

Further Reading

Harris, Murray. *Slave of Christ: A New Testament Metaphor for Total Devotion to Christ*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999.

Wright, Christopher J. H. *Old Testament Ethics for the People of God*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004.

15

Indiscriminate Massacre and Ethnic Cleansing?

The Killing of the Canaanites (I)

Probably the most difficult Old Testament ethical issue is the divine command to kill the Canaanites.¹ Theologian-turned-atheist Gerd Lüdemann wrote that “the command to exterminate is extremely offensive”—a far cry from the merciful God frequently proclaimed in Scripture.² Consider just one of these passages:

Only in the cities of these peoples that the Lord your God is giving you as an inheritance, you shall not leave alive anything that breathes. But you shall utterly destroy them: the Hittite and the Amorite, the Canaanite and the Perizzite, the Hivite and the Jebusite, as the Lord your God has commanded you, so that they may not teach you to do according to all their detestable

things which they have done for their gods, so that you would sin against the Lord your God. (Deut. 20:16–18)

This is a tough question, and we'll take four chapters to tackle this and related issues. First, we'll review some introductory matters, then we'll address two possible scenarios regarding the Canaanite issue, and finally we'll look at the question of religion (whatever that term means) and violence.

Were the Canaanites That Wicked?

According to the biblical text, Yahweh was willing to wait about 430 years because “the sin of the Amorite [a Canaanite people group] has not yet reached its limit” (Gen. 15:16 NET). In other words, in Abraham's day, the time wasn't ripe for judgment on the Canaanites; the moment wasn't right for them to be driven out and for the land to “vomit them out” (Lev. 18:25 NET). Sodom and Gomorrah, on the other hand, *were* ready; not even ten righteous people could be found there (Gen. 18–19). Even earlier, at the time of Noah, humans had similarly hit moral rock bottom (Gen. 6:11–13). Despite 120 years of Noah's preaching (Gen. 6:3; cf. 5:32; 7:6; 2 Peter 2:5), no one outside his family listened; his contemporaries were also ripe for judgment. But it was only after Israel's lengthy enslavement in Egypt that the time was finally ripe for the Israelites to enter Canaan—“because of the wickedness of these nations” (Deut. 9:4–5). Sometimes God simply gives up

on nations, cities, or individuals when they've gone past a point of no return. Judgment—whether directly or indirectly—is the last resort.

What kind of wickedness are we talking about? We're familiar with the line, “The apple doesn't fall far from the tree.” In the case of the Canaanites, the Canaanites' moral apples didn't fall far from the tree of their pantheon of immoral gods and goddesses. So if the Canaanite deities engaged in incest, then it's not surprising that incest wasn't treated as a serious moral wrong among the Canaanite people. As we've seen, adultery (temple sex), bestiality, homosexual acts (also temple sex), and child sacrifice were also permitted (cf. Lev. 18:20–30).

Humans are “imaging” beings, designed to reflect the likeness and glory of their Creator. If we worship the creaturely rather than the Creator, we'll come to resemble or image the idols of our own devising and that in which we place our security.³ The sexual acts of the gods and goddesses were imitated by the Canaanites as a kind of magical act: the more sex on the Canaanite high places, the more this would stimulate the fertility god Baal to have sex with his consort, Anath, which meant more semen (rain) produced to water the earth.

Let's add to this the bloodlust and violence of the Canaanite deities. Anath, the patroness of both sex and war, reminds us of the bloodthirsty goddess Kali of Hinduism, who drank

her victims' blood and sat surrounded by corpses; she is commonly depicted with a garland of skulls around her neck. The late archaeologist William Albright describes the Canaanite deity Anath's massacre in the following gory scene:

The blood was so deep that she waded in it up to her knees—nay, up to her neck. Under her feet were human heads, above her human hands flew like locusts. In her sensuous delight she decorated herself with suspended heads while she attached hands to her girdle. Her joy at the butchery is described in even more sadistic language: “Her liver swelled with laughter, her heart was full of joy, the liver of Anath (was full of) exultation (?)” Afterwards Anath “was satisfied” and washed her hands in human gore before proceeding to other occupations.⁴

Canaanite idolatry wasn't simply an abstract theology or personal interest carried out in the privacy of one's home. It was a worldview that profoundly influenced Canaanite society. Given this setting, it's no wonder God didn't want the Israelites to associate with the Canaanites and be led astray from obedience to the one true God. He wanted to have Israel morally and theologically separate from the peoples around them.

