

# “How Do I Do Spiritual Warfare?”

I've heard several “spiritual warfare” stories before. My pastor says “stay away from that which is dangerous,” and I understand why he says that. But how do I keep away from having an unhealthy focus on such things, without completely ignoring it? Also, what exactly is spiritual warfare? Why does it happen?

I'm so glad you asked! Your pastor is right to counsel you stay away from that which is dangerous; however, when you find yourself in the midst of a battle zone and you don't have any CHOICE about being where it's dangerous, the best thing to do is to be armed and educated about how to protect yourself! A wise teacher once said that the Christian life is like living in a war zone. We don't have any choice about where to live, but we can protect ourselves in it!

What's unhealthy is to be focused on demons; what's healthy is to be focused on Christ and especially on who you are in Christ, the authority you have in Christ, and the importance of staying in moment-by-moment dependence on Christ. (Yes, it IS hard! Which is why we need to do it in the power of the Holy Spirit and not our own strength.)

Spiritual warfare is understanding that as believers, we are under attack by “the spiritual forces of wickedness in the heavenly places,” and using the spiritual armor and weaponry to withstand the attacks on our faith. The above phrase comes from Ephesians 6:12, and that whole paragraph (verses 10-18) describes the spiritual armor available to us as believers.



There is an EXCELLENT book and Bible study by Kay Arthur called *Lord, Is It Warfare?* that I strongly recommend for you. She not only handles the scriptures well but gives good illustrations to help the reader understand what's going on.

Finally, why does it happen? Because Satan really hates God and hates God's people. He has lost the war and knows it, but he's going to inflict as much damage on God's people as he can before going down. He can't keep us out of heaven, but he can distract us from concentrating on Christ by throwing doubts about God and about our faith at us. The thing to never forget is that Satan (and his legions of demons) is a defeated foe who was stripped of all weapons by Jesus when He died on the cross (see Col. 2:15). All he has left is "wiles" or "schemes," which means he whispers lies and questions to us. The battleground for spiritual warfare is the mind, which is why it's so important to be transformed in the renewing of your mind and diligently pursue a Christian world view so you know what is true about God, yourself, and reality.

I hope this helps.

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

# **“Does ‘Touch Not the Lord’s Anointed’ Mean that Abusive Pastors Can’t be Challenged?”**

I have read your article, [“Abusive Churches: Leaving them Behind.”](#) It is loaded with useful information, esp. for me as I have been in an abusive church. Before I left I had a series of meetings with the pastor in which I confronted him on a number of things I thought were not right in the church, only to be labelled a troublemaker. The pastor used to say to me that even if he did anything wrong, I was not the one to “judge” him because as the Lord’s anointed he was only accountable to God and not man or any authority.

He used to draw attention of the church to a scripture that says that Saul had backslidden and sought to take the life of David, but the latter could not do anything about him because he was the Lord’s anointed. (1 Sam. 24:1-15)

My question to you is: Was David right in saying that he could not touch Saul even if Saul was his enemy just because Saul was the Lord’s anointed? Can the Lord’s anointed threaten lives and no action be taken? Does anointing give one immunity from punishment for wrong-doing? How do you answer this question of David and Saul?

The context of that verse is that David’s soldier was looking to kill Saul since he was there in a very vulnerable situation. That is very different from confronting a leader with regard to sinful behavior. Nathan confronted and rebuked David on his sin with Bathsheba (1 Sam. 12). So did General Joab, who confronted David on his sinful conduct after the death of his son Absalom (2 Sam. 19:5-8). Many abusive leaders misuse that verse to say they are above criticism, but that is a misuse of that text to keep themselves accountable to no

one.

Pat Zukeran

Probe Ministries

---

# **“Could My Children’s Autism be the Result of a Generational Curse?”**

I understand that it says in the Bible that the children may be cursed for generations because of their fathers’ sins. I have two children with autism and a cousin that has a child with autism as well. Could this be a curse since both of our parents are sisters? There has been talk that in our family that relatives from two and three generations back married cousins. Isn’t that a sin?

