keep the climax of these events on the temporal side of any final great judgement at the end of time which has a point of agreement with Premillenarians. They believe the millennial interregnum of Christ after the second coming will be in a temporal, earthly kingdom preceding the final eternal age.²⁵⁷

Archer, whose interpretation is driven by his premillennialism, sees the term “a time yet to come” as relating to the final period of world history. He considers it a mistake to restrict the interpretation to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.²⁵⁸ Conner sees the time of Antiochus as an initial, temporal fulfilment of the projected end-time battle, supporting the Pentecostal interpretation that parts of chapter 11 refer to the future Antichrist.²⁵⁹ Ronald Wallace also represents a premillennial view.²⁶⁰ He reiterates that Daniel 7 forms the basis of the prophetic vision, as it is there the initial suggestion is seen of a sinister figure arising out of the maelstrom of the conflict among the nations infinitely important to the final period of human history, just before the kingdom of God comes. The final Antichrist in the great conflict at the end of time will engage in a last, desperate attempt

²⁵⁴ Jack W. Hayford (ed.), “Keys to Daniel,” *Hayford’s Bible Handbook* (Nashville TN: Thomas Nelson, 1995), CD ROM. Pentecostalism’s incompatibility with dispensationalism has been discussed previously.

²⁵⁵ Hammer, *Book of Daniel*, 15; in this context he draws attention to Dan. 7:25; 8:14; 9:27; 12: 7, 11-13.

²⁵⁶ Collins, *Daniel*, 80.

²⁵⁷ See G.E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1930), 182.

²⁵⁸ See “Daniel,” *Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, 125.

²⁵⁹ See Conner, *The Book of Daniel*, 267.

²⁶⁰ Although his book is written as a popular exposition, it is considered to be backed by solid research. See bibliographic entry for “Daniel,” in Tremper Longman III, *Old Testament Commentary Survey. Second Edition* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Books, 1995), 142. Wallace gained his PhD at Edinburgh University in 1958, pastored several Church of Scotland parishes and later for 10 years held the position of Professor of Biblical Theology at Columbia Theological Seminary in the USA. His background is not Pentecostal, nevertheless the comments about chapter 12 (191ff) under subtitles The Antichrist and The tribulation have a premillennialist slant.

to spoil what belongs to God by instigating an ultimate rebellion to thwart the will of God by attempting to dethrone God and disband the heavenly hosts. The final Antichrist will be assisted by demonic forces embodied in a world power²⁶¹ and engage in a monumental contest against “the truth and power of God and those allied to him.”²⁶² The mean and cunning Antiochus was insignificant in himself. It was his allegiance to demonic supernatural powers which allowed him to achieve earthly success. Wallace considers that the same spirit that was behind Antiochus will inspire the final Antichrist in the last days.²⁶³

To summarise, Pentecostal interest is stimulated in signs of what is to come at the end and because of the unique importance understood to attach to “abomination of desolation” mentioned in Daniel and as taken up by Jesus Christ.²⁶⁴ Antiochus Epiphanes and Titus may be viewed as types of the final Antichrist.

Conclusions

In the Classical Pentecostal tradition, the view held is that Scripture is divinely inspired and authoritative. The theological understanding and experience of Jesus as related in the Gospels involve angels and give important insights into the role of angels in end times.²⁶⁵ The existence of a supernatural world of good and evil forces is therefore affirmed. This is not in a dualistic sense, but one that recognises that the supreme Lord of creation has chosen to limit his power in certain dimensions by granting freewill to the beings he created, which include the angelic hosts.²⁶⁶ The conclusion in this study is that the glimpse Dan 10:13 allows of demonic powers relates to political rather than geographic connections. Michael’s power is directly associated to God’s power,²⁶⁷ and in

²⁶¹ Wallace’s premise is based on the book of Daniel, and it is debatable whether the text intimates the human representatives (of Persia and Greece) were actually embodied by demons or in other words, demon possessed as this is understood in contemporary demonology. However, other aspects of this topic will be taken up in Chapter Three.

²⁶² Wallace, *The Lord is King*, 144.

²⁶³ Wallace, *The Lord is King*, 144f.

²⁶⁴ Wallace, *The Lord is King*, 145.

²⁶⁵ The intent of this study is not as an apologetic on supernaturalism. However, the stance adopted in this paper is based on the Pentecostal presupposition of the existence of a supernatural realm as understood within the orthodox Judeo-Christian belief system and as based on biblical evidence, i.e. the existence of God who is Spirit and hierarchies of spiritual beings, both good and evil, known as angels and demons.

²⁶⁶ Strict monotheism upholds that no other supernatural deities actually exist, but does not deny the existence of supernatural beings, good and evil.

²⁶⁷ Even Michael must have had certain limitations since he is not actually God.

Dan 10:13 the prince of Persia's strength is related to the political latitude God allowed the Persians regarding the exile.

The undeniable message of Daniel is that "Heaven rules" (Dan 4:26). The context of Dan 10:13 is Daniel's prayer to see the seventy years of exile ended for Israel. The episode involving Michael/Gabriel/unnamed messenger illustrates the turning of the tide. The sense in which the prince of Persia prevails temporarily over the messenger angel until Michael comes to his aid must be read in the same way, that nothing in heaven or on earth would be able to permanently hinder the fulfilment of God's plan that Israel would return to the land. The decree is God's and the battle is the Lord's. The emphasis is on the superior forces of Yahweh rather than the prince of Persia's ability to prevail temporarily. Daniel reveals nothing about the origin or ordering of angels, and little can be gleaned about their nature, or even distinctions between the good and evil beings. The prophet does not seek out the names of the tutelary spirits, rather the spirit behind these particular national leaders is revealed by God.

Daniel's example of prayer and fasting to see the will of God implemented is a valid model for modern Christians, but its strongest validation is when it is viewed in context. The aim of a prayer-model based on Daniel's example would be to align oneself with the purposes of God and set one's heart to understand one's own place of effectiveness. Daniel's answer to prayer was in receiving a revelation and he faithfully recorded it for posterity. It is the purpose of God which unites the common interest of the messenger angel and Michael, not the prayer of Daniel, for as has been noted, the angel is dispatched without waiting to hear his prayer. In other words, Daniel is one part of the whole scenario and his prayer is not the initiating catalyst. If anything, Jeremiah's prophecy was. This must be remembered when utilising Daniel's situation as a prayer model.

Traditional prophecy in Scripture until this time is largely open to interpretation, but by the end of the book of Daniel, it is only the wise who can make sense of the mystery and relate its true meaning. The necessity of interpretation points to future possibilities of

reinterpretation, where circumstances allow later exponents to claim fresh enlightenment of the divine truth – just as Daniel reinterpreted Jeremiah’s prophecy.²⁶⁸

Daniel may be taken as a model of faithfulness and piety for succeeding generations of persecuted Jewry, the prophetic visions able to stimulate hope in the future triumph with the coming of the Messiah. The theme of God’s sovereignty on earth now and in the last days, and assurance of God’s control and foreknowledge of human history, gives the book fresh relevance to later readers. This is a very broad description and scholars vary greatly in their interpretation of details, particularly when it comes to eschatological orientation.

Finally, warfare in heaven involves world powers who in turn have power over God’s people. Although defeat and victory on the heavenly side indicates the fortunes of the earthly counterpart, the final victory of the sovereign Lord is assured. From a Pentecostal perspective, and this study in particular, the problems of evil and its distinctively apocalyptic solution are issues vitally relevant to contemporary Christian life and practice. The question of spiritual warfare and prayer intercession is taken very seriously by Pentecostals. Hayford and Curtis, talking of the constant struggle in the spiritual world over the control of people’s lives, invite believers to consider the means by which Scripture indicates that the works and powers of the enemy are able to be bound. They encourage believers to examine their responsibility as prayer warriors in exercising what they call ‘kingdom authority’ and conclude with the question: “What can happen if we do not assume our role as intercessors?”²⁶⁹ These subjects will be taken up in the final chapter.

Comments on Aligning the Conclusions of the Exegesis with the Hermeneutical Principles for a Pentecostal Reading of Daniel 10:13

The aim of this study was to arrive at a Pentecostal reading of the being entitled ‘the prince of the kingdom of Persia’ in Dan 10:13. In the process of considering consensus

²⁶⁸ Hammer, *Book of Daniel*, 15. In fact, Hammer draws attention to the writer of 2 Esdras who does later claim the right to reinterpret Daniel (cf. 2 Esdras 12:11 with Dan. 7:7) when applying the message to his own day.

²⁶⁹ Hayford and Curtis, *Until the End of Time*, CD-ROM.

about the identity and nature of the personage, various comments were made as to the Pentecostal position. Part A established the approach to the text and laid the basis for exegesis of the text in Part B. The relationship to the previously established hermeneutical position needs some further comment. Three interpretive principles were established as characteristically Pentecostal: *Sola Scriptura*, a pneumatic interpretation of Scripture (with qualifications), and biblical revelation, not self-revelation, in the community of faith.

i. *Sola Scriptura*: The first section of this chapter began by explaining why Pentecostals accept the historical Daniel as the author of the whole book, adhere to an exilic or early dating and accept the historical authenticity of the material. It was discussed how they read Daniel as a combination of narrative and prophecy and that suggestions the prophecies are *ex eventu*, or derive from Ancient Near East myths are rejected. Each of these positions is based on the doctrine of the inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture. In addition, the authority of Scripture has been upheld by reading it as an accumulation of revealed truths, the principles of which have permanent validity. As Collins observes, this is an attempt to read the Bible as if it were from God's point of view.²⁷⁰ This is precisely the Pentecostal understanding of revelation and why Scripture is an actual site of authority, but the text is not read, as he suggests, without regard to the human circumstances which shaped its composition. Exegesis has been an important part of this study, heeding Longman's warning against a simple appropriation of the Old Testament which neglects the chronological, cultural and redemptive-history distance when applying an ancient text to a modern situation.²⁷¹

ii. Pneumatic Interpretation: Pentecostals expect to find in Scripture illumination of God's cosmic intentions and also models for Christian life and practice. The gap between the testaments can be bridged satisfactorily through a biblical theology approach by seeing God and his eternal purposes as central in the Old Testament narrative and not simply as descriptive of the ancient Israelite cult and religion. On the one hand, Longman's perspective of Daniel as a Christocentric book in

²⁷⁰ Collins, *Daniel*, 6f. Collins disagrees with the validity of such a stance.

²⁷¹ Longman, *Daniel*, 29.

which there is a theological rather than simply a moralistic message,²⁷² accords with the Pentecostal emphasis of a Christ-centred, mission-oriented hermeneutic. On the other hand, the ‘reader with the text’ approach facilitates a pneumatic approach to interpreting models and principles in Daniel which can be adopted for today without violating the context.

The study of genre clarified distinctive elements and typical characteristics of given texts. As suggested by the emended definition of an apocalypse, such writing is intended “to interpret present earthly circumstances in the light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behaviour of the audience by means of divine authority.”²⁷³ A Pentecostal pneumatic interpretation applies to Daniel in that the theological immanentism of the Pentecostal *Weltanschauung* is consistent with a worldview that sees the ordinary affairs of human beings as intricately connected with the reality of the spiritual realm. The issue of how the spiritual realm is understood continues to engage Pentecostals at both academic and congregational levels. A supernaturalist position is upheld by Pentecostals regarding Daniel as a genuine book of prophecy²⁷⁴ composed in approximately 530 BC, and further, as a key to the study of prophecy. ‘Scripture interprets Scripture’ remains central to their hermeneutic.

The definition of apocalypse involves a worldview indicating shared foundational assumptions, such as the mysteries of the world being revealed supernaturally through the mediation of angels, that an unseen world of angels and demons is directly relevant to human destiny and that the future will be determined by an ultimate eschatological judgement. The role of the genre offers a structure for appraising the problems of life. Collins may see genre as merely a literary device, but his observation remains valid to the opposite view: “The appeal to supernatural revelation provides a basis for assurance and guidance, and establishes

²⁷² Longman, *Daniel*, 27f.

²⁷³ Attributed to Adela Yarbro Collins, “Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism,” *Semeia* 36 (1986), 7. See discussion earlier in this chapter.

²⁷⁴ Josh McDowell, *Prophecy Fact or Fiction? : Historical Evidence for the Authenticity of the Book of Daniel* (San Bernardino CA: Campus Crusade for Christ, 1981), 5. McDowell’s rationale is to defend the authorship and authenticity of Daniel as a prophetic book in defence of the supernaturalist position (back cover).

the authority of the text. The prospect of a final judgement creates a context for the clarification of values.”²⁷⁵

The yada mode epitomised by the prospect of knowing God in active relationship, is seen to function vitally for Pentecostals at the nexus of their Christology and their eschatology. Recognising the symbolic or referential nature of apocalyptic literature does not mean the reality to which it refers does not exist, just as symbols on road signs may point to the physical and factual. Even Collins admits that in general scholars have been preoccupied with the referential aspects of language and uncovering factual information in the text, to the detriment of the emotional language of poetry and myths which describe feelings and attitudes.²⁷⁶

The book of Daniel reveals something about the life of faith for the times: “The supreme point of history is almost immediately upon them. With the end at hand – an end which was to usher in the universally acknowledged rule of God – the faithful were to live in hope and expectancy.”²⁷⁷ Pentecostalism’s view of the church being on a continuum with the ancient chosen people in salvation history, explains all the more this expectant attitude to the imminent return of Christ.

Accepting the idea that the kingdom of God provides the frame for human history only increases the theological implications of Daniel, particularly when classified as an apocalypse, for as Collins says, the genre label points to “a context for the interpretation of the individual text.”²⁷⁸ Longman agrees with the concept that God has scripted history climaxing in the rescue of his people, and sums up the Evangelical view that this is news good enough to elicit great hope and celebration not only within the world of the text but extending to all readers who are invited to share.²⁷⁹

iii. Biblical Revelation, not Self-revelation, in the Community of Faith: This is where theologies of retrieval play their part, particularly now that Pentecostals are

²⁷⁵ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 8f.

²⁷⁶ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 17.

²⁷⁷ Hammer, *Book of Daniel*, 14.

²⁷⁸ Collins, *Daniel*, 38.

²⁷⁹ Longman, *Daniel*, 252f.

increasingly recognising the role played by their traditions and communities in shaping their beliefs.²⁸⁰ Two issues which were taken up in this chapter are of particular relevance to this study: Daniel as a model for prayer and the nature of the prince of Persia's influence.

(1) **Daniel as a Prayer Model.** A prayer theology is found in Daniel with Passover nuances accentuating deliverance from bondage. Jeremiah's prophecy is the background of Daniel's prayer. The modern reader knows, as Daniel did not, that the second great exodus of the Israelites was imminent. The deliverance from bondage in Egypt and Babylonian exile both stand as historical types or models of salvation. They foreshadow the coming of Christ at the end of the age for the final deliverance of humans from the bondage of evil. However the context of Dan 10:13 shows this particular visionary experience of Daniel's was privileged, not shared by his companions. This is emphasised by Daniel being specifically designated as favoured. Pentecostals strongly believe in the personal involvement of God with his people. As discussed, they see the book of Daniel as having much contemporary relevance, not least as a prayer model, but there are limits to which duplicating Daniel's prayer experience can be pushed. The nature and content of Daniel's vision show this was a unique event, in itself not repeatable.

Daniel's prayer is responsible for the appearance of the messenger (10:12), and various expositors see a direct connection between Daniel's fasting and prayer and the outcome of the battle in heaven. For example, Archer, who is in no doubt that the source of the opposition is satanic, entitles Daniel 10 "Triumph of persistent prayer."²⁸¹ Wallace regards Daniel's prayerful participation and sensitivity to what was occurring in the heavenly realm as facilitating a more rapid outcome.²⁸² Hayford is less fixed, saying prayer with fasting may affect the outcome.²⁸³ Fyall in the context of Daniel talks of the struggle and uncertainty of prayer and the necessity of faith. He links the process with Ephesians 6:12, which states that we

²⁸⁰ Hey, "Changing Roles of Pentecostal Hermeneutics," 217.

²⁸¹ Gleason L. Archer, *A Survey of the Old Testament Introduction, Revised Edition* (Chicago IL: Moody Press, 1974), 385; Archer is an Evangelical scholar, ex-Harvard and Princeton.

²⁸² Wallace, *The Lord is King*, 178f. He gives an interesting explanation for the angelic attendance on Daniel: "So grateful were the heavenly powers for the help of Daniel's prayers that the heavenly messenger came to thank him and strengthen him in the weakness the conflict had caused him, and to encourage him to go on praying with the same concern and anxiety."

²⁸³ Hayford, *Spirit-Filled Life Bible*, 1250, note on Daniel 10:13.

“struggle not against flesh and blood,” but “against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms,” concluding that this realm is “the only one where real victories can be won.”²⁸⁴ Hence in this cross-section of Evangelical and Pentecostal opinions (with the Pentecostal being noticeably the most cautious), Daniel’s prayer was noted as persistent, requiring faith, and possibly affecting the outcome or its more rapid conclusion. The point is not that Daniel’s prayer was an unnecessary catalyst in God’s plan to allow the Jews to return to the land, but that his role was passive and earthbound - not active or metaphysical. It is clear from a study of Daniel that prayer does not control spiritual forces independently of God, nor does prayer manipulate angels, nor manoeuvre God into facilitating the plans of humans. The term ‘spiritual warfare’ in the context of Daniel is not based on human initiative. He is not portrayed as engaging in ongoing spiritual warfare through prayer. There is no suggestion he continued praying against the power of the national angelic patrons. Prayer should not become an exercise in metaphysics and the importance of angels should never be exaggerated.

(2) **The nature of the prince of Persia’s Influence.** Pentecostals view the princes of Persia and Greece as actual, demonic, tutelary spirits, but the point has also been argued that their titles in Daniel are not in reference to the princes having a territorial dominion. The text shows their control of or influence was on national rulers only. In addition, the prophet never sought the identification of angelic patrons and should not be seen as providing a model for such a practice. The titles occur in Scripture as identifying labels to explain what God was doing in specific circumstances and not *ipso facto* indicative of a demonic hierarchy over every nation. Political facets are recognisable but the supernatural battle is portrayed in cosmic rather than local dimensions. This view accords well with Pentecostal eschatology, but the text does not make clear whether this is a metaphysical battle or whether, as in other biblical examples, the altercation is legal/verbal. It is always considered dangerous for exposition to go beyond what the text actually says. Tutelary spirits or angelic patrons may exist, but the text is not explicit about their territoriality.

²⁸⁴ Fyall, *Daniel*, 157.

There is one final point to make in this section concerning biblical revelation, not self-revelation, in the community of faith. It centres on orthodox Christology and the implications of Wagner's interpretation of Dan 10:13. Collins' terminology of an implied theology of history was reflected on in this chapter. In this concept, the portrayal of God as sovereign over pagans, having ability to reveal all mysteries and possessing an overall plan of salvation for His people is positive Pentecostal theology. Resurrection and exaltation in an afterlife is the finale of history. The wise are shown to be those who align themselves with God's plan. Their role in Daniel is displayed in two main ways. First, having understood from history and Scripture the ultimate triumph of Yahweh, the wise enlighten the many regarding prophetic Scriptures in their supernatural framework. Second, they are willing to lay down their own lives to remain faithful to Yahweh. In the New Testament, the fulfilment of both these roles is epitomised in Jesus – he proclaimed the good news of the kingdom and laid down his life for the cause. It is these aspects which are taken up in Chapter Three, where it will be argued against Wagner, (a) that the efficacy of Christ's death on Calvary was once-for-all and that the theological justification for further defeat of the forces of evil by SLSW undermines the doctrine that the work of Christ is completed; and (b) that the gospel is the power of God to salvation (Rom 1:16) achieved by proclaiming the good news of the kingdom as modelled by Jesus and the early church.

It should be noted here that SLSW is not specifically concerned with the book of Daniel or prophetic interpretations of end times as such. The interest of SLSW proponents is in Dan10:13 insofar as it supplies a basis for their demonology, or as they see it, the biblical precedent which anchors the beliefs driving their praxis. Trask and Goodall stress that no biblical particulars are provided in Daniel as to possible strategies or types of demons, therefore it is inadvisable to "try to figure out all the possible demonic activity in any given part of the world."²⁸⁵ In addition, they recognise the biblical information is sufficient for believers to understand that Satan has a plan. More importantly, they consider the lack of specifics a positive feature, one that keeps the modern Christian focused on Jesus

²⁸⁵ Trask and Goodall. *The Battle*, 56.

Christ rather than the devil. This was the example of the early church, consumed as they were with Jesus and reaching people who did not know Him.

Guided by the three hermeneutical principles and a composite of methodological approaches, the emphasis in this chapter has been on the text, without ignoring certain critical issues and recent trends in the apocalyptic genre studies. The interpretation of Dan 10:13 has been considered from scholarly opinions and writings on Daniel from within and outside the Pentecostal tradition, with the intention of being dialogic and open. The results provide a basis for the critique of Wagner's position in Chapter Three of this thesis.

Chapter 3

IS C. PETER WAGNER'S READING OF DANIEL 10:13 PENTECOSTAL?