In other words, the land of Canaan was no paradise before the Israelites got there. Israel had no inherent right to inhabit the land (as an undeserved gift from God), and neither did the Canaanites have a right to remain in it. In fact, both the

Canaanites and the Israelites would experience (partial) removal from the land because of their wickedness.

I'm not arguing that the Canaanites were the *worst* specimens of humanity that ever existed, nor am I arguing that the Canaanites won the immorality contest for worst-behaved peoples in all the ancient Near East. That said, the evidence for profound moral corruption was abundant. God considered them ripe for divine judgment, which would be carried out in keeping with God's saving purposes in history.

Some argue that God is intolerant, commanding people to have “no other gods before Me” (Exod. 20:3). They state that Israel's laws illustrate the denial of religious freedom at the heart of Israelite religion. And didn't other ancient Near Eastern religions value religious diversity? Couldn't non-Israelites worship whatever god they wanted? Israel had committed itself to be faithful to Yahweh; as in any good marriage, spouses shouldn't play the field in the name of marital freedom. As for the Canaanites, God judged them not only because they happened to worship idols but also because of the corrupting moral practices and influences bound up with this idolatry. Notice that God judges the nations listed in Amos 1–2 not because they don't worship Yahweh but because of outrageous moral acts. I've already addressed the topic of divine jealousy, but I'll come back to some of these themes later.

So was God just picking on the Canaanites but not other peoples? No, Yahweh frequently threatened many nations with judgment when they crossed a certain moral threshold. For example, in Amos 1–2, God promised to “send fire” on nations surrounding Israel for their treacheries and barbarities. And he promised the same to Israel and Judah. Later, Jesus himself pronounced final judgment on nationalistic Israel, which would face its doom in AD 70 at the hands of the Romans (Matt. 24).

What’s more, we moderns shouldn’t think that severe divine judgment was only for biblical times, as though God no longer judges nations today. Despite many gains over the centuries in the areas of human rights and religious liberty, due to the positive influence of biblical ideals in America and other Western nations, Westerners have their own share of decadence, and we may resemble the Canaanites more than we realize. We should proceed cautiously about what counts for direct divine judgment, as we may not be able to determine this precisely.⁵ These sorts of acts serve as illustrations of a cosmic final judgment yet to come. Ultimately, God’s judgment will come to all who refuse to submit to God’s kingdom agenda and instead seek to set up their own little fiefdoms. God grants humans freedom to separate themselves from God. In the end, humans can have their final divorce from God both as a just judgment as well as the natural fruit

borne out of a life lived without God. As a last resort, God says to them, “*Thy will be done.*”

Who Determines the Point of No Return?

Israeli psychologist Georges Tamarin undertook a study in 1966 involving 1,066 schoolchildren ages eight to fourteen. Presented with the story of Jericho’s destruction, they were asked, “Do you think Joshua and the Israelites acted rightly or not?” Two-thirds of the children approved. However, when Tamarin substituted General Lin for Joshua and a Chinese kingdom three thousand years ago for Israel, only 7 percent approved while 75 percent disapproved.⁶ The critic is baffled at this: “We rightly condemn the killing of an ethnic group when carried out by Nazis or Hutus. But Israel seems to get a pass—indeed, a divine *order*—when doing the same thing to the Canaanites!”

What guidelines do we have to determine when a culture is irredeemable, beyond the point of no moral and spiritual return? Don’t we need something more than mere mortals to assess a culture’s ripeness for judgment? Aren’t these considerations too weighty for humans to judge? Yes, they are! Any such determinations should be left up to God—namely, through special revelation. The Israelites, when they went into battle against the Philistines *with* the ark of the covenant but *without* divine approval, were roundly defeated (1 Sam. 4).

The requirement of special revelation before any such undertaking is precisely what we have in Scripture. The one true God told his prophet Moses or Samuel when the time was right. Likewise, without such clear divine guidance, Israel *wouldn't* have been justified in attacking the Canaanite strongholds.