I believe the concept of generational curses is best understood as the natural consequence of ingrained behavioral patterns that are passed down from one generation to the next. I yelled at my kids when they were small because my mom yelled at us. My brother is a (recovered) alcoholic because he saw our dad drink a lot every night he was home, and he internalized that behavior for himself. The guy down the street mistreats his wife because he saw his father continually do it to his mother. (And societally speaking, there can be generational “curses” when those in one generation make decisions which have effects for generations to come, such as the abortion decision. Our society continues to pay for that errant decision in more ways than the 30 million+ abortions since Roe v. Wade. The value of young innocent life continues to decline.)

We can't change what we don't acknowledge, so these behavior patterns (or curses) continue to play themselves out in the lives of those who don't confront them and decide to stop them. But we CAN change what we DO acknowledge, particularly when we invite the Lord to release His power into an area we want to change.

But what you're asking about is something different. Marrying cousins isn't a sin biblically. The laws in place against marrying close relatives such as siblings are there to protect children from experiencing the fallout of recessive genes being expressed; however, the Journal of Genetic Counseling recently released a report that the risk of serious genetic disorders among children of first cousins is much smaller than originally thought

(<http://depts.washington.edu/mednews/vol6/no15/cousins.html>).

Since there is talk in your family of cousins marrying several generations ago, and non-family genes were subsequently introduced through marriage to non-cousins which would strengthen the genetic mixture, I would think that while there is a chance that the autism in your family is connected to the cousin marriage, there's probably more of a chance that it isn't. More to the point, I don't think this is a generational curse since the marrying cousins didn't break any of God's laws.

I am so sorry that you are having to deal with autism. That is a difficult burden to bear. Please don't carry an unnecessary burden of thinking you are dealing with the consequences of someone else's sin, when you're probably not.

I hope this helps!

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

Posted 2003

---

# **“Why is the Appendix to the Book of Daniel Omitted from Most Bible Versions?”**

One of my Sunday School classmates mentioned that his Bible had an appendix to Daniel, which included three additional chapters (13 to 15). Do you know the reason why these are excluded from most Bible versions?

The Hebrew and Aramaic texts of Daniel have been very well preserved. The Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament written in the third century B.C., includes these other chapters but they are not in the Hebrew or Aramaic texts: the Prayer of Azariah, Song of the Three Young Men, Susanna, Bel and the Dragon. These books were never accepted as inspired by the Jews and were never in their Old Testament. As well, the Dead Sea Scrolls do not contain these chapters. These were probably later additions which probably came from Egypt.

Pat Zukeran

Probe Ministries

---

# **“Who Was Lillith?”**

I hope you can give me direction on the issue of Lillith from a biblical perspective. A female student brought up this question: Who was Lillith? I was ashamed that I could not tell

her my position on the issue because, quite frankly, I didn't know who Lillith was. I am a married Christian man so I may not be as tuned in to what our youth are concerned with as I once was. At 34 years, I don't feel quite ancient either. I don't want to turn an unsaved girl loose on a quest for knowledge on a decidedly pagan subject. Any help you can offer would be appreciated. BTW, our pastor simply told her she had been reading too much feminist propaganda, an answer that left her with doubts about him. Thanks for your help.

Well, it's easy not to know who Lillith was because she's not in the Bible. There is a "Lillith myth" which is no more than a story about Adam's first wife. Here's a link that will give you a full story:

<http://www.webcom.com/~gnosis/lillith.html>

The pastor's dismissive comment about reading too much feminist propaganda may have been easy for him, but certainly wasn't going to help HER any! Feminists have, indeed, adopted Lillith as a symbol of their philosophy, and when you read the stories you'll see why, but that doesn't tell a young unbelieving girl the truth: that Lillith belongs in the same category as Venus, Medusa and Aphrodite—make-believe for grownups!

Hope this helps. . .

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

# “Why Is God So Consumed with Blood?”

Why is it that God seems to be so consumed with blood? It seems that from the beginning of scripture to the New Covenant under Christ's blood, that God was consumed with blood.