1. C. Peter Wagner and Strategic Level Spiritual Warfare (SLSW)

This chapter will look at some aspects of the theological use C. Peter Wagner makes of Dan 10:13. The case to be made is that he does not identify himself as a Pentecostal, does not stand within the Pentecostal tradition, and claims originality for his views utilising the above passage. The aim of this section is to show that in addition, Wagner's interpretive method does not correspond to the hermeneutical principles of Classical Pentecostalism. It is posited that Wagner's demonology, having dissimilar hermeneutics and ecclesial affiliation, should not be classified as Pentecostal.¹

While Wagner himself makes no such claim, his interpretation is widely assumed to be a Pentecostal teaching. For example, an opening remark by Stephen Noll in a recent book links Pentecostal teaching to Frank Peretti's novels and Wagner's theories:

Peretti [through his widely-read novels about spirit powers] popularised views commonly held by Pentecostals, who have long taught the discernment of spirits and exorcism. Pentecostal teaching gained a considerable boost among mainstream evangelicals when C. Peter Wagner of the U.S. Centre for World Mission began to speak of a battle with "territorial spirits" as a necessary part of Christian mission.²

Noll moves from Peretti to Pentecostals to Wagner, insinuating a connection but offering no actual evidence of the existence of either theological or denominational relationship.

This common misconception is to be examined.

Certainly Noll is correct that Pentecostals believe in the discernment of spirits and exorcism, but this should not be held to equate with official recognition of Wagner's

¹ This chapter is not intended as a polemic against Wagner, but rather as a clarification of Pentecostal hermeneutics.

² Noll, *Angels of Light, Powers of Darkness*, 12. Another example is that of eminent Harvard theologian, Harvey Cox, who writes that "Pentecostals who sometimes refer to themselves as the 'Third Wave' ... do not like to be identified with either of the previous two 'waves,' and they do not want to be called 'pentecostals'." See Cox, *Fire from Heaven*, 281f. These claims to different identities are, nevertheless, ignored by Cox, and Third Wave and Pentecostals appear synonymous in his ensuing discussion on Third Wave literature. Incidentally, he claims that in his investigation of Third Wave, their material was virtually limitless.

teaching on the territoriality of spirits.³ Wagner agrees that Peretti's books stimulated interest in spiritual warfare but he personally considers Peretti's books as fanciful fiction, noting that many fall into the trap of reading them as documentaries.⁴ This does not lead one to assume any formal connection between the writings of Peretti and Wagner.

In the contemporary context, a great deal of prayer warfare is based on belief in territorial spirits. Supernatural beings are deemed to have authority over or control of specific geographical regions, while also uniquely linked to specific cultures. Many Christians, utilising various means such as evangelism, prayer and social action, attempt to engage in conflict with the demonic strongholds identified with these entities.⁵ The prince of Persia and the prince of Greece as identified in the book of Daniel (10:13, 20-21) are invariably cited as biblical examples of territorial spirits.

Proactive spiritual warfare may rightly be recognised as a contemporary phenomenon in Christian circles, affecting large numbers.⁶ The compelling motivation for proponents of SLSW is the Great Commission issued by Christ (Matt 28:19-21) and their understanding of Dan 10:13, 20- 21 underpins the whole concept. The resulting prayer praxis called spiritual mapping is considered by SLSW proponents to be both God-given and one of the most important things the Spirit is saying to the churches at this time.⁷

The foundational demonology of SLSW teachers has come under scrutiny of late, not least from within the Pentecostal movement.⁸ To grasp Wagner's hermeneutical methodology it is necessary to look at his application of the verse(s) in question because he does not utilise the usual exegetical tools or methods to interpret the text. It is almost

³ Nor Peretti's demonology, for that matter.

⁴ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 11, 19; see also Wagner's comment about his approach differing from Peretti's, p.64.

⁵ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 76f; Wagner's hypothesis is quoted in full later in section 2 of this chapter. See also George Otis Jr, *Informed Intercession* (Ventura CA: Renew, 1999), Appendix 3 entries Spiritual Strongholds, Spiritual Warfare, Spiritual Territoriality, Strategic-Level Spiritual Warfare, and Territorial Spirits, 257.

⁶ Not only Pentecostals, but mainline Protestants, Evangelicals and also Catholics. For the massive extent of the networking and influence involved, see C. Peter Wagner, Stephen Peters and Mark Wilson (eds), *Praying Through the 100 Gateway Cities of the 10/40 Window* (Seattle WA: YWAM Publishing, 1995), 7-8.

⁷ Wagner, 'Introduction', *Breaking Strongholds In Your City*, unnumbered.

⁸ One of the most thorough in this area is Chuck Lowe's critique, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelisation? A biblical, historical and missiological critique of Strategic-Level Spiritual Warfare* (op. cit.) Lowe looks at SLSW and Peter Wagner's beliefs and practices in particular, but his thrust is largely from a missiological standpoint. Mark R. Taylor presented a study of the theory of territorial spirits in an earlier book, *Do Demons Rule Your Town? An examination of the 'territorial spirits' theory* (London: Grace Publications, 1993). Taylor gives a detailed study on the concept of territoriality, in similar vein to Lowe's, concentrating on scriptural evidence.

impossible to follow his explanation without reference to the practice of spiritual mapping.

Whilst Wagner's interpretation of Dan 10:13 is formative to understanding SLSW, his writings on spiritual warfare are prolific and often repetitious. This study has therefore been restricted largely to the two most relevant books, namely, *Warfare Prayer*⁹ and *Acts of the Holy Spirit*,¹⁰ the latter being Wagner's commentary on the book of Acts.

2. Wagner's Method and Classical Pentecostal Hermeneutics

The tenets of Classical Pentecostalism set out in Chapter One were reduced to three major headings: (1) the Reformation principle of *Sola Scriptura*, (2) a pneumatic approach to interpreting Scripture and (3) biblical revelation, not self-revelation, within the community of faith. As previously discussed, *Sola Scriptura* does not preclude the use of reason, traditions or councils, except when these are considered to be at odds with the received text.¹¹ Notwithstanding that Scripture was the norm by which all others were to be judged, Reformation and post-Reformation orthodoxy largely embraced the Christian exegetical and dogmatic traditions they had inherited, and then reframed them in Reformation terms and insights.¹² In Muller's words, they "took the catholicity of Protestantism seriously, claimed for themselves and their churches the best of the Christian tradition, and appropriated it critically, for the clarification and for the defense [sic] of the faith."¹³ Doctrinal orthodoxy is considered important to Classical Pentecostals.¹⁴

The intention now is to analyse Wagner's interpretive method in the light of the three principles mentioned above. The subject is best introduced by setting out Wagner's

⁹ The first in a trilogy called the "Prayer Warrior" series.

¹⁰ C. Peter Wagner, *Acts of the Holy Spirit: A Modern Commentary on the Book of Acts* (Ventura CA: Regal, 2000).

¹¹ The methodology of the Protestant Reformers entailed detailed exegesis in the original Hebrew, Greek and Aramaic and none intended that any new theologies should be built on their own exegesis; rather it was their belief that their theology stood uninterrupted in the great tradition of the universal church as expressed in the various ecumenical councils, the church fathers and many of the medieval doctors.

¹² Muller, "Sources of Reformed Orthodoxy," 48. The argument for the acceptability of this position in the formulation of a Pentecostal theology was made in Chapter One in connection with the Renewal Theology of J. Rodman Williams.

¹³ Muller, "Sources of Reformed Orthodoxy," 52.

¹⁴ See Wacker, "Wild Theories and Mad Excitement," in *Pentecostals From The Inside Out*, 21f. See also Archer, "Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Retrospect and Prospect," 68. Throughout this thesis claims about Classical Pentecostal beliefs are not intended to infer exclusivity or that other groups find such matters unimportant. The intention is only to state the Pentecostal position clearly.

hypothesis, and explaining his taxonomy of demonic beings, considered a unique contribution.

In his book *Warfare Prayer*, Wagner treats fully the subject of SLSW. The reader is told that before commencing writing, Wagner surveyed the field, consulted with a broad range of theologians, biblical scholars, current authors and practitioners. As a consequence he believes he handled in greater depth certain subjects which, he points out, *had not thus far found their way into print*.¹⁵ These are specified as the concepts of spiritual territoriality and the naming of the powers.¹⁶

Wagner recognises he has a hypothesis to defend, therefore this is stated here in full:

Satan delegates high ranking members of the hierarchy of evil spirits to control nations, regions, cities, tribes, people groups, neighbourhoods and other significant social networks of human beings throughout the world. Their major assignment is to prevent God from being glorified in their territory, which they do through directing the activity of lower ranking demons. It can immediately be seen that this hypothesis will stand or fall on the issue of whether spirits or demonic beings can legitimately be perceived as occupying territories.¹⁷

Wagner reasons that Satan delegates to a hierarchy of demonic forces responsibility to blind the minds of billions to the gospel (cf. 2 Cor 4:4). Wagner is not alone in believing that the evil spirit realm is hierarchical. This inference is commonly based on designations in Eph 6:11-12 of “rulers, authorities, cosmic powers of this present darkness, the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places.” Wagner concedes this text is only a generalisation to describe varieties of supernatural beings (rather than a strict hierarchical order), agreeing that at other times Scripture uses the same Greek terms differently or interchangeably.¹⁸ Nevertheless, Wagner’s contribution has been in relating a hypothetical demonic hierarchy in accordance with his perception of the function of each level (not just the degree of power they are believed to possess), under the general label of territorial spirits.

¹⁵ Emphasis mine.

¹⁶ The interest of this thesis is the concept of territoriality. The naming of powers is secondary.

¹⁷ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 76-7.

¹⁸ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 63.

Three broad levels of spiritual warfare are noted by Wagner.¹⁹ It is helpful to list them all to establish a general context to the taxonomy devised by Wagner,²⁰ though only the third level is of ongoing relevance to this thesis:

- i. Ground-level spiritual warfare: relates to casting out demons (e.g. Matt. 10:1; Luke 10:17; Acts 8:7);
- ii. Occult-level spiritual warfare: demonic powers through shamans, channelers, occultists, witches, Satanists etc (e.g. the demonised fortune-teller in Acts 16:16-24).
- iii. Strategic-level spiritual warfare: demonic power manifested as territorial spirits (e.g. Eph.6:12; Revelation 12, esp. v.7).

Warfare Prayer was first published in 1992. Eight years later Wagner published *Acts of the Holy Spirit*, a commentary in which his theories are applied to the text of Acts. The headings utilised in the Acts of the Holy Spirit incorporate all of Wagner's demonic groupings: ground-level, occult-level and strategic-level.²¹ The reader is reminded of these categories throughout the book,²² reinforcing Wagner's teaching.

Interestingly, the incident involving a Philippian slave-girl with a spirit of divination in Acts 16:16-24 is categorised by Wagner as occult-level (level 2) spiritual warfare in *Warfare Prayer*. He has adjusted his position by the time he wrote Acts of the Holy Spirit. Under the heading "High-Level Power Encounter," he argues that the Acts 16 incident is strategic-level (level 3) spiritual warfare.²³ This ambivalence will be discussed further. Wagner's reading will now be tested against the first Pentecostal hermeneutical rule of *Sola Scriptura*.

a. *Wagner and Sola Scriptura*

The concept of demonic princes with territorial authority appears on the face of it to have Scriptural foundation. Not only has Wagner's understanding become widespread in

¹⁹ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 16-19.

²⁰ For an analysis and discussion of the adequacy of Wagner's classifications, see Chapter 1 "Strategic-Level Spiritual Warfare: A New Type of Demon and A New Way of Fighting," in Lowe, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelisation?* [op. cit.]

²¹ Wagner, *Acts of the Holy Spirit*, 359, 474-480.

²² E.g. Wagner, *Acts of the Holy Spirit*, 292. Acts 8:10 (Simon Magus), 13:6-12 (Elymas), Acts 19 (Diana of the Ephesians) and 12:1-23 (King Herod ordering Peter's execution) are similarly categorised; see Wagner, *Acts of the Holy Spirit*, 396.

²³ Cf. Wagner, *Acts of the Holy Spirit*, 396.

contemporary demonology amongst Christians, but so too has the associated praxis. Wagner's rationale for writing *Warfare Prayer* is specific: "because many are questioning whether there is biblical warrant for strategic-level spiritual warfare at all."²⁴

Wagner sets the scene for Scriptural warrant by describing the way in which the public ministry of Jesus began. Directly after His baptism, Wagner says, Jesus was involved in "the highest degree of strategic-level spiritual warfare."²⁵ When Jesus goes into the wilderness and is confronted by the devil, this power encounter heralds to the whole world that the Kingdom of God had come and the battle has commenced. Under a sub-heading "Biblical Examples", Wagner explains that it is when one understands the biblical and theological principles behind the encounter Jesus had with the devil in the wilderness (Matt 4:1) that various other biblical passages "take on a new meaning."²⁶ Wagner gives only three biblical examples of how God used His servants in warfare prayer and Daniel stands as the first.²⁷

Wagner's synopsis of Daniel 10 in *Warfare Prayer*, in less than three hundred words, gives his readers the barest details: that Daniel had a great vision in which an angel who appeared to him describes the fierce spiritual battle in the heavenlies which occurred in the three-week interval since Daniel first began to pray. The demonic being named the prince of Persia had blocked the passage of the good angel until the intervention of Michael. On the messenger angel's return trip the battle would broaden to include the prince of Greece. On the basis of the circumstances depicted in Daniel 10, Wagner comes to two conclusions:²⁸ (a) that territorial spirits greatly influence human life in all its sociopolitical aspects; and (b) that the only weapon Daniel had to combat these rulers of darkness was warfare prayer. Daniel as a model for prayer practice will be dealt with later in this chapter. It is sufficient at this point to simply note Wagner's suppositions.

Wagner's style is largely anecdotal, but he does briefly explain how the Old Testament influenced his concept of the territoriality of spirit beings. He sees Deut 32:8 as one of the key texts, and has noted difference between translations, resulting in two main

²⁴ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 12.

²⁵ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 51.

²⁶ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 65.

²⁷ Jeremiah (in approximately 150 words) citing only Jer. 1:10, and Luke and Acts (given a slightly longer treatment of 2 ½ pages); however Wagner's approach in these areas will not be pursued but limited to Daniel as sufficient for the purpose.

²⁸ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 66.

renditions: “according to the number of the sons/children of Israel” *vis-à-vis* “according to the number of the sons/children of God.”²⁹ Wagner makes this revealing statement: “Unfortunately, its meaning is hidden in most English versions translated from the Hebrew of the Masoretic text.”³⁰ The only example he cites, however, is the Authorised Version, with its reading that when God “divided to the nations their inheritance”, he did so “according to the number of the children of Israel.” Wagner rightly says that translated this way, in itself, the phrase has little to do with spirits ruling territories. He prefers the Septuagint translation rendered in English, “according to the number of the angels of God” and it can only be presumed this is because it accords with his belief in ruling spirits.

Julie A. Duncan writes that Deuteronomy texts found at Qumran shed light on the nature of the Septuagint as translation. She writes:³¹

The [Hebrew] *Vorlage* of the Greek is now confirmed by Deuteronomy^j which preserves the phrase “sons of Elohim”... This is in all likelihood the original reading, as it is more probable that a reference to divine beings was later suppressed for theological reasons than that it was substituted for the reading “sons of Israel.”

It is generally agreed, regarding emendations to the Hebrew text,³² that any alterations are understandable if there seemed to be a suggestion of other gods existing. Christensen considers that the Deut 32:8 passage anticipates the idea of angels watching over the nations in Dan 10:13; 20-21; 12:1.³³ Most scholars seem to agree with this, and also with P.C. Craigie’s explanation that the translation “according to the number of the sons of God”, is an allusion to the divine council of the Lord which consisted of “holy ones” (see Deut 33:2). It is this factor, Craigie says, that accounts for them being called “angels” in the Septuagint.³⁴

As raised in Chapter Two, McConville suggested that if the Hebrew “sons of Israel” is original, it could be read as Yahweh apportioning land to Israel “in the context of the

²⁹ NIV “sons of Israel”; RSV “sons of God”; NRSV “gods” NAB “sons of God”, NJB “children of God.”

³⁰ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 90.

³¹ See “Deuteronomy, Book of” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Volume 1)*, Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (eds.) (Oxford University Press, 2000), 200.

³² Reading “according to the number of the sons of God” from “Sons of God,” found in 4QDeutj and LXX, “angels [or sons] of God.”

³³ Christensen, *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12*, 796.

³⁴ P.C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy (NICOT)* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976), 379-80.

creator's distribution of land to all nations, according to their size and need."³⁵ Israel's election is thus emphasised and the gift of the land "is set within a purpose of God for the whole world."³⁶ McConville is cognisant of the opinions of other commentators, who sometimes see these verses in Deut 32:8 as endorsing the belief that the High God assigned nations and territories to the "sons of God." Accordingly he argues that the text is best interpreted in the context of the strong mono-Yahwistic theology of Deuteronomy, rather than in the process of domesticating Canaanite polytheism to Yahwistic theology.

Since Deut 32:8 is a key text intended as support for the concept of territoriality, Wagner appeals to a commentary on The Epistle to the Hebrews by F.F. Bruce in which some mention is made of the passage.³⁷ The context of Bruce's point concerns Heb 2:5, relating to the superiority of Christ to the angels, particularly in the age to come. In that era, Bruce believes, they will not be entrusted with administration as they have in this present age. He points to the Song of Moses as early evidence "that the administration of various nations has been parcelled out among a corresponding number of angelic powers,"³⁸ noting that the Septuagint reading of Deut 32:8 "has claims to represent the original text."³⁹

It should be pointed out that Bruce says very little in relation to Daniel, no more than a passing remark that by the time of Daniel this concept had become explicit, as indicated by the use of the terms "prince of Persia/Greece" (Dan 10:21; 12:1). His discussion then turns fleetingly to Eph. 6:12 by noting that angelic governors are sometimes portrayed as hostile principalities and powers. Bruce then returns to the Epistle to the Hebrews and ends by saying that it is concerned only with the fact that they are angels and mentions nothing of their possible hostility.⁴⁰ Notwithstanding Bruce's final remark, the connection between Deut 32:8, Daniel 10 and Eph 6:12 apparently provides sufficient scholarly authentication of Wagner's view⁴¹ and for him uncertainty has been dispelled.

³⁵ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 448. Scholarly opinions on Deut 32:8, on possible reasons for the emendations were discussed in Chapter Two.

³⁶ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 454.

³⁷ See Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 91. The late F.F. Bruce was Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism & Exegesis at University of Manchester, England.

³⁸ F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1964), 33.

³⁹ Bruce, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 32. In a brief footnote Bruce compares the Septuagint and MT versions with the Qumran findings, indicating articles on the topic; see *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 33, n.16

⁴⁰ Bruce, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 33.

⁴¹ See Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 91; citing Bruce, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 33.

He concludes “we now know that the Septuagint version . . . more accurately represents the original text.”⁴²

Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the reading “according to the number of the children of Israel” *vis-à-vis* “according to the number of the angels of God” is a crucial one, and does alter how Deut 32:8 could be understood. However, Lowe still maintains that at best, these alternatives serve to affirm the existence only of ruling angels, not demons.⁴³ Certainly in relation to Daniel 10:13, the Protestant Reformer Calvin understood guardian angels (not territorial demons) to be appointed rulers over nations and provinces.⁴⁴

The story of Ben-Hadad’s threat to Israel (see 1 Kgs 20:23) is the next example utilised by Wagner in support of his hypothesis on the territoriality of spirit powers. The Syrian king Ben-Hadad believed his advisors when they told him the Israelites were controlled by gods of the hills, in contradistinction to their own Syrian gods who were thought to rule the plains. The Syrians consequently laid plans orchestrating a battle on the plains which would supposedly be to their advantage.

Wagner says this story reveals a Syrian perception of ruling spirits who have, if not territoriality, at least topographical jurisdiction. It does appear that the Syrians believed their own gods were transportable, not restricted territorially, and this seems to be the basis on which Wagner broadens his concept of territoriality to include topography. He adds “Nothing in the passage or elsewhere in the Old Testament contradicts their perception of territorial spirits ruling areas.”⁴⁵ He therefore concludes the Syrian assumption was correct. Their mistake, he says, was in wrongly considering Yahweh as just another territorial spirit and explains why a prophet was sent to Ahab, king of Israel, with the message from Yahweh:

Because the Syrians have said, ‘The Lord is God of the hills, but He is not God of the valleys,’ therefore I will deliver all this great multitude into your hand, and you shall know that I am the Lord (1 Kgs 20:28 NKJV).

⁴² Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 90. Refer Chapter Two for discussion of other academic opinions as they relate to the Daniel 10:13.

⁴³ Lowe, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelization?*, 30.

⁴⁴ John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (London: Clarke, 1957), 1.14.7.

⁴⁵ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 91f.

Based on this story, then, Wagner comes to two conclusions: (a) that the Syrians were correct - that territorial spirits existed but (b) that Yahweh, as God of the Universe, is not limited by location. However, the prophet's words to Ahab can be understood as meaning quite the opposite to Wagner's reading. In fact, it is more likely the mono-Yahwistic prophet was indicating a direct contradiction of the Syrian belief - not simply that Yahweh is unlimited, but that the Syrians were utterly wrong in thinking anyone but Yahweh had authority on earth. In so saying, no quarter is given by the prophet to any notion of either territorial or topographical jurisdiction by alien gods or spirits. Though the story is found in Scripture, the belief was that of a heathen people, not the base for a biblical theology.

One final example will serve to illustrate Wagner's handling of Scripture. 2 Kings 17 tells of the Lord's final judgement of the apostasy of the Northern Kingdom by "removing them from His sight" (2 Kgs 17:18). Wagner calls it "one of the most detailed treatments of the territorial nature of the pagan so-called gods."⁴⁶ Miscellaneous foreign settlers were moved into the land by their Assyrian captors. These people brought their own religious beliefs with them (see 2 Kgs 17:29-31). Wagner remarks, "There is little question that each people group perceived itself to be under the direct influence of a specific principality whose name and habits they well knew, and to whom they were subservient."⁴⁷ Bear in mind that in his citation of this Scripture, he is intent on establishing a concept of territoriality, yet it is immediately evident from the context that none of these people groups are in their own territory which their gods/angels/territorial spirits are supposed to rule. The biblical story tells of a variety of worship practices of different national gods taking place in a single geographical area. This is at odds with Wagner's concept of the territorial nature of spirits.

Clearly, adherence to certain beliefs had been fostered in the immigrants at grass roots level within family or tribal relationships, in their original homelands. The practice of new settlers setting up shrines and worshipping their own gods in the former Northern Kingdom surely shows the supposed spiritual entities involved were not territorially bound, even in the minds of worshippers. Territoriality, it seems, is a transportable commodity to Wagner, at variance with his concept of a ruling spirit in a land. The indications are that Wagner bases his understanding on what the Scriptures say the

⁴⁶ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 92.

⁴⁷ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 93.

Samaritan settlers believed, which is not the same as basing understanding on the monotheism Scripture indicates the Israelites were to believe.

Wagner's altered terminology from territoriality to geo-political seems to incorporate a shift in a broader position. He states that "much of the Old Testament is based on the assumption that certain supernatural spiritual beings have dominion over geo-political spheres."⁴⁸

In his very thorough analysis of Wagner's writings, Chuck Lowe focuses on the meaning of the word "territorial" to discern how territorial spirits might compare to other types of demons. He shows that Wagner's theory of demonic hierarchies is difficult to align with concrete biblical examples, without blurring the distinctions.⁴⁹ Also, although Wagner cites various early Church Fathers in support of the existence of territorial spirits, these historical authorities merely affirm demonic possession and exorcism, which in Wagner's proposed taxonomy are ground-level, not strategic-level, spirits.

The same may be said regarding secondary sources utilised by Wagner to support his theory e.g. Susan Garrett's book on Luke-Acts.⁵⁰ According to Wagner's own system of demonic classification, Garrett's work relates to occult-level spirits, giving no support to the existence of territorial spirits. This is not surprising, since her stated interest is exclusively with the correlation between magic and demons. Likewise, in his book *Confronting the Powers*,⁵¹ Wagner makes comprehensive appeal to Ramsay MacMullen's work on the subject of church growth between AD 100-400, attributed by MacMullen to the church's "mastery of the spirit world." In no way is Wagner's theory substantiated by MacMullen's examples, for as Lowe shows,⁵² these are yet again references to what Wagner designates as ground or occult-level spirits. Though MacMullen uses neither the terms, nor similar categorisation Wagner writes as though he

⁴⁸ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 92.

⁴⁹ Lowe, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelization*, 16ff.

⁵⁰ See Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 67-69, 88-89, 94; *Acts of the Holy Spirit*, 177, 292-93, 295, 361, 474, 478, 480; also C. Peter Wagner, *Confronting the Powers: How the New Testament Church Experienced the Power of Strategic-Level Spiritual Warfare* (Ventura CA: Regal), 175-177, 192-193 etc.; citing Susan Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989).

⁵¹ See Wagner, *Confronting the Powers*, 100-106, 114-116, 220-222, etc; citing Ramsay MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire (AD100-400)* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984).

⁵² Lowe, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelization*, 17.

does: “According to Ramsay MacMullen, a historian, John, unlike Paul, eventually did enter directly into the famous temple of Diana *to do strategic-level spiritual warfare*.”⁵³

This is the same explanatory method which Wagner uses to apply his theory to Scripture. Once the concept of spiritual warfare is formed from Dan 10:13, and validated by saying it is revealed by the Holy Spirit, it appears it may be applied to other Scriptures without further need to substantiate context. The definition “seeing the world as it really is” has been readily extended from Persia, to the world as a whole, then to any other individual territories, ancient or modern. What applies to one, applies to all.

Lowe analyses the overall manner in which Wagner has classified demon spirits according to function. He shows that Wagner is inconsistent in the way in which he cites texts intended to support the notion of territorial spirits. Wagner does not classify strictly according to function, rather he supersedes geographical distinctions by some other characteristic, in references which would otherwise point to ground or occult-level spirits within the listing he devised. Wagner, however, overrides his own categorisations, altering the criteria to one of rank, rather than function, but Lowe notes that even this modified distinction is not adhered to with any uniformity. As utilised by Wagner the idiom “territorial spirits” becomes indistinct because other characteristics are imposed over geographical divisions, such as social, cultural, ethnic or other human networking.⁵⁴ As Lowe says, such treatment leaves the term irretrievably vague.

In *Confronting the Powers*, Wagner admits more than once that there is not one definite biblical example of a strategic-level spirit.⁵⁵ This must be taken seriously since by his own admission his hypothesis stands or falls on whether demons can legitimately be perceived as occupying territory. As noted in Chapter Two, there is scholarly agreement that Daniel 10:13, 20-21 and 21:1 are the clearest Old Testament references to angelic

⁵³ Emphasis added. Wagner continues to set out the words of the prayer John purportedly prayed, citing MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire*, 26.

⁵⁴ Lowe lists references in leading SLSW literature to show “that territorial demons are purportedly assigned not only to geographical regions, but also to geopolitical institutions, such as nations and states; to topographical features, such as valleys, mountains or rivers; to ecological features, such as trees, streams and rocks; or to smaller physical objects, such as houses, temples or idols.” See Lowe, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelization*, 19; Lowe gives copious examples of Wagner’s inconsistent taxonomy in his endnotes 38-42.

⁵⁵ Wagner, *Confronting the Powers*, 163, 171, 175, 177, 191, 193, 196, 203.

beings influencing nations.⁵⁶ The Old Testament shows the Israelites acknowledged the existence of evil spiritual beings.⁵⁷

Pentecostal beliefs accord with the likelihood that angelic and demonic tutelary spirits do exist, but Lowe's point that based on Scripture they cannot be said to be territorial, cannot be ignored. Neither is it possible to establish from Scripture how their respective jurisdictions are differentiated.⁵⁸ When the Early Church Fathers wrote on the subject, they used terminology such as custodial, guardian, tutelary or ruling to describe spirits dominating areas.⁵⁹ There is a marked degree of appeal in reverting to the traditional labels, as Lowe suggests, as these appear less ambivalent than the recently coined phrase "territorial spirits."

In conventional Pentecostal hermeneutics, the rule is to read out of the text and for Scripture to interpret Scripture. Wagner habitually reads into the text what he expects to find there and in fact substantiates his interpretation on the historical practices of Israel's Ancient Near East neighbours. In relation to doctrine, Pentecostal lecturer W. J. Maybin writes, "...if we are to uphold the truth of God's Word, we are under obligation to accept the entire Scriptures," and he specifically warns against treating Scripture as a collection of isolated texts, but that as a system of truth, each part must "be viewed in light of the totality of revelation."⁶⁰ This means biblical interpretation should not be merely biblicistic by means of proof-texting, that is, "arbitrarily extracting texts from the Bible for use as the basis of propositional claims unrelated to the original context of the verse in Scripture."⁶¹ Certainly, as Preus cautions, biblical proof should not be sought *ex post factum* as justification for pre-determined theological positions.⁶² This stance is totally in keeping with that of the Reformers and their successors, who balked at any idea that

⁵⁶The only explicit mention of national patron angels in Jub 15:3 is non-canonical, therefore not a basis for Pentecostal belief.

⁵⁷ However, no scholarly consensus is reached about what was actually believed, how this affected the practice of their religion or even which biblical texts are involved, because of the assortment of expressions used to refer to evil spirits and the variety of ways in which these may be understood. Cf. Sydney H.T. Page, *Powers of Evil: A Biblical Study of Satan and Demons* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker/Apollos, 1995), 43.

⁵⁸ Lowe, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelisation*, 144. See also Page, *Powers of Evil*, 260.

⁵⁹ For example, see William Jurgens (ed.), *The Faith of the Early Fathers*. 3 vols. (Collegeville MN: Liturgical, 1979): Theodoret of Cyr (393-466) Jurgens 3.248 #2161; John Damascene (645-749), *Source* 3.2.3, Jurgens 3.334 #2354; Clement, *Miscellanies* 6.12.157.4, Jurgens 1.184 #430; Hilary of Poitiers (315-367), *Psalms* 129.7, Jurgens 1.387 #895; Origen, *Luke* 12, Jurgens 1.201 #475; Gregory of Nyssa, *Life* 2, Jurgens 2.45 #1022.

⁶⁰ W.J. Maybin, "Bible Prophecy," in P.S. Brewster (ed.), *Pentecostal Doctrine* (Cheltenham UK: P.S. Brewster/Elim Pentecostal Church HQ, 1976), 211. At time of publication, Maybin was a lecturer at Elim Bible College and a serving Elim minister in Southampton, England.

⁶¹ Muller, "Sources of Reformed Orthodoxy," 45.

⁶² Preus, "Sources of Lutheran Dogmatics," 34.

they were "... sectarian theologians who blindly grasped onto Scripture as an exclusive basis for all theological insight and then proceeded to trust their own exegetical intuitions..."⁶³

To sum up Wagner's alignment with *Sola Scriptura*, we have seen that he recognises that the biblical warrant for SLSW is questioned. Secondly, he begins his explanation with Jesus, a positive factor for Pentecostals. However, in his bid to build a portfolio of biblical examples, little exegesis is undertaken by Wagner and the way in which secondary sources are cited never fully engages with the authors line of reasoning, even, at times, appealing for support when there is none. Wagner's style is most likely due to the popular audience at whom his books are aimed. The geographical distinction is not sustained in SLSW literature and since Wagner himself admits Scripture does not provide any specific examples of territorial spirits, justification for the use of the term on that basis is weak.

Next, Wagner's interpretive method will be examined in light of the second principle of Classical Pentecostal hermeneutics, which entails a pneumatic interpretation of Scripture.

b. *Wagner and the Pneumatic Approach to Scripture*

The Pentecostal practice of interpreting Scripture pneumatically, an approach which leaves ample space for experience and testimony, is accepted as a valid means of faith interpretation. Most of the evidence Wagner supplies to support his beliefs is empirical data.⁶⁴ Certainly Pentecostalism has no inherent argument against testimony, particularly in discussing relationship with God.

The previously discussed Lucan hermeneutic, fostered by the connectedness Pentecostals feel with the early church of Luke-Acts, facilitates an eschatological approach. In his commentary on Acts, Wagner mentions neither Stronstad nor Menzies, but he does make

⁶³ Muller, "Sources of Reformed Orthodoxy," 52.

⁶⁴ Whilst saying he hoped his material has scholarly integrity, Wagner claims to be a theoretician whose practical bias led him to test these theories of identifying and binding the territorial spirits controlling cities from as early as 1985 on the basis of the anecdotal evidence of various Pastors in South America whose evangelistic tactics Wagner considered to be demonstrably effective. See Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 13. Unfortunately, it has been established that some of the anecdotal evidence on which Wagner has depended is inaccurate, whether by misinformation or misrepresentation; see R. J. Priest, T. Campbell, and B. A. Mullen, "Missiologial Syncretism: The New Animistic Paradigm" in E. Rommen (ed.) *Spiritual Power and Missions: Raising the Issues* (EMS Ser. 3) (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library), 36ff, 48. Priest, Campbell and Mullen explore three differing views on the nature of spiritual warfare.

some use of I. Howard Marshall's insights.⁶⁵ He admits his own limited critical and linguistic capabilities, and therefore gleans insights from various scholars regarding grammar, theology and historical context, leaning heavily on their exegesis.⁶⁶ As mentioned earlier, his writings are not without scholarly citations, however the use he makes of their opinions in his writings seems to be strategic deployment, rather than the investigative employment hinted at above. It does not appear that Wagner intended justifying in his writings a more formal Pentecostal environment.

That being said, it is still evident that Wagner reads the narrative of Acts as didactic, a standard paradigm adopted by Pentecostals when reading Scripture, as Stronstad suggests. Wagner never qualifies his interpretive method within a particular structure, but his popular writing style is consistent with a reader-oriented literary approach to Scripture. Modern audiences may review the ways the biblical authors experienced the revelation of God and attach vicarious significance to the narrative; at the same time, the fixed literary form of Scripture remains historical data. Pentecostal assemblies see themselves as eschatological community and read Scripture as having contemporary, not simply historical, relevance. Post-modernity, arguably, has a spiritistic worldview⁶⁷ and SLSW proponents make maximum use of this outlook, which may account for its popularity.⁶⁸

The episode of Daniel's three weeks of prayer with fasting (Daniel 10) is described by Wagner in *Warfare Prayer*, not surprisingly, as warfare prayer. Notice is taken by him that the issues being prayed over were directed to the highest political realm of the day, that of Cyrus, king of Persia. Daniel was praying with regards to the natural, socio-political concerns of the realm in which he lived. The resulting vision gives the reader, in Wagner's words, "a rare glimpse of what actually happened in the spiritual realm... We are shown the kingdom of Persia as it really is, not only as it appears to be."⁶⁹ The phraseology employed here, that the kingdom of Persia is shown as it really is, not only

⁶⁵ Stronstad's views are linked to those of Menzies and Marshall; see the section *The Pneumatic Approach to the Interpretation of Scripture* in Chapter One.

⁶⁶ Wagner, *Acts of the Holy Spirit*, 11. Of the five citations from Marshall, none is in reference to spiritual warfare; cf. Wagner, *Acts of the Holy Spirit*, 101, 136, 146, 245, 436.

⁶⁷ Lowe, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelization?*, 151.

⁶⁸ A prime example in SLSW literature is the book by key leader George Otis, Jr., *The Last of the Giants: Lifting the Veil on Islam and the End Times* (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1991). A leading text on the back cover, giving a clue to the contents, poses the question "What stands in the shadows behind the dominant world systems?"

⁶⁹ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 66.

as it appears to be, is called by Wagner a “nontechnical condensed definition.”⁷⁰ In his various writings it is modified as necessary to designate either specific regions or broadened to the more encompassing term “the world” (e.g. seeing the world/Russia/Manhattan, and so on, as it really is). In fact, the definition is quite adaptable and any geographical area may be substituted, particularly when related to the purpose of spiritual mapping.

In summary, analysis of Wagner’s approach under the second Pentecostal principle of a pneumatic approach to the interpretation of Scripture, it is evident that he empathises with the concept of understanding Scripture under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. This is highlighted by his belief that SLSW is God-given and one of the most important things the Spirit is saying to the churches at this time.⁷¹ His theological conclusions cannot be said to be based on an anti-supernatural premise. Also, he writes in a manner which affirms a continuity between the modern and the early church. His stance toward the *charismata* is non-cessationist. Wagner’s position is without doubt Christ-centred, and his praxis mission-oriented. Substantial evidence of his prolific networking shows his approach could not be construed as non-relational and self-serving. Wagner writes straightforwardly of being in active relationship with God, which accords with the Yada mode described earlier. Also, because Pentecostalism has traditionally welcomed experience and testimony as valid means of faith interpretation, and Wagner’s approach makes good use of this, his methods appear to fit comfortably with the Pentecostal view. These similarities with Pentecostalism account for why he is often mistaken as a Pentecostal, despite his assertion of standing solidly within conservative Evangelicalism.

Wagner’s interpretive method must now be considered under the third and final principle of Classical Pentecostal hermeneutics, that of biblical revelation, not self-revelation, within the community of faith.

c. Wagner and Biblical Revelation, not Self-Revelation, within the Community of Faith

In the last quarter of the twentieth century, around the same time that Wagner’s writings on spiritual warfare were increasing in popularity, calls were being made within

⁷⁰ The phrase is attributed to George Otis, Jr. see Wagner, *Breaking Strongholds*, 14; see also Table of Contents description of ‘Introduction’ in *Breaking Strongholds In Your City*, which notes “Spiritual mapping is an attempt to see the world around us as it really is, not as it appears to be.”

⁷¹ Wagner, *Breaking Strongholds In Your City*, Introduction (unnumbered).

Pentecostalism to re-examine their more subjective way of hearing the text. Cargal was one of those urging that the viability of culturally relevant meanings of the text be reconsidered in relation to Pentecostal hermeneutics in the postmodern milieu.⁷²

Wagner's writings are independent of the call to bridge the hermeneutical gap relating critical and theological issues to an experienced-based theology. Nevertheless, just as Pentecostal scholars are recognising and seeking solutions to the theological inconsistencies between dispensationalism and Pentecostalism, the theology and hermeneutics of SLSW must also be scrutinised to distinguish inconsistencies with the tradition.

The application of standard hermeneutics is chiefly occupied with internal cohesion. The question remains, in which hermeneutical path does Wagner stand? On the issue of misinterpretations and excesses, Pentecostal scholar Gordon Fee writes positively of the norms of good exegesis as accepted by contemporary Pentecostal communities, not only as the means of guiding interpretations, but also where deeper meanings must be evaluated with extreme caution.⁷³ It appears that because neither Wagner's hermeneutic nor teachings are clearly defined as either Evangelical or Pentecostal, by default they are unwittingly attributed to Pentecostalism. This has no doubt been aided by the fact that historically Pentecostals have not been viewed as having a formally defended theology. Fortunately, the tide has turned.

Pentecostals are firm in their stand that subordinate revelation may never contradict the text, therefore as argued previously, the community of faith is the forum, and community testimony the means, to ensure the maintenance of orthodoxy within any faith tradition. Since Pentecostalism allows for a pneumatic reading of the text, it is obvious that there will be a delicate balance in guarding against unsustainable interpretations. Open discussion with the wider ecclesiastical community is to be encouraged as a guard against sectarianism. At the same time, denominational distinctives can be retained in the broader forum by allowing for some diversity, yet upholding internal cohesion by careful hermeneutics.

The Pentecostal Movement is barely a century old, and the development of a systematic Pentecostal theology is a work in progress. It is therefore all the more important for

⁷² Cargal, "Beyond the Fundamentalist-Modernist Controversy," 174.

⁷³ Fee, *Gospel and Spirit*, 39.

those at the congregational level to know what is included in the rule of faith. Distinctions between Pentecostals, neo-Pentecostals/charismatics and neo-charismatics have blurred over the past quarter of a century. Ordinary Christians are faced with a barrage of literature and conferences from all these streams and do not have a standard by which to differentiate the theology of their own grouping from that of the others. This has resulted in theological pluralism.⁷⁴

The notion of Christianity reaching a post-denominational phase, as Preus fears, carries with it the prospect of contemporary religion becoming so eclectic that some individual faith traditions, stripped of their past identity, may discover their worship practices and essential mission similarly diminished.⁷⁵ Biblical theology is the most favoured approach by Pentecostals, and the need to co-ordinate this with a systematic theology relative to their tradition has already been noted. The aim is for biblical unity in conjunction with distinctive theological stances and the necessity of sound and consistent exegesis cannot be overemphasised. Dogma provides the boundaries of what is heretical, but exegesis facilitates new and helpful insights.⁷⁶

It is against this background that one must view Wagner's position. His own terminology makes his quest for new meaning explicit. Earlier in this chapter mention was made of how Wagner begins his biblical description of SLSW with Jesus' encounter with the devil in the wilderness. He pointed out that the real battle was spiritual and when this was understood, the biblical and theological principles behind the engagement led to various other biblical passages taking on a new meaning.⁷⁷ Pentecostals also believe the wilderness temptation of Jesus had spiritual connotations. The concern here is Wagner's ongoing hermeneutic. There has been a rise of concern about his teaching. Many believe that Wagner's reading of Daniel 10:13, [20-21] is not simply a fresh

⁷⁴ Cf. Hollenweger, who conversely, does not consider this "profusion of Pentecostal organisations with conflicting views who ironically hold huge united conferences which give the impression of agreement" has led to "unstructured chaos." Rather, he believes the loose relationship of organisations and cross-pollination of ideas between Pentecostals along invisible media networks are factors to be taken into account when considering the relationship between organisations; see Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals*, 69, 71. A group of international Christian leaders (including people such as Wagner, Charles Craft, Cindy Jacobs and Clinton Arnold) formed the Spiritual Warfare Network (SNW) after the 1989 Lausanne II Conference in Manila. See Clinton Arnold, *Spiritual Warfare: What Does the Bible Really Teach?* (London: Marshall Pickering, 1999), 164. The AD2000 and Beyond Movement (of which Wagner was an integral part), had formally disbanded by 2001. For some insight into the colossal degree of networking, conferences and dissemination of information the Movement was able to achieve in its 12-year history, see Rick Wood, "Passing the Baton," *Mission Frontiers* (June, 2001), 32-35.

⁷⁵ Preus, "Sources of Lutheran Dogmatics," 30 and 36.

⁷⁶ Arand, "The Church's Dogma and Biblical Theology," 22f.

⁷⁷ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 65.

insight, but that it has indeed taken on new meaning. A variety of prominent leaders amongst Pentecostals, charismatics, and Third-Wave and even spiritual-warfare networks, have demurred, if not outright objected to aspects his teaching.⁷⁸

Chuck Lowe goes so far as to accuse Wagner of espousing a new demonology. Lowe considers that many of the Christians who embrace SLSW so enthusiastically do so without examining its actual teachings. He concedes the burgeoning interest in prayer meetings and missions is a positive, but these benefits come at a price. SLSW and the attendant practice of spiritual mapping is called a new prayer methodology, but if it is wrong, it carries numerous and serious negative consequences.⁷⁹ The cost of SLSW in time, personnel and money is huge. The cost of incorrect theology is inestimable, not least, as Lowe points out, to those who have committed their ministries and reputations to this new doctrine and practice. “For many it has become a new test of orthodoxy and orthopraxy: a new basis for unity, and thus a grounds [sic] for division.”⁸⁰

Lowe’s main argument relates to Wagner’s demonology, whereas here we are concerned with biblical revelation as the basis of authority within the community of faith. One of the problem areas, where Wagner’s hermeneutics and demonology combine, may be seen in his deduction that ancient Israelite high places were literally possessed by demons. His conclusions lean towards assumptions implicit in contemporary animism. In his survey of Scripture aimed at defending the territoriality of spirits this appears to be a presupposition. Beginning in the Old Testament he remarks on the tendency of peoples in the era to regard “gods, deities, spirits or angelic powers of various kinds as having territorial jurisdiction.”⁸¹ He adds that at certain times in its history this “unfortunately” included Israel. (This is curious since he himself believes in the territorial jurisdiction of spiritual beings.) Many of the high places in Israel, he points out, were once used for false worship and subsequently became the *literal* (emphasis added) dwelling places of the demonic spirits later referred to in the New Testament as principalities and powers. He notes that God’s anger was fiercely expressed towards those Israelites who “rather than destroy the high places, worshipped and served the demonic beings that occupied

⁷⁸ Opal Reddin, John Wimber, David Pawson, John Robb, Kenneth Hagin, Wolfgang Kopfermann, amongst others; see Lowe, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelization*, 13 and endnote 8.

⁷⁹ Lowe, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelization*, 12.

⁸⁰ Lowe, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelization*, 13.

⁸¹ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 89. Wagner takes note of the Sumerian’s belief in a pantheon of gods who ruled individual cities in consultation with a heavenly council and the council head *Enlil*, is designated a territorial spirit by Wagner. In this context he says Abraham was the first to understand that Yahweh was king of the whole universe. Cf. Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 91.

them.”⁸² He ends that this was considered by the prophets to be spiritual adultery and that the Babylonian captivity was one of God’s punishing judgements for such behaviour.

Wagner’s explanation of the Gospel story of the Gadarene demoniac is another example of his animistic assumptions. In his estimation, the notion of demons having territorial dominion finds biblical support here. He is convinced demons can attach themselves to specific things, whether living (pigs) or inanimate (idols, houses) and to natural features (trees, mountains) and makes the point that the demons in this passage, aware they were to be cast out of a human being, begged to not be sent out of the country (Mk 5:10). He poses the question of why they would make such a request, and to him, the obvious answer to is that “remaining in the same geographical territory had some value to the demons.”⁸³ This style of reasoning by Wagner is not uncommon. However, Lowe argues that the point being made in Scripture is that the demons were demonstrating their fear of the Abyss, or torment in hell, not of deportation.⁸⁴

To sum up, the need to guard against unorthodox doctrine is universally recognised. Self-revelation must be tested and subordinated to the text as accepted within the community of faith. In his writings about territorial spirits, Wagner specifically denies having put forward an unassailable doctrine, but rather claims a new insight to assist the task of church mission with a new prayer methodology. No claims are made of esoteric secrets only for the initiated. Nevertheless, aspects of his teaching have been questioned by Classical Pentecostals, charismatics, Third Wave and spiritual warfare groups, these last two being those with whom he has claimed specific alliance.⁸⁵ His faith community can be depicted by a schema of concentric circles.

Wagner is not challenged for claiming a fresh insight inspired by the Holy Spirit *per se*. It is not simply that Wagner sees hierarchies amongst demons. Others have held similar views. The titles prince of Persia and prince of Greece are also commonly understood to

⁸² Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 89.

⁸³ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 77. Various questions naturally arise from Wagner’s remarks: Did Jesus first intend to cast them into the abyss? Did being consigned to pigs, which subsequently drowned, trap the demons? Do they continue to exist once the pigs have decayed? Is it only a matter of time before they return to dominate the area? Since they were in a person, does that disqualify them as territorial spirits? Following up these questions is not possible within the parameters of this study.

⁸⁴ Lowe, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelisation?*, 38.

⁸⁵ Argentine pastors have been amongst those most receptive to Wagner’s methodology, but Wagner writes that “Even Argentine pastors struggle with some of the same theological and practical issues.” See *Warfare Prayer*, 35.

refer to national angels, albeit in less specific terms than Wagner employs. Pentecostals have always believed Scripture to be didactic. However, Classical Pentecostal teaching is very clear that experience alone is never to be accepted as sufficient in matters of doctrinal significance.⁸⁶ Wagner constantly prefaces his observations with “I believe,”⁸⁷ and Lowe is not alone in cautioning that under the guise of Holy Spirit inspiration this claim cannot be allowed to become the new hermeneutic.⁸⁸ Wagner suggests implications, possibilities, opinions and assumptions that can be read into the text, regardless that no commentator supports this interpretation.⁸⁹ Cartledge stresses that all mainstream Pentecostal denominations expect their preachers to conform to proper principles of biblical interpretation “rather than allowing personal subjective experiences to be the final arbiter of truth...or ... claiming special revelation as their authority, instead of submitting it to other criteria for evaluation.”⁹⁰

This section has discussed Wagner’s method and Classical Pentecostal hermeneutics. The conclusion is that despite having a pneumatic approach to Scripture, Wagner’s teaching does not stand up to the other two principles. The results are as follows:

- i. *Sola Scriptura* - On his own admission Scripture does not provide any specific examples of territorial spirits;
- ii. Pneumatic interpretation of Scripture – Wagner’s approach is pneumatic;
- iii. Biblical revelation, not self-revelation, in the community of faith – inadequate exegesis, over-reliance on anecdotal evidence and disquiet in Pentecostal, charismatic and Third Wave circles show Wagner’s understanding is not standard.

A last area of concern remains in relation to this thesis – the degree to which Wagner’s demonology is related to Classical Pentecostal demonology. His theories will now be considered in more detail.

⁸⁶ Cartledge (see *Apostolic Revolution*, 46) represents the Classical Pentecostal position: “...supernatural phenomena alone can never be the basis of making decisions or formulating doctrines. Every spiritual experience must be subjected to the plain teaching of the Bible to establish the credibility of such revelations.”

⁸⁷ E.g. see Wagner, *Confronting the Powers*, 162, 163, 164, 186, 190, 191, 196, 208.

⁸⁸ Cf. Judith Lynn Howard, “Cult Watchers Adopt Guidelines,” *Christianity Today* (October 28, 1996), 88. The article refers to comments made by James Bjornstad, at a conference titled “The Culting of Christianity,” charging the church with losing the knowledge of a systematic study of Scripture. “Hermeneutics today is reduced to one sentence: ‘The Spirit told me’.”

⁸⁹ Lowe, *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelisation?*, 145. Lowe cites numerous examples (page 173, endnotes 385-386) and the same tendentiousness in Wagner’s treatment of history and empirical data is noted.

⁹⁰ Cartledge, *Apostolic Revolution*, 27.

3. Wagner's Theories and Classical Pentecostal Demonology

Pentecostals, in common with orthodox Christianity, believe that the death of Christ at Calvary and His resurrection secured victory over Satan. The Kingdom of God has come and eschatological events been inaugurated. It is a tenet of Pentecostalism that believers, as heirs of salvation, consequently received power and authority over demons in the present age.⁹¹ Further, the belief that Christians have been given the same power and authority to cast out demons and to heal that Jesus exercised is one conviction that is common to Pentecostals, neo-Pentecostals/charismatics and neo-charismatics.⁹²

Despite some commonalities, this final section will show that Wagner's theories are not derived directly from Classical Pentecostal sources. First a developmental chain proposed by Walker will be looked at and the ramifications discussed. Wagner's demonology then will be compared with two sources of Classical Pentecostal: one is early (Myer Pearlman) and the other more contemporary (George Canty). The chapter will conclude by looking at the way in which Wagner links Daniel and Acts with his SLSW theory and the model which results.

a. *Linking Wagner to Pentecostal Demonology*

Reference was made at the beginning of this chapter to assertions that Wagner's demonology is synonymous with Pentecostal teachings. Some critics even consider the thinking undergirding SLSW to be part of a chain of beliefs held throughout Pentecostal history. However, Wagner believes that prior to the Lausanne II Congress on World Evangelisation in Manila in 1989, there had not been much discussion amongst Pentecostals, charismatics or evangelicals about how territorial spirits could influence world evangelization.⁹³ He includes himself amongst the uninformed prior to 1990.⁹⁴

⁹¹ Cf. Doctrinal Statement section "The Devil", *Assemblies of God National Minister's Manual*, 3rd Edition, Alec Spence (ed.), (Assemblies of God Australia Queensland Conference State Executive, 2000), 13; the AOG Australia Statement of Beliefs, consistent with the Christocentric approach, shows no formal preoccupation with the interpretation of prophecy. See also Canty, "Demons and Casting Out Demons," 245.

⁹² Henry H. Knight III, "God's Faithfulness and God's Freedom: A Comparison of Cotemporary Theologies of Healing," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 2 (1993), 84. See also Guy. P. Duffield and Nathaniel M. Van Cleave, *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology* (Los Angeles CA: L.I.F.E. Bible College, 1987) 309.

⁹³ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 45; also 64.

Wagner describes himself as one who comes from the traditional Evangelical wing of the church, and he pointedly separates Third Wave from the Pentecostal/charismatic movement, though he says he is open to learning from them.⁹⁵ It may be assumed by this that he has adapted certain concepts he has gathered from sources outside his own tradition, which would account for some of the confusion as to where his teachings fit.

Wagner is aware that many Christians in America have questioned theological and practical issues related to SLSW.⁹⁶ In 1993 Wagner not only spoke of spiritual mapping as a new subject, but guessed that few readers would have much background or understanding to prepare the way for this new strategy for evangelism.⁹⁷ In his estimation, only some isolated small groups over the previous 20 years were the exception. He added that there was still much to learn and only those conversant with SLSW would find the way paved for this mental shift.

In looking at how Wagner's understanding of demonology connects within Pentecostalism, a developmental path is suggested by Andrew Walker.⁹⁸ He recognises that no major historical investigation has yet been undertaken to establish exactly when the paranoia regarding demons arose.⁹⁹ He suggests it occurred in the late 1940s and 1950s in America with the teachings on demons by William Branham (known as the "Latter Day Rain" movement) and his disciple Ern Baxter. Although himself a Pentecostal by experience since 1932,¹⁰⁰ the latter was a close associate of Derek Prince and Don Basham.¹⁰¹

⁹⁴ Wagner, *Breaking Strongholds In Your City*, Introduction (unnumbered).

⁹⁵ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 48.

⁹⁶ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 35. This remark is significant because the South American pastors are a major resource for Wagner, providing much of the anecdotal data relied upon as support for his theories in his many writings.

⁹⁷ See *Breaking Strongholds In Your City*, Introduction (unnumbered); 1993 was the year of publication.

⁹⁸ Walker belongs to a group called *The C.S. Lewis Centre*, described as "an international network of Christians from many different churches and traditions, [who despite their differences] are united by their commitment to historic Christianity [in open, frank debate]"; see Tom Smail, Andrew Walker and Nigel Wright (eds.), *The Love of Power or the Power of Love: A Careful Assessment of the Problems Within the Charismatic and Word-of-Faith Movement* (Minneapolis MN: Bethany House Pubs., 1994), facepage.

⁹⁹ Andrew Walker, "Demonology and the Charismatic Movement," in Tom Smail, Andrew Walker and Nigel Wright (eds.), *The Love of Power or the Power of Love: A Careful Assessment of the Problems Within the Charismatic and Word-of-Faith Movements* (Minneapolis MN: Bethany House Pubs., 1994), 57.

¹⁰⁰ See S. Strang, "Baxter, William John Ernest ("Ern"), *DPCM*, 52.

¹⁰¹ Incidentally, Branham later fell into disrepute within the movement. Prince and Basham between them produced much literature on their beliefs and practices regarding demons. Basham was a Disciples of Christ pastor before he became identified with the Charismatic Renewal; see Stephen Mansfield, *Derek Prince: A Biography* (Lake Mary, Florida: Charisma House, 2005), 226. As for Derek Prince, despite his extremely brief association with a Pentecostal church when he first made a Christian commitment, he is described in his biography as "largely unchurched" until he commenced his own independent house church

Walker suggests the theological link between Branham/Baxter and Basham/Prince was strong. There is no doubt that Basham and Prince were extremely influential in the 1970s at the height of the Charismatic Movement. Walker credits these two teachers with pioneering “a belief in the prevalence of witchcraft in our societies and in the danger of amulets and charms, which they saw as demonically infused, or at least under the dominance of Satan.”¹⁰² Walker notes that Basham and Prince talked of demons trying to control individuals, which was by no means a new concept. He draws attention to their use of such terms as “strong men” or super-demonic powers that dominated churches, cities, and whole nations.¹⁰³

Although the terminology “territorial spirits” is not employed at this time, Walker considers the doctrine could be said to have arrived at the chrysalis stage. Paul Cain (a prophet from a Pentecostal Holiness background) was another who had strong associations with William Branham and the Latter Day Rain Movement. Cain, in turn, impacted upon John Wimber.¹⁰⁴ Wimber’s popular handbook *Power Evangelism* taught Christians how to engage in “power encounters” with the enemies of Christ (i.e. demons) to see people saved from the devil’s thralls and set free to worship God. Wimber and Wagner co-taught a controversial evangelism/church growth course at Fuller Theological Seminary School of World Mission, bringing Walker’s theoretical circle back to the SLSW debate.¹⁰⁵

To sum up Walker’s argument, a link was forged through Branham (Latter Rain) with Baxter, Prince, Basham (major leaders in the Charismatic Movement) then via Cain to Wimber and Wagner (founders of Third Wave). If this path is correct, connections lie with the Charismatic Movement, not Classical Pentecostalism. The slowly developing theory on territorial spirits was not founded in Classical Pentecostal sources. The Latter

in England after World War II. Although his theology and ethics were Pentecostal due to the influence of his first wife, Lydia (also an independent Pentecostal), he declined any connection with organised Pentecostalism because he was disappointed with their legalism. It was not until he became associated with the Charismatic Renewal, the point at which he became well-known internationally, that he admitted to feeling any connection to other ministers. Prince commenced his deliverance (exorcism) ministry early in the Charismatic Renewal period of his life (1963-4); see Mansfield, *Derek Prince*, 170, 175, 177, 180-1, 204, 208f, 227. Derek Prince’s particular understanding on spiritual warfare is well explained in his book entitled *Spiritual Warfare* (New Kensington PA: Whitaker House, 1987.)

¹⁰² Walker, “Demonology and the Charismatic Movement,” 58.

¹⁰³ Walker, “Demonology and the Charismatic Movement,” 58f.

¹⁰⁴ Walker, “Demonology and the Charismatic Movement,” 57f.

¹⁰⁵ The connection between Wagner and Wimber is summed up briefly by Anderson; see *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 158. Wimber subsequently dissociated his Vineyard movement from Wagner’s spiritual warfare emphasis.

Rain group was rejected by Pentecostals worldwide as a sect with dubious theology.¹⁰⁶ Walker asserts that it is a matter of record that Classical Pentecostalism has not capitulated to the popular obsession with demonic infestation despite what he sees as their primarily dualistic worldview. On the contrary, he notes, mainline Pentecostal denominations such as Elim and the Assemblies of God,¹⁰⁷ while believing in the existence of demons, have not become fascinated by the current preoccupation with evil spirits. He attributes this firmer control on the subject to Classical Pentecostalism's essentially evangelistic nature, which kept it outward-looking and Christ-centred during the period of the charismatic renewal movement.¹⁰⁸ Added to this, Wagner himself believes that warfare prayer, as he describes it, was a new concept to the great majority of American Christians.

The case has been made that the antecedents to Wagner's demonology are not that of Classical Pentecostalism. Further comparisons with Classical Pentecostal demonology will be discussed next.

b. *Wagner and Classical Pentecostal Demonology*

The brief discussion of conservative Pentecostal demonology here will be based mainly on two sources, both representative of the Classical Pentecostal position: Myer Pearlman's *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible*¹⁰⁹ and the chapter titled "Demons and Casting Out Demons", written by George Canty in the book *Pentecostal Doctrine*.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶ Hollenweger notes claims that "all the rest of the Pentecostal Movement rejects the 'Children of the Latter Rain'. The Apostolic Faith Movement disputes the 'blood theory' of the Latter Rain Assemblies. The German Pentecostal Ludwig Eisenlöffel ... makes the curt remark: 'There is do doubt that the Latter Rain movement is a sect'." Pentecostal leaders F.P. Möller and August Kast state of Latter Rain: "They have nothing to do with the Pentecostal movement, but were expelled from it." See *The Pentecostals*, 145f.

¹⁰⁷ Elim is a major British Pentecostal denomination. The Assemblies of God is worldwide. Wagner notes its growth from 1.6 million in 1965 to 13.2 million in 1985, making it now "the largest or second largest denomination in more than 30 nations of the world." See Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 47.

¹⁰⁸ Walker, "Demonology and the Charismatic Movement", 57.

¹⁰⁹ Pearlman's book was published in 1937 in an era when the Pentecostal Movement was grounding its theological position in more concrete terms. Considered a classic, it has been described as a "monumental outline of [Pentecostal] theology" by G.W. Gohr; see "Pearlman, Myer", *DPCM*, 684. It was used for years as a standard textbook for Pentecostal doctrine at the Assemblies of God's Central Bible Institute in Springfield Missouri, and also a number of other Pentecostal Bible Colleges. Pearlman, a converted Jew, was well educated and widely recognised within the Pentecostal Movement as a conservative theologian and exegetically sound in biblical interpretation.

¹¹⁰ See G. Canty, "Demons and Casting Out Demons," in P.S. Brewster (ed.), *Pentecostal Doctrine* (Cheltenham UK: P.S. Brewster/Elim Pentecostal Church HQ, 1976). At time of publication, Canty was a well-known preacher and evangelist in the Elim Pentecostal Church in Britain. For an additional brief overview, see W. Duane Collins, "An Assemblies of God Perspective on Demonology Part I," *Paraclete* (Fall 1993), 23-30.

Pearlman devotes only fourteen pages to the subject of angels, Satan and wicked spirits as fallen angels. A brief section titled *Angels of the Nations*, mentions Dan 10:13 and 20. Pearlman's language is guarded, writing of it only as seeming to teach that every race has its guardian angel concerned with the welfare of that nation. He merely notes that the historical background to the passage was the time for the Jews to return from captivity (Dan. 9:1, 2), and that consequently, Daniel set himself to prayer and fasting for their return. The next sequence in the story draws some comment from Pearlman. It concerns the explanation the messenger angel gives Daniel for the three weeks which intervene until their visionary conversation could take place. The angel faced supernatural opposition. Pearlman gives as the reason for this that "the prince, or angel, of Persia had opposed the return of the Jews," adding "perhaps being reluctant to lose their influence for the land of Persia."¹¹¹ The battle anticipated by the unnamed angel on the return journey is explained in the same terms, "that in his petition for the return of the Jews he had no supporter except Michael the prince of the Hebrew nation."¹¹² Pearlman considers a similar rationale motivated the prince of the Greeks, as being no more inclined than the prince of the Persians to favour the departure of the Jews (Dan.10:20, 21). His explanation relates strongly to the history of Israel with no attempt to press a contemporary application.

Wagner sees the connection to the pending return of the Jewish exiles to the land, but unlike Pearlman lays no accent on this as the purpose of the angelic mission. Pearlman does not suggest Daniel's prayer affected the outcome of the heavenly battle or that Daniel had any function other than as the recipient of the vision. Wagner's stress on Daniel is on what he sees as prayer warfare. Pearlman offers no advice or model for theological insights which may be gleaned from the biblical text. His closing observation cautions: that the word 'principalities' found in Eph. 3:10; 6:12 and Col. 2:15 is used of both good and bad angels and these "may" refer to angelic princes of the nations. Again, this does not coincide with the emphatic manner in which Wagner talks of the territorial authority of these spiritual beings.

Canty notes that the Old Testament all but ignores demons. He considers this striking because of the universal belief in them in the Ancient Near East. His emphasis is quite unlike Wagner's. He believes that Scriptural descriptions of the gods of the heathens as

¹¹¹ Pearlman, *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible*, 83.

¹¹² Pearlman, *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible*, 83.

demons were intended to be contemptuous (he cites Psalm 96:5 where in the Septuagint the word for ‘idols’ is *daimonia*). He writes of ancient Israel as being taught not to fear the sky-powers of the sun, moon and stars, since they were nothing more than lights. He holds that teaching regarding calamities and sicknesses in general was attributed to God, pointing out that even the atypical reference to King Saul having an evil spirit (1 Sam. 16:24) is described as being from the Lord. In this way, he contends, the Old Testament “insists that all events and powers are under God’s control. Israel did not believe they were at the mercy of wicked, capricious spirits. There was justice behind everything.”

113

Canty, like Wagner, regards Satan as a real and powerful enemy, personifying every principle which contradicts the nature of God. Consequently Christianity is a war against “spiritual wickedness in heavenly places” (Eph. 6:12) and in Canty’s opinion, such thinking badly needed to be restored in the Church.¹¹⁴ The major difference between Canty and Wagner is that Canty relies only on gospel preaching as being able to turn people from the power of Satan to God (Acts 26:18) and effectively delivering them from “the prince of the power of the air” (Eph. 2:2) into the kingdom of God’s Son (Col. 1:13). This is standard Pentecostalism.¹¹⁵ The world, but not Christian believers, is regarded as being in the grasp of the devil. It is considered normative that believers are free from Satanic power (Luke 10:10). The whole of the salvation experience (for those to whom grace is extended on the basis of faith) is directly related to repentance which, as Canty reminds from Pauline teaching, means that people “recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will” (2 Tim. 2:25, 26).¹¹⁶ Thus Canty considers the war waged against demons who control the world to be direct evangelism by preaching the Gospel. His next comment requires further discussion:

Satan can also create difficulties for us, and “hinder” us through circumstances ...¹¹⁷ and the world at large is the stronghold of mighty spiritual powers against which we are to wage ceaseless war (Ephesians 6:12-19; Daniel 10:13).¹¹⁸

Canty proceeds to explain what positive measures are entailed in waging such war under the heading “Casting out Demons.” First is the recognition that the battle must continue

¹¹³ Canty, “Demons and Casting Out Demons,” 243f.

¹¹⁴ Canty, “Demons and Casting Out Demons,” 244f.

¹¹⁵ According to their typical Christocentric mission-oriented dynamic.

¹¹⁶ Canty, “Demons and Casting Out Demons,” 245.

¹¹⁷ The Scripture reference included here (1 Timothy 2:18) does not exist; it is most likely Canty intended 1 Thessalonians 2:18, which in any event, is related.

¹¹⁸ Canty, “Demons and Casting Out Demons,” 252.

until Christ comes again to bind Satan finally and completely (Rev. 20:2), that the breadth of the warfare encompasses far more than merely “winkling out demons from certain strong-points. The whole range of world evil must be challenged by every means – prayer, witness, holiness, faith, preaching, and so on.”¹¹⁹ Canty acknowledges the example of Jesus in casting out demons as part of the gospel commission (Mk. 16:15-20; Lk. 9:1, 2; 10:1, 17; Matt. 10:8), but at the same time sees as remarkable that in neither John’s Gospel nor in any apostolic letter is anything said on this,” though they frequently urge the preaching of the gospel as a continuation of Christ’s own work.”¹²⁰ The point he makes is that Jesus came to destroy the works of the devil (1 Jn. 3:8), and did so by going “about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil” (Acts 10:38). The Bible emphasises how Jesus’ example should stand as our model. He strongly reiterates that “The preaching of the gospel is deliverance – it is the power of God in itself “unto salvation” (deliverance).”¹²¹

This point has been to show first, that details of Wagner’s demonology do not show similarities with Classical Pentecostalism as portrayed by Pearlman and Canty, and second, that preaching and evangelism have traditionally been Pentecostalism’s method of battling Satan on behalf of the Kingdom of God. Concerns have been raised about the Christology behind Wagner’s praxis. The role of the so-called territorial spirits have been so exaggerated that the biblical teaching on divine sovereignty is compromised.¹²² The issue of Wagner’s praxis will be taken up now.

c. Wagner and Praxis Resulting from His Reading of Daniel

The stated purpose of SLSW is to target world evangelisation, and Wagner’s demonology connects to this mission emphasis. It is the progression normally expected of theology leading to praxis. A case has already been made that it is the responsibility of the community of faith to ensure the maintenance of orthodoxy within their tradition, and the same may be said to apply to orthopraxy. That being said, this section is not a full critique of Wagner’s praxis, rather the discussion remains on the underlying

¹¹⁹ Canty, “Demons and Casting Out Demons,” 252.

¹²⁰ Canty, “Demons and Casting Out Demons,” 252.

¹²¹ Canty, “Demons and Casting Out Demons,” 255.

¹²² See Page, *Powers of Evil*, 65; also John MacArthur Jr., *Our Sufficiency in Christ* (Milton Keynes UK: Word Books, 1991). MacArthur devotes a whole chapter (10) to the topic “Spiritual Warfare: Who’s After Whom?”

hermeneutics which led to the spiritual warfare practice called spiritual mapping, described earlier.

Wagner's interest in warfare prayer is related directly to its effectiveness in world evangelisation. The added feature in his prayer methodology is the direct attack levelled at the spiritual dimension considered to be interfering with this.¹²³ It is in this context, as we have seen, that the term territorial spirits is applied to supernatural spirits deemed to have authority over or control of specific geographical regions. The passage in Daniel should be revisited now to see how Wagner incorporates its message into his methodology for evangelism, and the expanding theological conclusions which result.

The reason Daniel went before the Lord in prayer and fasting concerns the timeframe of the exile as relating to Jeremiah's prophecy (Dan 9:2-3; cf. Jer. 29:10), in realisation that the end was imminent. Wagner's conclusion is that Daniel was actively involved in the outcome, and that warfare prayer was his only weapon.¹²⁴ The consensus of commentators discussed in Chapter Two, is that Daniel's prayer and setting his face to understand the former vision precipitated the visionary encounter with the angel in Daniel 10; however the question of whether his prayer in any way influenced the battle is moot.

There is no suggestion in the text that Daniel is aware of any active involvement in the heavenly battle. The first battle takes place unbeknown to Daniel and a plain reading of the text shows he was not a combatant. Daniel does not know the name of the spiritual entities Wagner calls territorial spirits when he begins praying. In addition, on learning a further battle was looming, Daniel is not shown as continuing in prayer to facilitate a good result. If the author intended the reader to understand the historical Daniel's contribution to be critical to the outcome, particularly once he had supposedly been armed with vital information, such as the name(s) of territorial spirit(s), one would expect to read that Daniel continued vigorously in prayer. This is not the case. The context seems only superficially acknowledged by Wagner, and his conclusion that the only weapon Daniel had to combat these rulers of darkness was warfare prayer is drawn without following through on all the elements in the text.

¹²³ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 16, 20 etc.

¹²⁴ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 131.

Nevertheless, Wagner is able to draw a direct parallel between the spiritual battle in heavenly places on Peter's behalf in Acts 12 with the one he perceives as having occurred as a result of Daniel's prayers. Wagner sees this incident in Acts as an excellent example for understanding the enormous spiritual power released by prayer intercessors during a power encounter. Peter's life is saved, not so much by his own prayer as that offered constantly by the church on his behalf (Acts 12:5). Whenever a human political authority over a population is involved, then, Wagner writes,

we can suspect that the spiritual battle is on the strategic or cosmic level (see Isa 24:21 and Eph 2:2). This power encounter was more than casting out a demon on the ground level or dealing with sorcery on the occult level. It undoubtedly involved the principalities and powers that Paul writes about in Ephesians 6:12.¹²⁵

The narrative in Daniel wherein the unnamed angel meets resistance from the prince of Persia is interpreted by Wagner as the need for a stronger angel, namely Michael, to help the unnamed angel finally get through. (The text, in fact, does not explicitly say Michael is stronger, only that by Michael relieving the unnamed angel, the latter is free to complete his mission to Daniel.) The point of commonality Wagner believes exists between Daniel's situation and Peter's is that God answers human prayers by releasing powerful angels to implement His will.¹²⁶ He points out that neither the travail of intercessory prayer nor the invisible spiritual engagement is easy "because simultaneously the forces of darkness are using whatever means they have at their disposal to counteract the ministry of good angels."¹²⁷

These details are superimposed on the text, as no mention is made of additional forces in the Daniel text or of any spiritual battle at all in Acts 12, yet

This is what we call spiritual warfare," says Wagner, "and the intensity of the battle rises the higher we move through human structures that have authority over the well-being of entire human populations. When the spiritual warfare involved rulers such as King Cyrus of Persia or King Herod Agrippa I of Judea, we can be sure it was extremely intense."¹²⁸

In Daniel the demonic obstruction to the implementation of God's will that Wagner sees is only in the angel being stopped from delivering the message to Daniel. No connection

¹²⁵ Wagner, *Acts of the Holy Spirit*, 273.

¹²⁶ Wagner, *Acts of the Holy Spirit*, 274.

¹²⁷ Wagner, *Acts of the Holy Spirit*, 274.

¹²⁸ Wagner, *Acts of the Holy Spirit*, 274.

is mentioned by him that the obstruction could be a factor in inhibiting the release of the Jews from captivity (cf. Pearlman). Although he recognises Daniel's prayer was precipitated by the issue of the exiles' prospective release, it is offered only as background detail.

Wagner further identifies Daniel's situation with Peter's by discussing Daniel's confession of Israel's sin and identification of his own sin with that of his people (Dan.9:3, 11, 20). Wagner sees this dual confession/identification as the catalyst which precipitated the spiritual battle in heavenly places.¹²⁹ In point of fact Israel's sin which led to their exile was their rejection of covenant with Yahweh by persistent apostasy, idolatry and unbelief. Thus it was that they incurred the ultimate covenant curse of losing the land of promise. It is difficult to understand how this can be compared to Peter's situation and even more perplexing how either Daniel or Peter's situations can be used as a SLSW model in relation to heathen countries or cities. Daniel was praying for the exilic remnant of people in covenant relationship with Yahweh and Peter was a believer under the New Covenant.

To take this a step further, world evangelisation is the major focus of SLSW. The aim is to break down demonic spiritual strongholds hindering the Gospel. This is not synonymous with bringing covenant people to repentance to restore relationship with Yahweh, therefore as a prayer model Daniel is an unsound example. In fact, nor are there any similarities between Daniel's prayer of repentance on behalf of Israel and the prayer of the early church on Peter's behalf. Peter was not an apostate, nor a sinner needing a mediator. Even if he were, as Reid points out, "Our representation in heaven is not a nameless messenger, as in Daniel 10, but God's own Son who has taken on the forces of darkness and defeated them."¹³⁰

Pentecostals greatly regard the Book of Acts, both as an example for Christian living and as a doctrinal sourcebook for their denominational distinctives. But as Trask and Goodall point out, the names of Satan and the devil are used only four times in Acts. By this readers may understand that the early church was not unaware of the devil's devices, but neither were they "trying to figure out how to "map" cities (locating the different demonic strongholds in various communities) or to find out the names of the demons

¹²⁹ Wagner, *Acts of the Holy Spirit*, 274.

¹³⁰ Reid, *Kingdoms in Conflict*, 214.

involved in a particular place. Rather, they were concerned to bring an effective gospel witness to the lost.”¹³¹ As highly positioned Classical Pentecostal leaders, the opinion of Trask and Goodall cannot be discounted.

To sum up this discussion, one must conclude the text gives no clear understanding of how Daniel’s prayer influenced the battle, except that it precipitated the visionary encounter with the angel. Daniel was non-combatant, did not seek the names of the spiritual princes and is not shown as continuing to pray for the looming battle with Greece. Drawing a direct parallel between the spiritual battle in heavenly places on Peter’s behalf in Acts 12 with the one described in Daniel 10 is unsustainable. Neither situation is viable as a SLSW model in relation to heathen countries or cities. This section has endeavoured to show that Wagner’s demonology does not derive from Classical Pentecostalism and that Wagner’s hermeneutical methods result in inappropriate models.

Conclusions

Wagner’s interpretation of Dan 10:13 as he incorporates it into SLSW and the various assumptions made thus far concerning his hermeneutics must now be drawn together. The common misconception that Wagner’s interpretation is a Pentecostal teaching was posed as the reason for the discussion. Consequently it was proposed that Wagner’s method be assessed in the light of the three principles of Classical Pentecostal hermeneutics earlier established to determine the degree of accord.

Points of agreement between the Classical Pentecostal view and Wagner is that both see Scripture as divinely inspired and also believe that there are unseen spiritual powers to contend with, as taught by Paul (Eph.6:4-10). In addition, both hold the mandate of Jesus Christ as the head of the Church, that all believers are to “go into all the world and make disciples” to be the driving purpose of all preaching, teaching and mission. The wilderness temptation of Jesus is said by Wagner to be the biblical and theological heart on which other scriptures take on new meaning. This Christ-centred position is a positive aspect to Pentecostals.

¹³¹ Trask and Goodall, *The Battle*, 56.

By his own admission Wagner's hypothesis stands or falls on the issue of whether spirit beings can legitimately be perceived as occupying territories. In discussion of how Wagner understands the Assyrian engineered transmigrations (which followed the destruction of Samaria and captivity of the Northern Kingdom of Israel), it was concluded that Wagner views territoriality as transportable. This indicates a faulty hypothesis. Wagner and other leaders of this recently discovered prayer strategy have asserted that their new understanding of Scripture led to this method, and they have been recognised as innovators. The claim of divine revelation is also noteworthy, as is the fact that the method is to a large degree empirically verified.

The historical and theological context of the Daniel vision cannot be ignored in the bid to extend the application. It has been seen how the definition 'seeing the world as it really is' is extended by Wagner from Persia, to the world as a whole, then to every other modern country individually. In other words, what applies to one time and place in Scripture assumes universal application when current relevance is sought. Deut 32:8 is generally recognised as a key scripture to understanding ruling spirits. Wagner accepts a single Septuagint reading 'angels of God' in preference to the more common Hebrew 'children of Israel/Elohim'. He opts for this textual variant apparently because its use of the word 'angels' fits more closely with his interpretation. He does so by relying solely on F.F. Bruce's observations (made in the context of the angels in Hebrews) that debate had occurred regarding the nature of the Septuagint translation. Without further deliberation or analysis, Wagner co-opts Bruce's asides into his own case, giving the appearance of academic validation, a tactic which does not build confidence in his hermeneutical method. A consistent tendency is to substantiate SLSW belief and practice by proof-texting from Scripture.

Pentecostals do relate to a pneumatic approach to reading Scripture, but at the same time recognise that extreme caution should be exercised in claiming personal leading of the Holy Spirit to unfold the meaning of Scripture and overriding traditionally accepted methods. Logically, if the position is held that the interpretation of Scripture is quickened by the Spirit and subordinated to the Spirit, it should be impossible to ignore the Spirit's original intention when He inspired Scripture, in arriving at the meaning. This, of course, is the very point at issue.

Wagner's interpretation of Dan 10:13 may be construed as pneumatic but that does not automatically make it Pentecostal unless it can also be shown that it is consistent with that of the community of faith, which in this instance is Classical Pentecostalism. At times the scope was necessarily widened to include the Evangelical academic community and Reformed Protestantism in general, basically because Pentecostals defend their hermeneutics as being orthodox. They claim that any interpretation of Scripture by individuals cannot be contrary to the revealed and inspired Word of God, the only authoritative rule for belief and practice. Third Wave leaders make the same claim. C. Peter Wagner claims to be a biblical Christian and is thoroughly convinced that his teaching not only does not violate scripture, but actually proceeds from a biblical premise, and further, is the will of God. Yet the point on which SLSW and spiritual mapping is most questioned is whether it is biblical. The point has been made that to be biblicistic is not synonymous with being biblical. Barry Chant points out that it is impossible to identify even one New Testament example of Wagner's suggested method that before a city can be evangelised, the territorial spirits in that place must be identified.¹³²

The importance of the book of Acts to Pentecostals is well known. A Christocentric reading of Daniel allows for the apocalyptic viewpoint in that the God depicted as intervening warrior in chapters 7-12 also points strongly to a future decisive battle. This is not only how the Old Testament concludes, says Longman, but the note which reverberated through the intertestamental period, until the prophetic silence was broken by John the Baptist. The message of this Messianic forerunner is simply a continuation of the expressed hope for "the coming intervention of the divine warrior who would bring evil to a violent justice (Matt. 3:11-12)."¹³³

The military language employed in Paul's reflections on Christ's death shows he also understood the warlike character of the cross, in which Jesus "disarmed the powers and authorities" and "made a public spectacle of them, triumphing over them" (Col. 2:15). Longman elaborates that the great conflict begun in Genesis 3:15 (and, in his words, provocatively described in Daniel 10), has been completed and won by Jesus on the

¹³² Barry Chant, "Warfare Prayer: Theology or Mythology or Both?" *New Day Magazine* (February 1993), 19. cf. Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 143ff.

¹³³ Longman, *Daniel*, 257.

cross. Nevertheless, the victory still awaits its final denouement.¹³⁴ This accurately encapsulates Pentecostal Christology.¹³⁵

There is no argument that in the New Testament the way of relating to the outsider is not with real weapons, as in the Old Testament, but rather that, as defined by Jesus in the Great Commission (Matt. 28:19-20), evangelism replaces warfare. Hence our weapons now are spiritual, as fitted to that dimension, and set out by Longman as prayer, faith, and bold love.¹³⁶ Andrew Evans, at the time he was General Superintendent of the Assemblies of God in Australia, also wrote of spiritual warfare in terms of a military campaign, teaching similarly that Christians already have the right spiritual weapons for meaningful engagement, in particular, he considers these to be unity, prayer and fasting.¹³⁷ Canty writes of how, in once-Christian nations and non-Christian lands where demonic activity is encountered by missionaries, the response of the Church may be to cleanse people of foul spirits where necessary, “but the preaching of the gospel is the main means, and this should be the prior activity of all God’s servants.”¹³⁸ It is submitted that Pentecostal praxis which arises from their Christology is summed up by Longman, Evans and Canty in a way which detracts nothing from the finished work of Christ on the cross.

It is here that the problem exists with the SLSW prayer model. Wagner is convinced that the effectiveness of evangelistic efforts depends not on church growth strategies or the clever use of technology, not even when combined with Christians willing to share their faith, but that the outcome is directly related to spiritual battles in the heavenly places.¹³⁹ Wagner mitigates his position by stating that spiritual warfare is not an end in itself, but a continuation of the ministry of Jesus in destroying the works of the devil (1 Jn 3:8) which itself was only a means to the end of seeking and saving the lost (Lk 10:10). God’s highest priority is recognised as evangelism and Christ is central, but in addition to the work of Christ, implicit in Wagner’s teaching is the suggestion that there is something more to be done before preaching is effective. Territorial spirits first must be bound before the way is clear and the Gospel effective.

¹³⁴ Longman, *Daniel*, 258; the terminology used by Longman to describe the victory is as “an already/not yet event”, which he explains as living spiritually between D-Day and V-Day.

¹³⁵ The basis on which Pentecostals find Longman’s position acceptable was set out in Chapter Two.

¹³⁶ Longman, *Daniel*, 261.

¹³⁷ Andrew Evans, “Spiritual Warfare or Shadow Boxing?”, *Church Growth* (Autumn 1993); 11.

¹³⁸ Canty, “Demons and Casting Out Demons,” 256f.

¹³⁹ Wagner, *Warfare Prayer*, 35-48.

The sufficiency of Christ's work in having already taken captivity captive (Eph 4:8) triumphing openly over the rulers and authorities he disarmed (Col 2:15) is made questionable. Satan's power was effectively destroyed at the cross and the body of believers is to regard the devil as a defeated foe.¹⁴⁰ Eph 1:20-21 regards Christ as exalted over the powers. Eph 6:12 demonstrates that the powers continue to wage war against believers. It is acknowledged that subjection has not ended their opposition to God or his people. Page observes that "Paul does not specify how the powers attack believers, but there is good reason to think that he conceived of the attack as being primarily in the religio-ethical sphere."¹⁴¹ The point is that the manner in which Paul places moral issues in a cosmic perspective in Eph 6:10-18 shows "They are not minor matters of personal preference but vital components of a much larger struggle between the forces of good and evil."¹⁴² This is quite different to the geo-political emphasis of Wagner's SLSW model.

In common with all Pentecostal groups, Wagner is concertedly evangelistic in his outlook and adherents of SLSW have been commended for their sincere commitment to praying, but Page specifically notes that the practice of spiritual mapping lacks scriptural warrant and should not be embraced uncritically, notwithstanding various scriptures appearing to point to some degree of territorial authority of spiritual beings.¹⁴³ Longman is another who considers that promoters of spiritual mapping take the concept far beyond the limits of biblical revelation.¹⁴⁴

In conclusion, it has been shown that the method and results of Wagner's interpretation of Daniel 10:13 do not accord with all three principles of Classical Pentecostal rules of interpretation – the most important being *Sola Scriptura*. On his own admission, Wagner agrees Scripture does not provide one definite example of a strategic-level spirit.

¹⁴⁰ Page, *Powers of Evil*, 215.

¹⁴¹ Page, *Powers of Evil*, 247. Page suggests Eph. 4:26-27 as a specific example of how Satan attacks believers and is intended as an illustrative model of the spiritual warfare of Eph. 6:10-20. He considers it noteworthy that the struggle is primarily in the moral realm: "That is, the battlefield is within the hearts and lives of Christians. Spiritual victories and defeats are the results of the ways in which everyday temptations are handled." Page, *Powers of Evil*, 188f.

¹⁴² Page, *Powers of Evil*, 248.

¹⁴³ Page, *Powers of Evil*, 64f. He writes (p. 65) that this "does not constitute grounds for thinking that Christians can or should attempt to identify them and the areas they control. The presence and influence of the princes were disclosed to Daniel, but not because he sought to discover their identity or functions. Nor is there any evidence that Daniel prayed for their defeat."

¹⁴⁴ Longman, *Daniel*, 265. For alternative Pentecostal views on so-called "spiritual mapping" see Tai M. Yip, "Spiritual Mapping: Another Approach," *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* (April, 1995), 166-170; and Chant, "Warfare Prayer: Theology or Mythology or Both?," 19ff. Chant points out that "spiritual mapping" is what missiologists call "cultural anthropology."

Wagner's interpretation may be pneumatic, but in itself this is insufficient to make it Pentecostal unless it could be reconciled with a biblical reading within the community of faith. This was not the case, whether "community of faith" was regarded as Third Wave, Classical Pentecostal or the wider interpretive community. A case has been made that (a) Wagner's academic and theological location is not Pentecostal; (b) that Wagner does not claim to be a Pentecostal; (c) he does not formally speak for Pentecostals. Notwithstanding some points of agreement, the conclusion is that Wagner's interpretation of Daniel 10:13 is a non-Pentecostal reading, certainly standing outside Classical Pentecostalism.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes with reflections on issues raised in each chapter, on what Pentecostals have said in the past, what they are saying now and in what ways this study contributes to the Pentecostal position. Essentially, this has been a study in Pentecostal hermeneutics. The aim has been not solely to show in isolation that Wagner's interpretation of Daniel 10:13 is non-Pentecostal. This study has been motivated by concern that so many Pentecostals have uncritically embraced both the interpretation and methodology employed by Wagner. Those who choose to engage in SLSW should at least be made aware that the hermeneutics employed by Wagner (in respect of this SLSW prayer methodology) are inconsistent with those accepted historically as Pentecostal. Syncretic belief systems are increasingly evident in what is becoming known as post-denominationalism.¹ In the past, as a matter of convenience, Pentecostals have utilised resources antagonistic to their beliefs (e.g. Darby's eschatology and Scofield's Bible). Pentecostals should guard against continuing such practices, particularly now as they attempt to reclaim their distinctive heritage by strengthening ties with their historical roots. This active retrieval of Pentecostal theology is a positive move. A major purpose of studying historical theology is to recognise historical errors in belief and practice. This may then act as a guide into right paths, rather than allowing the continuation of dubious historical practice.

1. Reflections on: Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Principles and Methods

Robert P. Menzies confirms that early in the Pentecostal movement, when stability was a problem, the largest of the American Pentecostal bodies, the Assemblies of God, "established the principle that all theology, practice, and experience must be tested by the objective revelation of the Bible."² Today, the variety of interpretations or deficiencies in applying a consistent Pentecostal hermeneutic threatens the strength of the movement. Developing theologically informed practice is essential to any group committed to remaining faithful to its historic faith. This study began by seeking to clarify affirmations about revealed truth in Pentecostalism. Secondly, techniques meaningful to Pentecostals in seeking to accurately portray the message of the text were identified. The

¹ The merits or otherwise of post-denominationalism are not under discussion here and are not entered into as the topic falls outside the scope of this paper.

² Menzies, "The Movers and Shakers," in Harold B. Smith, (ed.) *Pentecostals From The Inside Out* (*Christianity Today Series*) (Wheaton IL: Victor Books, 1990), 34.

intention was to apply these principles specifically to Dan 10:13 because this text is used by C. Peter Wagner as the basis of his demonology. As this has been called a Pentecostal teaching, the purpose was to show the validity of this claim.

A Pentecostal hermeneutic can be viewed as basically traditional and conservative in its commitment to the truth and authority of the Bible, whilst admitting the role of the reader in the interpretation process. Pentecostals view historical narrative as didactic, not simply descriptive, and use it in constructing doctrine. In addition Pentecostals bring to the process of interpreting the Bible the theological assumption, which Anderson describes as a nondispensational ecclesiology, one that sees “a uniform continuity of God’s relation to the church along with a strong sense of identity with the experiences and practices of the first century.”³ Personal experience, worldview and culture are inevitably incorporated into the process of hermeneutics, but Anderson declares that Pentecostals do so not only consciously, but intentionally and critically, with both personal and historical experience receiving prominence.

The emphasis on personal experience implies a certain existential subjectivism. At the same time, any claim made for special insight unavailable to non-Pentecostals is at best elitism and at worst, a form of gnosticism not representing a genuine Pentecostal hermeneutic.⁴ Dependence upon God and diligent exegesis should be bound together in harmonious relationship, Anderson continues, because dependence on one does not negate the other. Furthermore, God’s ‘anointing’⁵ should not be viewed as replacing time spent in preparation, but rather as empowerment for specific ministry, bringing people face to face with God. Pentecostal theology depended on the same exegetical methods as other evangelicals.

Interpretation of the writings of Luke, particularly the Book of Acts, forms the primary basis for distinctively Pentecostal theology and hermeneutics. Luke’s writings have a different emphasis from those of Paul and should be seen as complementary to, not identical with, the Pauline view. Roger Stronstad asserts that a Lukan theology is found to have a charismatic (grace giftings for service) rather than simply a soteriological (concerned with salvation,

³ Gordon Anderson, “Pentecostal Hermeneutics,” 2.

⁴ Gordon Anderson, “Pentecostal Hermeneutics Part 1,” 8.

⁵ The term utilised commonly by Pentecostals to indicate a special endowment of enabling grace to individuals and which exceeds natural gifting.

especially at the initiation of Christian life) theology of the Holy Spirit.⁶ Stronstad sees Luke as using historical narrative but having didactic intention, making these descriptive passages important to revelation of the purpose of God. Luke's teaching is then seen as a solid foundation for a doctrine of the Spirit, with implications for the church's ongoing mission and religious experience.

Scripture should shape the Christian's life and ministry, rather than the individual's experience being allowed to shape their understanding of Scripture. Testimony is an essential part of Pentecostalism, but the danger inherent in incorporating historical accounts and anecdotal experiences into the process of hermeneutics is in discerning the difference between actual events and exaggerations (or fabrications), however sincere. Indiscriminate use of unsubstantiated testimony and unverifiable fact is not acceptable in good hermeneutics, Pentecostal or otherwise. Such indiscriminate use causes much criticism of Pentecostalism at the popular level. The problem is not reflected in doctrinal statements of conservative Pentecostal denominations, which have remained consistent.

Classical Pentecostals perceive their theology in terms synonymous with biblical theology. In recent trends more rigorous academic standards are being applied to developing Pentecostal theology, and objective exegesis is not avoided. While it is important that data are not ignored that could modify the interpretation of a given text, the aim must be to maintain biblical authority in a relational and experiential setting within the community of faith. To maintain a Pentecostal ethos, in the interpreting community place must be given not only to the biblical text, but to God as the final authority in and through the process and, finally, to what is normative for the community's tradition and context.

This means Pentecostals should continue to delve not only into their own theological heritage, but in what Arand terms 'theologies of retrieval', to utilise all aspects of historical theology. More work needs to be done in linking and comparing doctrinal distinctives to Reformation and to Early Church dogma. Such back-tracking and correlation is necessary for any group claiming to stand within the tradition of historic Christianity, or what in an oral tradition would be called the community's story. This bridging between biblical theology and dogmatics may be accomplished by bringing into

⁶ Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*, 5-9. Stronstad's assertion is that as a theologian, Luke modelled his writings on Old Testament methods which were extensively used in the first-century Church.

play McKnight's 'metacritical' level of thinking. Sufficient at this point is the knowledge that the task has begun, and the contributions of competent Pentecostal scholars are receiving academic acknowledgement.

James H. Railey, Jr. and Benny C. Aker confirm Pentecostalism's commitment to the *Sola Scriptura* principle, that Scripture is the sufficient rule for faith and practice, but say that "theology is done best when the Bible is acknowledged as the authority and the Holy Spirit is allowed to mediate the revealed Word of God to us."⁷ They agree that Creeds and statements of faith from Church history are valuable to biblical interpretation and application, but add that the human experience, the prompting and direction of the Holy Spirit, and human reason, also assist the believer in understanding the revelation.

From at least the middle of the twentieth century Pentecostal academics utilised historical-grammatical methodology and increasingly made judicious use of certain historical-critical conventions in their research, consciously bridging the hermeneutical gap.⁸ Railey and Aker confirm that Old Testament theology should be the starting place for building a systematic theology from a Pentecostal perspective. Understanding of texts must be established on exegetical grounds, allowing the Old Testament to speak "its own message for its own time to its own people."⁹ Using W.C. Kaiser as support, they point out that only then should New Testament revelation be brought into conclusions or summaries,¹⁰ since the plan of God is progressively unfolding and points to the future. New Testament theology may then be studied in its own right.

Notwithstanding the diversity of historical and cultural contexts, the importance of the unity of both testaments in God's plan of salvation must be recognised. It is this factor which "makes possible the application of biblical theology for different situations and in different cultures, as systematic theology attempts to do (*taking biblical theology as its source*)."¹¹ The reading of Daniel 10:13 offered in Chapter Two followed this line of thinking. The method was both exegetical and theological, the passage interpreted against its historical and literary background, rather than in the first instance against a

⁷ James H. Railey, Jr. and Benny C. Aker, "Theological Foundations," in Stanley M. Horton, *Systematic Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective* (Springfield MO: Logion Press, 1994), 45f.

⁸ For example, see remarks by Scott T. Stephens, "Postmodernism, Poetry and a (Pentecostal) Text: An Approach to the Book of Joel", *Australian Pentecostal Studies* 1 (1998), 85, n. 13 and 14.

⁹ Railey and Aker, "Theological Foundations," in Horton, *Systematic Theology*, 48.

¹⁰ Cf. W.C. Kaiser, *Toward an Exegetical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981), 140.

¹¹ Railey and Aker, "Theological Foundations," in Horton, *Systematic Theology*, 48. Emphasis added.

theological horizon. It is only then, as Huibert Zegwaart affirms in an article on Apocalyptic Eschatology and Pentecostalism, that the text should be used for theological reflection.¹² The final step is to then put “the truths of theological investigation into practice in the life of the community”¹³ and through preaching, evangelism and missions.

2. Reflections on: Reading Daniel 10:13 with a Pentecostal Approach

Claims to orthodoxy for any position require it be tested by adherence to interpretive principles. A reading of Dan 10:13 respecting the historical and literary context of the passages was proposed.¹⁴ The eschatological focus of early Pentecostalism has long been the driving force of their mission, and academic studies in Daniel have remained the province of scholars from other traditions. Writings which have been distinctively Pentecostal have been published as popular eschatology or aids to interpreting prophecy. Monographs on Daniel from the Pentecostal perspective are rare,¹⁵ but fortunately academic articles in journals are becoming increasingly available. The test applied in interpreting Dan 10:13 from a Pentecostal perspective was based on the criteria proposed in Chapter One.

This study adheres to the Pentecostal position of an exilic date of writing by the historical Daniel, not only the early court stories but also the visions. These were sealed for future time and as the Old Testament era ended, the revelations contained in the book made

¹² Huibert Zegwaart, “Apocalyptic Eschatology and Pentecostalism: The Relevance of John’s Millennium for Today,” *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 10:1 (Spring 1988), 6 3-25.

¹³ Railey and Aker, “Theological Foundations,” in Horton, *Systematic Theology*, 48.

¹⁴ Cf Zegwaart, “Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 6.

¹⁵ Weiler has written a study on Pentecostal eschatology (specifically relating to Daniel 7-12) as understood in a community of Pentecostal/charismatic readers. It is based on the presupposition that the movement’s theology is at its most genuine and clearly defined level within its popular literature; see “Readings in hyperspirituality”, 3. He contends that despite being regarded in a disparaging light by the non-Pentecostal academic community, this level of resource, particularly where it arguably functions as a primary source, must be researched in pursuit of the Pentecostal position. (This is acknowledged, however only limited reference is made to such books in this thesis due to the wide variety of viewpoints from authors of differing placement within Pentecostalism. As pointed out previously, stances vary even within avowedly SLSW circles. The focus has been maintained on Wagner, whose writings are foundational to SLSW, however, two authors are given here as examples of how the Daniel text is utilised in popular Pentecostal writings: Anne Gimenez spends several pages discussing the vivid portrayal in Daniel 10 of “how this heavenly battle works.” (“Battle in the Heavens,” in C.P. Wagner and F.D. Pennoyer (eds.) *Wrestling with Dark Angels* (Ventura CA: Regal, 1990), 78-80). Similarly, see how Richmond Chiundiza understands the same passage regarding the existence of territorial spirits in his own African nation in “High Level Powers in Zimbabwe,” originally published in *Dawn Report*, April 1990 by Dawn Ministries/reprinted in Wagner and Pennoyer, *Wrestling with Dark Angels*, 122-123.) Jon Newton notes that the non-academic but distinctive contribution made by Pentecostals has been to emphasise the link between world evangelism and the timing of the second coming, and the expectation of an imminent worldwide end-time revival in fulfilment of prophecy; see *Teaching the Book of Revelation* (Gold Coast QLD: Pentecostal and Charismatic Bible Colleges Conference Paper, 2006), 1.

sense to the Jews persecuted by the Seleucids and were valid sources of comfort and hope. The prophets “yet spoke” in an era when there were no longer prophets and the Old Testament canon was essentially complete, (accepting that the guardians of the sacred writings in the Maccabean era were probably not aware of this, or even accepting of such terminology).¹⁶ As inaugurated eschatology, the content of Daniel remains relevant regarding end-times. As the archetype of apocalyptic literature (though not the only biblical example), the contents of the book were accessible to the apocalyptic expectation notable in the second-century BC. The desire inherent in apocalypticism is to escape current circumstances. In apocalyptic terms the promised reign of God broke into history at the incarnation. God chose Jesus Christ to inaugurate it, an act to be consummated at His Parousia or Second Coming.¹⁷

The major divisions of Daniel, the stories of 1-6 and the visions of chapters 7-11 plus the finale of chapter 12, all maintain the theme that the God of heaven rules (4:26). The historical stories teach that God does and will intervene to keep his elect alive (e.g. 2:18; 30) and the final outcome of all the fearful visions may be summed up by 7:18 – “But the saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever” (NKJV). The message of the Book of Daniel is that God is supreme in the present and the future. He had not then, nor has He yet, put an end to suffering, but such an end has been appointed by God and His faithfulness and integrity are unimpeachable. In a Pentecostal reading this book can offer no future hope, no present consolation, and no reason to endure affliction if it is not Scripture (Rom. 15:4). Daniel asserts a confident certainty in the victory of the Most High (4:17).

Dan 11:31-33 envisions Yahwists having no access to the Temple or daily sacrifices, with many forsaking their religion, but a faithful remnant, namely ‘the wise’, are willing to face martyrdom rather than deny their God and their traditions. Daniel and his godly compatriots are portrayed heroically as willing to lay down their lives for their faith, even while recognising the situation was in God’s hands and the outcome sure. Earthly persecutors will be defeated ultimately, God’s heavenly army will be victorious, the dead will be resurrected. Their faith and prayers, strengthened by their persecution, rested on the sure hope that the appointed time of judgement and vindication would come. Also, Daniel was brave when he advised Nebuchadnezzar, saying “break off your sins by

¹⁶ Cf. Luke 24:27 – Jesus’ references to the Old Testament seem to indicate that the canon of Hebrew Scriptures was complete by his day.

¹⁷ Page, *Powers of Evil*, 109.

practising righteousness and your iniquities by showing mercy to the oppressed, that there may perhaps be a lengthening of your tranquillity” (4.27). Schofield sees offering such counsel as the behaviour of a true wise man (and in keeping with the early prophetic teaching; cf. Amos 5.15).¹⁸ All these factors should feature in any prayer model derived from Daniel.

Pentecostals read Scripture expecting to encounter teaching, and this applies equally to Daniel.¹⁹ This occurs in at least three dimensions: as an example of godly behaviour, as prophetic testimony to the faithfulness of God to his covenant people, and as eschatology in both its human and supernatural dimensions. The behaviour exemplified by Daniel, his exilic companions, and the wise ones, are also considered valid models of the triumph of godliness in hostile circumstances. They are a model of faithfulness and piety for their times, triumphing by the grace of God while in exile and keeping alive the Mosaic traditions. The series of prophetic visions chart the testing course of world history and times of severe persecution to occur later under foreign domination. Hope in the future is stimulated by describing the triumphs in which God’s people would share in the last days with the coming of the Messiah.

The apocalyptic chapters of Daniel are confrontational with regards to ungodly heathen nations, but it is worth mentioning that there was no suggestion of their conciliation with the kingdom of God, as seems to be the point of SLSW. Daniel, his exilic companions and the wise ones mentioned later in the book, are not portrayed as militants, nor was Daniel’s prayer aggressive towards his persecutors. The cause of the calamity of exile was attributed to God as punishment for covenant disobedience (9:4-19).

In the chain of events between Jeremiah’s prophecy of the seventy years and the subsequent return of the exiles, Daniel’s contribution (as he prays and communicates the subsequent revelation) stands as one link in the chain. The SLSW idea that Daniel is the initiator is a concept which detracts from the strong theme in Daniel of the sovereignty of God which is so strikingly portrayed in the genre as apocalyptic determinism. While it is accepted that Daniel portrays spiritual factors as all-important in human history, this is framed in relation to God’s plan and purpose for His people. There is no context here of

¹⁸ Schofield, *Law, Prophets and Writings*, 341.

¹⁹ Newton, *Teaching the Book of Revelation*, 10. John, for one, believed that revelation is a significant source of knowledge, Newton notes, adding: “God who knows everything communicates some of that knowledge to us through angels and prophets like him.”

any proselytising of the other nations (Persia and Greece) as a result of the spiritual conflict. SLSW hermeneutics do not do not go far enough in establishing Daniel 10:13 as the context for their praxis. The revelation to Daniel of the presence and influence of the supernatural princes was not given because he sought this information in his prayer (recorded in Dan.9:4-19).²⁰ Daniel in 10:13 was not praying for the overthrow of Persia or Greece. In terms of the providence of God, he was incidental.

Scripture articulates religious experience being faced or felt at the time of writing, broadening insights into the worldview and beliefs of a different period. Undoubtedly Daniel communicates God's greatness and control through everyday stories, but the particulars of the apocalyptic visions can only be understood up to a point, because they are specifically designed to communicate mystery. Descriptions of visions are not intended as expositions of biblical truth, therefore caution should be exercised when speculating on their meanings. "Without the stories, the visions could lead us to an impractical, disembodied mysticism," but viewed together they offer the hope and confidence that God is indeed in control.²¹

In this thesis the text of Dan 10:13 has been studied in its historical setting. Exegesis is not held to diminish the role of the Spirit in interpreting the text, nor to detract from the doctrine of plenary inspiration. Scholars agree that interpretation of a genre requires recognition of the integrity of writings within its religious, historical, political and cultural setting. This applies equally to apocalyptic literature, as Russell assures us: "God speaks and acts in history and through history to specific situations, and it is within that context and not isolated from it that we are to interpret the message."²² Daniel, in common with the book of Revelation, reveals a universe which includes good and evil supernatural beings. Though invisible, they sometimes interact with humans and at times God has allowed the spiritual world to be seen "in the Spirit" (Rev 1:10). Pentecostals take the biblical worldview seriously, but ought not to uncritically interpret what are

²⁰ Nevertheless, Wagner writes approvingly of the practice of discovering the names of territorial spirits and dealing with them individually. See C. Peter Wagner, "Territorial Spirits," in *Wrestling with Dark Angels*, 83-84.

²¹ Terry C. Muck, "General Editor's Preface," in Tremper Longman III, *Daniel: The NIV Application Commentary* (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1999), 14.

²² D.S. Russell, *Divine Disclosure: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 132f. He points out that Daniel as a particular example where scriptural passages have frequently and gratuitously been severed from their historical setting, leading to interpretations of the message which seem to have little connection with the original meaning. Russell, a Baptist, points by way of example, to the writings of Hal Lindsey, which were hugely popular in the mid-80s, e.g.: *The Late Great Planet Earth* (1983), *There's a New World Coming* (1984), and *Satan is Alive and Well on Planet Earth* (1989).

essentially ancient Near-Eastern texts when attempting to apply them in modern situations.

3. Reflections on: Is C. Peter Wagner's Reading of Daniel 10:13 Pentecostal?

This study does not address the origin or the nature of evil, but only some of the forms it takes in this world and the ways exponents of SLSW believe the effect (or influence) of evil may be controlled. It has only been possible to examine briefly Pentecostalism's understanding of Scriptures as relates to demonic activity. The developmental trail leading to SLSW demonology and practices was considered. The point was to compare the underlying assumptions of Wagner's interpretation of Dan 10:13 with those held by Classical Pentecostals.

G. Canty, in a book on Pentecostal doctrines, writes that the purpose of preaching the gospel is to turn people "from the power of Satan to God" (Acts 26:18). Those obedient to the claims of Christ are effectively delivered (or saved) from the control of "the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now works in the children of disobedience" (Eph 2:2). The world is regarded as being in the grasp of the devil, and salvation means being delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of God's Son (Col 1:13). "If this effect is not achieved, the purpose of the gospel is not realised," says Canty.²³ He points to Paul's writings to affirm that repentance is the means by which captive people are set free from the snare of the devil (2 Tim 2:25, 26). Allowing that Canty speaks for Classical Pentecostalism, he makes the order clear: first and foremost, the gospel must be preached to unbelievers. They may choose to respond with repentance and obedience to the teachings of Jesus.

SLSW is pre-emptive, arguing that if preaching is to be effective, the demonic principalities and rulers over various territories, whether countries, cities or lesser locations must first be bound by spiritual warfare to clear the way for the gospel to be preached. The theology inherent in this position tends to weaken the comprehensive work of Christ on the Cross, that he has already "bound the strongman" (to use SLSW terminology). Christ has finished the work and led captivity captive (Eph 4:8) triumphing openly over the rulers and authorities he disarmed (Col 2:15). The Great Commission of Jesus was to preach the gospel and make disciples based on the authority

²³ Canty, "Demons and Casting Out Demons," 245.

of his name and over the evil one (Matt 28:18-20). The good news Christians are to proclaim is that Jesus Christ himself bound the strongman already – arguably a description of his work. (cf. Matt 12:29).

There is no doubt that Wagner has a high view of Scripture as authoritative, that he believes in the efficacy of work of Christ on Calvary and in preaching the gospel as the mission of the church. However, in his teaching on the territoriality of demonic beings, he uses quasi-biblical explanations to legitimise the practice of SLSW and makes necessary an additional work to achieving the salvation of individuals – that territorial spirits must be bound before preaching the gospel will be effective. More subtly, the fundamental theology of freedom of choice is jeopardised. Human responsibility is negated if hostile spiritual powers control human decision-making.

Pentecostals have recognised the need to develop a biblical model of spiritual warfare.²⁴ D. Neil Hudson notes that there has been little critical engagement from within Pentecostal and charismatic contexts regarding spiritual warfare. This is despite the recent heavy emphasis on verbal declarations under such names as “positive confession” and “claiming the land for Jesus” which are intended to stimulate a general turning to God by nations. He raises issue with such beliefs, saying they may have led to a triumphalism “not matched by realities around us.”²⁵

Final Comments

The Reformation theologians engaged in rigorous exegesis both in doctrinal and theological formulation. Their theological discipline resulted in sermons and commentaries intended to lead the church in practice. It was a direct relationship. In that sense, both then and now practice acts as “an index to the success or failure of the work of the theologian.”²⁶ The proposal that doctrine forms the connection between belief and practice is particularly relevant for groups who perceive their role in terms of primitive and eschatological community (cf. McKnight in Chapter One). Pentecostals view themselves in this light. Third Wave groups agree with Pentecostals that the *charismata* have not ceased and read Scripture pneumatically, but this does not equate to full

²⁴ D. Neil Hudson, “Worship: Singing a New Song in a Strange Land,” Keith Warrington (ed.), *Pentecostal Perspectives* (Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1998), 197.

²⁵ Hudson, “Worship: Singing a New Song in a Strange Land,” 1999.

²⁶ Muller, “Sources of Reformed Orthodoxy,” 56.

doctrinal accord. A distinction should be made between Pentecostal and Third Wave teachings to prevent further confusion amongst adherents.

As Preus pointed out, Christians are becoming confused as to what their tradition actually teaches. It has long been recognised “that it is neither prudent nor appropriate to engage in theological discourse without taking into account what the church has always, everywhere confessed.”²⁷ This is particularly true of Wagner as a teacher to whom many are listening. The ready absorption of neo-charismatic demonology by Christians of other faith communities owes much to the copious networking. The affinities of groups identified loosely as fundamentalists, Evangelicals and Pentecostals are based on certain tenets held in common, in particular their common goal has been Christian mission. Wagner’s interpretation of Dan 10:13, the basis of the prayer methodology devised by him known as Strategic Level Spiritual Warfare, is widely assumed to be a Pentecostal teaching. Wagner’s strategies for dissemination of his teachings have been nothing short of remarkable, yet he has no official affiliation to many of the groups he has influenced.

The nature and function of Scripture as read by Pentecostals, specifically in relation to the Prince of Persia spoken of in Dan 10:13 was the basis of this study. It was contended that certain major principles are fundamental to a Classical Pentecostal hermeneutic and must be adhered to in any interpretation of Scripture for it to be construed or classed as a Pentecostal interpretation, despite what might be perceived as certain interpretive or systemic connections. The task of this study was to develop a methodological framework for theological discussion of Dan 10:13 from a Pentecostal perspective. Three main hermeneutical principles were rationalised as Pentecostal by their common usage within this tradition. Three main principles were proposed as conventional to a Pentecostal interpretation of a Scriptural text, namely, (1) the Protestant Reformation principle of *Sola Scriptura*, (2) a pneumatic approach to interpreting Scripture and (3) biblical revelation, not self-revelation, in the community of faith.

A considered reading of Dan 10:13 was arrived at using a conventional exegetical model, with leeway made for a more contemporary literary approach. There is no one uniquely Pentecostal position on interpreting Dan 10:13. The reading offered here is a contribution to studies in the book of Daniel which take the Pentecostal position into consideration. The form in which the book of Daniel comes to us requires an

²⁷ Preus III, “Sources of Lutheran Dogmatics,” 34.

understanding of the apocalyptic nature of the text, not only as an interpretation of biblical prophecy. Throughout the history of the Christian Church doctrinal interpretations have been tested and the results made available to the wider body of Christ. Accountability must be open, not closed, biblical validity established, not simply claimed. The testing of innovative theology or Christian practices is an essential part of authentic pastoral responsibility.

Classical Pentecostal hermeneutics was differentiated from that of neo-charismatics with particular reference to the method of C. Peter Wagner. The three principles above were applied to Wagner's interpretation of Dan 10:13. Pentecostalism's most important hermeneutical principle is that of *Sola Scriptura*. Wagner himself says Scripture does not provide one definite example of a strategic-level spirit. His reading was agreed to be pneumatic, but it is insufficient in itself to make it Pentecostal as it could not be reconciled fully with a biblical reading within the community of faith, whether this was regarded as the wider interpretive community or more narrowly defined. Wagner has made the onus on Christians first to bind spirits then preach the gospel. There is no exegetical support for this sequencing and in addition, this position pre-empts the work of Christ in the lives of prospective converts. As a first option the praxis of the church should have Scriptural mandate and Scriptural precedent. Despite Wagner's high view of Scripture and enthusiasm for evangelism, this study shows that his interpretation based on Daniel 10:13 should not be considered Pentecostal.

In closing, the words of James Glass ring out a continuing challenge to the Pentecostal Movement - that eschatology for Pentecostals ought not to become alienated from the formative context of the movement, that is, the local church and evangelism. There is great need for eschatology to regain a positive place in preaching, particularly in a world which often appears to have lost hope not only in political and economic visions, but in man as the measure of all things.

The task of the Pentecostal preacher and theologian is to articulate Pentecostal eschatology in such a way that it addresses both the great issues that concern the people of our time and the great purposes of the God of eternity. In so doing, our world will hear a message of clear and present danger, but also one of sure and certain hope. And that hope is bound up in the true centre of all eschatology, Jesus Christ.²⁸

²⁸ Glass, "Eschatology: A Clear and Present Danger – A Sure and Certain Hope," 146.

GLOSSARY

Charismata	Gifts of the spirit as recorded in 1 Cor 12: 8-10.
Charismatic	Groups historically identified with the renewal movement of the late 1960s to late 1970s. A term synonymous with Neo-Pentecostal.
Classical Pentecostal(s)/ism	Groups with traditional Pentecostal beliefs and worship forms, whose roots lie in the 1901-06 historical revivals.
Dispensational ecclesiology	Understanding whereby early church history is divided into “apostolic” and “post apostolic” eras. The writings of the apostolic era are then interpreted according to whether the authorial intent is considered descriptive or didactic.
Dispensationalism	Dispensationalism is a branch of Christian theology that (1) teaches Biblical history as best understood in light of a number of successive economies or administrations under God, called "dispensations," and (2) emphasises end-times prophecy and the pre-tribulation rapture view of Christ's second coming. All dispensationalists are premillennialists, but not all premillennialists are dispensationalists.
Neo-Pentecostal	Groups identified with the Charismatic Renewal Movement of the 1960s -1980s.
Non-cessationist (<i>vis-à-vis</i> cessationist)	Belief that the <i>charismata</i> did not cease at the end of the Apostolic era.
Princeton theology (old, late 19th – early 20th century)	Scholarly defence of inspiration, authority and inerrancy of the original autographs of canonical Scriptures at Princeton Seminary, e.g. Charles Hodge, Benjamin B. Warfield and J. Gresham Machen. Also known as textualist theology.
Third Wave	Non-Pentecostal evangelicals with a non-cessationist view of the <i>charismata</i> . Synonymous with Neo-Charismatic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aker, B.C. "Initial Evidence, a Biblical Perspective," in Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids MI: Regency Reference Library, 1988.
- Anderson, Allan. *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Anderson, Gordon L. "Pentecostal Hermeneutics Part 1," *Paraclete* 28/1 (Winter 1994), 1-11.
- Anderson, Gordon L. "Pentecostals Believe in More Than Tongues," in Harold B. Smith, (ed.) *Pentecostals From The Inside Out (Christianity Today Series)*. Wheaton IL: Victor Books, 1990.
- Arand, Charles P. "The Church's Dogma and Biblical Theology," in *A Confessing Theology for Postmodern Times*, Michael S. Horton (ed.). Wheaton IL: Crossway Books, 2000.
- Archer, Gleason L. "Daniel," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Daniel and the Minor Prophets* (Vol. 7), Frank E. Gæbelein (ed.) Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1985.
- Archer, Gleason L. *A Survey of the Old Testament Introduction. Revised Edition*. Chicago IL: Moody Press, 1974.
- Archer, Kenneth J. "Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Retrospect and Prospect," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 8 (1996), 63-81.
- Arnold, Clinton. *Spiritual Warfare: What Does the Bible Really Teach?* London: Marshall Pickering, 1999.
- Arrington, F.L. "Dispensationalism," in Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movement*. Grand Rapids MI: Regency/Zondervan, 1988.
- Assemblies of God in Australia, "What we Believe" accessed 22 December 2006, available from <http://www.aog.org.au/AboutUs/WhatWeBelieve/tabid/109/Default.aspx>, Internet.
- Averill, Lloyd. *Go North Young Man*. (Springwood QLD: Lloyd Averill, 1992.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. *Daniel (TOTC)*. Downers Grove IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1978.
- Baker, Carolyn Denise and Frank D. Macchia, "Created Spirit Beings," in Horton, Stanley M. (ed.) *Systematic Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective*. Springfield MO: Logion Press, 1994.
- Baker, David W. and Arnold, Bill T. (eds.) *The Face of Old Testament Studies: A Survey of Contemporary Approaches*. Grand Rapids, MI: Apollos/Baker Books, 1999.
- Barker, Paul. "Correctly Handling the Word of Truth – Teaching the Old Testament as a Christian Book," in Richard S. Hess and Gordon J. Wenham (eds.), *Make the Old Testament Live*. Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Boccaccini, G. *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.*. Minneapolis : Fortress, 1991.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. "Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Contribution of Italian Scholarship" in *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 9*. John J. Collins, and James H. Charlesworth, (eds.). Sheffield UK: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Boyd, Gregory A. *Oneness Pentecostals and the Trinity* (A worldwide movement assessed by a former Oneness Pentecostal). Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1992.
- Brewster, P.S. (ed.), *Pentecostal Doctrine*. Cheltenham UK: P.S. Brewster/Elim Pentecostal Church HQ, 1976.

- Bruce, F.F. *Israel and the Nations*. Exeter UK: Paternoster Press, 1963.
- Bruce, F.F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Bryant, David J. "Christian Identity and Historical Change: Postliberals and Historicity," *The Journal of Religion* 73 (January, 1993), 31-41.
- Bundy, D.D. "Irving, Edward (1792-1834) in Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids MI: Regency Reference Library, 1988.
- Burgess, Stanley M. and Gary B. McGee (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids MI: Regency/Zondervan, 1988.
- Burton, W.F.P. *God Working with Them*. London: Victory Press, 1933.
- Byrd, J. "Paul Ricoeur's Hermeneutical Theory and Pentecostal Proclamation," *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 15:2 (Fall 1993), 203-214.
- Callahan, James. "The Bible Says: Evangelical and Postliberal Biblicism," *Theology Today* Vol.53, No. 4 (January, 1997), 449-463.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. London: Clarke, 1957.
- Canty, G. "Demons and Casting Out Demons," in P.S. Brewster (ed.), *Pentecostal Doctrine*. Cheltenham UK: P.S. Brewster/Elim Pentecostal Church HQ, 1976.
- Cargal, T.B. "Beyond the Fundamentalist-Modernist Controversy: Pentecostals and Hermeneutics in a Postmodern Age," *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 15:2 (Fall 1993), 163-187.
- Cartledge, David. *The Apostolic Revolution: The Restoration of Apostles and Prophets in the Assemblies of God in Australia*. Chester Hill NSW: Paraclete Institute, 2000.
- Chafer, Lewis Sperry. *The Kingdom in History and Prophecy*. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1915.
- Chan, Simon. *Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Tradition: Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplementary Series 21*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Chant, Barry. *Heart of Fire*. Unley Park, Australia: House of Tabor, 1984.
- Chant, Barry "Warfare Prayer: Theology or Mythology or Both?" *New Day Magazine* (February 1993), 18-21.
- "Cheryl Bridges Johns," *Directory for Church of God Theological Seminary*, accessed 19 December 2006, available from http://www.cogts.edu/directory/cb_johns.html , Internet.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*. London: SCM Press, 1992.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Chiundiza, Richmond. "High Level Powers in Zimbabwe," originally published in *Dawn Report*, April 1990 by Dawn Ministries; reprinted in C.P. Wagner and F.D. Pennoyer (eds.) *Wrestling with Dark Angels* (Ventura CA: Regal, 1990).
- Christensen, Duane L. *Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12 (Word Biblical Commentary)*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2002.
- Collins, W. Duane. "An Assemblies of God Perspective on Demonology Part I," *Paraclete* (Fall 1993), 23-30.
- Collins, J.J. *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel, Harvard Semitic Monographs*, no. 16 (Missoula, Mont: Scholars, 1977).
- Collins, John J. "Genre, Ideology and Social Movements," in *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 9*. John J. Collins, and James H. Charlesworth, (eds.). Sheffield UK: JSOT Press, 1991.

- Collins, John J. *Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature: The Forms of the Old Testament Literature*, Volume XX. Grand Rapids MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1984.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, Second Edition. Grand Rapids MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1998.
- Conner, Kevin J. *The Book of Daniel: An Exposition*. Vermont VIC: KJC Ministries Inc., 2004.
- Conner, Kevin J. *Interpreting the Book of Revelation*. Vermont: Vic: KJC Publications, 1995.
- Cox, Harvey. *Fire from Heaven: The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-first Century*. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1995.
- Craigie, P.C. *The Book of Deuteronomy (NICOT)*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Cross, Terry L. "A Critical Review of Clark Pinnock's *Flame of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit*," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 13 (1989) 3-29.
- Cross, Terry L. "A Proposal to Break the Ice: What Can Pentecostal Theology Offer Evangelical Theology?," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 10:2 (2002), 44-73.
- Cross, Terry L. "Toward a Theology of the Word and the Spirit: A Review of J. Rodman Williams's *Renewal Theology*," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 3 (1993) 113-135.
- Dawson, John. *Taking Our Cities for God: How to Break Spiritual Strongholds*. Lake Mary FA: Creation House, 1989.
- Dayton, Donald W. *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*. Metuchen NJ: Hendrickson Publishers/Scarecrow Press, 1987.
- Delitzsch, F. "Daniel," in J.J. Herzog (ed.) *Realenzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* 3. Hamburg: 1855.
- Dempster, Murray W., Byron D. Klaus and Douglas Peterson (eds.) *The Globalization of Pentecostalism: A Religion Made To Travel*. Oxford: Regnum Books International, 1999.
- Dillard, Raymond B. and Longman, Tremper III. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994.
- Dowley, Tim (ed.) *The History of Christianity*. Oxford UK: Lion Publishing, 1990.
- Duffield, Guy P. and Nathaniel M. Van Cleave. *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology*. Los Angeles CA: L.I.F.E. Bible College, 1987.
- Duncan, Julie A. "Deuteronomy, Book of," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Volume 1)*, Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (eds.) Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Dunn, James D.G. "Baptism in the Spirit: A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 3 (1993) 3-27.
- Ellington, Scott A. "Pentecostalism and the Authority of Scripture," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 9 (1996) 16-38.
- Elwell, Walter A. (ed.) *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Evans, Andrew. "Spiritual Warfare or Shadow Boxing?" *Church Growth*, (Autumn 1993); 10-11.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1987.
- Fee, Gordon. *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutic*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Fohrer, G. *Introduction to the Old Testament*, trans. D. Green. Nashville: Abingdon, 1968/London: SPCK, 1970.

- Fraenkel, P. *Testimonia Partum. The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melancthon*. Geneva, 1961.
- Frei, Hans. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*. (Hew Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1974).
- Frei, Hans. *The Identity of Jesus Christ: The Hermeneutical Bases of Dogmatic Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Frei, Hans. "The "Literal Reading" of Biblical Narrative in the Christian Tradition: Does it Stretch or Will it Break?" (Abridged and edited by Kathryn Tanner), in Peter Ochs, *Return to Scripture in Judaism and Christianity. Essays in Postcritical Scriptural Interpretation*. Muhwah NJ: Paulist Press, 1993.
- Frost, S.B. *Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origins and Growth*. London: Epworth, 1952.
- Fyall, Robert. *Daniel*. Fearn, UK: Christian Focus Publications, 1998.
- Gammie, J.G. "Review of P.D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*," in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1976) 654.
- Garrett, Susan. *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Gee, Donald. *This is the Way: Finding the Better Life Through Divine Guidance* (originally entitled *Studies in Guidance*). Springfield MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1936.
- Gee, Donald. *Wind and Flame*. Croydon, England: Assemblies of God Publishing House/Heath Press, 1967.
- General Council of the Assemblies of God, *Statement of Fundamental Truths*, accessed 19 December 2006, available from <http://www.creeds.net/Misc/AOGtruths.pdf>; Internet.
- Gilpin, G.W. "The Inspiration of the Bible," in P.S. Brewster (ed.), *Pentecostal Doctrine*. Cheltenham UK: Elim Pentecostal Churches, 1976.
- Glass, James J. "Eschatology: A Clear and Present Danger – A Sure and Certain Hope," in Keith Warrington (ed.), *Pentecostal Perspectives*. Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1998.
- Gohr, "Pearlman, Myer," in Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (eds.) *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids MI: Regency/Zondervan, 1988.
- Goldingay, John E. *Daniel: WBC 30*. Dallas TX: Word Books, 1989.
- Goldingay, John "The Corporateness of Scriptural Interpretation," *Models for Interpretation of Scripture*. Carlisle UK: Paternoster Press, 1995.
- Green, Garrett (ed.) *Scriptural Authority and Narrative Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Gimenez, Anne. "Battle in the Heavens," in C.P. Wagner and F.D. Pennoyer (eds.) *Wrestling with Dark Angels*. Ventura CA: Regal, 1990.
- Hammer, Raymond. *The Book of Daniel: The Cambridge Bible Commentary*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Harrell, David Edwin Jr., "Foreword," in Harold B. Smith (ed.) *Pentecostals From The Inside Out (Christianity Today Series)*. Wheaton IL: Victor Books, 1990.
- Hartman, Louis F. and Di Lella, Alexander A. *The Book of Daniel. Anchor Bible Vol. 23*. New York: Doubleday, 1978.
- Hathaway, Malcolm R. "The Elim Pentecostal Church: Origins, Development and Distinctives," in Keith Warrington (ed.) *Pentecostal Perspectives*. Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1998.
- Haughey, S.J., John C. (ed.) *Theological Reflections on the Charismatic Renewal: Proceedings of the Chicago Conference October 1-2, 1976*. Ann Arbor MI: Servant Books, 1978.

- Hayford, Jack (ed.) *Spirit-Filled Life Bible. New King James Version*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1991.
- Hayford, Jack W. and Curtis, G. *Until the End of Time: Revealing the Future of Humankind: A study of Daniel and Revelations [sic]. Spirit-Filled Life Bible Discovery Guides*. Thomas Nelson: Nashville, 1997.
- Heflin, Ruth Ward. *Harvest Glory: I Ask for the Nations*. Hagerstown MD: McDougal Publishing, 1999.
- Hey, Sam. "Changing Roles of Pentecostal Hermeneutics," *Evangelical Review of Theology*, 25:3 (2001) 210-218.
- Hill, Andrew E. and John H. Walton, *A Survey of the Old Testament* (2nd Ed.) Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 2000.
- Hillerbrand, Hans J. (ed.) *The Protestant Reformation*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968.
- Hoffecker, W.A. "Darby, John Nelson," in Walter A. Elwell (ed.) *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Hollenweger, Walter J. *The Pentecostals*. Peabody MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1972.
- Hollenweger, Walter J. "Biblically 'Justified' Abuse: A Review of Stephen Parsons, *Ungodly Fear: Fundamentalist Christianity and the Abuse of Power*," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 10:2 (2002) 129- 135.
- Horton, Michael S. (ed.) *A Confessing Theology for Postmodern Times*. Wheaton IL: Crossway Books, 2000.
- Horton, S. M. "Daniel, Book of," in Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (eds.) *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids MI: Regency/Zondervan, 1988.
- Horton, Stanley M. (ed.) *Systematic Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective*. Springfield MO: Logion Press, 1994.
- Ironside, H.A. *Lectures on Daniel the Prophet (with chart)*. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, Pubs., 1920.
- Jacobs, Cindy. *Possessing the Gates of the Enemy: A Training Manual for Militant Intercession*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids MI: Chosen, 1994.
- Jacobsen, Douglas. *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement*. Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 2003.
- Janz, Denis R. (ed.) *A Reformation Reader: Primary Texts with Introductions*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
- Johns, Cheryl Bridges. "The Meaning of Pentecost for Theological Education," *Ministerial Formation* 87 (October 1999), 42-47.
- Johns, Cheryl Bridges. *Pentecostal Formation: A Pedagogy among the Oppressed*. JPTS, 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Jurgens, William. (ed.) *The Faith of the Early Fathers*. 3 vols., Collegeville MN: Liturgical, 1979.
- Kaiser, W.C. *Toward an Exegetical Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981.
- Käsemann, E. "The Beginnings of Christian Theology" (trans J.W. Leitch), *Journal for Theology and the Church* 6 (1969), 40.
- Kay, William. "Assemblies of God: Distinctive Continuity and Distinctive Change," in Keith Warrington (ed.) *Pentecostal Perspectives*. Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1998.
- Kendrick, K. "Initial Evidence, a Historical Perspective", in Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids MI: Regency Reference Library, 1988.
- Kerr, W.N. "Scofield, Cyrus Ingerson," in Walter A. Elwell (ed.) *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1984.

- Knight III, Henry H. "God's Faithfulness and God's Freedom: A Comparison of Cotemporary Theologies of Healing," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 2 (1993) 65-98.
- Koch, Klaus. *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*. Trans. M. Kohl, SBT2/22. Naperville, Ill.: Allenson/London: SCM, 1972.
- Kratz, Reinhard G. "The Visions of Daniel," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, Volume I, John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint (eds.) Boston/Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, Inc., 2002.
- Ladd, G. E. *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1930.
- Ladd, G.E. "Why Not Prophecy-Apocalyptic?," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 76 (1957): 192-200;
- Land, Steven J. "A Passion for the Kingdom: Revisioning Pentecostal Spirituality," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 1 (1992) 19-46.
- LaSor, William Sandford, David Allan Hubbard Jr., and Frederic Wm. Bush, Jr. *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament*, Second Edition. Grand Rapids MI/Cambridge UK: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1996.
- Lederle, Henry I. *Treasures Old and New: Interpretations of 'Spirit-baptism' in the Charismatic Renewal Movement*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988.
- Life Application Bible: New King James Version*. Wheaton IL: Tyndale House, 1993.
- Liechty, Daniel (ed./trans.) *Early Anabaptist Spirituality: Selected Writings*. New York: Paulist Press, 1994.
- Lindbeck, George. *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postbiblical Age*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984.
- Lindbeck, George. "Scripture, Consensus, and Community," in Richard John Neuhaus (ed.) *Biblical Interpretation in Crisis*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Longman III, Tremper. *Daniel: The NIV Application Commentary*. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan 1999.
- Longman III, Tremper. *God is a Warrior*. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1995.
- Longman III, Tremper. *Old Testament Commentary Survey*, Second Edition. Grand Rapids MI: Baker Books, 1995.
- Lowe, Chuck. *Territorial Spirits and World Evangelisation?* Sevenoaks, Kent: Mentor/OMF, 1998
- Lucas, Ernest C. *Daniel*. Leicester: Apollos, 2002.
- Luther's Works*. (55 vols). J. Pelikan and H. Lehman (eds.) St.Louis: Concordia/Philadelphia: Fortress, 1955-75.
- MacArthur, John Jr. *Our Sufficiency in Christ*. Milton Keynes UK: Word Books, 1991.
- Macchia, Frank D. "The Struggle for Global Witness: Shifting Paradigms in Pentecostal Theology," in Murray W. Dempster, Byron D. Klaus and Douglas Peterson (eds.) *The Globalization of Pentecostalism: A Religion Made To Travel*. Oxford: Regnum Books International, 1999.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. *Christianizing the Roman Empire (AD100-400)*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.
- Mansfield, Stephen. *Derek Prince: A Biography*. (Lake Mary, Florida: Charisma House, 2005.
- Martin, R.F. "Apocalypse, Book of the," in Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (eds.) *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movement*. Grand Rapids MI: Regency/Zondervan, 1988.
- Martin, Francis. "The Charismatic Renewal and Biblical Hermeneutics," in John C. Haughey, S.J. (ed.) *Theological Reflections on the Charismatic Renewal:*

- Proceedings of the Chicago Conference October 1-2, 1976.* Ann Arbor MI: Servant Books, 1978.
- Martinez, F. Garcia. "Les traditions apocalyptiques a Qumran," in C. Kappler, ed., *Apocalypses et voyages dans l'au-dela.* Paris: Cerf, 1987.
- Massey, Richard D. "The Word of God: 'Thus Saith the Lord'," in Keith Warrington (ed.) *Pentecostal Perspectives.* Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1998.
- Maybin, W.J. "Bible Prophecy," in P.S. Brewster (ed.) *Pentecostal Doctrine.* Cheltenham UK: P.S. Brewster/Elim Pentecostal Church HQ, 1976.
- McConville, J.G. *Deuteronomy (Apollos Old Testament Commentary).* Leicester, UK/Downers Grove, IL: Apollos/InterVarsity Press, 2002.
- McGee, G.B. "Horton, Stanley Monroe," in Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (eds.) *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements.* Grand Rapids MI: Regency/Zondervan, 1988.
- McGee, Gary B. "Historical Background," in Stanley M. Horton (ed.) *Systematic Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective.* Springfield MO: Logion Press, 1994.
- McGrath, Alister. *Reformation Thought: An Introduction.* (3rd Ed.) (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.
- McIntire, C.T. "Fundamentalism," in Walter A. Elwell (ed.) *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology.* Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- McKenna, John E. 'Daniel' chapter in William Sandford LaSor, David Allan Hubbard Jr., and Frederic Wm. Bush, Jr. (eds.) *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament,* Second Edition. Grand Rapids MI/Cambridge UK: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1996.
- McKnight, Edgar V. "A Defense [sic] of a Postmodern Use of the Bible," in Michael S. Horton (ed.) *A Confessing Theology for Postmodern Times.* Wheaton IL: Crossway Books, 2000.
- McNeill, J. T. (ed.) and F.L. Battles (trans.) *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion.* 2 vols. (Library of Christian Classics). Philadelphia: Westminster, 1955.
- McPherson, Aimee Semple [in collaboration with George Stiffler (Th. D)] *The Foursquare Gospel.* USA: Echo Park Evangelistic Assoc. Inc., 1946.
- Meadowcroft, Tim. "Who are the Princes of Persia and Greece (Daniel 10)? Pointers Towards the Danielic Vision of Earth and Heaven," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 29.1 (2004) 99-113.
- Melanchthon, Philip. "Apology for the Augsburg Confession (1531)" [Article IV. Justification] in Denis R. Janz, (ed.) *A Reformation Reader: Primary Texts with Introductions.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
- Menzies, Robert P. "James Shelton's *Mighty in Word and Deed: A Review Article,*" *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 2 (1993), 105-115.
- Menzies, Robert P. "The Movers and Shakers," in Harold B. Smith (ed.) *Pentecostals From The Inside Out (Christianity Today Series).* Wheaton IL: Victor Books, 1990.
- Menzies, Robert P. "The Spirit of Prophecy, Luke-Acts and Pentecostal Theology: A Response to Max Turner," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 15 (1999) 49-74.
- Miller, S.R. *Daniel (New American Commentary).* Nashville: Broadman, 1994.
- Moltmann, J. *Theology of Hope,* trans. J.W. Leitch. New York: Harper & Row/London: SCM, 1967.
- Montgomery, James A. *The Book of Daniel (The International Critical Commentary).* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927/1989.
- Moore, Rick D. "Canon and Charisma in the Book of Deuteronomy," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 1 (1992) 75-92.
- Morris, L. *Apocalyptic.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/London: Inter-Varsity, 1972.

- Mowll, Basil C. *Futurist or Historicist?: A Plea for the Historicist Interpretation of Revelation*. London: The Protestant Truth Society, No Date.
- Muck, Terry C. "General Editor's Preface," in Tremper Longman III. *Daniel: The NIV Application Commentary*. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1999.
- Muller, Richard A. "Sources of Reformed Orthodoxy: The Symmetrical Unity of Exegesis and Synthesis," in Michael S. Horton (ed.) *A Confessing Theology for Postmodern Times*. Wheaton IL: Crossway Books, 2000.
- Neuhaus, Richard John (ed.) *Biblical Interpretation in Crisis*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Newton, Jon. *Teaching the Book of Revelation*. Gold Coast QLD: Pentecostal and Charismatic Bible Colleges Conference Paper, 2006.
- Noll, Stephen F. *Angels of Light, Powers of Darkness: Thinking Biblically About Angels, Satan and Principalities*. Downers Grove IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998.
- Oberman, Heiko A. *The Reformation: Roots and Ramifications*. Trans. Andrew Colin Gow. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1994.
- Ochs, Peter. *The Return to Scripture in Judaism and Christianity. Essays in Postcritical Scriptural Interpretation*. Muhwah NJ: Paulist Press, 1993.
- Oswalt, John N. "Recent Studies in Old Testament Apocalyptic," in Baker, David W. and Arnold, Bill T. (eds.) *The Face of Old Testament Studies: A Survey of Contemporary Approaches*. Grand Rapids, MI: Apollos/Baker Books, 1999.
- Otis, George Jr. *Informed Intercession*. Ventura CA: Renew, 1999.
- Otis, George Jr. *The Last of the Giants: Lifting the Veil on Islam and the End Time*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1991.
- Page, Sydney H.T. *Powers of Evil: A Biblical Study of Satan and Demons*. Grand Rapids MI: Baker/Apollos, 1995.
- Pannenberg, W. "Redemptive Event and History," in *Basic Questions in Theology: Collected Essays*, trans. G.H. Kehm, 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press/ London: SCM, 1970-71, 1:15-80.
- Payne, J.B. "Daniel, Book of," in Tenney, Merrill C. (Gen. Ed.) *Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary*. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1967.
- Pearlman, Myer. *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible*. Springfield MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1937.
- Petersen, Douglas. "Changing Paradigms: An Introductory Overview," in Murray W. Dempster, Byron D. Klaus and Douglas Petersen (eds.) *The Globalization of Pentecostalism: A Religion Made To Travel*. Oxford: Regnum Books International, 1999.
- Petts, David. "The Baptism in the Holy Spirit: The Theological Distinctive" in Keith Warrington (ed.) *Pentecostal Perspectives*. Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1998.
- Pinnock, Clark "A Bridge and Some Points of Growth: A Reply to Cross and Macchia," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 13 (1998) 49-54.
- Plöger, O. *Theocracy and Eschatology*, (trans. S. Rudman). Richmond: John Knox/Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.
- Pontifical Biblical Commission, The. *The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church*. Boston MA: St. Paul Books & Media, 1993.
- Powell, Mark Allan. *What is Narrative Criticism?* Minneapolis MN: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Preus III, J.A.O. "Sources of Lutheran Dogmatics: Addressing Contemporary Issues with the Historic Christian Faith," in Michael S. Horton (ed.) *A Confessing Theology for Postmodern Times*. Wheaton IL: Crossway Books, 2000.

- Priest, R., J. T. Campbell and B. A. Mullen. "Missiologial Syncretism: The New Animistic Paradigm," in *Spiritual Power and Missions: Raising the Issues* (EMS Ser. 3). E. Rommen (ed.) Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.
- Prince, Derek. *Spiritual Warfare*, New Kensington PA: Whitaker House, 1987.
- Pusey, E.B. *Daniel the Prophet*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Parker, 1869/Minneapolis MN: Klock & Klock Christian Publishers, Reprint 1978.
- Railey, Jr., James H. and Benny C. Aker. "Theological Foundations," in Stanley M. Horton, (ed.) *Systematic Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective*. Springfield MO: Logion Press, 1994.
- Ramm, Bernard. *The Evangelical Heritage: A study in historical theology*. Grand Rapids MI: Baker Books, 1973.
- Reid, Andrew. *Kingdoms in Conflict: Reading Daniel Today*. Sydney NSW: AIO Press, 2000.
- Rommen, E. (ed.) *Spiritual Power and Missions: Raising the Issues* (EMS Ser. 3). Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.
- Roth, W. "Between Tradition and Expectation: The Origin and Role of Biblical Apocalyptic," *Explor* 4 (1978), 10.
- Rowley, H.H. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*. New York: Association Press/ London: Lutterworth, 1944, 3rd ed. 1963.
- Russell, D.S. *Apocalyptic: Ancient and Modern*. Philadelphia: Fortress; London: SCM, 1978.
- Russell, D.S. *Divine Disclosure: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Russell, D.S. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- Ryrie, C.C. "Dispensation, Dispensationalism," in Walter A. Elwell (ed.) *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Schmithals, W. *The Apocalyptic Movement: Introduction and Interpretation*, trans J.E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon, 1975.
- Schneiders, S. *The Revelatory Text: Interpreting the New Testament as Sacred Scripture*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1991.
- Schofield, J.N. *Law, Prophets, and Writings: The Religion of the Books of the Old Testament*. London: SPCK, 1969.
- Shelton, James. *Mighty In Word and Deed*. Peabody MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.
- Silvoso, Ed. *That None Should Perish: How to Reach Entire Cities for Christ through Prayer Evangelism*. Ventura CA: Regal, 1993.
- Skehan, P.W. "The Structure of the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy (Dt 32:1-43)," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 13 (1951) 153-63.
- Smail, Tom, Andrew Walker and Nigel Wright (eds.) *The Love of Power or the Power of Love: A Careful Assessment of the Problems Within the Charismatic and Word-of-Faith Movements*. Minneapolis MN: Bethany House Pubs., 1994.
- Smith, James K.A. "The Closing of the Book: Pentecostals, Evangelicals, and the Sacred Writings," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 11 (1997) 49-71.
- Spence, Alec (ed.) *Assemblies of God National Minister's Manual*, 3rd Edition, Assemblies of God Australia Queensland Conference State Executive, 2000.
- Stephens, Scott T. "Postmodernism, Poetry and a (Pentecostal) Text: An Approach to the Book of Joel", *Australian Pentecostal Studies* 1 (1998), 55-101
- Stibbe, Mark W.G. "The Theology of Renewal and the Renewal of Theology," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 3 (1993) 71-90.
- Strang, S. "Baxter, William John Ernest ("Ern")," in Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movement*. Grand Rapids MI: Regency/Zondervan, 1988.

- Springer, Kevin (ed.) *Riding the Third Wave: What Comes After Renewal*. Basingstoke UK: Marshall Pickering, 1987.
- Stronstad, Roger. *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*. Peabody MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1984.
- Stronstad, Roger. "The Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts," *Paraclete* (Spring 1989), 18 -26.
- Synan, Vinson. *The Century of the Holy Spirit: 100 Years of Pentecostal and Charismatic Renewal, 1901-2001*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001.
- Synan, H.V. "Fundamentalism," in Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (eds.) *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids MI: Regency/Zondervan, 1988.
- Synan, Vinson. *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century* (2nd ed.) Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1997.
- Taylor, C.V. "Notes on History of Views on Revelation" (compiled from H.G. Guinness, O.T. Allis, Thomas Foster and other sources), unpublished, 1991.
- Taylor, Mark R. *Do Demons Rule Your Town? An examination of the 'territorial spirits' theory*. London: Grace Publications, 1993.
- Tenney, Merrill C. (Gen. Ed.) *Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary*. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1967.
- Trask, Thomas E. and Wayde I. Goodall. *The Battle: Defeating the Enemies of Your Soul*. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1997.
- Trask, Thomas E., Wayde Goodall and Zenas J. Bicket (eds.) *The Pentecostal Pastor: A Mandate for the 21st Century*. Springfield MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1997
- Triplett, Loren. "Back to Basics in Missions," in Thomas E. Trask, Wayde Goodall and Zenas J. Bicket (eds.) *The Pentecostal Pastor: A Mandate for the 21st Century*. Springfield MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1997.
- Veldkamp, Herman. *Dreams and Dictators: on the Book of Daniel* (Trans. Theodore Plantinga). Ontario, Canada: Paideia Press, 1978.
- von Rad, Gerhard. *Old Testament Theology*, trans. D.M.G. Stalker, 2 vols. New York: Harper & Row/Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962/1965.
- Wagner, C Peter (ed.) *Breaking Strongholds In Your City. (How to use spiritual mapping to make your prayers more strategic, effective and targeted)*. Ventura CA: Regal Books, 1993.
- Wagner, C. Peter. "Territorial Spirits," in C.P. Wagner and F.D. Pennoyer (eds.) *Wrestling with Dark Angels*. Ventura CA: Regal, 1990.
- Wagner, C. Peter. *Confronting the Powers: How the New Testament Church Experienced the Power of Strategic-Level Spiritual Warfare*. Ventura CA: Regal.
- Wagner, C. Peter, Stephen Peters and Mark Wilson (eds.) *Praying Through the 100 Gateway Cities of the 10/40 Window*. Seattle WA: YWAM Publishing, 1995.
- Wagner, C. Peter. *Acts of the Holy Spirit: A Modern Commentary on the Book of Acts*. Ventura CA: Regal, 2000.
- Wagner, C. Peter. *Warfare Prayer*. Crowborough UK: Monarch Books, 1997.
- Wagner, C.P. and F.D. Pennoyer (eds.) *Wrestling with Dark Angels*. Ventura CA: Regal, 1990.
- Walker, Andrew, "Demonology and the Charismatic Movement," in Tom Smail, Andrew Walker and Nigel Wright (eds.) *The Love of Power or the Power of Love: A Careful Assessment of the Problems Within the Charismatic and Word-of-Faith Movements*. Minneapolis MN: Bethany House Pubs., 1994.
- Wallace, Ronald S. *The Lord is King: The Message of Daniel (The Bible Speaks Today Series)*. Leicester UK: Inter-Varsity Press, 1979.
- Walvoord, John F. *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation*. Chicago: Moody, 1971.

- Warber, W.E. "Publications," in Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movement*. Grand Rapids MI: Regency/Zondervan, 1988.
- Warrington, Keith (ed.) *Pentecostal Perspectives*. Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1998.
- Weiler, Peter T. "Readings in Hyperspirituality: Postmodern Allusions in Contemporary Popular Pentecostal Literature," *RE 496 - Honours Thesis*, St. Lucia QLD: University of Queensland, 2000.
- Wiles, Maurice F. "Scriptural Authority and Theological Construction: The Limitations of Narrative Interpretation," in Garrett Green (ed.) *Scriptural Authority and Narrative Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Williams, George H. and Angel M. Mergal (eds.) *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers (Library of Christian Classics)*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957.
- Williams, J. Rodman. *Renewal Theology. Systematic Theology from a Charismatic Perspective, Three Volumes in One*. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996.
- Williams, J. Rodman. *The Pentecostal Reality*. Plainfield NJ: Logos International, 1972.
- Wimber, John. "Introduction," Kevin Springer (ed.) *Riding the Third Wave: What Comes After Renewal*. Basingstoke UK: Marshall Pickering, 1987.
- Wood, Rick. "Passing the Baton," *Mission Frontiers* (June, 2001), 32-35.
- Yarbro Collins, Adela (ed). *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting. Semeia 36*. Deacatur GA: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Yip, Tai M. "Spiritual Mapping: Another Approach," *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* (April, 1995), 166-170.
- Yoder John. H. and Kreider, Alan. "The Anabaptists", in Tim Dowley (ed.) *The History of Christianity*. Oxford UK: Lion Publishing, 1990.
- Young, Edward J. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964.
- Young, Edward J. *Daniel (Geneva Commentaries)*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1972/First pub. 1949.
- Zegwaart, Huibert. "Apocalyptic Eschatology and Pentecostalism: The Relevance of John's Millennium for Today", *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 10:1 (Spring 1988), 3-25.
- Zodhiates, Spiros (ed.) *The Hebrew-Greek Key Study Bible: New International Version*. Chattanooga TN: AMG Publishers, 1996.