Some TV stunt shows warn children, “Kids, don’t try this at home!” Likewise, we could say about Israel’s “holy war” situation: “Don’t try this without special revelation!” These matters aren’t up to humans to decide. Yahweh-initiated battles were never intended for non-prophet organizations! Think of the disastrous results when Israel attempted to go into other battles without divine approval (e.g., Num. 14:41–45; Josh. 7). As we’ve seen already, God’s call to battle was unique to Israel’s situation. Such a call, though, isn’t an enduring, universally binding standard for all time and all cultures.

Did the Canaanites Know Better?

Some scholars have questioned whether we can hold the Canaanites morally accountable. After all, weren’t they just practicing *their* religion, which they received from *their* parents, who received it from *their* parents? Shouldn’t God have enlightened them about himself and his requirements for humans?

As we look at history, we see that nations and civilizations have been capable of moral reforms and improvements. We shouldn’t be surprised at this. After all, God reveals himself to humans through conscience, reason, human experience, and creation. This revelation opens the door for moral improvements from one generation to the next. People without the Scriptures can still have access to what is good and right.

For a little support, let me quote a notable theist and a notable atheist. The notable theist is the apostle Paul, who affirms that special revelation isn’t necessary for people to know about God or to recognize right and wrong:

That which is known about God is evident within them [human beings]; for God made it evident to them. For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes, His eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made, so that they are without excuse. (Rom. 1:19–20)

The notable atheist is philosopher Kai Nielsen:

It is more reasonable to believe such elemental things [as wife beating and child abuse] to be evil than to believe any skeptical theory that tells us we cannot know or reasonably believe any of these things to be evil. . . . I firmly believe that this is bedrock and right and that anyone who does not believe it cannot have probed deeply enough into the grounds of his moral beliefs.⁷

We've seen how Amos 1–2 illustrates these two quotations nicely. God had warned the morally accountable Gentile nations surrounding Israel. Although they knew their moral duties, they disregarded them. Knowing better, they stifled compassion, suppressed their conscience, and carried out terrible atrocities, such as ripping open pregnant women or betraying vulnerable, displaced populations into the hands of their enemies. The author of Hebrews called the Canaanites “disobedient” (11:31)—that is, having a moral awareness but disregarding it. In C. S. Lewis’s *Abolition of Man*, he lists moral codes of many cultures across the ages. They are strikingly similar at key points: honoring parents, being faithful in marriage, not stealing, not murdering, not lying, and so on.⁸ In other words, doing the right thing isn’t as elusive as some may think.

Consider Rahab and her family (Josh. 2). Though immersed in Canaanite culture, they prove to be a clear sign that other Canaanites could potentially have been rescued as well. Israel’s God had convincingly delivered his people from Egypt. He had supplied signs and wonders, revealing his reality and surpassing greatness, and the Canaanites were fully aware of this (Josh. 2:9–11; 9:9–10). Some charge that Rahab was selling out her people to save her own neck. But is that fair? For one thing, Rahab risked a lot by taking in the foreign spies and hiding them. And surely loyalty to one’s race or ethnic group isn’t the ultimate virtue, particularly when it goes

against what’s right and true. Many Afrikaners in South Africa who protested apartheid broke with the traditions of their racially prejudiced ancestors, which was the right thing to do.

Was It Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing?

According to Richard Dawkins, the killing of the Canaanites was an act of ethnic cleansing in which “bloodthirsty massacres” were carried out with “xenophobic relish.” Were the Israelites truly xenophobic—fearful of strangers (non-Israelites)?

Terms like *genocide* and *ethnic cleansing* evoke negative emotions in all of us. Dawkins isn’t exactly interested in accuracy; so he resorts to misleading rhetoric to sway the jury. Ethnic cleansing is fueled by racial hatred. The alleged in-group pronounces a pox on the out-group and then proceeds to destroy them. Does this scenario really mesh with the facts about the Israelites, though? As it turns out, xenophobic attitudes didn’t prompt the Israelites to kill Canaanites.