Thanks for your letter. You are certainly correct to notice the profound importance of blood in the Bible. The author of Hebrews wrote, “And according to the law almost all things are purified with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission” [of sins] (Hebrews 9:22). And Paul reminds us that Jesus made propitiation by His blood (Rom. 3:25) and that believers are justified (i.e. declared righteous) on the basis of the shed blood of Christ (Rom. 5:8-10). And elsewhere Paul tells us that Jesus reconciled the world to God, “having made peace through the blood of His cross” (Col. 1:20).

Because of the importance of this issue, and its prominence throughout the Bible, I would recommend reading the following article from bible.org. It's called, “The Preciousness of Blood” (Leviticus 17) and you can find it at [http://www.bible.org/page.asp?page\\_id=278](http://www.bible.org/page.asp?page_id=278).

The Lord bless you,

Michael Gleghorn  
Probe Ministries



---

# **“Why Were Things Like Polygamy OK in the Old Testament But Not Now?”**

What about the issues in the Old Testament with families like masters sleeping with their servants and men having many wives or even the issue of “inter-family” relationships and the like? Was it a population issue? When did the law change? Why was it okay then and not now?

Great question! The problem is, the Bible rarely makes commentary on historical events. If it did, we would see notations like “[and this was not only sinful but STUPID because God’s plan for marriage is one man, one woman for life, and bad things happen when we disobey His commandment].”

The fact that sinful, unwise behaviors are recorded (without commentary) in the Bible doesn’t mean it was OK any more than newspapers reporting on crime means they condone it. They’re both just telling you what happened.

Hope this helps!

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

# **“Why Did God Reject Cain’s Offering?”**

I was reading to my grandchild about Cain and Abel. The book we read said Cain was jealous of Abel because God rejected the sacrifice Cain made and accepted Abel’s. She asked me why, can you tell me?

The difference in the sacrifices was really about the difference in their hearts. If you read the actual story in Genesis 4, you will read that Abel, who was a rancher, made his offering of the first of his flock and of the “fat portions” of his flock. In other words, he gave God the first and the best of what he had. Cain, a farmer, only gave God “some” of his crops. He was greedy and self-centered and apparently wanted to keep the best for himself. God rejected Cain’s sacrifice because Cain rejected God’s right to his heart.

Hope this helps!

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

# **“What is the Value of the Old Testament for New Testament Christians?”**

What exactly is the significance of the Old Testament for us Christians (other than to point towards Jesus Christ)? How does the Old Covenant apply to someone under the New Covenant

## **(if at all) in daily life?**

Thank you for writing Probe Ministries. You ask some very good questions!

As to your first question, "What exactly is the significance of the Old Testament for us Christians," I would probably want to say the following. First, the OT teaches us a number of crucial doctrines which are essential for Christianity. These include creation (Gen. 1-2), the fall of man (Gen. 3), the promise of a Deliverer (Gen. 3:15, etc.), the holiness of God (Leviticus), the need for a substitutionary blood sacrifice (Leviticus), the essential requirement of faith in God and His promises (Gen. 15:6), and God's discipline of His wayward people (seen throughout the OT). We also learn a great deal about God's interactions with people in the past (see 1 Cor. 10:6 in context), as well as His plans for the future. The wisdom literature and poetry (Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Solomon) are, for the most part, timeless. They include wise advice on getting along successfully in the world, in relating to both God and our fellow man, as well as offering us examples of how to approach God in prayer and worship. Of course, as you said, its primary importance is to point us to Jesus Christ, the promised Messiah and Savior of the world. Finally, it's interesting to note that in passages like 2 Tim. 3:14-17 and 2 Peter 1:20-21, the "Scripture" which is in view is primarily the OT. This is so because the NT was still in the process of being written. And it wouldn't exist in its present form (i.e., 27 books bound together and recognized by the church as authoritative in matters of faith and practice) for a few centuries.

In your second question you ask, "How does the Old Covenant apply to someone under the New Covenant (if at all) in daily life?" First, let me point out that there are many moral commandments which are the same under both covenants. In fact, nine of the Ten Commandments are repeated and enjoined upon believers in the NT (all but the Sabbath day observance).

