

Like a roaring lion...

Essays on the Bible, the church and demonic powers

Editor: Pieter G.R. de Villiers

C.B. POWELL BIBLE CENTRE
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA
PRETORIA

1987

C

BY C.B. POWELL BIBLE CENTRE
FACULTY OF THEOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

PRETORIA

1987

ISBN 0 86981 473 7

The articles in this publication were originally presented as papers at a conference on the Bible, the church and demonic powers, held at the University of South Africa during June 1986.

The C.B. Powell Bible Centre was established by means of a bequest by the well-known Cape businessman, Mr. Charles B. Powell. The Centre is part of the Institute of theological research at the Faculty of Theology, University of South Africa.

The address of the Centre is:

C.B. POWELL BIBLE CENTRE
P.O. BOX 392
PRETORIA
0001

TEL. 440-2291

CONTENTS

1.	The conception of evil and satan in Jewish traditions in the pre-Christian period P.J. Nel	1
2.	Demonology in New Testament times A.G. van Aarde	22
3.	The problem of evil in Africa. A survey of African views on witchcraft and of the response of the Christian church D.J. Bosch	38
4.	The interpretation of and reaction to demonic powers in indigenous churches G.C. Oosthuizen	63
5.	The development in Biblical times of belief in demons and devils and the theological issue raised by such a development B. Gaybba	90
6.	Better the devil you know? Seeking a Biblical basis for the societal demension of evil and/or the demonic in the Pauline concept of the "powers" H.I Lederle	102
7.	Multiprofessional case representation: the case of David H. A.H. Potgieter M.G.S. Pierides A.E. de la Porte A.D. Geel	121
8.	Satanism, witchcraft and the occult: a psychiatrist's view W. Bodemer	132
9.	Pastoral counselling and demonology J.T. de Jongh van Arkel	141
10.	Some aspects of the ministry of deliverance from evil forces J.P.J. Theron	147

11.	Demonic powers from an evangelical perspective	
	R.B. Codrington	162
12.	Pentecostal perspectives on the activity of demonic powers	
	F.P Möller	173
13.	Demonic powers from a high church perspective	
	G. Ashby	192
14.	Demonic bondage	
	J.S. du Plessis	197
15.	Theological response to Ashby, Codrington, Gaybba and Möller	
	A. König	200

THE CONCEPTION OF EVIL AND SATAN IN JEWISH TRADITIONS
IN THE PRE-CHRISTIAN PERIOD

P.J. Nel

1. INTRODUCTION

In Paradise Lost John Milton subtly juxtaposed the truth of the textual evidence of Genesis 2-3 - that Adam did not know that satan was camouflaged as a serpent - and the truth of the Christian tradition (and also of Milton's audience), that is that the serpent of Genesis 3 was in fact satan himself. Milton's readers (listeners) thus know more than his character Adam (cf. Gagen 1983:116-121).

In a comparable fashion it seems as though the popular notion of satan in Old Testament religion is a retrojection of Christian belief and is not a verifiable inference from the textual evidence. The notion of satan in the Old Testament, therefore, thrives on a misconception [1].

In this paper no attention will be given to the psychological and sociological explanations of the notion of satan (for a résumé, cf. Haag 1974:11-28). I also refrain from both the dogmatic premiss that the doctrine of the existence of the downfall of the angels, and the logical or ontological premiss for the existence of the devil (satan) by reversing the propositions of Anselm's ontological argument for the existence of God (cf. Haight 1974: 152-156).

The method to be followed here can be described as an empirical inquiry into the textual evidence of Biblical literature, the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in pre-Christian traditions. The conclusion will result from inductive synthesis. Because of the comprehensiveness of the topic this paper can hardly be more than a summary of tendencies.

2. ISRAEL'S ENVIRONMENT

A search for satan in Ancient Near Eastern literature is a vain effort. No trace exists of a character (god or demon) similar to the one of popular Christian tradition who reigns over a particular dominion and is responsible for all evil in this world (for the views of early Christian traditions see Russell 1981:33ff.).

In so far as one is able to deduce a basic mythology from the so-called creation epics and other literary sources from Mesopotamia, Egypt and Canaan, one is struck by the prominent role of

primordial chaos. The chaos and the powers of evil were seen as being in ontological opposition to created order (cosmos) [2]. The chaos that threatens Order is symbolically represented as an ocean of uncontrolled waters with dangerous monsters (cf. the creation myths collected by Pritchard 1969:6-10, 60-72, 129-131; also Eliade 1977; Ricoeur 1969:175-191; Keel 1972:39-48). Created order is seen as the result of the triumph of the mighty gods over the forces of chaos. The cosmos or created order, however, does not escape the constant threatening of chaos. The cosmogony thus does not transcend the categories of a time-specific cosmology. In consequence order and chaos constitute reality - one without the other is impossible. Order (cosmos) and chaos function within a relation of binary opposition. Chaos, as negative order, is obviously related to negative connotations and portrayed as evil per se [3].

Man's ethical conduct is also evaluated in accordance with the two basic alternatives, order-constitutive or evil, because the judicial and righteous order is established and sanctioned by the major gods, especially the sun gods Ra (Egypt), Šamaš (Babylon) and Šapšu (Ugarit). Just as darkness disappears before the rising sun, so the righteous order of the gods guards the individual against evil and evil powers and provides a sphere of "good" life for him (cf. Janowski 1984:16-72).

The polar-structured cosmology of the Ancient Near East also brings about a definite distinction between gods and demons with good intentions (establishing order) and those with evil intentions (establishing chaos).

Although the Mesopotamian gods originally were closely associated with the social groups (clans) or city, recent research has confirmed a religious development towards the worship of a personal god. This development can be traced back to the beginning of the second millennium B.C. (cf. Albertz 1978; Vorländer 1975). The preference for a "personal god" did not imply a substitution for the other gods, especially not for the major ones, but rather satisfied the need for a more personal divine guardian. The "personal god" also acted as a mediator between the individual human and the major gods [4]. Certain good (benevolent) demons could also act as personal guardians [5].

The harmful and malicious demons [6], on the other hand, were responsible for physical sickness, abnormalities, catastrophes, witchcraft, black magic, and so on [7]. Existential needs and the threats to human existence were directly linked with the activities of demons [8]. The demons, therefore, were "forms given to the numinous power experienced in sudden illness and pain or in other terrifying situations" (Jacobsen 1976:13). In

psychological terms one may say that the demons were an externalization of human experience, of a person's needs and feelings [9].

The existence of evil and of evil powers was believed in and they were part of everyday living in Mesopotamia. It was of crucial importance to accept the wisdom of tradition and cult and to acquire the skill to avoid evil and to neutralise its effect. Religion and magic thus implied no essential dichotomy. Various institutions and practices came into being with the sole motivation of protecting the individual or group against evil forces. Harmful effects could be avoided by early recognition of evil signs (omens) by wearing protective objects (amulets), by reciting specific ritual formulae (incantations) and by countering malicious intentions with magic.

Evil, therefore, was a reality of existence, an existential fact to be reckoned with. Another (good) reality existed which was opposed to the reality of evil and established by the benevolent gods as a mode of existence for their adherents. Man's actions were, however, never determined so absolutely by evil or its forces, that his own responsibility was suspended.

In Egypt the situation was similar to that in Mesopotamia. Benevolent and harmful demons appeared in earthly existence as well as afterlife, but the latter were more prominent. The name achu (beings of light) was frequently given to the "good" demons [10]. Although demons could act independently, they often served as messengers of the gods. They (especially Apophis) could also inflict punishment in the nether world [11]. Amulets were very popular in Egypt, because it was believed that they had the power of removing or warding off noxious influences caused by evil spirits. An amulet was also put on the breast of a deceased person in order to protect him on his way to the underworld. The incantation or charm on the amulet was normally combined with an apotropaic image or symbol. These images most frequently represented the guardian god or even a demon (often only a typical manifestation of the god or demon occurred). Besides the wearing of amulets, magic was practised by special priests and sorcerers to manipulate the good and evil spirits (Hornung 1967:72).

The main force behind all evil is seen as being primordial chaos, that is Apophis. Thus evil was a reality of existence in Egypt. Protection against evil and its avoidance were, in effect, a struggle against chaos to restore order (cosmos).

We have sparse evidence from the Phoenician context (cf. Gese 1970:171). It is nevertheless certain that a belief in demons also existed here. In the Ugaritic text (UT 181) a field-demon

('uqrm) is mentioned and in the Krt-epic the demon of sickness (zbln) occurs.

From the Arabic context the djinn-spirits (demons) are well enough known from the Thousand and one nights. It was believed that they sojourned in the desert and in the underworld. Magic was the main means by which the individual could protect himself from them. Some of the djinn were also regarded as guardians of the wanderer and trader.

In Islamic literature the figure of a schaiṭan occurs, which is also found in earlier Jewish-Christian tradition from which it is most certainly adapted. The devil (iblis) is also known in Islamic traditions - the term is in all probability derived from the Greek diábolos. Iblīs refused to honour Adam and Eve at God's demand (cf. the first book of Enoch discussed below). As a result of his disobedience he was cursed and banned from heaven. He, however, obtained sufficient time to lead Adam and Eve astray and to cause other people to sin. But at the end of time he will be thrown into the fiery pit of hell.

Apart from the wearing of amulets and the reciting of incantations to protect one against evil forces, the Arabic cultures developed a specialised practice to manipulate demons by substances (such as salt, ice, blood, fire, noises, etc.) believed to have deterrent powers.

In concluding this section it may be stated that the mythologies of Israel's neighbours do not constitute firm dogma. The existence of evil was accepted as an obvious reality. Cosmos (order) and chaos constituted opposite and opposed ends of the polar axis of reality. Chaos and evil were a constant threat to cosmos and orderly existence. However, the primacy of human responsibility was maintained. In other words, it was man's responsibility to avoid evil and to protect himself against its malicious influences by whatever means. The primordial cause for evil and chaos was not ascribed to a specific demon or god. Thus a figure that resembles the Christian conception of satan is absent in the mythologems of Israel's neighbours.

3. SATAN IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The monotheism of Yahwism brought a peculiar problem about the notion of evil to the fore. The closed paradigm of mythological thinking could easily accommodate the existence of evil alongside order (cosmos) without any essential contradiction in belief. Israel shared mutually the mythological cosmology with her neighbours, but - and this created a problem - the advocates of Yahwism deliberately opposed the religious implications. In

consequence, certain harmful phenomena of existence which were attributed to demons within the mythological context had to remain unexplained or had to be imputed to Yahweh himself. Yahwism could not tolerate an opposing demon or god. Consequently Yahweh became responsible for illness and suffering (cf. e.g. Ps. 6, 51, 88; Ex. 12:23; 2 Sm. 24:16ff.; 2 Ki. 19:35) [12]. The innate contradiction that arose from such an assumption, namely the reconcilability of good and evil despite maintaining an all-good God, was left unsolved.

Yahweh's activity was sometimes seen in conjunction with hostile forces (e.g. Gn. 32:23-33; Ex. 4:24-26; 12:21-23) and evil spirits could be in his service (e.g. Jd. 9:23; 1 Sm. 16:14ff.; 18:10f., 19:9ff.; Is. 19:14; 29:9-10). At times Yahweh almost became the cause of harmful forces in human existence (e.g. 1 Sm. 2:6-7; Is. 45:7; Lm. 3:38; Am. 3:6; 1 Sm. 26:19 and the prologue of Job 1-2). Despite the possibility of a justified logical deduction by which Yahweh himself would become the sole source of evil and in fact evil itself, such an assumption nevertheless did not occur (cf. the comprehensive discussion of Lindström 1983). One could, therefore, assume that the binary opposition of good and evil without essential conflict (typical of the mythic context), might still prevail over the logical consequences of a monotheism in the Old Testament in explaining the existence of both good and evil. Yahweh never became all-evil. Although Yahweh allowed evil He himself did not become evil. The manipulation of evil forces were still for the sake of good ends.

It is also evident from the Old Testament that the poles of the binary opposition had not yet developed into metaphysical and ontologically opposed entities, in other words, into an absolute dualism in cosmological conception. The maintenance of the binary opposition of good and evil had effective and heuristic powers to explain the existence of both good and evil in human existence without hampering the individual's responsibility of choice. The main principle of Old Testament ethics could, therefore, be formulated as an avoidance of evil, for example Job 28:28 (cf. Nel 1982:130-149).

The fact that the mythic thought-structure was not totally banned in the Old Testament is underscored by the occurrence of cherubs and seraphs with apotropaic functions. Various demons also occur in the Old Testament, such as the "goat spirit" [13] (Lv. 17:7; Is. 13:21; 34:14; 2 Chr. 11:15), desert spirits (Is. 13:21; 34:14), guardian demons (Dt. 32:17; Ps. 106:37f.), Azazel (Lv. 16:10ff.), spirits of sickness (Ps. 88:17-18, 91:5ff.) and the "angel of destruction" (1 Chr. 21:15; 2 Sm. 24:16).

From empirical observation it is evident that the notion of an

extraterrestrial being equivalent to our Christian conception of satan plays an insignificant role in the religious activity and belief in ancient Israel (see also Von Rad 1935:73). The intention here is not to rule out the possibility of satan's existence, but rather to attempt by a close reading of the relevant texts to ascertain the way in which the Old Testament speaks of satan. The relevant textual context of the Old Testament will be maintained without reference to the established conventions of Christian dogmatics [14].

The verb śtn and the noun śātān frequently occur in the Old Testament and usually refer to an obstructing or opposing activity in a negative sense. It could therefore correctly be translated with substitutes such as "adversary", "opponent", "enemy", and so on.

Only four occurrences of śātān in the Old Testament require a closer examination, because these instances are often quoted in support of the existence of satan. A brief remark will suffice to elucidate the first instance, namely Numbers 22:22. In this narrative Balaam encounters the "Messenger of God", depicted as a "satan" (lēśātān) on the road to Moab. The context clearly shows that satan is not used as a proper name, but as a common noun, meaning "adversary" or "enemy". Thus, the "Messenger of God" appears before Balaam as his adversary/enemy and not as satan, which Von Rad (1935:73) assumes.

The second occurrence is to be found in the fourth vision of Zechariah (Zch. 3:1-7). The scenario resembles that of a court session: The accused is Josuah, the High Priest, the plaintiff is called śātān (3:1) and the defender of Josuah's case is Yahweh himself (represented by the "Messenger of Yahweh"). In the heavenly tribunal a specific being performs the role of an accuser or plaintiff and his title is śātān. The noun śātān was in fact often used to designate the one who falsely lays a charge against somebody (cf. Ps. 109:6) [15]. The śātān (with the definite article) in this passage of Zechariah is not a proper name but an appellative, referring to the title or the function of a particular person (cf. Von Rad 1935:72; Gaster 1982:224). This "satan" had no dominion of his own. He was part of a heavenly tribunal where the justification and sanction of Josuah as high priest was at stake. The content of the accusation of "satan" against Josuah can only be reconstructed from the content of the rejection of "satan's" case.

A heavenly tribunal is also presupposed in the third occurrence of satan: the prologue of Job (1:6, 2:1). The noun śātān appears with the definite article and is rendered with ho diābolos in the Septuagint. From the prologue one gets the impression that the

heavenly prosecutor [16] was subordinated to Yahweh and not Yahweh's antagonist [17]. This "satan" has no rival dominion and is not responsible for the depravity of man. Although his objectives with Job are suspicious, he is not portrayed as an autonomous instigator of evil. He is in fact part of the divine entourage (The Sons of God) and has the judicial position of the prosecutor in the heavenly tribunals (cf. Haag 1974:210-215) [18].

The fourth, and most problematic occurrence of śātān is to be found in 1 Chronicles 21:1. The absence of the definite article is the main reason why most scholars interpret śātān as a proper name, referring to a transcendental being (cf. Wanke 1976:823; Haag 1974:214; Horst 1962:705).

It is said in verse 1 that śātān incited David to the sin of taking a census. In the Deuteronomistic counterpart of this episode (2 Sm. 24:1) it was the "wrath of the Lord" that caused the national census to be undertaken by David. Although the notion that God could cause evil and sin (cf. Jdg. 9:23; 1 Sm. 2:25; 1 Sm. 16:14; 1 Ki. 12:15; Is. 6:10) was not altogether alien to Old Testament belief, it was in direct conflict with the theological viewpoint of the Chronist author who emphatically emphasized the transcendence of the Lord as well as human responsibility and accountability for one's conduct (cf. 2 Chr. 36:14-16; cf. also Haag 1974:207). It is therefore understandable that the Chronist would "correct" the tradition which linked David's sin directly with God. It is further important to note that śātān does not substitute for Yahweh himself, but for the "wrath of Yahweh" (cf. 2 Sm. 24:1). Śātān was, therefore, viewed as a kind of demon which personified or substituted for the "wrath of Yahweh" (cf. Von Rad 1935:73; Horst 1962:705; Wanke 1976:823).

The major problem arises from the fact that one cannot be absolutely sure whether śātān, without the definite article, is a proper noun or not. It could be an ordinary appellative, referring to an "adversary." But who could this "adversary", scheming against Israel, be? It is also possible that the name śātān was used as an (allegorical) personification of human frailty.

One fact seems to be beyond doubt: This śātān acted as Yahweh's instrument (cf. the version of 2 Sm. 24:1) and not as his antagonist or rival. Nothing in the text of 1 Chronicles 21 hints at a metaphysical dualism. One can, therefore, accept that śātān here is still part of the heavenly entourage. Śātān, already known as the prosecutor in heavenly tribunals, was introduced by the Chronist as the one who sets himself against Israel and incites David to count the people. By this alteration of the tradition, Yahweh's sovereignty and transcendence were secured by the Chronist.

We may next conclude that nowhere in the Old Testament does satan appear as a distinctive demonic figure, opposed to God and responsible for all and for man's depravity. Although the LXX renders the last three post-exilic occurrences (i.e. Zch. 3:1; Job 1-2; 1 Chr. 21:1) with ho diábolos it nevertheless does not confirm the notion of a super-human being who is the absolute antagonist of God. The Old Testament conception of śātān is mainly that of a prosecutor in the heavenly tribunals.

I feel, therefore, justified in underscoring the viewpoint of Von Rad (1935:74):

Der alttestamentliche śātān verkörpert die Bedrohung der Menschen von der Welt Gottes her, sei es, dass er der Verkläger ihrer sittlich religiösen Fehlsamkeit ist, sei es als ein im Heilsplan fest verankertes dämonisch-zerstörerisches Prinzip.

The texts of the Old Testament themselves do not compel their readers to believe in "satan" as God's antagonist and the origin of all evil.

4. SATAN IN THE APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

The intention here is to focus on basic trends in pre-Christian literature in order to facilitate a better understanding of the new dimensions in Israelite belief which form the natural background of some New Testament conceptions of satan. In the pre-Christian period satan emerged in the literature as a being with a distinctive personality. This development was most probably linked with and a consequence of the development of a dualistic theory in post-exilic times, which is particularly evident in the apocalyptic literature. One of the major notions of the new world-view was that "the world was in the clutches of a demonic marplot who was responsible at once for the massive sinfulness that had occasioned God's displeasure and for the vicious malevolence of Israel's oppressors" (Gaster 1982:225). This new theological reasoning comprised a vivid awareness of existential evil (sin) which cannot have its origin in an all-good creator-god. In this context satan (or an equivalent figure) appeared as a personified representation of all evil and of every evil force (cf. Mensching 1962:704; Koch 1982:17).

Satan was seen as the obstructor of man's prosperity: "For among all men the spirit of hatred works by satan through human frailty for the death of mankind" (TGad. 4:7; cf. also TBenj. 7:1). Satan or belial (beliar) was always ready to cause men to stumble and to conquer them (TReu. 4:7-11). He became the author of sickness, failure, misfortune and all human tribulation (cf.

TSim.; TJos. 7:4; Jub. 5:5, 10:8 and 1 QS. 3:23). In short: satan became God's antagonist and ruled over his kingdom of evil.

The reasons for the new orientation in the post-exilic period are diverse and complex nature [19]. Of major importance is the Persian influence; Philip (1962:710) maintains that this is the source of the metaphysization of the transcategorical reality into distinctive devil characters together with the notion of a plurality of demons as part of a satanic dominion. In the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha [20] satan (or belial) is depicted with characteristics similar to that of the Avestan figures of Ahriman, the antagonist of the supreme god Ahura-Mazda [21].

Social-political factors, such as the conflict between rival Jewish groups and the conflict between orthodox Jews and aggressive Hellenistic imperialism, contributed a further stimulus to a metaphysical explanation of irreconcilable realities. In consequence a dualistic theory of reality developed.

Too often scholars have ignored the fact that the notion of a binary opposition of good (order) and evil (chaos) in Israelite belief in particular lent itself to a form of dualism. Traces of such a development can be detected in exilic wisdom literature and even earlier. This tendency paved the way to personification and hypostasization of the antithetic poles of good and evil in the Persian period (cf. Pr. 1-9). The binary order-chaos opposition eventually became unrelated ontological realities of good and evil.

Before we go any further, it is necessary to emphasize that the archdevil was not always named "satan". In fact, the name belial (beliar) [22] was often preferred. The noun "belial" often occurs in the Old Testament in compound expressions such as "sons of belial" (Dt. 13:13), "daughter of belial" (1 Sm. 1:16), "man of belial" (2 Sm. 10:1), "word of belial" (Dt. 15:9), and so on [23]. It usually denotes a reprobate, uncouth person or rascal [24].

In the pseudepigraphic and Qumran literature, Belial (Beliar) [25] emerges as a proper name and holds a position similar to that of satan, the prince of evil (cf. TLevi. 3:3; 18:12; TZeb. 9:8; 1 QS. 1:18; 1 QM. 1:15; 13:11, 12; 18:1; 2 QMelch. 9; 1 QH. 3:27-39 and the MartIs. 2:1-7).

The observation here will be limited to two formative tendencies in pre-Christian literature towards an explanation of the existence of evil. The development and establishment of post-exilic dualism created the need to explain the inevitable dichotomy of good and evil without jeopardizing to the notion of an all-good

God. In other words, how could one account for the existence of evil in the context of a monotheistic belief?

The first tendency or mode of explanation is reflected in Qumran literature. According to the dualism of Qumran [26], God created the "spirit of goodness" as well as the "spirit of evil" and God himself was responsible for the two opposing categories of actual existence: "From the God of Knowledge" comes all that is and shall be. Before ever they existed he established their whole design, and when, as ordained for them, they come into being, it is in accord with his glorious design that they accomplish their task without change. The laws of all things are in His hand and He provides them with all their needs.

He has created man to govern the world, and has appointed for him two spirits in which to walk until the time of His visitation: the spirits of truth and falsehood. Those born of truth spring from a fountain of light, but those born of falsehood spring from a source of darkness. All children of righteousness are ruled by the Prince of light and walk in the ways of light, but all children of falsehood are ruled by the angel of darkness and walk in the ways of darkness. The angel of darkness leads all the children of righteousness astray, and until his end, all their sin, iniquities, wickedness, and all their unlawful deeds are caused by his dominion in accordance with the mysteries of God." (1 QS. 3:15-23 - transl. by Vermes 1975:75-6). The "community rule" thus implied the dominion of belial as a rival dominion, endangering the covenant of the Qumran community. The members of the elected community of God could abandon the dominion of belial through obedience to the commandments of God (1 QS. 1:1-20).

It is beyond doubt that belial is the leader of the realm of falsehood and evil (cf. the Levite sayings and curses in 1 QS. 1:21-24; 2:4-10; 1 QM. 13:4-6) [27]. However, the apocalyptic fate of belial and his reign were everlasting destruction (1 QM. 1:5-7; 2 QMelch. 9; 1 QM. 18:1). The "war rule" describes the final battle between the "sons of light" and the "sons of darkness". God himself created belial for destruction:

But Belial, the Angel of Malevolence, Thou hast created for the Pit; his rule is in Darkness and his purpose is to bring about wickedness and iniquity (1 QM. 13:11-12).

It is important to note that the conflict or rivalry between God and belial was not about God's throne, but God's people (the community of Qumran). God himself, therefore, was not directly involved in the battle with belial. God's side was commanded by his "Angel", the "Prince of Light" (Michael), or even Melchizedech (cf. 2 QMelch. 9-13) - also called the "Angel of his truth"

4 QCat. A, f. 12-13 col.1,7; cf. the remarks of Laubscher 1972:46-51).

We may then conclude our remarks on the Qumran evidence as follows: Although a homogeneous picture of belial does not emerge, the impression is irresistible that belial was the personified representation of all evil. Belial and his forces (including historical enemies) were the main threat to the community abiding by God's commandments.

Human conduct was, however, not interpreted as being determined by belial and his forces. The individual had a choice whether to abide by the community's rules or to follow belial. Human responsibility in ethical and religious behaviour was still maintained in Qumran, and was in particular evident from the notion of the "voluntary" (cf. Von der Osten-Sacken 1969: 219-220).

The second main effort to explain the existence of evil is intertwined with the notion of an expulsion of a number of angels because of various trespasses committed in the heavenly realm.

The Ethiopic apocalypse of Enoch [28] includes a narrative about the fallen angels, their intercourse with earthly women (cf. Gn. 6) and their corruption of the human race (Gn. 6:36). Different names, such as Semyaz and Azazel [29], were given to the leader of the fallen angels. Satan appears for the first time in Book 2 (chs. 37-71) and specifically with regard to the final judgement of the "Righteous One" over the fallen angels and their adherents. Chains were prepared for satan, the leader of the evil spirits (chs. 53:3) [30]. In chapter 54:5-6 the armies of Azazel are depicted as messengers of satan who led astray those who dwell upon earth. Chapter 64 tells us that the fallen angels had revealed the heavenly hidden secrets to the people and caused them to commit sin [31]. The members of the evil dominion were actively involved in man's trespasses. A form of causality had thus begun to replace human responsibility in ethical conduct. The origin of evil was by now directly related with the primordial rebellion of heavenly beings against God.

In the Jubilees [32] (a kind of midrash of Gn. 1 - Ex. 12) it is explicitly stated that demons were responsible for the corruption of the sons of Noah (ch. 10:1-2). After listening to the prayer of Noah, God decided to expel these demons, who were actually created to tempt and to lead people astray. The "Prince of the Spirits", Mastemah, pleaded with God to show mercy and to exclude but a tenth from the verdict. This was granted and so it came about that a tenth of the evil spirits reunited on earth to serve satan (ch. 10:3-11). They would remain on earth and would be responsible for the sin and impurity of man (ch. 11:3-6) until

the time of final judgement, when there would be no satan or evil spirits (ch. 23:29).

Thus one may conclude from the contents of the Jubilees that God allowed evil, but was not directly responsible for it.

The apostacy of certain angels is only incidentally referred to in the Testaments of the twelve patriarchs (cf. e.g. TNaf. 3:1-5; TRub. 5:1-6).

In the Life of Adam and Eve (cf. Kautzsch 1962:506-528), dating from the first century B.C., one encounters a detailed narrative of Adam and Eve's expulsion from Paradise and of Satan's downfall. After Adam and Eve are driven out of Paradise, they decide to do penance by standing in the water, Adam in the Jordan river and Eve in the Tigris. Once again satan approached Eve, this time disguised as an angel. Satan persuades Eve to stop her mourning and lamenting. Together they go to Adam. When Adam sees satan accompanying Eve, he asks satan why he does not leave them alone [33]. Adam is surprised to hear Satan's account of the events: "Because of you I have been cast off from there (i.e. heaven)" (par. 13). Satan was expelled from God's presence and the heavenly realm of angels, because he refused to adore Adam, created in God's image. Consequently he envies Adam and will in future not hesitate to cause Adam's disobedience (par. 12-17).

It is important to note that this document is reminiscent of the first attempt in history of the reception of Genesis 3 to relate the fall of man with the activity of satan in a causal fashion [34].

In Second Enoch [35] (dating from the first century A.D.) Enoch sees the gigantic Grigori on his journeys in the fifth sphere of heaven: "These are the Grigori, who turned aside from the Lord, 200 myriads, together with their prince Satanail" (cf. ch. 18:3 and 7:1-5). The text elaborates further on the saga of the origin of giants, comparable to the account of Genesis 6 (ch. 18:4-8). Satanail is explicitly called a devil, because of his expulsion from the circle of angels. Satan's condemnation by God led him to scheme against Adam by corrupting Eve (ch. 31:3-6). Contrary to the notion that satan causes evil as is stated in the text Life of Adam and Eve, human responsibility is still maintained in this text: The first human couple was cursed by God on account of their nescience (ch. 31:7).

5. CONCLUSION

In the Old Testament and Jewish writings up to the New Testament period there exist no uniformity in the conception of the archde-

vil (satan/belial).

Jewish writings from the second century B.C. and onwards, portray an increasing awareness of satan/belial and the activity of evil spirits.

One may postulate the thesis that the establishment of a comprehensive dualism in world-view and religious belief in the post-exilic period forced new explanations of the origin of evil, without endangering the monotheistic belief in an all-good God. It has been shown that two main-stream solutions had been given in the course of Jewish traditions: firstly, that God created both spirits of goodness and evil; secondly, that a number of angels were expelled from heaven because of hubris and that they deliberately caused evil as an act of retaliation.

The latter solution also reflects signs of a replacement of human responsibility for human depravity.

The textual evidence is not consistent about satan and does not compel one to believe in his existence.

In the Old Testament itself no conception of an archdevil is to be found.

FOOTNOTES

1. It is particularly evident from the study of Burger (1982) in which he uncritically, and without scrutiny, forces the traditional Christian presuppositions about satan into the textual evidence from the various cultures of the Ancient Near East. Leahy (1975:11-32) also unconvincingly tries to synthesise the Biblical references to angels, spirits and "satan" with an alleged angelology. In consequence the Old Testament evidence is interpreted by the parameters of much later Christian tradition. The same assumption permeates the comprehensive study of De Bondt (no date of publication is indicated) of satan.
2. This view is strongly emphasised by the leading Sumeriologist Jacobson (1976:97); "Since human society is not the only structure based on authority and command (the natural world is as well), all things and forces in the polity that is the universe conform to An's will. He is the power that lifts existence out of chaos and anarchy and makes it an organized whole". Cf. Janowski (1984:19): "Diese alltägliche Erfahrung des Antagonismus von Kosmos und Chaos war mit der Einsicht verknüpft, dass die empirische Welt als Manifestation und Symbol über ihre vordergrundige Wirklichkeit hinausweist, dass also der Lebensraum des Menschen eine von Gott ordnender, schöpferischer Macht bewahrte, aber zugleich vom Chaos und seinen Exponenten bedrohte Welt ist"
3. The Sumerian term for sin (nam-tag) literally means "an interference in the divine order", cf. Von Soden (1985:176-177) and Jacobsen (1976:12-13).
4. It is particularly evident from the incantation literature and more specifically explicit in the invocatory sections, cf. Mayer 1976:40ff.
5. The main good ones were šedu, rabišu and utukku/ištaru.
6. In the Sumerian myth "The Death of Dumuzi" (cf. Kramer 1972:158) one finds a colourful description of the demons (galla):
The are inhuman creatures who
"Eat no food, know not water,
Eat no sprinkled flour,
Drink not libated water,
Accept no gifts that mollify
Sate not with pleasure the wife's bosom
Kiss not the children, the sweet ..."

7. The most harmful ones were Etemmu (spirit of death), Lamaštu (the chief of small children), Šebettu (the seven evil spirits) and Wardat lili (the demon of the storm).
8. The demons could attack someone without reason, cf. Keel (1972:68-72), Von Soden (1985:189-192) and Oppenheim (1977:199-206).
9. Compare the statement of Oppenheim (1977:200): "The four protective 'spirits' (i.e. ilu, ištaru, lamassu, šedu) in Mesopotamia are individualized and mythologized carriers of certain specific psychological aspects of one basic phenomenon, the realization of the self, the personality, as it relates the ego to the outside world and, at the same time, separate one from the other."
10. The demon bes was portrayed as the guardian of one sleeping.
11. Compare Keel (1972:73) for a description of the demon of the underworld.
12. Compare also Haag (1974:172). Lindström (1983:239) denies that any traces of divine pancausality are to be found in the Old Testament. Even the prologue of Job is excluded from such a notion. Such a statement is an exaggeration of the factual evidence. One can, for example, easily infer from the prologue of Job that God at least allows Job's suffering.
13. Compare Keel (1977:73), for the depiction of the so-called "goatspirit" found at Megiddo and which is often related to Azazel.
14. Unger (1952:9) strongly objects to the "dangerous procedure" of a philological treatment of the textual evidence about demonology. He traces the origin of evil and Old Testament demonology back to the fall of "Lucifer" (Is. 14:12-20). Apart from his predisposition and dogmatic approach, the assumption that Isaiah 14:12-20 provides evidence about the origins of Old Testament demonology (cf. 15) results from a misreading of the narrative symbols of Isaiah 14 and its metaphoric thought-structure. The fall of Babylon (portrayed in Is. 14) has nothing to do with angels in revolt.
15. It is also noteworthy that the LXX translates all the verbs štn in the Psalms with endiabállein (to deceive).
16. Horst (1969:14) rejects the idea that "satan" represents an accuser in Job. He prefers to view him as an "oppositor".

17. De Bondt's (s.a.:37; 45-60; 112-115) exposition of Job 1-2 clearly presupposes the pseudepigraphic narratives of the fallen angels and consequently he maintains "satan" in Job as the archdevil.
18. The notion of a heavenly council is well-attested in Canaanite religion and is also reflected in the Old Testament, for example Psalm 29:1, 82:1, 6, 89:6. Compare also Gese (1970:100-102) and Schliisske (1973:15-78).
19. For detailed discussions compare Hanson (1979:209, 401, Collins (1975:218-234), Koch (1982:21-24), Schmidt (1976:252-302) and Gese (1973:20-49). Recently Lambert (1978) argued in favour of the Babylonian genre of concise analytic history (in practice from the late seventh century up to the Hellenistic period) as the most probable formal background of the apocalyptic style.
20. Satan does not appear in all late Jewish writings, for example Jesus Sirach, Psalms of Solomon, Judith, the Maccabean books and the Fourth Book of Esra.
21. Ahriman brings death into the world, he causes sickness, evil spirits are under his command and he is the father of lies; compare further Haag (1975:263-269) and Von der Osten-Sacken (1969:239-240).
22. Maštēmah or šar hammaštēmah (prince of enmity) are also found, compare for example Job 10:8, 11:5 and 17:16.
23. Compare also Judges 19:22, 1 Samuel 2:12, Proverbs 16:27, Job 34:18, Psalms 41:8, 2 Samuel 22:5 and Nahum 2:1.
24. The Septuagint normally renders it with paranómos, anomía or aphon.
25. Compare also the synopsis of the Qumran evidence by Huppenbauer (1959:81-89) and Von der Osten-Sacken (1969:73-78).
26. Von der Osten-Sacken (1969:62-72; 239-240) convincingly argues in favour of the thesis that the oldest form of the dualistic tradition of the community of Qumran is to be found in the War Rule. It is further maintained that the historical Sitz im Leben is most likely to be the Maccabean period.
27. In the Hodajoth (The Hymns) the notion of rival powers against God exists, but these forces are not personified, compare Huppenbauer (1959:84).

28. Its origin can be dated between the second century B.C. and the first century A.D. For the English translation, cf. Charlesworth (1983:6-89).
29. Most scholars agree that the episode of Azazel (ch. 10:4-8) was not originally included in the narrative, compare Hanson (1977:220).
30. The final destruction of the wicked is described as an eternal punishment in the Sheol (chs. 91-105).
31. Hanson (1977:203ff.) convincingly demonstrated that the mythopoeic elements of the Enoch narrative differ from and modify the story of Genesis 6. He further demonstrates that the Enoch narrative conveys elements paralleled in Ancient Near Eastern myths (illustrated from Hurrian, Canaanite and Accadian myths). Compare also the discussion of the same topic by Nickelsburg (1977:383-405).
32. The original text dates from the second century B.C. Compare Kautzsch (1962:31-119) for a brief commentary and the translation.
33. It is the first textual account from which it is evident that the snake, responsible for the temptation in paradise, was in fact satan himself (cf. par. 9-11). For a résumé of the reception of the paradise snake in history, compare Haag (1974:247-262).
34. This notion is also worked out in Eve's account of the events in Paradise as described in the Apocalypse of Moses. Compare Riessler (1984:139-155) for the translation.
35. Compare Charlesworth (1983:92-221) for further background and translation of the text.

WORKS CONSULTED

- Albertz, R. 1978. Persönliche Frömmigkeit und offizielle Religion: Religionsinterner Pluralismus in Israel und Babilon. Stuttgart: Calwer.
- Burger, W.A. 1982. Satan en die sataniese magte in die Ou-Testament. Doctoral thesis, University of the Orange Free State, Bloemfontein.
- Charlesworth, J.H. 1983. The Old Testament pseudepigrapha. New York: Doubleday.
- Collins, J.J. 1975. The court-tales in Daniel and the development of apocalyptic. JBL 9, 218-234.
- De Bondt, A. (s.a.). De satan. Baarn: Bosch & Keuning.
- Eliade, M. et al. 1977. Die Schöpfungsmythen: Ägypter, Summer, Hurriter, Hethiter, Kanaaniter und Israeliten. Darmstadt: Benziger.
- Gagen, J. 1983. Adam, the serpent, and satan: Recognition and restoration. Milton Quarterly 5, 116-121.
- Gaster, T.H. 1982. s.v. "Satan" ktl. IDB.
- Gese, H. et al. 1970. Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Gese, H. 1973. Anfang und Ende der Apokalyptik, dargestellt am Zacharjabuch. ZThK NF 70, 20-49.
- Haag, H. et al. 1974. Teufelsglaube. Tübingen: Katzman.
- Hanson, P. 1979. The dawn of apocalyptic. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Hanson, P. 1977. Rebellion in heaven, Azazel, and euhemeristic heroes in 1 Enoch 6-11. JBL 96, 195-233.
- Height, D.F. 1974. Devils. International journal for the philosophy of religion 5, 152-156.
- Hornung, E. 1967. Einführung in die Agyptologie. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

- Horst, F. 1969. Hiob. Neukirchen: Neukirchener. (BK 16/1).
- Horst, F. 1962. s.v. "Teufel" im AT, Judentum und NT ktl. RGG 6, 705-707.
- Huppenbauer, H.W. 1959. Belial in den Qumrantexten. ThZ 15, 81-88.
- Janowski, B. 1984. Rettungsgewissheit und Epiphanie des Heils: Das Motiv der Hilfe Gottes "am Morgen" im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient. Habilitationsschrift. Universität Tübingen.
- Jacobsen, T. 1976. The treasures of darkness: a history of Mesopotamian religion. London: Yale University Press.
- Jennings, F.C. 1975. Satan: his person, work, place and destiny. New Jersey: Neptune.
- Kautzsch, E. 1962. Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments, 2 vols. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Keel, O. 1977. Die Welt der altorientalischen Bildsymbolik und das Alte Testament am Beispiel der Psalmen. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Koch, K. 1982. Apokalyptik. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. (WdF 365.)
- Kramer, S.N. 1972. The Sumerians, their history, culture and character. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lambert, W.G. 1978. The background of Jewish apocalyptic. London: Athlone Press.
- Laubscher, F. du T. 1972. God's angel of truth and Melchizedek; A note on 2 QMelch 13b. JSJ 3, 46-51.
- Leahy, F.S. 1975. Satan cast out: a study in Biblical demonology. Illinois: Banner of truth trust.
- Lindström, F. 1983. God and the origin of evil: a contextual analysis of alleged monistic evidence in the Old Testament. Lund: Gleerup.
- Mayer, W. 1976. Untersuchungen zur Formensprache der Babilonischen Gebetsbeschwörungen. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.

Mensching, G. 1962. s.v. "Teufel". Religionsgeschichtlich ktl. RGG 704-705.

Nel, P.J. 1982. Israelite wisdom in the Persian period: the motivation of its ethos. OTWSA 25, 130-149.

Nielsburg, G.W.E. 1977. Apocalyptic and myth in 1 Enoch 6-12. JBL 96/3, 383-405.

Oppenheim, A.L. 1977. Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a dead civilization. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Philip, W. 1962. s.v. "Teufel". Dogmatisch ktl. RGG 6, 710-712.

Pritchard, J.B. 1969. Ancient Near Eastern texts relating to the Old Testament. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ricoeur, P. 1969. The symbolism of evil. Boston: Beacon Press.

Riessler, P. 1984. Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel. Freiburg: Verlag F.H. Kerle.

Russell, J.B. 1981. Satan: the early Christian tradition. London: Cornell University Press.

Schliske, W. 1973. Gottessöhne und Gottessohn im Alten Testament. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Schmidt, J.M. 1973. Die Jüdische Apokaliptik. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag. (BWANT 5/17.)

Unger, M.F. 1952. Biblical demonology. Illinois: s.n.

Von Rad, G. 1935. s.v. "Die alttestamentliche Satanvorstellung" ktl. ThWNT 4.

Von der Osten-Sacken, P. 1969. Gott und belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in der Texten aus Qumran. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck.

Von Soden, W. 1985. Einführung in der Altorientalistik. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Vorländer, H. 1975. Mein Gott: Die Vorstellungen vom persönlichen Gott im Alten Orient und im alten Testament. (AOAT 23).

Vermes, G. 1975. The dead sea scrolls in English. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Wanck, G. 1976. s.v. "Satan" kt1. THAT.

Professor P.J. Nel teaches Semitic Languages at the University of the Orange Free State.

Dept. of Semitic Languages
University of the Orange Free State
P.O. Box 339
Bloemfontein
9300

DEMONOLOGY IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES

A.G. van Aarde

Der Teufel, der ist alt.
(Goethe)

Christ is the visible likeness of the invisible God. He is the first-born Son, superior to all created things. For through him God created everything in heaven and on earth,
the seen and
the unseen things,
including spiritual powers, lords, rulers, and authorities. God created the whole universe through him and for him.
(Col. 1:15-16)

You are doomed! You call evil good and call good evil. You turn darkness into light and light into darkness. You make what is bitter sweet, and what is sweet you make bitter.
(Is. 5:20)

1. INTRODUCTION

Theologians are more than once behind the times - they sometimes have no option. Theologians have to deal with questions created by the development in human thought and natural sciences. Theological discussions, therefore, often reflect aspects of new paradigms of thought. This had been the case since Copernicus (1473-1543) and Galileo (1564-1662) who inaugurated the replacement of the second-century Ptolemaic view of the universe by the Newtonian world-view. As a result of this change in world-view many people no longer believed in the existence of the devil. And again many a theologian followed suit. However, the situation has again changed, but as yet no one is exactly certain to what changes in world-view this should be ascribed. Demonology has become the subject of lively debate and, unfortunately, a cult - as it was in mediaeval times. But there is a difference. People resisted the devil then; now they believe in the devil.

What a difference a decade makes! Ten years ago, fifteen years ago Satan was pronounced dead, and every theologian of any international stature was rushing forward, volunteering to be a pallbearer at the funeral That is the way it was ten years ago, fifteen years ago But today! What a dramatic swing of the pendulum! Today, it is no overstatement to say that there is no topic as widely discussed, enthusiastically endorsed, and as generally recognized as true as Satan And the professional theologians, late as usual, are limping along at the rear, trying to catch up,

at last taking Satan seriously themselves. One learned leader of the church after another suddenly finds himself filled with prophetic insight and under the obligation to announce that Satan is alive again (Kallas 1975:9-12).

When a theologian, like a traffic inspector, arrives after an event, he describes the situation and distinguishes between good and evil. If the theologian is a Biblical scholar, the theologian ought to perform the descriptive and normative tasks in the light of Biblical testimony. Because the theologian is a scientist, it should present no problem that the face of the devil has changed between Biblical times and the present. However, science does not exonerate the theologian from distinguishing between good and evil.

My thesis is embodied in the following words of Kallas (1975:13):

Modern demonology is negative, an escapist abandonment of the real world in which we find ourselves, a bailing out, a capitulation of our power, a corruption of our convictions. Modern demonology is directly contrary to the New Testament proclamation that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow and every tongue confess, both on the earth and under the earth, that Jesus is Lord!

I have said that my thesis is embodied in the above-mentioned negative evaluation of modern demonology. This thesis has now to be worked out. Firstly, against the background of the proclamation of the New Testament, it must be demonstrated that believing in the devil is a form of escapism. Secondly, it must be shown that to believe in the devil is in direct contrast with believing against the devil, and that the New Testament demands the latter attitude.

Modern demonology is escapism because it is a socio-religious and psychological phenomenon where man does not escape his misery through faith in God, but flees from God to find shelter in his own miserable heart. Apparently, this is what Karl Barth meant when he referred to evil as das Nichtige (Weber 1967:141-146). This does not, however, mean that evil is simply "nothing" or "inaction". On close inspection evil is always manifested as the recalcitrant force in man which opposes the superior power of God's word.

My contribution chiefly deals with both the origin of the figure "satan" and the associated demonology in the New Testament.

2. THE ORIGIN OF THE FIGURE "SATAN" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Demonology in New Testament times had the same background as that of Late Judaism, when the devil began to appear in the Bible. The

appearance of the devil in the Bible coincided with Ancient Israel's shift from a national-religious hope towards a cosmic eschatology.

However, "satan" preceded the devil (see Bultmann 1956:97). During Old Testament times (with one exception) "satan" had not yet become the devil. When the devil appeared in the Bible, via the altered eschatology and worldview which resulted from the influence of Parseism on the Jewish nation, he had many different names. "Satan", meaning either "enemy" or "accuser", was but one. These are also the Old Testament meanings for the term šāṭān.

Although the monotheism of Ancient Israel did not prevent the adoption of the mythological cosmology and demonology of the Semitic Umwelt, the age-old dualism of good and evil was not associated with the dualism of good-god and bad-god.

Yahwism in Ancient Israel saw the consequences of "good" and "evil" (such as prosperity and ill-fortune) as the work of the one God (Sabourin 1974:142). Yahwism did not, however, identify God with evil. Man himself is to blame that he is overtaken by the consequences of evil.

Was sich in anderen Religionen auf verschiedene Götter verteilt, wird in Jahwe vereinigt. Das meint keine nachträgliche Eintragung dämonischer Züge in Jahwe; vielmehr hat Jahwe alle Wirksamkeit an sich gezogen. Seine alleinige Kausalität ist in seinem Anspruch auf ausschliessliche Verehrung begründet; und auch der Mensch ist dem unterworfen, unbeschadet seiner Eigenverantwortlichkeit (Stendebach 1975:2).

The view that God is both wrathful and merciful is, in the words of Otto (see Stendebach 1975:3), the confession of "das Mysterium des ganz anderen". It is possible that the ambivalence in this religious experience created the milieu in Late Judaism, into which the satan figure, under Persian influence, appeared in 1 Chronicles 21:1.

The term šāṭān does not function as a proper name in Zechariah 3:1 and Job 1:6; neither does it oppose God; it opposes man. Its translation in the Septuagint as ho diábolos should not be interpreted as referring to a metaphysical figure and personal opponent of God. This also applies to the satan figure in 1 Chronicles 21:1. The personification of satan in the above Old Testament texts coincides with the substitution of a cosmic view of the future for Ancient Israel's national expectation .

The nature of Israel's expectation, in its traditional form, was

nationalistic. The re-establishment of the Kingdom of David under the leadership of a messianic figure was eagerly anticipated. This messiah was not seen as a supernatural liberator. However, the situation has changed. In a document written in the first century before Christ, namely the Psalms of Solomon, a different messianic figure is to be found. The war waged by this messiah, is no longer a traditional war. He will slay his enemies with the "words from his mouth". According to Bultmann (1956:96-97) this messiah is symbolic, figuring within the context of the theocratic ideals of the priesthood and the legalism of the scribes.

However, the traditional national-religious expectation of Ancient Israel developed not only into an idealistic messianism. After the destruction of the temple, God, who had had his earthly home in Zion, became distant. A cosmic eschatology gradually appeared in Biblical as well as in intertestamental literature. The Bible does not have as its object the putting forward of theories about the structure of the universe. Neither is the worldview that may well be deduced, straightforward (Kingsbury 1975:133). Normally God's heavenly dwelling is taken to be somewhere above the earth on which man dwells. The dwelling-place of the dead is called both "Hades" and "Gehenna", and is below the earth. However, in the letter to the Ephesians, the earth is referred to as being the lowest part of the universe. Satan and the evil spirits are presented as being in the air, directly above the earth (Conzelmann 1969:16). Therefore, the place of punishment was believed to be above, and not below, the earth.

With the substitution of a cosmic eschatology for a national-religious expectation, and with the idea that God had become a distant God, all kinds of intermediary and substitutionary figures appeared in the literature of Late Judaism. The origin and growth of apocalyptic literature are related to these developments, under the Babylonian and Persian influences on the Jewish nation. This mythological and cosmic eschatology in apocalyptic literature, was integrated in various ways with the Jews' national-religious expectation. The failure of nationalism led to a pessimistic dualism. Nevertheless, the monotheistic belief that the one God created the world was not abandoned.

The earth, scene of misery, illness, death, sin and violence, is ravaged by the evil spirits, lead by satan, resisting the sovereignty of God (Bultmann 1956:97). A state of war exists between the kingdom of darkness and the kingdom of light. The kingdom of darkness is not static and everlasting. One can therefore be freed from this kingdom by such means as magic formulae, rites, and asceticism. Albert Schweitzer (1967) is one of the earlier historians of religion that pointed out the particular influence

of Iranian Zoroastrianism / Zervanism on the Jewish future expectation. This religion was an ethical monotheism with the conflict between good and evil as its point of departure. The triumph of good over evil brings forth a kingdom where everything happens according to the will of the good god. This dualism led to the supposition that the good god has a heavenly court and that evil has a principal god, Zervan (Stendebach 1975:5). Earthly misery and death are caused by evil. The destruction of evil precedes both the establishment of the good god's kingdom, and the resurrection from the dead.

Stendebach justly warns against over-emphasising Iranian Zervanism's influence on the demonology of Jewish apocalypticism. Many themes with Iranian analogies, can be understood from Old Testament presuppositions. Presentations of the holy war and the day of the Lord are examples. It is important to realise that the satan figure in Biblical literature is developed within the context of demons in the Old Testament; this development is linked to the development of a cosmic eschatology against a background of disappointed national-religious expectations.

Initially, a distinction was made between "demons", which were responsible for physical disorders, and "evil spirits", which tempted man to egotism and self-idolisation. Both these functions were ascribed to God in monotheistic Yahwism (cf. resp. Ex. 12:23 and 1 Sm. 16:15, 23). In chapter 3:8 of the apocryphal Tobit, this distinction between "demons" and "evil spirits" is dispensed with. The terms are used interchangeably and the functions can no longer be distinguished from one another. Tobit 3:8 refers to an "evil demon" (ponëron daimónion) as the adversary/destroyer of man. This Jewish document is under Persian influence. The tendency observed in this document is probably the reason that the terms "demon" (daimónion) and "evil spirit" (pneûma akátharton) are used interchangeably in the New Testament. The latter term appears only once in the Septuagint (Zch. 13:2) and implies ritual impurity. In both Hellenistic and Tannaitic Judaism this expression, together with other terms (see Sabourin 1974:145), began to refer to "demons". In Luke 4:33 the possessed man from Capernaum is described as a "man... possessed by a devil [a demon - AG v A], an unclean spirit". In Greek it literally reads "a spirit of an impure demon" (= pneûma daimoníou akathártou). In Jewish as well as Christian literature the satan figure (ho diábolos) has become the evil leader of all the demons (see Sabourin 1974:148). The Hellenistic-Jewish author of the Wisdom of Solomon, in chapter 2:24, identified this figure with the snake of the Garden of Eden. This tradition, in conjunction with Old Testament mythology about the seamonsters Rahab and Leviathan (Ps. 74:13-14; 89:10), who personify the evil power of primitive chaos, is echoed in Revelation 12:7-9:

Then war broke out in heaven. Michael and his angels [see Dn. 10:3; Jude 9 - AG v A] wage war upon the dragon. The dragon and his angels fought, but they had not the strength to win, and no foothold was left them in heaven. So the great dragon was thrown down, that serpent of old that led the whole world astray, whose name is Satan, or the Devil - thrown down to the earth, and his angels with him.

The Tannaitic Jewish literature describes this war as between two angelic powers. The Qumran literature (especially the Community Rule) presented this cosmic struggle as a war between the "prince of darkness", the diabolical tempter of the people of the light, and the "prince of light" (see Sabourin 1974:148-149). In the New Testament (such as in the extract from Revelation mentioned above) this cosmic struggle refers back to the creation passage in Genesis 1, as well as to the first sin recorded in Genesis 3. Two further explicit traces of this mythology in the New Testament are to be found in Johannine literature:

Your father is the devil and you [the unbelieving Jews - AG v A] choose to carry out your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning [anthropoktónos en ap' archēs - AG v A], and is not rooted in the truth; there is no truth in him. When he tells a lie he is speaking his own language, for he is a liar and the father of lies (Jn. 8:44).

My children, do not be misled: it is the man who does right who is righteous, as God is righteous; the man who sins is a child of the devil, for the devil has been a sinner from the first [ap' archēs - AG v A]; and the Son of God appeared for the very purpose of undoing the devil's work..(1 Jn. 3:7-8).

In the only instance in the Old Testament where the term "satan" is a proper name (1 Chr. 21:1), "satan" features as a kind of angel figure in the service of God. It is this angel motif which was strongly emphasised in the demonology of both the Christian and Late Jewish literature. Certain elements of this motif also appear in Revelation 12:7-9. The most significant aspect in this connection is probably the motif of the "fallen angel". In evidence, 2 Peter 2:4 and Jude 6 may be quoted:

God did not spare the angels who sinned, but consigned them to the dark pits of hell, where they are reserved for judgement (2 Pt. 2:4).

Remember too the angels, how some of them were not content to keep the dominion given to them but abandoned their proper home; and God has reserved them for judgement on the great Day, bound beneath the darkness in everlasting chains (Jude 6).

In Genesis 6:1-4, the presence of giants on earth and the theme of the deluge were related to the conviction that certain angels had sinned. Evidence of this can be found in parts of the Qumran and Late Jewish writings as well as in 2 Peter 2:4 and in Jude 6. In this connection Jude 6 is the only passage in the New Testament which links the origin of satan/the devil with this Jewish speculation. Certain writings of the early church, for example the second-century Pseudo-Clement, hand down this tradition. This writing, however, also contains a different interpretation of the origin of the "evil prince". Besides the above-mentioned Jewish speculation, Pseudo-Clement's interpretation concerns a combination of the basic elements of nature. According to Pseudo-Clement a new combination will emerge and evil will become good. Origines, on the other hand, has a completely different view of the origin of satan (see Sabourin 1974:155-156). He relates it to Lucifer, referring to Isaiah 14:12-15 and to the king of Tyrus mentioned in Ezekiel 28:12-19.

To summarise the origin of the figure "satan" in the New Testament (and contemporary literature), I quote Lindström (1983:241):

... the Biblical texts provide no grounds for generalizing either one way or the other about the origin of evil.

3. DEMONOLOGY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

In common with the controversy surrounding the origin of the satan figure, demonology in the New Testament is an amalgamation of the various views of that time. In general, apart from the mythological animal figures, the following can be distinguished: the commander of evil (the devil), malevolent angels and demons, and an impersonal power.

3.1 The commander of evil

Writers of the New Testament use different names for satan (see Yates 1980:97-105): "the devil" (Eph. 6:11), "satan" (Lk. 10:18), "beelzebub" and "prince of devils" (Mk. 3:22), "belial" (2 Cor. 6:15), "prince of this world" (Jn. 12:31), "the god of this passing age" (2 Cor. 4:4), "the commander of the spiritual powers of the air" (Eph. 2:2), "the Antichrist" (1 Jn. 2:18), "the Enemy" (2 Th. 2:3) [1], "the dragon" (Rv. 12:13) and "authorities" and "the superhuman forces of evil in the heavens" (Eph. 6:12). The latter refer to cosmic powers. They are among similar collective terms, found in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline writings (see Lee 1970), which imply the attempt to separate God's children from the love of God that is in Christ Jesus (see Rm. 8:38-39). Other terms and references are: "forces"

(Rm. 8:38), "sovereignties, authorities and powers" (Col. 1:16), "many 'gods' and many 'lords'" (1 Cor. 8:5), "any title of sovereignty that can be named" (Eph. 1:21), "every knee... in heaven, on earth, and in the depths" (Phlp. 2:10) and "elemental spirits of the universe" (Gl. 4:3).

All the above words and expressions refer, in one way or another, to the concept of "devil". Russell (1977:256) identifies nine important characteristics of this concept in the New Testament:

- He is the personification of evil.
- He causes physical indisposition by either attacking men's bodies or taking possession of them.
- He tempts people to sin, either to destroy them or to make use of them in his spiritual war against God.
- He denounces sinners and punishes them.
- He is the leader of a host of evil spirits, fallen angels or demons.
- He possesses most of the evil characteristics of the subversive, classic demons of nature.
- He was the ruler of this world from pre-creation until the advent of God's kingdom.
- He was involved in continuous conflict with God before the kingdom of God was established.
- At the end of the world he will be conquered and destroyed by God.

These characteristics basically boil down to the fact that the devil is God's opponent and is doing his best to thwart Jesus' work of salvation (see Sabourin 1974:150-151). This is evident from the reports of his temptation of Jesus (Mk. 1; Mt. 4; Lk. 4), his instigation of Judas to betray Jesus (Lk. 22:3 and Jn. 13:27), his opposition to the work of the disciples (Lk. 22:32), his hindering of missionary work (1 Th. 2:18), the report of Elymas, the sorcerer, where he was the power behind the idolatry and sorcery of paganism (Ac. 13:10) and also in his last attempts with the aid of the so-called "wicked man", on the day of the Lord (2 Th. 2:9).

3.2 Malevolent angels and demons

Demons, represented as malevolent angels, are not very prevalent in the New Testament. The term "angels" generally has a positive connotation and refers to "messengers of God". However, in Jewish apocalyptic literature it frequently referred to "messengers of satan". Unlike most instances in the gospels and in the Acts of the apostles, there are, for the greater part, no positive references to "angels" in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline literature (see Yates 1980:98). In 1 Corinthians 6:3 it is stated that the faithful will pass judgement on the "angels";

in Romans 8:38 it is mentioned that "angels" will not be able to separate the chosen from God or from his love through Jesus Christ; Galatians 4:19 states that it was "angels" that gave the enslaving law to the people; in Colossians 1:18 "angels", together with other cosmic forces, are mentioned as a collective category for the "domain of darkness" (Col. 1:13) which was created in the beginning, subject to the Son of God.

Our discussion on demons has led us to the reports of exorcism in the gospels. In this study, however, I do not intend to analyse the literary form and function of the exorcisms as microtexts within the macrotexts of the different gospels. Only two aspects are touched on. In the first place, it should be noted that in the exorcisms (Biblical or non-Biblical) it is emphasised that man has been delivered to the demon and that the exorcist, who has recourse to the same means and incantations, enjoys supremacy over the demon. Secondly, reports on exorcism in the gospels should not be interpreted in isolation from the full context of the gospel concerned, or from the dominant perspective of its message.

From the holistic context of the synoptic gospels, demonology has a particular function in each gospel. From the Gospels of Mark and Matthew these can be explained as follows:

The aim of the Gospel of Mark is the pastoral education of the congregation of Jesus regarding the urgency of following Jesus correctly in the light of the second coming. To illustrate this, the Gospel of Mark states that Jesus Christ as the Son of God had to suffer, according to the will of God, and that Jewish leaders were instrumental in this suffering. Through his resurrection, however, Jesus proclaims that true life follows suffering, which culminated in the crucifixion. This is essentially the reason why the reader of Mark finds it significant to follow the suffering Son of God, even if it implies that the reader has to give up earthly security. To follow Christ in this way means that the kingdom of God has become a reality in this life. In other words, the way of Jesus is a way to the cross, which guarantees true life. The way of the congregation follows that of Jesus. In effect, the proclamation of the kingdom of God to the congregation is inseparable from the appeal to follow Jesus, and this means following in spite of suffering. The actions of satan and the demons in the Gospel of Mark should be interpreted against the background of this suffering. Only then will it become clear why Peter, for example, is called "satan" in Mark 8:33. The reason is that Peter sees the way of Jesus as an object of shame and embarrassment, and therefore recoils from it. According to Mark such an attitude is diabolic, because it does not respect God's will, but only man's will.

The theme of Peter's equation with satan is also found in the Gospel of Matthew. However, because of Matthew's particular perspective, the function completely differs. The one-way denomination in the Gospel of Mark (Peter confesses Jesus as Christ) is a two-way denomination in the Gospel of Matthew (Peter confesses Jesus to be Christ and Son of God): Jesus calls Simon a rock (Mt. 16:13-20), but also the stumbling block (Mt. 16:21-23). Thus Peter is called "satan" in the Gospel of Matthew, because he does not consider God's will, but is only concerned with what men want (Mt. 16:23). Evil was presented as "lawlessness" by Matthew because it was associated with "false prophets" (the Jewish leaders and hypocritical Christians), who did not interpret the Torah as Jesus, the "incarnated Torah" (Gibbs 1968). Matthew writes that God left his domain, the kingdom of heaven, to come down to earth. In the Old Testament the temple was God's dwelling-place, but it had deteriorated as a result of the actions of the leaders of the Jewish people. God instead became God with us in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who is "greater than the temple". The forgiveness of sins for the Jewish multitude especially, but also for heathen, was the purpose of Christ's mission. He achieved this by completely obeying the will of his Father. Theoretically, the "will of the Father" comprises the "law and the prophets" (the scriptures of those times) and, in practice, it is realised when the fundamental demand for love is heeded. On the one hand, Jesus' obedience amounted to compassion for both the Jews and the heathen, such as when they were ill and hungry. On the other, it included the willingness to lay down his life as ransom for many, Jews and heathen alike - the New Testament community. Although he had already chosen disciples at the beginning of his work among the Jews and the heathen, and he had told them that they would assist him in "catching men", their mission on earth in reality started with Jesus' resurrection. The disciples, and also the reader of the Gospel of Matthew, are commanded to learn and to teach; this implies an understanding of the "law and the prophets" as the will of the Father, interpreted by and embodied in by Jesus himself. The lasting presence of the resurrected Jesus as Emmanuel, amongst his congregation until the end of the world, is manifested in the obedience of the disciples, converting others to do God's will in accordance with the way Jesus lived. If the disciples perceived and fulfilled this vocation, they would be like a scribe who has become a pupil in the kingdom of heaven (Mt. 13:52). However, the disciples in the Gospel of Matthew tend to associate themselves with the formalism of the scribes and the Pharisees. The work of the devil is, in this sense, manifested in the Gospel of Matthew. In this context, the parable of the darnel among the wheat in Matthew 13:24-30; 36-43 acquires its referential meaning.

And this was his answer: "The sower of the good seed is the

Son of Man. The field is the world; the good seed stands for the children of the Kingdom, the darnel for the children of the evil one. The enemy who sowed the darnel is the devil. The harvest is the end of time. The reapers are angels. As the darnel, then, is gathered up and burnt, so at the end of time the Son of Man will send out his angels, who will gather out of his Kingdom whatever makes men stumble (all the obstacles - AG v A), and all whose deeds are evil (who transgress the law - AG v A) ..." (Mt. 13: 37-39, 41).

The metaphor of this parable illustrates that, in this life, poisonous, pernicious darnel cannot be distinguished from the wheat. Jesus is talking to the Jewish multitude and at the same time explaining the parable to the disciples. It is made clear that the darnel refers to the "stumbling blocks" who do not support the Torah. The Jewish multitude was running the risk of becoming prey to the Jewish leaders, as they in fact did (see Mt. 27:20). However, Christians, in a post-Easter congregational situation, as the extension of the "historic" disciples, run a similar risk by not demonstrating Jesus' love towards the multitude - the despised members of their community.

Thus man is portrayed as a puppet of evil in both gospels (cf. for example, how the Jewish leaders were addressed as "wicked generation"/geneà ponéra and "sons of Gehenna"/huioi geénnes in Mt.12:39; 16:4 and Mt. 23:15 resp.). Van Tilborg (1972:167) observes the following with reference to the parable of the darnel among the wheat: "When the wickedness of man becomes manifest, the work of the devil becomes visible".

Therefore there is no consistent image of demonology in the New Testament period. With regard to the gospels, there is, however, a possible point of contact. Baumbach (1963:208-209) formulates it as follows:

Das Böse erscheint somit in allen Evangelien als der zum Verständnis des Heilswerks notwendige dunkle Hintergrund, auf dem der Sieg Jesu über alle finsternen Mächte um so heller aufleuchtet ... Nicht das Böse, sondern der Überwinder alles Bösen wollen die Evangelien verkündigen.

Aber die Evangelisten sind nicht bei dieser prinzipiellen Negation des Bösen stehengeblieben, sondern haben ... dem Bösen wieder eine aktive Macht und damit eine aktuelle Bedeutung für die Gemeinde zugestanden. Die Gemeinde wurde auf diese Weise zu einer theologischen Durchdenkung ihrer eigenen Existenz in der Welt gezwungen Die Frage nach dem Verständnis des Bösen erweist aber damit ihre eminente Bedeutsamkeit für die Entstehung und Ausbildung einer christlichen Theologie.

With reference to this quotation, the following could be noted:

- Demonology functions as the necessary background of soteriology.
- There is a trend in New Testament soteriology which can be described as the fundamental negation of demonology.
- Demonology spells danger for the followers of Jesus, not only in the pre-Easter situation, but it also has a very real meaning for the post-Easter congregation.
- Demonology is an integral part of Christian theology.

3.3 Impersonal power

Demonology in the New Testament is not to be found only in personified shape or in the mythological form of animals. Paul sees man without Christ as the agent of the impersonal power of sin. For example, in Romans 5:12-21, Adam, doomed to die, is portrayed as the archetype of the power of sin and Jesus Christ as the first-born, living without sin in the service of God (see Van Aarde 1985:127-129).

Jesus Christ and Adam are contrasted each as a "corporative character", one involving all mankind. Adam was the first sinner; death was the consequence and all people were involved, because everybody sinned. Adam is the archetype of the disobedient sinner who is condemned to die. Thus mankind is enslaved to the power of sin and death. As a result of his sin Adam, who had started out with the love of God, became the first man to leave death as an inheritance. Sin becomes recognisable when law arrives on the scene. The establishment of the law further aggravated the burden of sin; consequently "law" and "sin" became interchangeable terms to Paul. It has already been mentioned that Paul states, in Galatians 4:19, where he also refers to the establishment of the law, that it was the angels, as bearers of evil, that gave this enslaving law to the people. In Romans Paul is leading up to the doxology in chapter 8 where he states, among other things, that the angels would not be able to separate the chosen from the love of God in Jesus Christ. Ironically, Adam stands in direct relationship to Jesus Christ, who is the "second" Adam. Unlike the "first" Adam, Jesus Christ, brings about the inheritance of "life" as a result of his obedient expiatory death. He is the first-born living without sin in the service of God. Romans 5:21 summarises the pericope (Rm.5:12-21) by contrasting the power of death with the power of grace which leads to eternal life. The believer now lives in the era of grace and obedience; the era of the law (sin) belongs to the past. Romans 6:8 is an explicit Christological justification for the theological idea of freedom as regards the power of sin. Sin and grace cannot exist side by side. The consequences of the power of sin can be compared to the small holes in Swiss cheese. This meta-

phor will presently be explained.

4. SUMMARY

Demonology in the New Testament shows a dualism: the conflict between good and evil. This conflict is as old as man himself. In this context Goethe justly remarks: "Der Teufel, der ist alt".

Fundamentally, evil and good do not go hand in hand. In the Old Testament, tension resulted from the ambivalence of the monotheistic Yahwism, and the cosmic eschatology of the Late Judaism provided a solution. The appearance of demonology in the New Testament (as well as in other literature of the time) had a principally etiologial motive: it endeavoured to explain the origin, as well as the functioning, of evil. In the light of the events surrounding Christ, the etiology mingled with the message of salvation (see Theissen 1974:94). Christians must needs reason that the presence of evil implies the absence of good. Evil, however, cannot exist independently.

Evil exists in the cosmos like holes in a Swiss cheese: the holes are there, but they are there only as noncheese and have no existence apart from the cheese. As one cannot eat a cheese and discard the holes into a box, one cannot remove good and put evil into another category (Russell 1977:205).

In this study I have taken a stand on two matters which I shall now integrate summarily: The kingdom of darkness is not static and everlasting; it always manifests itself as the refractory power within man which is in conflict with the superior power of God's word, but from which man can be freed. Demonology in the New Testament implicitly stresses a paradox: Jesus Christ has defeated evil and triumphed over it; evil, nevertheless obstructs the work of the church.

Men who, in the Newtonian scientific paradigm, are concerned only with the rational question of evil's real and objective personal existence, are unable to comprehend the message of the New Testament in this regard:

The story of the devil is grim, and any worldview that ignores or denies the existential horror of evil is an illusion (Russell 1977:260).

As regards modern demonology, every believer in evil, in contrast to the believer who opposes evil, is leading an uneigentliche and an unwesentliche existence. Barth (see Weber 1967:145) refers to "gnadenfremde, gnadenwidrige, gnadenlose Sein". It is a way of trying to escape answering God's call. Deliverance signifies

that man, by virtue of God's grace, consciously chooses to live as man created by God and recreated by Jesus Christ.

The New Testament proclaims that salvation means that man again becomes the man of God that he had been before the power of sin made him the slave of evil. The Christian ought to sin no longer (Rm. 6:1-14; 1 Jn. 2:13-14; 3:2-6). Metaphorically, evil is thus like the holes in Swiss cheese. The power of evil cannot be denied. Concerning this, Weber (1967:145) interprets Barth as follows:

Nur im Handeln Gottes hat das Nichtige seinen ontischen Zusammenhang (Barth's terminology; my emphasis).

Expressed differently: evil functions in the cheese as non-cheese. In practice, this metaphor implies that evil manifests itself in imperfect man, who does not exist as a true man of God, before God. According to New Testament evidence regarding demonology, this is escapism.

Aber der Christ blickt nicht scheu und angstvoll auf das Nichtige, sondern er schaut auf die Auferstehung Christi zurück und auf die Wiederkunft aus, und in dieser Sicht hat er der Freiheit das Nichtige für abgetan zu halten (Barth, in Weber 1967:146).

FOOTNOTE

1. In 2 Thessalonians 2:4 "the Enemy" is portrayed as evil incarnate, one who sees himself as superior to anything worshipped by man and who even professes to be God. However, in 2 Thessalonians 2:9 this figure is distinguished from that of satan, for in apocalyptic language it is stated that the public appearance of "that wicked man" at the second coming of Christ will be a direct consequence of the work of satan which will be displayed with great power.

WORKS CONSULTED

- Baumbach, G. 1963. Das Verständnis des Bösen in den synoptischen Evangelien. Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt. (TA 19).
- Bultmann, R. 1956. Primitive Christianity: In its contemporary setting. London: Collins.
- Conzelmann, H. 1969. An outline of the theology of the New Testament. New York: Harper.
- Gibbs, J.M. 1968. The Son of God as the Torah Incarnate. StEv 4, 38-46.
- Kallas, J. 1975. The real satan: From Biblical times to the present. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Kingsbury, J.D. 1975. The historical-critical method in perspective. Currents in theology and mission 2, 132-141.
- Lee, J.J. 1970. Interpreting the demonic powers in Pauline thought. NT 12, 54-69.
- Lindström, F. 1983. God and the origin of evil. Lund: Gleerup.
- Russell, J.B. 1977. The devil: Perceptions of evil from antiquity to primitive Christianity. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Sabourin, L. 1974. The miracles of Jesus (II): Jesus and the evil powers. BTB 4, 115-175.
- Schweitzer, A. 1967. Reich Gottes und Christentums. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Stendebach, F.J. 1975. Das Böse und der Satan: Der Ursprung des Böses in der Heiligen Schrift. BiKi 30, 2-7.
- Theissen, G. 1974. Urchristliche Wundergeschichten: Ein Beitrag zur formgeschichtlichen Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus. (StNT 8).
- Van Aarde, A.G. 1985. Romeine 6:1-14 as 'n voorbeeld van 'n argumentatiewe teks met die oog op eksegeese en prediking, in Smuts, A J (red.), Die Woord aan die werk, 127-136. Pretoria: N G Kerkboekhandel.
- Van Tilborg, S. 1972. The Jewish leaders in Matthew. Leiden: Brill.

Weber, O. 1967. Karl Barth's Kirchliche Dogmatik. 6. Aufl.
Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

Yates, R. 1980. The powers of evil in the New Testament. EvQ
52, 97-111.

Professor A.G. van Aarde teaches New Testament Studies at the University of Pretoria.

Dept. of New Testament
Faculty of Theology
University of Pretoria
Pretoria

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL IN AFRICA .
A SURVEY OF AFRICAN VIEWS ON WITCHCRAFT AND
OF THE RESPONSE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

David J. Bosch

All religions wrestle with the problem of the origin of evil and how to reconcile the presence of evil in the world with the existence of a benevolent and omnipotent God. In theological literature this has become known as the theodicy problem. The answer to this problem is usually looked for in one of two directions. The first answer is called dualism, where good and evil come from two different and opposing superhuman agencies. The classical example of dualism is to be found in the religion of ancient Persia. Ahura Mazda, the good divine being, is opposed by Ahriman, equally eternal and powerful, the personification of evil (Widengren 1969:130-139). These two divinities are involved in a fierce duel to the bitter end. In this duel human beings are nothing but puppets or pawns. It is therefore hardly a coincidence that the game of chess should have developed in Persia and nowhere else. Omar Khayyam aptly expressed the prevailing sentiment of ancient Persia and Arabia when he wrote.

'Tis all a chequer-board of nights and days
Where destiny with men for pieces plays;
Hither and thither moves and mates and slays,
And one by one back in the closet lays.

The opposite answer to the problem of the origin of evil is monism, the view according to which both good and evil come from one Supreme Being. This does not mean that evil would necessarily come directly from God. It may come from him indirectly, as in the case of the moirai, the goddesses of fate in ancient Greek religion. They interpret the negative role, so to speak, of the Supreme Being, Zeus, but they also serve to underline that, ultimately, everything, both good and evil, comes from Zeus.

1. THE BIBLICAL PICTURE

This is not the place to answer the question how the Christian scriptures see the origin of evil. A few rather general and even superficial remarks will have to suffice.

In a recent study a Swedish scholar, Lindström, who had set out to prove that the Old Testament understanding of God was essentially monistic, was forced by the evidence uncovered in his research, and to his own surprise, to conclude that there is no trace of monism in the Old Testament passages he examined (Lind-

ström 1983:passim). There are, however, certain problems with Lindström's approach: some key passages are not researched, little, if any, allowance is made for the possibility of development in Israelite religion on this issue, and he does not examine the question whether or not the Old Testament understanding of God might then be dualistic rather than monistic.

Two texts which Lindström does not study are 2 Samuel 24:1 and 1 Chronicles 21:1, which both relate to the same event: David's decision to hold a census of the people of Israel, an event which led to a terrible punishment which affected the entire nation. There is, however, a significant difference between the two texts: 1 Samuel 24:1 states that it was God who incited David to count the people, whereas 1 Chronicles 21:1 reads: "Satan rose up against Israel and incited David to take a census of Israel".

I am not suggesting that I can explain this discrepancy. One possible explanation is that, when the Samuel text was written, Yahweh was still understood in predominantly monistic terms, whereas some centuries later, when 1 Chronicles was written, traces of dualism had already become evident in Israel's understanding of the origin of good and evil. A similar development may then be detected in the book Job, where satan appears as accuser or prosecutor. We have here a situation somewhere between monism and dualism: satan is a distinctly separate figure but not yet clearly dissociated from God: he is (still) a member of the heavenly court. In the subsequent period he is increasingly portrayed as God's adversary and implacable enemy. In apocalyptic literature, for instance, he is presented as the ruler of the empire of sin and evil, as the serpent, the dragon, the beast. The demons of the New Testament reports are understood as manifestations of satan. There is, thus, phenomenologically speaking, a development towards dualism in the Christian scriptures. Even so, the Biblical portrayal of the relationship between good and evil never reaches the extreme position of Persian dualism (Gründe 1983:105-125; cf. Shorter 1985:107-108, 111-113).

2. AN AFRICAN SATAN?

If we now turn to the African scene, the situation becomes even more complex, if not confusing. Karen Blixen, whose account of life in Kenya during the early decades of our century was recently dramatised in the film Out of Africa, had little doubt about the answer. Africans, she said:

... had preserved a knowledge that was lost to us by our first parents; Africa among the continents will teach it to you: that God and the devil are one (quoted in Shorter 1985:116).

This is, however, a bit too easily said, for the simple reason that there does not appear to be any figure in Africa truly comparable to the devil of the Christian scriptures. Whereas Bible translators experienced no difficulties in finding African "dynamic equivalents" - for the God of Scripture - Modimo, Nkulunkulu, Thixo, et cetera, - they usually could not find any such equivalent for satan. So they mostly rendered satan untranslated, and only Africanised the word (e.g. uSathana in Xhosa). In some cases translators are believed to have indeed found dynamic equivalents for satan in the indigenous languages: so, in the Yoruba Bible (Nigeria) satan is translated Eshu, the Ewe Bible (Benin) calls him Legba, whereas the Rundi Bible (Burundi) translates satan with Rwuba. It is seriously to be doubted, however, that these translations are appropriate. Eshu, Legba and Rwuba may indeed be termed evil divinities but they are very different from the Christian understanding of satan, who is regarded as intrinsically and irreversibly evil. Idowu, for instance, in his book on Olódūmarè, the Supreme Being of the Yoruba of Nigeria, discusses Eshu in his chapter on "The ministers of Olódūmarè". Eshu is not absolutely evil. He is worshipped and even sacrificed to. In Idowu's words: "When sacrifices are offered, the portion which belongs to Eshu should be set aside for him" (Idowu 1966:81). The reason is simple: Human beings should see to it that they remain on good terms with Eshu; he can be persuaded to be favourably disposed to people, so they should do everything in their power to turn him into a friend. Thus, if Yoruba Christians are told that Eshu is the same as satan, they may easily conclude that satan is not too terrible an enemy, that he can be placated and that people should do everything in their power to retain his goodwill. This is an attractive notion. After all, people the world over would feel comfortable with a devil who is not too devilish. Eshu is such a figure; he is a devil with a likeable streak in him.

Perhaps, then, Bible translators should not employ the name of an evil divinity if they translate "satan" or "devil" in the Bible. What would the alternative be? As I have already said, the usual solution has been to use the name of "satan" or "devil" in an Africanised form. Apparently, however, this has not solved the problem either. In this way, a word with a "zero meaning" is introduced and people tend to associate it with the world they know and experience. And since the concept of satan as absolutely and irrevocably evil and as the final antithesis of God is, as far as I can gather - foreign to traditional Africa, the tendency is to interpret this figure in relation to the Supreme Being. satan is then understood as a manifestation of God, his dark side, as it were, perhaps, but even so a divine manifestation with which we have to remain on friendly terms. I have discovered that many Xhosa, even third and fourth generation Chris-

tians, conceive of satan as a son of God, indeed his elder son. He is therefore, by definition, not the enemy of human beings and therefore, in the final analysis, harmless.

3. HUMAN AGENTS OF EVIL

There is, however, another figure in traditional African cosmology which, at least in some respects, resembles the Biblical portrayal of satan. This figure is, however, not a supernatural one, but a very human one: The witch, who, in traditional African society, is the author of evil par excellence. Witches are by no means the only human sources or agents of evil. There is also a "category of ... malevolent ancestral spirits, people who died with 'a chip on their shoulder', as it were, and who now take it out on the living ..." (Shorter 1985:111). These malevolent spirits are the exception, however, and even where they harass people, they hurt rather than kill (cf. Berglund 1976:269). On the whole, ancestral spirits - the "living-dead" in Mbiti's phrase - are favourably disposed towards the living. To venerate them was regarded as virtuous in traditional society. The nineteenth century missionaries, however, had a deeply pessimistic view of African religion, culture and tradition and regarded all of this as being under the sway of the devil - including so-called "ancestor worship" which the missionaries sometimes took to be idol worship.

Africans, however, distinguish clearly between ancestral spirits and evil spirits, between good magic and bad magic, between the "witch-doctor" (or "safety-doctor" [Haule 1969:40-47]) on the one hand and the witch and sorcerer on the other.

4. WITCHCRAFT AND WITCH-HUNTING IN EUROPE

European understandings of witchcraft have had some influence on the way scholars - both Western and African - have interpreted African witchcraft. Up to the tenth century of the Christian era the church's official teaching was that belief in witchcraft was incompatible with the Christian faith. In subsequent centuries, however, as economic and social conflicts began to multiply and opposing nationalisms started to emerge in Europe - that means, during a period of social uncertainty and heightening tensions - witchcraft beliefs began to reappear. In addition, a new element was added to the European concept of witchcraft, an element that was absent in earlier centuries, namely the notion that witches owed their powers to having made a pact with the devil. These witches, supposedly, held secret meetings known as covens, sabbaths or synagogues, at which they adored satan and practised infanticide and cannibalism. Several papal bulls from the late Middle Ages revealed that the Catholic Church had, in the mean-

time, completely accepted the witchcraft theory of the masses. The most horrifying document of the period was the Malleus maleficarum or Hammer of the witches, compiled by two inquisitors, Sprenger and Krämer, in 1486. This manual listed all kinds of fantastic activities ascribed to witches and also detailed the tortures to be inflicted on those found guilty of witchcraft (Trevor-Roper 1984:101-105).

For several centuries so-called witches were persecuted and prosecuted throughout Europe by the Catholic Church and, after the Reformation, by protestant churches as well. People were programmed to see witches as the embodying of evil itself. The prosecution of witches reached a point of frenzy during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when an estimated 500 000 individuals accused of witchcraft were burnt at the stake. Trevor-Roper, who made a study of the phenomenon, pointed out that it was not during Europe's Dark Ages that witches were most persecuted, but at the dawn of the modern world (Trevor-Roper 1984:192). Witchcraft beliefs tend to flourish in a society in transition (Wilson 1973:78-82).

Christian Europe understood the persecution of witches as an all-out war against satan and his empire. It is often said that satan is never more pleased than when Christians deny that he exists. It may, however, be equally true that satan might never have smiled more broadly than in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when the endless smoke of thousands of holocausts, in effect, paid tribute to his power and gave proof of the grip of terror in which all of Christendom was held (Parrinder 1970: 17-36).

5. THE REALITY OF WITCHCRAFT

By the time the first European missionaries arrived in Africa, they had, by and large, forgotten about the terrible legacy of witchcraft beliefs and persecution in Europe. They were children of the Enlightenment and tended to deny the existence of supernatural forces located in human beings as well as the reality of spirits in general and the "living-dead" in particular. They thought that, with education, these "superstitions" would disappear. It took a long time before they understood that, for Africans, these forces were a reality and had to be accepted as such. The question whether or not witchcraft is an objective reality is, in a sense, a secondary one. As Idowu (1973:175) puts it:

In Africa it is idle to begin with the question whether witches exist or not ... To Africans ... witchcraft is an urgent reality ... (therefore) the actual belief of Africans comes first.

Moreover, he who pooh-poohs the existence of witches only reveals himself as an ignoramus in the eyes of many Africans. When Berglund asked a Zulu gentleman about ubuthakathi (witchcraft), the latter retorted:

You must not start questioning me whether these things are true, as other whites have done. Then we cannot talk ... Just let me ask you, son of a white man, I being a black man, do you believe that ubuthakathi exists?

When Berglund answered that he believed in ubusathane (the reality of satan), the Zulu was satisfied:

Ubusathane and ubuthakathi are one and the same thing. There is no difference. So I can say that you believe in ubuthakathi. I am glad (Berglund 1976:269).

Perhaps the attitude of Needham is helpful here. He says:

I myself have no idea, empirically, whether any human being possesses a secret capacity to inflict harm by some immaterial and unseen means. But the one thing I am sure of, simply as a point of method, is that we ought not to base our investigation into witchcraft on an unsure (even unexamined) premise, let alone the premise that the essential attribute of witches - namely malign power - does not exist (quoted by Burton 1985:284).

We have indeed to take witchcraft beliefs seriously, then. As far as traditional Africa is concerned, Berglund is correct when he (1976:269) says:

A denial of the presence of sorcery and witchcraft is a denial of the existence and activities of evil.

As a matter of fact, this seems to hold true not only for traditional Africa but for Christian Africa as well, at least to some extent. A recent survey among Nigerian Catholics, for example, has revealed that 83,7 percent of them would like a priest to bless those who have trouble with witches (Singleton 1980:33).

6. THE SOCIAL FUNCTION OF WITCHCRAFT

Belief in witchcraft, in fact, fulfils an important social function in traditional Africa. It provides a channel through which people can deal with hatred, hostility, frustration, jealousy and guilt. The witch epitomises the exact opposite of what a given culture considers normal and normative (Singleton 1980:14-15). Belief in witchcraft is:

... part and parcel of a fundamental outlook on, and basic option about, life in the world and in society. It is not just an ugly excrescence that can be excised without jeopardizing the whole. Remove witchcraft, and a substantially sound edifice could crumble (Singleton 1980:31).

There are, therefore, scholars - including missionaries - who argue that belief in witchcraft is not a prunable branch on the tree of culture. It has an integrative function. It prevents the formation of severe neuroses in both individuals and communities. It upholds, and in turn receives support from, most of the other major institutions in the culture. It functions as an arm of law and politics, as a stimulus to economic distribution, and as a cause for rupturing social relations which have become too cramping; it also provides socially acceptable opportunities for aggression, vengeance, prestige and attention (Adeney 1974:378). It provides:

... an outlet for anxiety, a means for making the dark unknown manageable ... Through reducing anxiety, managing the unknown and containing evil, society maintains its equilibrium (Adeney 1974:385).

Far from being an unmitigated evil, witchcraft is:

... in many ways a source of comfort and hope; a handle to manage the unmanageable (Malinowski 1949:96).

Michael Singleton highlights yet another positive value of witchcraft beliefs. It is true, he admits, that these beliefs prevent progress, but it is only a certain kind of progress they prevent, namely the progress of the few privileged ones at the expense of the majority. It is a progress which makes people "have" more but not "be" more, a progress which could lead to an increase of social well-being but might end up in isolated individualism and a neurotic rat-race. Does not everybody agree, he asks, that it is both materially impossible and morally undesirable for all humankind to reach the level of affluence and intense competitiveness reached by an élite in the West? Is it not true that, during and after the Industrial Revolution, competition won out over mutuality and that, as a consequence, the traditional family was sacrificed to progress and profit? Witchcraft beliefs provide an alternative understanding of progress, one which is more egalitarian, more solidary, more gradual than that exported by the West (Singleton 1980:31).

Other researchers have reservations about Singleton's positive evaluation of the socio-cultural role of witchcraft. Lagerwerf (1985:34), for example, asks:

Should the rich nations not be challenged to stop taking far more than their fair share in the natural resources, rather than suggesting that the Africans remain at an economically low level?

And also:

Is Africa not too much perceived as an entity in itself, while in fact it is part of a world community? Expectations have been raised; can the process of modernization be reversed?.

I agree with those scholars who argue that witchcraft and witchcraft beliefs are far too devastating to the community to be allowed to flourish unchecked.

7. WITCHCRAFT: ITS NATURE AND ESSENCE

But what exactly is witchcraft?

In attempting to answer this question it is necessary to point out, first of all, that many scholars distinguish between witchcraft and sorcery (Evans-Pritchard 1958:9-11, 21, 387; Parrinder 1970:133-137; Wilson 1951:307-308; Wilson 1973:75-77; Berglund 1976:276-279; Shorter 1985:99-100). Sorcerers are individuals who consciously and deliberately employ magic against other people by means of "medicines", rites or spells. It is a technique, or rather a craft, which people can acquire and then practise. Witchcraft, on the other hand, is regarded as an inherited capacity for causing evil to others, a mystical and innate power and a kind of supernatural quality, of which the witch - often a female - may in fact not even be aware. Witches are believed to go about at night, often naked, leaving their human bodies on their beds; they meet in assemblies and have familiars - owls, snakes, hyenas, baboons, and so on.

Magic may be employed for good or bad reasons. In itself it is neutral (cf. Haule 1967; Dalmalm 1985). The theoretical distinction between good and bad magic often breaks down in practice, however, and, with that, the difference between the diviner or witch-doctor or safety-doctor (isangoma in Zulu; iggira in Xhosa) on the one hand and the sorcerer on the other. What is good magic in the eyes of one person may be destructive magic in the eyes of another, who is at the receiving end, so to speak, of the magic of the first. One person's "safety-doctor" may thus be another person's sorcerer (cf. Singleton 1980:12; Shorter 1985:100).

My concern here, however, is not with the sorcerer or the divi-

ner, but with witches and belief in witchcraft. What is its essence?

All of traditional Africa, from the south to the North, appears to agree on the answer to this question. Witches are anti-social, they are enemies of life. The Xhosa have a word, umona, which, in conflict with all grammatical rules of the Xhosa language, is a noun belonging to the human class. Umona means malice, avarice, envy, selfishness, individualism, exclusiveness, vindictiveness. In Xhosa culture umona signifies the quintessence of witchcraft, the personification of evil. The person who has umona has turned his or her back on the community and is seeking gain at another's expense, acting in vile self-interest and refusing to share with others what he or she possesses. For the witch, "hell is other people"; the witch is the utter egotist whose behaviour subverts the social order.

Some people are, as it were, "predestined" to be suspected of being witches: lonely women, unbalanced individuals, people with physical or mental abnormalities, exceptionally gifted or progressive individuals (Malinowski 1949:96). It is, therefore, dangerous to be too prosperous. Says Wilson about the Pondo:

People fear to be conspicuously successful, lest, exciting envy, they bring upon themselves the attack of a witch (Wilson 1951:308; cf. Berglund 1976:272).

It is therefore safer:

to be like one's fellows economically than to be above them and run the risk of a jealous witch's attack - or conversely, to risk being accused of using witchcraft in order to acquire wealth and achieve success (Adeney 1974:381).

Good fortune is, indeed, very vulnerable to envy and never to be flaunted (Berglund 1976:272).

It may therefore be said that witchcraft beliefs spring from two sources: Jealousy (Evans-Pritchard 1958:109-112; Berglund 1976:271-272) and what Malinowski called "the scapegoat psychology" (1949:96). People's misfortune is not due to their own incompetence, weakness or even sin, but to an enemy who is at the same time branded as enemy of the entire community. Belief in witchcraft produces self-vindication and self-justification (Shorter 1985:96).

The witch is therefore, by definition, never I myself, but always someone else. Field tells of an alcoholic in Ghana who said to a diviner "My house is full of witches and they have made me a

drunkard" (Field 1960:109). His drinking was thus not attributable to his own weakness but to the malignant interference of others.

Confession of personal sin, as portrayed in Scripture, is foreign to traditional Africa (it is equally foreign to Westerners). Prayers are not for forgiveness of sin but for warding off evil. The conscience does not accuse of sin but warns of approaching danger.

All this by no means suggests that Westerners are more naturally disposed toward understanding and accepting the Christian message than Africans are. This is categorically not the case. It is often said that Africans have a "shame culture" and Westerners a "guilt culture". This distinction means that Africans are alleged to feel mortified and humiliated when their "sins" become public but otherwise do not feel concerned about wrong-doing, whereas Westerners are said to feel guilty about their sins even if nobody knows about them. I do not believe there is such a difference. I suggest that we all have a "shame culture", Whites and Blacks. In the West, too, it is not wrong for a man to have an affair; it is wrong to be found out. Westerners also define sin according to its consequences, according to the harm it does themselves and their reputation.

8. COMBATTING WITCHCRAFT

How do people combat witchcraft? Witches have to be smelled out, exposed and punished. This is what happened in Europe. I have pointed out how, during the Middle Ages, the belief that witches had made a pact with the devil and were his agents, took root in Europe. Because of this belief witches were regarded as incorrigible and impervious to the message of the gospel. Since this was so there was only one thing to be done with them - execute them, by means of the most gruesome method then known: burning at the stake.

I have also mentioned that some European ideas have been carried over into African traditional thinking. One of these appears to be the linking of witchcraft with the devil and devil worship. I have referred to Berglund's Zulu informant who regarded ubuthakathi (witchcraft) and ubusathane (the reality of satan) as synonymous. A colleague of mine in Transkei once asked a diviner what umona really was - that disposition of malice, envy and selfishness which is regarded as the quintessence of witchcraft. The diviner's reply was: "Mfundisi, umona nguSathana" ("Pastor, umona is satan himself"). So even non-Christian Africans have borrowed the idea of satan from the West and identified it with the closest thing they knew of in their own culture: the witch.

And "once a witch, always a witch" (Shorter 1985:101). Not even confession of guilt and vows to change will help. As a Zulu informant told Berglund (1976:267):

That is why this kind of abathakathi must be killed. They must be removed totally because this thing in them never comes out of them.

Because of belief in witchcraft, then all reality is divided into the wholly good and the irredeemably bad. Everybody is either on the side of the angels or on the side of the devil. There are no shades of grey.

For this reason the community must do everything in its power to rid itself of witches and thus eradicate witchcraft once and for all. So, from time to time, witchcraft-cleansing or witch-eradication movements emerge, as happened in Europe (Trevor-Roper 1984:90-192). The twentieth century has seen many of these movements in Africa: in Zambia, Malawi, Tanzania, Zaïre, Nigeria and elsewhere (Wilson 1973:84-94). As happened in Europe, this kind of frenzy follows in the wake of social disintegration (Shorter 1985:164). Desperate times require desperate measures. Travelling professionals act as witch-finders, often employing syncretistic techniques to identify and expose witches. The witch-hunter is often public prosecutor, judge and executioner rolled into one. Witchcraft-cleansing ceremonies are often preceded and accompanied by a kind of mass paranoia in which fact mingles with fantastic interpretation, and since people desperately crave for relief from witchcraft, they usually submit tamely to the carryings-on of the witch-eradicator. This happened frequently in Europe too. Thousands upon thousands of people, particularly women, confessed that they had made secret pacts with the devil, and that every night they were anointing themselves with "devil's grease" made out of the fat of murdered infants (Trevor-Roper 1984:93-94).

Observers are often puzzled by these confessions. Why do people admit to doing things which they could not have done, even in their wildest imaginings? Perhaps, however, this is not too difficult to explain. People interiorise the vision and values of their culture, they accept its explanatory horizon and are unable to break out into alternative frameworks (Singleton 1980:28). This phenomenon is not only to be found among unsophisticated and traditional people. Solzhenitzyn's novels tell us about persecuted Russian politicians who are totally convinced that they are guilty of the crimes of which the state accuses them.

It is ironical that witchcraft beliefs create the illusion - in the minds of those who hold them - of control over evil forces,

and that witchcraft eradication campaigns do exactly the same. Neither illusion, however, becomes reality.

Witchcraft eradication often results in making people feel secure for a time but its chief consequence is to reinforce people's fundamental belief in witchcraft and so, sooner or later, witchcraft accusations reappear and the witch-cleaner's services, like those of the rodent-controller, are required again. Witchcraft-eradication requires that a whole village or region concentrate on the belief and searches for any and every shred of evidence of witchcraft activity ... and people are willing to put up with blackmail, extortion and humiliation in the cause of a temporary security of the illusory millennium of a witch-free community (Shorter 1985:166-167).

Once again the parallel with European witch-hunting is striking. The more witches the Inquisitor and other fanatics exposed, the more insecure the populace felt. Any campaign against witches always results in strengthening people's fear of witches and consequently their acceptance of the theory.

9. "SECULAR" WITCH-HUNTING

I have already alluded to what may be called "secular" manifestations of witchcraft beliefs: the Russian politician who is persecuted by his government for allegedly holding deviant and therefore unacceptable views. There are indeed remarkable parallels between the way today's totalitarian societies - and not only totalitarian ones - hunt down their dissidents and the way witches were and still are persecuted. The slaughtering of Jews in Nazi Germany and their being held responsible for all Germany's ailments, the Communists' harassment of their opponents in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, McCarthyism in the United States of America of the 1950s, the way in which the South African government tends to hold Communists responsible for all that goes wrong in our country - all these are examples of secularised witchcraft beliefs and scape-goating. They all reveal the same characteristics: the opponents are stigmatised as implacably evil and wholly impervious to positive influences. There is only one thing to be done with them: they have to be eliminated. They are, after all, on the side of the devil, we, however, are on the side of the angels.

I am asking myself whether south African society is not currently experiencing a witch-hunt craze of grotesque proportions. The bizarre crimes that are perpetrated by people from both the right and the left are, phenomenologically speaking, manifestations of witchcraft beliefs and scape-goating. Even in church circles -

where we do not go to the extent of eliminating each other physically - we do eliminate each other spiritually by declaring ourselves to be on God's side and our "opponents" to be on the side of evil and satan.

10. "PHYSICAL" AND "MORAL" EVIL

How should the church respond to the scourge of witchcraft, witchcraft beliefs and witch-hunting in Africa?

Before I try to respond to this question I wish to address - very briefly - the issue of the understanding of sin that the church introduced to Africa. Gründel (1983:118-122) points out that, in the Christian tradition, sin may be understood, inter alia, as:

1. disobedience to God,
2. apostasy or unbelief,
3. offence against God's eternal law (Thomas Aquinas), and
4. refusal to love.

Since Western Christianity is the heir of the feudal era in which a feudal lord reigned over his subjects, the first of these definitions became the dominant one in Christendom: sin is disobedience to God as Lord and Ruler. It is only in recent times, with increasing egalitarianism, that Christians began to discover the fourth dimension of sin: that it not only has to do with disobedience and apostasy in relation to God, but also with refusal to love both God and our fellow human beings. Gründel quotes Sartre in this regard: "Hell is nothing but the suffering of those who cannot love".

It is this last dimension of sin that the Western missionary enterprise has, by and large, failed to communicate to Africa. Only the "vertical" dimension of sin, as disobedience to God, was communicated. Moreover, sin was understood as intensely individual.

Traditional Africa has an entirely different understanding of sin. To begin with, sin never related to God, but only to the community, it never affected only the individual, but always the group as well. For Africans, a specific deed or attitude is sinful not primarily because of its intrinsic nature but because of its results. "Sin is that which produces evil as its consequence" (Adegbola 1970:133). The word used for "sin" in several African languages essentially means "to spoil", particularly to spoil or harm human relationships. The witch is sinner par excellence, not primarily because of his or her deeds, but because of the evil consequences of those deeds: illness, barrenness, catastrophe, misfortune, disruption of relationships in the community, poverty, and so on.

Christianity hardly addressed these issues which had to do with the physical well-being of the community. As a matter of fact, it tended to explain away the reality of physical evil and home in on "moral" evil: sin as disobedience to God. An extreme example of this is to be found in an early Christian theologian, Basilus (330-379 AD), who, for all practical purposes, ignored the reality of every form of physical evil by describing it as "providential". In one of his sermons he referred to a prevailing drought and famine, declaring it to be a work of God's mercy and providence, aimed at drawing people to Christ. In the words of Young (1973:119):

God, like a schoolmaster, uses corporeal punishment for our good. So the whole creation becomes a vast teaching-machine, with lessons at every turn: even poisonous plants and ravenous beasts have such a providential purpose.

The theodicy problem simply did not exist for Basilus since he flatly denied the existence of physical evil.

To this day preachers tend to follow Basilus's example. Like him, their purpose is to vindicate God. Adversities should, in fact, be welcomed, since God is "speaking to us" through them. In this kind of thinking God becomes, in the final analysis, the source of physical evil, but in such a way that the element of evil is explained away. When a child has died, the parents are told: "It is a proof of God's trust in you that he could let this happen to you", or "You are privileged to have a child in heaven". Here evil is paraded as the handmaid of good.

This is, of course, the very opposite of what happens in traditional African society where "physical" evil is absolutised and "moral" evil explained away. In this way both the Western missionary approach and African traditional religion overlooked people's total distress and offered only partial solutions. The results of this failure of the Christian mission have been far-reaching. Says Mbiti (1971:9) of the Akamba (Kenya):

The people have not been sufficiently armed to fight against witchcraft and sorcery, in spite of many years of Christian teaching

God is still too far away to be experienced as "an ever-present help". He remains the last resort; people go to him "in desperation, after all other efforts have failed" (Parsons 1960:67). In most emergencies many still go to the diviners, not least because the church did not seem to be concerned about witchcraft and sorcery.

The situation has been further aggravated by the church's describing as "sins" practices which traditional Africa did not regard as sinful, in particular polygamy, consulting diviners, ancestor veneration, and the use of charms and magic. Not only are these practices not regarded as sins in traditional society: they are hailed as virtues, particularly since they all serve to promote social values and well-being. The conscience of Africans, far from accusing them of practising sins, praised them for upholding these traditions. The outcome of it all was this: on the one hand the missionaries proclaimed a Christ who released people from guilt which had been induced and who forgave sins of which the church, but not their consciences, found them guilty. On the other hand the area of real sin and evil in society, as Africans experienced it, was left untouched by the church. Thus the true relevance of the Christian message of sin and redemption was subverted. Redemption was made superficial for it did not penetrate to the heart of the problem of evil.

The authentic Christian message - so it appears to me - is different. It challenges both the African understanding of evil and the traditional Western missionary view. It does not play off "moral" evil, or individual sin as transgression of the will of God, against "physical" evil: disturbed relationships, sickness, barrenness, adversities of all kinds. Israel was led out of captivity and saved from oppression and other "physical" vicissitudes. And God promised his people shalom: peace, societal harmony, physical and social well-being. This seems to point in the direction of the African understanding of evil and its reversal. But salvation from the enemy outside Israel was never severed from salvation from the enemy within: self-centredness, lack of compassion, lack of love of God. So the Christian faith sees a close relationship between the "moral" and the "physical". And if sin and evil are both moral and physical, affecting both our "vertical" and "horizontal" relationships, so is salvation. This in turn means that the scope of salvation will determine the scope of the church's missionary mandate. The Christian message does not gloss over the problem of physical evil - as Basilus did and many Western Christians still do - nor the problem of moral evil - as did traditional Africa and as, in fact, some modern Western Christians also do.

After this brief detour on the Western, African and Christian understandings of sin, I can now return to the question I posed a while ago: how should the church respond to the bane of witchcraft and belief in witchcraft?

11. COMBATTING WITCHCRAFT: ACCEPTING THE TRADITIONAL MENTALITY

Two general approaches are advocated. The first approach is to

accept, in essence, the traditional framework and to minister to people accordingly. This can be done in one or more of several ways, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive. First, there are those pastors and theologians who advocate a pastoral and liturgical approach. The premise here is that, in the eyes of many Africans, Christ and his acknowledged human representatives - priests, pastors and the religious - appear to be conceived of in terms of people's ideas about the traditional diviner and medicine-man (Lagerwerf 1985:8). Ecclesiastical representatives should capitalise on this attitude and, through their ministrations, wean people away from traditional healers and diviners for, in the words of Nxumalo:

As soon as the minister neglects to help his people with his blessings the faithful become desperate and are tempted to have recourse to the sangomas.

Nxumalo therefore advocates the wider use of the Roman Catholic Collectio Rituum which contains prayers eminently suitable for people who believe themselves to be the victims of witchcraft, sorcery and evil spirits (Lagerwerf 1985:8). As a matter of fact, prayers, sacraments and rituals appear to be not fully adequate. People crave for something more tangible. Here the Roman Catholic Church, with its use of devotional objects such as holy water, the rosary, medals and prayer books appears to be more successful in discouraging the use of traditional fetishes and charms than many Protestant churches (Lagerwerf 1985:29-30).

A second variation within the first general approach of accepting people's basic interpretative framework is to encourage Christians to clear their conscience by confessing witchcraft practices and then to be restored to the community. Some African Independent Churches in Zimbabwe follow this course - at least as an alternative to other courses. Prophet Elison Mutingwende of the Shinga Postora movement, for instance, both exposed individuals guilty of anti-social behaviour and rehabilitated self-confessed witches. So:

Instead of urging the traditional practice of ostracism, Elison preached a message of hope and reconciliation. In this respect his church became a haven to the misfits and outcasts of society (Daneel 1982:101; cf. Daneel 1974:277).

This approach appears to be, potentially, a very important one. It is particularly significant that it vigorously counteracts the traditional view that witches remain witches and that not even confession or conversion can change that.

A third way in which the church can minister to people while at

the same time subscribing to the traditional interpretative framework is to practice exorcism in one form or another. Exorcism is something of a special case. It is not directed to God, as prayers are, neither to people, whether individually or as a group; it is, rather, a command delivered in the name of the power of God demanding an evil spirit to depart (Lagerwerf 1985:45). The most celebrated case of the practice of exorcism in Africa in recent years has been that of the former Roman Catholic Archbishop of Lusaka, Emmanuel Milingo. In 1973 he began to discover in himself special gifts for healing and driving out evil spirits. He was soon accused of unorthodoxy. After being summoned to Rome and subjected to intensive investigations, he resigned his see in 1982. He now resides in Rome where he is a Special Delegate to the Pontifical Commission on Migration, Refugees and Tourism (Milingo 1984). Milingo believes that people make pacts with the devil from whom they receive, in turn, the gifts of health and prosperity and also revelations (1984:35-45).

This is not the place to enter into an intensive dialogue with Father Milingo and his ministry. A few general remarks will have to suffice.

Father Aylward Shorter, who has no doubt that people such as Milingo possess God-given healing gifts (1985:197), nevertheless warns against his and other's practices. One of Shorter's problems is that Milingo imposes a medieval European demonological theory on the phenomena of the African spirit-world. It is a theory, he argues (1985:190):

which has more in common with the Malleus Maleficarum of fifteenth-century Europe than with any tradition to be found in Africa

It is, therefore, a culturally alien imputation. Furthermore, it is pastorally unsound to simply brand as diabolical the psychopathic delusions of people with psychiatric disorders (1985:197). Even more important, says Shorter (1985:197), repeated exorcisms only strengthen people's fears of demons and evil spirits, in much the same way as witch-eradicators in medieval Europe and present-day Africa strengthened people's fear of the witches they smelled out and disposed of. Therefore, as in witchcraft-cleansing, exorcism in actual fact leads to an increase of demons in society rather than a decrease. Coupled with this is a fourth and final concern of Shorter (1985:196) : exorcism encourages dualistic attitudes in which the fear of demons is more real than the healing love of God. He does not completely rule out the possibility of practising exorcism but believes that the Catholic Church's official practice of severely circumscribing the use of exorcism is wise and practical (Shorter 1985:197).

12. COMBATting WITCHCRAFT: CREATING AN ALTERNATIVE FRAMEWORK

If the first approach is to combat witchcraft and witchcraft beliefs by accepting, in essence, the traditional African interpretative framework, the second would be to help people change their overall interpretative framework, to switch to a new paradigm, as it were (Singleton 1980:23). Whereas the first approach follows what Andrew Walls has termed the "indigenising" principle - the Christian faith incarnating itself in a specific culture - the second approach follows Walls's "pilgrim" principle: God in Christ transforming a culture into what he wants it to be. The premise of the "pilgrim" principle is that there has never existed any society, in East or West, ancient time or modern, which could absorb the word of Christ painlessly into its system (Walls 1982:97-99).

If it is true, as Likeng says, that "la sorcellerie est une prison, un enchaînement" ("witchcraft is a prison, an enchainment" - quoted in Lagerwerf 1985:20), and if Shorter is correct when he says (1985:100) that: "... beliefs about witchcraft and sorcery tend to reduce those who hold them to the level of witches and sorcerers themselves", then "nothing could be further from the true spirit of religion than pandering to (such) beliefs..." and the church should do everything it can to combat witchcraft notions and beliefs. This may be easier said than done, given also the history of witchcraft beliefs in Europe. Indeed, even if the letter of witchcraft may die, the spirit will live on unless a society is reshaped deep down.

What do scholars and pastors subscribing to this second approach suggest?

First, Christians must be helped to live in a community without producing scapegoats, believing - as the Christian tradition teaches us - in that one Scapegoat who has carried away the sins of the world once and for all (Balz, in Lagerwerf 1985:24). The basic difficulty with witchcraft beliefs is the assumption that the only effective response to witchcraft is retaliation. However:

What we are strictly commanded to do is to desist from returning evil with evil, revenging, getting even, paying off scores. The Mahatma Gandhi echoed Christ's teaching in his own way: "If everyone took an eye for an eye, the whole world would become blind". Eye for eye - this is the peculiar blindness of witchcraft theory and the fears it generates (Shorter 1985:101).

The reason for rejecting the scapegoat theory is simple:

There are no absolute villains and no absolute heroes. None is absolutely innocent or absolutely guilty (Taylor 1986:22).

Secondly - and this is the positive side of rejecting the scape-goat theory - Christian teaching insists that we ourselves accept co-responsibility for what has gone wrong. We shall, as a matter of fact, fight evil:

more effectively through recognising in ourselves as well as in others the things we are fighting against. We shall be armed with new weapons through understanding in our own experience how the evil attitudes and the commitment to injustice took root (Taylor 1986:23).

Therefore, to credit every misfortune and every inexplicable failure or accident to a witch or the devil, subverts the possibility of true repentance, conversion and faith. Even our sins may not be blamed on satan. He is not the author or source of sin but the seducer and accuser. In the words of Trevor Ling (1961:11, 60):

The conception of satan ... provides no moral outlet by which man may be excused from his own responsibility for the evils which he suffers. ... (T)he power which satan exercises in the world ... he derives ... ultimately from men themselves.

Thirdly, there is the problem of suffering. Believers in witchcraft, says Shorter (1985:104):

see suffering as something to be avoided at the expense of their neighbour.

In the Christian tradition, however, suffering is not an evil that is to be avoided or avenged at all costs.

Baker is correct in saying that:

the crucified Christ is the only accurate picture of God the world has ever seen (quoted by Taylor 1986:8). If God was in Christ we have to come to terms with a God to whom it is natural to be humble, frustrated and at risk (Taylor 1986:9).

But if this is true of God, it will not be much different for those who follow Christ and believe in God: they too will experience suffering and weakness.

There is a prayer that is echoed all over Africa in all its

languages. It is the prayer "Give us power!" The greatest joy is to have an abundance of life-force, the greatest disaster to lose one's life-force. Bad magic is to be a victim of the diminution of life-force; good magic is to have one's life-force increased, even at the expense of others. It is prayer that rebels against the very idea of suffering.

This view is, however, no different from the one prevalent in the Western world. Although Westerners may express it in more sophisticated terms, the essence is the same, as the entire secular Western culture and the advertising media reveal daily.

The gospel's answer to this is a revaluation of all values. In the Incarnation and the Crucifixion God became totally powerless, conquering through weakness. Only the grain of wheat that dies, bears a rich harvest (Jn. 12:24). Power comes to its full strength in weakness; therefore when we are weak, we are strong (2 Cor. 12:9, 10). To die is to live, to serve is to be free, to leave self behind is to find oneself, to suffer is to experience joy. These are the strange paradoxes of the gospel, which no African and no Westerner can affirm.

Neither, of course, can Satan! In the book of Job Satan says to God:

Has not Job good reason to be God-fearing? Have you not hedged him round on every side with your protection ...?" (Job 1:9, 10 NEB).

This, then is Satan's explanation for the phenomenon of religion: people serve God for what they get out of it, and to escape disappointment and suffering. Religion pays dividends. Mbiti gives expression to this when he says of African traditional religion "God is 'utilized' rather than 'worshipped'" (1971:95). But is this not true in the West also? Here, too, we want to use God for our own purposes. One variation - by no means the only one - of this is the phenomenon of propagating the Christian faith as a religion that yields results, marketing it in a "Things-go-better-with Jesus" wrapping. On the dust cover of a book by Norman Vincent Peale I read the following:

Let Dr. Peale give you ten simple, workable goals for developing confidence; three proven secrets for keeping up your vigor; thirteen actual examples of how prayer power helped people in need; four words that lead to success; five actual techniques used by successful men to overcome defeat; an eight-point spiritual healing formula; a ten-point guide to popularity.

It is this kind of religion that has given rise to the prosperity cults we see mushrooming today all over our country.

And it is from within this perspective on religion that satan challenges God in Job 1:11:

Just stretch out your hand and touch all that Job has, and then he will curse you to your face.

In other words: the moment religion ceases to pay dividends, it forfeits its raison d'être. The amazing thing is that God accepts Satan's challenge. The entire book of Job portrays the drama of the ensuing encounter between two conflicting concepts of what religion is all about.

I move on to the fourth way in which the Christian gospel works toward helping people develop an alternative interpretative framework. In traditional African society magic can be both defensive and offensive; it can be employed to ward off evil but also to inflict evil on others. To give up the latter requires a fundamental shift in position. Lagerwerf explains what this involves. In Botswana there was a case of somebody with a sore and swollen foot, allegedly caused by witchcraft. Operating from within the traditional paradigm, the afflicted would have done everything in his power to send the illness back to the person who had bewitched him. The New Apostolic Prophets Church, however, took a different line:

... we don't do that in the church. We heal, but don't hurt other people. Jesus didn't do so. Did He pray: "Father, make them sick?" No, He prayed: "Father forgive them, for they don't know what they are doing" (Lagerwerf 1982:69).

The Christian faith indeed:

calls for healing, reconciliation, mutual service, not a preoccupation with searching out and exterminating (or at least ostracizing) the alleged human causes of misfortune (Shorter 1985:101).

Fifthly, the Christian believes that evil and moral wickedness have no future. The future lies with God, not with satan nor with any witch. Evil can only be understood in relation to good. Evil needs good to feed on; good, however, has no need of evil (Gründel 1983:111). It follows from this that satan and all manifestations of evil can only be thought of as conquered in advance by God. Evil is swallowed up in God's ultimate victory. And we already stand in the light of the rays issuing from that world in which evil has no part and healing is redundant.

On the whole, the church has not been very successful in communicating to the people of Africa that God is always with them no matter their circumstances and experiences. He has remained the God out there, far away. And as Taylor (1963:200) reminds us:

... the more remote God is made to appear the greater is the need for magic. If his hand is not there to protect and heal, if his eyes are indifferent to the mustering of the forces of darkness, then charms and spells and curses must be enlisted against them.

There is, of course, an abiding paradox here: to accept suffering, disappointment, evil, and at the same time celebrate God's victory. Once again the book of Job helps us to appreciate this paradox. The entire book, I said, portrays the encounter between two interpretations of religion. What is remarkable is that this drama unfolds in the book between two doxologies, one in the first chapter, one in the last. In Chapter 1 the words are "The Lord gives and the Lord takes away; blessed be the name of the Lord". In the final chapter they are "I knew of thee then only by report, but now I see thee with my own eyes".

The entire problem of the origin of evil thus, strangely, finds its "answer" or "solution" in a doxology. The miracle of many Biblical psalms of praise is that they are not sung in moments of victory but in periods of anguish and distress, from the shadows, as it were. I mention only one of many examples: Psalm 22. The opening words are:

My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ...? O my God, I cry in the day-time but thou dost not answer, in the night I cry but get no respite.

The bottomless "why?", the piercing reproach is not silenced here. There is rebellion in the air, not fatalism; there is resistance, not acquiescence. Luther rightly distinguished between acquiescence (which, he said, was "pagan") and affliction (which he called Christian). Affliction presupposes a tension between grace proclaimed and wrath experienced; it means that grace is being challenged by adversity.

In Psalm 22 then, as in Job, the resistance in the believer's heart, the struggle to keep on believing, is not glossed over, suppressed, or wiped off the slate as "unbelief". On the contrary: it is exposed, underlined, highlighted! The believer may clench his fists and asks his why's because in the case of the one who truly believes, the clenched fist is grasped by the fatherly hand of God, and the "why" ultimately caught up in a "nevertheless". Therefore it is precisely in Psalm 22 that we

find a doxology! It is at the same time a psalm about doubt and difficulty because God does not answer (v. 2) and a psalm of faith and gratitude because he does (v. 22). In this psalm the two opposite poles of "unbelief" and faith, of affliction and trust, are held in creative tension in the rapturous vision of verse 3, the vision that is the ultimate answer to the problem of the goodness of God in the face of the existence of evil - in Africa as in the West. For immediately after the bottomless "why?" and the terrible accusation that God does not answer, neither by day nor by night - which seems to suggest that God is helpless against the power of evil and that faith in him is without any value - the poet continues:

Nevertheless you are the Holy One, sitting enthroned above the praises of Israel! (v. 3).

Professor D.J. Bosch is presently dean of the Faculty of Theology at the University of South Africa where he teaches Missiology.

Faculty of Theology
University of South Africa
P.O. Box 392
Pretoria
0001

WORKS CONSULTED

- Adegbola, A.E. Adeolu, 1970 [1969]. The theological basis of ethics, in Dickson, K.A. & Ellingworth, P. (eds.), Biblical revelation and African beliefs. London: Lutterworth.
- Adeney, M. A. 1974. What is "natural" about witchcraft and sorcery? Missiology 2, 377-395.
- Berglund, A.-I. 1976. Zulu thought-patterns and symbolism. Cape Town: David Philip.
- Burton, J. W. 1985. Why witches? Some comments on the explanation of "illusions" in anthropology, Ethnology 24, 281-96.
- Dalmalm, A. 1985. L'église à l'épreuve de la tradition. La Communauté Evangélique du Zaïre et le Kindoki. Paris: Editaf.
- Daneel, M.L. 1974. Old and new in Southern Shona independent churches. Vol. 2. The Hague: Mouton.
- Daneel, M.L. 1982. Fission-dynamics in African independent churches, in Vorster, W.S. (ed.), Denominationalism - its sources and implications. Pretoria: University of South Africa, 101-135.
- Evans-Pritchard, E. E. 1958 [1937]. Witchcraft, oracles and magic among the Azande. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Field, M. 1960. Search for security. London: Faber & Faber.
- Gründel, J. 1983. Sünde als Verneinung des Willens Gottes. Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung von Leid, Übel und Bösem, in Rivinius, K. J. (ed.) Schuld, Sühne und Erlösung. St. Augustin: Steyler Verlag.
- Haule, C. 1969. Bantu "witchcraft" and Christian morality. Schöneck-Beckenried: Nouvelle revue de science missionnaire.
- Idowu, E. B. 1966. Olódùmarè: God in Yoruba belief. London: Longmans.
- Idowu, E. B. 1973. African traditional religion. London: SCM.
- Lagerwerf, L. 1982. "They pray for you" Independent churches and women in Botswana. Leiden: Interuniversity institute for missiological and ecumenical research.

- Lagerwerf, L. 1985. Witchcraft, sorcery and spirit possession. Pastoral responses in Africa. Exchange 41, 1-62.
- Lindström, F. 1983. God and the origin of evil. A contextual analysis of alleged monistic evidence in the Old Testament. Lund: Gleerup.
- Ling, T. 1961. The significance of satan. London: SPCK.
- Malinowski, B. 1949 [1945]. The dynamics of culture change. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mbiti, J. S. 1971. New Testament eschatology in an African background. London: Oxford University Press.
- Parrinder, G. 1970 [1958]. Witchcraft: European and African. London: Faber & Faber.
- Parsons, R. T. 1950. The idea of God among the Kono of Sierra Leone, in Smith, E. W. (ed.), African ideas of God. London: E.H.P., 260-276.
- Shorter, A. 1985. Jesus and the witchdoctor. An approach to healing and wholeness. Maryknoll: Orbis.
- Singleton, M. 1980. Who's who in African witchcraft? Pro Mundi Vita: Dossiers, Africa Dossier 12, 1-41.
- Taylor, J. V. 1963. The primal vision. London: SCM.
- Taylor, J. V. 1986. Weep not for me. Meditations on the cross and the resurrection. Geneva: World Council of Churches.
- Trevor-Roper, H. 1984. Religion, the Reformation and social change. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Walls, A. F. 1982. The gospel as the prisoner and liberator of culture. Missionalia 10, 93-105.
- Widengren, G. 1969. Religionsphänomenologie. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Wilson, B. R. 1973. Magic and the millennium. London: Heinemann.
- Wilson, M. 1951. Witch beliefs and social structure. AJS, 307-313.
- Young, F.M. 1973. Insight or incoherence? The Greek fathers on God and evil. JEH 24.

THE INTERPRETATION OF AND REACTION TO DEMONIC POWERS IN INDIGENOUS CHURCHES

G.C. Oosthuizen

In Africa, in general, a distinction is made between two types of diseases, namely those which could be classified as natural diseases (referred to in Zulu as umkhuhlane) and those which could only really be "understood" by Africans in the context of their cosmology (referred to as Ukufa KwaBantu).

The former types of disease (such as ordinary colds, flu or serious ailments) are always presented in somatic symptoms. These diseases are not associated with those malicious external factors which loom behind everything or are the victim's fault. These diseases are treated with medicines which are considered in themselves effective and which need not be accompanied by any rituals. There are traditional medicines for such diseases - as in the case of Western medicines, such medicines could be thrown away without ill consequences if ineffective. The disease is not considered to have mysterious power in itself.

Those diseases which are only understood within the African context (Zulu = Ukufa KwaBantu) such as witchcraft, sorcery, ancestor wrath, pollution, spirit possession, or a disturbed relationship with one's surroundings can only be effectively treated when certain medicines are accompanied by specific rituals. About the mystical forces Pritchard states:

The European does not appreciate that the Azande have to take into account mystical forces of which he (the European) knows nothing? (Marwick 1972:329).

The rites used in connection with the healing of diseases that are typically African cannot be really replaced by rites in the church, unless these are made christocentric and adapted. The main aim is to restore the disposition and balance of the affected person in the context of his/her family and community. The person has been put into a disarranged, disturbed and disordered situation and this has to be rectified. The main aim of such a person's adversary is either to destroy him or to influence negatively his social equilibrium, which results in all types of misfortune, ill-health or even death.

Such imbalance has to be rectified and this is possible also through specific medicines and accompanying rituals. When the somatic symptoms are diagnosed as natural they are treated separately, which implies that no special rituals are applied. In African context no separation is made between the physical and

the psychical. Disturbed equilibrium is rectified by treating the whole person, by the holistic approach and this is done in conjunction with the supernatural forces that fall outside the ordinary rules of cause and effect. The main emphasis is to take out of the system what has a negative effect upon it and the cause could be often something not on the body, but somewhere in the surroundings or stealthily canalised on or into the body. Such ritualised objects have to be removed either from the surroundings, or from the body, and when successfully removed the person's health is restored. What is extracted remains dangerous and could be used against others (cf. Ngubane 1977).

1. WHO ARE THESE ADVERSE FORCES?

The forces of good and evil have special significance and are given special attention within the context of the African Indigenous Churches (AIC). Many of this first generation Christians are still deeply involved with aspects of traditional spirituality. One should be careful not to generalise as does Daneel, who elevates his findings in the Eastern Zimbabwe indigenous churches to a norm whereby every other indigenous church on the continent of Africa should be evaluated, a type of nineteenth-century romanticism. There is such a variety of approaches that one should avoid falling into this trap. The emphasis, however, with Zionists, is to free their members and adherents from adverse forces. The evil forces are utilised by human beings against one another. Both the intention and the agony are human, while evil itself is generated in or from a non-human agency (Kiernan 1985:1).

The moral evil depends on the attitudes, inherent tendencies or behaviour of the individual which are the result of disregarding the generally accepted moral prescriptions in daily life. These could be understood by a Westerner, but then there are the mystical types of evil which are effected by others against a person. Here one of two forces is at work - either witchcraft or sorcery. These are factors with which many Africans have real problems, as they are held responsible for misfortunes, illness and death due to the evil intent of humans who use so-called black magic.

To be under bewitchment and sorcery means to be deprived of life, to be annihilated. It is seen as the destroyer of life, often through mysterious events and diseases. The witch works through some mystical power which is innate, inherited or "constitutionally implanted at an early age" (cf. Marwick 1975:12). A clear distinction should be made between witch and sorcerer. The former achieves her evil by some mystical power without magic and the latter by magic, referred to as black magic. Magic is a morally neutral term but may be used positively (white magic) or

negatively (black magic) - the former is usually the approach of the medicine man and the latter the sorcerer. The sorcerer uses rituals and material substances with the aim of controlling mystic forces. Anyone, however, can obtain the muti (medicine) for acts of sorcery if he/she is prepared to pay for it. As a result of envy and jealousy, usually in family relationships, sorcery or counter-sorcery methods are used (Bührmann 1983:25). The sorcerer is a poisoner and the victims often state that their crops or animals have been poisoned. It is the medicine man who solves these problems which are often the result of social conflict.

Different ways in which problems encountered are explained (for example, the transition from a traditional to a new cultural environment, from an ontocratic culture to a secularised situation), are expressed through spirit possession. Here the individual is in the centre and he believes that he is ill as a result of the influences of evil spirits. It is only by way of personal cleansing through exorcism that a person can get rid of such spirits. It is not so much the change from one culture to the other that brings tension, but the tension that is experienced because of the tensions in this change. The new culture is not described as evil, but to change to the new brings stress. This is a major reason why in such situations the role of the diviner becomes more prominent. Sorcery and spirit possession and personal cleansing become important - the individual is concerned with these. There is, however, also a tendency to harp back to the traditional environment, to the old securities and here witchcraft and communal cleansing are significant (Schoffeleers 1982:122; Lagerwerf 1985:1-62).

The role of the medicine man has become more prominent and he is often in the context of Christ, prophet and minister. Medicine-men have increased and no longer are they frowned upon by the black intelligentsia as was the case a decade ago. Many Zionists consult them and some Zionist prophets receive also training as diviners. The AIC have a different disposition to African culture from that of the historic churches and have taken healing seriously, as being associated with religion. This has given prominence to the prophet or prayer healer. Those problems that were the task of the diviner to solve, such as sorcery, witchcraft, evil spirits and spirit possession, have to be taken seriously.

Spirit possession reflects the human suffering involved in the transitional stage from the traditional microcosmic world-view to the macrocosmic world-view. The all-pervasive influence of evil spirits on the minds of people affects their adaptation to the new situation and, for this reason there is an emphasis on washing evil off as in the church which had at its Pentecost services in Clermont, Durban not less than ten thousand people from various parts of South Africa. On this occasion, 1439 were baptised (1050

women, 389 men) and practised isiwasho when thousands went through the baptismal pool from 09h00 to 11h30 on Sunday 18 May 1986, to wash off symbolically ("symbol" in the African sense) what was negative towards them.

2. AFRICA'S GREAT ANGUISH

There is a deep feeling that Africa must get out of its slumber into the modern world (cf. Okot p' Bitek 1972). This highlights the despair which prevails among those who would like to see Africa moving to the front line of modern progress. There is however a lack of "empathy" in modern man which could be explained as a person's ability to identify new aspects of a changing environment and act accordingly (cf. Lerner 1958).

From which world has the traditional African to extricate himself? Africa's preoccupation with adverse mystical forces stems from frustration. In order to move away from the old type of economic existence, ego goals must develop within the context of common goals, personal responsibility is called for and adaptation in the work situation is also necessary.

One has to make a distinction between Black Africans who no longer have a Third World, but a First World, outlook and the vast majority who are still embedded or partly rooted in the Third World tradition. About seventy per cent of Africa's Black population is still unurbanised. From indifference towards, to rejection of, Western culture, technology and scientific development, the tendency has become one of acceptance.

The secret of man's adaptation and progress in new situations is related to the fact that man is a whole; his whole life is affected when he enters a new situation but the problem arises when what happens to him is only understood by a part of him. Development cannot take place in one isolated sphere of a human being's existence (Fromm 1979:272). Milingo, the deposed Roman Catholic bishop of Lusaka, maintains that if Zambia wants to become truly modern, African and religious, it has to rid itself of one of the major obstacles to modernisation, namely the belief in evil spirits (cf. Schoffeleers 1982:24). Only in taking the whole life into consideration will effective adaptation and development take place. It could be that a people make contact with the modern outlook without changing themselves. Only where their thinking, their value judgments and their culture are all reconsidered in the new context, where a change not overpowered by the physical changes in the sphere of modernisation takes place, will development be effective. A people's world-view remains intact far longer than some of its customs, beliefs and other aspects of its culture. Even if there is a change to another religion, the people's world-view could remain, as both Islam and

Christianity have discovered in Africa. Whatever changes may take place as a result of the new religion's impact, basic beliefs remain rooted within their system. A world-view remains intact longer than traditional religion in Africa. Although the cities lead to secular values many traditional views remain. How can people develop away from the shackles of a world-view in which so much suspicion and jealousy prevails? Such emotions are often reflected in their beliefs in demons, evil spirits, spirit possession, witchcraft and sorcery. What should be done should be examined

in terms of transitions from magic to science, from myth to historical time, and from the closed, unitary or ontocratic society to the open, plural society (Turner 1984).

One could not speak of a scientific technological world-view, in spite of the fact that it has contributed to the material from which the modern world-view has been established. If a techno-scientific world-view did exist, it could have changed much of the traditional heritage. Africa has to change, otherwise it will remain shackled to the idea of contra-forces being responsible for its situation. In traditional terms, these forces are described in the form of evil spirits, demons, spirit possession, sorcery and witchcraft, but in modern terms the adversaries are still seen as the evil forces of colonialism. Peter Enahoro, a leading African publisher and journalist in a monthly magazine, Africa Now, February 1985, mentioned that when Africa reflects on the quarter century of independence the emphasis will be on "imperialist exploiters who invaded our land". Nearly forgotten will be the great question: What has Africa done with its independence in twenty-five years?

... (S)hould we not by now have progressed on the road to re-establishing our self-confidence?

He continues by saying that during the last twenty-five years Africans have stifled incentive and developed a disgraceful dependent mentality, weakening individualism and innovation.

He criticises the governments in Africa that act as though the world owes them a living, where people behave as though a government exists "to hand out largesse for which they do not have to toil". He emphasises that their economies are fundamentally import-orientated but that the political authorities speak about nationalising the means of production but:

There is no production to quarrel over. Conformity is held up as a virtue and show of business acumen denounced as greed ... This is what the first 25 years of African independence had encouraged ... Africa's best writers are still

twittering about how colonialism has robbed us of our innocence. They continued to be praised for their insight ... we have simply lacked the leader to lead us away from the convenience of hanging on to a scapegoat. The time has arrived for Africa to grow up. That must be the message of 1985 (Africa Now, February 1985).

A distinction has to be made between the section of black Africans who no longer have a Third World, but a First World, outlook and the vast majority who are still either embedded or partly rooted in the Third World tradition. About seventy percent of Africa's black population is still unurbanised. Black reaction has been one of rejection of Western culture, technology and scientific development to one of acceptance. Here a philosophy predominates that there is no being without force and there is no force without being (Kagame 1956). African philosophy is not positivistic, analysing its environment through observation, neither is it contemplative in the Eastern sense, where theoretical analysis predominates - this explains their tremendous scientific and technological developments - but is ontologically pragmatic, that is, it functions to the extent that it manifests the metaphysical. Man is at the pivot of reality - that is, as long as he participates in this omnipotent life force. From the basic universal force all these aspects get their life force. One being can influence another. No force can annihilate another force - it can only check its effectiveness. God is the most potent force, then patriarchs, ancestors and so on. The negative forces have to be continuously checked. It is this negative energy, which receives attention when evil spirits, bewitchment and suchlike come on the scene. These forces still play a central role in the lives of many Africans. While a truly axial period, a period of tremendous change, could be discerned among the peoples of the East and Europe from 800 to 200 B.C. (Jaspers 1949), Africa had no such experience.

During this time the most deep-cut dividing line in history was effected. There was most probably no greater creative period in human history than this one; the fundamental categories in which we think today were born in this period. During this time the modification of the thinking of man took place. A start was made to analyse the essence of things (Jaspers 1949). There were great changes in the human spirit, and for the transformation of human consciousness. These changes highlighted the analytic, inductive method, the method of science. Self-analysis was highlighted which led to various themes about man and his physical, eternal and psychic requirements. A new concept of time, now directed to the future, came to the fore. People who lived in the context of these cultures and philosophies had no real problem in adapting to scientific and technological developments. They excelled in mathematics and grasped what science and technology were all

about. The person respected in his society, the symbol of excellence, was the thinker, the saint, the hermit, the philosopher, the intellectual - not the strongman whose major task is to mediate vital force to those developments. It had an emotion charged with a deductive, not an analytic approach.

The primary civilisations were always dictated by magical and mythical ways of thinking. With the Greeks reason started to drive out myth but because they treated physics and chemistry with disrespect no real techno-scientific mentality could develop. Because these fields are so appallingly neglected in Africa this continent will remain behind in the basic instruments for development. While the Greek cosmology did manage to overcome the mythological way of apprehending the world, it remained essentially "dramatic" (Whitehead 1926:18). Nature was a drama in which each thing played its part. This is still the problem of contemporary Africa, namely everything in nature is an interplay of forces, a drama, an attitude which disturbs a clear rational orientation to nature. One source for the origin of science lies in that:

Medieval insistence on the rationality of God ... the faith in the possibility of science ... is an unconscious derivative from medieval theology (Whitehead 1926:18).

The primal religions of Africa are not religions of the rational, that is the rational does not play a significant role in religious matters. God's existence is not an epistemological question. Acceptance is a basic disposition of the mind - not fides but rather fiducia (trust), a deep sensitive experience, rather than logical argument, that predominates. For the person in Africa the world mediates a supernatural activity which could be either good or evil. The good can only survive if the evil is continuously checked and counteracted.

3. THE FRUSTRATION SYNDROME

There is a deep-seated frustration in Africa because of its inability to adapt to the modern situation and this has as reaction a belief in the proliferation of the evil with its negative demonic forces. Adeney states that when a missionary or local church leader has to face issues concerning sorcery he should:

check out the lines of tension in the local structure, probing for the sociological ingredients in the trauma (Adeney 1974:13, 394).

The desire to accept the new situation brings forth numerous guilt feelings which are symbolised as evil spirits which want to

counteract the new steps taken. Furthermore, the frustration stems from the low level of "industrial mentality" which according to a Nigerian systems engineer is the greatest obstacle in Africa's industrial progress. He (Anyiwo 1977) states:

Industrial mentality is a psychological orientation of the mind which puts the latter in adventurous frame within which the mind becomes truly the architect of its own future, deliberately designing its own trajectory of development and systematically "conquering" obstacles confronting it in the process; the industrial mentality is that agency by which scientific and cultural development are deliberately projected into a technology for the satisfaction of apparent needs and industrial mentality is acquired by long exposure to and practice in practical industrial problem solving situations.

Women are however greatly affected by the new situation, by the process of modernisation, and this is evident in the fact that they find their refuge in the churches and especially in the indigenous churches where many act as prayer persons and prophets. Many women are among those who feel at times possessed by evil spirits in their various forms. The other issue is the fact that there is still a strong group-consciousness in Africa which is also evident in the many small face to face church groups. Group consciousness could be tyranny or security. In this approach the law of participation is very prominent, for example, everything and everyone can have a share in everything and everyone else. Here the group takes precedence over the individual. An isolated human being in Africa is an anomaly: "I am only because we are, and since we are, therefore I am." This interrelationship often stultifies initiative, innovation and the spirit of enquiry because tradition has all the answers and jealousy reigns where an individual in the group excels and such a person easily becomes the object of witchcraft and sorcery. Man is more than a mere social being; he is in intimate relationship with other forces which influence him and others (Temple: 1959:28). The worst adversity is that which does not allow him to get this power, for example, when his human dignity, his authority are affected - a sign that contact has been lost with the totality, which has become hostile towards him (Taylor: 1963:75). Anyone who reacts against the group is treated in the same way as a witch and when "smelled out" is destroyed.

Traditional man is not surrounded by things but by beings. The world is not objectified as in the case of science but subjectified. He is part of the subjectified world. The personality of life in Africa is important. The very humanity of a person depends on integration in the family, clan or tribe. The self concept becomes a projection of the group. The traditional group "tyranny" did not allow any challenges to the timeless status quo.

Development implies creative unrest, the techno-scientific disposition invokes a never-ending questioning of everything. All acts, from birth to death and thereafter, bind a person as a communal being to all around him. When disequilibrium is experienced in the community the main task is to detect the enemy of social equilibrium and such an enemy has to be destroyed. The diviner has in this connection a special task.

Africa's concept of time has also to be considered. Temporality is an aspect so fundamental and obvious in human existence that the concept "time" is indispensable for a satisfactory description or interpretation of the world and man. Africa's emphasis on the past, its anti-clockwise concept of time, has affected its progress to the future. Only a future is planned for. The concept of time is closely linked to Africa's most pressing contemporary problems, namely the inability to plan for their needs. When the centre of gravity is in the past, what happens in the present has to fit into the past, otherwise it disturbs the harmonious relationship with those in the past because the past is sacral - if this is disturbed the forces of evil are unleashed.

The new emphasis on the future dimension led to social and political instability. The colonial powers created the idea that there is a kind of messianism in politics. Kwame Nkrumah emphasized "Seek ye first the political kingdom and all these things will be given unto you". The end result of this attitude is a sad chapter in Africa's history. This is expressed by Okot p' Bitek in The prisoner:

Crippled by the cancer of Uhuru,
Far worse than
The years of Colonialism,
The walls of hopelessness,
Surround me completely.

There is thus a great misconception not only about time and its emphasis on the past, but also about the recently discovered future. The future is now often seen in Africa as a kind of Father Christmas bringing manna miraculously. But the future is something to work at. In the secularised world, the mystery of the future predominates and those that have come-of-age in the modern world have at their disposal unparalleled creation and transforming power. He who cannot contribute in this process has not come-of-age. Africa has not yet utilised its potential - it does not really know how to do it. It took Europe nearly a thousand years to develop science and technology to what it is today - Africa is expected to attain this development in a hundred years without proper preparation.

The attitude to nature itself does also influence the world of supernatural forces. In traditional thinking, the earth is the symbol of the mother which is one of the central themes in modern African literature. In Africa, man has a personal relationship to nature. Nature does not consist of objects but is personal. In nature there are gigantic forces - some adverse, some well disposed. In traditional Africa the world has to come more under the dimension of time and history (Gogarten 1953). Secularisation made a break with the everlasting cycle of nature and ever-present myth (Van Leeuwen 1964:331). Secularisation brought freedom, it made room for man among all the forces that bound him. He has become emancipated from the ontocratic concept of the universe, namely that it is full of beings some of which are continuously struggling to disturb the balance.

The Old Testament emphasises the utilisation of the earth to man's benefit. It did not consider it as being loaded with fearful forces which prohibit even its cultivation unless certain magical acts are performed. Genesis 1:28 states:

Subdue the earth, rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air and over every living creature that moves on the earth.

The Greeks saw man aesthetically related to nature, as is the case in the Eastern religions. In primal religions one harmonises with nature and appeases the adverse forces in it - it is a mystical and mythical union; in Western scientific technological thinking one makes and breaks it, utilising it to the best of one's ability. Western man's relationship to the earth is primarily a horizontal, pragmatic relationship, that is a rational relationship, while traditional Africa's relationship to it is primarily intuitive and emotional. Land for the Westerner is basically economic; for Africa the earth is a mother. Ecstatic religious rites in order to benefit from Nature's resources are foreign to the man of science and technology. So many forces, however, disturb the relationship with Mother Earth and have to be counteracted. It is evident that a world-view based on a primal religious outlook cannot as such incorporate ideas about nature, time and history, man and community, which are an integral part of modern development. Even Christianity has not played the role in Africa that it did for Europe, in connection with the development of that continent. Education, its rudiments were mostly given and further education to a privileged few.

The traditional primal communities remain, thus, obstacles in the process of development and this accounts for much of Africa's frustration and its inhibition by evil forces. What is evil and bad should be seen in terms of the community and not merely in terms of personal and group morality. Where microcosmic

boundaries are broken down and adaptation to a wider world takes place, it leads to changing social structural circumstances and a more universal outlook. Religion is an integral infrastructural aspect of the African community which could not be said of capitalism, for example. But religion could stultify the dynamics of articulation. The majority of Africans have been reduced in the urban areas in this country to proletarian status. While in the traditional outlook man is subjected to the forces in nature which he fears, and nature cannot be controlled nor man controlled in nature, the other extreme takes hold in the urban setting, namely that man can make and break everything. Nature, governed by supernatural forces, holds traditional man at its mercy and he should not get too closely involved with nature through his own efforts. If it is well-disposed, it will give its benefits. This, however, has affected initiative, individual responsibility, determination, individual planning and innovation. Much of the frustration experienced is due to this background. The situation changes in urban areas where competition comes on the scene (Durand 1970). Much is being done, also in the African indigenous churches, to change this disposition. They take care of their families, form consistent habits, they assist each other and in fellowship encourage one another and their healing practices are a great help. Old paternalistic attitudes are broken down and younger persons become leaders and women play a significant role.

One could refer here to the emphasis on consumption, the devouring of resources for minor matters, while they are desperately needed for development. Fortunately, many AIC members have a simple lifestyle, they improve this position and are an example to others. Modernity is required more on the individual basis and this should be investigated more closely in social psychology. Personality changes take place in a specific context and this should be studied more closely (Inkeles & Smith 1974:11). Modernisation leads in most traditional cultures to personal psychic stress especially via the urban industrial institutions and patterns, because of social disruption. Although some doubt that the urban milieu brings distress, tension and insecurity, and thus personal disorientation, the South African black cities have proved what social disruption as a result of economic and political deprivation can lead to. Traditional and semi-traditional societies in the urban areas are not symbols of security and tranquillity, they all experience tension, insecurity and thus fear of many unpredictable forces.

Many of the fears that haunt traditional Africa will be partly removed when the process of modernisation becomes more effective, and "modern" in Africa includes the following:

- a) openness to new experiences such as a new environment, different peoples; b) readiness for social change; c) allow

for differences of opinion without considering this to be a threat; d) time evaluated as an important commodity; e) planning becomes important; f) the old fatalism with its emphasis on the looming dangers of evil forces such as bewitchment, sorcery, spirit possession is superseded by the knowledge that such forces are either imaginary or could be controlled; g) educational and occupational aspirations play a greater role; h) human dignity and human rights are greatly valued (Inkeles & Smith 1974:20-25).

The present confusion, bewitchment and suffering will last as long as there is insufficient basic training. In this country it will last as long as people have no horizons, but are kept in ghettos, because of an educational system maladjusted to the needs of the day, and socio-political discrimination.

4. HOW DO ZIONISTS SEE ADVERSE CIRCUMSTANCES?

It has already been indicated that human suffering is seen in the context of spiritual possession; that bewitchment and sorcery are considered to be major obstacles on the road to modernisation; that these phenomena have to be taken seriously, as in the Bible, and that "sin" should be seen within the African context as resulting in physical and psychical sickness because it is not "only" due to a disunity between the individual and God but also between persons in the family of the victim and also between such a person and the community.

The reaction of the church against the emphasis on the evil forces, especially the devil in the seventeenth and eighteenth century and the declaration that belief in witchcraft is heresy, did much to influence the missionaries against such forces. The reality of witchcraft and sorcery were refuted while in Africa they were live issues and the Bible did not ignore these phenomena. The movement to judge these phenomena in the light of the Bible is especially strong in the AIC. In the historic churches a schizophrenic attitude prevails - members pretend to uphold the stance of these churches, but many believe in such forces and seek help where help is given outside these churches. In this regard the problems of the African have also been ignored.

Western trained ministers of religion, Western trained medical doctors, psychiatrists and psychologists are prejudiced towards these phenomena or they simply ignore them. They are not in a position to give assistance in this regard. The unwillingness to give attention to traditional beliefs, religious practices and values, as well as the interpersonal and social structures of the Africans at the Western-orientated hospitals, have driven many African patients to their traditional healers where they are not things but persons with real problems which have to be understood

within their cosmology. Now that African psychiatrists and psychologists, also pastoral psychologists, come to the fore in many parts of Africa, there are determined attempts to understand these phenomena, namely bewitchment, sorcery and spirit possession, better. Although there may be disagreement about their potential harm, it is important to assess the effect they do have on health. Furthermore, the Bible does not conceal such issues as sorcery (cf. Dt. 18:10; 2 Ki. 17:17). The AIC take these issues seriously and offer pastoral care to members, with the result that they attract many people, also from the "historic" churches.

5. PRECEDENCE OF SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

A vital concern in Africa is to retain the equilibrium in social relationships. Sorcery and witchcraft are considered to be anti-social evils, as they disturb social relations, because their source is so often jealousy within the extended family. They affect the health and the general well-being of the victim. In traditional society such relationships are restored through confession and some visible symbolic rituals which are performed to reconcile those whose relationships have been disturbed, for example, the slaughtering of a black and a white chicken representing the guilty and offended party or merely the slaughtering of an animal.

Important in this procedure are the symbolic acts - even with most of the prophets in the AIC. Although prayer is important, only a few AIC prophets among those questioned, emphasised prayer. Prayer is necessary and it has value, but of vital importance is concrete reconciliation with the person to whom a wrong has been done. Thus, reconciliation has to do with the sick person and God, but is especially necessary also between the guilty and the offended. Thus it is not a matter of prayer only. Confession of wrongs done takes place regularly in the AIC services, and mutual forgiveness is to them a significant part of reconciliation. Their face to face services do much in this regard. For the African, sin is a concrete existential reality and many Africans in the historic churches see sin and confession in the terms and symbols of traditional religion (cf. Nxumalo 1979:29-30). The question of restoring relationships is a major task of the diviner and it is a major task of the prophet in the AIC. As was the case in the traditional society where the penitent had to seek reconciliation with his community, so, in the AIC, with their revival services (umvusilelo), reconciliation is affected among themselves, and with God. This is a regular process.

Into this procedure the ancestors are regularly brought, and with most of the AIC prophets this is also the case - of those consulted eighty-four per cent said that the ancestors play a role in witchcraft, sorcery and spirit possession. Those who fail to

adhere to the taboos and injunctions of the hierarchy get sick, insane or even die. The reason for such transgressions is often ascribed to sorcery or bewitchment. If removed, obedience will be restored. The problem is that the individual himself is then not held responsible so that individual guilt is obscured. In Africa public confession is important and this is one of the main features of AIC services. Much emphasis is put on relieving tensions due to unsocial behaviour. In certain cases the prophecies that expose those individuals guilty of anti-social behaviour can lead to ostracism. Wickedness could also be the mass reaction of a group which project their destructive instincts into an individual who is considered to be undesirable and who gets the role of the scapegoat. Balz (1984:374) states:

All human societies so far known have produced scapegoats in more or less barbaric ways, by killing or isolating people from human solidarity.

6. FORTIFICATION

The main issue concerning purification rites in the African context is fortification against misfortune and the forces of evil. Because there are typical African diseases which the "historic" churches do not take into consideration, they are not in a position to fortify themselves against their onslaughts. They either go to the traditional diviners and herbalists or to their replacement within the AIC, namely the prayer persons, their ministers or prophets. Here they find additional means of protection, not only the scriptural message that God cares, the prayers offered and the sacrament given as in the historic churches. Even the sacrament of baptism as practised in these churches is found to be inadequate - it has become, in the AIC, also a purification rite.

Furthermore, the ropes round the body, ankles and neck, the vestments, the stars, the beads, the pieces of string round the wrists, candles, ashes - all these serve as protection against evil forces. Then the washings (isiwasho), vomitings (palaza); emetics - all these are used to wash off the negative "magic" or get the evil forces out of the system. All these objects have "power" which come either from God, the Holy Spirit and the ancestor spirits and which protect and purify a person against the forces of evil. These protecting objects of cleansing actions are basically Christianised replacements of what is found in the traditional context. The mentioned objects in the AIC are protecting those who wear or use them against the evil spirits. In the AIC the emphasis is on protection and fortification, not on attacking the forces of evil as is the case within the traditional society. In the traditional society the evil when taken out could be restored to the evildoer - what is taken out and discarded

could be used as a potent means against someone else or in retribution. The AIC do not act this way as will be indicated later. They do not activate sickness in adversaries but only heal the victim.

Water, as the symbol of life and healing (including from the effects of evil spirits) plays a significant role in the exorcism practices of the AIC. The Roman Catholic Church's Collectio Rituum have special reference to evil spirits in its blessing of the water which reads inter alia:

... and instill into this element prepared by many cleansings the power of the blessing: Grant that this creature of thine, in the services of the mysteries, may effect the purpose of divine grace to banish all evil spirits and drive away diseases (Collectio Rituum 1960:163).

The prayer continues to ask that houses blessed with the blessed water be freed from all uncleanness and delivered from all harm. "Let no noxious spirit remain there ..." (Collectio Rituum 1960:163). When this attitude is observed by the African there is not the temptation to seek the help of the diviner (cf. Nxumalo 1979:35).

7. EXORCISM AS A HEALING PRACTICE

This is an important activity in AIC. It is now considered to be of importance to the pastoral ministry in the African context. It has been indicated above how social, economic and political issues could lead to tensions and to maladjustment and to the belief in the omnipresence of evil forces or an evil force. This is part of the world-view of the traditional African.

Masamba ma Mpolo, a Baptist minister from Zaire, presently with the Department of Family Education of the World Council of Churches, states:

Beliefs in bewitchment are functional in as much as they are used as a channel through which people can deal with hate, hostility, frustration, jealousy, guilt and sexual fantasies which are not culturally overtly expressed. Therapeutically, beliefs in bewitchment create social abreactions, thus preventing the formation of severe individual neurosis ... In general, the individual deals more easily with external than with internal dangers ... Aside from facilitating the discharge of aggression, in culturally accepted ways, beliefs in bewitchment serve another psychological function: they resolve ambivalent feelings which are encountered in the ambiguity of social relationships ... (cf. Masamba ma Mpolo, quoted by Lagerwerf 1985:37).

He sees bewitchment as functional in various respects, namely as helping the individual psychologically to deal with his/her personality crisis and mistrust of the environment; through bewitchment the person unconsciously affirms his/her worth because this person makes claims for his/her identity. It is also related to the individual's psycho-social concern, that is as a means to affirm himself in the context of the social system of thought and relationships (Masamba ma Mpolo 1984:154). Above all it is a symbolic acting out of inner guilt feelings (1984: 154).

8. ZIONISTS AND SORCERY

The Zionists strongly oppose sorcery which is to them a most hostile activity. The Zionists feel that they are not always fully accepted by the community and that traditional forces are used against them. Those who become marginal in their churches are considered to be the most susceptible to the adverse activities of evil forces. Only by devoting himself fully to the demands of his church is a member certain of protection and fortification against such negative attacks.

The counter-elements used against the attacks of sorcerers are inner cleansing through drinking a mixture of sea water (or water with salt) and ashes. Praying together as a group, laying on of hands, hitting the person with the hands or "holy" sticks are methods used. Often these acts have been preceded by a revival service (umvusilelo).

In a survey of prophets/prayer healers in the Zionist Churches, which took place on the Rand and round Durban, various replies were received concerning the typical ethnic diseases effected by sorcerers, who should treat them and how they should be treated. A well known leader of a Zionist church who acts also as a prophet maintains the ufufu-nyane (a kind of hysteria) caused by evil spirits, "is caused by various 'mixtures' used to get your brains off. Like a drunk person the person's brains do not work. If pills are given by the doctor then the brains come back. After this I give the person water over which I have prayed. The umthandazi can kill the disease." The umthandazi (prayer healer) stated that the victim is given water blessed by her and once the person drinks that water the ufufunyanane immediately removes itself from the person "because it does not want things that are blessed". Another umthandazi stated that she mixes "holy water" (i.e. water prayed over) with ash or salt or sea water and impepho (incense used to draw the attention of the ancestors). It is used for "vomiting, purging and steaming". For the ufufunyanane, the umthandazi or umprofeti is recommended as they "can see the disease - they can 'see' what others cannot 'see'" and through praying, the ufufu-nyane will tell you, "how it came in and how it

will get out". Medicines are also used. It is not only prayer but also certain ritual incisions that have to be observed.

In the case of idliso (food poisoning by a sorcerer) the prophets replied to the question: "who should treat this disease? Why this person?" as follows: five stated that the prayer healer should treat the victim, three referred it to the herbalist (inyanga), one to the diviner (isangoma) and one maintained that the prayer healer, the diviner and the inyanga could treat it but only one (who referred to all three) included the Western doctor which was put as an option. None of these prayer healers referred only to prayer as a means of healing in this case. It has been stated by some of the prophets that a prophet has to "see" which doctor should treat the victim. "See" here refers to a special ability found also with the diviner in the traditional context. The prophet "sees" because he/she is in contact with the Holy Spirit and/or the ancestors. Some maintained that if the isangoma has learned about traditional medicine he/she may also be able to help, otherwise not. The prayer healer "can give holy water (isiwasho) to take out the poison", that is to vomit (palaza); he/she gets advice from the ancestor ("messenger") "to help the suffering person". Another prayer healer stated "the prayer healer can chase away everything through God's spiritual power".

Those who referred to the herbalist as the best person to refer the victim to maintained that they prepare the medicine (muti) for idliso victims and they are thus best able to counteract or neutralise it - "they can also reverse the process through herbs".

All stated this condition (dliso) is caused by medicine (muti) received from the herbalist (inyanga); it is ascribed to jealousy or hatred. One stated that, as the name indicates (idliso = to be made to eat) a person eats something which he is unaware has been mixed with herbs. After eating this muti something like a nest or egg develops in the victims chest which damages mainly the lungs and the person coughs incessantly. "Because I am a prophet I predict the cause through visions".

With regard to ibulawo (bodily weakness as a result of witchcraft) the following: On the question of how this "disease" is recognised (types of symptoms), some have terrible headaches, others have lice in their hair and on their bodies, some are mentally disturbed, others have strokes or heart attacks; a rich person may become poor; he may try to do something but nothing comes right; or people may not come to a prophet for help anymore, or a person may do things he does not want to do, for example stealing (even from his own home) against his will. In the words of one prophet: "witchcraft causes this 'bad habit sickness'". The victim loses weight, gives the impression of having psychic

problems or is unable to work because of swollen legs; his general health condition is seriously affected.

All this is ascribed to medicines used against victims, which are effected by the herbalist (inyanga). The witches (abathakathi) pour medicine in the ground and call out a person's name and if that person steps over it, he gets the disease. The cause is "predicted", namely the prayer healer/prophet diagnoses it through a dream or a "vision" which he/she receives either from the ancestors or the Holy Spirit. Others maintain that there could be various causes, as different types of witchcraft ("witchcraft is often used in the sense of 'sorcery'") are used. It could be contracted by stepping over a herb or eating a poisonous herb or medicine; others see it as being caused by ancestors when they wish to have something from a person but there is no response. Soil from the grave of a person who had the disease, of stealing could be used and mixed with muti over which the person's name is called out. Such a person cannot rid himself from the crave to steal.

A person is bewitched because of jealousy. The name of a person is called on medicine (muti), and the muti is sent to a person in a "sort of a dream". Once the person has dreams, it gets him/her and causes sickness.

On the question "who should treat the condition and why?", three of the prayer healers/prophets stated the diviners should treat it; six referred only to the prayer healers/prophets, one to the herbalist and none to the Western doctor. In spite of the fact that traditional healers are mentioned, the prayer healers nevertheless remain in the picture. Nevertheless, certain ritual acts are considered important even by most of the prayer healers, for example, a well known prophet cum leader of his church, refers to the diviner and the prayer healer with regard to ibulawo because both steam the victim with medicine that has been cooked and when the victim has been steamed they give the person white medicine (water mixed with sugar). He added: "Then your luck starts to move". In traditional Zulu society, red and black medicines which are cooked stop the disease and white medicine heals the person. Other medicines are also used such as burning izinyamazana (made up of parts of an animal - horn, skin etc.). Because the diviners use medicine for vomiting and steaming they are also recommended by some prayer healers.

Those who emphasise the abilities of the prayer healers to assist such a victim maintain that they use different methods which have been proved to be efficient. Their methods depend on the sickness, for example, "holy" water (water prayed over) mixed with salt, sea water, imphepho (incense used by traditional healers to call up the ancestors) and white wash. White wash is a kind of

sympathetic magic. The prayer healer utilises prayer as told by the ancestor and/or Holy Spirit - the prayer healers are considered to have the power of God to chase away evil spirits and they use isiwasho (water mixed with ashes and salt and which has been prayed over), which helps in washing away all the "dirt" which has caused the ibulawo. The victim is also given a rope which is put round his/her waist; that is, the person is fortified against these evil forces.

It is thus clear that such treatment is not based solely on prayer but also on specific ritual procedures. Zionists, however, strongly react against sorcery and they do resist it vigorously as Kiernan also points out elsewhere (cf. Kiernan 1985). It is an evil which has to be eradicated by all means. The assistance of a diviner is not frowned upon by a number of Zionist prayer healers - in fact, it is encouraged. They do not create a witch-hunting atmosphere however, pinpointing the culprits, but they simply react against its influences which they believe do have negative effects. In this way they uphold the positive values of their church community, protect and fortify them against the negative attacks of sorcerers which their flock, or those who come to them for help, have to encounter.

In Christianity satan, the devil, the great adversary, uses his evil forces; he has dominion over the forces of evil. For the Zionist these forces are not abstractions or myths, but they are very real and one of the main emphases in the movement is to keep the flock intact from these forces which are activated primarily by negative human acts, and to help others who come to the church in this regard. Zionists firmly believe in the affliction of such concrete evil forces which are directed through certain specific agents and their means, to specific persons. It was only in the 18th century that belief in witches was declared a heresy in the Church of England but exorcism as a rite was not declared null and void - the impression most protestant churches give. The Zionist emphasis on exorcism might not be as unscriptural as it seems to be to some. Even its emphasis on ritual may be a meaningful exercise within the context. It is necessary to debate this.

The real antagonist in Zionism is the sorcerer - it is as if Satan is pushed into the background because of the strong feeling of the looming presence of these evil forces. Satan does not work through certain rituals but tempts people directly in doing what is morally wrong such as violent acts which disturb the peace of their group. Satan attacks the individual. Satan is spiritual; the sorcerer is human. Such a person usually falls ill although misfortune does also arise. It has been indicated above how the causes for this are established especially through the prayer healer or prophet or even the diviner. Here the processes used by the diviner also come to the fore.

Perhaps reference should be made to the psycho-therapeutic process of the diviner (cf. Mkhwanazi 1986:91-4). There are three different stages, namely:

Stage 1. The divination stage is the first stage when incense is burned, to call up the ancestors to be present at the diagnosis session. The clairvoyant powers are received by the diviner through the voices of the ancestors who address the diviner. Only when they are ready to assist will the diviner act. When the diviner is ready he/she then faces the client and the vumisa method begins, a method of ascertaining, by successive statements of the afflicted person and his/her relatives, the reasons for the problem. This is the first part of the therapy. Here it is the diviner who informs the client or victim of the nature and cause of the illness or discomfort. At this stage the diviner is most active - a stage which lasts twenty to thirty minutes.

Stage 2. The second stage of therapy follows in which the client/victim asks questions and clarification from the diviner. The diviner now informs the client/victim and his/her family with some understanding how the traditional belief system works. The provision of such a belief system appears to be of some therapeutic value for the patient.

Reassurance, explanation, advice, suggestion, direction are important variables in this stage of the diviner's therapeutic process. The diviner gives the reassurance by accepting the patient's problem as nothing unusual and indicates that it can be treated (Mkhwanazi 1986:93).

The therapeutic process is also now outlined - what the client/victim should avoid and what rituals should be performed, for example, the slaughtering of an ox or goat.

In this stage the relationship between client/victim and the diviner has become one of confidence in which the former discloses matters that are disturbing to him; his difficulties are analysed by the diviner and information and understanding given of his/her difficulties.

Stage 3. The actual treatment procedures, rituals to be performed as part of the therapy, animal sacrifices, the period of treatment and where the therapy/treatment (in the patient's family or home of the diviner) will be done, are discussed. In most cases it is done at the diviner's home. In this phase the patient continues to unburden himself of issues which trouble him. The patient's problems qualify the length of treatment. Lots of hope is offered to the patient by the diviner (Mkhwanazi 1986:93-4). Empathy, warmth and genuineness are characteristics revealed by the diviner towards the client/victim.

The approach of the prayer healer/prophet does not differ in intensity, in empathy, warmth and genuineness from that of the diviner. The prayer healer/prophet is actually a substitute in the Zionist context for the vacuum created in the historic churches, where healing has been pushed out of the church (except the often impersonal prayers) and relegated to cold, in atmosphere, Western orientated hospitals or asylums where the patient does not encounter the warmth and empathy, even genuineness, he/she experienced with the diviner. Just as in the case of the diviner, the presence of the Holy Spirit and/or the ancestors is also important. In some cases candles are lit - white represents the Holy Spirit, another colour, say green, the ancestors of the prophet and blue or yellow the ancestors of the victim. Not only is the presence of the ancestors important, but also that of the prophet and the client/victim, who should not be in discord about the diagnosis and procedures. Here also the clairvoyant powers are received from the Holy Spirit and the ancestors - only sixteen per cent of a sample of prayer healers maintained they receive visions only through the work of the Holy Spirit - the others emphasised, also, the co-operation of the ancestors; in some cases it seemed that they take precedence over the Holy Spirit.

During the first phase the illness is established and is usually conveyed to the prayer healer through a dream or a vision. The dream comes the night before the arrival of the victim, or in the case of an unannounced arrival, the diagnosis is given "like lightning through a vision". After this the patient is questioned about his/her illness. Then follows the explanation of the prophet, what and how it all happened and finally the victim is treated, with explanations of the reasons for the procedure.

During this stage there is much communication between the prophet and the patient. Patients are also treated in the prophet's home or with their relatives. The social communication is part of the therapy. In many cases chickens, or a goat or sheep or even a beast is slaughtered. Often the victim is informed by the prophet of some secret rituals that have been performed against him/her by the mystical assailant. Not one case has been encountered either in Soweto or in the townships round Durban, of bewitchment, that of persons being negatively affected by individuals who have some mystical power in their personalities to harm others without the use of magic. The Zionists are considered so successful in removing the cause of their client's illnesses that they are considered to be experts in granting people protection from, and fortification against, the powers of evil. This accounts to a great extent for the growth of the movement. What holds them together is the potential attacks and destruction that the mystical assailants could achieve if victims are not strengthened against them. One could argue, and this seems to be a valid argument, that much of the emphasis on the mystical aggressors

stems from the subconscious reaction against an unfriendly environment. Zionists are emphatic that sorcerers will never get a foothold or be able to act in their circle - if it does happen on very rare occasions it shatters the group. The main emphasis is that the destructive forces are from the outside, not from the inner circle. But such an outsider is never specially mentioned. It is not the sorcerer who has to be destroyed or eliminated - as is the case with a witch - but it is necessary to counteract the evil acts of the sorcerer. Very few Zionist healers work through the Holy Spirit and prayer alone - as already indicated, ancestors play a significant role as does ritual cleansing through vomiting, steaming and emetics.

Sorcery gives Zionists in a fiendish world a sense of cohesion; an incessant enemy which has to be confronted. The process of modernisation, the transitional change has made this phenomenon a force to be reckoned with and the Zionists have become experts in counteracting its evil effects. This is why the AIC have become a source of strength for many. They have a special way, based on the African world-view of alleviating suffering.

9. THE PROPHET AND NEED FOR CONTEXTUAL HEALING

The office of prophet which disappeared in the Church during the end of the third century, mainly as a result of the reaction against Montanus, and his prophetesses, Prisca and Maxmilla, has reappeared after nearly seventeen centuries in the Zionist Churches in Southern Africa. In the nature religions, one finds the Shamaans who are also seers, and their religion is referred to as actual prophecy. The Zionist prophets however are not so much concerned about the future as about the specific needs, especially restoring harmonious interrelationships and healing of people. In the small, dynamic AIC communities which are often substitutes for the extended family, the prayer healers keep the relationships on a healthy basis. Here the members feel supported and protected. The flag planted at the open space utilised for worship keeps evil forces away, so do the candles, the vestments, the sea-sand sprinkled in and around the house, the crosses and the holy staves, which ward off the attacks of sorcerers.

The office of prayer healer in the AIC indicates a vacuum in the counselling and psycho-therapy within the historic churches. There is a much greater understanding in the AIC of the complex relationship between culture and healing, namely in its physical and psychiatric context - especially the latter. It is more and more understood especially in new cross-cultural psychiatry that reality is not intrinsic to Western perception and the world-view - a grave Western fallacy - on the contrary, each culture is important in its specific context. Disease is thus not a separate entity stuck away in its pure form under the layers of cultural

camouflage. It must be studied within the context of specific cultural norms and the accepted patterns of normative behaviour within which it occurs.

In spite of being in contact with a secularised world-view, the animistic and personalised rather than scientific and mechanistic world-view predominates within many in the AIC. Thus to be therapeutic, treatment of illness among black people should be related in a culturally meaningful manner to the patient's prior experience and expectations. These expectations are not fulfilled in the historic churches as far as their counselling is concerned. Industrialisation and urbanisation have led to the disappearance of the "tradition-directed-personality" while the "inner-directed-personality" has not yet taken shape. This leads to psychiatric problems but here also the AIC act as a modernisation process in this transition.

It is important to see what is actually at stake when, for example, a person believes he/she has an evil spirit, as a result of the activities of a sorcerer. Such external dangers can be removed more easily when the danger is internal - it prevents severe individual neurosis. Spirit possession, bewitchment and sorcery could be related to a person's psycho-social crisis especially in rapid social change. To project one's weaknesses on evil spirits who possess you or who influence your behaviour, has an effect on the concept of guilt. So also, when sin is washed off or removed through vomiting and emetics. These have theological implications on which criticism could be launched but when it leads to positive healing results, the situation becomes ambivalent. But acts performed within a culture cannot summarily be described as "pagan". The Bible is often more lenient than the legalistic approaches of ecclesiastic authoritarianism.

The Western displacement of the African approach to the biblical message should be confronted even within the so-called historic churches in Africa, and alien forms of pastoral care in some of these churches should be replaced by an approach which comes nearer to the realities of Africa. In counselling, the symbols that live in their minds should be utilised in such a way that individuals can express their inner feelings. In dealing with sorcery some form of ritual assistance is necessary. Symbols and signs are important in African therapy - this is evident in the AIC at their services and baptisms. In contextualisation more will be attained when prayer is supplemented by specific rituals. It is essential that exorcism does not become an obsession - instead of looking at the world as loaded with evil forces, it should be viewed from the fact that it is in spite of these forces, in the hands of the Infinite Almighty Creator and that His love has been revealed through His Son who abides with this world always.

Demon possession cannot be looked upon as mere illusion or superstition or a psychological imbalance. Scripture took it seriously and handled it in this spirit, for the sake of those who felt themselves possessed. These people receive close attention in th AIC. Sunday after Sunday, the North Beach of Durban witnesses exorcism practices of AIC coming from many parts of the country such as Soweto, Mamelodi, Bloemfontein as well as Swaziland, Lesotho, Boputhatswana To many, the sea is the best place for this activity.

In their approach to healing the AIC act spontaneously, and the outcome is an adapted, contextualised approach within the cosmology of those among whom they live and work. This accounts for the meaningful way in which they handle the vicissitudes against body and mind in the modern situation.

WORKS CONSULTED

Anyiwo, J.C. 1977. Industrial cooperation in the Lomé convention, in Alting von Geusau, A.M. (ed.). The Lomé convention and a new economic order. Leyden: Sijthoff.

Adeney, M.A. 1974. What is "natural" about witchcraft and sorcery? Missiology 2, 377-395.

Berglund, A.I. 1976. Zulu thought patterns and symbolism. Cape Town: Philip.

Bührmann, M.V. 1983. Some psychological factors in particular crimes of violence in the black man. South African Journal of criminal law and criminology 7, 252-25.

Cheetham, R.W.S. & Griffiths, J.A. 1976. Cross cultural psychiatry and the concept of mental illness. South African medical journal 58, 320-325.

Deurden, D. & Pieterse, C. (eds.) 1972. African writers talking. London: Heinemann.

Du Toit, B.M. 1975. The isangoma: An adaptive agent among the urban Zulu. Anthropological quarterly 2, 51-65.

Durand, J.J.F. 1983. Swartman, stad en toekoms. Kaapstad: Tafelberg.

Edwards, S.D. 1985. Some indigenous South African views on illness and healing. KwaDlangezwa: University of Zululand. (University of Zululand series 849).

Field, M.J. 1960. Search for security. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Fromm, E. 1977. The same society. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Gilbert, A. & Gugler, J. 1982. Cities, poverty and development: Urbanisation in the third world. Oxford: University Press.

Gogarten, R. 1953. Verhängnis und Hoffnung der Neuzeit: Die Säkularisierung als theologisches Problem. Stuttgart: Kaiser.

Inkeles, A. & Smith, D.H. 1974. Becoming modern: Individual change in six countries. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

- Kiernan, J. [1987]. The role of the adversary in Zulu Zionist churches. Forthcoming.
- Kleinman, A.M. 1977. Depression, somatization and the "new cross-cultural psychiatry". Social science and medicine 11, 3-10.
- Krige, E.J. 1950. The social system of the Zulus. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter & Shooter.
- Kagame, A. 1956. La philosophie bantu. Brussels: Revandaise de l'Etre.
- Lagerwerf, L. 1985. Witchcraft, sorcery and spirit possession. Exchange 41, 1-62.
- Lee, S.G. 1969. Spirit possession among the Zulu, in Beattie, J. & Middleton, J. (eds.), Spirit mediumship and society in Africa. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Lerner, D. 1963. The passing of traditional society: Modernizing the Middle East. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Lloyd, P.C. 1981. A third world proletariat. London: George Allen.
- Malinowski, B. 1945. The dynamic of cultural change. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Margull, H.J. 1962. Aufbruch zur Zukunft. Gütersloh: Mohn.
- Marwick, M. (ed.) 1972. Witchcraft and sorcery. London: Penguin.
- Masamba, ma Mpolo. 1984. Kindoki as diagnosis and therapy. ATJ 13, 149-67.
- Mbiti, J.S. 1970. African religion and philosophy. London: Longman.
- Milingo, E. & Macmillan, M. (eds.) 1984. The world in between. Christian healing and the struggle for spiritual survival. London: Hurst.
- Mkhize, H. 1981. Traditional healing methods and Western psychotherapies. M.A. thesis, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg.
- Mkhwanazi, I.S. 1986. An investigation of the therapeutic methods of Zulu diviners. M.A. thesis, University of South Africa, Pretoria.

Ngubane, H. 1977. Body and mind in Zulu medicine. London: Academic Press.

Ngugi, wa Thiongo. 1972. A grain of wheat. London: Heinemann.

Nxumalo, J.A. 1979. Pastoral ministry and African world-view, JTSA 28, 27-36.

O'Connor, A. 1983. The African city. Johannesburg: Hutchinson.

Okot, p'Bitek. 1972. Song of Lawino and song of Ocol. Nairobi: EAPH.

Oosthuizen, G.C. 1968. Causes for religious independentism in Africa. Fort Hare: Fort Hare University Press.

Oosthuizen, G.C. 1986. Baptism in the context of the African indigenous churches. Kwalangezwa: University of Zululand. (University of Zululand series F2.)

Oosthuizen, G.C. [1987]. The role of the prayer healer (umthandazi/umprofeti) in the African indigenous churches. Forthcoming.

Schoffeleers, M. 1982. Christ as the medicine man and the medicine man as Christ: A tentative history of African Christological thought. Man and life 8, 1-2; 11-28.

Soyinka, W. 1976. Myth, literature and the African world. London: Cambridge.

Thompson, J.C. 1977. The measurement of modernization among South African Blacks. Johannesburg: Mimeographed.

Turner, H.W. 1984. The relationship between development and new religious movements in the tribal societies of the third world. Paper presented at New Era conference, Puerto Rico.

Van Niekerk, A.S. 1985. African religion and development. [s.l.]

Wessels, W.H. 1986. Traditional and faith healers. Paper presented at symposium on Indigenous healing methods, Medical School, University of Natal.

Whitehead, H. 1926. Science and the modern world. London: Cambridge.

Professor G.C. Oosthuizen is head of the Research unit for new religions and indigenous churches at the University of Zululand.

2 Jamieson Drive
Westville 3630

THE DEVELOPMENT IN BIBLICAL TIMES OF BELIEF IN DEMONS AND
DEVILS AND THE THEOLOGICAL ISSUE RAISED
BY SUCH A DEVELOPMENT

B. Gaybba

Fools rush in, we are told, where angels fear to tread. When I agreed to make this contribution I did not do so hastily. But I have undoubtedly entered where angels would tread with circumspection, and in doing so may well live to regret it. In short, this is a topic on which I am by no stretch of the imagination an expert. However, the little I have learnt, I have found not only interesting but also important because of the questions it poses.

The history of these beliefs is not easy to reconstruct. Several works exist on the topic, and opinions regarding many aspects of that history differ. However, its general outline is reasonably clear, and it is that that I will sketch here.

1. DEMONS

Let me begin with demons. We today make no distinction between devils and demons. And indeed the blurring of their distinction was already beginning at the end of the Old Testament period. However, demons were originally not conceived of as devils. Essential to the idea of a devil is a being wholly evil, a being opposed to God, to God's goodness, and to any sharing of man in that goodness. The demons of Biblical times, on the other hand, were originally beings that may have represented a threat to man in one way or another, but were not necessarily viewed as evil in themselves. For example, in ancient Babylon and Assyria, departed human spirits could become hostile to certain human beings, while not to others. Such hostile human spirits formed an important class of demons for the ancient Semites (Langton 1949:1). We find this belief reflected in the Old Testament in the ban on Israelites conversing with the dead (Dt. 18:10-12). Demons were regarded as responsible for a variety of ills, but the stress was on physical, not moral evils. Demons caused plague, miscarriages, famine, madness, dumbness, deafness, and so on. Their favourite haunt was the desert. They often assumed animal forms, and were most active at night. In this belief in demons we have a manifestation of a universal phenomenon amongst primitive peoples, namely the supposition that anything out of the ordinary, especially when the result is a physical evil, is to be ascribed to some non-human agent.

What is interesting for us is that while belief in demons played a large role in the lives of the surrounding peoples, it did not

do so in early Israelite thought, if one goes by the Biblical records. The most convincing explanation for this phenomenon is Israel's monotheism. Israel's neighbours believed in a host of gods, and demons were very often viewed as minor gods (a trace of this is found in 1 Sm. 28:13; cf. also Dt. 32:17). For Israel, however, there was only one God: Yahweh. This did not mean - for the early Israelites anyway - that other gods did not exist. But it did mean that they were of no real significance. It did mean that they were powerless against Yahweh. It did above all mean that the Israelite would pay no homage to them, or attempt to placate them in a way that would amount to homage. This would have been idolatrous, the worship of a false god.

However, the evils for which their neighbours blamed demons remained. How could they reconcile this with belief in one, all-powerful God?

The earliest answer was that they were caused directly by God. The God of the earliest streams of the Old Testament tradition seems to have incorporated both good and, as far as man is concerned, evil elements (Russell 1977:178). For example, God commands wide-scale slaughter and pillage (Jos. 8:11), hardens people's hearts so that they will do evil things and then be punished (Jos. 11:20; Ex. 10:1), dislocates Jacob's hip (Gn. 32:26), tries to kill Moses (Ex. 4:24), causes plagues (Ex. 7ff.; Gn. 12:17), and so on. This is not to say that the ancient Israelites believed God was evil. It is simply an assertion that belief in God's supremacy and omnipotence seems initially to have led them to ascribe to Yahweh, and not demons, physical evils.

The next development seems to have been the idea that God causes evils by sending "spirits" (who function as demons) to perform such evils. With the passage of time there is apparently a move to stress God's goodness, and therefore to start removing Yahweh from direct involvement in evil (Russell 1977:182ff.). Thus, God sends a "spirit of discord" between Abimelech and the leaders of Shechem (Jdg. 9:23), a "lying spirit" into the mouths of Ahab's prophets (1 Ki. 22:22), a "spirit of giddiness" on the governors of Egypt's provinces (Is. 19:14).

That there was here a movement to involve God less directly in evil seems attested to by the interesting change made in a later version of David's sin in taking a census of the Israelites. In 2 Samuel 24:1, God is said to have directly incited David to take the forbidden census. The later version in the book of Chronicles (compiled fourth century B.C.) attributes the action to a being called "satan". "Satan", we read (and not God) incited David to take a census (1 Chr. 21:1). A similar change can be found in the non-canonical book of Jubilees, where the attack on

Moses (ref. to above - Ex. 4:24) is now ascribed to a "prince of evil spirits". Mastema by name (Jub. 48:1-3; Russell 1977:204).

What were demons like? Well, they were pretty diverse in nature and character. There were, for example, the Se'irim, who were hairy, goat-like entities (e.g. Lv. 17:7). Then there were Shedim (e.g. Dt. 32:17), a word that described another class of demons, good and bad. Then there were individual demons such as Lilith, the female night-demon (Is. 34:14), although lilith was a term that also indicated a class of demons surrounding her (they are usually referred to as satyrs in English translations). Another noteworthy individual is Azazel, a vague demon to whom the scapegoat was driven on the day of atonement (Lv. 16:8ff), and who like many other demons was believed to inhabit the wilderness. As can be seen, demons were not necessarily conceived of as invisible spirits. On the contrary, vast numbers of them were conceived of as visible, beast-like creatures (see Kelly 1968:12).

There was no one Hebrew term for this variety of demons. The term we use for these beings, "demons", comes from the Greek daimon, which originally meant a divine being who may, or may not, be unfriendly to human beings. It was the translators of the Old Testament into the Greek Septuagint who began to use daimonia to describe a wide variety of demons. After that the term came to serve as a general one for all such beings.

But back to Old Testament times. It is difficult to trace any specific developments of Israel's belief in demons in pre-exilic times (i.e. before 500 B.C.). All that can be said is that the Israelites seem to have accepted their existence, but subjugated them to the power of the one true God. Where active, they were God's servants or agents.

The picture changes dramatically, however, in post-exilic times. A major reason for this, according to scholars, is Israel's exposure during the exile to Babylonian and especially Persian ideas. The change is not really noticeable in the canonical books of the Old Testament. But it is very noticeable in other writings of the period, including the deuterocanonical book of Tobit. To give but one example from Tobit, Asmodeus (a demon of Persian origin) killed all seven of Sarah's husbands before they were able to consummate their marriage to her. Instructions are given to Tobit by an angel on how to banish demons (6:8). Tobit acts on the instructions and meets with success (6:17ff; 8:2ff). The exorcised demon is pursued by an angel. The interest in demons here is very noticeable, when one compares it with the canonical literature of the Old Testament. However, even Tobit's interest is minor in comparison to that displayed in the non-canonical writings of the intertestamental period.

It is not only the degree of interest that changes in post-exilic times, but also the character of the demon. Demons still cause physical harm. However, they now begin to entice human beings to do morally wrong things - especially the worship of false gods. They also take possession of people (Michl 1970:194). Demons are becoming devils.

As mentioned already, what is distinctive to the concept "devil" is that the diabolical is irremediably evil, and as such opposed to God. This particular idea of a being or beings opposed to God, owes much to the influence of Persian thought. Persian - namely, Zoroastrian - thought was strongly dualist in character. It believed in two principles - one good, one evil - locked in conflict. The dualism is not absolute, since the evil principle is neither as eternal, nor as powerful as the good one. In the end the evil one and its followers will be destroyed by the good one. However, even though there is no absolute dualism, the point is that the principle of evil is real, personal, of long-standing duration, and immensely powerful. Moreover, just as the good principle, the creator god, has a host of angels and archangels around it, so too has the evil one a host of supernatural evil beings assisting it in its diabolical work (Langton 1949:63ff.; Russell 1977:218).

The similarities of this world-view with our notions of devils and angels is obvious. The main difference is that in Persian thought the evil one, Ahriman, is pretty much independent of the good God; but in post-exilic Judaism and therefore in our thinking, the Devil and the Devil's minions are definitely creatures of, and therefore totally dependent on, God. If one believes, as the monotheistic Jews did, that evil spirits are God's creatures, and if one came to believe, as they did by the time of the exile, that God does good, not evil - if one believes that, then one has to conclude that when God made these devils they must have been good. Hence, it is not surprising that stories begin to abound explaining the change. The explanations revolve especially around the idea of good spirits - angels - sinning (through lust [see e.g. Gn. 6:1-4] or pride), being banished from heaven, and becoming the foe of both God and man (for details see Langton 1949:107ff.).

In the New Testament, the blurring of the distinction between demons and devils continues. On the one hand, the demons are clearly good old-fashioned demons in that they do not attempt to lead people away from God or to eternal perdition. Instead, the demons are responsible for a wide range of physical evils. This is especially the case with the gospels (Michl 1970:194; Kelly 1968:11). Nevertheless, they are frequently associated with the devil's world and interests. Their exorcism by Jesus, for exam-

ple, is a sign that the devil's power is collapsing (Mk. 3:27). Their confession that Jesus is the messiah causes them torments (Mk. 1:24). Communion with them is incompatible with communion with the Lord (1 Cor. 10:22). However, no new element significant enough to be mentioned here was added to the concept in New Testament times.

As can be seen, the demonic has already become confused with the diabolical. It is time, therefore to look at the history of the idea of the devil, the prince of evil, the one who is presented as God's implacable foe, and who marshalls all the forces possible - demons, fallen angels, human beings - to destroy God's work.

2. THE DEVIL

There is no clearly developed idea of the devil in the Old Testament. Certainly, three times - all post-exilic - a being called "satan" is mentioned there. But the individual concerned has not yet become the devil. The word satan originally meant "to oppose", "to accuse". In this sense Solomon's enemy is described as a "satan" (1 Ki. 11:14). The earliest example we have of the word being used to identify a supernatural being is in Zechariah 3:1. The being is described as "the satan", that is to say, "the accuser", and fulfils this function by accusing Joshua before God. Being an "accuser" was a particular task performed by a member of God's heavenly court. The accuser's job was to test people's virtue. The accuser was therefore not a devil or even a demon. With the passage of time the fellow began to take on sinister characteristics. Instead of simply testing virtue, the accuser begins to appear somewhat hostile to mankind. Probably the heavenly functionary began to enjoy the job too much. Whatever the reason, we see this hostility to humanity very clearly portrayed in the book of Job. However, satan is still nowhere near being a devil. The nasty or evil side of satan is also clear in the third of the texts referred to above: 1 Chronicles 21:1. There the word satan occurs for the first time as a proper name, and not simply as a job description. But once again, satan is not yet a devil (see Langton 1977:10).

There is no testimony in the canonical books of the Old Testament, therefore, to a personal devil. However such a concept was developing in non-canonical literature. And one also finds a testimony to this belief in the deuterocanonical book of Wisdom (Wis. 2:24). The reason cannot be unconnected to Israel's exposure to the Persian ideas referred to earlier. As was seen, Zoroastrianism believed in the existence of a prince of evil, and invested this being with characteristics that have become part of our traditional ideas of the devil. A remarkably similar indi-

vidual begins to appear in the non-canonical literature of the late Old Testament period. That this individual was given the Hebrew name satan is not surprising. As we saw, the heavenly accuser was already developing into a being hostile to man. What is more natural than seeing this individual as having gone too far along the road to evil, and therefore banished from heaven? Once on the scene, passages from the older, canonical, literature were re-read and seen as referring to satan. Thus, the serpent in Genesis was now identified with satan. It is satan who was responsible for bringing death to the world (Wis. 2:24). We are told there that this was due to Satan's envy. A widespread rabbinical explanation of the envy was that, unlike the angels, mankind had been made in God's image. This explanation ties in nicely with the idea of the accuser becoming increasingly hostile to the creatures so fashioned!

One of the texts that were now re-read with minds convinced of a devil's existence, was Isaiah 14:12. It speaks of a morning star, a lucifer, falling to earth, indeed, of being thrown down to the abyss because of pride. We cannot go into whom the morning star actually referred to. But, once again, one can understand why that should be seen as a reference to the devil's fall - especially if, as seems likely, the story refers to the descent to earth of a Canaanite god. As a result the devil acquired a second name, destined to be as widely known and feared as the first: Lucifer.

The Jews and early Christians of the New Testament period inherited many ideas that developed in the intertestamental period in non-canonical literature, including those concerning the existence, origin and nature of the devil. And understandably the devil, satan, becomes central to the drama recorded on the pages of the New Testament books. Satan is the foe of Christ, who came to destroy his work (1 Jn. 3:8). Satan is the father of lies, a murderer (Jn. 8:44), and therefore the antithesis of Christ, who is truth and life. Christ's miracles and exorcisms are a sign that satan's reign is collapsing (Mk. 3:27). Christ's death is the final conquest of satan (Jn. 12:31). There is, of course, something of an inconsistency here, since elsewhere in the New Testament the devil is still very active, going round seeking people to devour (1 Pt. 5:8), and performing a variety of malicious acts amongst Christians (see Prager 1970:811).

However, these details are unimportant for our purpose. It is clear that the figure of the devil, absent from the Old Testament canonical writings, is prominent in New Testament ones.

That, then, in very broad outline is the history of the matter. Let me now turn to a rather serious question raised by it.

3. DO THE SCRIPTURES COMPEL US TO BELIEVE IN THE EXISTENCE OF DEMONS AND ANGELS?

Are we compelled by the Biblical references to demons, devils and satan to believe in their real existence? Unquestionably, evil was as real to the people of Biblical, especially New Testament times as it is to-day. Unquestionably too, the New Testament would call themselves Christians to believe that any evil power may have to separate us from God and destroy us totally. But the question is: does the evidence compel us to believe that there are invisible powers of evil, such as angels, with a leader known as the Devil with visible

What the question is down to is this: do the scriptures testify to a level of evil or simply presume the fact and show how creatures exist, or do they simply assume the fact and show how creatures can be integrated into the sort of vision of a Christ that is clearly part of revelation.

This narrows a number of issues, above all about scripture, about revelation and the relationship between the two. All I can do here is scratch the surface and leave to question time the deeper discussion.

I wish to suggest that others have done before - e.g., Kelly 1968, to name but one - that scripture does not compel us to believe in the existence of either angels (whose history shows a similar dependence on the ideas) or devils. As a Roman Catholic, the ongoing tug of war of the church into the Biblical evidence can bind me to an understanding of scripture that would not be as convincing as the actual evidence alone. But I do not wish to go into whether or not my church tradition binds me to such a belief. It is sufficient to say that I can ask similar questions of my tradition as I can of the scriptures.

To return to the scriptures, then. It is important to realize that simply repeating something is affirmed, even repeatedly, in the scriptures is not of itself a final argument for the reality of what is affirmed. It is impossible here to go into all the complexities of language and of how human beings affirm things - e.g., how competent to do so, which I am not. But the principle is not debatable, I believe. Let me give an example. In the opening verses of Genesis we are told that God made a dome, usually translated as "firmament", to separate the waters above from those below it. Now this passage reflects the unquestioned assumption of the author's milieu that the sky was a physical dome, with gates in it to let the water through. The

text clearly affirms that God made such a dome. However, we also know that no such dome exists. Hence the mere fact that scripture says God made something does not mean that it existed.

In any text, historically conditioned as it always is, one needs to try and distinguish between the point being made and the historical husk of assumptions, presuppositions, myths, what-have-you, surrounding it (needless to say the point in question is not necessarily an "eternal truth" or any similar nineteenth century version of the kernel under the husk). In the example given from Genesis, one could argue that the point being made is that God made everything. If one believes that, and one believes that there is a dome up in the sky - then one will naturally say that God made the dome. Such a statement would have added significance if, as was the case, the idea was widespread amongst Israel's neighbours that the sky was a supernatural being, part perhaps of a god's body. Such an idea is pretty quickly cut down to size by making it part of the creative activity of Israel's God.

Now just as the ancient Israelites subscribed to many of the cosmological ideas of the peoples surrounding them, so too did they subscribe to the universal belief of the existence of demons. Although there is not much direct evidence of interest in demons in pre-exilic literature, there is evidence that such an interest did exist in popular piety. But the salient point is that such beings were regarded as subject to Yahweh. It is possible that the reason why they were not as clearly absorbed into Israel's vision of reality as happened later was because at that early period Israel's monotheism was constantly under threat. It is worth considering that once it was established firmly, as was the case after the exile, demons and even devils could enter the scene without any threat to it. Such beliefs, which were part of the cultural air breathed at the time, could be incorporated into their vision of reality through the simple expedient of demoting them to creatures of Yahweh; fractious creatures, but nevertheless creatures.

Is it not possible to apply the principle here of distinguishing between the central points being made and their cultural husk? Certainly, a great deal is affirmed about demons, devils and their prince. But all these affirmations presume rather than positively argue for their existence. Most of the ideas are simply taken over, it seems, from other sources. The most striking theological addition of the Jews is to place demons and devils firmly in the realm of God's creatures and therefore totally dependent on and subject to God. One could therefore ask whether or not the heart of what is being affirmed here is God's dominion over all things, including evil beings.

One can approach this issue from another direction. Suppose one were to have taken the author of Genesis into a space flight and pointed out to him the error of his assumption of the existence of a dome. His response would very likely have been that the real existence of the dome was somewhat irrelevant to his main point, which was that God made everything. Similarly, suppose one were to have been able to provide a first century B.C. Jew with irrefutable evidence that demons and devils do not exist, what would his response have been? It could very well have been: well, that's very interesting, but it does not alter my faith in God as the creator of all things, as the one to whom all things are subject.

However, there is a difference between the belief in devils that developed, and cosmological ideas. The difference is that belief in devils did indeed help soften, if not solve, the harshness of the problem of evil for the people of the time. Towards the end of the Old Testament period, the ancient Israelite perception of God as the direct perpetrator of not only good but also (especially physical) evils had changed. Certainly, God was still seen as all powerful, but now the emphasis had fallen on the fact that God did good deeds. To explain evil, recourse was increasingly had to the malicious use of freedom, either by man or by superior created beings. The Persian ideas they were exposed to therefore supplied a useful solution to the tension that was created by trying to avoid ascribing evil to God (on this see Russell 1977:177ff.). Belief in a dome above the earth fulfilled no such theological role.

Does this mean that we need to conclude that the Biblical authors were teaching us, as a revelation from God, that such creatures existed? I do not think so. The fact that a useful world-view is at hand to help attenuate the scandal of evil in a world one believes to have been created by a sole, good, omnipotent God does not necessarily mean that that view is presented as part of God's revelation. One could argue that the point being made by it is that God is not an evil God but a God, as we read in 1 John, of love, a God who is love. In the New Testament "God is love" is certainly, to my mind, presented as a true revelation of what God is like. God appears as one radically opposed to evil. That could well be the real point being made. The fact that Persian dualist ideas help make that point does not elevate them to the level of revelation.

The most important Biblical documents to consider, of course, are the New Testament ones. Apart from the deuterocanonical books, there is no affirmation of the existence of true devils in the Old Testament. Now I cannot think of any clear evidence to the effect that the New Testament authors wished to teach us of the

existence of devils or demons. All the evidence is that they simply took over and reflected beliefs that grew up in the preceding centuries. Convinced that demons and devils existed, they attributed a host of evils to them, ranging from evils whose causes we know today (dumbness, epilepsy, etc.) to the opposition to Christ's work that they experienced in their midst. Evil is real, very real. If one inherits and simply accepts as part of one's world-view that demons and devils exist, and that they are responsible for much of the evil in the world, then one will talk about evil in a way that reflects such a belief. But such talk does not necessarily mean that one is reflecting a revelation from God, or even that one actually wishes to argue the thesis that such beings exist. Many people would have little difficulty in acknowledging that their primitive world-view may have led the writers of the Gospels to speak of certain psychological illnesses as being caused by demons. If one can acknowledge that in some cases, then there is no reason why one cannot extend that principle of interpretation to all cases where evils, physical or moral, are attributed to demons or devils.

But, one may object, does not Christ's exorcisms and words about casting out the power of satan show his personal endorsement of the beliefs that had grown up?

Here once again, a nest of problems emerges. The first concerns what exactly Jesus did or did not say. But apart from that, one needs to take seriously Jesus' humanity. Certainly, Jesus was (I believe) truly God. But he was also truly man. As a human being of a particular point in time, he was as culturally conditioned as any other person. He spoke with a specific accent and grew up with certain ideas that are now outmoded (e.g. that the world was flat). This no more contradicts belief in his divinity, than the very human character of the scriptures contradicts belief in their being inspired. If one can accept (as I do) the idea that as a human being Jesus had a culturally conditioned human mind; if one can accept the idea that as a human being he believed the world was flat; if one can accept the idea that as a human being he believed that Moses wrote the Pentateuch; if one can accept such ideas - as I do without seeing any threat to my belief in his divinity - then there should be no problem about accepting the idea that Jesus' belief in demons and devils simply reflected the cultural presuppositions of his day. There should be no problem about accepting the idea that such beliefs held by Jesus may be as erroneous as the idea that the world is flat.

Finally, I must insist that my question has been posed in terms of the Biblical evidence. There are very many experiences people have had down the ages, and still do have, of evil that convince them of the existence of the devil. I am not questioning the

reality of such experiences. Nor do I wish to question the legitimacy of concluding that therefore the devil or devils exist, though such a conclusion is not without its own problems. The point is that that is another issue. Christianity's faith is founded on the revelation attested to in the scriptures, not on personal experiences in post-apostolic times. Hence, my question was limited to whether or not we are compelled on Biblical grounds to believe in demons, devils and the devil.

To sum up, the evidence would seem to indicate that belief in angels and devils resulted not from a revelation from God, but simply from the absorption of foreign ideas into Judaism's world-view. By New Testament times, this view of reality was simply accepted unquestioningly. Demons and devils were presumed to exist. There is no attempt to argue for, to positively teach their existence.

WORKS CONSULTED

Kelly, H.A. 1968. Towards the death of satan. London: Chapman.

Langton, E. 1949. Essentials of demonology. A study of Jewish and Christian doctrine. Its origin and development. London: Epworth.

Langton, E. 1977. Satan, a portrait. A study of the character of satan through all the ages. London: Skeffington.

Michl, J. 1970. s.v. Demon. EBT.

Prager, M. 1970. s.v. Satan. EBT.

Russell, J.B. 1977. The devil. Ithaca: Cornell.

Professor B. Gaybba is professor in systematic theology at the University of South Africa.

Dept. of Systematic Theology
University of South Africa
P.O. Box 392
Pretoria
0001

BETTER THE DEVIL YOU KNOW? SEEKING A BIBLICAL BASIS FOR
THE SOCIETAL DIMENSION OF EVIL AND/OR THE DEMONIC IN THE
PAULINE CONCEPT OF THE "POWERS"

H.I. Lederle

In order to provide a backdrop for this paper on the societal dimension of the demonic I start with a number of general propositions on the devil from a systematic theological viewpoint. This is being couched in the style of apologetic "Thesen". The propositions are postulated without the necessary argumentation and discussion in an attempt to draw the outer lines of a rough sketch which could form a basis for a Christian doctrine on the devil.

1. TWENTY PROPOSITIONS TO ANGER THE DEVIL

1.1 The reality of satan, the devil, and demons is to be affirmed. The denial of the existence of these spiritual beings of absolute evil and the preoccupation with them are equally misguided.

There are two equal and opposite errors into which our race can fall about the devils. One is to disbelieve in their existence. The other is to believe, and to feel an excessive and unhealthy interest in them. They themselves are equally pleased by both errors and hail a materialist or a magician with the same delight (Lewis 1942:9).

1.2 The devil is portrayed in a personal manner in the scriptures - as tempter, accuser, slanderer, murderer, liar, oppressor, and so forth. He is not merely a personified abstraction of evil.

1.3 The devil should be taken seriously. He should not be domesticated or trivialised.

1.4 The devil should not be taken too seriously - one short, sharp, penetrating glance into his domain is sufficient (cf. Barth 1950:3).

1.5 The study of the demonic should not form an independent field of research separate from Christian theology, specifically Christology.

1.6 The primary datum of demonology is that Jesus Christ has triumphed over the devil.

1.7 Satan is a defeated enemy and the struggle against him should be viewed as "mopping up operations" after the decisive victory in the cross and resurrection (cf. Cullmann 1964).

1.8 The reality of "supernatural" evil beings challenges the popular materialistic and rationalistic Western world-view and its positivistic concept of reality as a closed spatio-temporal system.

1.9 In developing a new "open" concept of reality in which the miraculous and "supernatural" are acknowledged care should be taken not to lapse into superstition.

1.10 The three classical enemies of the Christian (according to Luther): the flesh (sarx), the world and the devil cannot be reduced to one another. Some try to reduce the devil to the flesh and the world. Others believe that the flesh can be exorcised as an alternative to crucifying it.

1.11 Classic monism as a theoretical construct of which there are traces in the oldest layers of the Hebrew scriptures is unacceptable since God is thereby ultimately conceived of as the author of sin and evil.

1.12 Classic dualism as a theoretical construct in which God and satan are conceived of as existing eternally is also to be rejected. The focus of the traditional debate has been to deny the eternal existence of satan with respect to his origin. In more recent times the eternal existence of satan has become problematic in terms of eschatology.

1.13 Christian orthodoxy necessarily incorporates a measure of dualism conceptually, especially in the light of the New Testament.

1.14 The "fall" of the angels as described in 2 Peter 2:4 and Judas 6 does not provide us with a theological explanation of the origin of satan. These texts function primarily in a paranetic context.

1.15 It is in the nature of the devil to imitate (counterfeit) God, but whereas divine involvement liberates the humanity of people, demonic involvement tends to eclipse their humanity and to dehumanise people.

1.16 Human beings are responsible for their own guilt and sin, the origin of sin remaining an inexplicable and astonishing mystery.

1.17 The fact that people can become the victims of demonic deception and lies, does not make their sin excusable, that is, guilt can never be absolved by the claim "the devil made me do it".

1.18 Apart from recognising the duality of God and satan a tripolarity principle should be maintained in all religious endeavour.

Der Mensch in der Religion steht im Schnittpunkt dreier Dimensionen: Der seiner eigenen Bezogenheit auf Gott, der des Bemühens Gottes um ihn und der Einflussbereiches der dämonischen Mächte. Wir sollten das Wesen der Religionen biblisch-theologisch, also weder monopolär noch bipolar, sondern tripolar verstehen (Beyerhaus 1969:103).

1.19 The tripolarity principle implies that the same structural given can be employed (a) to God's glory, and (b) for a variety of human reasons or (c) for diabolical purposes. (A good illustration of this is the psycho-physical manifestation known as being "overwhelmed", "slain" or "resting" in the Spirit. Kelsey (1978:44-45) mentions seven possible sources: (1) Auto-suggestion (2) Group expectations (3) Hypnosis (4) Autonomous arisings from the psyche (5) Archetypal experiences (6) Demonic spirits (7) God.

1.20 Our understanding of the devil's work should not be limited by individualism. Evil has systemic and structural dimensions and through man satan is at work both in society at large and in the church.

2. INTRODUCTION

Western culture seems to have an innate tendency towards rugged individualism. This diabolical streak has influenced Western Christianity, especially Protestantism to view both salvation and evil individualistically. The devil we know is the one who tempts us, who causes the individual to fall into sin, who fills his or her thoughts with fantasies of riches, power, prestige or lust. We have grown accustomed to this devil. We are also familiar with his (or her?) more extreme manifestations. In the last twenty-five years the ministry of deliverance (or exorcism) has been newly rediscovered or revived and is practised today inter alia in the charismatic renewal movement. Individual cases of demon possession and/or oppression are now more frequently heard of and discussed. We are accustomed to the work of the devil on a one-to-one basis. The proverb cautions us to fear the devil we don't know - namely, satán in structural garb. (As has become customary in many Christian churches the concepts

Satan, the devil and demons are here being used, if not identically then, as interrelated descriptions of absolute evil).

The increasing complexity and depravity of modern technocratic and consumerist society underscores the necessity that the church no longer limit her witness to the personal and the individual. Gradually even conservative evangelical Christians are beginning to develop an eye for structures and institutions although many still espouse traditional platitudes such as: "Change people's hearts and you will change their society" and "Don't mix religion and politics".

With the awakening of a social conscience amongst American evangelicals a new group of intellectual leaders (sometimes called neo-Evangelicals) have come to the fore, for example, John Howard Yoder, Richard Mouw and Ron Sider. It is from this group that a new quest has started. True to their evangelical moorings these socially-engaged Christian academics and writers are seeking Biblical backing for their task of furthering the systematic transformation of society and protesting social injustices at home and abroad. The traditional ecumenically-minded social activist from large mainline denominations has not felt the need for a stringently text-related undergirding for Christian participation in the task of countering systemic evil. The quest for such a legitimation of involvement in socio-political structures has caused attention to be focused on a rather obscure section of Pauline theology - his "exousiology" or teaching on "principalities and powers" (Eph. 6:12). It is to these concepts, especially eksousiai, archai and stoicheia tou kosmou and that attention must now be given.

Whereas the discipline of theological social ethics has given extensive attention to structural evil and there is a growing consensus amongst theologians from a wide variety of backgrounds that sin has both intra- and supra-personal aspects. A thorough treatment of the societal dimension of evil and/or the demonic must yet be attempted in systematic theology. Durand (1978:85) states: "'n Grondige en omvattende behandeling van die probleem van strukture en institute uit dogmaties - hamartologiese hoek ontbreek nog".

Berkhof (1973:221) says much the same when he claims that scant attention has been awarded to societal structures and anonymous forces of prevailing codes, tabus, traditions and fashionable ideas in theology.

3. PAULINE TEACHING ON THE "POWERS" (OR OUR TEACHING?)

The major portions of the corpus Paulinum which deal with the

exousiai et alia are Romans 8:38-39; 13:1-7; 1 Corinthians 2:6-8; 15:24-26; Galatians 4:1-11; Ephesians 1:19-21; 2:1-2; 3:10; 6:12 and Colossians 1:15-20; 2:8-3:4. (For the purpose of this article the specific issue of the authorship of the epistles is not dealt with).

The basic idea about the "powers" expressed in some of these passages (specifically from the larger sections in Colossians) is that the "powers" were created in Christ. They are dependent on his supremacy and all-sufficiency even after the fall by which they were tainted, becoming focused and directed on themselves instead of on God. Christ triumphed over them and disarmed them making a public example of them through his victory on the cross. He thereby robbed them of their power and manifested his cosmic Lordship. By his deed of reconciliation Christ put the "powers" back where they belonged - in his own triumphal procession. Here they became redirected on God and are seen to be his servants rather than "little gods" in their own right.

3.1 A good springboard towards understanding the "powers" is the concept stoicheia tou kosmou. Fortunately several doctoral theses have dealt with this enigmatic concept in the last few decades. (Cramer 1961; Du Plessis 1962; Bandstra 1964 [cf. Kist 1971:131]; Gabathuler 1965; Kehl 1967 [cf. Kist 1971:131]; Kist 1971; Van der Poll 1983).

In the historical development of exegetical research on this concept three schools of interpretation emerged advocating a material, figurative and mythological understanding of the "elemental spirits" in Galatians 4:3, 9 and Colossians 2:8, 20.

The material interpretation sees the stoicheia literally as natural elements: either the classical four basic elements - sky (air), earth, water and fire - or physical substances such as mountains, hail, sun, moon, stars, sea, and so on. This interpretation has received meagre support and seems to be dying out.

Another group of exegetes present a figurative interpretation. The stoicheia are seen as referring to spiritual "elements" of human life. Cramer's view (1961:163-164) is a good illustration:

Zo kunnen waarschijnlijk alle krachten die in de religieus-zedelijke instelling van de oude mens gestalte krijgen, die daar als het ware de "elementen" van zijn, zoals zijn gebondenheid aan de wet, zijn streven naar wijsheid, zijn neiging zich autonoom het heil te verwerven, als stoicheia beschouwd worden.

Bandstra refers to the fundamental forces inherent in the world

by which Paul specifically means the law and the flesh. Du Plessis (1962:89) sees the stoicheia as related to the Colossian heresy of salvation through the keeping of Jewish legalistic regulations. These primary principles of the world (eerste beginsels) refer to figurative concepts such as being saved through the law.

The third school of interpretation advocates a mythological understanding - the stoicheia as spiritual beings - angels, evil spirits. With the rise of the "religions-geschiedtliche Schule" in the nineteenth century this interpretation came to dominate. Prominent supporters were Hilgenfeld, Diels, Dibelius and more recently Schlier and Lohse. Many saw the "elements" as the astral angels referred to in Hellenistic apocalypticism. With reference to this interpretation Du Plessis (1962:88-89) states:

Die stoicheia van die dwaalleer sou daarom niks anders wees nie as stergeeste wat 'n heersersposisie in die Heelal beklee het. Die tekste wat ter ondersteuning van bogenoemde standpunt moet dien, is egter glad nie sterk of oortuigend nie en daar is buitendien van verskillende kante af, o.i. oortuigende argumente na vore gebring wat wys op die onhoudbaarheid van genoemde verklaring.

Kist (1971:131) asserts that with his philological research Cramer (to whom Du Plessis is also referring in the quotation above) has opened up a new way to bring an end to the mythological school of the last three-quarter century. Here Kist has probably overstated his case since the mythological interpretation is still the most popular, but it is significant that most of the exegetes of this persuasion have, since the Second World War, preferred to see the stoicheia as angels of the law rather than astral angels - Percy, Masson, Reicke, Daniélou and Bruce (Kist 1971:122). It is apparent that the figurative and mythological interpretations have moved closer to one another. It is also significant that Berkhof whose interpretation of the "powers" opened up a whole new avenue in the exegetical debate (which will be dealt with presently) acknowledges the influences of Jewish apocalyptic circles but believes that Paul is in fact consciously "demythologising" the angelology of the apocalypticists (1962:17-18).

Du Plessis later switched his affiliation to the mythological interpretation. In his commentary on Colossians he prefers interpreting the stoicheia as supernatural forces which control the world. Although he states that good arguments can also be brought forward for interpreting the "elements" as Judaistic instruction he finds the mythological interpretation more convincing in the specific context. He states:

Dié bonatuurlike magte het waarskynlik in die dwaling in Kolosse 'n besondere rol gespeel. Hulle is blykbaar as persoonlike magte gesien wat oor die mens heers en sy lewe beheer. Hierdie magte (the stoicheia mentioned in Colossians 2:8 - HIL) is waarskynlik dieselfde as dié wat in 2:10 en 15 genoem word, wat oor die mens wou heerskappy voer (1978:37-38).

Kist's own interpretation is to interpret the "elements of the world" as human traditions and structures that influence behaviour and lead one away from Christ and the faith (1971:138-142, 145-146). Very similar to this is Van der Poll's conclusion. He (1983:13) states that Paul is busy with the "teachings of men" - not with demons and also mentions Jewish legalism as the prime example.

3.2 Next we look at the exousiai, archai, dunameis, and so on. These concepts are all related and will be dealt with under the heading of "powers". The majority of exegetes see the "powers" as personal spiritual beings, intermediaries between God and man who function as forces of evil. In the first five doctoral theses referred to above there is unanimity that they refer to angelic beings. Gabathuler even sees them as identical with the stoicheia which he interpreted mythologically (1965:142-143). Kist points out that in all the commentaries on Colossians between 1960 and 1970 a transcendent or supra-human interpretation is given to the powers. Only one author, Uitman, mentions an immanent interpretation as a possibility (Kist 1971:155). The exceptions to this generally-held position are Berkhof, Barth and Kist who advocate a structural interpretation. Slightly different is the solution of Van der Poll which will be dealt with later.

3.3 It was the Dutch theologian, Berkhof, who rocked the boat in the fifties with his immanent interpretation of the "powers". Whereas the dominant mythological interpretation has the advantage that Paul is seen as a man of his times influenced by contemporary apocalyptic thought, Berkhof's interpretation has the advantage that it can be so readily applied to the circumstances of his own day. In fact the shadow of fascist statism in Nazi-Germany looms large in the background of his analysis. He speaks of a "verrassend-direct aansluiten" (1973:222) between Paul modern societal issues. This opens up new avenues of application for preaching on these texts. Paul is seen as transcending his times and there is a remarkably up to date ring to his thinking! In a nutshell his view is that the exousiai are not supernatural beings but structures of society. They belong to God's good order of creation but became tainted by the fall. Consequently they try to usurp the authority of God and attain demonic dimensions, becoming the "gods" of this world and

"the rulers of this age" (1 Cor. 2:6). German National Socialism is a clear example of how "powers" of "Blut und Boden" can become an obsession. Such "powers" have a relative value in themselves and initially operate for the good of society but can become absolutised and as supra-individual and impersonal forces in society get quite out of control. In principle their power has been broken in the cross and resurrection of Christ. In this respect Berkhof refers to the familiar triumphal imagery of Colossians 2:13-15. He uses (1962:35) an apt illustration to reflect the continuing, albeit limited, influence of the "powers":

The Powers are already unmasked and disarmed, and shall imminently be dethroned. "Already" and "not yet" are the poles of tension which dominate the entire New Testament proclamation. For faith this is no contradiction, any more than it was contradictory for us in the Netherlands during the "hunger winter" (1944-45) that the Nazis, defeated, were still oppressing us (1962:35).

The defeat of the powers makes their transformation a real possibility. Christians should strive to harness the "powers" for the sake of the rule of Christ in the world. The "powers" must be "neutralised" and "de-ideologised". Berkhof even speaks of "christianising" the powers. He sees the refusal of the early Church to participate in Caesar-worship and all forms of polytheism in the Roman Empire as a clear example of this "exorcising" task of the church (1962:52).

His application of this perspective to Communism is so interesting and unusual in our South African context that it is quoted here in full:

And what of communism? He who believes in Christ's victory cannot believe that the Powers of class and state, which have taken on the form of communism, are invincible. The church which resists in word and deed the ideological poisoning of her life (as she is doing today in the East Zone of Germany) can pray and can expect that Christ will endow with a far-reaching efficacy the encirclement of the Powers which she proclaims. Why then should no communistic society be possible, wherein a totally new economic order fills a purely matter-of-fact role, where the church within an equally practically oriented state system holds her vision of Christ's higher rule intact? The idealist who considers communism harmless misunderstands completely the strength of the Powers. The pessimist who considers communism incorrigible misunderstands completely the lordship of Christ. The living, prophesying Christian Church

goes her own way despite optimism and pessimism alike (1961:53-54).

3.4 In order to gain a proper perspective on Berkhof's view of the powers it is necessary to place it within the broader context of his concept of the demonic. He, in fact, rejects the existence of a personal devil. Nonetheless Berkhof firmly believes that there is a reality behind the Biblical mode of representing evil in this personified way. Portraying evil as the devil belongs to the cultural packaging of a bygone era but is an attempt to express the legitimate notion that evil goes beyond the personal and conscious sins of individuals. If one demythologises the devil it is necessary to express this idea in another way. Berkhof does this primarily by referring to the so-called tragic nature of reality (1973:211-214). The one who is guilty of sin is also its victim. It is our fate that we are so often blind, powerless and lead astray. We are destined to succumb to evil compulsion as we struggle against overwhelming odds. We are but dust, in so many instances enslaved by circumstances. Although Berkhof also underscores that man has freedom and responsibility one almost anticipates the objections against his view. Berkouwer cautions against an overestimating of the all-pervasive power (overmacht) of evil:

Er is geen overmacht, geen werken des bozen, geen verleiding, die niet in relatie staat met de schuld, de schuldigstellende daad van de mens zelf. De overmacht is alléén werkelijk in de modus van het schuldig staan. In de schuld en in de zelf-overgave van de zondige en verloren mens wordt deze "macht" tot óvermacht en wordt de mens tot slaaf der zonde. Dan komt het tot het "non posse non peccare"; dat geen lot is, maar schuld (1958:102). (The Latin phrase means: it is not possible not to sin - HIL).

Aware of this perspective Berkhof remarks that there is a wide difference amongst contemporary Dutch theologians with respect to the degree in which they acknowledge in our sinful human condition the element of the tragic in addition to that guilt. Berkhof states (1973:223) that Berkouwer represents the position most critical of recognising the tragic destiny of man.

It is this element of fate which Berkhof sees as the element of truth in the personification of evil in the figure of satan. However this is not the only way in which the Bible expresses the supra-personal all pervasive power (overmacht) of sin. Another way is in the concept of the "powers" in Pauline theology which has been discussed above. Although using apocalyptic categories Paul is there in effect (according to Berkhof) describing the tragic nature of reality as expressed in the systems and structures of societal life.

3.5 With this background we can now return to the neo-Evangelical quest for "texts" to support the newly found concern about structural injustices and other societal issues. What has in fact occurred is that Berkhof's exegesis of the Pauline "powers" was eagerly seized as fulfilling just that particular need. Yoder who later developed his own societal ethics in a volume provocatively called The politics of Jesus saw the value of interpreting the "powers" in terms of societal structures. He wrote the preface to the English translation of Berkhof's book Christus en de Machten and also translated it himself.

Yoder introduces Berkhof's approach with exuberance. In his discussion of it in The politics of Jesus one misses a critical awareness that Berkhof's concept of evil actually operates within a sophisticated theological framework that would be unacceptable to the evangelical audience that Yoder is addressing. Yoder (1972:140-141) declares:

One of the significant advances of theological understanding in the last generation has been the juxtaposition of a gap in theological ethics with a puzzle in New Testament interpretation. Since the onset of critical New Testament studies it has practically been taken for granted that when the Apostle speaks about angels or demons or powers this is a dispensable remainder of an antique world view, needing not even to be interpreted or translated, but simply to be dropped without discussion. And on the other hand, as we have just observed, under the shadow of Protestant individualism it was assumed that the Apostle did not deal with structural problems. What we now behold is that the unmanageable imagery has the same shape as the missing piece in the ethical puzzle

The fortuitous discovery of this new interpretation of the "powers" seems too good to be true! Perhaps one could best see the exegesis of Berkhof and that of Barth (which follows the same basic line) as an example of Biblical exposition in which the contemporary context (post-Nazi Europe) tended to dominate the interpretation to the exclusion of most other factors. Moreover the use made of Berkhof's exegesis by the socially aware neo-Evangelicals of the sixties is an even clearer example of an anachronistic usage of Paul. The legitimacy of using ancient texts in this manner is not being denied per se. I am merely arguing that such a reinterpretation should be made self-consciously and not presented as the authentic "missing piece" of the Pauline puzzle.

3.6 To my knowledge the most recent development in the debate about Paul's exousiology, apart from scholarly reiterations of the mythological and apocalyptic interpretation, has been the

position of Van der Poll. He strongly objects to the way in which the recent Rapport of the consultation on the relationship between Evangelism and Social Responsibility (which met in Grand Rapids, Michigan in 1982 under the auspices of the Lausanne Convention and the World Evangelical Fellowship) solves the dilemma of interpreting Paul's "powers" either as evil spiritual beings or as societal structures. Their approach is to accept both interpretations, thereby ostensibly pleasing at the same time those who focus on the rediscovery of the "supernatural" dimension as well as the others who need a structural interpretation to support their socio-political action. Van der Poll (1983:14) questions this convenient inclusive exegesis: "(Er zijn bezwaren) tegen het onder één noemer brengen van demonie en structureel kwaad". This is a crucial distinction, especially when operating within a framework where satan, the devil and demons are grouped together as representing absolute evil.

Van der Poll makes a clear distinction between demonic spirits, the stoicheia and the "powers". He states that there are frequent references to demons in the gospels but remarkably they do not play an essential role in the culmination of Jesus' life - his passion, death and resurrection. In the writings of Paul and John demonology is completely overshadowed by other concerns. Van der Poll's interpretation of the stoicheia is in agreement with the basic thrust of the figurative school mentioned above. These "basic elements" are not demons but traditions of men such as Jewish legalism. His concept of the "powers" however, is quite distinctive.

Van der Poll's exousiology tries to steer a new course between apocalyptic spirits and angels on the one hand and the "modern" concept of societal structures on the other. He sees the exousiai as referring to the political, societal and religious powers that be, that is, human rulers not supernatural forces. Only in Ephesians 6:12 are the "powers" and the demonic mentioned together, but Van der Poll points out that the various groups mentioned in that list can be seen as relatively independent from one another. Van der Poll's exegesis fits in quite readily with the reference to the Roman rulers in Romans 13 as exousiai and archai.

A further qualification is necessary. The rulers have the power to manipulate. Their power is often founded upon the system in which people live, a complex of ideology, vested interests, knowledge, influence, relations, force and possessions. Religious leaders can manipulate people to become the slaves of human customs and traditions (cf. Gl. 4 & Col. 2). Briefly stated Van der Poll's view of the powers can be described as follows: "Machten zijn opeenhopingen van manipulatief vermogen" (1983:14).

With reference to Colossians 2:14-15 Van der Poll sees the victory over the "powers" as a reference to the forgiveness of sins brought about by the nailing of the "legal bond" (which accuses sinners) to the cross. He states (1983:14):

In dat nieuwe leven houdt de zonde op toonaangevend te zijn. En daarmee is de "machtsbasis" van de machten aangetast. De grond voor hun manipulatieve werk weggenomen.

The "powers" can be a force for good as in Romans 13 or for evil as in Colossians 2. Temporal rulers can abuse their power, enslaving their subjects, and subjects can deify their rulers as we see in the cult of the Roman emperor. Although such "powers" can take on supra-human proportions the origin of this manipulation is not supernatural. It is to be sought in the sinful nature of humanity. That concludes the discussion on Van der Poll's view.

3.7 Looking back on this rather lengthy treatment of Paul's teaching on the "powers" we come to the conclusion that it does not provide a basis for the societal dimension of the demonic. Where the demonic is understood to be radical and absolute evil, I would submit that it cannot be said to have a societal dimension. Where the systems of society have in effect become the devil incarnate, human responsibility is eclipsed. Society and its structures can be, in fact, are sinful. This sin can function on various levels and to varying degrees. I find it to be an undeserved complement to the evil one when any human societal structure is described as satanic, diabolical or demonic in the most radical sense of these words. Try though he may, satan cannot succeed in duplicating the incarnation on a structural level. Even in the ghastly instances of the demon possession of individuals (and physical areas?) we have but a counterfeit example of his mimicry. Whereas God can indwell and rule in human lives without usurping their humanity or freedom the devil tends to dehumanise those over whom he gains influence and power and enslaves them.

From the above analysis it seems clear that the Pauline exousiology does not give support to the concept of the demon possession of societal structures. This can be seen from a quick survey of the main interpretations dealt with above.

If the mythological or apocalyptic understanding of the "powers" is accepted it is usually demythologised by those advocating it in order to be made relevant for today. Such a process of demythologising inevitably translates the "supernatural" categories into the natural (Compare the attempt above by Berkhof to interpret the mythical idea of satan as an expression of the

tragic nature of reality: our destiny in which there are overwhelming odds stacked against us and to which we are doomed by fate!)

The interpretation of the "powers" as societal structures was ultimately found to be wanting, an example of forced exegesis. Even if this conclusion is not considered to be convincing the whole line of Berkhof's argument entails that the "powers" be seen as human institutions and structures rather than demons.

The last interpretation mentioned, that of Van der Poll, (which I personally find rather convincing) interprets the "powers" as political and religious rulers. Once again we have a "this worldly" interpretation rather than an "other worldly" one. Suffice to say that whichever of the leading interpretations is chosen there is insufficient evidence to consider the Pauline exousiology as referring to a societal dimension of the spiritual forces of absolute evil.

4. SYSTEMATIC CONCLUSION

On the level of systematic theology this exegetical conclusion to which we have just come can be corroborated by means of what could be called the tripolarity principle. This principle referred to above in the "twenty propositions" states that there are not two basic factors operative in religion but three. Any concrete religious expression can have its origin in God, man or the devil. Too often the whole realm of human endeavour is bypassed by us in our naive superstition, and God and the devil are seen as the sole agents in life. It is also a consequence of the cosmic and radical nature of creation and redemption that no domain of human activity may be conceived of as totally given over to satan. (In traditional reformed thinking we are dealing here with the doctrine of common grace.) Any societal structure which is totally abandoned by God would in fact qualify to be classified as hell.

It is, however, possible to use the words "satanic", "diabolical" and "demonic" not as ontological descriptions of absolute evil but as the superlative degree of human corruption. It is only in this sense that they have validity in the realm of society.

It is interesting to notice for example the gradual progression in negativity in the descriptions given by some Christians in South Africa to the political system of apartheid. It has successively been described as wrong, inhuman, unchristian, unjust, false, unbiblical, sinful, cancerous and heretical. It will certainly not be long before official ecclesiastical pronouncements describe it in terms of the ultimate as: demonic,

diabolical and satanic. The Kairos document may even have paved the way for this final step.

Since so much of this paper has been devoted to the quest for a Biblical backing for acknowledging the societal dimensions of the demonic, the question now arises if there is a Biblical precedent for describing a societal structure as demonic in the figurative sense (i.e. without implying that it is ontologically identified with absolute evil). Revelations 13:1-10 provides such a possibility.

In her commentary on Revelation leading feminist theologian, Schüssler Fiorenza, describes this pericope as the prophetic unmasking of imperial Roman power (1981:129). Although this is an allegorical apocalyptic vision and should not be forced into Western categories of literalism and causal deduction there is little doubt that the Roman Imperium is seen as the servant and instrument of satan himself. That the beast emerges from the sea is significant: "... the 'sea' has not just geographical meaning but also mythological since, according to ancient beliefs, the sea is a symbol of chaos, evil, and demonic powers" (1981:130). The activity of this monster is directed against Christ. Through the Emperor cult the worshippers of the beast in fact worship satan. Fiorenza explains:

The multivalent imagery of Revelation's mythological symbolization is clearly focused and concretized politically. John does not speak in general about suffering or demonic realities but prophetically identifies the oppression of the Christians and other people as the Roman usurpation of God's power. Therefore, he ends this vision of the bizarre monster symbolizing Roman imperial power with a call that has concluded all the seven messages to the churches: Pay attention! (1981:131).

In passing it is interesting to note that Fiorenza had dedicated her commentary to, amongst others, Steve Biko: a victim "of contemporary oppressive political powers and regimes. As in John's time so too today the blood of those murdered unjustly cries out for justice and liberation" (1981:11).

Whereas the Pauline doctrine of the "powers" fails to give credence to a belief in "structural demons" Revelations 13 clearly portrays the corrupt Roman state as "demonic" without thereby excusing the guilt of those implicated in the system.

In Social theological ethics it has become common place to describe societal structures exhibiting a preponderance of evil as "demonic". Way back in the eighteenth century the poet,

William Blake, spoke of the "dark satanic mills" of industrial England. In the modern era examples abound, the most demonic threat of all probably emanating from the nuclear arms race and the possible annihilation of our planet in nuclear war. Almost as menacing are the vicious structural circles of widespread famine, hunger and disease, ideological domination and economic exploitation in Marxist-Leninism, militarism, sexism, racism, fascism, and so forth. Patterns of bureaucracy, capitalist consumerism and technocratic institutionalism can also be described as diabolical. Wendland analyses such structural evils in his social ethics. He highlights the familiar inner contradiction of scientific progress: modern physics has brought us spectacular technological advantages and atomic energy as well as the threat of a nuclear holocaust!

Wendland describes (1986:145-146) the time in which we live in the following words:

Das 20. Jahrhundert ist das klassische Jahrhundert der Explosion des kollektiven Bösen und der überindividuellen, zerstörerischen, dämonischen Mächte der Dehumanisierung in Staat und Gesellschaft. (The twentieth century is the classical century of the explosion of collective evil and the supra-individual, destructive demonic powers of dehumanisation in state and society).

In the "adjectival" or figurative sense such societal structures can rightly be described as satanic, diabolical and demonic. This does not mean that such tainted societal structures are totally devoid of "redeeming features". From a high doctrine of creation it can be pointed out that the basic created order has remained intact. Recently a South African theologian calling for a confession of guilt by the Dutch Reformed Church (NGK) for its support of apartheid acknowledged that there were some honest motives behind the inception of the system (König 1986:8). Here the appeal to human responsibility and complicity is clearly maintained - even in the midst of a diabolically dehumanising structure.

Human beings have always been inclined to try and deny their guilt and escape their responsibilities. When confronted with the evil and injustice of societal structures we are tempted to use their supra-individual nature as an excuse. There seem to be two ways of doing this.

One person may try to hide behind the magnitude of the task and his or her individual powerlessness. The other exclaims that we are up against the devil.

Naturally there is some legitimacy in the objection that most people cannot single-handedly change a structural situation. A white South African for example is all too inclined (especially when travelling overseas!) to exclaim: "Don't blame me! What can I, as one person, do about apartheid?" The fact of the matter is that personal lack of power does not automatically exonerate one from the task of opposing injustice. When faced with supra-individual and systemic evil that has become "habit forming" and self-perpetuating over several generations collective and ongoing organisational opposition is called for - even if it be extremely difficult and demanding.

There is a real danger today that describing supra-individual systemic evil as "demonic" can just become another form of "cop out". If this is conceived of literally such a mythological interpretation of the "powers" may function as a more "religious" way of saying the same kind of thing, namely: "Don't blame me. I can't change it. It is the devil that we are up against". It is the devil indeed - working through our sinful human nature. This "devil" needs to be crucified. A quick "exorcism" will not be sufficient.

It needs to be stated that the legitimacy of the concept of structural and systemic evil and the challenge of the gospel to Christians to further the cause of justice in society is not dependent on specific texts (Einzelexegese). The Biblical basis for christian social action, if it still needs to be clarified, should rather be sought (as is the case with most ethical issues) in the basic concepts of Old and New Testament theology and systematic theology. The neo-Evangelicals who sought legitimation in the Pauline texts on the "powers" could have built a stronger Biblical case arguing from central categories of the faith such as the concept of the kingdom of God, or rather, the kingly rule of Christ over all creation, or by using an integral doctrine of man and salvation, or concepts such as radical love, justice, discipleship, shalom, forgiveness, and so forth.

Ultimately the Christian's task when confronted with the demonic lies in proclaiming the victory of Jesus Christ over satan and becoming involved in the "mopping up operations" and, in this struggle, recognising not only the (individualistic) "devil we know" but also the evil embedded, through our sin, in the structures of society. This calls us to repentance, prayer and active resistance. "Resist the devil and he will flee from you" (Ja. 4:7).

WORKS CONSULTED

- Barth, K. 1950. Kirchliche Dogmatik. 111/3. Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag.
- Berkhof, H. 1962. Christ and the powers. Scottdale: Herald.
- Berkhof, H. 1973. Christelijk geloof. Een inleiding tot de geloofsleer. Nijkerk: Callenbach.
- Berkouwer, G.C. 1958. De Zonde I. Oorsprong en kennis der zonde. Kampen: Kok.
- Beyerhaus, P. 1969. Zur Theologie der Religionen im Protestantismus, Kerygma und Dogma 15, 87-104.
- Brown, C. (ed.) 1975-1978. The new international dictionary of New Testament theology. Exeter: Paternoster.
- Caird, G.B. 1956. Principalities and powers. A study in Pauline theology. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Cramer, A.W. 1961. Stoicheia tou kosmou. Interpretatie van een nieuwtestamentische term. Nieuwkoop: De Graaf.
- Cullmann, O. 1964. Christ and time. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Du Plessis, I.J. 1962. Christus as hoof van kerk en kosmos. Groningen: Kleine.
- Du Plessis, I.J. 1978. Die brief aan die Kolossense. Kaapstad: NG Kerk-Uitgewers.
- Durand, J.J.F. 1978. Die sonde. Pretoria: NGK Boekhandel.
- Fiorenza, E.S. 1981. Invitation to the book of Revelation. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Foster, R.J. 1985. Money, sex and power. London: Hodder.
- Gabathuler, H.J. 1965. Jesus Christus. Haupt der Kirche - Haupt der Welt. Zürich: Zwingli.
- Heering, H. J. 1974. Over het bose als macht en als werkelijkheid. Meppel: Boom.
- Kasper, W. & Lehmann, K. (eds.) 1978. Teufel - Dämonen - Besessenheit. Zur Wirklichkeit des Bösen. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald.

- Kelsey, M. T. 1974. Myth, history and faith. The remythologizing of christianity. New York: Paulist.
- Kelsey, M.T. 1976. The Christian and the supernatural. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Kelsey, M.T. 1978. Discernment. A study in ecstasy and evil. New York: Paulist.
- Kist, A. W. 1971. Antwoord aan de machten. Het vormingswerk voor volwassenen socio-theologisch gezien. Alphen aan den Rijn: Samsom.
- König, A. 1971. Een wat sterker is. Pretoria: NGK Boekhandel.
- König, A. 1986. Moet die NG Kerk skuld bely?, in Die Kerkbode, 14 Mei, 8; 21 Mei, 6.
- Kuyper, A. 1902. De engelen Gods. Amsterdam: Höveker en Wormser.
- Lewis C.S. 1942. The screwtape letters. London: Centenary.
- Lovelace, R.F. 1985. Renewal as a way of life. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity.
- Montgomery, J. W. (ed.) 1976. Demon possession. Minneapolis: Bethany.
- Nürnberg, K. 1975. Sistematiese teologie. Genadendal: VLTS.
- Ouweneel, W.J. 1978. Het domein van de slang. Christelijk handboek over occultisme en mysticisme. Amsterdam: Buijten en Schipperheijn.
- Philipp, W. 1962. s.v. "Teufel" kt]. Dogmatisch. RGG.
- Ridderbos, H. 1971. Paulus. Ontwerp van zijn theologie. Kampen: Kok.
- Sire, J.W. 1976. The universe next door. A basic world view catalog. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity.
- Stringfellow, W. 1977. Conscience and obedience. The politics of Romans 13 and Revelation 13 in the light of the second coming. Waco: Word.
- Swomley, J.M. 1972. Liberation ethics. New York: Macmillan.

Van den Heuvel, A. H. 1966. These rebellious powers. London: SCM.

Van der Poll, E.W. 1983. Paulus' spreken aangaande de machten (1). Hoeksteen voor evangelical visie op sociale opdracht. Evangelisch Commentaar, 1:28, 10-11.

Van der Poll, E. W. 1983. Paulus' spreken aangaande de machten (2). Manipuleren en gemanipuleerd worden. Evangelisch Commentaar 1:29, 13-14.

Wendland, H-D. 1968. Grundzüge der evangelischen Sozialethik. Köln: Bachem.

Yoder, J.H. 1972. The politics of Jesus. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Doctor H.I. Lederle teaches systematic theology at the University of South Africa.

Dept. of Systematic Theology
University of South Africa
P.O. Box 392
Pretoria
0001

MULTIPROFESSIONAL CASE REPRESENTATION:
THE CASE OF DAVID H.

The following case study was drawn up by a multiprofessional psychiatric team under leadership of Dr. Anton Potgieter. Members of the team:

Dr. A.H. Potgieter (psychiatrist)
Dr. M.G.S. Pierides (medical doctor)
Rev. A.E. de la Porte (minister of religion)
Mr. A.D. Geel (clinical psychologist)

Part one
CASE STUDY

One usually begins where one is born, but David had no idea where he was born, nor where he had begun. He suggested, however, that his mother might know.

He was referred to the Department of Psychiatry for psychiatric evaluation following display of excessively aggressive behaviour. The incident which precipitated his admission involved a fellow trooper in David's bungalow. David was apprehended while aiming an R4 rifle at his friend, threatening to shoot him. As far as David was concerned he did not know why he was sent to the Psychiatry Department. He said that he was well, had no problems and did not want to be admitted to the ward. He was quite willing to return to his unit. For much of his initial interview David was reticent and would answer questions monosyllabically or not at all. This initial psychiatric interview lasted about three hours. Much of the time I was frustrated because I was not able to establish any kind of rapport with David. But gradually the following life history unfolded:

His place of birth was unknown to him or he would not or could not disclose it. He attended several different schools, the family having moved frequently and for long distances. All in all he attended approximately eight different schools. He failed standard one, but recalls no other failures or extraordinary events in his scholastic career. He reported that he socialised just like the other children, played sport, and was only truant in his last year which was standard nine. After school he began military duties. Basic training was followed by a stint on the Namibian/Angolan border and it was during this period that he came to the attention of the authorities. David explained that he had developed a close relationship with a fellow soldier while on the border. One evening, this friend suggested, either verbally or non-verbally, that they have sex together. Enraged, David took up an R4 rifle and threatened to shoot his friend. He

was arrested and eventually taken to a doctor who then referred him. In the doctor's admission notes it was suggested that David was prone to aggressive outbursts which were, perhaps, misdirected.

His family history was, as will become evident, difficult to verify and indeed, at times difficult to believe: not because the patient was at any time dishonest, but rather because of the equanimity with which he would relate the horrors that befell him. As far as he can remember, his family had always been involved in a different religious sect to his friends and school-mates. He had two siblings, an older brother, who is a "high priest" in this church and a sister, who was killed under dubious circumstances two years previously. Her husband was acquitted on a charge of murder by the Regional Supreme Court. David believed that her husband was directly and completely responsible for the death of his wife. I shall elaborate on this later. From an early age David was taken to the church to which his family belonged. There he witnessed the offering up of animals to the "prince of darkness" and indeed, the ritualised drawing of blood from human beings as a part of an initiation ritual into a particular position in the echelons of the church. (Animals for slaughter were obtained from the SPCA.) It was David's mother who belonged to the church and she was instrumental in the conversion of her husband and they both then introduced the children to the church.

Behaviour within the family was certainly not consistent with the accepted social norms. A case in point is that sexual intercourse was not an issue at all. David was free, at any time, to bring home any person that he wanted to sleep with, and his first sexual experience was at the age of fourteen. Since then he had had about six or seven sexual encounters. His violent display directed at his friend on the border is evidence of his strong antihomosexual sentiments. Another interesting part of the family interaction is that David's father (whose history, as related by David, is strongly suggestive of alcohol abuse) would frequently encourage aggression in his two sons. He would do this by deliberate taunting and provocation urging David and his brother to punch him so that they would learn how to "fight and become men". As a result punch-ups between father and sons were commonplace.

His father died suddenly and David was deeply moved by his father's untimely death. His dislike for his mother now became a passionate hatred. David recalls that he was denied all opportunity to express the grief that he felt because the "funeral" was, in fact, a celebration. He cannot recall seeing his mother mourn, nor any sign of grief in members of the family or friends. He recalls his father being delivered to the "prince of darkness"

after which a party of some kind took place. His mother soon acquired a lover. Throughout the interview, David referred to his mother as "that bitch". He said that he had no feeling, except perhaps hatred, for her and he believed that the feeling was entirely mutual. He maintained little or no contact with his mother or brother. In the same year, his sister also died. Her death was by violence. She was discovered by the police after having been battered and eventually strangled to death in her bathroom at her apartment. Her husband was charged with the murder but was acquitted in court. David recalls how his sister's children were put into potato-sacks and strung up while beaten by their father. Throughout his stay at the hospital David vowed to avenge his sister's death by killing the man he felt who was responsible though he had been acquitted by the law. He stated that he knew exactly how her death occurred and had been told so, frequently, by his dead sister, who would appear to him in visions that he had. His sister had told him how she was beaten and then savagely strangled by her drunken husband.

Then the final and perhaps the most traumatic event occurred in David's life: He had been having a relationship with a girl during his army training. While he was on the border she told him that she was pregnant, and that the welfare organisation was to take custody of the child if she did not marry. David had strong feelings about this and wanted to marry the mother of his child. He was refused permission for leave and his girlfriend married an acquaintance of David. After this event David decided that there was really no purpose in living but that he would not kill himself. He wanted someone to kill him and could achieve this by orchestrating a situation where he would have to be shot. He now lived as if he had no responsibility towards himself and towards others.

David's admission and stay in the ward was tumultuous. His presence was imposing and he took advantage of this, quickly gaining control of the other patients in the ward. His intensely empty eyes, his grimacing smile gained him the respect he desired in the ward. To the patients, he was "the boss". He supplied them with drugs and assisted and encouraged them in any rule breaking adventure. His initial admission lasted about two weeks. After a diagnosis of a borderline personality disorder was made, it was felt that David should return to his unit for two reasons: He begged me not to discharge him from the South African Defence Force as he had nowhere to go, and I felt that under suitable conditions he would be manageable by the authorities. However, within three weeks he was returned to the Psychiatric Department. His threats of killing everyone in his bungalow were taken seriously. On the evening of his readmission, he posed as a guard in order to obtain a rifle. His

intention was to kill, so that someone would then shoot him. He was arrested whilst pointing a rifle at the matron of the hospital. The psychiatrist on call that evening wrote that "the patient was angry, with an intense but vacuous expression in his eyes". He concluded that the patient was psychotic and homicidal. David was appropriately sedated. He remained clinically depressed for a long period after this. He would speak of a spirit that spoke to him, encouraging him to beware of people and to murder. This was not a new phenomenon it was something which David had experienced frequently. Every day he would tell me that he wanted to kill someone, so that he would be killed. His emptiness, his hopelessness, and the deathly calm with which he would express his desire to kill, would leave me scared and helpless. His only expression of emotion was to say that he felt dead. He explained that nothing mattered. His nothingness would be expressed in his dreams. Recurring dreams of watching his dead body in a coffin occupied his mind at night. On many evenings he would wander away from the ward and go to the empty nursery so that he could hear the voices of little children and talk to his dead sister. This was the only form of relief he could find. At times I too would feel that perhaps David had suffered enough. I could understand his desire to die. At no stage did I feel more helpless with David. I was unable to convey to him that I cared and he could not understand this. The climax of his stay in the ward then occurred. A suicidal patient approached David, explaining to him that he wished to die but was too frightened to "do it himself". David offered to cut the patient's wrists, and did so. His drug abuse was increasing. His behaviour was now more dangerous than ever. He had drawn blood and wanted to continue to do so. He was the drug merchant, the boss, the Prince of Darkness of the ward. He was respected and feared by not only the patients but by the ward staff as well. My position became intolerable too. Where did I go now? The ward staff demanded that he be discharged immediately. To discharge David was to sign his death certificate. I took the only option that was left open to me, and had David arrested and placed in custody for that weekend.

The following day I spent some time with him in detention and, perhaps for the first time, my own belief that David's evil was not wilful was confirmed. His emptiness was filled with sorrow and he openly expressed his shame and his guilt for what he had done. I only wished that he would cry, but he did not.

After his weekend in detention there seemed to be a genuine attempt to reform. His drug abuse diminished and he began to cooperate with the ward staff. His depression lifted and our relationship improved. He began to think about life and not about death. Although he refused to even see a priest or minister, I felt that this was not because he did not want to,

but that he was scared of fierce retribution from his own church. He could not make this leap of faith from darkness to light, from death and from emptiness to life. He could not allow himself to change, if the staff and I could not accept the responsibility for his change. David did not underestimate the powers that had raised him and lived in fear of retribution: not because he had committed himself to change, but that he had even dared to contemplate it.

At this stage I felt that perhaps it was time to discharge David into the world. If there was going to be an improvement within David, it had occurred. The psychologist, the nursing staff and the minister involved also agreed. Most members of the Department were relieved with the news. Many of the doctors were more reluctant to admit patients to the ward during David's stay. David had been in the ward for two months now. We discussed his discharge and he agreed that he was ready to leave. He was still taking some drugs (dagga probably). Throughout his evaluation he strongly resisted any attempt by myself or the other members of the staff to contact his family. Much of the history is therefore not verifiable but it was obvious, for several reasons already mentioned, that there is no doubt that David had nothing to hide and had nothing to gain by lying. He decided to go and live with his grandparents.

I felt a certain sadness at our last meeting. My relationship with David was difficult for both of us. His emptiness could only be filled with drugs, violence and death and at times I had given up. Perhaps he would interpret this as not caring enough for him, because I can recall thinking that perhaps David should die. He was the loneliest and most frightened human being in the world. David left on March 31, 1986. He was employed by the mines and is now working underground.

It was always terribly difficult to make a psychiatric diagnosis on David. The diagnosis always hovered between a severe personality disorder and a psychosis, but settled on neither. Although he fulfilled many of the criteria for both disorders, he did not satisfy either category. At one stage in the ward the nursing staff believed that David was on Leponex, a psychotropic drug, but, in fact all the other patients were. Eventually, mainly for administrative reasons, the Axis I-diagnosis of a substance abuse disorder was made, together with the principal diagnosis on Axis II of a borderline personality disorder. The reason for his lengthy stay in the ward was principally for evaluation and although I did believe that our relationship was therapeutic, I did not follow the methods prescribed by any particular school. Briefly, I attempted to utilise the transference in the hope of encouraging a change in his personality.

His drug abuse never completely ceased, but it did diminish from twenty dagga pipes per day to two or three dagga cigarettes or "joints". He was never suicidal in the sense that he would kill himself - he did want to die but did not wish to kill himself. He hoped that he would be killed. This suicidal ideation had disappeared towards the end of his admission period. His suicidal thoughts, as often happens, were always accompanied by equally potent homicidal notions. At times he was more homicidally committed, especially towards his sister's husband. To the day he left he swore to avenge his sister's death. At no stage was I convinced that David was psychotic. His potential psychosis was evident clinically when his drug abuse was at its peak, but his "delusions" or "hallucinations" were somehow always intertwined with his religion and therefore difficult to label. However, what can be said is that his condition did not alter significantly while on anti-psychotic medication. No physical (organic) pathology was found and all investigations proved normal. His drug abuse was clinically proven with the demonstration of dagga in his urine.

Prognostically, I felt that David would at some point relapse into his violent world of drugs, destruction and loneliness. I still have had no communication from or about him since his discharge.

Today I still wonder whether his treatment should have begun, not with psychiatry, but with an exorcist.

Part two
RELIGIOUS EVALUATION

1. BACKGROUND

The patient belonged to the satanist church and strongly rejected the Christian religion. His condition and behaviour was very unstable, and therefore the psychiatric team felt that the involvement of the pastor would not be therapeutic. It appeared, however, that his religion was a relevant aspect of his pathology. Therefore the possibility of a religious evaluation was not excluded. After the psychologist who was responsible for his therapy had built a firm relationship with him and his condition was more stable, it was decided to mention the possibility of a conversation with the pastor to him. At that stage the patient was not that averse to Christianity and was willing to have an interview with the pastor.

2. IMPRESSION

The patient appeared anxious and tense. He tried to keep as much physical distance between himself and the pastor as possible. He avoided eye contact and answered questions very bluntly.

3. EVALUATION

Because of the briefness of the interviews (15 min.) it is difficult, if not impossible, to assess the person's religion fully. Only certain impressions can be given:

- 3.1 It appears that the person's religion is more functional for his personality, than formative for his life. He describes the value of his religion for himself as follows: "Religion helps me to get what I want". He sometimes used the magical practices of satanism to try and harm other people. If he wants to achieve or get something good, he feels he must use "a positive force". Religion, thus, is only relevant if it can be of service to his own needs.
- 3.2 During the interview he indicated that he did not want anything to do with religion, at that stage, neither with satanism nor Christianity. He wanted to try to resolve his problems without the influence of religion.
- 3.3 He terminated the interview after fifteen minutes by saying that he was experiencing "bad vibes". He found it difficult to describe this feeling and appeared more

anxious. The pastor concluded the interview by offering his assistance, if the patient should need it at any stage.

4. CONCLUSION

It appears that the negative and destructive aspects of satanism may fit in with the person's personality make-up. On the ground of this short interview one can only speculate on the influence of satanism on the person's personality and pathology. It appears, however, to be the contrary - that his religion has a functional role in his personality. It is also improbable that satanism would have a positive and liberating effect. It is possible that his presentation of his problems and symptoms could be influenced by his religious background. It is noteworthy that with the stabilisation of his condition and the positive effect of psychotherapy, he became more neutral towards satanism. At a later stage he also asked for more information about Christianity. He never indicated the need for further contact with the pastor.

Part three
PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

1. BEHAVIOUR DURING ASSESSMENT

Behaviour during the testing sessions is reported as follows:

David H. het heel waarskynlik dwelms gebruik net voor die toetsing. Hy is traak-my-nie-agting maar andersins is hy vriendelik en het hy deurgaans goeie samewerking gegee.

Die toetsing was ontspanne en het sy bes probeer by elke item. Dit het soms gelyk of hy ontevrede raak as hy nie die regte respons ken nie.

Volgens hom het hy die toetsing geniet.

In view of the possibility that he may have been under the influence of drugs, it is necessary to interpret the results which follow with extreme caution.

2. TEST RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the intellectual assessment indicate a significant reduction in performance scores. This could be indicative of severe pathology, or of right cortical damage, though it is more likely to be the result of possible drug use before the testing sessions. Specifically there was some indication of reduced motor activity and visual perceptual ability.

There was evidence, however, of good awareness of appropriate behaviour, including accurate perception of problems and determination of possible responses. In general, the assessment indicates that this person falls within the low normal category of intellectual functioning.

In respect of his relationship with others and his view of himself, he presents with a somewhat poor self-esteem, with strong elements of depression and hopelessness. He has a strong sense of being alone, and a strong need for comfort. He tends, however, to deny this need and also to deny much of the aggression he feels towards himself. Much of this aggression is linked to his sense of being confined by others - seeing them as moralistic and punitive. He also expresses a sense of not being able to control his own destiny, and of being trapped in a position of hopelessness.

Underlying these dynamics, though difficult to express, is the need for comfort and acceptance (particularly by "significant

others"), as well as the wish that in future there would be some improvement in interpersonal and family relationships.

On an intrapsychic level it appears that this person's level of aspiration is higher than his true abilities. There is evidence of lowered intellectual ability and some emotional disturbance, and limited ability to accept self impulses, fantasies and maintain object relations. He appears to be largely unaware of the true nature of his hostile impulses - which is cause for some concern. There is some lack of acceptance of affectional needs, yet there is an attempt to understand and tolerate his anxiety. He is able to get along with people, yet on a superficial level, with some tension, and without fully involving his feelings.

There is the strong indication of a lack of control and thus of impulsive behaviour, although he still has the ability to perceive the world as others do, and thus is in touch with reality. Reduced responsiveness to emotional influences and some emotional underproductivity are present, his perception being largely rational, impersonal and unemotional. There is definite emotional and intellectual constriction with the strong tendency toward aggression, incorporating strong uncontrolled affective reactions.

He further tends to be over-sensitive, somewhat naive and lacking in perseverance. Associated with these qualities is a large element of concrete thinking; expediency, indicating weaker superego strength, and a forthright and sentimental attitude.

3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

As stated at the outset, these test results need to be interpreted with some caution. It nevertheless appears that some particular conclusions could be reached from the above data.

As far as intellectual abilities are concerned the test results suggest that this person falls within the lower limits of the normal range, that there is a reduction in motor activity and visual perception, some concretistic thinking, and good awareness of appropriate behaviour.

His view of himself included poor self esteem, a sense of hopelessness, loneliness and being unable to control his own destiny. Underlying his outward aggressiveness is a need for comfort and acceptance.

In interpersonal relationships he has a sense of being confined by others, whom he sees as moralistic, punitive and rejecting of him, although he is able to get along with them on a superficial level. On an intrapsychic level he is unaware of the nature of

his aggressive impulses, although they are strong enough to result in impulsive acting-out behaviour.

The general overall conclusion inferred from the data is that this person presents reduced intellectual abilities, extreme emotional constriction concealing unfulfilled affectional needs - this frustration being expressed in aggressive, impulsive acting-out behaviour.

SATANISM, WITCHCRAFT AND THE OCCULT:
A PSYCHIATRIST'S VIEW

W. Bodemer

The origins of most of psychiatry's scientific concepts are rooted in the past. The study of the primitive tribes still living today lends support to the suppositions concerning the concepts of illness held by prehistoric man which are reflected in the myths and records of the early pages of history. Comparative studies also have provided valuable insights into the ranges of man's behaviour under varying conditions. They have made clear the modifying influence of culture on the symptomatic expressions of psychopathology and highlighted the deficiencies in certain theoretical explanations of behaviour that come from a study of man in a particular culture during a given time span.

The concepts of disease found among primitive people differ from those held by the scientific communities of today. Remnants of such primitive ideas of illness may however be noted from time to time in the general populations of even the most technologically advanced societies. To primitive people, all illnesses are attributed to forces acting outside the body. Such forces are seen as supernatural; they are the evil spirits, witches, demons, gods, or magicians. These demonological explanations are particularly strong for illnesses affecting behaviour. It is pertinent to speculate that primitive people arrived at these ideas from their own personal experiences and contacts with the sick. Their own dreams of the return of the dead and the remembrance of the dead ones' threats, demands, and affections perhaps fostered the belief in influence from beyond life. Their observations of the meaningless and destructive behaviour of the delirious and psychotic patient and their apprehensions when faced with a convulsive attack, must have given rise to the concept of demonological possession as the causal means for the peculiar or frightening changes of behaviour which occurred in their friends or family.

If we move on to the Greek and Roman cultures, one finds in the literature that the popular Greek opinion characteristically adhered to the supernatural causation of mental disorders. Afflicted persons were thought to be possessed by evil spirits such as the goddesses Mania and Lyssa.

Hippocrates (460-355 B.C.) flatly rejected the influence of the gods as a causative factor in mental illness. Although others expanded the Hippocratic approach, undoubtedly the pinnacle of scientific observation during the Greek and Roman period was

reached in the time of the Roman physician, Galen (A.D.130-200).

With the decline of the Roman empire and throughout the dark ages of western man there occurred a revival of demonology, spiritual explanations and exorcisms by torture which was opposed by only a few isolated individuals.

Several treatises on witchcraft began to appear in the early fifteenth century. With the help of the newly discovered system of printing, these ideas were spread with ease. The highest peak in adherence to the beliefs of witchcraft was reached in 1484, when Pope Innocent VIII issued a bull which facilitated the persecution of the disciples of witchcraft. It was followed shortly thereafter by the Malleus maleficarum (The Witches' hammer), written by the two Dominicans Jacob Sprenger and Heinrich Kramer. This book was so comprehensive as to sexual details that it may well be considered a handbook of sexual psychopathies.

Weyer (1515-1588) adamantly rejected the belief in witchcraft and strongly condemned the clergy who supported it. He attributed such phenomena as hallucinations to a combination of natural and supernatural factors. Weyer had extensive clinical experience, which enabled him to describe a wide range of diagnostic entities.

Mental disorders have been classified since the time of the Greek civilisation. The first good classification however appeared in 1602 from the pen of Felix Platter. In this classification a category on possession was still included.

Except for the classification of Platter I have not been able to find, in all the subsequent internationally accepted classifications, any reference to demon possession.

In his book Witchcraft and demonianism, L'Estrange Ewen, states that the main factors in the development, dissemination, and perpetuation of the absurd belief in the existence of devils and witches capable of supernatural acts were:

1. Blind biblical teaching.
2. Corrupt clergy and their impostures.
3. The diagnostic errors of the medical profession.
4. Statutes against the craft.
5. Misunderstanding of the causes of the great mortality of children and cattle.
6. Confessions of demented or harassed persons.
7. Credence placed in evidence of mental degenerates.
8. The payment of witch-finders by results.
9. Issues of the printing press.

Life tends to revolve in cycles and often moves in circles. We seem to have a cycle or even a full circle in the renewed interest in satanism, witchcraft and the occult. During the last decade psychiatric literature has been inundated with articles on demonology and possession. These articles vary from single case studies to groups of patients and even dwell on philosophy. In an article on exorcism Trethowan (1976) examines in some detail the nature of supposed demoniacal possession and describes its symptoms and signs. He also touches on the social, as opposed to the religious, background in which demoniacal possession flourished (not lacking in the world today). This led to an examination of the psychodynamic aspects of demoniacal possession and the question of absolute evil. Finally he compares the technique of exorcism to those of modern psychiatric practice.

Many different psychodynamic aspects of demoniacal possession have been formulated. It is clear that man's idea of the existence of the devil almost certainly springs from his need to reject his deep-seated instinctive drives such as those concerned with lust, hate, envy, and aggression and which, by their very nature, are likely to arouse in him feelings of guilt. Following Freud, it would seem also that the most common way in which man divorces himself from his own sense of vileness is via the psychological mechanism of a fantasy of evil as something personified. Thus the devil is brought to life while at the same time man is at least partly relieved of the responsibility for some of his more bestial actions. In this way the tale as told, all too readily becomes: It was not I, but the devil who made me do it.

In a study on spirit possession and neuroticism in a West Indian Pentecostal community Ward and Beaubrun (1981) focused their experiment on the relationship between spirit possession and neuroticism as assessed by psychometric techniques. Twenty subjects who were regular members of a West Indian Pentecostal congregation were interviewed and tested with the EPI and the hysteria scale of the MMPI. Analysis of data indicated that the ten subjects who were defined as spirit possessed, scored significantly higher in both neuroticism and hysteria than did the control group. In light of these data and others it was suggested that possession constitutes a culture-bound neurotic disorder.

The term possession can be used in different ways: It could mean a state in which an individual is invaded and taken over by some supernatural entity. To maintain that someone is possessed in this sense, is to make a metaphysical claim. Another use of the word possession is as a simple description of an individual. This makes no supernatural claim but simply states that someone has those features which have traditionally been associated with possession. In this descriptive sense the word has been applied to several different states:

1. A syndrome present in varying degrees consisting of clouding of consciousness, anaesthesias, changed demeanour and tone of voice, impossibility of recalling patient to reality and subsequent amnesia (Yap 1960).
2. An altered state of consciousness or trance which may be induced deliberately in a certain cult setting (Sargant 1976).
3. A state that someone may ascribe to themselves - so that their self-report is the evidence for it.

Possession has been studied from two different angles. Anthropologists have seen possession as arising out of the social structure of certain cultures. Their explanations have focused on the setting that produces possession. Lewis (1971) stresses that possession cannot simply be equated with madness. He claims that in many cults that have been studied (mainly in exotic cultures), those who present as possessed are behaving in a way that is expected and accepted. He says that where psychiatrically trained observers have studied possession cults in such cultures, they have found that the majority of those involved are "only mildly to temporarily neurotic in any valid sense". Where psychotic individuals enter these cults they function badly and are not helped. Skultuns (1974) in a study of Welsh spiritualists found similarly that although most of those attending had physical ailments and personal problems, those with serious psychiatric disturbances were not encountered. This possibility, that in certain cults "normal" people may experience possession, means that the cultural setting is of the utmost importance in understanding any individual case of possession.

The more traditional Western approach to understanding possession focuses on the individual. The question being asked by theological and religious writers, is how to distinguish "genuine" states of possession from similar states, often called "pseudo-possession" (e.g. Lhermitte 1963). The difference between these is that only genuine possession was thought to result from the interference of a supernatural entity. The possibility, that some states resembling possession were really due to natural illness rather than supernatural influence, was already raised by Scot (1665) in The discovery of witchcraft. Writers turned to traditions handed down within the church to provide criteria for distinguishing "genuine" possession from "pseudo-possession". They drew up lists of distinguishing features such as change of facial appearance, voice and personality, speaking in tongues, unnatural strength, blasphemy and fear of the name of Christ. The broad concept of "genuine" possession has received varying acceptance in different church groups. One considered statement from within the Church of England is contained in the findings of a commission convened by the Bishop of Exeter (Petitpierre 1972).

This is not official policy, but it recommends that "the exorcism of a person must not be performed until possible mental and physical illness has been excluded" - by a "competent physician in psychological medicine" (Whitwell & Barker 1980:288).

In America and on the Continent there has been some writing by Christian psychiatrists on the subject of possession. They may accept the possibility of "genuine" possession because of their beliefs, but differ widely in how readily they arrive at such a diagnosis. Jackson (1976) discusses seriously the criteria he uses in looking for possession, but concludes that in his extensive experience in this area he has not encountered a single genuine case. Lhermitte (1963) describes both genuine possession and pseudo-possession. Wilson (1976) derives her own rather broad set of criteria, and goes on to describe a wide range of cases in which she made the diagnosis of possession.

A second type of classification of possession has been according to the nature of the abnormal mental state. Oesterreich (1930) distinguished two main types of possession:

1. "Somnambulistic" states - usually episodic with impaired consciousness and subsequent amnesia;
2. "Lucid" states - which persist in full awareness, often for a long time.

Lhermitte (1963) accepted this major subdivision and identified various clinical groups using the psychiatric classification of his time and place. Yap (1960) reported a large series from Hong Kong, all of which he considered to fall into Oesterreich's somnambulistic group. The diagnosis of his sixty-six patients were thirty-two hysteria, sixteen schizophrenia, eight depression (with hysterical features), four mania and six organic. Psycho-analytic studies have gone further and tried to identify specific individual conflicts which may underlie possession (Taylor 1978).

There are several reasons why these patients, who on the face of it may not have a great deal in common, are worth studying.

1. People continue to present with this complaint.
2. Their numbers, if anything, may be rising.
3. These patients have a common tendency to seek non-medical help. Exorcism continues to be sought and practised.
4. There are special difficulties in treating these patients.

Whitwell and Barker (1980) did extensive research in a group of sixteen patients at the Barrow Hospital from 1973 to 1977. Of

these sixteen patients, thirteen believed that they were possessed by a "demon" or "the devil"; one called it an "evil spirit"; and two women believed that they were possessed by a man's spirit.

The sixteen cases consisted of seven men and nine women. The diagnosis in hospital was made as follows:

1. Affective disorders - nine patients;
2. Schizophrenia - five patients; and
3. Neurotic state - two patients.

As far as their religious background was concerned, ten had strong emphasis on religion in their childhood home (all Christian, belonging to major denominations rather than small sects). Two had no great interest in religion in their childhood home and in four cases there was insufficient evidence.

At the time of their admission, nine patients had strong Christian beliefs; four had recently become dissatisfied with their former denominational attachments and had become associated with smaller groups. Five had shown recent interest in occult practices; five patients lacked strong religious beliefs, but were interested in the occult.

If one looked at the spiritual help they sought, three patients were exorcised; three asked for exorcism but it was refused; one had a laying on of hands; two patients' homes were blessed by a priest; one went to a faith healer; two sought help from a priest - and were sent to a psychiatrist.

This may well underestimate the tendency of these patients to seek spiritual help.

We do not have the same number of patients at Weskoppies Hospital, but from the nine I could trace, the spectrum of diagnosis was more or less the same with a larger percentage of neurotic conditions. In order to help these patients, one must become aware of their religious beliefs, and how they understand what is happening to them. These beliefs should be respected and not treated as part of the symptomatology that the patient must shed. Unless one attends to this aspect, it will be difficult to form a therapeutic relationship with the patient. After the acute episode some counselling from a member of the church is often requested by the patient and proves very valuable. If the medical team encourages this, they are likely to find help forthcoming. However, if they are obstructive to such contacts, they are likely to take place anyway, and without any liaison they may have unfavourable results. Particular problems occur in

patients who have highly individual and exotic beliefs which do not correspond to those of any church. They may have gathered beliefs from a variety of religions and are often attracted towards the occult. These are restless and unsettled individuals. They pose particular problems, first in distinguishing delusion from belief and, second, in advising and counselling as to the nature of what has happened to them.

Finally, another of Oesterreich's (1966) many cogent observations would seem to be appropriate:

Possession begin to disappear amongst civilised races as soon as belief in spirits loses its power. From the moment they cease to entertain seriously the possibility of being possessed, the necessary autosuggestion is lacking.

So, it might be added, does the need for exorcism.

I would however like to stress again that in any person who appears to be possessed or believes himself to be possessed by evil spirits one must make an in depth investigation into the cultural and religious background and beliefs of the person and make every effort to exclude organic and psychiatric disease.

WORKS CONSULTED

Ehrenwald, J. 1975. Possession and exorcism: delusion shared and compounded. Journal of the american academy of psychoanalysis 3, 105-109.

Henderson, J. 1982. Exorcism and possession in psychotherapy practice. Canadian journal of psychiatry 27, 129-134.

Jackson, B. 1976. Reflections on the demonic: a psychiatric perspective, in Montgomery, J. W. (ed.), Demon possession, 256-267. Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship.

Kaplan, H.I. & Sadock, B.J. 1981. Modern synopsis of comprehensive textbook of psychiatry. III. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.

Kolb, L.C. 1977. Modern clinical psychiatry. Philadelphia: Saunders.

L'Estrange Ewen, C. 1933. Witchcraft and demonianism. London: Heath Cranton.

Lhermitte, J. 1963. Diabolical possession, true and false. London: Burns & Oates.

Mester, H. 1981. Besessenheit - psychodynamisch betrachtet. Psychotherapie, Psychosomatik, medizinische Psychologie. 31, 101-112.

Oesterreich, T.K. 1966. Possession, demoniacal and other: among primitive races in antiquity, the middle ages, and modern times. New York: University Press.

Sargant, W. 1976. The mind possessed. London: Pan.

Seltzer, A. 1983. Psychodynamics of spirit possession among the Inuit. Canadian journal of psychiatry 28, 52-56.

Simons, R.C. 1985. Understanding human behaviour in health and illness. Baltimore: William & Wilkins.

Summers, M. 1969. The history of witchcraft and demonology. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Trethowan, W.H. 1976. Exorcism: a psychiatric viewpoint. Journal of medical ethics 2, 127-137.

Ward, C. & Beaubrun, M.H. 1981. Spirit possession and neuroticism in a West Indian pentecostal community. British Journal of clinical psychology 20, 295-296.

Whitwell, F.D. & Barker, M.G. 1980. "Possession" in psychiatric patients in Britain. British Journal of medical psychology 53, 287-95.

Professor W. Bodemer is professor in psychiatry at the University of Pretoria.

Dept. of Psychiatry
University of Pretoria
Pretoria
0001

J.T. de Jongh van Arkel

1. INTRODUCTION

I am a pastoral theologian. My subject is practical theology. In saying this I restrict myself to a specific field, which implies a specific method. I do not plan to spend time questioning the reality of the devil. Let me only say that, at this stage, I find myself in a paradoxical position where I accept the personalised identity of the devil and, at the same time, believe that much of what is written in the Bible about the devil can be taken as metaphoric language. I do not regard the Bible to be a handbook for either cosmogony or therapy. Neither do I believe that we are supposed to imitate everything Jesus did according to the synoptic gospels. When I choose not to be a fundamentalist, I must adopt the same attitude to my interpretation of what is written about demons, spirits and exorcism.

2. DEMONS AND REALITY

When approaching this topic, one is forced to deal with the question of the reality of demons and demon possession. Most of the discussion about demonic powers, demon possession and exorcism centres on differences in the realities of the issues. When is something real? When it can be proved beyond doubt through scientific investigation? Then - God might not be an objective reality. On the other hand, only the most naive will claim experience to be absolute reality. Psychologists tell us that research into the mysteries of the psychic world has just touched the tip of the iceberg.

Let me therefore offer a word of warning: when something cannot be proved scientifically it is not necessarily unreal. At the same time, we should know that experience might be only that and nothing more and therefore not necessarily reality.

All of this may sound extremely confusing. Yet I am convinced that if we do not agree on what I have said, we shall make no progress in our discussions. I shall try to work from that premise.

3. CARING FOR THOSE IN NEED

As a pastoral theologian I am involved in care. This brings me into contact with people in need. In pastoral counselling we come face to face with people with all sorts of problems, who are unable to handle their lives. When they come for help, they come

after some sort of self-evaluation. In presenting their problem, they immediately provide the answer which they feel might be relevant. In their self-evaluation they choose answers which seem obvious in the circumstances, and they are very often influenced by what they have heard or read. When a group of theological students attended a lecture on cardiac disease and its high incidence among fairly young people, eight percent of this group consulted their doctors within a month, complaining of symptoms they had heard might indicate cardiac problems. It turned out that not one self-diagnosis was correct.

The act of counselling is a hermeneutical function where I as a pastor interpret people's lives, actions, and stories (which themselves are interpretations of what happened to them) in the light of the interpretation of my own experience, knowledge, beliefs and history. This implies some subjectivity on the part of every pastor.

It is very easy to feel at a loss in this task and to become very frustrated with one's inability to understand what is happening in other people's lives and how to help them effectively (especially when one has not had a sound training in pastoral counselling). The temptation to jump on the bandwagon of a one dimensional solution (like e.g. demon possession) is especially dangerous for ministers who are not very competent in handling the more complex pastoral problems.

In our discipline, we must try to transcend our subjectivity as much as possible and remain open to the different perspectives of other disciplines in the field of helping. We must also be aware that a variety of methods and perspectives may each lead to the same result: cure.

The difference within and between professions might determine the diagnosis (evaluation, assessment or hypothesis) arrived at. All diagnoses are made from specific frames of reference.

The question is always: who decides, and on what basis, that someone is demon-possessed? We find examples of misjudgements about possession even in the Bible. Jesus was accused of being possessed by an evil spirit on more than one occasion (Mk. 3:22; Jn. 7:20; 8:48, 52; 10:20).

4. A RELIGIOUS EVALUATION

Whenever demon possession is considered a possibility, a proper evaluation (diagnosis) should be made. Since the conduct of the person seeking help can be the result of a psychological or psychiatric disturbance, this diagnostic procedure should be a multidisciplinary one. Unfortunately this is not often the case.

The result is that psychiatrists make decisions about demon possession, without a proper pastoral diagnosis, and ministers prefer to conduct their business away from the critical eye of psychiatrists and psychologists.

Where the diagnosis is a religious one, it should be sound. Such a diagnosis needs to work with all the important aspects of faith. Demon possession should not be the only possibility investigated. A thorough evaluation should assess, inter alia: the subject's personal concept of sin and its binding power; the subject's levels of personal responsibility; their liberating concepts and beliefs; the religious rituals which, according to them, may be relevant; their relationships with other people; those closest to them; how they see themselves and feel about themselves and their own future; what they think others feel about them and to what extent they are in contact with reality and their views are conventional, stereotyped or idiosyncratic. The diagnosis should be done on three levels: behavioural, emotional and ideational. It should not be limited to the individual and, as far as possible, it should give recognition to the fact that behaviour and world view are governed by belief systems comprising a combination of attitudes, basic assumption, expectations, prejudices and convictions, all influenced by the family system of origin as well as by the system currently lived in. The diagnosis should, as far as possible, also determine the extent to which people could "use" demon possession to attract attention from those around them.

The evaluation of demon possession is the responsibility of a properly trained pastoral counsellor. Doing this evaluation in a multidisciplinary setting might pose some problems for pastors. Yet, I do not know of one psychiatrist in a state psychiatric hospital who is not willing to accept responsible assistance/guidance which might lead to the health of patients. The problem is, however, that exorcism is very often performed indiscriminately and without a prior proper pastoral diagnosis. During the ten years I worked in a psychiatric hospital I did not come across a single patient (other than those with whom I was involved) who was cured by an exorcising ministry. But I can quote scores of cases that were admitted to the hospital as a result of indiscriminate exorcistic activities. I must add that, over the years, a great variety of patients left the hospital after they received extensive pastoral counselling (which might have included confession of specific sins and the acceptance of Jesus Christ as saviour).

Not once was I denied the opportunity to make an in-depth pastoral evaluation of a patient's religious life. The only condition was that the evaluation should not be superficial or limited to

only one aspect of faith. I was, in fact, swamped by requests for evaluations by other members of the therapeutic team.

5. MYTH AND MAGIC

It seems to me that the people who become involved in demon exorcism have very often settled for mythical concepts and prefer mythical thinking. They do not need to be degraded for doing this. Their religious world is full of forces which control man. They can only take part in what is happening around them through participation in the greatest Power (Jesus Christ). I have no problem with mythical thinking as such - although it is not my frame of reference - but I think a word of warning should be given regarding the inherent dangers. A mythical religion is very easily degraded to the level of magic with a whole set of rituals (which might include exorcism). Magic is, in essence, a refined form of domination. It is used to avert disaster, to influence the forces of nature, and to influence or even manipulate other people.

Magic is, therefore, totally different from religion. Religion serves. Magic dominates. Magic is presumptuous! The rituals of magic (some forms of exorcising) degrade religious symbols and values, and are even used to manipulate God. Through the magic ritual, God is used to give power to man. Magic is coercive, and because of the horizons within which one lives, one's field of experience is narrowed. There is an implicit psychology in this magical ritual, which is very often unrecognised. This psychological manoeuvre dominates the proclaimed theology held.

All of this should caution the person who operates within a mythical framework not to become the slave of the devil of magic.

6. THE POWER OF THE HEALER

A second danger which threatens us when we work in this field is the idolatrous view of one's role in delivering people from the bonds of satan. People tend to believe in your power and that you can perform what others cannot. It can easily become pathological. Oates's theory on the pathology of religious leadership (1970:158-159) may have some validity. A religious vocation to invest one's total destiny in one's power to perform a given "job" as a religious leader is pathological. It results in fictitious goals for life, which produce a pathological religion. In turn, these fictitious goals blend with the person's illusion of omnipotence and denial of human limitations. A secondary reaction, according to Oates, is that, en route to the fictitious goal of personal omniscience, the religion of the (sick) religious leader tends to deteriorate into magic, cleverness, and

manipulation. This is very often seen where the main thrust of a ministry is focused on exorcism or deliverance.

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In conclusion: I am convinced that we cannot reject the possibility of demon possession, nor the ministries of deliverance and even exorcism, just because some people who operate in this field are unbalanced and guilty of malpractice, or even because some of the methods have not been functional in certain cases. If we follow that line of logic, we should arrive at the same conclusion regarding medical care and even the ministry of the church.

We ought to go beyond merely making room for a ministry of deliverance which runs parallel to other forms of help. I would like to suggest that we "exorcise" the unhealthy elements in these ministries, that we expose the people who degrade these ministries to the level of magic, and the movement be rid of exclusivist claims. What is needed is the development of a sound foundation for ministries of deliverance, in order to incorporate them as a specialised field into pastoral counselling. The overriding condition must be that a ministry of deliverance should not be allowed to become a substitute for pastoral incompetency.

WORKS CONSULTED

De Jongh van Arkel, J.T. 1981. Evaluering van godsdienstebeleving. Nederduitse Gereformeerde teologiese tydskrif 22, 303-313.

Montgomery, J.W. (ed.) 1976. Demon possession. Minneapolis: Bethany fellowship.

Oates, W.E. 1973. The psychology of religion. Waco: Word books.

Oates, W.E. 1973. When religion gets sick. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Van Peursen, C.A. 1978. Cultuur in stroomversnelling: Strategie van de cultuur. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

The Reverend J.T. de Jongh van Arkel teaches in the Department of Practical Theology at the University of South Africa.

Dept. of Practical Theology
University of South Africa
P.O. Box 392
Pretoria
0001

SOME ASPECTS OF THE MINISTRY OF DELIVERANCE FROM EVIL FORCES

J.P.J. Theron

Before embarking on a discussion of some present-day problems regarding the ministry of deliverance, one's own presuppositions should be made clear. First of all, the theological-theoretical framework used for such an evaluation should obviously be taken into account. Secondly, a specific practice - or the lack of it - should be investigated and discussed.

The first requirement is the easier one to comply with. Our framework is one which allows for the belief that Jesus Christ defeated Satan and in different ways and circumstances set people free from evil spirits. With this in mind, it is assumed that the church was given the commission and authority to continue this ministry until the second coming. This implies that one aspect of the church's comprehensive ministry at this moment is the task of setting free, in the name of Jesus Christ, people who are under the influence of, or bound by, evil forces. This premise is sometimes fallaciously described as fundamentalistic (cf. Singleton 1977:191-2).

The second task (of evaluating prevailing deliverance practices) is not so simple. It is difficult because some churches do not really have any such practices whereas in others, while the ministry is officially recognised, it is only practised in certain dioceses. In yet other groups and churches which have developed a ministry of deliverance, there is considerable variation in its implementation or in the norms set for implementation.

The latter problem (that there are not many recognised practices to be studied) can only be overcome by using literature from various sources. Data have also been drawn from in-depth interviews with five persons who practice a ministry of deliverance, and from twenty personal interviews with persons who claim to have experienced deliverance. I am furthermore including notes made by myself during or after participatory observation and active participation in charismatic deliverance sessions.

In conjunction with the literature, this gives rise to a number of conclusions which require further investigation and are here presented as a provisional theological theory.

Only the more important aspects are discussed. I would like to touch on the following points:

1. The position of the so-called main-line churches;

2. Attitudes in the ministry of deliverance towards the professional helping services;
 3. Why and how people get involved in this ministry;
 4. How those who experienced deliverance came into bondage in the first place;
 5. Trends in the ministry of deliverance and exorcism.
- Although all written sources will be duly acknowledged, data derived from interviews will be used without specific reference.

1. INADEQUATE GUIDANCE FROM THE CHURCH

It is clear in the first place that lay members in particular in a number of churches experience the lack of guidance with regard to a meaningful deliverance ministry as a serious handicap. This shortcoming manifests itself in various ways and has consequences for the churches, for those who claim to have been in bondage to evil forces and for those involved in their deliverance. Some of the consequences are as follows:

1.1 From the point of view of the so-called main-line churches, the lack of guidance forces members to seek help from persons who, in the official view of those churches, are not competent to provide it - from the wrong sources (cf. MacNutt 1981:133-9). Churches which provide no recognised deliverance ministry also lose members to charismatic groups who do provide help of some sort. The same applies to churches which formally recognise the ministry of deliverance but do not practise it - sometimes simply because members notice that the priests they approach are sceptical about what to them is a substantial issue of faith. Watkins (1983:156-160) gives pitiable examples of this problem in a chapter on Controversy within the churches. The position of the Afrikaans churches also illustrates this point. Another group of churches which have problems in this connection are the Pentecostal churches which in general do believe in the exorcism of demons but limit the ministry to troubled unbelievers. Their own (Spirit-filled) members have to resort to outside persons if they feel that they need deliverance. They give the same sort of reasons: my pastor does not preach about this. He won't believe me, and he anyway believes that this kind of thing only happens to unbelievers. Richards (1974:142) writes that at a large conference on deliverance at which he was speaking, every person who was active in this ministry indicated that cases had reached them because other ministers had been unsympathetic to the needs of such people.

Because of this approach, people go where they hope to receive adequate help. The desperate ones especially often find their way to people who are prepared to listen to their need for

The most negative outcome of all is when people resort to other faiths, even to occult sources, when they become desperate and can find no help in their own community (MacNutt 1981:134-136; Watkins 1983:160).

1.2 It is implied in section 1.1, but needs to be specifically noted, that the denial of the demonic precludes certain churches, and specifically certain pastors, from offering their flock a comprehensive pastoral care. This problem may be highlighted by referring to a related issue stated by Richards (1974:6) - that, from a theological viewpoint, our charge to "heal the sick" cannot be negated even by radical thinkers. He then quotes Bishop Robinson, who states in his book On being the church in the world that: "There is no preaching of the Gospel consistent with the new Testament which does not include the charge 'Heal the sick'; without that it would simply be a different gospel."

Hence it is not simply a matter of failure or incompetence to provide a complete ministry. The question arises whether the gospel itself is watered down by such failure. The main-line churches should therefore reconsider, as a matter of urgency, whether their charges are receiving comprehensive pastoral care.

1.3 The same matter may be approached from a somewhat different angle. The pastor should not console himself by reflecting that troubled people, or people who act strangely, can simply be referred to a psychiatrist or psychologist. Of course, this may well be the correct course of action in a given case, and there can be no question of an attack on psychiatry or psychology as such. The point at issue is that people are sometimes referred to a psychiatrist (or they are even institutionalised) when a Christian deliverance ministry is the real answer.

McAll (1975:298;1976:269-278) documented 280 relevant cases. (He says that about 4% of his patients have had to be referred to the ministry of exorcism.) To this can be added, apart from many others, a selection by Richards (1974:136-50) of 23 cases from the literature and a case documented by the Linn brothers (1981:22-34). Those cases investigated in the interviews call for special reflection and cannot be fully discussed in a paper of this kind. Howbeit, consider the following case cited by McAll:

McAll was the seventeenth psychiatrist to whom a lady named Mavis had been referred, and he learned that she had also been hospitalised four times. On the first occasion she had had eight months of deep insulin coma and ECT. The second time she was again diagnosed as a schizophrenic on account of hallucinations and withdrawal from reality. In another hospital she underwent air studies and an angiogram on the supposition that she might have a pre-frontal tumour. At the fourth hospital she was diagnosed as a

hysterical psychopath. In one instance (when she had been discussing her purchases in a shop with "the voices" and could not be recalled to reality) she was certified. McAll sought the help of an experienced priest who by a service of exorcism secured her deliverance from demon possession.

McAll also recalls a situation (1975:297; 1976:276) involving the daughter of a canon of the Anglican Church who became quite terrified when he found himself appointed as the official exorcist for the diocese. The daughter was in a padded cell. Her main problem was an overwhelming urge to gouge out the eyes of her children. The psychiatrist remarked that this seemed a very primitive form of behaviour and inquired who her ancestors were. He was informed that her mother was a titled lady from an ancient castle. He knew from having visited the castle that this form of torture had at one time been practised there. The present family apparently never went near the place and knew nothing of it. He suggested to the canon that he should seek the advice of his bishop. The bishop decided on a eucharist of remembrance and said that he would be free in five days' time to celebrate it with the canon and the psychiatrist. From the moment he made this promise, the daughter became perfectly normal. A few days later they heard that her aunt, who unknown to McAll was an inmate of another mental hospital in another country, had been cured at the same time. Neither of the two knew of the conversation with the bishop. The canon, too, was released from his anxiety and has helped many others since then.

McAll (1976:276) goes so far as to say:

Quite commonly one finds in what are known as the "back" wards of mental hospitals patients who have been labelled atypical schizophrenics or depressives. Some such cases have been completely cured by the prayer of exorcism - sometimes with, and even at times without, the patients' permission and sometimes in their absence. Even in a true schizophrenic the hallucinations and delusions may sometimes be removed as a result of exorcism. They then regain an increasing degree of insight and with the help of a spiritual discipline can learn to control their own medication. It seems that those with borderline or established mental disturbances are easy prey to occult or demonic control.

The problem can be illustrated by another case documented by McAll (1975:297; cf. 1976:270-271). A married woman in her twenties had been diagnosed as a schizophrenic and referred from one hospital to another. Her last two years had been spent in a padded cell where only her husband had been able to approach her. She had to be force-fed by him because she violently resisted members of the

hospital staff. She had not spoken for two years. Neither electro-convulsive therapy nor drugs had helped her. When McAll spoke to the husband of devil possession, about which he (the husband) knew nothing, the woman - huddled, dishevelled, in her dark corner - stood up, spoke for the first time in two years, named the possessing spirit and asked to see a priest. She was delivered and for the past seven years has lived as a normal housewife again, helping her husband in his business.

The abovementioned cases and the testimonies of the people I interviewed make one point quite clear: theologians and clergy should take another look at the deliverance ministry. There is a need for a sound theology as well as for a recognised and accepted ministry in this area. Theologians and clergy in general have a responsibility and privilege which they have not exercised.

In this regard MacNutt (1981:135-139) mentions a fascinating research article referring to the disbelief of priests and bishops which causes the "possessed" to seek help from non-Christian sources. One of the cases documented was that of a woman named Ursulina. Ursulina got the run-around from priest to bishop and from bishop to nuns. Then the nuns dropped out. The family went back to the priest, who sent them to a psychiatrist. Later, after Ursulina had been discharged from the hospital uncured, she was taken to a group of spiritualists who taught her to communicate with spirits. She later became a gifted medium and the centre of a cult. Thus, when neither the church nor the psychiatrists were able to help, the family had had only one recourse - to go the occult route.

This poses a number of questions to the church and to priests, pastors and dominees in particular: "Why can't you help us? Don't you believe in what you were called to do?" (cf. MacNutt 1981: 139).

Finally, the point made by Richards (1974:109-110) may be the one we need to address. According to him Dr Frank Lake, in a talk on the demonic, recalled an occasion when

Hans-Rudi Weber was giving a talk on Christ's Victory over the Demonic Powers to this large gathering of psychiatrists and theologians. It was quite amusing to see how uncomfortable the theologians were at this strange exhibition of what I think they regarded as Medievalism from a distinguished member of their own theological group. It was as if they were apologising to the scientific psychiatrists present that a theologian had returned to the era of demons and evil possession. By contrast the psychiatrists were in fact leaning forward eagerly recognising that the collective demonic is something with which they are continually

dealing. As they said afterwards, "Why didn't some theologian tell us about this before? We know what he's talking about, we live with it."

Linn (1981:7) mentions an interesting point in passing. He says that a growing number of doctors, psychiatrists and social workers are now aware that it is sometimes as necessary to treat demonic bondage with deliverance prayer as it is to treat bacteria with penicillin, a manic-depressive neurosis with therapy and drugs, or an alcoholic with the help of AA and environmental change. Through the Association of Christian Therapists he has come to know over twelve hundred professionals who combine healing prayer (of which deliverance prayer is a small but important part) with their professional practice. The practice of White, who is both a psychiatrist and a pastor, is a good example (1976:281-299). It is also noteworthy that some professional writings are beginning to confirm the good effects of deliverance. An article by Barlow, Abel and Blanchard, Gender identity change in a transsexual: An exorcism (Linn 1981:252-264), illustrates this point.

One final remark on this section. It seems that it is not only the professionals who are recognising the need for the deliverance ministry. I am assured by those involved in it that they are often approached by priests, pastors and dominees who seek their advice and ministry.

To summarise this point: There is an urgent need for theologians, pastors, priests and dominees to rethink their stance on the ministry of deliverance.

2. THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STORY

Much has been said about medical and psychiatric openmindedness to the ministry of deliverance. On the other hand, not all the practitioners of that ministry who came from a Pentecostal or charismatic background - unlike their fellows in the liturgical churches - have the same appreciation of the professional helping services. The argument is more or less that in the ministry of the church all problems should be taken care of. This attitude raises obvious and serious problems which I do not need to address now. But it underlines the problems in the present situation. Although nowadays pentecostals and charismatics often cooperate with the medical profession in respect of physical illness, they are much more reserved when it comes to mental problems. One is reminded of the remark by Jackson (1976:266) that the demonic factor in etiology tends to increase pro rata with our ignorance and lack of knowledge. On the other hand we should note the view expressed by Richards (1974:127):

Since medicine is increasingly recognising the mental and spiritual causes of illness, and psychiatric terms and treatment are (as I indicated ...) concerned with symptoms rather than causes, it means that neither medicine nor psychology is in any position to deny (or affirm) a suggested cause that lies outside the rightful scope of their study. A doctor may have personal opinions about the alleged influence on bodily health of flying saucers, reincarnation, demons or prayer, but as a doctor he is in no position to deny or affirm the influence of such things, as their alleged reality lies outside the sphere of medical investigation. He may as a personal hobby conduct an intensive enquiry into one or other of these and be able to talk with authority on the matter, but until such time as he does this he must remain largely agnostic. Such "agnosticism" is no different from the suspension of judgement which is expected when a medical diagnosis is given - except, of course, by those qualified in medicine.

A spiritual diagnosis has, therefore, as much validity as a medical or psychiatric one, and is certainly of equal importance. If an assessment at the spiritual level is a true one it will in no way clash with an accurate diagnosis from any other discipline, and in so far as it is likely to be concerned with things at the depths of a person's being, rather than on the surface, it may well turn out to be the most important diagnosis of all.

What is urgently needed is free dialogue between open-minded people on both sides. I am sure that the Kingdom of God can benefit by the coming together of those involved. Reflections on practice and theory from both sides are healthy and essential contributions to an understanding of the real issues. Perhaps we should organise such open dialogues between practitioners of various disciplines, people actively involved in the ministry of deliverance and people who were set free from bondage to evil spirits.

To get back to the point at issue, however - those who pray for people in terms of deliverance tend to assert that their point is proved by results. This attitude - "it worked, therefore it is valid" - should be examined critically. Failure to do so will result in an ideological praxis, and that in turn will place the ardent defenders of the new praxes in the same camp as those they sometimes accuse of not being open-minded.

We also need to note the remarks made by Jackson (1976:260) on what he calls one of the most important areas of fallacious reasoning, one which is now almost universal among evangelicals: the trap of "pill before change is proof that change is due to

pill". In this context it might be stated as follows: The fact that a client is "cured" of demon possession and feels better or behaves differently, even after the most sincere rite of exorcism, does not prove that demons were involved or that the devil had anything to do with the client or his condition.

This reasoning becomes problematic when people who have actually experienced deliverance tell about their life-style before this event - their involvement in the occult, contracts with and worship of Satan, obedience to specific forces of darkness, and the encounter during the deliverance process. At the least one has to concede that, to them, "proof" in terms of scientific thought means nothing: they know the devices of the enemy and they know the liberating power of Christ. Some of those who claim to have been delivered report that during the actual process they had life-changing experiences in which they encountered Satan and/or Jesus Christ. In some cases this took place while they were lying "unconscious" for over three hours. Very often these experiences also resulted in noteworthy physical and emotional healings. To them this is proof enough - they have been freed from bondage!

3. HOW DID PEOPLE GET INVOLVED IN THIS KIND OF MINISTRY?

The overwhelming majority of people who testify that they have been used in deliverance became involved through experience, not through theory (cf. MacNutt 1981:127,132; Linn 1981:8). This in itself is not evidence that either the practice or the experience is unhealthy. In practical theology we have become aware of the tremendously valuable influence of praxis on theory. Thus we encourage our students to discover for themselves the influence of praxis on the formation of theories. On the other hand, there is an alarming aspect to this method of coming to grips with demons. Often a lot of harm is done to those seeking relief as well as to those who try to offer assistance. Very often the process is one of trial and error, and sometimes it ends disastrously.

The tragic story of Michael Taylor is a case in point. After a midnight-to-dawn "exorcism" in October 1974, done by two inexperienced clergymen, the thirty-year-old Taylor returned home, killed his wife and her mother's poodle with his bare hands and walked naked through the streets covered with their blood. When police in the Yorkshire town asked where the blood came from, he answered, "It is the blood of Satan" (White 1975:8). Other documented cases that ended in death are those of German student teacher Annelise Michel and of Beatrix Rutherford (Watkins 1983:139-40; 151-5).

What can be learned from this? In the first place it would be unwise to discard the whole of the deliverance ministry on the basis of the abovementioned cases. Instead, it seems necessary

that those who have an effective ministry should disciple their followers. Some of those interviewed are doing this already - teaching their students the theory and practice. In the Church of England an exorcist must have at least a year's training by another priest before embarking on a ritual of exorcism (Watkins 1983:155). In the charismatic churches people are introduced to the ministry by teachings, courses and videotapes, and through practical assistance in actual cases. People who seem especially gifted in this area are used in ministering teams. These groups rightly feel that the church "is responsible to furnish spiritually and intellectually competent leadership in the ministry of salvation and deliverance from the powers of evil" (Unger 1972: 190).

Secondly, the church as a whole should be taught how Christians should overcome Satan in everyday living (White 1976:290).

4. Footholds for the Enemy

Both in the literature and in the interviews conducted, one aspect came to the fore: involvement in occult practices is one of the main gateways to demonic bondage. People active in the ministry of deliverance unanimously blame dabbling in the occult as one of the main snares by which people fall under the influence of Satan, "for it is basically the worship of what is created" (Richards 1974:132; cf. Green 1981:122-147). Richards (1974:19;122) clearly links occult practices with evil disturbances and even affirms that the rapid growth of the church's ministry of deliverance and exorcism is not a reaction within a materialist church from those who yearn for the supernatural. It arises as a practical and compassionate response to disturbed or troubled people or families. Those I interviewed share this notion.

In this regard it might be asked whether practice is not once again saying to the sophisticated academic, technological, and rationally theological world that some of our theories regarding occult practices need serious rethinking.

On the same level it may be asked whether Christians, or the church in general, do not underestimate the impact of the occult explosion of the last three decades on society and on individuals. According to the literature, people involved in the ministry of deliverance and those who have been set free, this is indeed the case. Richards' chapters on the occult explosion and the occult journey (1974:19-37;38-90) make interesting reading. Blasdale (1974:120-147) likewise, in a bibliographical essay, portrays the present horrific scene. It is my personal view that the church should urgently and seriously attend to these matters. Most of the people who became involved in the occult did so as a result of experimenting with the powers of darkness without knowing the dan-

gers involved: they had never heard about these, although most of them were active members of their churches. For example, people played with the ouija board at parties, in hostels or during military service - just for the fun of it. Others were unknowingly led into the world of the occult by older, more experienced people (cf. Ketchen 1974:63-68).

Although deliberate or accidental occult activity seems to be a prominent clue to the nature of this type of distress, exorcists in general do not see it as the only avenue by which the enemy gains admission to a life. Those interviewed would agree with Bovet (quoted by Richards 1974:20), who has rightly criticised the "unbelievable gullibility" of those who confuse cause and effect because of the high incidence of occult practices among the neurotic, and who proceed to exorcise the moment any occult activity is mentioned. On the other hand they would insist, with him, that a firm stand must be taken wherever there has been any real commitment to occult practices or ideas. A prayer of confession and repentance at the very least is standard practice where occult involvement is known to have occurred. None of the respondents accepts the excuse that "the Devil made me do it" (cf. Miller 1977). People seeking help are always taught to take responsibility for their own sins and to deal with these in terms of the grace and forgiveness available through the cross.

Are there other ways in which evil spirits may gain entrance into people? Our sources indicated that in their experience there are many gates and traps which Satan tries to use. In this connection Wheeler (1981:174-204) - who has a wide and accepted ministry - sees deliverance in a wide context and indicates five different areas where a prayer of command can be used. Others involved in the ministry agree with this approach and say that entry can be gained through sin, curses, weaknesses in the person's spiritual armoury, drug abuse, and so forth. Once again, having said this, they also emphasise that they do not know why this does not apply to everyone involved in these practices. Not all are affected in the same way. Richards (1974:132) makes the following suggestion:

Viewed positively, those who are immune from such suffering are those whose doors are "shut" to psychic, occult, magical or demonic forces and pressures, who love God (and hence live without fear) and whose lives not only have a spiritual foundation in this way, but a psychological one as well - in that their love for God will show itself in an ordered way of life and service to others.

Otherwise it is suggested that very often deliverance takes place at the time of conversion or other spiritual breakthroughs in people's lives - by the power of the Spirit of God.

5. EXPERIENCE, GROWTH AND MATURITY

Asked whether there has been any growth or increase of maturity in this ministry the response of those interviewed was definitely positive. This corroborates with the impression given by the literary sources. The following aspects need to be mentioned:

5.1 Respondents testify that they have grown in experiential knowledge of the power of the living One. This means, in the first place, that they have more authority over the demons. Understandably they always have to trust the Lord, but through their experiences they have learned to rely on Him more positively. They say they are growing in appreciation of the Lord's power and character. Shouting at demons, defending the person's right to be free, and long "dialogues" with demons (practices which tend to be spiritualistic in themselves), have stopped. In most cases this has also meant a reduction in the actual time spent in this ministry.

5.2 In the area of discernment (diagnosis), a great change of emphasis is being experienced in terms of past developments. Much less time is being spent on the actual process of casting demons out. The reason is that those experienced in this ministry are concentrating more on trying to find out how the enemy got a foothold in the first place. After that, they first of all minister to the troubled person in the area of forgiveness, repentance, inner healing and so forth. They find that this reduces the time they have to spend in the actual deliverance.

5.3 Growth, trust and experience in being sensitive to "a word of knowledge" given by the Spirit are seen as vital developments in the ministry of deliverance. This gift not only helps to identify demonic influences but also the times and places where they gained entry. The exercise of this gift, as understood in these circles, thus strengthens the faith of those who are ministering and those who are being ministered to (Saxenmeyer 1976-1977: 33-34). By the way the exercise of this charisma - once again as understood in these circles - also provides fascinating material for academic research (cf. Jackson 1976:266) and would bring us nearer to our goal of precision in diagnosis.

5.4 A development which is closer to a good, long-standing praxis in the liturgical churches is the recognition of the necessity to minister in teams. One church, for various reasons, works specifically with husband-and-wife teams. Sometimes other people are invited to attend the actual deliverance - not as spectators but as active and experienced prayer warriors.

5.5 A wholesome trend mentioned by all the respondents is that deliverance is increasingly seen as a small (though important)

part of God's dealings with us. Deliverance has no place on its own. It is not (or no longer) considered a panacea for all ills. Total healing is receiving greater emphasis than before. Richards, for instance, rightly sees deliverance as only a part of healing and exorcism as only a part of deliverance (1974:1-5; 119-120). Thus "although a deliverance is a healing, a healing is not always a deliverance or exorcism" (Saxenmeyer 1976-1977:36).

5.6 There is a growing understanding and appreciation of the church as a body. There is a tendency to move away from the one-man ministry to a church-based ministry. This is in line with the view stated by Richards (1974:6-7), that to heal is Christ's charge to the church, and to individuals only in so far as they are genuine expressions of the church. We can agree with his notion and Charrington's, that it is becoming clear that the healing church rather than the healing individual is the logical successor to and continuation of the healing Christ. A side effect is that more people are thus involved in preparation through prayer as well as in the important aspect of follow-up which is seen as an integral to the ministry of the church as a whole.

5.7 Although not well developed, it seems that in pentecostal and charismatic circles there is also a growing appreciation for the sacraments of the church. On the other hand, there is a new appreciation for the ministry of unordained or lay people. Without some of these devout and highly gifted persons, this ministry would not have grown as it did. The vision of Richards (1984:158) is shared by more and more people:

When the church's healing ministry is truly sacramental and truly charismatic then it will itself be the more healed and a better instrument for the healing which has been entrusted to it by the risen Lord.

5.8 Those interviewed, though they have definite ideas about the validity of and scriptural basis for this ministry, are prepared to acknowledge that they are working with quite a corpus of extra-Biblical material in terms of diagnosis, methodology, theory and praxis. We agree with White (1976:286) that this insight should make advocates of this ministry aware that this body of knowledge has the same innate strengths and weaknesses as the extra-biblical theories of the sciences or of history. Nevertheless, it should be taken as seriously as other bodies of knowledge. To put this into a wider perspective: it must be remembered that the same applies to more accepted theories and practices such as preaching

or pastoral counselling. In those ministries, too, a whole body of knowledge is derived from extra-biblical sources.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1 First of all it needs to be stated that there is a growing ministry of deliverance and exorcism in various churches and charismatic groups. This fact should be noted by those in different disciplines and by leaders in various churches.

6.2 It is acknowledged that there is still much to be learned with regarding to this ministry. Its relationship with the professional helping services, the problem of diagnosis, and the proper way to minister to troubled persons are examples of areas for further study.

6.3 The ministry of deliverance challenges certain modern theological notions in respect of Satan, demonology in general, some of the causes of illness and so forth.

6.4 At the same time, some traditional assumptions regarding the dichotomy between clergy and laity are also being changed.

6.5 Those in pastoral leadership should do all they can to protect their flocks from the growing influence of occult practices.

6.6 There are positive signs of growth in this ministry. Open dialogues between interested parties will promote this service to the Body of Christ.

WORKS CONSULTED

Barlow, D.H., Abel G.G. & Blanchard E.B. 1981. Gender identity change in a transsexual: An exorcism, in Linn 1981, 252-264.

Blasdale, J.C. 1974. Occultism: A bibliographical essay. Journal of Christian reconstruction 1, 120-147.

Green, M. 1981. I believe in Satan's downfall. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Ketchen, D.R. 1974. Table raising: Introduction to the occult. Journal of Christian reconstruction 1, 63-68.

Jackson, B. 1976. Reflections on the demonic: A psychiatric perspective, in Montgomery 1976, 256-267.

Healy, J.B. 1981. The tradition for charismatic deliverance prayer, in Linn 1981, 86-106.

Linn, M. & Linn D. (eds.) 1981. Deliverance prayer: Experiential, psychological and theological approaches. New York: Paulist Press.

Linn, M. & Linn D. 1981. Deliverance in the tradition of our Father: A case study, in Linn 1981, 22-48.

McAll, R.K. 1975. The ministry of deliverance. Expository Times 86, 296-298.

McAll, R.K. 1976. Taste and see, in Montgomery 1976, 268-278.

MacNutt, F. 1981. The imperative need for the Church's involvement in a deliverance ministry, in Linn 1981, 126-159.

Miller, P.M. 1977. The evil did not make me do it: A study in Christian deliverance. Scottsdale: Herald.

Montgomery, J.W. (ed.) 1976. Demon Possession: A medical, anthropological and theological symposium. Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship.

Richards, J. 1974. But deliver us from evil: An introduction to the demonic dimension in pastoral care. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.

Richards, J. 1984. The Church's healing ministry and the charismatic renewal, in D. Martin & P. Mullen (eds.), Strange gifts?: A guide to charismatic renewal, 151-158. Oxford: Blackwell.

Saxenmeyer, G. 1976-1977. Approaching the ministries of healing and exorcism: Methodologies for approach. Journal of pastoral counselling 11, 32-36.

Singleton, M. 1977. Spirits and spiritual direction: The pastoral counselling of the possessed. Missiology 5, 185-194.

Unger, M.F. 1972. Demons in the world today. Wheaton: Tyndale.

Watkins, L. 1983. The real exorcists. London: Methuen.

Wheeler, J. 1981. Deliverance within the total ministry of the Church, in Linn 1981, 174-204.

White, E. 1975. Exorcism as a Christian ministry. New York: Morehouse-Barlow.

White, J. 1976. Problems and procedures in exorcism, in Montgomery 1976, 281-299.

Doctor J. Theron teaches in the Department of practical theology at the University of South Africa.

Dept. of Practical Theology
University of South Africa
P.O. Box 392
Pretoria
0001

DEMONIC POWERS FROM AN EVANGELICAL PERSPECTIVE

R.B. Codrington

1. INTRODUCTION

It is a particular honour to be invited to offer a consideration of the subject of demonic powers from an evangelical perspective. I believe it is important at the outset to define this particular designation, since there is wide misunderstanding concerning the label, "evangelical". For many years the "fundamentalist" label has resulted in evangelicals being disregarded in the seats of higher learning because they tended to "park their brains on the shelf" in so many areas of academic and theological study. Many Christian leaders in this category would adopt an "a priori" stance on truth and then defend it at all costs, often with their heads firmly in the sand.

It is probably true to say that most fundamentalists are evangelicals, but it is most certainly NOT true to say that all evangelicals are fundamentalists. This is not just playing with words, but is of great importance within the context of a work such as this one. Whatever may have been true historically, I believe that the "head-in-the-sand" approach to an academic study of the Bible and Christian truth has changed and is continuing to change. Evangelicals are more willing today to countenance new ideas and to put their own beliefs and traditions to the test, believing firmly that truth WILL prevail and WILL survive even the most searching examination by the best minds in the world.

Evangelicals are known, of course, basically for holding tenaciously to three fundamental truths:

1. The belief in a God who is both transcendent and immanent and Who desires to enter into a relationship with men and women;
2. The belief in the necessity for a personal commitment to Christ in conversion, thus becoming a child of God, which requires a life of service and ensures a future existence in heaven for eternity; and
3. The belief in the Bible as the inspired, inerrant and authoritative Word of God.

There are some who would accuse evangelicals of having held so firmly to these beliefs that they have become quite unreasonable and unrealistic in their attitudes to scholars outside of their own tradition. Perhaps it would be helpful to understand that, like other "movements", the evangelical movement is not static

but developing and, in some ways, maturing. Petersen (1985:4) notes in a recent "Evangelical newsletter" that evangelicals are now, "more comfortable with scholarship."

However, there is an added complication in speaking on behalf of evangelicalism and that is the very broad spectrum of people who would lay claim to the title, "evangelical". Thus, when one looks at any religious phenomenon, and indeed any doctrine, one is certain to find a wide divergence of opinion. This is certainly true in the matter of demonic powers, the subject before us here.

2. DEMONIC POWERS

All evangelicals would admit of the existence of "demonic powers". The clear teaching of both the Old and New Testaments regarding the existence and power of demons (Dt. 32:17; Rm. 8:38; Ja. 2:19) would be accepted as adequate testimony to their reality. Unger speaks representatively of evangelicals when he writes:

In the New Testament demons afflict men with mental, moral, and physical distempers (Mk. 1:21, etc.). They enter into men and control them in demon-possession (Mk. 5:1-21) ... energize idolatry, immorality and human wickedness (1 Cor. 10:20; Rv. 9:20,21), and in general assist Satan in his program of opposition to the word and will of God (Unger 1982:163).

All evangelicals would also accept that demonic powers were particularly evident during the earthly ministry of Christ. The synoptic gospels bear ample testimony to the miracles which Jesus performed on a number of occasions to free people who were in bondage to evil spirits of one form or another (Mt. 8:31; Mk. 1:34; Lk. 11:20; et. al.).

In the gospels the outbursts of demonic opposition to the work of God in Christ are most evident, and the evangelists depict Christ in continual conflict with evil forces. To expel demons was no easy matter, as the disciples discovered (Mt. 17:19); Mk. 9:28) and the recognition that Christ was able to accomplish this with apparent ease led His enemies to link Him perversely with demonic forces instead of recognizing His divine origin (cf. Lk. 11:15; Jn. 7:20; 10:20) (Harrison 1975:98).

But there would be some difference of opinion among evangelicals concerning the activity of demons today, and considerable difference on the methods of dealing with people apparently involved

with demonic powers in some way. Statements on the phenomenon range from the "wild" to the "wary"; from the spectacular to the sceptical.

On the one hand, there would be the kind of apparent exorcism which Larson relates. Dealing with a woman called Ann, he describes the scene:

I soon discovered that blasphemy, though the main demon, was not the only demon that possessed Ann. There were seven in all, and we required that each demon identify itself by name. The sequence of casting them out was commenced by having each demon speak audibly and pronounce its own doom (Larson 1974:148).

On the other hand, one reads of the reservations of a scholar like Dabney who wrote:

Whether "possessions" occur now, I do not feel qualified to affirm or deny (Dabney 1972:274).

This provides a particular problem in evaluating this subject from an evangelical perspective, since unfortunately there are some who have pandered to the sensational and produced books which, paradoxically for an evangelical, have taken little note of biblical evidence and have given authority and credence to so-called "case histories" which have been subjective in the extreme. In seeking to add some perspectives to today's discussion, then, I believe I must be true to what evangelicalism TRULY stands for and try to present a BIBLICAL picture against which to evaluate the modern phenomena.

Evangelicals believe that demons are in fact fallen, evil angels, who owe allegiance to the prince of the demonic forces, Satan. Although we are referring here, obviously, to the spiritual rather than the physical world, it must be understood that these beings are none the less real and very active in the world of space and time. Their task is at all times to oppose the works and plans of God in the world, and they do this by influencing the behaviour of human beings. 1 Timothy 4:1-3 speaks of "deceiving spirits" which Hendriksen (1972:146) maintains should be understood to be demons. Good and evil cannot simply be presented in abstract terms; the picture presented in Scripture is of a world of created beings, who fell from positions of privilege as a result of rebellion and who now unite to oppose the works of God in the world. This opposition takes the form of the temptation of believers; that is seeking to lead them into sin. It also involves a strong influence on the lives of unbelievers, in terms of which some form of demon-possession is possible.

At this point, there would not be total agreement among evangelicals, since some would doubt whether we can expect the same kind of demon-possession today as is spoken of during the ministry of Jesus. However, an increasing number would accept that, since these demonic powers quite clearly still exist today, they must be capable of exercising a similar kind of influence to that shown in New Testament times.

Certainly, through church history, many of the great leaders of the Christian church have both acknowledged the reality of the demon world and the ability of demonic powers to possess people.

Origen claimed that "By calling on the name of Jesus and the name of martyrs, demons could be driven out" (Hendriksen 1976:64). His mention of some kind of mystical power inherent in the names of martyrs seems rather strange, but it is clear that he believed in the demon world and in the Christian's authority over them in the matter of exorcism.

Luther, on the other hand, began to propound the view that the preached gospel was quite adequate to deal with any apparent occurrences of demon-possession and therefore that the activity of demons could be expected to decrease with the preaching of that gospel. He stated bluntly:

We cannot of ourselves expel the evil spirits, nor must we even attempt it (Luther 1975:113).

Calvin was wary of the kind of exorcism which all too quickly became a ritual to be practised indiscriminately. For example, he forbade the Roman practice of exorcism at baptism (Calvin 1960: chap. 15:19).

Today, as already indicated, there is certainly widespread belief among evangelicals in the existence of demons and a recognition of their considerable power. However, the mainline evangelical denominations would differ from certain of the charismatic and pentecostal groups concerning the matter of demon-possession, especially relating to Christians, and it is to this matter that we must now turn.

3. DEMON-POSSESSION

Demon-possession in Bible times appears to be that state in which demonic powers take over control of a victim to the extent that there is a physical manifestation of some kind, either permanently or periodically. This could take the form of mental abnormality, epileptic fits, superhuman strength or violent attitudes towards others. On many occasions, there appeared to be an acute awareness of the presence and authority of Christ. It should not

be thought that the biblical mention of demon-possession was "simply another name for insanity or for dissociation" (Hendriksen 1976:64). Evangelicals are happy to accept the simple statements of fact in the gospels, since they are quite consistent with the teaching of all of Scripture.

However, we would want to point out that in no case in Scripture was this possession ever true of a Christian. The incidents referred to invariably involved people who were either actively opposing the preaching of the gospel or were at the very least clearly non-Christian. To say that a Christian might be demon-possessed would seem to cut across many passages of Scripture. The question must be asked whether an evil spirit and the Holy Spirit, who indwells all believers, may ever occupy the same home. If a person truly becomes a "new creation in Christ" at conversion (2 Cor. 5:17), it would seem very strange that a demon could be part of that renewal. The new Christian is made part of the Body of Christ (Eph. 1:23); he is sealed by the Holy Spirit (Eph. 4:30); and he becomes the "temple of the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor. 6:19). In the light of all that happens to the new believer, it makes no sense at all to maintain that one who is part of the Body of Christ can also be controlled and possessed by one who is opposed to all that Christ is doing in the world. It is in fact diametrically opposed to Paul's teaching in 2 Corinthians 6:15-16 where he makes it clear that there can be no agreement between the temple of God and idols. Indeed, one of the central themes of Paul's prison epistles is to show what it means for the believer to be "in Christ". To follow that by saying that one who is "in Christ" could also be "under the demon power" is to use a contradiction in terms.

Therefore, the predominant evangelical position on demon-possession, among those who would still acknowledge its possibility today, would be that while Satan and his hosts can certainly place believers under tremendous spiritual pressure, it is absolutely impossible for a Christian to be demon-possessed. It may be pointed out that in ALL the epistles of the New Testament, designed as they were to instruct believers in how to live the Christian life, there was not ONE warning about demon-possession for Christians. We must conclude that such possession was, and is, just not possible.

As has been hinted, many evangelicals, especially from the Reformed tradition, would discount the possibility of ANY kind of demon-possession today at all. Hendriksen is typical of this position when he states bluntly that "convincing evidence of present-day demon-possession has not been furnished" (Hendriksen 1974:437). However, I believe it is true to say that an increasing number of evangelicals would accept the possibility of a

non-Christian falling into this kind of possession. With widespread interest in the spirit world and the occult in our day, we believe that many people are opening themselves, wittingly or unwittingly, to the influence and power of evil. Leahy describes what this kind of possession may be like:

It results in the complete or partial loss of the sufferer's reason or power of will. His thoughts and actions are controlled by the evil spirit until his personality is completely submerged and overborne, producing either a two-fold consciousness (e.g., "My name is Legion: for we are many", Mark 5:9), or a total loss of self-awareness (Leahy 1975:92).

4. THE CHURCH'S RESPONSE

Given that such possession is in fact possible, particularly of those who have dabbled in the world of the psychic and the demonic, the evangelical community would not be unified in prescribing how this situation should be approached. Certainly, many would warn against the danger of seeing every form of deviant behaviour as demonic. Wilson makes this point very forcibly:

Some credulous people tend to see demons everywhere It is all too easy to suspect that all problems are the result of demon activity. By this view, if a person has a mental or emotional problem, the problem can always be dismissed, so long as that person will submit to the casting out of the demon. If someone is sick or is injured in an accident, that is a direct demonic attack. If a person is unstable in nature, by such a view that person is demonized (Wilson 1974:79).

This kind of "demon-hunting" can have very tragic side-effects, and it has been the cause of a certain polarisation in views on this subject. Two approaches need to be dealt with at this point:

4.1 The "preaching" approach

Put very bluntly, those who hold to this position maintain that the disciples were not told to "Go into all the world and diagnose demon-possession!" Modern-day practices of exorcism are viewed with grave misgiving, as it is felt that people are making use of extra-Biblical and un-Biblical rituals in their attempts to cast out demons. Many scholars, like Leahy, believe that there is never a place for Christian exorcism. He believes that:

Mere exorcism ... finds no support in Scripture and stands condemned by it. Nothing less than actual salvation can meet the need of any sinner. Nothing less than the preached Word will, in normal circumstances, effect deliverance and renewal (Leahy 1975:137). (Leahy would see "abnormal circumstances" as those involving infants and the mentally deficient.)

The approach adopted here is that the preaching of the Word is adequate to meet the needs of all sinners, whether demon-possessed or not and therefore there is never a need for exorcism of any kind. The marked decline in this kind of activity in the book of Acts and the total omission of any teaching on it in the epistles leaves the impression that the preached Word of God would accomplish its own form of deliverance. In any case, if exorcism is not accompanied by the preaching of the Word and the filling of the void with the Holy Spirit of God, in the words of Jesus, the "final condition of that man is worse than the first" (Mt. 12:45). Whatever may appear to be accomplished by those who go around carrying buckets and urging people to have demons cast out of them, the feeling is that theology cannot be based on pragmatics.

The first response of the Christian, when he believes that he may be confronting a case of demon-possession, is not to practise exorcism but to speak the gospel into the situation and permit the Holy Spirit to fight whatever spiritual battles may be required. An examination of the instructions of Jesus in this regard seems to point to the authority over demons always being seen in the context of preaching.

For example, in Mark 3:15, Jesus appointed twelve men,

... that he might send them out to preach and to have authority to drive out demons.

The context of the driving out of the demons is the preaching of the Word. In Mark 6:12, it is again noteworthy that as the disciples went out and "preached that people should repent", they were also involved in driving out demons. Luke 9:1 seems to have the same perspective, when Jesus

... gave them power and authority to drive out all demons and to cure diseases, and he sent them out to preach the kingdom of God.

Even Paul's clear teaching in Ephesians 6 on dealing with the powers of evil makes no mention of exorcism of any kind but simply urges the use of "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God" (v.17).

However, this refusal to accept exorcism as a normal Christian practice in evangelism does not mean that no interest must be shown in people who might be bound in some way by demonic forces. On the contrary, those who adopt this approach believe that the truth is quite powerful enough to lift the blindness which Satan has placed over unbelievers (2 Cor. 4:4).

4.2 The "exorcism" approach

There is, however, a second major group of evangelicals who would opt for actually practising exorcism when confronted with a clear example of demon-possession. I am not here referring to the kind of person already referred to above who would find a demon "under every bush". The kind of comment which Whyte makes is a little worrying when he says:

If you have a demon, or suspect that you have one, I would strongly recommend that you submit yourself to Christian exorcism. Find a man of God and ask him to cast the demon out in the name of Jesus Christ (Whyte 1974:25).

I would suggest that evangelicals who fall into this second category would want to be more careful than that. First of all, they would not go around assuming that all problems were demon-inspired. They would want to become a little involved in the life of the person concerned, so that "the general pastoral counselling of definitely Christian quality is never waived or omitted" (Koch 1965:262).

The list of spiritual gifts provided by Paul in 1 Corinthians 12:10 indicates that to some is given "the ability to distinguish between spirits", which is seen by those of this persuasion to be stressing the need for discernment when confronted by apparent demon-possession or many other spiritual manifestation. Of course, the spiritual gifts always have to function within the context of the church and this is an important point to emphasise. Those who go around as itinerant exorcists are not submitting to the discipline and control of the body, the Church, nor are they using their gift within the context of that Body.

However, having placed these restrictions on the situation, there would still appear to be room for exorcism in certain situations where, after the preaching of the Word and in the context of a discipling relationship, there appears to be an abnormal barrier to the acceptance of truth. Bizarre behaviour may or may not accompany such resistance, but through the guidance of the Holy Spirit, a Christian may feel it necessary to practise some form of exorcism, based on the example of Christ and perhaps using the words of Paul in Acts 16:18 "In the name of Jesus Christ I command you to come out of her!"

Proponents of this approach also point to the disputed last verses of Mark 16, where Jesus seems clearly to indicate that his followers would cast out demons in his name and that this would represent a "sign". Warfield dismisses this by saying,

These gifts were part of the credentials of the apostles as the authoritative agents of God in founding the Church They necessarily passed away with it (Warfield, in Hendriksen 1976:690).

However, unless one is going to dismiss the entire last verses of Mark as non-canonical, it would seem only honest to admit of an apparently clear statement from Jesus indicating that it would actually be necessary to "cast out demons" at various times, as the gospel was taken to the ends of the earth.

This approach stresses the importance of caring for people who are under any kind of demonic power. Exorcism is not just to be undertaken without careful thought and counselling, but an ongoing involvement in the life of the people concerned is a priority. The Christian church has too often been guilty of hiding behind its sanctified walls instead of being out in the hurly-burly of daily living, as our Lord was.

5. CONCLUSION

The rising interest in the occult in the last decade provides a sphere of ministry for Christians in which they may confront demonic powers more frequently than many might expect. It is not my place to dictate whether the approach should be that of simply providing the preached Word to them and allowing the Spirit to meet their spiritual needs; or that of actually being prepared to confront the evil forces where necessary in exorcism. I would like to hope that the evangelical community, believing as it does in the reality and power of the demonic forces in the world, would not shirk its duty in ministering to those in the grip of those forces.

To those who are already truly Christians, as the Bible would define that term, while there is the tremendous spiritual pressure from Satan and his demonic forces in the sense of some kind of oppression, there can never be the loss of control that the non-Christian may experience. The challenge concerning non-Christians is for Christians to become truly involved in pastoral care of those affected in any way by demonic forces. The concern expressed by coming alongside them speaks volumes of a love for those outside of Christ. Obviously this means that, should a form of exorcism prove advisable, it should always be conducted with due regard for the feelings and emotions of the person concerned. All too often the blazing zeal of Christians can

result in a total lack of sensitivity to people, and that is to misinterpret completely the example set by our Lord. As Christ was incarnated in order to feel as we feel, so the incarnational principle must be set to work by Christians who wish to reflect the image of Christ to a hurting world.

WORKS CONSULTED

Calvin, J. 1960. Institutes of the Christian religion, ed. by J.T. McNeill. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Dabney, R.L. 1972. Lectures in systematic theology. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Evangelical newsletter, 20 December 1985. Evangelicalism: A movement's direction.

Harrison, E.F. (ed.) 1982. Baker's dictionary of theology. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Hendriksen, W. 1972. I & II Timothy and Titus. London: Banner of truth trust.

Hendriksen, W. 1974. Matthew. London: Banner of truth trust.

Hendriksen, W. 1976. Mark. Edinburgh: Banner of truth trust.

Koch, K.E. 1965. Christian counselling and occultism. Grand Rapids: Kregel.

Leahy, F.S. 1975. Satan cast out - A study in Biblical demonology. Edinburgh: Banner of truth trust.

Tenney, M.C. (ed.) 1975. Zondervan encyclopedia of the Bible. II. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Whyte, H.A.M. 1974. A manual on exorcism. Pennsylvania: Whitaker.

Wilson, C. 1974. Crash goes the exorcist! Melbourne: Word of truth publications.

Doctor R.B. Codrington is principal of the Rosebank Bible College in Johannesburg.

Rosebank Bible College
P.O. Box 452047
Saxonwold
2132

PENTECOSTAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE ACTIVITY OF DEMONIC POWERS

F.P. Möller

It is not possible to give a comprehensive exposition of all perspectives from which Pentecostals see the activity of demonic powers. The subject is stated too broadly for such a purpose and consequently this article does not lay claim to completeness.

It also has to be pointed out that, despite the numerous books and articles on this subject, to the best of this writer's knowledge, there is no specific and detailed theology on this subject in pentecostal circles. The reason for this is not because Pentecostals are indifferent to the activities of this demonic powers, but possibly because they have a particularly real experience of the Holy Spirit's dynamic working, which overcomes every power of evil. They have, therefore, not felt the need to be supported in this by a detailed theology. The problem, however, consists in the fact that the lack of such a knowledge may lead to malpractices.

The writer, therefore, in order to write this article, depended not only on books and articles, but also on conversations with leading personalities in pentecostal circles as well as on his own personal experience and observation. The latter relates mainly to the perspective of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa.

Lastly, it should be pointed out that the activities of demonic powers must be seen in relation to many related matters. Among these are the occult, witchcraft, sin, spiritism, parapsychological phenomena, illness, demon possession, deliverance practices (e.g. exorcism) and pagan religions.

1. GOD AND DEMONIC ACTIVITIES

Within the framework of the kingdom of God the reality of Satan and demons is not being ignored in pentecostal circles. According to Latourette (1953:41):

He (Jesus) saw his healings, especially his cure of those troubled by demon possession, as evidence that it (the kingdom of God) had come. To him the forces of evil were intensely real and personal. He accepted Satan as an existent being, an enemy of God, and he addressed the demons whom he cast out, not as delusions of sick minds, but as actual. To him the fact that the demons were being deprived

of their baleful power over men was clear that the kingdom of heaven, the rule of God, was beginning.

In line with Latourette, there is also no problem in accepting Barth's opinion that the dominion of Christ over the powers of evil, and the miracles that accompanied it, should be seen as fleeting manifestations in the present of the fullness of God's coming kingdom (Barth 1968:68-80).

The Pentecostal is realistic enough to realise that he cannot shut his eyes to the reality of demonic powers. Yet there is also the knowledge that the powers of darkness are not a power alongside God; there is only One who is truly powerful, namely God. All other powers are totally subordinate to him. The kingdom of God is revealed precisely by the fact that demons are cast out by his Spirit (see Mt. 12:28). There is no thought of an evil domain functioning alongside God as an autonomous and original power, as though there are two equal powers standing in opposition to one another. God triumphs over the devil and his demons in every respect.

This does not mean, however, that pentecostals ignore the tremendous influence and power which the evil one exercises on earth. But they firmly confess that Christ has already defeated Satan and his demons and that, therefore, the believer can be more than a conqueror (Rm. 8:37) in Christ, (but only in Christ). The pentecostal Dearing, who is sometimes typified as "England's exorcist", explicitly declares, for instance, that the powers of darkness are limited by God and can only act if He permits (Dearing 1977:27).

With reference to this Möller (1985:302-303) writes:

It is God Himself who keeps the evil one within limits and does not permit that everything will be destroyed by corruption ... For the sake of the elect does God resist the evil one and limits the corrupting power of sin ... God's control over sin's power does not only consist of the fact that He disposes it in such a way that sin's influence is brought into subservience to His will and purpose. Thus He uses heathen nations (nations which are still living under the power of the evil one) to punish His apostate people and to move them to repentance. We also see how the sin of the Pharisees and Scribes, along with the unjust handling of the legal authority by Pontius Pilate led to the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. And yet the crucifixion of the Son of God was the manner in which He was going to accomplish the redemption of mankind in accordance with His eternal council Yet all of this does not mean at all that the Lord condones sin or consents to it. What it does testify of is God's

sovereignty over all and everything, yes, even over the evil and the power of sin.

The activities of demonic powers and God's sovereignty over them is, to the pentecostal believer, much more than a merely theoretical truth. The working of God's Spirit in pentecostal churches is a very real and sometimes also a spectacular occurrence which is experienced empirically. Consequently to the pentecostal believer, spiritual activity is not something alien and it is no problem for him to give recognition to its reality. As a matter of fact, the activities of demonic powers and God's sovereignty over them, as revealed by the Spirit, are occasionally closely connected. As long ago as September 1933 for example, an article had been published in the official organ of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa in which the writer points out that wherever there is a mighty revelation of the power of God, demonic powers manifest themselves more openly. The idea here is that if the Spirit of God is quenched, demonic activity cannot be identified.

When the Son of God was manifested in the flesh, the activity and outspoken agency of demons were manifested more than ever before, and we often see instances in Scripture where the approach of Christ or of the Spirit-filled apostle to some possessed person would mightily stir the demon in him. Just as the approach of summer causes vegetation to sprout, the same heat also stirs the snakes into action (Comforter 1933:1-2).

This statement has to be seen in the light of the belief in God's complete dominion over demonic powers and the fear that these powers have of God.

This brings us to the relation between demonic powers and the baptism of the Holy Spirit, precisely because this experience can also be regarded as an endowment with power to give further expression to the sovereignty of God.

2. THE BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT AND DEMONIC ACTIVITIES

We have already pointed out God's sovereignty over demonic activities, and yet this does not mean that man also possesses this sovereignty. He needs the help and power of God to offer effective resistance to these evil powers, especially in view of the Lord's warning in Luke 11:24-26. The baptism in the Holy Spirit is therefore regarded by pentecostal believers primarily as such an endowment with power (see Ac. 1:8). Now this does not mean that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is seen only as a kind of spiritual experience to get power over the evil one. It also does not mean that the Holy Spirit is being emphasised at the

expense of Christ and his victory over the evil one. When a person is baptised in the Holy Spirit the risen Christ is powerfully revealed and glorified in the life of the believer. The person who seeks the baptism in the Holy Spirit is therefore not encouraged to seek a spiritual experience in the first place, but to seek Jesus Christ as the Baptiser in the Holy Spirit. The believer becomes aware of Christ and it is in his name that victory is gained. Wilkerson (1964:158-159) writes:

We place a tremendous store in the baptism of the Holy Spirit as it was foretold by John, promised by the Father and experienced by Pentecost. I'm sure you've noticed the vast change that took place in the apostles after this experience. Before they had been timid and powerless men. Afterwards they did receive that power that Christ spoke about. They healed the sick, cast out demons, raised the dead. The same men who had hidden themselves at the crucifixion went on after this experience to stand up to the hostile world with their message.

Practice had also shown Wilkerson that the power of the baptism of the Holy Spirit is not to be under-estimated:

I spoke to Nicky who had been taking goof balls and smoking marijuana. I asked him when it was that he felt he had victory over his old way of life. Something tremendous had happened to him he said, at the time of his conversion on the street corner. He had been introduced at that time to the love of God. But it wasn't until later that he knew he had complete victory. "And when was that, Nicky?" "At the time of my baptism in the Holy Spirit." I called in David and asked him the same thing. When did he feel that he had power over himself? "Oh, I can answer that," said David. "When I was baptised in the Holy Spirit." Again and again I got the same report. I cannot describe how excited I was. A pattern seemed to be emerging. I felt that I was on the verge of something tremendous (Wilkerson 1964:156-157).

There are even those who maintain the extreme point of view that a person who is not baptised in the Holy Spirit, is in a dangerous position.

If you have not yet received the infilling with the Spirit, you are in a dangerous position. For those who have formerly been possessed or oppressed may again become so possessed and oppressed, and those who have never been possessed lay themselves open to this danger when they fail to avail themselves of the protection which God has provided, especially in these closing days of age, when demonic activity is increasing (Allen 1953:155).

Although this view will not be accepted by everyone, there is still the point of view that, especially after a demon or demons have been cast out of a person, such a person should find the Lord and preferably be baptised in the Holy Spirit. This is confirmed, inter alia, by Dearing's testimony after he had been confronted with three women who had practised the occult. He writes (1977:56):

One had been tormented by horrific visions and suffered definite spiritual disturbances. She needed exorcism. Eventually she found release for her soul and the fulfilment of needs in the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

In line with this Van Dam writes (1974:132):

The praises and thanksgiving for the deliverance must result in an exchange of power Liberation from the enemy is liberation for the Lord. Now is also the best moment to pray for the infilling of the Holy Spirit.

The reason why the baptism of the Holy Spirit is emphasised in this connection is the fact that it can be regarded as the complete opposite of demon possession (see Van Dam 1974:91, 133). It is not far-fetched to characterise demon possession as the baptism with an evil spirit. Yet the manner in which such an "evil baptism" occurs has to be distinguished from the way in which the baptism of the Holy Spirit takes place. Without going into a detailed comparative study of these two experiences, the following difference is of great importance: in the baptism of the Holy Spirit man's faculty of will is not eliminated. Man's will is overarched and included in God's will, but never replaced. It does not lead to obsessive behaviour in which man's will is forcibly annihilated. In all this man remains active and involved through his own personal initiative. He never becomes a will-less instrument of the Holy Spirit. In short, God never denies the intrinsically subjective character of man, but in fact by the working of the Holy Spirit leads it to greater self-actualisation.

In contrast to this it is found that in cases of demon possession man's willpower is at times completely eliminated. The person acts obsessively, saying and doing things which later make him feel ashamed or embarrassed, simply because he did not want to do them. It is as though the person becomes a will-less tool in the hand of the evil one with utterly humiliating consequences. This is how McAlister (1971:34-35) describes it:

To be possessed by a demon, or to be demonised, which is a more accurate translation of the Greek daimonizomai, is to be under control of an evil spirit. Every facet of the

demoniac's personality is affected by the demon who inhabits and dominates him. His mind, speech, and actions are subjected to the demon. After a demon has been cast out of a person, he will often ask what he did while under the demon's influence. During his torment, a demoniac is not conscious of his actions or words Frequently changes occur in his voice. I have listened many times to a deep bass male voice coming from the throat of a possessed woman. I have also heard demons speak in highpitched, reedy tones, which were likewise quite different from those of the demoniac when he or she was not being tormented. When a person is demon possessed, it is impossible to talk to him, all communication must be addressed to the demon who is in full control of both mind and voice.

Unger (1984:103-107) writes:

The chief characteristic of demon possession or demonomania is the automatic projection of a new personality in the victim. During attack the victim's personality is completely obliterated, and the inhabiting demon's personality takes over completely The victim is referred to in the third person and looked upon during the attack as unconscious and for all practical purposes as non-existent during this interval.

To summarise, it can be said that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is, for the pentecostal believer, an intense and powerful revelation of the risen Christ in a person's life. Such a person's faculty of will is not eliminated, but rather led to self-actualisation. Demon possession is the exact opposite. It is an intense and powerful revelation of an evil spirit or evil spirits in a person's life. The person's faculty of will is forcibly obliterated, as are all forms of self-fulfilment. It is remarkable, for example, how often suicidal tendencies occur among demoniacs (see Dearing 1977:14, 23; Sumrall 1973:85).

With the baptism of the Holy Spirit a person receives power to overcome compulsive and obsessive behaviour, whereas evil spirits in a person rather increase compulsive and obsessive behaviour.

And so a person who disregards, or treats his faculty of will passively, runs the danger of falling prey to the evil one. Möller (1985:194-195) writes:

The passive person, the person who switches off his reason, conscience and will and expects that God, or other people, or circumstances should dictate his thoughts and path in a mechanical way, in reality abdicates his humanity. More than that, such a person is in danger to fall prey to the

evil one Because the evil one is eager to fill the spiritual vacuum, which is the result of a passive spirit, with all kinds of suggestions, obsessive experiences and revelations, a person gets exactly that for which he has adjusted himself, namely extreme compulsions influencing his life. Further, someone like this has the illusion to think that these extreme compulsions he possesses the voice and leading of God. It is precisely because the world and mankind are in the power of the evil one, that one must always watch and pray in order not to fall into a passive attitude and to end up in the power of the evil one.

Meditation as a passive opening to any transcendental influence is therefore strongly condemned in pentecostal circles. Meditation should rather be viewed in the words of Psalm 1:2:

But his delight is in the law of the Lord, and in this law he meditates day and night.

This is a matter of a purposeful and positive activity during which a person fills his thoughts with the things of God (see Phlp. 4:8). Forster (1985:15) puts it this way:

Christian meditation leads us to the inner wholeness necessary to give ourselves to God freely, and to the spiritual perception, necessary to attack social evils.

Instead of a passive mental attitude there is an active thinking, which is God-orientated, nourished by the working of the Holy Spirit. Without the working of the Holy Spirit a person's thinking ultimately remains spiritually insensitive to the voice of God and is not really effective in combatting the evil one. The believer's thinking is therefore prayerfully directed towards God, receptive to the working of his Spirit. This working of his Spirit takes place above all in the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as has already been shown, and also in the active manifestation of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which we will now consider.

3. THE GIFTS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AND DEMONIC ACTIVITY

Before investigating the connection between the gifts of the Holy Spirit and demonic activities, we need to look briefly at the inter-relation between the Holy Spirit and the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

The gifts which, in this context, are usually considered applicable by pentecostals are those of faith, healing, miraculous powers and discernment of spirits (1 Cor. 12:9-10). In demon possession, particularly, the last two are emphasised. The question is now, whether these gifts are only manifested by

a person who is baptised with the Holy Spirit. Some would appear to confirm this. Allen (1953:141), for example, writes:

It is surprising that some good people today desire to exercise this power, yet reject the source of that power, the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Jesus himself did not perform any miracles or cast out any demons until God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power (Ac. 10:38; Jn. 2:11). The more moderate position of Van Dam (1974:90-91) is more acceptable. He points out that the Holy Spirit was the secret of Jesus' power. He began his public ministry, in which the conflict with the evil one had a very important place, only after having been filled with the Holy Spirit during his baptism in the river Jordan. Jesus relates this anointing with the Holy Spirit directly to his commission of giving freedom to the captives and the bound (Lk. 4:18; Is. 61). By the Spirit of God he casts out demons (Mt. 12:28). The infilling with the Holy Spirit was also necessary before the apostles could begin their work. Through the pentecostal event they were endued with power from high (Lk. 24:49). Van Dam (1974:91) explains it further:

To be sure, the disciples had already cast out demons earlier, on Jesus' command. In the many centuries, in which the infilling by the Holy spirit had become widely unknown in the Christian church the fight for deliverance of the bound and the possessed nevertheless continued, especially in the non-reformed churches. We can therefore not preclude that people who have not received this infilling of the Spirit, are not used by the Lord in the conflict against evil spirits. Yet this infilling, the pneumatologically positive opposite of demon possession, is a very important help. The Spirit is a power given from on high.

We therefore conclude that the gifts of the Spirit, except diversities of tongues and the interpretation of tongues, do not presuppose the baptism in the Holy Spirit. All gifts, except these two, had also occurred before the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Yet, in view of the fact that the power of the evil one must not be underestimated, we recommend that a person should preferably have been baptised in the Holy Spirit before demonic activities are confronted, particularly when exorcism is needed. It is also our observation that the spiritual gifts are manifested more freely by those who have a testimony of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Early in church history there was a close connection between the gifts of the Spirit and the battle against demonic activities. Stander points out that the supernatural gifts of the Holy Spirit, (i.e. especially those described in 1 Cor. 12:8-10) were functioning freely for at least the first

centuries after Christ in the church and that exorcisms of demons in particular were frequently reported (Stander 1986:88). It is primarily the gift of discernment of spirits and the working of miraculous powers, as mentioned above, which are involved in cases of demonic activities.

The gift of the discernment of spirits is regarded as very important in helping in the identification of demonic activity (see Möller 1975:257 for an exposition of the pentecostal tradition in this regard). There is an awareness in pentecostal circles that the devil and his demons quite often pursue a strategy of deception. By this we mean that the powers of evil will disguise themselves and pretend to be angels of light. The devil does not like to be identified, for then his wickedness will be exposed. There is, therefore, a real danger of confusing the activities of demonic powers with natural phenomena or with conditions of illness, which are merely due to the brokenness of human existence. It might even happen that he (the devil) deceives the church as indicated in Matthew 24:11. We are therefore admonished in the Bible to test every spirit whether it is of God (1 Jn. 4:11). In all this the gift of discernment of spirits is of supreme importance among pentecostals. Dearing (1977:29) writes:

By this gift of discernment Satan stands revealed and the church is built up and maintained in pure beliefs.

Pentecostals generally agree that the gift of discernment of spirits does not necessarily include the power of exorcism. Casting-out demons is usually linked to the gift of miraculous powers (see Möller 1975:259, 269). Naturally the gift of miraculous powers is not just directed at the casting out of demons; this would be a simplistic categorisation of this gift. Horton (1946:119-131) lists a variety of other revelations of miraculous powers, which do not require further consideration here. It must be pointed out, however, that there are also those who would link the gifts of healing to exorcism (Möller 1975:225, 227). The connection between this gift and exorcism might be linked to an exaggerated demon-consciousness among some pentecostals where illness is concerned. Möller (1975:227) quotes Roberts and Daoud in this context:

Oral Roberts regards some forms of epilepsy, all forms of sexual aberrations and obsessions (psychical bondages), as well as various illnesses, as a revelation of demon possession

Another healing evangelist, Daoud, declares:

Blind devils make people blind, deaf ones make people deaf etc. and cancer-demons eat out the vital organs wherever they fasten themselves.

In July 1950 another article appeared in the church publication of the Apostolic Faith Mission of South Africa on demon possession which shows concern about this exaggerated sensitivity to demonic activities:

Stop this talk about all sickness being demon possession. I would refuse any preacher my platform who preaches such a doctrine ... there was no sickness or death before sin. Sickness and death are the result of sin ... (Comforter 1950:7).

Möller (1975) writes in his critical discussion of certain healing evangelists' ministry:

The direct relation which is seen between illness and the working of the devil, is not biblically warranted ... Sickness might be caused by a direct attack of the devil (something quite exceptional and only recognised by special revelation), there is divine grace to either overcome this condition, or to live to the glory of God despite of it ...

It can be biblically justified to relate certain illnesses to demon possessions, if we think of the ministry of our Lord Jesus. Yet to regard blindness, deafness, obsessions, sexual aberrations on so on, all as demonic powers in a person, is not warranted. (Möller 1975:235).

The danger of seeking a direct relation between illness and demonic activity, lies in the claim that the sick person also has a demon. If he has to hear that in addition to his illness he is demon possessed as well, his condition must appear hopeless!

Lastly, it may be pointed out that the gift of faith is also occasionally mentioned in this connection. McAlister (1971:98) for example writes:

Once you have decided that a person is demonised you may need the gift of faith (1 Cor. 12:9). Fighting demons has challenged my faith and, in turn, given me new understanding of Jesus' power.

Naturally, it should also be kept in mind that it is actually impossible to separate these spiritual gifts from one another. When all is said and done it is one and the same Spirit who works these things. In the revelation of the Holy Spirit the one gift may possibly be more prominent than the other, yet overlapping

cannot be ruled out. In the context of 1 Corinthians 12:7 the following expression is used: "...phanerosis tou pneumatou" (the revelation of the Spirit). Die woord "phanerosis" means "to shine" or "to lighten", the noun "phanos" indicates a "lamp" or "lantern". As a lamp radiates light, so the spiritual gifts may be seen as different rays of light, distinguishable yet not separable.

In other words, the spiritual gifts are considered a very important part of the believers equipment, provided by the Holy Spirit, for his defence against demonic activities. It is also noteworthy that, in addition to the operation of the spiritual gifts among pentecostals, there is also the custom of pleading the blood of Christ when demonic activities are apparent.

4. THE CUSTOM OF PLEADING THE BLOOD OF CHRIST

Although we have the testimony of several pentecostals who "plead the blood", there is no biblical testimony of anyone having done so, nor is there any commandment at all to do this (Bendixon s.a.:20).

The expression is probably derived from the Old Testament custom of sprinkling the blood of the sacrificial animal on the lid of the ark, in order to be allowed to appear before God - a custom which found its actual fulfilment in Christ who shed his blood on Calvary to reconcile us with God. The blood of Christ, in other words, speaks of his death, deliverance from our guilt and reconciliation with God. McAlister sees the blood of Christ in relation to man's sin, rather than to his defence against the evil one. If the person who casts out demons is living in spiritual victory, he need not "plead the blood", since that has reference to our sins. If he is not walking with the Lord because of unconfessed sin, he has no business trying to cast out evil spirits (McAlister 1971:94).

Yet the custom of "pleading the blood" which prevails with some pentecostals is an indication that, as far as they are concerned, it points to more than merely the forgiveness of their sin and reconciliation with God. The defensive power of Christ's blood against the power of the demonic activity is also being acknowledged. This may be linked with Revelation 12:11 which declares: "And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony". This may also be seen in the words of Whyte (s.a.:22) when he writes of exorcism: "Before beginning this ministry cover yourselves by faith in the precious blood and keep under its shadow". We also have the testimony that during the manifestation of demonic powers songs about the blood of Christ have been sung through which victories have been gained (Sumrall 1973:22). Van Dam points out that even the celebration of holy

communion, which, inter alia, speaks of the blood of Christ, can be of great value in preparing a person to resist demonic forces:

At times, before (such) a ministry, holy communion is held. We shall see that this may also happen, if the conflict should take a long time (Van Dam 1974:102).

In this connection reference is also made to John 12:31 which is linked to Jesus Christ's death.

Now is the time of judgement on this world; now the prince of this world will be driven out.

In the mission field there are many testimonies to victory over demonic activities by the believer's claiming the power of the shed blood of Christ (e.g. Geschwend s.a.:42, 44, 48).

Without ignoring the danger that the custom of "pleading the blood" may be lowered to the level of superstition or the use of some kind of magic formula, there should not be any misunderstanding of the context in which this is seen. The blood is not detached from Christ as though it were an autonomous power. Bendixen, for example, writes:

His (Jesus') plea is that we are guilty, His plea is that we are condemned, His plea is that He took our place and shed His blood. His blood is the evidence that the debt has been paid, and because of that plea of the blood we have entrance into heaven. When we face the devil - it is with the knowledge that the blood has been pleaded for us and that he cannot touch us (s.a.:21).

5. VICTORY OVER DEMONIC FORCES

We have already pointed out that there is a strong awareness of God's sovereignty over demonic forces in pentecostal circles. This truth is a very real experience in the light of the working of God's Spirit. The baptism in the Holy Spirit is therefore seen as the pneumatological antithesis of demon possession, and as far as the pentecostal believer is concerned, it is preferable that both the pastoral worker and the person who has received deliverance from demonic activities in his life, should be baptised in the Holy Spirit. It has also been found that the baptism in the Holy Spirit contributes to such a person receiving power in his life to withstand future attacks of the evil one effectively. The working of the gifts of the Holy Spirit has also been pointed out, as well as the part which the blood of Christ has in attaining victory. No one, however, is altogether free of spiritual influences. Whoever is not in the Lord, is in

one way or another still under the power of evil and needs deliverance. The way in which deliverance takes place, however, differs from case to case. In cases of demon possession deliverance most often comes through speaking a word of authority (e.g. Mt. 10:8). This word of authority is spoken in the name of Jesus Christ but is not seen as detached from the working of the Spirit of God. Möller (1957:82-83) writes:

This word of authority (or power) can only be spoken through the Holy Spirit, in other words when a person becomes aware that He leads him to oppose the devil. This conviction would usually follow prayer and intimate fellowship with God. Whoever would cast out demons by his own strength in the name of God, will expose himself to ridicule and dishonour the name of God. The name "Jesus Christ" can never be used as a kind of magic formula or spell, as the incident described in Acts 19:13-16 clearly proves.

With reference to this McAlister (1971:87) writes:

Prayer, except for oneself as the exorcist, is ineffective for the expulsion of demons; rather, you must speak to the evil spirit in the authority of the name of Jesus.

Asked whether the question of prayer then is unimportant, McAlister (1971:87) answers:

Not at all. When the disciples asked the Lord why they could not cast out the spirit, He replied: "This kind cannot come out by anything but prayer" (Ac. 9:27-9). Jesus did not pray for the young demoniac, but he had prepared himself through prayer to the Father in order to be equipped for this ministry.

The importance of prayer is also emphasised by Van Dam, when he points out that prayer circles should be formed to pray especially for those who have been subjected to a large measure of demonic control, because a counter-offensive by the devil cannot be ruled out (cf. Van Dam 1974:132; Gschwend s.a.:48).

Occasionally, when speaking a word of authority, hands are laid on a person in order to deliver the possessed, as mentioned, for example, in Lake's testimony, who laid hands upon a woman and cast numerous demons out of her (Lindsay 1952:115). McAlister, however, warns against this practice and points out that we have no biblical testimony for such a practice and should preferably avoid it.

This is one point on which I was ignorant for many years.

I has seen men cast out demons with laying on of hands, and so, in the beginning of my minstry, I did what I had learned. But I was always disturbed by the wrestling matches which ensued. When I finally realised that the name of Jesus was power enough to cast out demons, it was a great relief to me. (McAlister 1971:90).

Yet there are no strict rules in pentecostal circles. The leading of the Holy Spirit is sought in each case and action taken accordingly. We have already shown that the devil and his demons often prefer to remain anonymous, so that their wickedness is not exposed. Possibly on account of this it is recommended by various pentecostals to first talk to and identify the demon or demons, as Jesus did in the case of Legio (Lk. 8:30). There are many testimonies of demons speaking through a person (cf. the testimony of Henning in the "Trooster" 1959:13), but this does not always happen, and does not happen in biblical examples. A conversation with a demon is therefore possible, but not necessary (cf. Van Dam 1974:106; McAlister 1971:91). Yet conversation with the demoniac himself is strongly recommended. The writer of an article in the "Comforter" explains, for example, that if a person can be brought to the point of admitting being in the power of the evil one, more than half the victory is won (Comforter 1933:2). Van Dam points to the fact that if the one needing help does not get insight into his problem, or keeps brushing aside the working of demonic forces as a medieval myth, he cannot really be helped. If a person is seriously possessed not much can be expected of him, considering that his will is paralysed to a large degree. And yet he is, except in crisis-situations, not completely deprived of his freedom, so that Jesus Christ can be impressed on him. If the one needing help, however, is not prepared to give himself to Christ, the pastor may withdraw his help. "The Lord does not impose His deliverance on us against our own will" (Van Dam 1974:77-100).

The whole idea of confession of sin enters the discussion here. Sin is often the reason for a person being in the grip of the evil one. Indeed, it is the product of his evil works. Möller writes (1957:86):

If one turns to God with one's whole heart and a desire to be delivered from the power of the evil one, does He (God) not only forgive your sins, but also enables you by the working of His Spirit to overcome sin and turn from it. Even for Christians who have become entangled by Satan because of their spiritual coldness, indifference and sin, confession and a new surrender to God are the only path to deliverance.

If a person's sin consists of having established contact with any form of occultism, it is necessary that, besides confession, any object or objects which have been used in practising the occult be removed. In talks with pentecostals there was agreement in their testimonies that the removal of such objects is closely connected with deliverance (cf. Gschwend s.a.:43-46; Van Dam 1974:100-101; Möller 1957:67). Such things as superstitions, witchcraft, fortunetelling and necromancy are consequently strongly rejected in pentecostal circles. Among numerous testimonies from people who are delivered from the workings of demonic forces, one principle was prominent: the Lord has quite often placed the activities of demonic forces into his own service. After a person had been delivered, this has usually led to the conversion of many people, as well as to the strengthening of the faith of Christians. Whenever a Spirit-filled person opposed the forces of evil in the name of Jesus Christ, the evil one was defeated. The sovereignty and dominion of God over the evil one is thus repeatedly demonstrated, to the glory of the Lord. The manifestation of demonic forces must therefore also be seen by the believer as an opportunity in which God can mightily reveal himself as Lord over all powers that exist. It would be a great pity if the body of Christ had to send persons who are caught in the snares of the evil one to other quarters for deliverance. This would be an accusation against the church's testimony that Jesus Christ had come to destroy the works of the evil one. The church is responsible for proclaiming the message of redemption in deliverance from the forces of the evil one and to practically demonstrate it. The truth of the gospel is not a theoretical matter but must also be realised practically in people's lives. If this is not so, Unger (1974:190) points out:

The tragic result is that people who suffer from spiritual, mental, physical or psychic disorders, which only Christ can really cure, are turned over to other professionals for medical or psychotherapeutic treatment which cannot reach the heart of the matter.

In connection with this McAlistier (1971:74) says, of the renewed world-wide interest in occultism:

The reasons are plain. In most Christian churches there is total ignorance of the power of the Holy Spirit to bring healing to body, soul and spirit. The professional Christian ministry is simply not meeting the need of church members The only solution is to turn away from cold rationalism and to embrace the present day outpouring of God's Holy Spirit.

6. CAN A CHRISTIAN BE DEMON POSSESSED?

Finally the relation between Christianity and demon possession must be pointed out briefly. It is stressed in various pentecostal circles, and in my own view this is quite acceptable, that believers cannot be demon possessed. Bendixen (s.a.:2), for example, writes:

Can a Christian, one who is born of the Spirit, one in whom Christ has come to dwell, have a demon in him at the same time? The verdict of scripture is a resounding, emphatic No!

Du Plessis, too, supports this standpoint and states:

I have no controversy with exorcism of demons in unbelievers, but I must reject the doctrine that says demons could inhabit Christians who are truly born of the Spirit. Recent books and articles which teach this are the most faith-destroying and fear-inspiring perversion of scripture that I have ever read.

This point of view is usually based on the argument that the Holy Spirit and an evil spirit cannot dwell in the same temple. Yet there are those who, because of their own practical experience, contest this viewpoint. Whyte (s.a.:16) declares that he has many times cast demons out of Christians and goes on to say:

Oh, we know many will refuse to believe this, because they have been taught the Holy Spirit will not enter an unclean vessel, but we were learning things. The Holy Spirit is given, like every other gift of God, on the basis of faith, not of our worthiness or holiness.

Van Dam (1974:43-44) also agrees and says:

Just as a genuine Christian can sin, so a sincere Christian can be demonised. Sometimes this may have been the case before the person became a Christian. Sometimes the Holy Spirit comes to dwell within one possessed or bound in order to help from within with the deliverance. Thus it may happen that one is possessed and in bondage, yet filled with the Spirit and praying in tongues.

In conversation with a person who had formerly been under the power of demonic forces, the writer of this article received a similar testimony. The person said that even after having been baptised in the Holy Spirit, a demon spoke through him in a strange voice and his deliverance was systematic.

These conflicting points of view are accommodated in pentecostal circles by distinguishing between demon possession and demon oppression. In cases of demon possession one usually speaks of a person's obsessive behaviour, while in cases of demon oppression depressive forces can usually be seen to be working in a person's life (Whyte s.a.:29).

It must be noted, however, that words such as "demon possession" and "demon oppression" do not occur in the Bible. The Greek word "daimonizomai" is possibly rendered best by the word "demonised". Yet there is no agreement among pentecostals about the extent to which a Christian can be "demonised". This uncertainty may be attributed to the truth that spiritual matters cannot be explained completely rationally.

The truth that in every attack by the devil and his demons on the life of a Christian, victory may be obtained in the name of Jesus Christ is comforting. Christ has broken the power of the evil one, and in him we are more than conquerors!

WORKS CONSULTED

- Allen, A.A. 1953. Demon possession today and how to be free. Dallas: Allen.
- Baith, K. 1986. Evangelical theology. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Bendixen, R. [s.a.]. The Christian and the demon world. (Forthcoming).
- Comforter, September 1933. Demon obsession.
- Comforter, July 1950. The question of demon possession.
- Dearing, T. 1977. Supernatural superpowers. New Jersey: Logos international.
- Geschwend, J. R. [s.a.] A burning candle. Pretoria: Nations Gospel publishers.
- Horton, H. 1946. The gifts of the spirit. England: [s.n.]
- Latourette, K. S. 1953. A history of Christianity. London: Harper & Row.
- Lindsay, G. 1952. Sketches from the life and ministry of John G. Lake. [s.l.] : Voice of healing publishing.
- Mc Alister, W. R. 1971. The dilemma: deliverance or discipline? New Jersey: Logos international.
- Möller, F. P. 1957. Die verborge vyand. Johannesburg: Evangelie.
- Möller, F. P. 1975. Die diskussie oor die charismata soos wat dit in die Pinksterbeweging geleer en beoefen word. Johannesburg: Evangelie.
- Möller, F. P. 1985. Dogmatiek. II. Johannesburg: Evangelie.
- Stander, H. F. 1986. Die besondere gawes van die Heilige Gees in die eerste vier eeue n.C. Pretoria: Didaskalia.

Sumrall, L. 1973. Demons. The answer book. New York: Thomas Nelson.

Trooster, Junie 1959. In My Naam sal hulle duiwels uitdryf.

Unger, M.F. 1974. Demons in the world today. A study of occultism in the light of God's Word. England: Tyndale House.

Dr. F.P. Möller teaches at the theological college of the Apostolic Faith Mission at Aucklandpark.

A.G.S. Theological College
P.O. Box 91046
Auckland Park
2006

DEMONIC POWERS FROM A HIGH CHURCH PERSPECTIVE

G. Ashby

A "High Church" perspective is irrelevant to the demons themselves. They believe in God (not with a high church perspective) and they shudder (Ja. 5:19). Jesus they cannot ignore. Nor can they be ignored. Hence the so-called "High Churches" (Rome, Orthodoxy and Anglicanism) have always taken them very seriously and the liturgies of those churches have shown this. The rite of admission to the catechumenate has, for instance always contained an exorcism of the candidates and the rite of baptism and confirmation (now united) always involves renunciation of the devil and all his works.

In this paper the appeal to Scripture and to tradition on this subject will be briefly examined, together with the present pastoral and liturgical practice.

1. There is no doubt about the existence of the devil, or satan and his minions, as far as the New Testament is concerned. He (and who can say that Biblical language is chauvinist when the devil is consistently masculine) tempts Jesus and is resisted (Mt. 4:10 and parallels). He inspires Peter to attempt to deter Jesus from his goal (Mt. 16:23). He afflicts people with certain sicknesses and he enters into Judas Iscariot (Jn. 13:2). He can appear disguised as an angel of light (2 Cor. 11:14) to seduce people from God. He can hinder God's work (1 Th. 2:18). As the dragon in the Apocalypse he has been cast out of heaven, vanquished already, but in the "short time" left to him he can do an immense amount of damage on earth. In that last book of the New Testament he is the opposition to God and to the Lamb. But he has been vanquished once and for all, whether as dragon or serpent or devil. Now, various attempts have been made, certainly within the Anglican tradition, to get rid of the devil from formularies and from theological thinking on the grounds that we have here and outmoded concept, rooted in the complex, post Persian angelologies and demonologies of the sixth to the first century B.C. Near Eastern religions. The Church of England catechism quietly dropped him a few years ago and the revising committee of the time claimed that he had "just been forgotten". Since he is reckoned in the Scriptures to be the father of lies (Jn. 8:44), it would appear that he had done his work remarkably well. However, the lapse of memory was rectified, if only on the grounds of an appeal to Scripture in which it was found impossible to classify the Devil's as an outmoded social convention.

In patristic and medieval theology, East and West, the devil remained an ever present, real and threatening factor in life.

Those church fathers who most wrote of the spiritual life and of the monastic life tend to mention him most frequently (Athanasius, Chrysostom, Jerome, John Climacus, Theodore of the Studium, Thomas Aquinas). Perhaps the most vivid and all embracing picture of the evil One is drawn in Dante's Divine comedy, where, at the bottom of that vast funnel of iniquity, the Inferno, wherein all the private and society vices are represented and exposed, where all that has rejected God lies eternally tortured, stands Lucifer himself, in coldest ice, with, nearest to him the arch-betrayers of all that they knew to be good - of the Bible, of the ancient Roman world and of Dante's own world (Judas Iscariot, Brutus and Archbishop Roger of Pisa, whose scalp is perpetually gnawed by the governor of Pisa) (Inferno). But, though a host of demons afflict the damned under satan's command, he himself is bound in chains and remains so for ever.

Traditionally and by appeal to Scripture, the "High Church" has always maintained the reality of personalised evil - the devil. Indeed, as Dostoevsky, in the Orthodox tradition, suggested in The brothers Karamazov, he is at his most dangerous and deceptive when he appears to the disbelieving Ivan Karamazov dressed like a seedy down-at-heel gentleman and can get himself discounted and ignored. The wiles (Methodiai Eph. 6:11) of the devil are proverbial and getting himself passed off as the shadow of an unenlightened past is one of them. But he has been conquered and the stronger man of Mark 3:27 has bound him. The cry of the Church has been with that character in The Cloister and the Hearth whose leitmotiv was "Courage, mon ami, le diable est mort". We need reminding that we are not, even today, dealing with human beings, warped and brutal though they may be, but with evil powers that are immensely powerful. (What is the theology of Dallas, where J.R. is too bad to be true?) The church admits the reality of evil and acts accordingly. Perhaps there is no more eloquent testimony to the reality of evil and to the utter folly of demythologising the personal devil than the works of the real theologians of twentieth century England, whose works will survive long after others are forgotten: I refer to the Oxford triumvirate of the three laymen (perhaps the Greek orthodox church has wisdom in encouraging theologians to remain laymen, but under the authority of the hierarchy), C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams and J.R.R. Tolkien (who was a boy in Bloemfontein and whose Lord of the rings and Silmarillion constitute that best and most gripping study of cosmic good and evil that I know).

Christ, we are told by the gospel-writers, conquered the devil and protects those who call on his (Christ's) name. This he did by means of the cross and his risen life is the proof that this was and is utterly effective. The compline hymn set for Holy week reflects the language of those typical patristic and

medieval passionate hymns that proclaim the cross as a resounding victory over the evil one. It begins, "Begone thou twisting serpent". The church's task is to proclaim this loudly enough for the world and the devil to hear and to protect its own members by means of the armour provided by God himself (Eph. 6), which amounts to being dressed up in Christ himself.

2. In actual ministry there are always people who are either oppressed or possessed by demons. There is a society, of which the church itself is part, which is devil-oppressed at the least and at certain times and places, devil-possessed. At one time it was customary to relegate demons and demon possession to the Third World in general and to Africa in particular, thereby implying that Western Civilisation had either, by being civilised, conquered the devil and demons, or had dispelled the illusions of tangible evil. All Western problems are now due to accidents, or to economics, or to microbes or germs or to some form of psychological imbalance. It is strange that the sixties and afterwards have seen a flourishing of societies and individuals in the West who seek to harness the powers of evil, seen as very real and naïvely exploitable, by means of occult practices, such as mediums, ouija boards, covens, witchcraft and even demon worship. In the village of Warminster, Wiltshire, England, there are in 1986, several churches, a convent, and a flourishing coven of witches and Warminster is not unusual. California can easily outstrip that. Darkest Africa can hardly be called darker than the post-Christian West.

So what is the church's ministry? It can only be effectively a continuation of Jesus' ministry. We act as Jesus did.

1. We take the devil and his demons seriously.
2. We discern and identify the problem in each case.

Not all Jesus' healings involved demons. Neither Jesus, nor St. Paul omits the sheer responsibility of human sin. Many of Jesus' mighty acts concerned blind and disabled people who were not described as demon-possessed. Many other people he healed were simply corrupt or sinful. It is quite wrong and unscriptural to treat every problem as if there were a demon waiting to be cast out. The Ossett case of several years back underlined this concern. There are many cases where prayer and medical or psychiatric treatment are the answer. If we follow Jesus himself we will neither laugh off the possibility of demon activity as a mediaeval hangover nor will we see a demon lurking under every bed, in the way that South Africans have been taught to find two communists under every bush.

Nevertheless there are more instances than are commonly recognised where people have been dabbling in the occult, or have

become mixed up with false worship or with various spirits and are either oppressed or even possessed so that their personalities have become alienated. Such people Jesus delivered. He either bound the demon with a word of power or he cast it out by the same means. There have always been services and rites of exorcism used in the "High Churches". It is interesting that a set liturgy and the use of certain acts and formulas, such as the making of the sign of the cross, sprinkling with blessed water, even the use of garlic (in fresh flower form, not in spaghetti vongole) have been effective. Maybe this is because such actions and formulas take the whole operation away from the originality or personal holiness of the minister concerned which is not by itself to be very convincing to the powers of evil.

In this ministry of deliverance several very necessary processes need to be observed.

1. The person, unless unconscious, needs to actually ask for deliverance. He/she needs preparation and diagnosis of the problem in which various available ministries are needed.
2. Those involved in ministry should not normally attempt this task solo but act as a team. They must first protect themselves under the power and authority of the Holy Trinity. Woe betide anyone who tries to cast out demons in their own strength. Remember the sons of Sceva (Ac. 19).
3. All involved must be in a state of repentance.
4. All evil must be renounced, including the occult.
5. The demon should be cast out specifically and by name for example, ("demon of dumbness" etc.) and told where to go and where he may not go. All this specifically in the Name of Jesus or of the Trinity.
6. Some come out only by prolonged ministry, including prayer and fasting (Mt. 17:21). The process may have to be repeated.
7. A person must never be left cleaned out, "swept and garnished". The Holy Spirit must be invited in instead. Matthew 17:21 contains a severe warning.
8. The delivered person must be cared for by the Christian community around him/her.
9. Scripture at all points provides the aggressive armour, though it is as well to remember that satan proved in the Temptation of Jesus that he was not unfamiliar with the words of Scripture.
10. Exorcism, whether of people or places (and places can be demon infested too), is the work of the church, under the direction of the elders of the church, not a freelance operation.

I would like to quote two examples from very different backgrounds. A friend of mine, a bishop in England, once discussed with me an act of desecration of an Royal Air Force chapel by a boy aged fourteen and a half years. The first reaction of the local family had been either to call in a psychiatrist or to beat the lad. I asked for details of his background. It soon transpired that his grandmother, who had recently died, had a great influence over the boy. She had been a medium. Enough said.

I was asked to visit an elderly Baca or Pondo (I forget which) schoolteacher who used to moan and shriek when there were church services or when a priest came near her. The demon was commanded to leave here alone and after a course of such prayer and ministry this behaviour ceased.

My former colleague, Jacob Dlamini, now bishop of St. John's, used to tell me that he was many times called in to minister to people with problems who told him that these were a result of an infliction from their ancestors. His reply was, "My ancestors would never harm me: what you suffer from is not ancestors, but demons. Let us pray!" Would that the same words were used at séances.

Finally, it is not only people, but nations and societies that can be demon oppressed or possessed. Dostoevsky wrote this novel, The possessed in 1871 (forty-six years before the Russian Revolution). In it he draws a vivid and startling picture of a society falling apart. Holy Russia is on the way to becoming demon possessed. He prefaces his story with this incident of the Gadarene swine. He gives no solutions except to point out that behind the actions and political or social policies of those involved there is a momentum far more powerful than the human forces or ideas in themselves. It is this that sends them hurtling to their destruction. What would he have had he lived among us here and now? From Sharpeville to Pietersburg what are we seeing? Behind the by no means negligible human sins of anger, privilege, oppression, rebellion and authoritarianism lies a far deeper evil.

We can rebuke this in the name of Jesus and with prayer and fasting, but there was a dimension in the enormity of evil for which God in Christ provided one solution - the cross. This is a shadow under which communities must sometimes suffer before they begin to climb in its light.

Professor G.W. Ashby is professor of divinity in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of the Witwatersrand.

Jan Smuts Drive
Johannesburg 2000

DEMONIC BONDAGE

J.S. du Plessis

With your own eyes you have seen the
mighty work that the Lord did (Dt. 11:7).

These words I wish to bring to bear on my own experience of bondage by demonic powers.

Even after having been a minister for twelve years I hardly knew anything about the subject. It was only after an experience in our own family circle that my eyes were opened to the threat of demonic bondage facing believers. One evening after I had thoroughly discussed with my children the question of assurance of salvation, our experience began.

My two daughters were eleven and nine years old at that stage. The younger one, an intelligent child, started hearing voices addressing her. Although I tried to offer various answers, words of comfort and explanations, she insisted that the voices were real. They told her that she could not become a Christian as her life belonged to them. On another night my son, then five years old, came into the room telling us that Lucifer was in his room talking to him. He described Lucifer to us as he had seen him. Up to that stage we had never discussed demonic bondage with any of our children, ourselves being totally ignorant about it.

Since then we have heard of the ministry of deliverance and have also met Ds. D. Pypers who prayed for us. All problems connected to this problem disappeared. We ourselves hardly had any contacts with occult occurrences, but my grandmother was a spiritualist medium. When these occults bonds of our ancestors were broken, we and our children experienced deliverance. As a minister I believed myself to have been a Christian already and my wife as well. Yet, although we served the Lord with all our heart, we were not spared this ordeal in our family. Since then we have heard of many people experiencing the same things. In praying with them, we often have witnessed the same liberating results.

The Bible clearly warns us against the devil and his powers. These warnings are directed to believers (1 Pt. 5:8; Jn. 4:7; Eph. 4:27; 6:10-18; 1 Tm. 4:1).

It is impossible to give, in the span of time allotted me, a thorough explanation of the whole issue of demonic bondage. I can only touch on certain main facets.

There is always the danger of getting so involved with problems of terminology and concepts, that the main issue is overlooked: The hold that the devil and his powers obtain in the lives of people. There are various terms that can be used, but I will stick to "bondage".

The degree of bondage exercised by the devil and his powers can vary from almost nothing, as in strong temptations, to the other extreme, the powerful bondage of possession by evil.

Demonic bondage inevitably results in the hampering of the individual's spiritual life. People experience problems in assurance of their faith, their prayer life, their understanding of spiritual things and many more. Others experience handicaps on moral and psychic levels such as depression, anxiety and fear, compulsive behaviour, sexual enslavement, suicidal tendencies and so on. Some experience all kinds of physical ailments and sensations, which are sometimes scientifically inexplicable. There are also occurrences of a psychic nature such as clairvoyancy, clairaudience and other psychic abilities. I do not want to claim that all these occurrences are per se the work of the devil. Demonic bondage is one of the possible causes.

I believe it possible that a Christian may become so entangled in bondage by a demon, that in his own power he will never be able to free himself. I say this on the ground of our own and other people's experience. A person bound is not the same as a person possessed. In the case of possession there is no control over the own will, thoughts and abilities. When someone is bound, however, the demonic control is only partial.

A person may be bound when he or his forbears have had close contact with the occult and similar practices. In this way the Evil One obtains a right in his life, which can have serious results. We call it bondage because its effects are graver than the mere demoralising and enslaving effect of sin.

Salvation and deliverance are indeed possible through the substitutive work of Jesus on the cross. We ourselves have prayed with many who were gloriously delivered from bindings by evil powers.

WORKS CONSULTED:

Koch, K. 1978. Occult ABC. Aglasterhausen: Literature Mission.

Lelay, F.E. 1975. Satan cast out. Pennsylvania: The Banner of truth trust.

Ouweneel, W.J. 1978. Het domein van de slang. Amsterdam: Buijten & Schipperheijn.

Unger, M.F. 1981. Demons in the world today. Illinois: Tyndale.

The Reverend S.J. du Plessis is a minister of religion in the Dutch Reformed Church.

P.O. Box 8006
Van Dyk Park
1471

THEOLOGICAL RESPONSE TO ASHBY, CODRINGTON,
GAYBBA AND MÖLLER*

A. König

I intend to touch on three areas in this response: firstly, on what I see as a vast area of ecumenical agreement - even if not in every small detail; secondly, on some points of less agreement - though not necessarily total disagreement; and finally, on one point that seemed to be the bone of contention.

1. A VAST AREA OF ECUMENICAL AGREEMENT

It is of interest and even encouraging to observe the vast area of agreement in the papers of Ashby, Codrington and Möller - all the more if one considers their different ecclesiastical backgrounds. It is possible that this agreement is simply because the Centre approached ecumenically minded people to put the theological positions of their different churches. However, I like to believe that the extent of agreement indicates that Christians, and indeed Churches, have more in common than is often realised - even in such a controversial field as that of demonology.

The following are the major points of agreement between Ashby, Codrington and Möller.

1. There are demonic powers opposing the work of God.
2. There are, even today, instances of demonic possession and other forms of affliction by evil powers, such as demon oppression.
3. One should however not look for demon possession or oppression in every sickness or personal problem.
4. Demon possession is not easily identifiable but may be present in people who have somehow lost control of themselves. It may even be reflected in an abnormal barrier to the acceptance of the gospel, in permanent or periodic physical manifestations and even in forms of bizarre behaviour. Möller elaborates on demon possession

* It does not seem fit to respond to the paper of Du Plessis, as it is very short and is not a fully fledged theological argument. Because of the lively and interesting discussion on Gaybba's paper, and on those of Nel and Van Aarde, I was asked by the Bible Centre to include these papers in this response, though they were not part of my initial response at the conference.

as the opposite of Spirit-baptism or -filling, the main difference being that while the Spirit incorporates and activates the will of the human, the demons suppress the will and completely inactivate it; a possessed person may even speak with another's voice.

5. Exorcism of demons is possible and is first and foremost the responsibility of the Church - not that of itinerant individuals - one of the reasons being that the Church has to accept the freed person into a permanent, caring fellowship.

2. SOME POINTS OF LESS AGREEMENT

2.1 Exorcism

In the four papers it is clear that, traditionally, there are some differences of opinion as to how exorcism should take place - though these differences do not necessarily exist between the writers themselves. Lutherans and Reformed Christians tend to agree that exorcism should be done by preaching the Gospel, as God works through his Word and Spirit. The High Church tradition, however, is more institutionalised, and includes exorcism in its liturgy. Over against this, all the speakers do accept a more personal, "ad hoc" approach, where one or more Christians may exorcise a demon from a specific person. Such individual exorcisms may include a variety of elements, such as personal prayer by the Christian(s) to protect themselves against the demonic powers; some form of discussion with the possessed person and in some cases with the demon(s) possessing the person, a command to the demon(s) in the Name of Jesus Christ or the Trinity to leave the person, and guidance to the delivered person to accept the Lord and, according to the Pentecostal tradition, to be baptised in the Spirit. The practice of the laying on of hands is also discussed by Möller. Codrington warns against "case histories" which are often considered normative but may be subjective in the extreme.

2.2 Possession or oppression

Two very interesting and extremely difficult issues surfacing in the papers are whether groups of people can be demon possessed and whether Christians can be.

Only Ashby refers to group-possession and mentions Dostoevsky's description of the Russian people towards the end of the previous century - before the communist take-over. His references to the present South African situation are, however, rather vague, but are at least clear enough to reflect his conviction that there are possible examples of group-possession in our situation.

This problem is not addressed by the other speakers, but it will come to the fore more explicitly in the paper of Lederle.

The question of whether Christians can be demon-possessed is a difficult one. There is some disagreement amongst Christians on the subject. Codrington is quite explicit that it is impossible for Christians, though he allows for some oppression for Christians which consists in tremendous spiritual pressure. I cannot say that the arguments of Codrington are convincing.

Möller holds to much the same view. He acknowledges the existence of two opposing views in Pentecostal circles, one rejecting demon possession of Christians, and the other accepting it, especially in the light of specific cases, where Christians have testified to being possessed. Möller also refers to the difference between demon possession (characterised by obsessional conduct) and demon oppression (as does Ashby). Möller's objection to this distinction because these concepts do not occur in the Bible, sounds rather Biblicistic, but his suggestion that it may be impossible to solve this problem because spiritual things cannot be fully explained in rational terms carries weight.

Du Plessis holds that Christians can be bound by evil powers and need to be freed in much the same way as possessed non-Christians are. However, as was already said, this view is inadequately developed by Du Plessis to be discussed theologically.

2.3 The meaning of an ecumenical discussion

Möller's paper presents a very important question. How should an ecumenical discussion be conducted, and what role should a participant's ecclesiastical background play in it?

Möller comes from the Pentecostal tradition with its particular view on the Spirit, especially on baptism by, and the gifts of, the Spirit. Half of his paper comprises two long discussions entitled Spirit baptism and demonic activity, and The gifts of the Spirit and demonic activity. It is obvious that Möller's paper deals essentially with demonic powers in the context of Spirit baptism by, and the gifts of, the Spirit, a specific Pentecostal approach. To a lesser extent this is also true of Ashby's evangelical paper, with its emphasis on the Bible, though I failed to find anything specifically High Church in his approach.

To return to Möller's paper, does this conscious and even one-sided emphasis on one's own tradition and background enrich or impoverish an ecumenical discussion? Möller can, of course, not be blamed for this Pentecostal emphasis as he was pertinently

asked to speak from his theological background.

Möller's rather exclusive emphasis may indeed be enriching. The more specifically and clearly each writer starts from her or his own background, the better the other attendants can appreciate the various theological traditions. Möller has accordingly dealt with the problem rather exclusively within the Pentecostal tradition. The more faithfully the various traditions are presented at an ecumenical conference, the more enriching the conference can be.

On the other hand it would not have been a truly ecumenical discussion if Möller - and for that matter each of us - had left the conference still as one-sidedly anchored in, or attached to, a former specific background. A discussion can only reach full ecumenical maturity if we open ourselves to other views, are willing to learn and broaden our backgrounds. Only if Pentecostals leave the conference a little more aware of the relative-ness of their views on Spirit baptism and the gifts of the Spirit, and if those from other backgrounds leave a little more aware of the meaning and importance of the work and the gifts of the Spirit in combating the work of demonic powers, can we speak of an enriching ecumenical discussion.

I suggest that one should evaluate the meaning of such a conference not so much in terms of what one could tell and teach others, but rather in terms of what one has learned personally and the extent to which one's views have been enriched and even changed.

3. THE EXISTENCE OF SATAN

The existence of the devil, and of evil powers and demons was not discussed directly by Ashby, Codrington or Möller. They simply accept that the devil and evil powers do exist.

At least twice during the congress, however, lively discussions were held, specifically regarding the existence of satan and evil powers. No real distinction was made between the devil (or satan), demons and evil powers. Nel stated that "the texts of the Old Testament... do not compel one to believe in the existence of satan" (abstract), and Gaybba extended this view to cover the entire Bible: "I wish to suggest...that scripture does not compel us to believe in the existence of either angels...or devils". Of course Gaybba is aware that frequent mention is made of the devil, at least in the New Testament. However, he asks: "Does this mean that we need to conclude that the Biblical authors were teaching us, as a separate revelation from God, that such creatures existed? I do not think so I cannot think of any clear evidence to the effect that the New Testament

authors wished to teach us of the existence of devils or demons".

Quite a few members of the conference reacted sharply against these views. They felt strongly about the existence of the devil and evil powers, and the necessity of believing it. It may be to this type of belief that Van Aarde addresses himself when he calls modern demonology a form of "escapism" in which people rather believe in the devil than against the devil, while the New Testament bids us to believe against the devil.

A few remarks are appropriate to this discussion. I think one can accept that the Bible does not call on us to believe in the existence of the devil, evil powers and demons. The reason is that most of the Biblical writers simply accepted the existence of various evil creatures and powers, warned against them and preached a way out of the dangers posed by such powers. In this sense, Van Aarde is correct in that the New Testament calls us to believe against the devils, thus to believe in Jesus Christ who had broken the power of the devil. In fact, one could possibly similarly assert that the Bible does not call on us to believe in the existence of God either, simply because its authors accept that He exists. They rather call on us to believe in Him, that is, to trust Him because He will protect us against the devil and his powers of evil.

In this sense Gaybba, Van Aarde and Nel are probably right - and yet I do have some problems with their points of view. They are correct when they say the Bible does not call on us to believe in the existence of the devil and evil powers. The existence of the devil is certainly not a revelation from God (Gaybba). I do, however, think that the Gospel presupposes the existence of evil powers, and that it is difficult to think of Jesus' victory without taking them into account. Take death for example. The New Testament message concerning the resurrection of Jesus states not only that He rose from the condition of being dead, but that He also triumphed over the evil power of death. That is why we should fear death no longer. Sin is represented, not only as wrongdoing, but as an evil power triumphed over by Christ, a power from which we have been liberated (Rm. 6). One may even concede that the existence of these powers are not part of God's revelation itself (Gaybba) but the reason for this would then rather be that their existence is accepted as axiomatic and that the revelation (or the gospel) is then expressed in terms of Christ's victory over these powers.

Another reason for my uneasiness with the points of view of Van Aarde, Nel and Gaybba, is that the evil powers are by no means incidental phenomena in the New Testament. Regardless of how satan originated and the subsequent development of the concept of the devil, and regardless of how the teachings about demons and

evil powers progressed in the New Testament, one should remember that the concept of the powers of chaos, acting in opposition to God, is very old in the Old Testament. I suspect that the idea of a power struggle with these powers at creation may even have originated before the exile. From her earliest days, Israel had experience of life-threatening powers, thought of as powers of chaos (Leviathan, Behemoth, Rahab etc.) standing in opposition to the Lord. The idea of the struggle and victory of the Lord, an important part of the Biblical message in both Testaments, assumes the existence of these powers of chaos. Of course, the Bible does not call on us to believe in them, but rather to believe in God and therefore to believe them conquered. This trust in God, however, assumes their existence.

When Gaybba then contends that the existence of these powers is not part of God's revelation, his view is probably correct per se, but one may not deduce from that fact that these evil powers do not exist, but rather that their existence is being accepted as a matter of course and consequently did not need to be expressed as part of revelation itself.

When one leaves the idea of God's struggle and victory out of one's concept of the gospel, one can scarcely claim to retain the gospel in its fulness. Think, for example, of the dramatic (struggle-and-victory) interpretation of reconciliation (Aulén).

I therefore think that the devil, the evil powers and the demons, are an indispensable background to our understanding of at least part of the Gospel. This view, however, does not imply an acceptance of all facets of modern demonology, a phenomenon with which I myself have many problems.

Professor A. König is professor in systematic theology at the University of South Africa.

Dept. of Systematic Theology
University of South Africa
P.O. Box 392
Pretoria
0001