From the beginning, God told Abraham “all the families of the earth” would be blessed through his offspring (Gen. 12:3). We’re not off to a very xenophobic start. Then we read many positive things about foreigners in the chapters that follow. Abraham met and honored Melchizedek (Gen. 14). He encountered just and fair-minded foreign leaders among the

Egyptians (Gen. 12) and the Philistines (Gen. 20) who proved to be more honorable than Abraham. A “mixed multitude” left with Israel from Egypt (Exod. 12:38). Moses married a dark-skinned Cushite/Ethiopian (Num. 12:1). The Gentile Rahab and her family joined Israel’s ranks (Josh. 6:23), in ironic contrast to the Israelite Achan, who stole goods from Jericho and was put to death for his disobedience (Josh. 7). Also, the very language of “dedication to destruction/ the ban [*herem*]” could be applied equally to Israel as well as to a Canaanite city (Deut. 13:16). Later on, Israel’s prophets would readily condemn Israel’s wickedness, as they would that of the surrounding nations. In general, God’s judgments fall on those practicing evil and wickedness—whether Jew or Gentile, as Paul makes clear in Romans 1–3.

Furthermore, God also repeatedly commanded Israel to show concern for (non-Israelite) aliens or sojourners in their midst (e.g., Lev. 19:34; Deut. 10:18–19). Why? Because the Israelites had been strangers in Egypt. God frequently reminded his people to learn the lessons of their history so that they wouldn’t be doomed to repeat it with Gentiles in their midst.

Furthermore, according to Israel’s civil law, the stranger living in Israel had the same legal rights as the native Israelite: “There shall be one standard for you; it shall be for the stranger as well as the native, for I am the Lord your God” (Lev. 24:22; cf. Num. 35:15). As we’ve seen, the alien (*ger*)

—one who embraced Israel’s covenant and Israel’s God—could participate in events such as the Passover (Num. 9:14). Negative concerns regarding the foreigner (*nokri*) had to do with theological compromise and idolatry; such negativity wasn’t assumed when a non-Israelite like Rahab or Ruth or Uriah embraced Yahweh, the God of Israel.⁹ We could add that God exhorted Israelites to show concern even for their personal enemies: “If you come across your enemy’s ox or donkey wandering off, be sure to take it back to him. If you see the donkey of someone who hates you fallen down under its load, do not leave it there; be sure you help him with it” (Exod. 23:4–5).

What about God allowing Israelites to take interest from foreigners but not from fellow citizens (Deut. 23:20)? We’ve seen that interest was charged to foreigners, who were temporary residents and not members of society. They typically borrowed money to invest in profit-making pursuits and trading ventures; these weren’t loans given to help foreigners escape poverty.¹⁰ This regulation had a built-in incentive: the outsider (who didn’t *have* to live in Israel) could choose to become a part of Israel and embrace the one true God; if so, he could benefit from divinely commanded economic perks and displays of Israelite concern. Instead of hostility, God commanded the Israelites to love and show concern for the resident aliens in their midst. The command to love the resident alien and to treat her the same way as a citizen (Lev.

19:33–34) is remarkable and unique in the ancient Near East’s religious thoughts and practices.¹¹

Critics will point to Deuteronomy 23:3: “No Ammonite or Moabite shall enter the assembly of the Lord; none of their descendants, even to the tenth generation, shall ever enter the assembly of the Lord.” *That* doesn’t seem very kind. However, earlier (in Deut. 2) three nations were favorably mentioned: Edom, related to Israel through Esau, Jacob’s brother; and Moab and Ammon, nations from the sons of Abraham’s nephew Lot. Notice that Israel is prohibited from fighting against them (vv. 4–6, 9, 19). So let’s not misread 23:3 as xenophobia. That said, God took treachery against Israel very seriously. Genesis 12:3 implies judgment on those who would mistreat Israel. And Deuteronomy 23:4 reveals the reason for the Ammonites’ and Moabites’ exclusion from the assembly: “because they did not meet you with food and water on the way when you came out of Egypt, and because they hired against you Balaam the son of Beor from Pethor of Mesopotamia, to curse you” (see Num. 22–25). Even so, remember that generations later Ruth the *Moabite* was readily received into the midst of Israel. A lot depended on whether the alien from Moab (or Ammon) fully embraced Israel’s covenant, which meant his acceptance into the assembly as a genuine worshiper of Yahweh.¹² As John Goldingay writes:

Being of non-Israelite origin is not a disqualification for membership of the [Israelite] community in any period. The question is, what God do you serve? The reason for not marrying a Canaanite is that this will turn you away from following Yhwh and lead to your serving other deities (Deut 7:3–4). A Canaanite who has made a commitment to Yhwh is a different matter.¹³

So we should put to rest this idea of divinely inspired racism or ethnocentrism. In fact, God regularly reminded his people not to get so high and mighty. He frankly told Israel that possessing the land wasn’t due to their righteousness and uprightness of heart. It was because of the wickedness of the Canaanites. What’s more, God considered the Israelites “a stubborn people” (Deut. 9:4–6). The most-favored-nation status was given with the goal of inviting others to experience God’s gracious favor—and God could revoke that status. Likewise, just as he would give the land to a group of wandering, landless Israelites as an inheritance (Exod. 12:25; Num. 34:2), he could revoke it as well (Deut. 4:26). Those in the land—whether Canaanites or Israelites—were only tenants, not owners (Pss. 24:1; 50:12).¹⁴

We’ll explore the phrase “utterly destroy” (*haram*) below. Suffice it to say here that God’s charge to Israel to “utterly destroy” the cities of the morally bankrupt Canaanites was turned on Israel when groups of Israelites were seduced into following false gods (Deut. 13:15; cf. 7:4; 28:63). God was

concerned with *sin*, not *ethnicity*. In fact, as we read the Old Testament prophets, they (with God) were angered about Israel's disobedience, and they threatened divine judgment on Israel/Judah more often than they did on the pagan nations. If we read carefully, it's obvious God was opposed to *Israel's* sin just as much as he was to that of their oppressors.

Inefficient Means?

Some critics raise a potentially embarrassing question: if God wanted to destroy Canaanite religion by removing the Canaanite peoples, didn't he fail spectacularly in achieving this purpose? Wasn't Old Testament Israel continually getting sucked into pagan idolatry? Why not a more effective divine judgment—perhaps scorching fire and brimstone to clear the land of Canaanite idolatry so that Israel wouldn't get entangled spiritually and morally?

Many critics focus on efficiency, that it's somehow immoral or un-Godlike to be less than efficient. But what theological reason compels us to assume that God must operate with maximum efficiency? Are we too Western in our assumptions about what God *ought* to do? Is God obligated to expedite his purposes? Must God's purposes be less "clunky" to reveal his divinity? Don't such questions take for granted knowing God's purposes in detail?

God doesn't seem to think it's a problem that a small planetary speck is home to all the universe's inhabitants while the rest of the cosmos is (from all we can see) uninhabited and uninhabitable. Throughout Scripture, God took plenty of time and utilized seemingly inefficient means to accomplish his purposes. For instance, God didn't exactly jump-start the descendants-as-numerous-as-the-stars program. Rather, he began with a barren, elderly couple—Abraham and Sarah—and then continued to work through a stubborn and rebellious nation. Biblical categories such as grace, covenant faithfulness, relationship, obedience, perseverance, and love are the more relevant considerations. Efficiency doesn't seem to figure in all that prominently. As a friend of mine says, "God is always *almost* late."

The Scriptures reveal a *sufficient* God, not necessarily an *efficient* one. And the question of efficiency revolves around what the particular *goal* is: "efficient" to do what and to exclude what, exactly? Getting hot-house-grown tomatoes from your supermarket may be efficient, but if maximal satisfaction is uppermost in your mind, then growing tomatoes in your backyard and enjoying their vine-ripened taste would be the way to go. Yes, it's more work and time, but the results are far more enjoyable and tasty.

Why then didn't God make sure that *no* Canaanite was left in the land just to make sure that Israel wouldn't be lured by the lifestyle encouraged by Canaan's idolatry? The Scriptures

reveal a God who works through messy, seemingly inefficient processes—including human choices and failures (Gen. 50:20)—to accomplish his redemptive purposes in history. That humans see God’s grace, holiness, and love is more of a priority than efficiency. The route God chose didn’t require the death of every last Canaanite. Not only were the Canaanites *sufficiently* driven out so as not to decisively undermine Israel’s spiritual and moral integrity in the long run, but, as we’ll see below, Canaanites participate in God’s redemptive plan in both the Old and New Testaments (e.g., Zech. 9; Matt. 15:22; cf. Ps. 87:4–6; Isa. 19:23–25).¹⁵

Despite occasional spiritual revivals and moral successes in Israel’s history, her failure to eradicate idolatry led to many troubles. She paid for her compromises with an Assyrian captivity of the Northern Kingdom (722 BC) and then a Babylonian captivity of the Southern Kingdom (587/6 BC; cf. 2 Kings 17:7–41; 2 Chron. 36:15–21). The theological and moral threat of foreign religion, however, didn’t so damage Israel that its monotheism and covenantal awareness were totally eclipsed. By the first century AD, the theological stage had been sufficiently set: Israel’s Scriptures were preserved, her national identity forged, her temple worship restored, her messianic expectations rekindled, and her monotheistic dedication secured. Despite Israel’s compromises and rebellions over the centuries, Jesus’s arrival on the scene came “in the

fullness of time” (see Gal. 4:4). Was this efficient? Not in an obvious way. Was it sufficient? Very much so.

Cosmic Warfare

The worship of idols wasn’t innocent or harmless. The Old Testament connects idolatry with the demonic—that is, with the cosmic enemies of God who rebelled against him: “goat demons” (Lev. 17:7); “strange gods . . . demons . . . gods” (Deut. 32:16–21); “demons . . . idols” (Ps. 106:37–38); “demons” (Isa. 65:3, Greek Septuagint). Even Pharaoh—the earthly representation of Egypt’s gods—was a picture of this cosmic opposition. So in the exodus, Yahweh is the cosmic warrior who engages the evil powers of Egypt and the forces that inspire them. The New Testament picks up on this theme (e.g., 1 Cor. 10:19–22; 2 Cor. 6:14–16; Eph. 6:12–18). God’s act of engaging in battle is not for the sake of violence or even victory as such but to establish peace and justice.¹⁶

God’s commands to Israel to wipe out Canaan’s idols and false, immoral worship illustrate the cosmic warfare between Yahweh and the dark powers opposed to his rule. This theme of spiritual warfare is certainly much more pronounced in the New Testament, which clearly exposes Satan and his hosts as the ultimate enemies of God and of his kingdom’s advance. Yahweh—“the Lord of hosts” (cf. Ps. 24:7–10)—is a “warrior” (Exod. 15:3) who opposes all that mars the divine image

in humans, all that threatens human flourishing, and all that sets itself in opposition to God's righteous reign. "Yahweh wars" aren't simply a clash between this and that deity; they represent a clash of two world orders: one rooted in reality and justice, the other in reality-denial and brute power; one representing creational order, the other anticeation.¹⁷

Israel's taking Canaan, then, is unlike the General Lin analogy, in which a stronger nation happens to invade and overpower a weaker nation. This would rightly draw the reaction, "What gives the stronger nation the right?" So perhaps we should think more along the lines of the Sicilian police invading a Mafia stronghold to remove a corrupting network of crime so that citizens can live in peace rather than in fear.

Just as the plagues in Egypt were a demonstration of Yahweh's judgment on her gods, so Israel's wars revealed God's sovereign rule over the presumed gods of the nations. In Israel's officially sanctioned wars, God's supernatural power and supremacy were revealed:¹⁸

- God didn't allow Israel to have a standing army (cf. David's unlawful census in 2 Sam. 24:1–17); Israel's wars weren't for professionals but for amateurs and volunteers. Fighting, however, wasn't for the fainthearted or for those distracted by other concerns. Those lacking courage or who had other reasons for not wanting to

fight were allowed—even *invited*—to excuse themselves from battle (e.g., Deut. 20:5–8).

- Soldiers fighting in a Yahweh war weren't paid, nor could they take personal plunder, unlike warfare tactics elsewhere in the ancient Near East.
- Kings, tribal leaders, and high priests weren't authorized to call for a war, only a prophet through divine revelation.
- Victories for Israel's (mainly) ragtag army clearly signaled that God was fighting on their behalf (e.g., 2 Chron. 20).

In Old Testament Israel's physical battles, God wanted to show forth his greatness, not a display of sheer human power. And though the true Israel—the church—doesn't wage war against "flesh and blood" (Eph. 6:12) today, our warfare against Satan and his hosts has its roots in Yahweh wars in the Old Testament.

Further Reading

Boyd, Gregory. *God at War: The Bible and Spiritual Conflict*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1997.

Hess, Richard S. "War in the Hebrew Bible: An Overview." In *War in the Bible and Terrorism in the Twenty-*