Thus, there is clearly some continuity between the two covenants. However, there are also some important differences. For example, the dietary laws set forth in passages such as Leviticus 11:1-47 and Deuteronomy 14:1-21 were temporary laws given by God only to Israel. These laws are not applicable to Christians today under the terms of the New Covenant. This is not only made clear in Peter's vision, recorded in Acts 10:9-16, but it is stated explicitly by Christ Himself in Mark 7:14-23. Notice in particular what Jesus says in vv. 18-19. In part, this text reads, "Do you not understand that whatever goes into the man from outside cannot defile him; because it does not go into his heart, but into his stomach, and is eliminated?" Then notice the parenthetical statement which concludes this verse: "Thus He declared all foods clean." In other words, the dietary restrictions given by God to Israel have been nullified. Christians today are not bound by such laws. Today, the Old Covenant under which Israel operated is obsolete (Hebrews 8:13). Thus, while some of the moral commandments of the Old Covenant are reiterated for us in the New Covenant, strictly speaking, I do not believe that Christians are obligated to any of the duties or requirements of the Old Covenant. After all, the Old Covenant has been done away with by God Himself. Thus, any obligations that apply to us are repeated for us under the terms of the New Covenant. The New Covenant not only tells us how to live pleasing to God, etc., it also provides the means (through the indwelling of God's Holy Spirit) to live consistently with it (as we walk in faith relying on the power of God's Spirit).

In the New Testament, the book of Hebrews has a great deal to say about this New Covenant. In an article on "Covenant," Trent Butler describes some of the special features of the New Covenant as related in the book of Hebrews:

"The emphasis is on Jesus, the perfect High Priest, providing a new, better, superior covenant (Heb. 7:22; 8:6). Jesus represented the fulfillment of Jeremiah's new covenant

promise (Heb. 8:8, 10; 10:16). Jesus was the perfect covenant Mediator (Heb. 9:15), providing an eternal inheritance in a way the old covenant could not (compare 12:24). Jesus' death on the cross satisfied the requirement that all covenants be established by blood (Heb. 9:18, 20) just as was the first covenant (Ex. 24:8). Christ's blood established an everlasting covenant (Heb. 13:20)." (*Holman Bible Dictionary*, gen. ed. Trent C. Butler [Tennessee: Holman Bible Publishers, 1991], 312)

Shalom,

Michael Gleghorn  
Probe Ministries

---

## **“Which Version of the Bible is Most Accurate?”**

**Do you know which version of the Bible is most accurate? The main ones I'm considering for thorough Bible study are the King James Version, New International Version, and the New American Standard Version. Are the NIV and NASB inferior to the KJV? Also, what study bible do you feel is most helpful? Life Application, Scofield, Ryrie?**

I would never recommend the KJV for Bible study because language has changed so much since 1611, and better manuscripts are now available as the basis for translation than what they used for the KJV. (I suggest you read [our article on the King James debate.](#))

The NIV is a dynamic translation, where the translators sought to communicate the general idea and thoughts behind the

original languages, rather than an actual word-for-word translation, which can tend to be more wooden. I no longer use the NIV exclusively (although I did for 20 years) because I am frustrated by the fact that they translate the word "flesh" as "sin nature," which leads to a misunderstanding of the Christian life, I believe. I have joined the ranks of a growing number who have returned to the NASB for serious Bible study. However, I am very much enjoying the NET Bible (New English Translation), which can be downloaded for free ([www.netbible.org](http://www.netbible.org)) although the beta version is now out in print. Each page has more translator notes and study notes than actual text, which gives the reader a VERY full understanding of what's going on in the original languages. I am using the NET Bible to augment my NASB reading; it's like listening to color commentary during a sports telecast.

In terms of the study Bibles, that is really a personal preference issue depending on one's theology. The Life Application, Scofield and Ryrie Bibles are dispensational, and the Reformation Study Bible is reform in its theology. The Student Bible is especially good, as is Kay Arthur's Inductive Study Bible. All the study Bibles you mentioned are good and have their fans. The best way to judge, I think, is to compare the notes on the same passage between the various versions.

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries