

Year of publication: 2019

Author's Address: Ghana Christian University College (GhanaCU),
Accra

E-mail: jimmyamoah@yahoo.com

Author's Contacts: 024 446 2843

Design & Printed in Ghana By:

Classic Graphics

Asafo, Kumasi-Ghana

Tel: 0244887832

COPYRIGHT © 2019 Rev. James Yamoah (PhD)

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in
any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including
photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval
system without permission in writing from the publisher.

ISBN: 978-9988-2-9762-9

-Published by: Classic Graphics, Asafo - Kumasi

OD Series: Volume Two

“Holy War”:
The Consequence of
OPEN DEFECATION

by
Rev James Yamoah (PhD)

Dedication

To:

Dr. Victor O. Okoh (MBChB),
MSc Community Health, MSc Med Paramedic,
Rtd. Director of Health Services, Volta River Authority (VRA),
Snr. Presbyter, Presbyterian Church of Ghana, Boso (E/R);

and

Mr. Nii-Noi Adumuah,
MCE, Adentan Municipal Assembly, G/A,
Dean of the Metropolitan, Municipal, and District Chief Executives,
Ghana,

for

their extreme demonstration of interest, encouragement and
support during my period of research into the issues that have
culminated into the writing of this book.

Acknowledgement

This book was completed with the support of many dependable persons, particularly, my great family. Specific names that constantly ring bells in my spirit are: Madam Mary Nyarko (my mother), Messrs Francis Gyamera Akwaw (of blessed memory) and Peter Yamoah Akwaw (my uncles), Mrs Rose-Vida Danquah and Ms Georgina Achiaah (my aunts), my siblings, cousins and the entire family. The families of Mr Obiri-Yeboah, Mrs Rita Amakye-Ansah, and Madam Charity Nyarkoah (my mother-in-law) deserve mention together with Madam Ernestina Addo.

On the academic front are all who have mentored me in my education. Dr Manuel Budu Adjei and all known past and present faculty and staff, graduates, and students of Ghana Christian University College, Accra, deserve mention. Some professors of Cincinnati Christian University (CCU), Ohio, USA, especially, Dr and Dr (Mrs) Weber, Dr and Mrs Roadcup, Dr Mark Ziese, and Professor Dan Dyke, deserve mention. I am grateful to Dr S Gyanfosu, Mr E Ofori-Attah, Ms A Frempong-Kore, and Ms E Abena Agyeman, and Rev Dr James Walton of Akrofi-Christaller Institute (ACI) for their editorial support. To crown this group are the supervisors of this dissertation, Dr A Asumang and Dr R W Domeris. May God reward all of them for their support for me.

As for the special lady in my life, Mrs Florence Yamoah, and my biological children, they cannot be forgotten in any of the books I author. While it is her presence that provided the needed comfort for this work, it is the constant interactions of Jemima, Emmanuel, and Joseph (my children), that constituted the source of power that catapulted me to the finishing line. I pray God's abiding presence with them eternally. Above all, I am forever

grateful to my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It is His faithfulness that has brought me thus far. Indeed, His faithfulness is great (Lam 3:23). **Amen.**

Table of Contents

	Page
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Abbreviations	vii
Table of Hebrew Alphabets	x
Table of Greek Alphabets	xi
Introduction	xii
Chapter 1	1
Open Defecation is a Recipe for ‘Holy War’ against People	
Chapter 2	
What is the Foundation of ‘Holy War’?	
Chapter 3	9
Types and Examples of ‘Holy Wars’?	
Chapter 4	17
Yahweh as Commander-in-Chief in ‘Holy War’	
Chapter 5	27
Is ‘Holy war’ connected to Physical battles?	
Chapter 6	41
Some experiences of ‘Holy War’ in the OT period	
Chapter 7	46
Was ‘Holy War’ Significant to the People of Israel?	
Chapter 8	55
Who are Yahweh’s Physical Enemies in ‘Holy War’?	

Chapter 9	60
Who are Yahweh's Spiritual Enemies in 'Holy War'?	
Chapter 10	73
What is 'Holy War' to the New Testament Believer?	
Chapter 11	78
Who are Yahweh's targets in 'Holy War' in the New Testament?	
Chapter 12	91
Post-New Testament 'Holy war' is Not Physical Violence	
Chapter 13	100
Why is 'Holy War' regarded as Divine Judgement?	
Chapter 14	106
Yahweh will wage "Holy War" against destruction of "Sacred" Earth	
Chapter 15	112
All Christians to Engage Prayer Crusades against "Holy War"	
Chapter 16	117
Thus says Yahweh, the LORD God: 'No open defecation, else...'	
Works Consulted	122

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviations for various Bible versions

ESV	2001. <i>English Standard Version</i> . Wheaton: Standard Bible Society.
	2012. <i>Global Study Bible</i> . Wheaton: Crossway
GNB	1992. <i>Good News Bible</i> . New York: American Bible Society.
	1994. <i>Good News Bible</i> (with The Deuterocanonical Books). Africa: The United Bible Societies.
KJV	1611. <i>King James Version</i> .
NAB	1970. <i>New American Bible</i> . Paterson, NJ: St Anthony Guild Press.
NASB	1995. <i>New American Standard Bible</i> . La Habra: Lockman Foundation.
NET	2006. <i>New English Translation</i> . Biblical Studies Press.
NIB	<i>New International Bible</i> (UK).
NIV	1984. <i>New International Version</i> . Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
NJB	<i>New Jerusalem Bible</i> .
NKJV	1982. <i>New King James Version</i> . Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishing.
NLT	2004. <i>New Living Translation</i> (2 nd Ed.). Wheaton Tyndale House.
RSV	<i>Revised Standard Version</i> . Oak Harbour: Logos Research Systems.

Common Theological abbreviations (Abb)

Abb	Full meaning	Abb	Full meaning
AD	In the year of our Lord	HB	<i>Hebrew Bible</i>
ANE	Ancient Near East(ern)	LXX	<i>Septuagint</i>
BC	Before Christ's advent	NT	New Testament
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls	OT	Old Testament
et al	and others		

Abbreviations for Bible books used in parentheses

<i>Genesis</i>	Gen	<i>Nahum</i>	Nah
<i>Exodus</i>	Exod	<i>Habakkuk</i>	Hab
<i>Leviticus</i>	Lev	<i>Zephaniah</i>	Zeph
<i>Numbers</i>	Num	<i>Haggai</i>	Hag
<i>Deuteronomy</i>	Deut	<i>Zechariah</i>	Zech
<i>Joshua</i>	Josh	<i>Malachi</i>	Mal
<i>Judges</i>	Judg	<i>Matthew</i>	Matt
<i>Ruth</i>	Ruth	<i>Mark</i>	Mark
<i>1 Samuel</i>	1 Sam	<i>Luke</i>	Luke
<i>2 Samuel</i>	2 Sam	<i>John</i>	John
<i>1 Kings</i>	1 Kgs	<i>Acts</i>	Acts
<i>2 Kings</i>	2 Kgs	<i>Romans</i>	Rom
<i>1 Chronicles</i>	1 Chr	<i>1 Corinthians</i>	1 Cor
<i>2 Chronicles</i>	2 Chr	<i>2 Corinthians</i>	2 Cor
<i>Ezra</i>	Ezra	<i>Galatians</i>	Gal
<i>Nehemiah</i>	Neh	<i>Ephesians</i>	Eph
<i>Esther</i>	Esth	<i>Philippians</i>	Phil
<i>Job</i>	Job	<i>Colossians</i>	Col
<i>Psalms</i>	Psa	<i>1 Thessalonians</i>	1 Thess
<i>Proverbs</i>	Prov	<i>2 Thessalonians</i>	2 Thess
<i>Ecclesiastes</i>	Eccl	<i>1 Timothy</i>	1 Tim
<i>Song of Songs</i>	Song	<i>2 Timothy</i>	2 Tim
<i>Isaiah</i>	Isa	<i>Titus</i>	Titus
<i>Jeremiah</i>	Jer	<i>Philemon</i>	Phlm
<i>Lamentation</i>	Lam	<i>Hebrews</i>	Heb
<i>Ezekiel</i>	Ezek	<i>James</i>	Jas
<i>Daniel</i>	Dan	<i>1 Peter</i>	1 Pet
<i>Hosea</i>	Hos	<i>2 Peter</i>	2 Pet
<i>Joel</i>	Joel	<i>1 John</i>	1 John
<i>Amos</i>	Amos	<i>2 John</i>	2 John
<i>Obadiah</i>	Obad	<i>3 John</i>	3 John
<i>Jonah</i>	Jonah	<i>Jude</i>	Jude
<i>Micah</i>	Mic	<i>Revelation</i>	Rev

Some Deutero-canonical book

<i>Tobit</i>	<i>Tob</i>	<i>1 Maccabees</i>	<i>1 Macc</i>	<i>2 Maccabees</i>	<i>2 Macc</i>
--------------	------------	--------------------	---------------	--------------------	---------------

Abbreviations of theological research & reference resources

<i>ABC</i>	<i>African Bible Commentary</i>
<i>ACE</i>	<i>African Christian Ethics</i>
<i>AJET</i>	<i>Africa Journal of Evangelical Theology</i>
<i>AJPS</i>	<i>Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies</i>
<i>BBR</i>	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
<i>BDB</i>	<i>Brown, Driver and Briggs, Hebrew-English Lexicon</i>
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
<i>BR</i>	<i>Biblical Research</i>
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>EBC</i>	<i>Expositor's Bible Commentary</i>
<i>EQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>ISBE</i>	<i>International Standard Bible Encyclopedia</i>
<i>JACT</i>	<i>Journal of African Christian Thought</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JRE</i>	<i>Journal of Religious Ethics</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JTI</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Interpretation</i>
<i>JTSA</i>	<i>Journal of Theology for Southern Africa</i>
<i>NIBC</i>	<i>New International Biblical Commentary</i>
<i>NICOT</i>	<i>New International Commentary on the Old Testament</i>
<i>NIDB</i>	<i>The New International Dictionary of the Bible</i>
<i>RQ</i>	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
<i>SBL</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>SBLDS</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series</i>
<i>TrinJ</i>	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
<i>TWOT</i>	<i>Archer, Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament</i>

<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>WBC</i>	<i>Word Biblical Commentary</i>
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>

Introduction

In the first book, *Thus says the LORD: 'No Open Defecation, else...'* the fundamental concepts undergirding Deuteronomy 23:12-14, which basically addresses the topic of Open Defecation, was discussed. It came out that the text is pregnant with interesting theological, moral, and socio-cultural and other important concepts which have implications for contemporary life. The analyses identified key concepts such as environmental cleanness, hygiene, holiness or ritual purity, 'place theology', 'name theology', and 'Yahweh war'/holy war', as undergirding the Open Defecation law which produced an interpretation for the original and other OT audiences. I showed in that book that the overall motivation for the pericope was not Yahweh's presence in the camp; rather the 'holy war' that He would execute on behalf of His covenanted community, should they obey His instructions on how to treat their human excrement.

From the premise that the possession of and survival on the Promised Land required that Israel would engage in warfare, Yahweh's presence in their camp to engage in a 'Yahweh war'/holy war' against His enemies, who were Israel's enemies, had to be accordingly ensured. Such divine presence required the maintenance of holiness of their military camp. This called for the people having to ensure acceptable sanitary habits by burying their faeces outside it, a practice argued to be motivated by other reasons as well.

In this second book, *"Holy War": Consequences of Open Defecation*, the concept of 'holy war' from the OT passage is connected to the NT context, with the discussion linking the

pericope to appropriate passages. Finally, the concept will be alluded to in the eschatological camp (Rev 19:11-21:27), where God's final war is described. Besides other significant issues, the arguments here are aimed at showing how Deuteronomy 23:12-14, which was set in the OT Israel camp and its environment give meaning to the 'name and place theology' underpins a kind of warfare which may be referred appropriately as 'a war of YHWH/Yahweh' or Yahweh war (cf. Wright 2008:87-88), and which is also designated a 'holy war'.

On one hand, obedience to the stipulations of this sanitation law that deals with open defecation would no doubt ensure the needed holiness (or purity) of the place and thus pave the way for Yahweh to fight His enemies in a 'Yahweh war'/'holy war'. On the other would be disobedience on the part of the covenant community which has grievous consequences for them. The book is meant to lay the needed foundation for a third one, ***Fellow Ghanaians, Let's Stop Open Defecation, else...***, which applies the fundamental issues discussed in the first two books to a contemporary context.

The third book explores the link between improper disposal of excrement or faeces and the outbreak of disease, which is a well-known fact in Public Health, and the link which also exists between desecration of Israel's sacred space/place and 'Yahweh war' spelt out in Deuteronomy 23:12-14, to argue that there is a link between 'Yahweh war' and some epidemics or disasters in the world today. Thus, the third volume is to be regarded as a practical application of the issues mentioned earlier, which are relevant in many ways to a larger present-day society.

However, to be able to understand the issues presented in the third book, the discussions in this second book need to be

appreciated. The details of 'holy war' would be understood as the content of this volume is patiently digested and assimilated.

REV. JAMES YAMOAH, PhD
VICE PRESIDENT – GHANA CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, ACCRA
CONTACTS: 024 446 2843 (WhatsApp line);
E-mail: jimmyamoah@yahoo.com

Chapter 1

Open Defecation is a Recipe for 'Holy War' against People

In the Volume One of this series, Open Defecation (OD) is defined as the situation where human faeces are dropped in open places or in a “free range”. In other words, faecal matter is usually left exposed in open places or not well covered. It is mentioned that the practice is common in both in rural and urban areas and is done in bushes, in gutters or drains, on the beach and banks of water bodies, behind people houses and, in fact, in any available open places.

Since OD is a threat to human life and undoubtedly the riskiest of all the insanitary practices, the desire to deal with the menace has driven researchers to explore many fields including turning to the Scriptures for solution. No doubt, the breakthrough from the point of Scripture bothers on a law that the Lord God Almighty gave to Israel which is found in Deuteronomy 23:12-14. The text in the NIV¹ reads:

¹² Designate a place outside the camp where you can go to relieve yourself. ¹³ As part of your equipment have something to dig with, and when you relieve yourself, dig a hole and cover up your excrement. ¹⁴ For the LORD your God moves about in your camp to protect you and to deliver your enemies to you. Your camp must be holy, so that he

¹ Unless otherwise stated, all Scriptural quotations are from the NIV. Moreover, the text provided here is only provisional pending the outcome of the translation of the exegesis of the original text.

will not see among you anything indecent and turn away from you.

This text is seen as raising several interconnected issues which need thorough examination to establish its meaning to the original audience, and all the subsequent communities of the OT and even the NT context. On the strength of the argument in Volume One of this OD series, some fundamental themes which among other ones include: environmental care, hygiene and health, holiness, place theology, are discussed. It is not only the undergirding concepts of the stipulations that are discussed but the motivations for such concepts as well as some of the possible interconnections that exist among them are also considered.

While some scholars argue that the instructions are for Israel not to pollute the environment and consequently show stewardship over creation and also preserve other creatures with whom they shared the land others claim that it is to ensure hygiene and thus secure the health of the people and prevent any form of contagion in the camp. There are other scholars who also argue that preventing open defecation is linked to holiness of God and/or holiness of people, others argue on the basis of 'Theology of Place and thus preventing open defecation is as a result of the holiness of Israel's camp. Through their integration, the relevance of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 to its immediate recipients and subsequent OT communities is established.

A fundamental issues of the law that comes out from all the discussions of Volume One is that in Israel's observation of God's instructions stated in passage (Deut 23:12-14), the Lord God Almighty is present in their camp to protect them and deal with their enemies (cf. Liroy 2010:27). More importantly is the fact that this promise to protect them and also bring judgement on their enemies would be achieved through a special kind of

war. This war declared by Yahweh, the Lord God Almighty, is regarded as a 'divine war'², and is therefore appropriate that it is called 'Yahweh war' or 'holy war'. Moreover, it is this 'Yahweh war' or 'holy war' that is argued as the overall motivation of the passage.

In other words, the call on the people of Israel to avoid open defecation is to open the doors for the Divine Warrior to engage 'holy war' against His enemies. The converse holds true, i.e., failure of the people to obey the instructions of the Lord God will lead to such a war against them. Whichever way one looks at it, then, open defecation opens the door for 'holy war' against people.

It is in the light of the above that the need for a thorough consideration of this concept of 'holy war' is inevitable. So, in this Volume Two of the series, we will concentrate our discussions on this 'holy war' which the Lord God of Israel was ready to wage against His enemies

Chapter Conclusion

This first chapter is meant to establish a link between discussions of the Volume One and this volume. The main focus is to reiterate the connection between OD and 'holy war'. The chapter has tried to focused on why Open Defecation is considered as a recipe for 'holy war'. Fundamentally, it has mentioned the need for God's people to prevent defecating in the open and has attempted to lay the platform for what should be done by the covenant community of Israel in order to enjoy

² The Divine war is appropriately called 'Yahweh war' or 'holy way' because it is a special war declared by Yahweh or the Lord Himself.

Yahweh war against their enemies and the risk involved in their failure to heed to the instructions of Yahweh, the Lord God, contained in the pericope.

In the next chapter, we will be narrowing the focus on the foundation and other detail considerations of the concept of 'holy war'. Some details of the concept; its roots in the Old Testament and what it really is, would be considered in appreciable details.

Chapter 2

What is the foundation of 'Holy War'?

Towards the paragraphs of the previous chapter, it was established that breakdown in sanitation leads to a certain kind of divine war against people. This kind of war is also referred to as 'YHWH/Yahweh war' is commonly designated as 'holy war'. This chapter begins the actual interrogation of the concept of Yahweh war of holy war which is argued in this book as a divine judgement or a punishment sanctioned by the Lord God himself.

The chapter aims at establishing that 'holy war' is still the overall motivation for the continued presence of Yahweh, the Lord God Almighty, among His people and in His dealings with creation in general. The discussions will end with implications for Christians and the larger society before a final conclusion is drawn.

'Holy War' in the OT

One subject of greatest significance to our discussion is the concept of war in the OT. Generally, all wars involving God's people come under the umbrella of a 'holy war'. Interestingly, holy war is one of the key concepts identified with the pericope (cf. Christensen 2002:542-544; Adeyemo 2006:240, 967). This section argues that 'holy war' (□□□), does not only constitute a further motivation for the instructions in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 but is rather the overall motivation for the pericope.

Without doubt, 'holy war' can be argued as the overall motivation for the call for holiness of the camp. Holy war is explicitly indicated in the text and cannot be denied as the underlying motivation for the call of the Lord God, for holiness. That is, the call for holiness of the camp by the pericope certainly lays the platform for the launch of Yahweh war, where He deals

with enemies. Moreover, when all of the identified concepts are integrated holistically, the end product of such integration is not only the provision of a deeper meaning to the text. Also, it makes 'Yahweh war' stand out as the main motivation for the holiness of the camp.

Once Christensen identifies the reason for the presence of the God Almighty, with Israel in the camp to be His preparedness to engage in war against His enemies. What this means is that the motivation goes beyond just the holiness of Yahweh, the I AM THAT I AM, who is also the Lord God Almighty. The implication is that the divine presence is motivated by another reason, and an indication that the emphasis shifts from the presence to the reason for it in the camp. It is reasonable then to argue that if the Lord's presence in the camp is to engage in a 'holy war', then the latter is the reason for the former. Be that as it may, 'holy war' obviously becomes the overall motivation of the pericope.

A 'holy war' against the enemies of the Lord God Almighty and/or His people is thus the ultimate goal for Him in the midst of the camp (Deut 23:14). This argument is premised on two particles in the text. The first is the conjunction $\square\square$, which is also a demonstrative particle, and which according to Holladay (1988:156) is used to indicate emphasis, in which case it is translated to mean 'yes' or 'indeed'. This, notwithstanding, the conjunction $\square\square$, can also be translated 'for' when it serves as a causal clause (cf. Holladay 1988:156).

The second is I which may be translated 'to' or 'for' or 'at'. In the English language, a combination of 'to' and a verb as an infinitive is an expression of purpose or intention or reason (cf. Crowther 1998). This also means that in the statement: '*For the LORD your God moves about in your camp to protect you and to deliver your enemies to you*' (Deut 23:14, my emphasis), two

particles provide reasons in the text: first, $\square\square$ emphasises the presence of the LORD; and second, I which appears after the LORD's presence is mentioned. While the first reason serves a preceding case, that is, the instructions of verses 12 and 13, the second serves for the first section of verse 14.

The immediate paragraphs reveal an interesting series of motivations. The practice of purity and sanitation of the camp and observation of hygiene by the people serve as the initial or short-term motivation for locating the latrine outside the camp. The presence of the Holy God is the motivation for the practice of purity in the form of avoiding open defecation, as a result of the use of the conjunction 'for' serving as a causal clause (cf. Holladay 1988:156). It implies that the presence of the Almighty God can also be described as the medium-term motivation. Be that as it may, 'holy war' definitely becomes the long-term or final motivation, because it is the motivation for the presence of Holy One in the camp of His congregation.

In the subsequent sections, the concept 'holy war' will require greater attention. This is necessary in order to cover areas such as the reason and the types that exist. In the end, it would be realised that the purpose of the Lord God for waging a war is His desire to execute judgement on all who disobey His laws or oppose His sovereignty.

What actually is a 'Holy war'?

Any discussions of 'holy war' will definitely cover areas such as its definition and the types, the role of the Almighty God, in such wars, that this Divine Warrior is in charge of an army and thus uses weapons, that His army has enemies (cf. Isa 13:3-5), as well as other interesting aspects of warfare. The section will conclude with the theological, socio-cultural, and political

significance of 'holy war' for Israel, the immediate recipients of the message of the text under study, and the larger society.

'Holy war' (קדש) is a term which is not explicit or distinct in Scripture (cf. Wright 2008:87; Longman III 2013:794-95), but it is usually transliterated *herem* or *cherem*, but sometimes as *kherem*. Because of the common usage of 'holy war' for 'YHWH/Yahweh war' in this book, mention is often made of them interchangeably. There appears to be some difficulty in the exact translation of this term, nevertheless Longman III (2003:62) provides the meaning in its native language as, 'the entire enemy must be killed'. The concept nevertheless represents battles in which Yahweh, the Lord God Almighty, exercises judgement on His enemies, who are also the enemies of His people. It was a remarkable element in the life of the ancient Israelites.

One of the scholars on this subject, van der Woude (1989:29), notes concerning 'holy war': 'YHWH himself acts as the warrior who comes to the aid of his followers and himself conquers the enemies' (cf. Matthews 2006:58). Then also is Domeris (1986:36-37) who does not only underscore the importance of warfare in the scheme of the Almighty God, but also singles it out as 'one of the three functions of Yahweh's Council' and it affirms His role in war. While Firestone (1996:99-123) considers the possibility of all the wars of OT Israel as 'holy', whether they are designated as 'holy war' or 'Yahweh war', though some scholars differentiate between the two (Longman III 1982:292).

Asumang's (2011:1-46) examination of the subject extends from the OT to the NT and beyond. He does not only identify the Lord God Almighty, Yahweh, as the Divine Warrior (cf. Longman III 2013:120; Matthews 2006:58) but also describes His involvement in 'holy war'. He defines 'holy war', also called

‘divine warfare’, ‘wars of Yahweh’, as a physical and/or purely metaphorical military combat that is mandated by God, and fought either by Him alone, or with or wholly through the agency of His people (2011:18). Asumang does very well with his arrangement of the types of such wars in a significant form and this will be considered in appreciable details in the next chapter.

The idea of a ‘holy war’ has a number of distinctive characteristics. For Asumang:

God is the initiator of the war, the war involves superhuman miraculous elements, the victory is assured and attributed to God, the war is regarded as part of the mission of God and so of His people, and because of its relationship to God’s mission, the concept pervaded several aspects of the life of God’s people, including the cultic, worship, and ethical dimensions (2011:19).

Asumang notes that the biblical concept of ‘holy war’, in the view of many interpreters of the OT, is not peculiar to the Israelites. He reveals that some of these interpreters have argued that the concept has some continuity with the conception of ‘holy war’ among the Ancient Near Eastern people, which also reflects the geo-political tensions of the tribes jostling for existence in the Mediterranean region. In this case, therefore, Asumang posits that there is a likelihood of commonness in the understanding of the originality of the idea.

Some scholars have gone to the extent of linking the idea of ‘holy war’ not only to the various creation stories but to other cultural issues of the Israelites as well. For instance, some major features of ‘holy war’ are believed to be ritual sanctification of the army before the war (1 Sam 13:7-12), some are believed to be offerings and liturgical rituals (11:14-5), then also, they have

some as victory celebrations with praises (18:6-7), while others are done as rituals after the war. Longman III (1982:44:290-307; 2006:20-21; 2013:118-120) identifies Israel's wars under God as sacred events. He indicates the extent to which 'holy war' can serve as a motivation for our OT text and also as God's ultimate mission in the NT.

In terms of connection, a host of scholars identify 'holy war' with the OT book of Deuteronomy. For instance, Hasel (2008:68) notes thus: 'One impetus for Deuteronomy's date, among others, revolves around the laws of warfare'. Similarly, Rast (1972:26) agrees with the view of von Rad that 'holy war' plays a central role in the ideology of Deuteronomy. Longman III and Dillard (2006:104) also assert that 'Deuteronomy, more than any other book of the Torah, prepares the nation for the wars of conquest by stipulating laws governing holy war (chap. 7, 20)'.

Firestone (1996:104) and Christensen (2002:542-543) make substantive comments on the Deuteronomy. For Firestone, 'the book of Deuteronomy represents the most fully developed and theologically 'canonised' expression of holy war in ancient Israel'. It is thus not surprising that the pentateuchal book in which our pericope resides, Deuteronomy, in the words of Firestone, 'represents the most fully developed and theologically "canonised" expression of holy war in ancient Israel'. In fact, Christensen (2002:542-543) is particularly more specific when he admits that the concept of 'holy war' is indicative of the text of Deuteronomy 23:12-14.

However, the extent to which the concept is grounded beyond the main text, the book of Deuteronomy as a whole, and even the *Torah* is not immediately known. This, notwithstanding, 'Yahweh war' is one of the three issues mentioned in connection with specific theological contexts beyond what is contained in

Deuteronomy 23:12-14 (cf. Hasel 2008:68; Rast 1972:26; Firestone 1996:104; Longman III and Dillard 2006:104). It is likely that the 'holy war' idea in this Deuteronomy text was an extension of the laws that banned the nations from entering the assembly of Israel (Deut 23:1-8).

'Holy war' is the principal undergirding concept not only for the pericope but for the book of Deuteronomy. Focusing specifically on the passage, then, its 'holy war' underpinning is reasonable. The people who emerged from Egyptian slavery and travelled through the wilderness had given way to a relatively new generation that was ready to engage in wars to conquer and settle in the Promised Land – Canaan. It was therefore necessary for Moses to recall some of their wars in order to convince this remnant generation of the involvement of the Lord God Almighty in their warfare. More importantly, it was to prepare their minds to accept the Lord's role in their battles as the only option for continued and guaranteed protection and victory over their enemies, who by human standards looked stronger than them.

Clearly, the book of Deuteronomy prepares Israel for the wars of conquest by spelling out laws of 'holy war' more than any other book of the Torah (cf. Longman III and Dillard 2006:104). This is corroborated by the comments of Earl (2009:41-62) that the concept is central to the context of the book. His view that these injunctions reflect an obedient response to the election of the Lord God Almighty and that Israel will be blessed for their obedience (ref. Deut 7:6-15) re-echoes the main objectives of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 as Israel prepared for war. The Israelites were commanded not to make treaties with the seven nations of the land, and not to intermarry with them. In fact, they were not to turn away from the Lord God Almighty (Deut 7:1-5), but to utterly annihilate the nations of the Promised Land.

Chapter Conclusion

A lot of conclusions can be drawn from our discussions at this stage. One of them is the observation that, ‘those who humble themselves and persevere in faith would come out of it transformed whereas those who would succumb to the tests and dangers might give up their faith and end up departing from the living God’ (Asumang and Domeris (2007:7). But that is not just the end of such people, for they ultimately suffer divine judgement by way of “holy war”. This brings us to a discussion of the types of “holy wars” in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

Types and Examples of 'Holy Wars'

Discussions on wars have always generated interest because of the importance attached to the reasons for these acts and their consequences. So, as might be deduced from the discussions so far, many scholars have made contributions to the subject of 'Yahweh war'/'holy wars'. Asumang (2011:19) and other scholars, for example, Madeleine and Lane (1978:270-271) and Christensen (2002:157, 542-543), have classified the major types of these wars in the Scriptures.

In the previous chapter, mention was made of the fact that Asumang has arranged the types of 'holy wars' in a significant form which will be considered in details in this chapter. His classification of these wars facilitates deeper understanding of the concept and makes great contribution to its discussion. Indeed, that of Asumang is quite extensive and better organised than the one by Longman III (1982:44:290-307; 2006:20-21; 2013:118-120), especially in view of their identification of Yahweh, the Lord God Almighty, as Warrior, and the in-depth discussion of 'holy war' they give.

The contributions of these scholars also show the extent to which the concept can serve as a motivation for our main text (Deut 23:12-14). However, the overall contribution by all of them to the direction of our arguments in this book cannot be overemphasised.

'Holy war' may be a physical battle

To begin with, Madeleine and Lane observe that 'holy war' can be revealed as a physical battle. This is where I AM, the Lord God Almighty, fights against the physical enemies of Israel. They argue that by reason of the covenant between Israel and God,

the land of the covenanted community, Canaan, became a sacred land. Consequently, any invasion of the land by any enemy was a call on the Lord to its defence, who usually brought forth His wrath against the invader.

Besides, 'once God was invested with the qualities of a warrior-god and was the principal agent in the waging of a war, His support was essential for victory' (1978:270-271). For Madeleine and Lane, the Almighty God actually fought for Israel during 'holy wars' (Exod 23:27-28), because Israel's wars were the Lord's (Exod 17:16) and their enemies were His (1978:270-271; cf. Bruce 1979:259).

Christensen is among the renowned scholars who identify Deuteronomy as containing issues of Yahweh's war, and gives the subject some attention. Unlike Asumang who classified 'holy war' into types, the significance of Christensen's work to our discussions here is that it provides specific characteristics of the concept. He reveals that the theologians of ancient Israel chose stories which were shaped in terms of specific cultic activity that focused on the figure of the Lord God Almighty as Divine Warrior to convey the mystery and demands of His holiness. Thus, he identifies the Divine Warrior with 'the God who revealed himself through Moses at Sinai' (2001:lxviii; cf. 2002:157).

Christensen (2002:CX-XII) observes that the institution of 'holy war' during the period of the tribal league in ancient Israel, 'should be distinguished from Yahweh's holy war as celebrated event in the cultus of the ritual conquest'. He notes that 'holy war' marks 'the epic journey of Israel from slavery in Egypt to freedom' in the Promised Land. For him, 'the war with Amalek is the first in a series of wars and together with Egypt's defeat at the Red Sea, forms YHWH's holy war par excellence'.

Arguing further, Christensen posits that the quotation from the *Book of the Wars of the Lord* in Numbers 21:14 presents the Divine Warrior as poised on the edge of the Promised Land, before the primary battles of the eisodus under Joshua in Cis-Jordan. He depicts Yahweh, the Lord God Almighty, as coming with His hosts to the Arnon river in Trans-Jordan, and, 'turning aside to settle affairs with Moab before marching against the two Amorite kings to the north, and then across the Jordan to Gilgal and the conquest of Canaan' (2002:CXI).

Christensen views war oracles as delivered to inspire the troops in battle, typified by those in the time of the judges and by some prophets (2002:CX-CXI). In specific reference to Yahweh's involvement in wars against physical enemies, certain phrases are employed. Christensen (2002:542) notes for example that 'YHWH "hardened" Sihon's spirit and "made obstinate his heart" is "holy war" language'. Moreover, the reference to 'when you go forth as an army camp against your enemies' according to him, probably refers to more than normal military situations, for the Israelites envisioned themselves as the 'hosts of Yahweh' with God himself as a Warrior.

Christensen also considers 'holy war' to be an expression of purity. The absolute destruction of anything that is evil, according to Christensen, is a way of expressing the meaning of holiness in relation to God himself (2002:157). The people are commanded to remove all the places of worship of other gods in the land, for they are a holy people whom the Lord God Almighty has chosen. Continuing, Christensen (2002: 542-543) notes that the language in Deuteronomy 3:6-7 is that of 'holy war' with the repetition of the phrase 'devoted to destruction'. He posits that the Israelites are the 'family property' of the Lord God Almighty, and, as such, they share in His holiness (2002:156).

Traditional 'holy war' in the life of ancient Israel, according to Christensen (2002: CX, 543-44), 'involved actual warfare against specific enemies, and was usually in a defensive situation'. It is like Israel's battle against the Canaanites. He notes however, that 'Yahweh's holy war is the ritual fusing of the events of the exodus from Egypt and the eisodus into the Promised Land in one great cultic celebration, in which the Divine Warrior marched with his hosts from Sinai to Shittim and then across the Jordan River to Gilgal, the battle camp for the conquest of Canaan'.

Christensen him, 'holy war' was not limited to the conquest period. He reveals that there were cultic re-enactments during annual pilgrimage festivals in the vicinity of Jericho in the pre-monarchy period of Israel, when the people gathered to celebrate Yahweh's holy war. Christensen (2002: 51) notes that 'all Israel, past and future would have a part in this YHWH's Holy War celebration'. He observes that such a tradition was still alive in the community at Qumran (2002: 542).

Of greater importance is Christensen's (2002: 542-543) argument that the 'holy war' concept is clearly underscored by the instructions spelt out in Deuteronomy 23:12-14. Moreover, Christensen describes the assembly of the Lord God in ancient Israel as 'a military camp in which the Divine Warrior walks in the midst of the camp to drive their enemies before them' in a holy war. He comments that Yahweh, the Lord God Almighty, as Divine Warrior, who walks in the midst of your camp depicts the sense of 'marching with his troops to battle', not that He is just 'walking about within the camp'. Indeed, His presence is the role of the Commander of an army.

'Holy war' as spiritual battle against the gods

This type of 'holy war', Asumang (2011:19) notes, is a purely cosmological spiritual combat between God and other gods, without human involvement, as expressed in the hymns of the OT (e.g., Exod 15), and where God is depicted as surrounded by armed angels, as 'the Lord of hosts' (Exod 12:41; 14:24; Deut 4:19). All idols, because they are channels of Satan and his team of demons, are included in this category of enemies.

Asumang (2007:16) notes that the Divine Warrior motif depicts God as the warlord who leads the hosts of angels to fight spiritual forces on behalf of His people. For Aboagye-Mensah, these kinds of warfare are 'reflections of larger battles on the spiritual level (2006:967; cf. Dan 10:10-21). That is to say, there is no indication of humanity involved in such wars; it is regarded as "the battle of God against the gods".

'Holy war' as spiritual battle but revealed as physical miracle

This type of 'holy war' classified by Asumang (2011:20; cf. Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967) involves limited human combat, but is still an extension of the spiritual combat waged by God, in the sense that the miraculous elements of the military combat are elaborated in the biblical account. In this type, as Asumang puts it: 'God is depicted as fighting human enemies on behalf of his people, whose role involved largely the ransacking of the defeated army and the collection of the spoils after the war, as typified by the war against Amalek (Exod 17)'.

In this battle, anytime God is brought into the picture by the raising of the staff in the hands of Moses, there is spiritual victory, and it is reflected on the ground by the Israelites defeating the Amalekites. The opposite also held true for the outcome of the same battle.

'Holy war' as physical combats involving Israel and enemies

In Asumang's classification (2011:20), this type of 'holy war' was mostly fought during the period of the judges and kings of Israel. It involved much more elaborate physical military combats against geo-political and religious enemies, but with features clearly defined as 'holy war' (Deut 32; cf. Lind 1980:32). Such military wars, according to Asumang (2011:20; cf. Deut 1:21; 3:21; 31:8), were accompanied by attempts to either seek God's mandate before the war or some indication of divine permission and justification, accompanied by encouragement not to fear the enemy.

In the context of the wilderness sojourn, any Israelite who became unclean was to go 'outside the camp'. Any uncleanness on the part of the people endangered the nation and placed people in a 'dangerous' condition, even death (Lev 15:31). This, Sprinkle (2000:642) notes, was because uncleanness defiled the dwelling place of the Lord God Almighty who was in their midst (Lev 16:16; Num 19:13, 20), as well as the land itself (Lev 18:27) and if not checked, could lead to 'holy war'.

'Holy war' as eschatological event against spiritual enemies

This type of 'holy war' is described by Asumang (2011:20-21) as a mixture of eschatological (or apocalyptic) and ethical reinterpretations of the previous three types. God is depicted as a Divine Warrior who wages war against non-aligned parties or enemies. Here, Satan and his team of demons and/or evil spirits constitute the main antagonists. Asumang posits that these enemies are ethically opposed to God. He indicates that the enemies are identified not by virtue of their wrongdoing, but principally, by their lack of allegiance to God as the Creator of the universe and everything therein, including them.

Consequently, the 'holy war' here is against such spiritual targets. Asumang notes that this type of warfare assures God's people of their impending deliverance from unethical issues that militate against them, and also vindicates them.

'Holy war' as eschatological event against ethical practices

Asumang observes what may be the last type of 'holy war', which like the previous one, is a mixture of eschatological (or apocalyptic) and ethical components. The difference, however, is that, 'the ethical dimension is considerably more emphasised than in the previous one' (2011:20-21). Unlike the fourth type, where enemies are identified by their lack of allegiance to God, he indicates that those here are enemies of God because of their lack of moral qualities such as justice, peace and righteousness.

In other words, these people are God's enemies because they disobey His moral laws. Asumang (cf. Sprinkle 2000:637-38) concludes that in this regard, sinful Israel, and specifically those in its midst who have broken the covenant, are equally God's enemies, against whom He conducts this warfare.

Since 'holy war' is one of the major concepts to be espoused by me, elucidations by Asumang on the subject are significant here. He unravels how the Israelites understood God's involvement in their daily affairs, and consequently, how He made the laws on OD as presented to them. Of much interest is the fact that the concept does not only apply to the Israelites as an OT community, but has ethical dimensions applicable to even the NT believer. This makes Asumang's work relevant not only to the understanding of the concept, but in explaining and applying it in the NT context.

The 'holy war' concept might have surfaced in Israel during the exodus to the Promised Land. This is in line with the position

of Madeleine and Lane (1978:270) that until the time of David's "United Kingdom" of Israel, the Israelites waged war under the concept of 'holy war'. They disclose that Israel's war concept was dependent on the Hebrew understanding of one of the attributes of the Lord God Almighty, Yahweh, that He was a God of war.

This is probably reflected in their song phrase 'the LORD is a man of war' (Exod 15:3), that is, He will do battle for them and lead them to victory. They note that the Almighty graciously chose Israel as His people, and they in turn freely covenanted with Him to serve Him. So He became their God, a tribal God, theirs alone. For His part, God declared to be an enemy to their enemies (Exod 23:22; cf. 17:16; Num 31:3).

Chapter Conclusion

As the Creator of the universe, God has the sole right to declare war on nations that indulge in unacceptable forms of worship (Deut 32:16-17). So He decides to wipe them away. In such a situation, as Asumang (2011:20) observes, 'God is depicted as fighting His enemies on behalf of his people' in a 'holy war'. The chapter has considered this concept and the different nuances that exist. In all these cases, whether the enemies are the surrounding idolatrous nations or rebellious Israel, there are some conditions to be met as indicated in Deuteronomy 23:12-14, where strict obedience to sanitation of the camp was necessary.

Chapter 4

Yahweh as Commander-in-Chief in 'Holy War'

The preceding chapter reveals a lot about 'holy war'. Not only is it a defining factor in the whole concept of warfare in Israel, the pericope under discussion also reveals lots of interesting issues concerning the role of God, the Mighty Warrior, in 'holy war', which need exploration. So, the discussion in this chapter is more of a continuation of the previous one. A couple of titles of God that can be deduced from the passage describe His military functions. For example, Yahweh, the Lord God Almighty, is revealed as both the 'Defender' and 'Attacker'. Here, Israel as His people, are regarded as the weaker party at war with their enemies, who are the nations in the Promised Land and its surroundings, constituting the stronger party (cf. Deut 7:17).

Matthews (2006:58) explains: 'In these battles it is God's intervention not the strength of the Israelite tribes, which determines the outcome' (cf. Longman III 2013:118-120). It also depicts the Lord God Almighty as being both on defensive and offensive. Here, the Almighty God engages in the dual mission of defending Israel against their enemies as well as attacking the enemies to conquer and hand them over to Israel (Deut 7:23-24). As was observed in the previous chapter, there are many passages that reiterate the fact that it is Yahweh who is Commander-in-Chief in a 'holy war' (cf. Deut 1:29; 3:22; 7:18-21; Exod 23:27-28), a title we proceed to explore.

Yahweh's role in 'Holy war'

Every Commander-in-Chief in a war has general oversight responsibility not only over the soldiers at the battlefield but also

over the military camp and all other activities therein. Similarly, the understanding of the rhetorical devices to a camp setting such as that of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 is beneficial in helping to define the role of God in 'Holy war'. Due to Israel's preparation to conquer the Promised Land, to imagine Yahweh 'walking in their military camp' is a carefully chosen metaphor to first of all create an impression of responsibility on the part of Yahweh in the minds of the covenant community and elicit positive responses from them (cf. Christensen 2002:542-543). As expected of the Sinaitic covenant, Yahweh's faithfulness would be demonstrated by; a) protecting, and, b) granting them victory in their battles (cf. Deut 20:4; Exod 23:20-30; Josh 5:13-15).

As the Commander-in-Chief (cf. Longman III 2013:120; Wright 2008:87), He is the one who 'commands his people to go to war' (Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967-68). It is no wonder that Yahweh is metaphorically portrayed as a Warrior who leads His army to the battlefield and also fights for them (Deut 20:4; Exod 23:20-30; 1 Sam 17:45; cf. Asumang 2011:1-46; Matthews 2006:58). Christensen (2002:543) argues along similar lines: that Yahweh 'walks in the midst of your camp' is presented in the sense of marching with His troops to battle, not that He was 'walking about within the camp' aimlessly.

Undoubtedly, 'walking in the midst of the military camp' is one of the best practices expected of any military highest command during warfare. During such periods, the military high command would move within the camp, not only as part of its surveillance strategies to execute its duties, but also for various operational purposes. In the case of the Divine Warrior, the operational purposes would include:

- instilling in His army obedience to the rules of military engagement (cf. Deut 20:1-9; Josh 5:13-15).

- Inspecting the military parade in order to ensure that there is no immoral person, that is, law-breaker among them, and if so to deal with such a one (cf. Josh 7).
- Issuing specific strategic and cutting-edge instructions for the battles ahead (cf. Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967) such as when, where, and how to attack (cf. Deut 20:10-12; Josh 6:2-5; 8:2), and whom to attack (cf. Deut 20:13-18; Num 31:1-3).
- Encouraging and inspiring the troops through delivery of war oracles, as the judges and some prophets used to do (cf. Christensen 2002:CX-CXI), and also boosting their confidence by impressing upon them never to fear, as Asumang (2011:20) observes.
- Checking their combat readiness of the army. For soldiers who are combat-ready, the presence of the Commander-in-Chief to lead His troops to the battlefield will obviously serve as the needed inspiration to conquer. For Israel, 'Yahweh's support was essential for victory' (Madeleine and Lane 1978:270-271).
- Instructing them to pray, and as Aboagye-Mensah (2006:967) notes, 'to be spiritually in tune with him (Exod 17:8-13)'.
- Making 'his presence and Name' (cf. Exod 23:20-22) terrify the opponents of His army (cf. Exod 23:27).
- Issuing the command for His people to either 'move to the battlefield or not', as Longman III (2013:794) rightly notes: 'God tells Israel when to go to war. Israel's leaders cannot engage in a battle without first hearing from God'.
- Assuring them of His promise: 'I will walk among you and be your God, and you will be my people (Lev 26:12).

Along this same line, Adeyemo (2006:967) reveals that God's involvement in the struggles of His people went beyond merely giving them strategies and the strength to use physical weapons. He also required them to pray and to be spiritually in tune with Him (Exod 17:8–13).

Of additional interest is Yahweh's involvement in Israel's wars, not only in the capacity of Commander-in-Chief of His army, but also to offer security and guidance as part of the duties in a 'husband-wife' relationship. The Lord performed this domestic role as a husband during Israel's exodus, a fact stated by Longman III: 'He leads them safely out of Egypt, through the wilderness, and on to victory in battle' (2013:251). Thus, in the congregational/military camp His presence was also to satisfy His marital obligations.

Moving on, the phrase 'He (should) not see' depicts another aspect of the rhetorical intentions. It identifies the Almighty as actively observant of whatever happens in His presence or before Him and portrays Him as virtually possessing eyes (cf. 2 Chr 16:9). Also, the phrase, 'and turn away from you' indicates a departure of the 'presence' of Yahweh. This action is described metaphorically: 'the LORD will turn [or move away] from you'. In a sense, it means 'the LORD will turn against them'.

In effect, the Commander-in-Chief *cum* Inspector would punish them not only by refusing to lead them in their battles, but could also engage in a war against His own people. Such an action is a demonstration of displeasure, and the picture is calculated to drive home the implications of Israel's failure to comply with the divine instructions. The consequences of defiling the camp would be the departure of the divine presence, which would lead to Israel's defeat in battles, until the sin had been purged (Num 25:1-8; Josh 7:12; cf. Briley 2000:100).

Overall, the Lord God Almighty symbolically performs the role expected of Him as the Chief Defender and/or Protector of Israel by checking the military posts and all borders to ensure that all intrusions are dealt with. This portrays the Lord's real position as the ultimate territorial defender of the whole of Israel, and specifically the army against any foreign invasion. In the event of any attack, He will move in to save Israel from their enemies.

Yahweh's army in 'Holy war'

A consideration of who constitutes the Lord's army is significant here, since the stipulation touches specifically on warfare. As the Lord of hosts, a title that underlines His warrior function (cf. Domeris 1986:38), and which is recorded about 282 times in the Scriptures (Sumrall 1982:150), the Almighty God commands an innumerable number of spiritual and astral forces (Josh 10:11; Judg 5:20; 1 Sam 17:45). These constitute part of His supernatural or 'superhuman miraculous elements' in war (Asumang 2011:19).

Scripture testifies of angelic forces that are organised under specific agents. Michael, who is mentioned twice in the book of Daniel, is not only recognised as a great prince (12:1), but also as one of the chief princes (10:13), a description that presupposes that there are a number of angels who probably perform similar functions. Tobit (5:4-12:21) also mentions the angel Raphael, who served as a companion and protector to Tobias. In 2 Maccabees 15:23, Judas is on record to have prayed to the Lord God Almighty thus: 'Send your good angel to make our enemies shake and tremble with fear' (GNB).

Still in Daniel Chapter 10, mention is made of a spiritual figure that touched the prophet Daniel by hand in a vision. This

figure revealed how as a messenger of the Lord God Almighty, he had been detained by the prince of Persia until help from the Chief Prince, Michael, enabled him to reach Daniel with the message. This same figure intimated to the prophet how after the delivery of his message he would return and engage the prince of Persia in a further fight (vv. 10-20).

This also shows that divine forces are involved in a war (Isa 13:3) and gives an indication of who the hosts of the Divine Warrior are. It confirms that 'holy war' is a spiritual and also a physical combat, as Aboagye-Mensah (2006:967-68) and Asumang (2011:1-46) notes, respectively. Spiritually, it is against demonic powers, and physically, the breakers of the Lord's laws.

The physical army of the Lord is His team of executioners who possess weapons to punish His enemies or deal with all forms of opposition. Specifically described as His warriors (Judg 5:10) and His armies (1 Sam 17:45), it is the men of fighting age that formed the army. The army of Israel was 'a volunteer military force or warriors, men of twenty years and older from all the tribes, clans and families' (Longman III 2013:118-120), that constituted a special unit and fought for the whole community of Israel (Josh 1:14; cf. 4:13).

To a greater extent, however, Israel as a nation entirely belonged to Yahweh, the Lord God, and wholly (that is, all of them together: men, women, old young, children) constituted His army (Exod 13:18). As Madeleine and Lane (1978:270-271) note, 'the whole nation of Israel was regarded as an army'. According to these scholars, the whole nation of Israel was regarded as God's army or executioners ('host'; Exod 6:26; 12:17, cf. Longman III 2003:62). Hence God is described as the 'God of hosts', the God of Israel in His 'war-god' character (Exod 15:3).

Not only was the nation God's army, they are portrayed as

playing, in effect, the role of priests, that of 'holy persons' in the service of the Lord God Almighty during the war (Madeleine and Lane 1978:270-271; cf. Sprinkle 2000:642). Thus, in reference to Deuteronomy 23:12-14, the 'priest' needed to ensure the purity that the camp deserved, by keeping it free of excrement. Madeleine and Lane's identification of Israel as God's army is essential for the study of the text which identifies Israel as an army in a camp.

Besides, Israelite soldiers are portrayed as playing a priestly role or that of 'holy persons' in Yahweh's service for the duration of the war, or the army could be represented by the priests who would perform divine functions on behalf of the people at the battlefield (Madeleine and Lane 1978:270-271). Yet, the priests were responsible for addressing the nation prior to a battle and leading the battle procession in connection with the Ark of the Covenant (Josh 6:4, 9). In accordance with the covenant regulations, the call to war was given by the sound of trumpet throughout the camp (Judg 3:27; 6:34; 1 Sam 13:3; 2 Sam 15:10; 20:1; Num 10:2) by the priests (2 Chr 13:12-16; 1 Macc 4:40; 16:8).

The Commander-in-Chief of any army has the responsibility of leading them to discharge their military duties, and the choice of who constitutes the army is his/her prerogative. Similarly, the Holy One reserves the right to select any preferred nations or groups of people as His army to execute judgement or engage in a 'holy war' against another nation, including His own sinful people (cf. Longman III 2013:795). Interestingly then, Israel is not always the army of the Lord God Almighty; sometimes they are rather the enemies.

This was the case when the Almighty God wanted to punish Judah, representing the Southern Kingdom of the divided nation

of Israel, for straying from His covenant stipulations (2 Chr 36:15-17; Jer 44:1-14; Hab 1:5-11). Such a move was, however, not only against Israel, He could use any nation as His army or tool to punish another, as was declared through Isaiah about Assyria (10:7-13), Obadiah about Edom (1:1-21), and Nahum about Nineveh (1-3).

Yahweh's arms in 'Holy war'

There is no war without weapons and no army without arms and armour. One can therefore not deny that implied in Deuteronomy 23:14 are some weapons of war. The weapons that the Lord God Almighty would apply during a 'holy war' would be of some interest here. As indicated earlier, there are divine as well as human weapons for the Divine Warrior and His divine forces and the Israelite army respectively. Scripture is replete with them. Longman III (2013:118-120; cf. Borowski 2003:36; Matthews 2006:43, 58-62) describes a couple of the weapons.

From the Pentateuch to other parts of the HB, various divine weapons are used for defensive purposes, some of which Longman III (2013:118-120) discusses: the sword (Hb *khereb*, Gen 3:24); the shield (Hb *magen*, Gen 15:1; cf. Psa 91:5-6); the pillar of cloud and pillar of fire (Exod 14:13-25); to mention a few. Blood, the life medium of many animals including man, is not only a physical defensive fluid that protects and defends them from pathogens, but also a weapon in divine warfare.

The 'blood of the lamb' was applied this way by the whole community of Israel to protect and defend them during their deliverance in Egypt, and served as the climax of the Passover ritual (Exod 12:1-51; cf. Isa 31:5). Touching on blood, Owiredu (2005:22-23; 133-135) throws light on the Jewish 'symbolic view of blood as life' which made it a dominant symbol in keeping

them alive. He notes, 'blood gives life when in the body, but it does not change when it moves outside the body'.

Some divine weapons are mentioned in Deuteronomy (7:20; 28:38; 32:22, 24, 41-42; 33:29). Sometimes, the weapon is quite mysterious, in that it cannot be defined. Scripture tells how I AM, the Lord God Almighty, struck down with death all the firstborn of Egypt, from those of animals to those of men, including the firstborn of Pharaoh (Exod 11:4-8, 12:12-13, 29-30), but no weapon is mentioned.

There are divine weapons that are also used figuratively. One weapon of interest is 'fire' (Hb אֵשׁ, *esh*). Fire is not just associated with the presence of Yahweh in Deuteronomy (4:36, 39; cf. Exod 3:2; 19:18; Judg 13:18-21; 1 Kgs 18:38), as Macdonald (2006:212-14) also states, but is used most often as a weapon of offence. In its occurrences in the OT, this noun is usually rendered 'fire', or occasionally, 'flames', even if it is obvious that it is a divine fire when it accompanies theophany (Exod 19:18; Psa 50:3; cf. Strong's database no. 784; Aune 1998:1066).

The connection between 'fire' as weapon, which was common in the OT and early Judaism (Aune 1998:1066), and our pericope lies in the realisation that this weapon was not only sent down by the Lord God Almighty to consume His enemies, but also represents the Almighty God. For instance, the consuming fire descended on a couple of occasions to defend and defeat the enemies of the Lord God (2 Kgs 1:10-14; Psa 18:8-14). But the Almighty God himself is sometimes identified as a 'consuming fire' as found in Deuteronomy 4:24; 9:3.

In Deuteronomy 9:3, it text reads: 'The LORD your God is passing over before you, a consuming fire'. In terms of relevance, though no particular weapon is mentioned in connection with the

'holy war' in Deuteronomy 23:14, the 'Consuming fire' himself is the only One who is believed to be in the camp to fight for His people. Of additional importance is the indication of 'fire' as a weapon which is also featured in the apocalyptic war of the NT.

Chapter Conclusion

It has been discussed in this chapter that Yahweh, the God of Israel, reserves the right to marshal all the aforementioned divine and human armies, imaginable and unimaginable, and unlimited weapons to engage in a war, because all these are subject to His will. My interest in 'holy war' is not only because it is a major concept that underlies Deuteronomy 23:12-14, but also because it is the functional reason for the presence of the Lord God and the overall motivation for the given regulation. Beyond this, however, it would be interesting to find out what enemies are His targets. This is the subject of the following section.

Chapter 5

Is 'Holy war' connected to Physical battles?

A major area of any discussion concerning 'Yahweh/holy war' as an act of divine judgement is to explain it not in terms of spiritual warfare alone but also as physical battles which involve weapons. This is in the light of the universal mission of God which relates to the issue of 'holy war'. The theological and moral dimensions of 'holy war', which arguably stands out as one of the means to fulfil His overall mission of creation, have engaged the attention of scholars over many centuries. This is agreed by Augustine (V.22, 216, 217) who notes how wars in general owe their existence to the will of God and serve a divinely appointed purpose such that even the durations of wars are dictated by Him.

However, if the Lord's objective for the law of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 is misconstrued, some people may always employ physical war or violence in dealing with their enemies. Obviously, God did not intend the regulation to be a rule to merely engage in wars. Nevertheless, based on the fact that it is also God who sanctions 'holy wars' (Num 14:39-45; 1 Kgs 12:21-24; cf. Asumang 2011:19; Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967-68; Domeris 1986:35-37; Poythress 1995:142; Kunhiyop 2008:115), it is imperative to examine how the concepts of 'holy war', especially in its physical form, applies meaningfully and practically to current life situations.

'Holy war' as a combat to deal with physical enemies

In Asumang's (2011:20) classification, 'holy war' is seen as a combat that also involves efforts calculated to deal with

physical enemies. Indeed, engagements in physical wars have been part of the world's system of operation since creation. The commonly observed reasons for such wars are that they are a part of people's service to their nation, when they are called to lay down their lives to defend its peace and protect its citizens. While for power-seekers the reasons are usually political, however, many of them happen to come in the colours of ethnicity and religious faith.

Yet still, some people proclaim themselves as 'saviours', and resort to war if they perceive that they and/or their society is being cheated in any way or deprived of the needed freedom. In some cases, there are those who do so just to take advantage of innocent people and rob them of their properties and peace. The extreme forms of such wars are the situations where 'terrorists' - groups of people whose method of war is indiscriminate attack and the use extreme violence as a way of instilling fear in order to achieve their aim - often take to arms as a retaliatory action, which they often consider as retributive justice.

Besides these, some people engage in physical wars for unknown reasons. Fortunately, or unfortunately, the world continues to witness such wars which are just as in the biblical times. Weeks (2010:10) provides the statistics of physical war over the six millennia of human history. He notes down as many as 14,000 major armed conflicts in the civilised world alone with the death toll of about 21 million persons during World War I (1914-1918) and 50 million persons during World War II (1939-1945).

However, while underscoring the moral underpinnings of warfare in the NT in general one wonders whether the extensive occurrence of physical weapons of war in the NT does not also underscore the importance of physical violence in the NT context.

The reason is that lots of physical weapons are mentioned in the NT, some of which are discussed by Longman III (2013:118-120). Jesus himself referred to one of such weapons of war (Matt 10:34) and had others connected to His earthly ministry.

Sword (Gk μαχαιρα, *machaira*) is one of the weapons wielded by the mob that came to arrest Jesus (Matt 26:47, 55; Mark 14:48), as well as the weapon used by Peter to cut off Malchus' ear (John 18:10). Jesus referred to the sword as a weapon of war (Matt 10:34). The longer swords, usually referred to in the Greek NT as *Rhomphaia*, describes the type which is generally worn over one's shoulder (Rev 1:16; 6:8; 19:21). Another weapon is the spear (Gk longche, *longche*), which occurs only once, referring to the weapon used to pierce Jesus' side at his crucifixion (John 19:34). Also, θυρεος (*thyreos*), in the Greek NT, is the LXX rendition of the Hebrew, tsinnah (*tsinnah*), for shield.

These references to weapons not only indicate the emphasis on the concept of 'holy war' in the NT, but that physical battles would be a feature of the NT. Moreover, a reasonable expectation of God's promise of deliverance at any future time is that it would be a continuation of the OT pattern of deliverance where attention was on engaging battles with human enemies by mostly physical weapons. However, there are indications that the extent of application of such weapons in the OT for violent overthrow, military engagements, and other brutalities to establish divine purposes is not wholly encouraged in the NT. Clearly, there is a shift of emphasis from human battles which were quite common in the OT to spiritual warfare, and this also defines the mission of the NT.

Holy war is not violent retaliation, aggression, and human war

Whatever motivates these wars; whether ethnic, political, religious, and so forth, and in whatever magnitude they assume, whether they involve only words or simple weapons such as clubs or cutlasses or sophisticated ones such as guns, atomic, biological, chemical and nuclear, the fundamental question is whether there are any theological, moral, and socio-cultural justifications for modern physical wars? Moreover, since physical wars are likely to continue as long as life on earth goes on. Hence, this begs the composite question: how should 'holy war' be differentiated from any other war, and how should the concept be interpreted, most especially in the light of the 'just war' tradition/theory and contemporary war challenges?

At this juncture, then, the question is how does the NT reconcile the 'holy war' and peace missions of Jesus? Our interest in the justifications for modern physical wars has a strong foundation. It is premised in Aboagye-Mensah's (2006:967-68; cf. Kunhiyop 2008:115) quest for an answer as to whether Jesus' words to Peter (Matt 26:52) and Pilate (John 18:36) mean that 'pacifism should be the only option for Christians' under circumstances of violence. That is, if the Christian should respond to any violent abuses at all, then to what extent should it be? As the 'light and salt of the world' (Matt 5:13-16), Christians in particular have a duty to address the question of whether the use of violence and war as a means of resolving conflicts is ethical/moral.

Thus, the book is directing focus on the lessons the contemporary Christian world can learn from Deuteronomy 23:12-14 in relation to violent retaliation, aggression, and in the extreme, war. Our plan is to evaluate wars in the light of their theological, moral, and socio-cultural significance, and narrow our focus on the implications to state military service and

individual self-defence. The motivation is the obligation placed on Bible believers to be responsive to the state of wars today.

An interesting aspect of 'holy war' is where as God of hosts (Exod 6:26; 12:17), Yahweh employs human instrumentality to execute His purposes (cf. Madeleine and Lane 1978:270-271; Longman III 2003:62). This is where international bodies, state authorities, and people groups engage in wars in the hope of fulfilling their mandate as peace-makers. Along this line, there are those who argue that efforts to eliminate war adventurists like 'terrorists' and other warmongers such as mentioned earlier constitute a 'holy war', since such moves are calculated to destroy enemies of peace and progress. Packer (2002:45-49) and Galli (2001:24-27) are examples of those who defend such action.

However, the positions of people differ depending on where one draws the line between the moral and immoral objectives for such actions. For, as O'Donovan (2003:16) argues:

It is better for practical reasons, perhaps, not to try to be too clear about precisely where 'peace' ends and 'war' begins, or to mark where moral rules 'towards' war end and moral rules 'in' war take over. For the principles of judgment that divide responsible action from irresponsible, charitable action from uncharitable, disciplined from undisciplined, are very much the same.

Faced with the current challenges of war, there is the need for some policies that will constitute the lines drawn between the moral and immoral objectives of war and bodies that will also regulate such policies, without leaving decisions to people's guesses. As Plato suggested, war should not be left unregulated, but there should be some way to subject it to rules (Weeks

2010:18). This is where the foundation and principles of the 'just war' tradition become significant.

From 'Holy war' to 'Just war'

The connection between 'holy war' and the 'just war' tradition is neither new nor strange. The "just war" tradition, a somewhat acceptable position between pacifism and realism' (Lee 2007:4), has existed from antiquity. Mattox (2006:1-2) also argues that the 'just war' tradition is ancient. For example, he mentions names such as Plato, who even cites Socrates, then also are people like Xenophon, Euripides, Polybus, and many other philosophers, historians, and playwrights who were mainly concerned with the way in which wars could be initiated or prosecuted justifiably.

It is likely that before the Christian era, the concept of OT 'holy wars' had assumed a new face, the 'just war', as the principles undergirding the wars began to gain wider interest. This is especially in the light of the moral teachings of the then existing superpowers, i.e., the Greeks and the Romans (Stott 1990:87). And it continued into and even beyond NT days.

However, Augustine is traditionally and regularly regarded generally as the 'father of just war theory in the West' or more particularly as the 'father of *Christian* just war doctrine' (Mattox (2006:1-2). It is he who is often credited with Christianising the notion of 'just war', though Thomas Aquinas organised the concept centuries later, with the final contribution from Francisco de Vitoria (Stott 1990:87). The ascription to Augustine, according to Mattox (2006:2), is because 'the whole Western just-war tradition that follows from the fifth century AD on, in both its Christian and secular varieties, traces its roots not to Plato or

Aristotle, nor even to earlier Church Fathers, but rather to Augustine’.

Indeed, we owe Augustine credit for the preservation of many of Cicero’s statements on ‘just war’. Second is Ambrose (AD 340–97), a Roman governor of northern Italy, who was later proclaimed Bishop of Milan by acclamation while a catechumen and also acknowledged as Augustine’s mentor (Mattox 2006:8–11). But the hallmarks of the ‘just-war’ discourse, according to Dougherty (1984:39) ‘are [more] perspicuous in the works of Cicero than they are in Ambrose’.

The foregone positions, notwithstanding, there are other scholars also have their positions. For example, while Lenihan (1995:15) mentions Aristotle as the earliest recorded Western source to use ‘just war’, the issue is not about the first contact with the concept, ‘but certainly the one whose contact with it, unlike all those who came before him, made a lasting impression upon the entire subsequent development of the Western world’ (Mattox 2006:2).

The ‘Just war’ Policy

The policy that governs the ‘just war’ is a set of principles that have to be satisfied when nation-states or world authorities are making any case for/or against military interventions; they are principles to be followed in order for an action of war to be justified (cf. Bell Jr 2009:74). It is the reliability of the ‘just war’ heuristic that makes it ‘the last best hope for meeting the contemporary challenges to the ethics of warfare’ (Lee 2007:6).

Admittedly, the fundamental principles of the ‘just war’ tradition, at least, offer elaborate propositions, not only to distinguish, but to also pursue, genuine wars from the others. However, such positive and active steps towards physical war are

not without opposition. War pacifists argue that the teachings of Jesus commit Christians 'to the way of non-resistance and non-violence' and thus they are 'not to resist an evil person', for his life exemplified these features (Stott 1990:87). The positions of Volf (1996:290-95) and Yoder (1975:193-214) follow this line of argument.

The 'just war' policy is portrayed by Murnion to be a series of paradigm shifts beginning from 'the divine law approach of Augustine, to the natural law approach of Aquinas, to the law of nations approach of Vitoria and Grotius, to the contemporary international law approach' (Lee 2007:6). Augustine is observed to have developed his ideas on 'just war' from the works of two men. First is Cicero (106–43 BC), a man he described as one 'among the most learned and eloquent of all mankind' (Augustine XXII.6).

Interestingly, Miller (1964:255) argues that Augustine himself did not intend to formulate 'legal rules for regulating war' and that his doctrine did not 'pretend to lay down principles for the law of nations'. Rather, that his doctrine was intended merely to be 'a workable ethical guide for the practising Christian who also had to render unto Caesar his services as a soldier'. However, Bainton (1960:95) disagrees and refers to Augustine's 'just war' statements as Augustine's 'code of war'.

For Mattox (2006:Preface), the 'just war' theory argued by Augustine is a 'double juxtaposition'. He explains this as follows: 'the voices which decry the evils of war are the same voices which admit with resignation that war seems to be a permanent fixture in the present order of human existence; the voices wishing war away at the same time acknowledge the seeming futility of the wish'.

As public policy, the 'just war' tradition 'thinks primarily in terms of the laws and rules that do and/or should regulate the behaviour of modern-nation states in war' (cf. Bell Jr 2009:74). Considering most wars 'as acts of mere "brigandage," that established grounds for empty, meaningless heroics', Augustine hoped the advent of Christianity would rather change this attitude (Weeks 2010:15). Therefore, it is by way of addressing the violence of war that his submissions on 'just-war' have often been organised under two, but sometimes more, headings that correspond to the traditionally accepted principles of the 'just war' theory.

How justified is the concept of 'Just War'?

Mattox (2006:8-11; Lee 2007:3-19; Weeks 2010:7-37; Stott 1990:86-91) lists the dimensions for the two traditional major headings: *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*. The first, *jus ad bellum*, or 'the justice of war', specifies principles which define the right of one sovereign power to engage in a violent action against another. It is defined by specific moral principles which are: just cause, comparative justice, right intention, competent authority, public declaration, reasonable probability of success, proportionality, and peace, which is regarded as the ultimate objective of war.

The second, *jus in bello* or 'justice in war', specifies the limits of morally acceptable conduct in the actual prosecution of a war. It is in support of the claim that 'it is not permitted to employ unjust means in order to win even a just war'. It is usually represented by principles of proportionality and discrimination.

However, laws and rules alone cannot guarantee justice. No wonder, Yoder (1975:207) describes the doctrine of the 'just war' as 'not too successful an attempt to apply some of the logic

of violence that pertain to, say the police or military authority, to the wider arena of war'. For him, 'there is some logic to the 'just war' pattern of thought but very little realism'. Thus, he puts as a footnote:

The use of the term 'just war' has become unpopular in many circles since Hiroshima; but the logic it refers to is still the only serious way of dealing with the moral problem of war apart from pacifism. Even many who call themselves pacifist are in fact still using 'just war' reasoning (1975:207).

In other words, we should be able to distinguish genuine wars which require employment of the 'just war' policies from the mischievous ones. The reason is that any violence by way of war might lead to hatred and produce other forms of violence by way of retaliation. For instance, will God condemn the elimination of hardened individuals or terrorists whose definite intention is destruction of life as revenge? Packer (2002:45-49) describes the actions of terrorists thus:

They act out their self-justifying heartsickness in a way that matches Cain killing Abel. They see themselves as clever heroes, outsmarting their inferiors by concealing their real purpose and by overthrowing things they say are contemptible. So their morale is high, and conscience does not trouble them. Gleeful triumphalism drives terrorists on; they are sure they cannot lose.

Accordingly, should the state be obeyed for any killings or wars that it decides to engage in because it is an institution of God? The answer, certainly, is no, since the morality for the actions of a divinely mandated institution has to be ascertained

and accredited. While we must accept the will of God in matters of war, since He is the One who ordains and justifies war (cf. Augustine VII.30, 291, 292; Kunhiyop 2008:115; Asumang 2011:19; Domeris 1986:35-37; Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967-68; Poythress 1995:142), each war situation should be looked at in the context of its merits and demerits.

It is difficult to make any hard and fast rule or provide a yes or no answer to every physical war. As Stiltner (2010:255) rightly points out, 'one of the great weaknesses of the theory is the way that anyone can use it rhetorically to rationalise any result that he or she wants'. Bell Jr (2009:90-94) describes three scenarios where Just War policies can be used wrongly:

- a) Just war 'with no teeth' which is a situation when people pay mere lip service to the tradition's demands;
- b) Just war 'with a few teeth pulled', a situation when people just pick and choose among the criteria; and
- c) Just war 'with too many teeth, that is, when the checklist is interpreted so rigidly that no war can be justified.

As Augustine rightly argued, 'such detestable emotions as the "love of violence", "fierce and implacable enmity", "the lust for power", "revengeful cruelty" or "wild resistance" can never in and of themselves count as appropriate justifications for the resort to war, the righteous intention to punish these evils can' (Mattox 2006:47). So, he interpreted just war as 'a 'harsh kindness' that can be a service of love to others and to the common good' (Bell Jr 2009:31).

In this light, the definition of 'just war' as a Christian discipline, and for that matter, 'an expression of the character of the Christian community' (Bell Jr 2009:74), is most appropriate. That is, in agreement with Bell Jr, 'just war' should be understood as a demanding discipline and a form of witness rooted in

community, character, and spirituality'. Accepting 'just war' as Christian discipleship makes its policy criteria, 'adequate to the task of appropriately guiding our disposition toward entering into war' (Bell Jr (2009:89).

The Church must be able, as Yoder 1975:208) puts it, to 'judge and measure the extent to which a government is accomplishing its ministry, by asking namely whether it persistently attends to the rewarding of good and evil according to their merits'. This is irrespective of whether that state is regarded as pagan/secular as Yoder (1975:195) may want to describe the one in Paul's picture of Romans 13, or Christian as some people may want to label other governments. The Christian community should usually regard 'just war' as a product of 'its fundamental confessions, convictions, and practices; and an extension of its consistent day-to-day life and work on behalf of justice and love of neighbour (even enemies) in the time and realm of war' (Bell Jr 2009:74).

In this way, justice becomes an irreplaceable moral requirement for any decision by state authorities to apply force by way of war. In this light, the principles of justice, particularly, *just cause, comparative justice, and right intention*, in the 'just war' theory (cf. Mattox 2006:8-9) which Stott (1990:86-91) describes as 'righteous cause', are justified. Even pacifists like Miroslav Volf thinks that we must search for terrorists and 'in a carefully qualified sense, bring those people to justice' (Carnes 2001:22).

Additionally, the social implications such as public declaration of intent cannot be overlooked. The final moral principle, the reasonable probability of success of the war, should be able to guarantee peace as the ultimate objective of war. By way of a one sentence definition, Stott (1990:88) puts it

this way: 'A "just war" is one fought for a righteous cause, by controlled means, and with a reasonable expectation of success'".

Within the war dimensions as discussed above, it is hard not to agree with Aboagye-Mensah (2006:967-68) that 'the state may sometimes legitimately use force or wage war in order to protect its citizens and maintain peace'. Thus, as to whether 'holy war' as a physical event in the contemporary world is justified or not, the answer is both yes and no. Violent retaliation and physical wars are not justifiable means to solving conflicts, and such issues require much circumspection. Nevertheless, since wars are sanctioned by God to satisfy His purpose of bringing security and peace to His people, and ultimately the removal of evil people from society, such a war may be engaged in to fulfil His will for justice.

Packer's discussion of the views of two twentieth century Christian leaders, Oswald Chambers and C S Lewis, on physical war shows that both agree that it is one of life's unfortunate challenges which must be faced. No physical war is desirable, as Packer (2002:45-49) states, 'because God overrules a thing and brings good out of it does not mean that the thing itself is a good thing'. However, he adds that sometimes God, by way of war, 'puts his people through pain for their spiritual progress'.

In Packer's quote of Lewis, he notes: 'War makes death real to us; and that would have been regarded as one of its blessings by most of the great Christians of the past'. Packer notes Lewis's statement that despite the threat of war, 'we should let God-given-life' continue not forgetting that 'God is in charge' (Rom 8:28). Both leaders agree that war 'will not destroy the faith of real believers and will under God produce a measure

of realism about life, death, and the issues of eternity that was not there before’.

Chapter Conclusion

We can conclude this section on the note that not all physical wars are, after all, evil (cf. Packer 2002:45-49) since there is a divine hand in some wars (cf. Augustine V.22, 216, 217). However, we must admit, as Egan and Rakoczy (2011:45) rightly note, that there is need ‘to go beyond vague just war theories and emphasize the need for close, critical examination of acts, intentions, consequences and notions of the common good, to give just war theory greater moral “flesh” if we are to achieve a useful contemporary understanding of just war doctrine’.

We have to be extra sensitive in applying the rules of divine justice to achieve human justice else we step beyond the prescribed boundaries. It is on this foundation that the services of people who are under authority and committed to states’ defence system should be evaluated, as the subsequent section elucidates.

Chapter 6

Some experiences of 'Holy War' in the OT period

It has emerged from some of the previous discussions that all the identified concepts of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 interact not as a chain, but rather as a web, to ensure both the holiness of the camp and set up the stage for God to fight His enemies. 'Holy war' thus becomes the main reason for the presence of the Lord God in the camp of His people and the overall motivation from the integration of the sanitation law.

This chapter examines the idea of 'holy war' as a means of divine judgement against those who oppose God's will, purposes or instructions. It will show that the concept of 'holy war' has been running throughout the Scriptures and is a current feature in God's dealing with humanity.

Dealing with the fundamental questions

To achieve our aim for the current discussions, some specific questions need consideration. First, what universal truth does our OT passage expound about God's expectation of His people in terms of handling their human waste or faecal matter in the light of His requirement for holiness/purity? Specifically, how does this expectation to deal with open defecation connect with sanitation or environmental cleanliness and matters of health, particularly preventive medicine, in the light of the 'name' and 'place' theology concepts? And what does Deuteronomy 23:12-14 reveal about the relationship between God and creation with emphasis on humanity?

At this juncture, it is pertinent to lay the foundation for answering the above questions. At least, one significant

deduction that can be made is that obedience to the stipulations of the passage will inure to the benefit of the people such as God's unfailing presence and assurance of full protection from their enemies. On the contrary, the failure of God's people to observe acceptable hygienic and sanitary practices as stipulated in the text can compromise the holiness of the camp leading to undesirable consequences.

This is also argued by Douglas (2002:50) who points to the universe as a place where people prosper by conforming to holiness and perish when they deviate from it. She notes that since the opposite of blessings is cursing where God's blessing is withdrawn, it is the power of the curse which is unleashed. It can be generalised then, that any form of sanitary impropriety would be expected to be repudiated by God, and very likely to go unpunished. For the covenant community of Israel, any form of covenant disobedience could unleash God's punishment as a 'holy war' in several different forms.

References which are indications of Holy War

Typical examples of 'holy war' include attacks in the forms of diseases, barrenness, pestilence, and the like (Deut 28:35; cf. 15:26; Num 16:46; Deut 7:15; 28:35; Isa 10:5-6; Jer 21:5-7; Hab 1:5-11; Borowski 2003:77; Zodiates 1996:1526; Unger 1988:201; Bruckner n.d.: 6-8; Saxey n.d.:122-123). Definitely, an outbreak of disease can be 'holy war', as happened to Israel at the time of King David (2 Sam 24:10-17; cf. Matthews 2006:115), Azariah (2 Kgs 15:1-5), and Jehoram (2 Chr 21:4-15). Another example is Uzziah's pride and unfaithfulness which incurred God's judgement, with leprosy as consequence (2 Chr 26:16-20; cf. Num 12).

It is through such a 'holy war' where people are inflicted with plagues and diseases, just as the Almighty unleashed on Pharaoh (Gen 12:17), the Egyptians and other nations (Exod 7-12; cf. 1 Sam 5). These examples confirm our argument that sometimes the outbreak of diseases might be Yahweh war against people for disobeying His moral prescriptions. Moreover, it could be that in the war of the Lord against His enemies, He allows their enemies to attack them with diseases (cf. Madeleine and Lane 1978:68-70; Scurlock and Anderson 2005:17).

Judgement of the Lord by way of war is against all acts of disobedience of His moral laws. It is not the case that the Lord God punishes with war at all times; sometimes He punishes with hardships like famine or diseases (cf. Borowski 2003:36), such as He did to Egypt (Exod 9:8-12; cf. Isa 10:5-6; Jer 21:5-7; Hab 1:5-11). In Deuteronomy and to a large extent, the HB, God inflicted diseases as part of His weapons (Deut 28:35; cf. Exod 7-12; Num 16:46; Matthews 2006:115; Saxey n.d.:122-123). The Lord's move to inflict His people with diseases is premised however on covenant disobedience (Deut 7:15; cf. Exod 15:26).

The punishment from disease is even worse when it is contagious. The exclusion of lepers from the community till their leprosy was healed is a typical indication of this point (Lev 10:4-5; 13:46; Num 5:2; 19:3; 31:12; 15:35-36; Josh 6:23), which is also corroborated by some scholars (cf. Matthews 2006:115; Zodiates 1996:1526; Unger 1988:201). In his contribution to the diseases-contagion link, Borowski (2003:76) indicated that these could come as a punishment from God.

Judgement against Open Defecation not in doubt

The relationship between some infirmities as punishment from God and lack of purity is observed by James Tabor to have

been one of the cultural beliefs of the Essenes (Anonymous 2006:¶30). This clearly confirm the argument that any unhealthy practice such as disobedience to the instruction to defecate outside of the camp and cover the faeces could subject the Israel community to contamination by the exposed faecal matter with the resultant outbreak of diseases. This means that whether in the OT or the NT, and whether by individuals or a community, God judges and punishes sin.

Obviously, such punishment would be regarded as 'holy war' visited on the people for disobeying the Lord God. That is, people become God's enemies for breaking His moral injunctions. God would definitely wage war against 'individual, corporate and structural sins' (Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967-68). This position also underscores God's promise to prevent some diseases from afflicting Israel when they obey Him alone (Exod 15:26).

It must also be emphasized here that the consequence of defiling the OT camp is not only that God would depart from it (Deut 23:14), but also that Israel would be defeated in battle until the sin or disobedience was purged (Num 25:1-8; cf. Josh 7:12). Since the removal of evil includes those who break God's moral laws or lack moral qualities (cf. Asumang 2011:20-21; Sprinkle 2000:637-38), 'holy war' is also a way of expressing the meaning of purity in relation to God (cf. Christensen 2002:157).

Israel became the Lord's enemy after it disobeyed Him and chose to follow the ways of the heathen and served other gods (Lev 18:24-30; 20:23; Jer 27:4-6). Consequently, He used other nations to punish them (cf. Poythress 1995:142). For instance, Assyria was used to punish Israel, and Babylon to punish Judah (Isa 10:5-6; 2 Chr 36:15-17; Jer 27:4-6; 44:1-14; Lam 1:2; cf. Longman III 2003:62; Kunhiyop 2008:115; Stott 1990:88).

Chapter Conclusion

In all the discussions so far, 'holy war' has been shown to be a contributing factor to the effective implementation of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 as well as the main motivation for the integration of the other concepts (ref. fig. 10.1 cf. 10.2). By the dictates of our pericope, Yahweh, the Lord God Almighty, wanted the covenant community to maintain the military camp as a sacred place (cf. Christensen 2002:542-44; Lioy 2010:31; Macdonald 2006:217; Inge 2003:42) in respect of His presence and what He was in their midst to do – to wage a 'holy war' against His enemies.

Moreover, just as God was interested in the health of His people in the OT and still shows the same interest, He does not wish for anyone to suffer sickness or death as a result of sin. Since the Lord is present with His people, a moral battle has to be waged continuously by them, so that they don't fall short of His moral laws and incur His wrath.

Therefore, in the subsequent chapter, attention is devoted to establishing the implications of 'holy war' for the Post New Testament world such as our contemporary circumstance. Particularly, efforts are directed towards interpreting physical 'holy war' in the light of the principles of the 'just war' traditions for the present world. This, notwithstanding, the book particularly emphasises spiritual warfare as the means to fulfilling God's ultimate purpose for creation.

Chapter 7

Was 'Holy war' Significant to the People of Israel?

The concept of 'holy war' has been discussed to an appreciable limit in the previous chapter. And the underpinnings of this concept in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 has been greatly emphasised and argued for. *Per* the stipulation in the text, God specifies the condition under which He would be present to fight for Israel. He mentions maintenance of holiness in the military camp as a prerequisite for His continued presence with the troops. Anything short of a holy precinct would compromise the position not only of the military but the whole congregation.

In this chapter, the focus will not only be on the theological and socio-cultural issues, but will also include the political dimension of the 'holy war'. The addition of the third dimension is in the light of the significance that political issues bring to bear on the message. The final issue is to determine whether the concept has any significance for the Israelites. Though there may be a number of reasons for such wars, only three of the most significant areas will engage our focus in the subsequent discussions.

The Theological significance of 'Holy war'

The theological dimension of 'holy war' is usually regarded as the most fundamental of all. Usually, such wars involve God, and it is definitely sanctioned by Him (cf. Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967-68; Kunhiyop 2008:115; Poythress 1995:142; Wright 2008:87), and is justified as long as it is with His consent or under His command (Num 14:39-45; 1 Kgs 12:21-24). As stated,

‘...God who is the object of...worship controls or allows all things according to His pleasure, to include ‘the beginning, the progress, and even end of wars, which He ordains when mankind needs to be corrected and chastised by such means’ (Augustine:VII.30, 291, and 292). Asumang (2011:19) also acknowledges God as ‘the initiator of the war’ while Domeris (1986:35-37) points to war as one of the functions of Yahweh’s Council, with worship and judgement being the others.

For the covenant community of Israel, the issue of ‘holy war’ had many underlying implications. This is because of the circumstances they found themselves in; they had been freed from slavery through battles that they contributed very little to their successes. Moreover, their journey to the land of freedom was punctuated by a number of warfare as a consequence of the many enemies through whose very eyes they had to pass to reach their destination. Even after their settlement on the Promised Land, they would be involved in wars since they would be surrounded by some enemies.

War thus qualified as the prime challenge to Israel’s life and a determinant of their faith in God. Before the instructions of the pericope came to the surviving generation, the Lord God Almighty had shown His warrior character to their fathers (Exod 5:20-21). Indeed, He proved to be their warlord, and this He did by the great arm of deliverance with which He saved them from the Egyptians (Exod 3:20; Deut 4:34; 26:8).

Thence, He had to deal with a nation that was afraid of war. Their fearfulness informed God’s plan not to lead them through the land of the Philistines, though that was a shorter route to the Promised Land. ‘For God said, “If they face war, they might change their minds and return to Egypt”’ (Exod 13:17-18). Nevertheless, after the pursuing Egyptian army was annihilated

by God at the Red Sea, the Israelites acknowledged Him as their Warrior (Exod 15:1-19; 17:10-16).

By this time, the Israelites were coming to terms with the fact that constant engagement in warfare was a common feature for their survival; they had to be prepared to face one enemy or the other throughout their wilderness journey. So they would need the Divine Warrior to fight for them. This is one reason the Sinaitic covenant became significant to Israel. By way of the covenant, Israel belonged to Yahweh, the Great I AM, the Lord God Almighty, so their enemies became His enemies, meaning that 'Israel's wars were the wars of YHWH' (Exod 14:13-14; cf. Borowski 2003:36).

As their covenanted God, then, He would jealously stand for them. And as 'husband', the Jealous God (cf. Exod 20:4; 34:14), He is obliged to be jealous over His 'wife' at any time. In fact, without I AM, who is Yahweh (YHWH), the Lord God Almighty, there is no Israel; He is not only their foundation of existence and covenanted God (cf. Gen 13:14-16; 15:13; 17:7-8; 22:17-18; 46:1-3; Exod 3:7-8; 24:24:8), He is their protector (Exod 14:19-20), and the Divine Warrior who fights their wars and grants them victories (Deut 3:22; Exod 15:1-5; Num 21:21-35; 31:1-12).

God's warrior nature is revealed in His holiness, and He thus expects same from His covenant partner, Israel. Domeris (1986:35-37) observes that there is a 'numinous power' revealed in war, one of the functional aspect of God's Council, and that this power emanates from His holiness. Consequently, he argues that this power for war is connected to the title, 'the holy one'. He regrets that discussion on this functional role 'has been either lost or ignored'. However, I agree with this functional role of the Lord. My argument is that 'holy war' is not only an ethical issue in Deuteronomy (cf. Millar 1995:389-392) or the

functional role of the Divine Warrior (cf. Domeris 1986:36-37), but is also the main motivation for the pericope. The outcome of the 'holy war' rested on the obedience or otherwise of the people to the instructions laid down in the text.

Consequently, the stipulations of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 demanded that Israel needed to demonstrate total obedience to the Almighty God, in order to enjoy His promises. Therefore, 'the LORD would turn away from you' (Deut 23:14) is a statement that Israel would not wish to hear or dream about let alone engage in anything to experience it. As a nation, and even as individuals, the presence of God in their midst meant everything to them.

Should the Lord God Almighty turn away from them by way of their disobedience they would become His enemies and would consequently face His wrath. The consequences of this would be disastrous (cf. Douglas 1966:12; 2002:50; Klawans 2003:21-22). It was incumbent on the nation, represented by the army, to obey His instructions. Hence, 'holy war' is theologically significant since it linked Israel to Yahweh, their Covenant Keeping God.

Socio-Cultural significance of 'Holy war'

In relation to Israel's socio-cultural context, Deuteronomy 23:12-14 is part of the overall instructions that were very fundamental for the survival and victory of the Israelites as they prepared to cross the Jordan. As a nation in transit they could not be classified or well organised both socially and culturally. They had not been together long enough to develop strong social and cultural bonds. Though they had travelled for about forty years, their longest stay together was at the base of Mount Sinai, where they spent about a year (Exod 19:1-2; cf. Num 10:11). Even then, Yahweh said they had stayed enough at the mountain (Deut 1:6), so the rest of their period was a matter of wilderness wandering.

Against this background, accepting Deuteronomy 23:12-14 as a message which was tailored to shape the mind of a nation that was in transit, that is, from Egypt to the Promised Land, is significant. This is also understood in the light of Asumang and Domeris' (2007:9) description of the exodus as 'the most profound spiritual, cultural, political, theological, and social experience that constituted them as a nation in Diaspora'. And there is no doubt, as Asumang and Domeris further point out, that Israel's experience in the wilderness 'was forever to serve as the template of the idealised liminal migrant spirit both positively and negatively' for all believers.

The reason is quite obvious; a wilderness transition under the leadership of I AM, the Lord God Almighty, like the one Israel experienced, would definitely offer some challenges not only to them as individuals, but more importantly as a community. As Funk (1959:209) also observes: 'It symbolises hardships that test one's covenantal loyalty and faithfulness to God'. On a good note, it is a 'location where God is encountered, where personal transformation takes place and where community is formed' (Dozeman 1998:43). Yet, it is also considered to be a place of 'judgment and renewal' (Gibson 1994:15).

Wilderness life experiences can be evaluated from many different perspectives. Asumang and Domeris (2007:7) describe it as one of the most common biblical symbols of liminality, 'since its symbolism in Scripture has both positive and negative aspects: everyone who passes through it is subjected to one test or another'. Therefore, one cannot ignore the dangers that a wilderness transition would bring to bear on the Israelites. Based on Victor Turner's definition of liminality as 'a transitional phase during which a person abandons his or her old identity and dwells in a threshold state of ambiguity, openness and indeterminacy',

Furthermore, Asumang and Domeris (2007:7-9) argue that the liminal phase of any wilderness life 'is particularly dangerous because of the disorientation, ambiguity and instability it produces'. However, the Israelites were not the only people to have had such transitional experiences; some of the nations that they would encounter were equally involved. Douglas (2002:119-120; cf. Oweridu 2005:20) notes that danger lies in transitional states, because 'the person who must pass from one to another is himself in danger and emanates danger to others'.

Apparently, the presence of Israel in both the wilderness and the land they were to possess was both a danger to them as well as the inhabitants. To the former it was the danger of being defeated or not being able to conquer the Promised Land, while to the latter it was the danger of being dispossessed of the land and completely annihilated. Consequently, there was the need for the Israelites to receive specific instructions aimed at making them alert to the dangers of impurity at the camp that could spell their doom.

Such instructions were, at the same time, necessary to allay their fears with assurance of protection, and at the same time motivate them with a guarantee of victory in their fight for possession of the land and survival on it. As revealed by Asumang and Domeris (2007:7):

The instructions that are provided before one enters the liminal period therefore tend to underscore these dangers and are aimed at instilling a positive sense of fear that will help *liminas* to maintain their concentration and therefore orientation during the movement. For the uninitiated, these warnings may sound as if they are exaggerations, but they are fundamental for survival during the movement.

The dictates of the laws of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 were therefore calculated to serve such a purpose. It was to prepare the Israelites for all the eventualities and dangers of not only the transitional journey but more importantly, the conquest of the Promised Land that would be achieved through war. Indeed, no instructions could have served a better purpose than those in the pericope.

The Political significance of 'Holy war'

The political situation of Israel at the instance of the message of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 was uncertain; only their God could determine their fate. By this time, their faith had been moulded by the fact that in His jealousy for them God had demonstrated His supremacy over both the nations around and His covenanted people through 'holy war'. The Lord God Almighty was dealing with a prepared and not rather a pampered nation; one that was ready to engage in a war to conquer the Promised Land. So, on the part of the Israelites, they needed to meet the fullest demand for a healthy covenant relationship with the Lord their God.

Accordingly, the detailed review of events at the plains of Moab (Deut 2:24-4:4) is seen not only as closing an old page to open a fresh one, but a reminder of the failure of their forefathers to observe the instructions of the Almighty God, which had led to undesirable consequences. Now, His presence in Israel's camp (Deut 23:12-14) was to perform His functional role, specifically, to engage a 'holy war', by virtue of the 'numinous power' that emanates from His presence (cf. Domeris 1986:35-37).

Egypt was probably the world's superpower at the time, and life in Palestine itself was turbulent. The land was possessed by heterogeneous tribes that the Almighty God had promised to

engage in a war with and drive away before the Israelites (Gen 15:18-21; cf. Exod 3:8). The occupants were living in large and high-walled cities (Num 13:27-33), and had formed leagues for defence against invaders (Josh 10:1-6; 11:1-5). Yet, Yahweh had promised to bring them to this land (Exod 3:8; 6:8). So God was disappointed when, after much forbearance with their fathers at Kadesh Barnea, their descendants failed to trust Him as the only Divine Warrior to overcome these enemies (Num 14:11-12). As a result, Kadesh Barnea became 'the archetypal place of rebellion' (Millar 1995:390). Their inaction called for a wiping out of that generation, something that is best described as a 'holy war' by the Lord God Almighty against His own people.

Moving forward, two significant but contrasting events were experienced by the surviving generation that had now matured at the plains of Moab. On one side, they, under the banner of 'Yahweh war', had conquered Og and Sihon, two kings of the Amorites. Thus, they had sent a signal of readiness to possess the land of promise with God on their side (Num 21:21-35). On the other, the Israelites' failure to observe purity at Shittim (Num 25:1-9) and the consequences of it was still fresh. They suffered a plague from the Lord Almighty, their God, as a result of their mingling with the Moabites at the camp. This was another 'holy war' by the Lord against His own people. The political effect of this was enormous: their military strength was reduced as they lost 24,000 men (v. 9), mostly leaders (v. 4). It confirms that 'holy war' is a means by which God punishes all provocations and gains victory over His enemies.

Consequently, the plains of Moab became a place of renewed opportunity, that of possessing God's promise through war, and described by Millar (1995:389-392) as 'the new Kadesh Barnea'. Victory in war would be a blessing to any people

and could be seen as the source of all good things; the reverse holds true, in other words, defeat means a withdrawal of blessing and danger. Since 'blessing and success in war required a man to be whole in body', Israel had to ensure that they were 'trailing no uncompleted schemes' by maintaining a holy camp by keeping themselves undefiled (Douglas 2002:52-53). Similarly, 'holy war' is an expression of purity, since, as Christensen (2002:157) notes, 'the absolute destruction of evil is a way of expressing the meaning of holiness in relation to God himself'.

Chapter Conclusion

The connection between the Divine Warrior and demands for a camp devoid of exposed faecal matter has been the focus of my discussion in this chapter. Christensen links 'holy war' in the wilderness battles with what would occur in the Promised Land, and as spelt in the pericope, helps in its understanding. To conclude the arguments here, 'holy war' which has been shown to be the overall motivation for the instructions stated in the law on OD required certain conditions to be satisfied.

In other words, the command to ensure sanitation in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 was calculated to ensure holiness, which was necessary to maintain the divine presence of Yahweh. For His presence was required to engage in war and overcome Israel's enemies. God through the text was telling them to prepare for this war, for He was ready to lead them to defeat their enemies.

Chapter 8

Who are Yahweh's

Physical Enemies in 'Holy war'?

As noted in the previous chapter, the phrase, 'your enemy' in the pericope may represent both personal and national enemies. It was also noted that the phrase may also mean both spiritual and physical enemies. Eventually, anybody could become an enemy depending upon whether the person has offended God or not. Thus, in response to His covenant promises of defending His people from attacks of their enemies (Gen 12:3; cf. Exod 23:22), the divine presence was very understandable.

This implies that every member of the community needed to be extra careful and strictly obey the law. Bruce notes: 'Yahweh would be especially present with His people, so precautions against offending him must be scrupulous' (1979:259). Since the previous chapter dealt with issues of spiritual enemies, the current one is dedicated to those of physical enemies. Those that will engage our attention here include idol worshippers, people of the heathen nations, breakers of God's covenant, and those who disobey God's laws on open defecation which are spelt out in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 (i.e., the sanitation law).

Idolaters as God's enemies

It has been observed earlier that Satan, and to a large extent, demons, are spiritual enemies of the Living God and His people (cf. Longman III 2013:426). Their activities indicated in the previous section confirm their designation as enemies of God. However, for humans to be enemies of Israel and their God, their way of life had to be contrary to the purposes of the Deity.

In this light, all who break the regulation of the Lord God Almighty as spelt out in the Scripture are the first enemies (cf. Asumang 2007:16-17; 2011:20-21; Sprinkle 2000:637-38; Christensen 2002:157).

The Pentateuch in general warns Israel against association with and/or consultation of demonic practitioners such as sorcerers or mediums or spiritists (Exod 22:18; Lev 19:26; 20:6, 27), and prescribes as severe a punishment as elimination by death for all such people. The Lord God Almighty is always provoked by these practices (Lev 17:7) such that all individuals, tribes, and nations who engage in such become His enemies and He fights them.

There are indications that the Israelites were not ignorant of these practices, and perhaps realised that they involved demons (cf. Kombo 2003:74). The difference between the practice of some cultures and that of the Israelites is that unlike the other cultures where association with demons was common, the HB warns Israel and actually forbids them against the use of demonic powers like witchcraft and idolatry in general. The practice of witchcraft, for example, is directly against the first and second commandments of the Lord God Almighty, because He is jealous and will not share His glory with any other (Exod 20:1-5; Josh 24:19; Isa 42:8).

The reason for the war on such demonic practices is His abhorrence of sin (cf. Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967). Grudem (1994:417) also notes that 'the subservience to such demonic practices usually leads to evil and destructive practices' (Deut 14:1; 23:17; 1 Kgs 14:24; 18:28; Psa 106:35-37; Hos 4:14). Since such practices involve the destruction of human lives, they definitely contravene the fifth commandment of the Lord, the God of Israel, namely 'Thou shall not kill' (Exod 20:13).

The Heathen nations as God's enemies

In relation to the kind of worship which, Yahweh, the Lord God Almighty demands, people, particularly all the nations in the ANE who were involved in abominable practices, were regarded as enemies of the Living God. Grudem (1994:417) observes that, 'all the nations around Israel that practised idol worship were engaging in the worship of demons'. Possibly, as a result of the continuous practice of idolatry for such a long period, it became so entrenched that it was hard to stop its spread.

Thus, sometimes it takes the total annihilation of a race in order to uproot it. Moreau (1990:8), commenting on Exodus 20:3-5, reveals that the sin of idolatry can be continued within a family to the third or fourth generation. It is because the nations in and around Palestine sought to turn Israel's loyalty and worship away from the Lord God Almighty through Baalism that they became His enemies who were earmarked for destruction through war (Lev 18:24-30; 20:23).

With reference to the Promised Land, specific nations were considered as enemies and thus targeted for Yahweh war. They were the people known as the Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites (Exod 3:8) as also indicated by Christensen (2002:CX, 543-44). I AM, the Almighty God, also judges those who allow themselves to be influenced by Satan and demons, through gods and idols, against His divine plans, through war. The case of how He dealt with Pharaoh, the king of Egypt, and his people prior to the Exodus, is an obvious example. The Egyptian soldiers acknowledged The Lord God's involvement in Israel's battles when they confessed, 'The LORD is fighting for them against Egypt' (Exod 14:25; cf. Yamoah 2012:71-72).

God can inflict diseases on the heathen kings for their disregard of His regulations, as happened to the Philistines when

they captured the Ark of Covenant (1 Sam 5). Another example is Sennacherib, an Assyrian king who boasted over Israel, but suffered when the Lord God Almighty visited death on as many as 185,000 of his army overnight, which led to his assassination (Isa 36-37:38; cf. 2 Macc 15:21-22). The Almighty God similarly engaged in war against Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon (Dan 4). This was when the king became haughty and overestimated his strength, claiming glory for everything the God of Heaven had given him the privilege to do and not given the deity honour.

Covenant-breakers as God's enemies

Where people fail to trust the Holy One for defence and victory over their enemies, He turns against such people (Isa 31:1-3). Even in cases where loyal worshippers become potential threat to God's will, He becomes their enemy and fights against them. This observation is also made by Asumang (2011:20) and other scholars including Sprinkle 2000:637-38, Madeleine and Lane 1978:270-271; and Bruce 1979:259. Meaning that not even those of the covenant community are spared.

Domeris' (1986:35-37) specific identification of Yahweh as Israel's representative within the heavenly Council, and hence responsible for her punishment, supports this argument. So then, the mention of Israel as the Lord's army in a preceding paragraph is never to mean that the Lord God Almighty is always on their side; not at all. Israel could also become an enemy of the Almighty when they fail to serve Him.

For example, King David experienced this when he counted the army of Israel in contrast to the will of God (2 Sam 24:10-17; 1 Chr 21; 2 Chr 11:15; Psa 96:5; 106:35-37; cf. Matthews 2006:115). His disobedience to the Lord God Almighty brought to him and the whole nation a regrettable and devastating

consequence. King Azariah (or Uzziah) of the Southern Kingdom was stricken with leprosy as a result of breaking God's regulations, and was quarantined for the rest of his life (2 Kgs 15:1-5).

Breakers of the sanitation law as God's enemies

In the case of the sanitation law under discussion, Israel in general or any individual would be considered enemy of God should they fail to obey the law. That is to say, should any person be found to be engaged in open defecation in the camp. As also corroborated by Bruckner (n.d.:6-8; cf. Borowski 2003:77): 'Failure to observe the covenant could visit God's punishment in the form of disease on people'.

The significance of these is that He punishes such people in the hope that they will repent and return to Him (cf. Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967). This proves that 'God is both transcendent and universal, and has no favourites. He simply demands loyalty and obedience' (Watt 2011:131) to His instruction.

Chapter Conclusion

It is clear from the discussions in this chapter that whenever humans choose to turn from the worship of Yahweh, the jealous God, alone and rather give attention to other spiritual powers by whatever means, He is provoked to respond accordingly. Of particular interest here is the realisation that Deuteronomy also outlines specific penalties for all such enemies; death for individuals who break God's covenant (Deut 4:25-31; 9:1-3; 13:6-11; 17:1-7), total annihilation for groups and towns (13:12-18), and suffering and exile for the nation (28:14-57) in the event of turning from God to serve His enemies.

Chapter 9

Who are Yahweh's

Spiritual Enemies in 'Holy war'?

It has been argued that the function of 'holy war' as a literary theme, institution, and ideology has widely been recognised in OT studies (Longman III 1982:291). In earlier times, some scholars did not observe the extensive use of the concept in the NT. Some claimed that it has not been elucidated enough, and that 'at best it has been only implicitly recognised' (Longman III 1982:290-307).

However, from a number of studies undertaken on 'holy war', it has emerged that the concept is not only limited to the text and the OT, but finds relevance in the NT as well. For instance, Asumang's (2008:1-19) treatment of Christ's demonstration of victory over evil powers is just like that from Aboagye-Mensah (2006:967-68). The issue of dealing with evil in the NT may correspond to the idea of dealing with the enemy in the OT.

Thus, the phrase 'your enemy' in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 may represent both personal (Exod 23:4), and national (Gen 22:17) enemies. It may also mean both spiritual and physical enemies. The fundamental question is, why should Yahweh fight Israel's enemies? As the Covenant-keeping God, fighting Israel's enemies was a fulfilment of what He had promised Abraham, the foremost patriarch (Gen 12:3). Exodus 23:22 re-echoed this promise: 'I will be an enemy to your enemies and will oppose those who oppose you'.

It is in fulfilment of the covenant to the descendants of Abraham that the Lord God will fight against their enemies, as

they had also become His enemies. These were both spiritual and physical, as will soon be seen.

Satan and demons as God's enemies

The observation of Longman III (2013:426) that an enemy in war is an 'opponent', *satan* (Hb סָטָן), a noun whose verb means 'to be an adversary' or 'to oppose someone/something', has been noted. The central figure in the discussion of God's enemies is Satan, who leads a team of demons, who are altogether referred to as fallen angels. Satan and all the demons or devils are also referred to as 'evil or unclean spirits' (Nkansah-Obrempong 2006:1454-55; Wright 2008:35-37; Yamoah 2012:72-79).

The presence of such spiritual enemies underscores one aspect of 'Yahweh war' – as a spiritual battle. Asumang pictures this as a cosmological spiritual combat between God and other gods, without human involvement (2011:20; cf. Exod 15), where the Lord God Almighty is depicted as surrounded by armed angels, as 'the Lord of hosts', who fights for His people (2007:16; cf. Exod 12:41; 14:24; Deut 4:19).

Commenting on the reality of these spiritual powers, Kunhiyop (2006:374) comments: 'We need to accept the reality of demonic powers, which are clearly known in both the OT and the NT'. Demonic powers were probably associated with sacrifices to animals and idols (Lev 17:7), an indication that idolatry one of the main tools or channels of demonic spirits (cf. Grudem 1994:416; Wright 2006:139; Watt 2011:128). When such idols are dealt with, the activities of demons are likely to be drastically affected. Truly, 'Idols have not always existed, nor will they exist forever' (Wis 14:13, GNB); since they are in themselves powerless unless they are possessed by demons.

As also observed by Asumang: 'Idols are channels of demons' (2011:19). However, "gods", "idols", and "demons" may sometimes be used interchangeably, on the grounds that they provide a common platform for worship, contrary to that of the Lord God Almighty. It is not wrong to assume that these refer to the same class of spiritual powers and their activities.

Watt (2011:124-133) provides some reasons why the demonic realm, often referred to as the 'excluded middle', can often be overlooked or excluded from deliberations about the nature of reality. For him, 'the basis for this exclusion may well be the rational, materialistic and objective world that has become a predominant worldview for many, and so the concept of influence from an unseen world may be deemed as archaic, superstitious or outdated'. Watt mentions another reason as what Barnhouse (1974:156-157) calls 'camouflage', which he also explains as 'demons being hidden or concealed inside something which masks what it really is'. Therefore, 'Satan or the demons can remain incognito, so that where there is no perceived enemy there is no need for defence'.

Satan and his team of demons or evil spirits were very likely part of the hosts of the God of Heaven, but because they could not hold on to their holy position in heaven, they turned to oppose the Lord (Ezek 28:12-15; Isa 14:12-15). Kunhiyop (2012:55-56; cf. Unger 1994:183) identifies Satan as the leader of rebellious angels, and provides other titles in reference to this rebel leader. Grudem's (1994:412; cf. Nkansah-Obrempong 2006:1454-55) definition of demons as 'evil angels who sinned against God and who now continually work evil in the world', is applicable here.

Scripture provides examples of some earthly rulers that parallel the description of Satan, the fallen Lucifer, though clear identifications do not exist. One such passage is Isaiah 14:4-20,

where a supposed ruler, is addressed as the morning star and son of the dawn. Arguably, certain characteristics of this figure support the arguments that his identification parallels that of Satan. The NKJV calls the figure Lucifer (probably the angelic name of Satan).

However, Longman III (2013:426-27) considers this Satan-Lucifer parallel to be unbiblical and a myth. Though the proof of this is beyond my scope in this book, a paragraph or two on this biblical figure will help. He is usually presented as a fallen angel that was part of God's creation, unequal to God, always associated with evil in Scripture, and usually revealed by some of the scriptural parallels (cf. Sumrall 1982:150). In Hebrew, it literally means 'Day Star' (Radmacher *et al* 1997:1136; cf. Longman III 2013:426). He is associated with one who was in Eden, the garden of God, and 'anointed as a guardian cherub' (Ezek 28:12-15).

Scripture indicates that Lucifer's fall occurred because of pride, self-centeredness, and lust for power. On top of these, it was due to his intention to oppose and set up a parallel kingdom to that of the Most High God as revealed in Isaiah 14:12-5 (cf. Ezek 28:16-17). This connection is strengthened by Satan's role in the war in heaven with the loyal angels, where he and some of heaven's hosts, now turned into demons, were defeated and cast out of heaven (Rev 12:7-9; cf. Luke 10:18). The description of Satan's rebellion is presented in one of the parallel fictions created by John Bunyan thus:

There was one Diabolus....This giant was king...and a most raving prince....As to his origin, he was at first one of the servants of King Shaddai, made, and taken and put by him into most high and mighty place; yea, was put into such principalities as

belonged to the best of his territories and dominions. This Diabolus was made 'son of the morning, 'and a brave place he had of it: it brought him much glory, and gave him much brightness, an income that might have contented his Luciferian heart, had it not been insatiable, and enlarged as hell itself. Well, he seeing himself thus exalted to greatness and honour, and raging in his mind for higher state and degree, what doth he but begins to think with himself how he might be set up as lord over all, and have the sole power under Shaddai. (2002:8).

Since then, these demonic powers have directed their scheme against God's creation on earth (Rev 12:9-12). Scripture talks about the reality of demonic forces (cf. Kibor 2006:156). With him as head, Satan, also called the devil, and demons or evil spirits have organised themselves into a force to oppose God or the angels of God in their work (Dan 10:12-13). The battle between God and Satan and his demons, falls into the fourth type of 'holy war' classified by Asumang (2011:19).

Similarly, Bunyan (2002:8-9) describes the war between God and Diabolus' team, where Satan and the evil spirits with whom he has set up his kingdom are known to be involved in destruction (Job 1:13-19; cf. Kunhiyop 2006:374). As Naugle (2002:282) points out, 'The goal of Satan and the powers is to create a culture of falsehood and death aimed at "the distortion, thwarting, ruin, annihilation and undoing of creation"'. It is not surprising that some cultures would ascribe every negative event to demons, though to the Jew, the authority behind all calamities is God (2 Sam 24:16; Job 1:12).

Still on the discussion of demons, Watt (2011:124-133; cf. Nkansah-Obrempong 2006:1454-55) argues that the knowledge pertaining to the organisation of the demonic realm 'can never be stated with utter confidence, as the Scriptures do not give sufficient evidence for such definitive clarity. Rather, these views need to be treated as possibilities based on biblical evidence'. Be that as it may, Barnhouse's (1974:127) anticipation of a possible correspondence between the organisation of demons and that of angels, because of their angelic origins, is not far from right. That, Satan has appointed some of his team of fallen angels to positions such as rulers and princes of specific territories to oppose the divine mission (cf. Eccl 5:8).

Aided by the hierarchy of demons, Satan is on the offensive to turn humanity from God's eternal plan. Unger (1994:183) reveals that demons fulfil various tasks in seeking to deceive and destabilise the purposes of God in the earth. That is to say, demons are behind all the efforts to destabilise the purposes of God by deceiving people into disobeying His word (Gen 3:4, 5, 13; Psa 8:5). Their scheme covers all spheres of life, including spiritual territories of kingdoms and nations, and issues in families and individuals (Onyinah 2004:337). The book of Daniel (10:10-21) talks about the angel who brought a reply to Daniel's prayer, and who explained that he was delayed for 21 days by the 'prince of Persia'.

Barnhouse (1974:132) considers the organisation of Satan and demons as corresponding to earthly governments. His position falls in line with that of Watt (2011:28) who posits that every nation has a guiding demon, which serves as its 'prince' or 'god'. And such appointment of gods over the nations, Wink (1986:201) reveals, 'is not a temporary or evil expedient but a permanent aspect of the divine economy'. The result of their

activities, as Asumang (2008:16; cf. Berkhof 1977:20) also notes, is to influence the social, economic and political courses of the world. One of such activities against families or individuals is noted by Tobit (3:7), who mentions a demon, Asmodeus, which works against marriage by killing husbands.

Satan and demons can inflict diseases on people (Job 2:7; cf. Kunhiyop 2012:55-59), or can oppress people, resulting in all sorts of disabilities. This observation finds support in Scurlock and Anderson (2005:17) who indicate that 'Mesopotamian physicians attributed illnesses to gods or goddesses, demons or demonesses, and ghosts'. Cromwell (2014:§6) mentions the Babylonians' idea that 'Šulak, the Babylonian lurker of the latrine or demon of the privy, strikes a victim when the person is exposed during urinating or defecating', and notes that the idea is believed to have come from the Hittites. Thus, 'people of this era would describe a disease as the "hand" of a specific god, demon, or ghost, meaning that the ailment is the result of being struck'.

Satanic forces are able to incite or influence people to act contrary to the Word of God (1 Chr 21:1-30). They can pollute the body with sin, which will make God's spirit leave the person as was experienced by King Saul of Israel (1 Sam 16:14). Demons not only possess people (cf. Kunhiyop 2012:58), but are the source of those who serve as mediums, magicians, spiritists, and the like (Lev 20:6), all of which are abominations to Yahweh.

Many passages in Exodus reveal that the magicians of Egypt were able to perform some of the miracles produced by Moses (7:11, 22; 8:7, 18, 19). In particular, in the book of Daniel, the reality of the power of Babylonian magicians is assumed (1:20, 2:27; 4:7, 9; 5:11). Sorcery is associated with practices of

spiritism (2 Kgs 23:24), the spirit of harlotry (Nah 3:4), and idolatry (Mic 5:12).

The god's and idols as God's enemies

Demons do not only operate directly against humanity as Naugle (2002:283) also indicates, they have set up parallel schemes primarily through gods and idols, and thus their snares definitely include the worship of these images. Radmacher *et al* (1997:343) are emphatic that 'the powers behind gods come from demons'. Not only do demons resist the will of God, the princes of nations among them can draw attention and praise from people to themselves, and in the process, worship is demanded from the people or nation over which the demon exercises dominion. This can result in the demon over the nation becoming synonymous with the state, and thereby becoming like a god to that nation (Watt 2011:129; cf. Nkansah-Obrempong 2006:1454-55).

Appearing in the form of demons who are being worshipped, these gods not only keep humanity from Yahweh's gracious plan of salvation, but by so doing provoke Him and make themselves His enemies. Mention of the gods which the Amorites worshipped is an example of the reasons for the judgement of the Almighty on them. There is also Baalism, which is considered by some scholars as the mother of all religions in the region of Palestine. For Steyne (1999:167), any man-made religion constitutes Baalism, because demons use it to control and manipulate people in order to counter the purposes of God.

The Pentateuch in general, and Exodus in particular, identifies the religion of Egypt as an example of worship of demons by way of the Pharaohs and the gods, which incurred the judgemental wrath of Yahweh, the God of Israel (Exod 12:12; cf.

Wright 2011:93). No wonder, Adjei and Nsiah (2000:46-48; cf. Endnotes of Yamoah 2012:322 no. 62) consider the plagues the Almighty God visited on Egypt as designed against specific gods of the land. However, Watt (2011:139-140) sees the plagues as, 'an effort to rid the people of the demonic influences which held sway over their lives, especially through the god-king Pharaoh', who from an Egyptological perspective, was a son of god.

Holladay (2002:58) also observed that a king of that time was regarded as a son of the god, and thus, empowered or 'sponsored' by the gods. The many gods involved in the war show the polytheistic structure of the demons that the Egyptians worshipped. However, these were possibly a fraction of 'all the gods of Egypt' that the Lord God Almighty punished through the final plague. All demonic practices are provocative to the Holy One 'whose name is jealous', and 'is a jealous God' (Exod 34:14). He is the Creator of humanity, and the practices make Him angry (cf. Wright 2011:177). He alone deserves total allegiance and worship, as Nwankpa (2006:840) similarly argues.

Consequently, idolaters incur the wrath of God, hence His punishment, as the first two commandments in Exodus 20:1-6 perfectly articulate. In instituting punishment for idolatry, the provoked God punishes not only the worshippers, but also executes judgement on their idols. This is why in Egypt their gods experienced the wrath of the Lord God when He declared a 'holy war' in the land and executed judgement on all of them (Exod 12:12). Moses' encounter with Pharaoh, in other words, Israel against Egypt, is a typical example of this type of war.

The Pentateuch generally warns Israel against idolatry, the worship of any other god(s), and in specific passages, God commanded that all who engage in such a practice should not be allowed to live (Exod 22:18; Lev 19:26; 20:6; 20:27). Yet,

such practices influenced the worship of Israel at a very early stage of nationhood, as recorded in Exodus 32 (Longman III 2013:825). As such, the tendency for the Promised Land-bound and relatively young generation of Israel to fall prey to such demonic influences and/or practices was high.

In this light, Earl's (2009:41-62) comment that 'holy war as a practice is related to Israel's response to idolatry' is appropriate. For, there was the need for the people to accept God's most effective way to address the menace and uproot it from the land. And it is perhaps against this backdrop that Deuteronomy gives special attention and spells out in-depth measures to deal with demonic practices.

It will be helpful, then, to devote some attention to idolatrous practices in the book to see how the 'holy war' theme in our text served to motivate Israel in their mission to deal with this canker. Akroing (2001:19) observes what might be called 'a qualified dualism in the Deuteronomic theory of evil'. This is where evil is explained as 'when one deviates from the precepts of God, sometimes as a natural consequence of disobedience to God'. Hence, the book warns the recipients of evil practices and the consequences of being implicated in such acts (cf. Longman III 2013:426).

For Radmacher *et al* (1997:342-43), Deuteronomy is an extended argument against idolatry and paganism and attaches great importance to the subject. In it, God does not only devalue their position (32:17), but rejects outright their presence beside Him (32:39). This might have instructed the Israelites to not even recognise these gods of idolatry or lesser powers because they are rendered powerless (cf. Psalms 95:3; 96:4).

All the gods are, as Wright (2011:138-39) rightly submits, 'nothing whatsoever compared with YHWH', and never stand in

the same category as He does. For him, 'All so-called gods are actual nonentities'. Wright further notes a likely answer the Israelite would give to a question of whether there are gods beside Yahweh, the Only True God. He writes: 'No, YHWH alone is "the God", and other gods have no real existence at all', which might be because of their belief that he is the source of all events of life, whether good or bad (Deut 28).

Deuteronomy is not only one of the books of the OT known to mention demons (Hb sing. ꠔꠔꠔ; pl. ꠔꠔꠔꠔ) in connection with idolatry, it is also the book that clearly reveals that the spiritual forces behind gods and idols are demons (32:17; NAS, NET, NIB, NIV, NJB, NLT, and RSV; though KJV translates the plural noun as devils). The popular rendition conforms to what Unger (1988:302; cf. Zohdriates 1996:1556) notes to be the Jewish understanding that 'idols are demons that caused themselves to be worshipped'.

These support the argument that the spiritual enemies of Israel could be a combination of entities that represent Satan and demons, which are the gods, idols, and/or other mediums connected to people, groups, or nations. In fact, the spiritual enemies of Yahweh were not only identified in Deuteronomy as images such as idols and gods, but also by reason of involvement in such practices as divination, sorcery, and witchcraft (18:9-13).

Though the other pentateuchal books warn the people against demonic practices (Exod 22:18; Lev 19:26; 20:6, 27), the concern of the book of Deuteronomy is quite understandable. The author realised that the presence of demons, revealed through these practices on the land ready to be possessed, would be a snare to the new generation. As Nkansah-Obrempong (2006:1454-55) observes: 'They oppose God and seek to draw worship away from him to themselves'. And he continues,

‘activities like consulting the dead, worshipping and sacrificing to idols and ancestors result in contact with demons’ (Deut 32:17).

The book leaves the people with no chance for spiritual consultation, and provides them with an alternative in the true prophets that God will raise up for them (Deut 18:14-19). Thus, the prophets would be God’s voice for all the needed direction. However, the book does not only warn that they should be wary of presumptuous prophets, but also that any such prophet would be duly accountable to Yahweh (Deut 18:14-19).

Deuteronomy in particular mounts a strong campaign against Satan and his team of demons, perhaps more than the other books of the Pentateuch. Passages like 4:3; 13:1-5; 16:21; 17:1-7; 29:16-18 provide clear evidence of the reality of demons in various forms, and also show how the Lord God Almighty was determined to deal with them, with our pericope (23:12-14) signalling the climax. Some of the texts not only denounce the idolatrous practices of the Canaanites, which caused them to be destroyed (18:8-12), but prescribe severe punishment for Israel when they fail to completely eradicate such practices, but do the same (8:19-20; 11:16-17; 18:9-12).

Such spiritual enemies obviously ‘deprive God of his proper glory, distort the image of God, and are profoundly disappointing’ (Wright 2011:171-76) to those who put their trust in them. It is as a result of demonic activities that God becomes angry (32:19) and jealous (32:21) and kindles a fire by His wrath (32:22) to devour the earth, and heaps calamities on His people who sacrifice to them. Warnings against participation in the worship of gods and idols always have other practices like divination, sorcery, and witchcraft in mind (32:17; cf. 18:9-14), since all of them are ‘akin to involvement with evil forces’ (cf. Kunhiyop

2006:374), and were the target of the crusade of Chapter 23:14 against the enemies of God.

Psalm 91:3 gives a clue to the harmful activities of demons, when it mentions God's protection of His people from the snares of demons. This is in accordance with the comment of Madeleine and Lane (1978:270-271) that an invasion of the land of Israel by any enemy was a call on Yahweh to its defence. Since diseases and some deaths can result from attacks by demonic forces, the kind of protection and deliverance which the Lord God Almighty moves about in the camp to give Israel can be extended to include arrows shot from spiritual enemies that cause plagues and deadly diseases (Num 14:37; 16:49; 25:9).

In this way, the Almighty is ensuring the good health of His people by fighting His enemies. Such a battle by the Lord God against the gods and satanic powers falls into the first category of 'holy wars' that Asumang (2007:16-19) discusses.

Chapter Conclusion

A lot has been discussed in this chapter. The significance of all the foregoing arguments is that Deuteronomy confirms the Jewish, and, maybe, the general biblical understanding that the war of the Lord God Almighty against the gods and idols is in actual fact against the spirits/demons behind them. The Lord's abhorrence of such demonic practices is the reason for such war. In a nutshell, 'Yahweh war' demonstrates the supremacy of the monotheist God of the Israelites over all other gods.

Such supremacy was soon to be visited on the demons of the Promised Land, who obviously constituted a part of the enemies of I AM, the Living God. In Deuteronomy 23:14, He was ready to wage war, not only to protect His people from these powers, but to deliver all such enemies to them. This chapter has

tackled the class of enemies called spiritual enemies and will be continued in the next chapter while those who fall into the category of physical enemies will be dealt with later.

Chapter 10

What is 'Holy War'

to the New Testament Believer?

There is the need for an application of the idea of 'holy war' from the OT background text to the NT church. This is in the light of the fact that the nature of the recipients, the Israelite covenant community, has changed through the ministry of Jesus, who redefined the people of God in the NT. Thus, one of the key objectives in this chapter is to validate the application of 'holy war' to the Church. This also confirmed the hypothesis that the fundamental message of the text is still relevant for NT believers' reflection and also applicable to the contemporary global community.

This is to say that the relationship between the Testaments is smooth and that the application of OT texts in general to the NT Church exists. In this light, the application has identified and explained the meaning of the OT text in the NT context specifying how the passage can help us understand timeless truth especially in relation to God's eschatological agenda. Enough light has been shed on the ultimate mission of God to the world and the fact that God's mission which began in the OT has to be continued in the NT period.

Scholars are divided on application of 'Holy war'

Biblical scholars continue to debate the issue as to whether the OT Sanitation Laws are relevant to Christians or not. While some, like the theonomists and Reformed thinkers, hold to the view of a straight connection or direct between the two Testaments, others, like the dispensationalists, advocate a

completely opposite view. There is yet another group, the progressive covenantalists, whose arguments portray a position link between these two extremes. Thus, indications that scholars have not really agreed to a connection between the two Testaments abound (cf. Woodbridge 2006:91; Beale 2012:1; Lioy 2004:6; Bruce 1979:56).

Some of the collections of such disagreements is contained in series of debates by five scholars, and edited and compiled by Stanley N Gundry (1996). In this volume, a number of scholars share various views on the relationship between the Law and the Gospel. Strickland (cf. Gundry 1996:279; Lioy 2004:6), an advocate of 'dispensationalism', sees such a disconnection. He argues: 'It is not necessary for anyone to propose a construct where obedience is the defining element of faith and where Gospel and Law are in absolute continuum'. And he continues: 'When Israel failed in its stewardship responsibilities under the Mosaic dispensation, the law in its regulatory function ceased in validity' (cf. Gundry 1996:278).

'Holy war' in OT is significant to NT Believers

Against the background of the above scholarly misunderstanding, this book argues that there is a smooth relationship between the OT and the NT which needs to be comprehensively explored. In this way, the OT will become relevant to Christians, and particularly evangelicals. This is not only because of their deeper interest in the study of the whole Bible (cf. 2001:99-117; Klein 1998:325) but as Goldingay (2011:238) puts it, 'Evangelical study of the Old Testament works within the framework of the gospel'.

For Goldingay (2011:238-253), the message and the spirit of the gospel are revealed right from the beginning of the OT

through to the NT. Therefore, 'the OT should be understood as revealing the good news of God's redemption and restoration to sinners right from Genesis to Malachi, and not just leading up to the NT'. That is, the OT should be taken as a part of the NT gospel right from the beginning, as also argued by Kaiser Jr (1971:20-28).

Sprinkle (2000:654-656) notes how the OT laws applied to the gospel when he states: 'In the OT cleanness and uncleanness metaphorically symbolised moral purity and impurity, and moral purity is still a Christian idea'. Still making a case for OT application to the gospel, and for that matter, its relevance to the NT believer, Sprinkle writes that the place where two or more gather in Christ's name becomes by that fact, 'holy ground', and as such can be defiled, not by ceremonial but ethical impurity. Thus, Yahweh's presence in both OT and NT camps was not only to purify the camp and save His people, but also to punish His/their enemies. That is to say, God's judgement against His enemies for ritual and/or ethical sins and the punishment of all other enemies including evil forces would be by a 'holy war'.

While expressing concern that war as a concept has not been greatly elucidated in the NT, Longman III (1982:291) shows its extensive use as a literary theme, an institution, and ideology in the NT just as in the OT. Arguably, no running concept in the NT defines the mission of God for the world more than a 'holy war'. There are clear indications that the concept of 'holy war' which is argued as God's main mission against impurity and satanic forces in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 sheds light on the NT. In other words, 'holy war' as the underpinning concept of the text largely undergirds the NT and can be linked to key passages.

In the OT, Israel had to embark on war in order to conquer the Promised Land in fulfilment of God's promise to their

forefathers, hence the stipulation under study (Deut 23:12-14). But even after the conquest, Israel had to engage in wars to maintain possession of the land. Quite clearly, the NT concept of war is not often traced to causes such as the need for space or survival on the land as pertained in the OT. However, some of the NT writers obviously understood the Christian's engagement in warfare from its underpinnings in the OT shown by passages such as Deuteronomy 23:14 and Isaiah 14 and possibly, 59.

Of additional significance to our understanding is the fact that Asumang (2011:20-21; cf. Sprinkle 2000:637-38) also notes God's 'holy war' against unethical practices, especially in relation to people's disobedience to and abuse of His rules. Any disobedience to God's moral rules might not go unpunished. Isaiah 59 mentions how God would engage in a 'holy war' against His people because they had broken His moral laws (cf. Isa 13:3-5). Thus, God would put on 'righteousness like a breastplate, and a helmet of salvation on his head; put on garments of vengeance for clothing, and wrap himself in fury as in a mantle' in order to fight against His people for their sins (Isa 59:15-19; cf. Asumang n.d.:22; 2007:16-17).

However, if in relation to our pericope or the OT passage, improper faeces disposal can lead to the outbreak of diseases or plague as a result of 'holy war', then the reverse arguably holds true. That is, adopting prescribed ways to deal with excreta will not only keep Christians in good health, but they will also experience 'holy war' against their enemies. Thus, Christians should strive to keep themselves from all forms of sin and in specific connection with our discussion, the sin of polluting our environment with faeces, especially through open defecation. This is to avert any situation where Yahweh brings judgement on people who disobey His laws stated in the main passage under

discussion by waging war against them with sickness and other forms of plagues.

Chapter Conclusion

The chapter has considered 'holy war' beyond the confines of the OT by linking it to the overall mission of God in the NT is significant for understanding and proper application of our discussion. It has shown that issues of warfare raised in the NT generally serve as platform for the link that the current discussion hopes to establish between our OT pericope and the ultimate warfare plan of Yahweh not only in the NT but looking forward to the present and even into the eschatological period.

Besides, the application of the concept is not only extended to the NT/Christian context but should become applicable to contemporary Christian life and even points to the future period. At this stage, it has become clear that 'holy war' is the ultimate motivation for our discussion. It is to find out the various dimensions of 'holy war' that attention is now turned, beginning with its indication as a spiritual battle.

Chapter 11

Who are Yahweh's targets in 'Holy war' in the New Testament?

In the previous chapter, the integration of all the concepts of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 indeed underscored the significance of 'holy war' as the overall motivation. It also lays the foundation for the prescription of the passage for the OT and subsequent generations. This chapter considers the issue of 'holy war' into further depths. The discussions begin by looking at who are the main targets of such a divine war in the NT. The objective is to show why such enemies are considered inimical to the Bible believer's relationship with God, and hence are earmarked by God's law for divine judgement through a 'holy war'.

In the light of the many spiritual warfare metaphors associated with the NT in particular, there is every certainty that apart from moral warfare, a life focused on war against demonic forces and demanding spiritual weapons assumes a central role in the pursuit of God's eternal purposes. The observation of Longman III (2013:795; 1982:303) that 'Jesus intensified the warfare motif in the NT and directed it against demonic powers' also corroborates our argument.

Satanic and Demons as fundamental targets of Holy War

For NT believers, Satan and his forces attack through diverse forms of hardships and persecutions. The depiction of the devil as a 'roaring lion', who devours unwatchful Christians (1 Pet 5:8), links the persecution of believers with the devil's schemes, and so, underlines their sufferings as part of spiritual warfare. This is in agreement with Asumang's (2011:26) notes

on the believer's enemy, the devil, thus: 'Peter closely associates the devil with the unjust suffering that the believers were facing'.

The NT provides ample information about the operation of Satan (Gk σατανᾶς) and demons (Gk δαίμονες, *daimonisomai*) just like the OT, and that 'the NT opens with an intensity of activity' (Longman III 2013:427). As Longman III (2013:426) points out, however, the 'Satan' mentioned in the OT (Job 1-2; Zech 3:1-2; NIV: 'Satan') is mentioned in the NT as 'the devil'. Occasionally, 'Satan' (Luke 10:18), or 'a spirit' (Gk πνεῦμα) often associated with the adjective, 'evil' or 'unclean' (Gk ἀκαθάρτος), is used in connection with these fallen spirits or demons (Matt 12:43; Mark 1:23; Rev 16:13).

The operations of Satan (Gk σατανᾶς) and his team of demons (Gk δαίμονες) serving as 'principalities' (Gk ἀρχαί) and 'powers' (Gk δυνάμεις) or 'unclean' spirits (Gk ἀκαθάρτοι) against God and His creation are common knowledge (cf. Matt 8:28-34; 9:32-34; 15:21-28; 17:14-18; Mark 1:23; cf. Kunhiyop 2012:55-59). The NT also reveals evil activities as operations of demons. Most likely, these demons operate as 'authorities' (or 'powers' - KJV; Gk ἐξουσία, *exousia*) and 'principalities' (Gk ἀρχαί, *arche*) in the kingdom of darkness.

As Okom (2010:Back cover; cf. Kibor 2006:156) observes, 'Principalities and powers are not ordinary demons but controllers of areas'. Similarly, Wagner (1990:77; cf. Asumang 2008:16) describes principalities and powers as 'high ranking members of the hierarchy of evil spirits delegated by Satan to control nations, regions, cities, tribes, neighbourhoods and other significant social networks of human beings throughout the world'. They are therefore real spiritual forces that scheme

against all that God has up in the creation order. Their target is not only humanity but the whole of creation.

Satan and demons have organised themselves into a force to oppose God or His angels (Matt 16:23; Luke 10:18; Jude 6; 2 Pet 2:4; Rev 12:4-14). Thus, as in the OT, God is at war against Satan and demons in the NT. The writers emphasised this, as the term 'demons', is used frequently in the NT (Luke 10:18; Acts 17:18; 1 Cor 10:20-22; Eph 6:10-12).

In the gospels, demons are mentioned (Matt 12:27-28; 17:18; Mark 9:20; Luke 10:17) and Jesus was even accused by the Jews of casting out demons by the power of Beelzebub, the prince of demons. The NT also associates demons with idolatry (Rev 9:20) indicating that demons are the power behind idols. Wright (2011:144-45) also discusses the connection between gods, idols, and demons by observing Paul's statement that flirting with idols could lead to demonic practices (1 Cor 10:18-21).

Akrong (2001:19) notes that the personality behind all evil, the devil, God's chief enemy, is regarded as the ruler of the present age and is responsible for the negative experiences in the NT period till today. Since humanity's fall and dismissal from Eden (Gen 3), Satan's desire for control over creation through idolatry against the will of God has led to unabated war (cf. Asumang 2011:19). While the ultimate aim of Satan and his forces is the destruction of their captives, they in the meantime harass both believers and unbelievers.

Like the OT, the NT reveals Satan and his team of demons as operational in human affairs (Matt 8:28-34; 9:32-34; 15:21-28; 17:14-18; Mark 1:23; cf. Kunhiyop 2012:55-59). Satan has set a kingdom to oppose God's purposes for creation (Jas 4:1-4; 1 Pet 4:1-4; 5:8; Gal 5:17). Not only a kingdom, but aided by

demons, Satan has set up false religions to compete with Christ for the souls of people (1 Tim 4:1, 2). The NT describes him as 'the god of the world' (2 Cor 4:4), chief prince over authorities or principalities (Eph 2:2) and powers (Luke 10:19), and prince of the power of the air and over many spirits (devils).

The NT unquestionably underscores the belief of many cultures that demons are evil or unclean spirits. Grudem believes that Apostle Paul upheld the same position based on 1 Corinthians 10:20, where he says that pagan sacrifices are made to demons (Watt 2011:127). Additionally, Apostle Paul refers to believers' warfare with demons (Eph 6:12) and also warns of increased demonic activities (1 Tim 4:1). By extension, the life of every Christian is wrapped up in a war (cf. Asumang 2008:6). It is no wonder that Christ encouraged His disciples to engage in spiritual wars by the power given them (Luke 10:19). Paul also reiterates this path to fulfilling God's mission with an indication that the battle which is 'not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers...against the powers of this dark world' (Eph 6:12), is won by nothing but spiritual weapons (2 Cor 10:3-6).

The church is called to be on guard against the operation of spiritual enemies in general, that is, irrespective of the form they take. This is a clarion call for spiritual war because God's ultimate mission is to wage war against all His enemies. These enemies include those that operate through all forms of idolatry, which involve demons (Radmacher et al 1997:343; Naugle 2002:283; Watt 2011:129; Nkansah-Obrempong 2006:1454-55). This is because idolatry provokes God's judgement in 'holy war' (Akrong 2001:19; cf. Longman III 2013:426; Nwankpa 2006:840; Wright 2011:177).

This is probably the main reason Paul centred his message to the Christian community at Corinth on the need for purity as

against having engagement with the Greco-Roman idolatrous practices (2 Cor 6:14-15; cf. Barnett 1997:342). As a loving Father who desires what is best for His children, He is not only ready 'to go to great lengths in order to bring people back to the freedom of the truth', but also calls His people as warriors to join Him in the war (Wright 2006:188; cf. Watt 2011:123). This divine mission is motivated by the desire to see all individuals, people groups, and nations turn away from false gods and towards Himself (cf. Wright 2011:186).

God's effort to release people from the bondage of idolatry and all forms of immoral and provocative practices is because of His desire for people to live in the full delight of freedom, which comes from knowledge of the Creator (cf. Ezek 38:22-23; Watt 2011:129-131). His goal of blessing the nations requires not only that the nations abandon their gods but 'bring their true worship before the living God alone' (Wright 2011:186). Thus, He responds to all forms of disobedience and human commitment to demonic spirits with punishment as a corrective measure, and for all people to know that the Most High is sovereign over the kingdoms of humanity (Dan 4:17, 26, 34-37).

In this way, while 'Yahweh war' is sometimes understood as punishment, it is far from right. As Augustine (V.22, 216, 217) argues: 'All of God's acts, including wars, are manifestations of His love for His human creatures'. It also follows from Augustine that people everywhere – and particularly the righteous – stand to benefit from war: in His providence, God does not only use it to correct and chasten human errors, but also to train people in a more 'righteous and laudable way of life'. For Augustine, then, such divine wars remind humankind of the value of consistent righteous living (Mattox 2006:33). What this means is that such

wars are more or less part of the Fatherly measures to draw people to repent and respond correctly to Him.

Yet, God also reserves the right to engage in a 'holy war' to destroy His enemies for their outright rejection or opposition to His will. Christians are supposed to wage a spiritual warfare just as Christ himself did, hence the command to put on the full armour of God (Eph 6:10, 14-18). Therefore, as Okom (2010) appropriately notes on the back cover of her book, 'we need to know the right weapons with which to attack them, otherwise we may be attempting to use a stick to kill a crocodile or a stone to kill a dragon'.

The NT prescribes ways to overcome satanic forces. It reveals how God through Christ's perfect sacrifice has defeated Satan and his team of demons (Col 2:14-15; cf. Rev 12:11). Thus the NT war parallels the 'holy wars' of the OT, which usually began with rituals and sacrifices to seek divine presence and strength for victory (1 Sam 13:8-12). This also means that, 'faith in God's guarding power is a key part of the believer's spiritual armour' (Asumang (2011:30, 33). Indeed, the child of God has been given absolute power over all evil schemes (Luke 10:18). This is evident in the way the devil flees when there is an encounter between him and a Christian.

This is the more reason why purity is part of the moral dictates of Deuteronomy 23:12-14. Interpreting it in NT terms, it is the ability to overcome the 'internal spiritual conflict between the old and new natures, a conflict which requires the believer's constant assertion of victory and self-control', according to Asumang (2011:30, 33). The gospel requires 'total separation' from anything that is demonic or idolatrous by nature (1 Cor 10:14) as Nwankpa (2006:840) also argues. Douglas (2002:52-53) reiterates this call for purity when she notes that 'blessing

and success in war required a man to be whole in body, whole-hearted and trailing no uncompleted schemes’.

Along this tangent, Kunhiyop (2002:136) notes: ‘If there is the power of witchcraft, then the power of the child of God overshadows it’. The victory of Christ over satanic powers was so central to Paul’s messages that one of his epistles was devoted to the subject. His epistle to the Ephesians in particular, and to some extent the Colossians, is noted for the emphasis on the total victory of Christ over the powers (cf. Asumang 2008:2). The apostle’s message to the Colossians (2:14) also adds to this, noting that Christ stripped the evil forces of their power when he made a public display of them and triumphed over them.

Based on Ephesians 2, Gombis (2004:405: cf. Asumang 2008:7) enumerates the triumphs of God in Christ, in order to demonstrate that ‘the powers ruling the present evil age are indeed subject to the Lord Jesus Christ’. Dickason’s submission on the subject, quoted by Kunhiyop (2002:136), is also a strong exhortation for believers:

Satan and demons are no match for Christ, the God-man. In [the] face of satanic opposition, the cross accomplished God’s self-glorification, released the devil’s prisoner, publicly routed evil spirits, and sealed their judgment so that men would never have to fear or follow them again.

No wonder, Scripture is replete with wars that the Divine One wages against Satan and his team of spiritual forces. They are God’s main enemies because they oppose God’s purposes (cf. Asumang 2011:20-21). Not only are Christians encouraged to wage this kind of war with all seriousness (Eph 6:10-12), they also need in-depth information on them in order to resist and continuously overcome spiritual enemies (1 Pet 5:8-9). The

ultimate experience of 'holy war' for all creation, however, is the Lord's descent to destroy His enemies described in the eschatological age (Rev 19:11-20:15; cf. 1 Thes 4:16; Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967-68; Kunhiyop 2012:230).

This is when the Divine Warrior will descend from heaven, and as the Commander-in-Chief and riding 'a white horse', will make war with and destroy all His enemies – Satan and his team of demons (1 Cor 15:24; Eph 6:10-12). This event will signal the final war in which every enemy – both spiritual and human who lacks allegiance to God - will be completely and finally annihilated in the lake of fire (cf. Longman III 2013:427, 795). It is in line with the expectation of a final war that Paul, in 1 Thessalonians 5, combined its apocalyptic and eschatological dimensions with some vital moral instructions 'as part of preparations for the second coming of Christ' (Asumang 2011:23).

This is what Akrong (2001:19), in his comment on war as the ultimate reason for Deuteronomy 23:14, means by 'God would break into history and put an end to the rule of the devil'. God's people are assured of His presence always (Matt 28:20) to protect and grant them victory over their enemies. So Christians, and even believers of the HB only, should be obedient to the instructions to stay and maintain morally holy lives both on the outside and inside in order that God would not depart from them (Deut 23:12-14; cf. 2 Cor 10:3-6).

After the eschatological war, the people of God will enjoy His eternal presence in the holy city, the New Jerusalem. Herein is the sovereignty of God revealed – from the OT camp (Deut 23:12-14) to the NT camp (Rev 19:11-21:27), He is the One in charge. His rule is universal; He is not God only to a specific group of people, but sovereign (cf. Watt 2011:130-131); He reigns now and it will always be so (cf. Ao 2014:23). So no matter the efforts

of evil forces to oppose God's plans for humanity, all their practices are already condemned and the powers behind them have already been destroyed in 'holy war' by Christ (Luke 11:14). But this will be fulfilled in the 'holy war' revealed in the book of Revelation.

Witchcraft and related practices not the only targets

This section is committed to examining how we can appropriate to our lives lessons from God's dealings with His enemies in both camps of OT (Deut 23:12-14) and NT (Rev 19:11-21-27). However, the focus will be narrowed down to particular demonic practices, in order to show why such practices are targets of 'holy war' by Yahweh, the Lord God Almighty. For reasons of emphasis, it will serve the interest of our discussion to provide brief notes on a few of such practices.

The specific demonic practice here is witchcraft and or its related practices. Indeed, many common practices such as witchcraft, sorcery, magic, soothsaying, and the like involve demons and serve as channels by such spiritual forces to influence people (cf. Longman III 2013:427). The unfortunate cases however are situations where some people or cultures go to the extreme and ascribe every negative events to such demonic powers.

Elder James identifies some people as using demonic wisdom (Jam 2:19; 3:15). Witchcraft is one of such practices. It is known not only because of the extent of its entrenched operation in the world, but also the proportion it has assumed since early biblical period to the present in many cultures of the world. Kombo (2003:75; cf Akrong 2001:20) notes: 'Witchcraft has been practised for many centuries world-wide, and is still

deeply rooted in people's lives such that it is not ready to eradicate'.

Kombo further underscores the existence of witchcraft thus: 'To doubt the existences of witches and their activities was to deny the very existence of God'. He defines witchcraft as 'a mystical and innate power which can be used by its possessor to harm other people'. Kibor (2003:74; cf. Yamoah 2012:72-79) submits that the people who have been delivered from the power of witchcraft speak of its reality, claiming it to be 'Satan's power at work, using demons and human agents to expand his wickedness and rebellion against God on earth'.

Related to witchcraft are practices like sorcery, and magic. Scriptural renditions may differentiate between these practices, especially witchcraft and sorcery. For instance, versions such as NIB, NIV, NLT, and NAS differentiate between them, while the KJV rather highlights witchcraft and identifies sorcery with it or with other similar ones. Scholarly definitions also differ, sometimes.

Kibor (2006:152), for instance, defines sorcery as 'the use of black magic and medicines against others' and that it is known to involve the use of objects, formulas, incantations and casting of spells to harm people. Witchcraft on the other hand is defined as a psychic act which has no rites neither casts spells nor uses medicine. However, 'it is a psychic act whose mysterious power permeates all aspects of human life, be it political, economic, social and psychological' (Kombo 2003:75).

However, the two practices in particular appear to be similar or the same, because they come from the same root word (Hb קַשָּׁפִּי, *kashaph*; Gk φάρμακεία, *pharmakeia*), and translated by Strong (no. 3784, 5331; cf. TWOT 1051a and 1051b) as witchcraft (cf. 2 Chr 33:6; 2 Kgs 9:22; Gal 5:20) or sorcery (cf. Exod 7:11; 22:18; Isa 47:9; Dan 2:2; Gal 5:20).

However, magic (cf. Acts 8:9, NAS) and sometimes sorcery (cf. Acts 8:9, KJV) are translated by another word (Gk □□□□□□, *mageuo*). Hence versions such as RSV, NJB, NET, and CSB identify witchcraft with sorcery or any similar practice and use the two words interchangeably.

Sometimes, however, the Scriptures single out one and list it among other sins. For instance, witchcraft/sorcery (Gal 5:20) as against magic (Rev 21:8), yet both are connected to idolatry as spiritually dangerous and unholy, because they all lead people away from properly worshipping Yahweh and expose them to demonic influences or practices (cf. Longman III 2013:825; Kibor 2006:157). Simon, identified as the sorcerer (NIV, NIB, KJV and NLT), or magician (NAS), for instance, was rebuked by Peter and commanded to repent (Acts 8:9-24). Elymas is mentioned as the magician who was rebuked by Paul and described as 'a child of the devil' and 'enemy of everything that is right' (Acts 13:6-12).

Many factors may generate people's interest, and in the process initiate them into witchcraft and the related forms. Kombo (2003:74) comments that practitioners of witchcraft in particular claim that they have no option but to follow family clan tradition, otherwise they would themselves suffer misfortunes. Further, he notes how in many instances witchcraft was inherited or passed on from one generation to another, and that the means of acquiring witchcraft may take various forms.

The bottom line to initiation into witchcraft, however, appears to be what Kibor underscores here. He writes: 'Human beings in their free agency make pacts with the devil, in virtue of which he was allowed, under divine administration, to share with them some of his supernatural powers as prince of the power of darkness, and god of this world' (2006:153-56).

Witchcraft is blamed for everything in Africa context

In Africa, for instance, Parrinder (1974:133; cf. Kibor 2006:151) observes that belief in witchcraft on the continent is, 'a great tyranny spreading panic and death', and that the practice is still very widely feared and operating just as much 'under the influence of modern civilization and Christianity as ever before'. Similarly, Kibor (2006:151) notes that the beliefs of practices like witchcraft and sorcery in the traditional worship which are firmly held in many parts of Africa have been carried over into the Church. Watt (2011:139) argues along the same line thus:

From the writings of many African authors and theologians, it seems that contemporary Africa does indeed continue to practice and perpetuate certain rituals and religious traditions which can be deemed idolatry. It has been proposed that these idolatrous activities can act as pathways for the demonic powers to traffic and gain sway or influence over people's lives.

Thus, the significance of the knowledge of witchcraft is in the fact that the practice is harmful to what is the norm in society. For example, Kombo (2003:73-74) notes that it is the witch who is spoken of as 'the epitome of evil, the negation of the human being, the external enemy intent on destruction, whose image has been said to represent the standardised nightmares of the people'. Their activities, as Kibor (2003:74) notes, 'focus on areas of competition for personal gain within society'. There is no doubt, however, that people with weak faith, and not filled by the Holy Spirit, form the most vulnerable group to the witches' attacks.

These reasons are behind the call on people, beginning with OT Israel and extending to the Gentiles, to worship the true

God only, by repenting of idolatry which is often practised under the guise of cultural and social norms. All who have dabbled in demonic activities such as witchcraft will by all means suffer some regrettable consequences in the end. This is because they are listed among those who are excluded from the holy city or annihilated in the lake of fire (Rev 21:8; 22:15; cf. Kunhiyop 2002:136). It is against this backdrop that serious efforts should be made not only to warn people against such a demonic practice, but to also help those involved in it to come out.

Chapter Conclusion

So far, our discussions have been clear on the fact that Satan can transform into an angel of light among believers in order to remain unnoticed and operate (2 Cor 11:14). Due to the increasing involvement of people in demonic practices such as worship of idols and gods in the end time (cf. Kibor 2006:156), and the revelation that the influence of the anti-Christ will be boosted by great miracles and signs (2 Thes 2:9-12), Scriptures warn against engagement with them. Any kind of loyalty to any entity other than God amounts to the deceit and trickery of spiritual powers (John 8:44; 1 Cor 4:4; Eph 2:1-2; 1 Tim 4:1-3).

Chapter 12

Post-New Testament

'Holy war' is Not Physical Violence

While the idea of a 'holy war' had been understood from the Old Testament as involving violence, that picture is not wholly the case. The change which comes by way of God's dealing with humanity in the New Testament must be strongly appreciated. Consequently, a number of interesting questions arise when the NT believer talks about 'holy war'. For example: Can a Christian serve as police or military personnel? To what extent is the service of those in state enforcement roles such as the police or military significant? Should the Christian be absolutely nonviolent or should be self-defensive or both, and if self-defence should be employed at all, under what circumstances and to what extent?

This chapter is dedicated to tackling two major issues related to 'holy war'. It intends to focus primarily on how Christians who want to pursue the course of non-violence and yet have to deal with self-defence can draw the lines.

What is 'Holy war' to the State/Nation/Government?

Since acceptance of careers in institutions like state security services should not lead Christians to conclude that 'Jesus would endorse the wars that soldiers fight' (Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967-68), they should be able to convince themselves of their involvement in the state police or military service. This is because the services of these personnel sometimes involve application of violence or enlistment for purposes of war, though the use of violence by these is more

often subject to the directives of a higher authority (cf. Yoder 1975:206). This is the topic for discussion in the current section. The arguments are also in the light of the observation that the current situation on the continent of Africa, for instance, indicates a failure to solve conflicts by any form of violence (Kunhiyop 2008:124).

For the discussions here, the question of whether nations/states should refrain from wars or not, or Christians should abstain from police or military service to their country or not, is not contentious. Scripturally, abstaining from all forms of meaningful services to state authority is no doubt tantamount to disobedience to God, since state authorities are also 'ordained by God' and do not 'bear the sword for nothing' (Rom 13:4). But the traditional idea of seeing the state as wielding power to execute any kind of mandate has been challenged in the face of the moral grounds for some of its actions (cf. Yoder 1975:193-214).

Truly, as a result of the usual negative effects and harm that result from physical wars, there are those who consider engagements in war and military service as some of the 'worldly' concerns that should not seriously engage the attention of any true Christians, let alone serve as attraction for them (Mattox 2006:35). It has been argued in the previous section that the state may apply legitimate force as a means of protecting its citizens and maintaining peace (cf. Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967-68). Therefore, in executing their divine function justifiably, then, everybody, most especially, the Christian law enforcement agents, who primarily are the police and/or soldiers, are obliged to submit.

This means that, a genuine police or military service to the moral order of a state is justifiable, as shown by the way some

soldiers were recognised by Scripture. The overriding objective must be to satisfy a noble cause of divine justice, that is, a step subject to the will of God anything less is subject to divine judgement.

Kunhiyop (2008:124) comments on the frequent physical unrest in Africa that 'violence is not the answer because violence produces more hatred and more violence, but never ultimately resolves the conflict'. While this submission is an honest one, it nevertheless elicits some responses, particularly where cases that call for war on this continent are extremely diverse. For example, coup d'états to overthrow legitimate governments are a common feature. Armed robbers are always on the heels of people to attack and sometimes rape female captives and/or maim the resisting males before they bolt with their booty. Family or tribal litigations over land and other natural resources and properties can lead to verbal battles that can erupt into ethnic or inter-tribal wars. And sometimes mischievous people take advantage of the chaos to settle scores with their enemies, which end up affecting innocent lives.

It is in this light that the role of state police or military service becomes significant to physical war and acceptable to God. This is why they are acknowledged and even lauded by Scripture for their noble missions. For instance, Luke 3:14 records how the soldiers who humbly inquired from John the Baptist at the Jordan how they should execute their services were advised. The 'firebrand prophet' did not ignore them because of their profession, but rather admonished them to do their work with honesty and be content with their wages - though Volf (1996:291) thinks this is a failure on the part of this NT prophet.

What about the Lord himself commending a Roman Centurion for his demonstration of faith instead of avoiding him

for pursuing an unjust cause (Matt 8:10-12)? Besides, the recognition of Cornelius, another military officer (Acts 10:1-48), is an example of how the military profession, when served with honesty, is recognised by God.

Therefore, Aboagye-Mensah's (2006:967-68) argument is appropriate. He states, 'the fact that none of these soldiers was asked to leave military service is an indication of the nobility of military engagements, especially when it is done as a means of defending their country or as peacemakers'. When institutions of states acting as God's instruments of justice employ some legitimate level of force to protect their citizens, by deploying the police/military to quash violence visited on innocent people by those who think that they can forcibly take advantage of others, such services should be lauded as missions. Such is what was done to save Paul from imminent arrest and death by some violent Jews (Acts 23:12-35).

Indeed, Christians are not obliged to obey the state for nothing. As Kudadjie and Aboagye-Mensah (1991:24) argue, 'it is not for the sake of the state that we obey but for God'. The call rests on the expectation that a government that Christ, the chief advocator of justice (Isa 9:7), expects His followers to submit to will have justice as one of its judicial pillars. The pair of scholars above also maintain that, 'the state was raised to establish and maintain justice'. It makes sense to agree with them that 'Christians are to obey the state in so far as such obedience does not conflict with God's purpose intended for the state'.

Definitely, the sword that the state authorities bear is not only a symbol of power but also of divine judgement (Unger 1988:104) or as Yoder (1975:206) puts it, 'judicial authority'. Since justice is an undeniable pillar in God's judicial standards (cf. 1 Kgs 10:9; Psa 89:14; Isa 56:1), He expects any state or

government to act accordingly (cf. 1 Chr 18:14). Thus, when they fall short of His 'just' standard He steps in to prove that He rules in the affairs of men, and as Nebuchadnezzar admitted, 'all his ways are just' (Dan 4:25, 32-37; cf. Rev 15:3).

One cannot but agree with the argument that while evil is not good, in situations where more acts of terror are likely to follow, an obvious reaction of war would be accepted as the lesser evil. Such an action might be burdensome and more likely to lead to some casualties and other losses, yet it 'is the best and only rational course' (Packer 2002:45-49). The question is: can the same argument be advanced for individual self-defence against violence? This will be addressed in the subsequent section.

Significance of 'Holy War' to Self-defence

It is likely that quite a number of NT users have misconstrued the position of the Lord on violence and self-defence, as Stott (1990:85) also argues. In today's world where violence is the order of the day, looking for answers to how the Bible believer should respond to this challenge is not strange. While some pacifists advocate for absolute nonviolence in response to any terror and are willing to even embrace those that are considered deceitful and unjust (Volf 1996:290-95), others see a possibility of a somehow liberal position.

For the latter group, 'nowhere does the New Testament suggest that it is acceptable to use weapons to settle a dispute'. Yet they submit that refusal to accept violence 'does not mean that we passively accept whatever is done to us, nor does it mean that we cannot use force to protect ourselves when attacked' (Kunhiyop 2008:115 and 124 respectively). This section will address where and how we should draw the line.

The gospel of Luke 22:36-38, which is recognised as 'undoubtedly the most difficult passage in the NT to reconcile with Jesus' teaching of non-violent love' (Kunhiyop 2008:118), offers us great insights to our discussion here. As observed in a previous chapter, Kunhiyop argues that an ordinary reading of this text suggests that when Jesus instructed his disciples to purchase a sword for themselves, 'he was simply acknowledging the reality of violence'. In other words, Jesus did not prohibit the use of the sword for self-defence, but rather acknowledged that the 'sword may be needed for self-protection'.

But Kunhiyop mentions William Barclay's argument that the words of Jesus in the text are simply and metaphorically 'a vivid eastern way of telling the disciples that their very lives are at stake'. It is also in defence of non-violence that he argues that the Lord's instruction to Peter to put the sword back (Matt 26:52) should be understood in the context of his arrest. This means that he did not want anybody to resort to violence or engage in a fight in order to prevent his arrest. This confirms the non-violent position of the Lord.

Nevertheless, there are passages that give indications of self-defence in the NT. The Lord's readiness at one point to free himself from the grip of those that seized him in the hope of throwing him down the cliff at Nazareth (Luke 4:28-30), while later, he humbly submitted himself without resistance to arrest (Luke 22:51-53), indicate his stance on self-defence. In the first instance, he realised it was not the will of God to allow his arrest, so he resisted it in contravention to the arguments of pacifists that Christians 'are not to resist an evil person' (Stott 1990:86).

However, in the second instance, he submitted to arrest in accordance with the Father's will (Luke 22:39-53). Therefore, just as the will of God is supreme in matters of war (cf. Augustine

VII.30, 291, 292; Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967-68; Domeris 1986:35-37; Asumang 2011:19; Kunhiyop 2008:115; Poythress 1995:142) one needs to submit to the will of God in matters of self-defence.

Much as some may argue that the Lord advocates a non-violent response to violent injustices, there are indications that he does not object to self-defence against physical abuses. That is to say, if it were possible, a non-violent type, where self-defence is understood here to involve violence or not, but choosing the latter. Refusal to employ violence means that we must not be aggressive in a conflict situation such as we may undergo under duress. This does not mean surrendering to unnecessary and meaningless circumstances. In situations such as when one is arrested for the sake of the gospel, Scripture says it should be counted a blessing (1 Pet 3:13-17; Jam 1:12). However, this is not a hard and fast rule for all situations, for when there was a plot to arrest and kill Paul, he sought means to quash it in order to save his life (Acts 23:12-35).

It is in this light that the argument of pacifists that 'we are not to resist an evil person' (Stott 1990:86) is quite challenging. Advocating a non-violent response to injustice just as Volf (1996:290-95) hopes to achieve, is 'not at odds with self-defence or defence of one's family or even one's church' (Kunhiyop 2008:118). There are situations where non-violent resistance is suppressed in the midst of unjust suffering on the basis of instilling a sense of hope and stressing a vindication at the day of the Lord, as Asumang (2011:9-10) observes. However, as he continues, this may be interpreted as 'fostering a sense of passivity that paralyzes believers into seeing themselves as helpless victims' and an attempt which 'extinguishes any

pressure for change with the promise of reward in heaven' and therefore a 'weak capitulation to oppressors.'

Where families and churches have been targeted for destruction by some religious fundamentalists, armed robbers, and other terrorist groups, for instance, it would be very appropriate for the person to seek self-protection. For, it is wise and rational to protect one's household when attacked (cf. Kunhiyop 2008:124). Accordingly, anybody who 'in wisdom as led by the spirit of God' employs any method of self-protection or defence against his/her enemies will be waging a physical holy/just war (cf. Deut 23:14).

Asumang's (2011:37-38) advice on how best to respond when believers find themselves in an antagonistic environment, based on Peter's approach to resistance (1 Pet 5:9) is in line with the NT's transformation of the 'holy war' motive of the OT. He confirms that 'resistance is the correct response to a culture that seeks to bully Christians into 'toeing the line'. He continues that, 'the way of the Lord, and as reiterated by the apostle, is one in which His mission must be served not through compromise, and retreat, but through an emboldened resistance that is prepared to suffer for the consequences of that stance'. However, such methods should only be employed when all other options have failed.

Besides, Asumang (2011:37-38) underlines such weapons of resistance as holiness through Christ's redemptive work, peaceful non-retaliation, and Spirit-empowered witness, which are clearly different from what the world would imagine. Far from being seen as weak people, he argues: 'these and other Spirit-filled qualities are spiritual weapons of the "holy war" that Christ has fought and won. As his following soldiers, we can engage the

bullying world with emboldened resistance, just as 1 Peter aimed to achieve in its first readers’.

Chapter Conclusion

This chapter has brought to the fore a couple of issues. One of the fundamental issues is that the phrase, ‘your enemy’ in the pericope may represent both personal and national enemies. However, the argument from the discussions is that as much as possible, we must encourage non-violent yet active resistance in dealing with all forms of conflict on the continent.

Resorting to non-violent means of redress is no doubt the ultimate, since, as Kunhiyop (2008:120) argues: ‘This enables Christians to extend a hand of reconciliation to others in order to fulfil the ministry that God has committed to all Christians’ (1 Cor 5:18). It is this reconciliatory position that both Paul (Rom 12:17-21) and Volf (Carnes 2001:22) also encourage. We will explore the practicalities of applying non-violent approaches as we consider who God’s physical enemies in ‘holy war’ really are in the next chapter.

Chapter 13

Why is “Holy War” regarded as Divine Judgement?

From the early chapters of Matthew to the later part of Revelation the ‘holy war’ motif underpins many of the narrations. When Jesus emerged on the scene of Jewish history in the NT era, he did not keep his listeners uninformed about how war would become a major factor to determine the direction of events in the world. By speaking about war more often in the gospels, Jesus was preparing people for it. For instance, he did not mince his words in telling them of how Jerusalem would come under siege and the consequences of this for the nation (Luke 19:41-44).

Wars and rumours of wars are at the top of the list of the signs of the last days given by our Lord (cf. ISBE no. 9050). Angel (2011:299-317) limits his argument of Christ as the Divine Warrior to only Matthew’s gospel, but military metaphors are employed in several different settings of the entire NT particularly the Gospels (cf. Asumang 2011:17-18). Passages like Matthew 24:6; Mark 13:7; Luke 21:9; and 21:20-24 are examples. Similarly, there are diverse divine and symbolic weapons in the NT with interesting descriptions which are related to virtues of the Christian life.

Communication in warfare terms is commonly used in most of the Pauline epistles; no wonder, then, the mention of weapons in figurative terms, to deal with them. As Longman III (2013:795) also observes, Paul described Christ’s crucifixion and ascension in warfare language (Eph 4:7-10; Col 2:13-15). For instance, Paul speaks about the ‘shield of faith’ as a divine weapon to block the

fiery darts of the enemy (Eph 6:16). Sword (Gk μαχαιρα, *machaira*) is also used figuratively for the word of God as 'the sword of the spirit' (Eph 6:17) and a 'double-edged sword' (Heb 4:12), though Yoder (1975:206) thinks it symbolises judicial authority. Then shiryon (Gk θώρακ, *thorax*) represents the 'breastplate of righteousness' (Eph 6:14; 1 Thes 5:8).

'Holy war' is a Divine mission against sin/evil

The NT writers traced warfare to a variety of factors, most of which are connected to the ethical behaviour of God's people. God's war against impurity in the NT is an allusion to the war that God declared right in Eden (Gen 3:15), and this culminated in the coming of Jesus. That is, to completely eliminate evil and the power of sin and in fulfilment of God's promise to Adam and Eve mentioned earlier, Jesus, the 'seed of the woman', 'had to wage the ultimate war against sin on Calvary' (cf. Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967-68). He did it so that he would fulfil God's covenant promise to humanity and conquer not only the powers of sin and death in which Satan, the 'seed of the serpent', held humanity (cf. Radmacher et al 1997:10, 1131-1132), but also those who are God's enemies because they have broken His moral laws (cf. Asumang 2007:16-17; 2011:20-21; Isa 13:3-5; 59:15-19; Rev 21:8).

In this light, another text on which Deuteronomy 23:12-14 sheds light is Romans 13:12-14: 'The night is far gone...So then let us cast off the works of darkness and put on the *armor* of light. Let us walk properly as in the daytime, not in orgies and drunkenness, not in sexual immorality...But put on the Lord Jesus Christ...' (ESV 2012). The use of armour in the text which is a weapon of war here links the language of "holy war" with the ethical/moral behaviour of God's children in the NT and today.

Particularly, Apostle Paul's messages of Romans 7-8 were likely underpinned by the struggle over sin, which is tantamount to a "holy war". He argued this war as a spiritual struggle that goes on within a person as a result of the desire to overcome sin (Rom 7:23; 8:37). Other NT writers also underscore the Christian's constant moral battle as a form of 'war against the soul' (Jas 4:1-3; 1 Pet 2:11; cf. ISBE no. 9050). It is thus to deal with such 'enemies of the soul' that 'holy war' is God's special mission of redemption of humanity in the NT.

Paul articulated this 'holy war' against impurity when he spoke about God's wrath revealed against all sin and evils of humanity (Rom 1:18-32). The undertones of 'holy war' also undergird some of Paul's message concerning those who destroy the 'camp or temple or church' through divisive acts (1 Cor 3:17) – which is tantamount to defilement of the community (cf. Liu 2013:122–26). Blomberg (1994:81) argues along similar lines, but emphasises the judgement that awaits such sin, describing it as 'eternal destruction' on the Judgement Day. These corroborate our position that 'holy war' is a divine mission against sin/evil in the NT. No wonder the apostle revisited the issue later (2 Cor 10:3-6) when he appealed for obedience to the word of God, an observation which Martin (1986:305) also makes.

In the NT context, 'holy war' is connected to unethical behaviour of God's people (cf. Rom 7:23; 8:37), and may be unleashed in the form of disease. Since God's wrath unleashed as leprosy on Uzziah as a consequence of his pride and unfaithfulness (2 Chr 26:16-20; cf. Num 12) was a form of 'holy war', the disease that was inflicted on Herod and which led to his death (Acts 12:20-23) should also be understood as 'holy war' – for his arrogance (cf. Scurlock and Anderson 2005:17). Similar

divine judgement awaits those engaged in impropriety at the 'Lord's table' (1 Cor 11:27-30). This link between sin and sickness in the NT, which Paul mentions in connection with the Lord's Table (1 Cor 11:17-31), and which James also indicates (Jam 5:14-16; cf. Albl 2002:123), should not be ignored.

Paul indicates this sin/impurity-sickness-death linkage in 'holy war' when he writes that anyone who attends the Lord's Table in an unworthy manner will be guilty of sin, with bodily weakness and sickness and death as divine judgement (1 Cor 11:17-31). The link between impurity and sickness in the NT as argued concerning the Israelite community in the camp on the basis of our OT pericope is underscored by James (5:14-16). It is an observation which Albl (2002:123) also makes and implies that purity guarantees the health of God's people.

Additionally, Paul's indication of divine judgement on those who rebel against state authorities (Rom 13:3) and his use of a weapon of war by a state ruler, 'for he does not bear the sword for nothing' (Rom 13:4), make a case for the warfare undertones in most, if not all, of his letters. Asumang (2007:17) consequently underscores the warfare picture that Paul portrays concerning Christ and the saints in Romans 13. His link of Paul's 'holy war' messages with the eschatological or apocalyptic war is of special interest. He notes:

Paul was teaching that in the final apocalyptic battle which is gathering, believers must put on their vestment of light and join in with Christ, their Divine Warrior, to defeat the world of darkness through their godly behaviour...

The foregone discussion strengthens the argument that moral purity is a motivation for the Divine Warrior to defend and defeat His enemy or the enemies of His people. Jesus also gave

indications that the kind of war he had come to promote goes beyond the usage of physical weapons. However, such indications are not enough to show that He condemns the use of violence or physical weapons for defence. Indeed, there are certain passages which lend themselves to the interpretation that Jesus does not condemn the use of violence or physical weapons for defence.

A typical example is Jesus' statement: 'Do not think that I have come to bring peace but war' (Matt 10:34). This statement appears ironical in the light of the commonly accepted view that Isaiah's prophecy about the 'Prince of Peace' (Isa 9:1-7) refers to him as intimating God's overall mission of peace in His eternal kingdom. Jesus' statement about buying a sword (Luke 22:36), is another typical text that reveals his earthly mission, but seems quite difficult to interpret.

Consequently, it is easy to misconstrue Jesus on violence or the application of physical weapons. For instance, Kunhiyop (2008:120) argues that the Lord's statement about buying a sword is in the context of His arrest, which He did not want anybody to fight to prevent. Clearly, the text appears to suggest that His followers should accept to live as warriors; most unlikely as physical warriors, but rather as spiritual ones.

This is in the light of the fact that in Matthew 26:52, he condemned any usage of or any call to take up physical arms. Similarly, Aboagye-Mensah (2006:967-68) points to Jesus' statement to Peter and Pilate (John 18:1, 36 respectively) as evidence of the 'non-violence' option for Christians in solving conflicts. Thus, it is a condemnation of the 'medieval crusades and any other wars fought to promote the kingdom of God'.

Chapter Conclusion

In other words, apart from the instances where issues of physical violence are inferred from his statements, Jesus primarily focused on spiritual warfare as the believer's mode of engaging in 'holy war'. This is never to argue that physical wars automatically ceased with the advent of Jesus. As a matter of fact, as long as physical life on earth goes on, issues of physical warfare are likely to 'pop up'.

Nevertheless, the issue of concern here is Jesus' concentration on spiritual warfare. Indeed, matters of physical wars will be looked at in the subsequent sections. In the next chapter, attention is devoted to some experiences of 'Holy War' in the OT period.

Chapter 14

Yahweh will wage "Holy War"

against destruction of "Sacred" Earth

From the early chapters and particularly the previous one, it has been argued that just as the camp of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 was a sacred place because of God's presence and so is the whole earth. It is not only in the above law but throughout the Bible that 'the essence of holiness is tied to the unique nature of the earth as a 'sacred space'. The character of God is such that 'he is beyond all human definitions, above all human power, and deserving of all human worship, yet through which he longs to relate to human beings' (Wells 2000:14-16).

It is in this light that in spite of the fall of humanity with its consequences for the rest of creation (Rom 8:19-22), 'God still rejoices in the beauty and balance of his creation' (Richter 2010:368). Thus, closely connected to moral purity is what a person demonstrates by way of attitude towards the outside world. In other words, the call for purity cannot be separated from our relationship with our earthly environment, which in the passage was seen not only as a camp but as a 'sacred space'.

To the greatest extent, 'the entire world has been God's sanctuary since the dawn of time, as also affirmed in Isaiah 66:1 that 'the heavens are His throne, and the earth is His footstool' (cf. Matt 5:35). Indeed, not only the earth but 'the entire universe is a sacramental place for God' (Lioy 2010:25-29). Therefore, the 'camp' here can be applied to the earth as a geographical location. Asumang and Domeris (2006:1-26; cf. 2007:10) employed sociological models in spatiality to examine the expositions made by the author of Hebrews. They conclude that

the spaces of the wilderness camp (Num 1:47-2:34; 3:14-16, 29-38; 10:11-28) were typologically presented and interpreted by the author of Hebrews in his schematic expositions, in which the 'inhabited world' (Heb 2:5-18) corresponds to the camp of God's people.

The whole world then becomes a 'camp', not only because the earth and its fullness is Yahweh's (Psa 34:1), but like the OT camp where His presence dwells, He constantly walks amongst His people (cf. Martin 1986:204; Hafemann 2000:284). Consequently, not only should specific places be regarded as 'camp/holy grounds/temple' as in the OT/NT Jewish worship or as associated with some religious groups in some parts of the world, rather, for Christians, every place of this 'inhabited world' becomes a sacred space.

It is reasonable then to identify with Skolimowski (1993:6) that humans should regard the earth as a sanctuary, since it immediately alters the role of any dweller to that of 'a shepherd, a responsible priest who maintains the sanctuary'. This is because it 'creates a sense that the world is a spiritual place, and if this is deeply felt then the only possible way to act in the world is with reverence' (Cox and Holmes 2000:73). What this also means is that since humanity is created in the image of God, we should live in a holy/clean environment that reflects God's nature (cf. Faniran and Nihinlola 2007:6; Bakke n.d.). We are called to demonstrate responsible stewardship towards the earth (Gen 2:15; cf. Lioy 2010:25-29; Richter 2010:376), because it is God's footstool.

Consequently, we have to treat our environment with respect. We should live with a deep sense of devotion, or as Skolimowski (1993:7) puts it, 'empathy fused with reverence', and 'to watch, notice, and live in heightened contact', as Cox and

Holmes (2000:73) also put it. As people created new not only for good works (Eph 2:10), but to be advocates of God's handiworks (1 Pet 2:9), Christians 'cannot afford to ignore the natural environment' (Osborn 1993:12). The environment, according to Skolimowski (1993:6; cf. Cox and Holmes 2000:73), often becomes what we as guardians determine:

Treat it like a machine and it becomes a machine.
Treat it like a divine place and it becomes a divine place. Treat it indifferently and ruthlessly and it becomes an indifferent ruthless place. Treat it with love and care and it becomes a loving and caring place.

Thus, when we beautify our environments it does not only speak volumes of the way we cherish what the Lord God Almighty has given us, it also indicates our preparedness to let it reflect His beautiful creation. As Christian community living in the environment, a healthy environment will impact on our bodies and enable us to live healthily as the temple of the Lord God Almighty. Moreover, since the whole earth is a 'sacred space', we should treat our immediate environs with some sense of devotion or respect, because Yahweh, the I AM, still walks in the midst of His creation.

By extension of our pericope, then, Lord God wants people to regard the earth as 'sacred', because of His presence, and not mess it up with faecal matter. God's message in Jeremiah 2:7: 'I brought you into a fertile land to eat the fruit and rich produce. But you came and defiled my land and made my inheritance detestable', as Faniran and Nihinlola (2007:48) argue 'was a reprimand which came particularly when He saw that His original purpose for man which was to take care of land had been replaced by uncontrolled pollution through diverse waste'.

That is to say that, just as the OT camp was prone to defilement, the earth as the universal camp had been defiled, this time 'not by ceremonial, but by ethical impurity' (Sprinkle 2000:637). The statement 'Yahweh still walks in the midst of His people', in direct anthropomorphic terms, means He might soil Himself by stepping into any human matter or "shit" in our environment (cf. Christensen 2002:540). Accordingly, pollution of the any part of the earth by human waste in violation of God's instructions is, as Newmyer (2001:428) puts it, 'not merely foolish but sacrilegious as well'.

Unfortunately, the challenge of filth argued so far is not current but dates back to time immemorial (cf. Aklikpe-Osei 2014:9). Indeed, Biblical and Talmudic sources reveal the difficulty of separating such a challenge from both religious and moral considerations (Newmyer 2001:428), but the effort to deal with it pays fruitful dividend. This is in the light of the fact that humanity's responsibility is not only to our fellow human beings but to our environment and creation as a whole (Bruce 1979:8; cf. Richter 2010:354-376).

Moreover, since as humans we are God's creatures of a physical environment, we are always subject to all the conditions therein. In other words, the geographical environment affects every person's mode of life and thought, social and religious life, and whole culture (cf. Nesbitt 1942:306), because everyone is hedged in by the forces of nature together with the total physical setting. Our subjection to the effects of our environment includes the everything, particularly all the negative health implications when our environment is polluted by faeces. Thus caring for our environment becomes a duty we owe to ourselves and future generations, and should not be compromised. We should not be our own enemies by destroying ourselves by negative practices.

Since any disregard for the instructions of the Lord God Almighty for the care of the environment constitutes ethical infringement, such disobedience is likely to elicit judgement and wrath from the Almighty God in the form of a 'holy war' (cf. Wright 2008:47-48). This argument also finds support in the beliefs and practices of the Greeks. Newmyer (2001:429) notes how 'the Greeks adopted a cautious and reverential attitude toward the out-of-doors which was rooted not so much in an ecological consciousness as in fear of divine retribution for transgression against nature'. In the light of these pieces of evidence from the OT, NT, and secular history, I consider the link between improper faeces disposal and the outbreak of diseases or plague and 'holy war' too compelling to be overlooked.

Consequently, the high incidence of outbreak of diseases with resultant deaths in our contemporary world cannot be ignored but explained as a possible 'holy war' by the Lord God Almighty against humanity's indiscriminate disposal of human waste in our 'earthly camp', and a corruption of His property (Psa 24:1). This situation is aggravated by continuous reports of high sickness levels and/or outbreaks of diseases in many unhygienic communities. For instance, current reports on health and sanitation indicate a lack of usable toilet facilities leading to high rate of open defecation and other forms of negative disposal practices (cf. Black and Fawcett 2008:¶4-5).

Chapter Conclusion

Some people may see the idea of sacred space under the new covenant as abolished, and arguably, the idea of sacred spaces like the OT temple with their regular rituals might not be applicable now. The distinctive feature of the NT idea is that the external aspect of sacredness of a place has almost entirely

disappeared, and the ethical meaning has become supreme. Nevertheless, as Sprinkle (2000:657) admits, the fact that we call church buildings 'sanctuaries' is an indication that 'we sense the need psychologically of having sacred spaces even today'.

Presently, Yahweh, the I AM, and the true Living God, is tabernacled among believers such that not only is our body the temple of the Holy Spirit, but His presence is also where two or three have met in the name of the Lord (Matt 18:20). This makes any practice that destroys the earth condemnable. And all who will engage in such a practice enemies of the Lord God Almighty, and subjects liable to divine judgement via 'holy war'. It is to avoid such war against people that attention is now turned to deal with open defecation in Ghana.

Chapter 15

All Christians to Engage

Prayer Crusades against “Holy War”

It appears that Bible believers are sometimes the worst offenders when it comes to addressing some of the cankers of contemporary society. Some think that once they become Christians they are guaranteed the right to use creation the way they like, including abusing it for their individual benefits or communal interest. This is rather unfortunate. Christians should rather understand that Yahweh, the Lord God Almighty, is not isolated from His creation and that when they abuse creation they do not only offend the Creator but they put themselves in a position to be held accountable for such misdeeds. Thus, there is the need for Bible believers, especially Christians, to be role-models in ensuring that best practices of sanitation and hygiene to conserve creation become the order of the day.

At this juncture, it is clear that efforts to champion the campaign against insanitary practices might be achieved better by emphasising specific roles that Christians who constitute majority of the populace can play. At least, two of such roles have been raised in the subsequent section.

Intensive Prayers Crusade needed

All the recommendations above might prove futile if the Church fails in its mandate to promote effective warfare against its enemies. In other words, as part of the divine army, God’s people should not be passive in the battle, but rather serve as active warriors under the guidance and inspiration of God, the Commander-in-Chief (cf. Deut 20:4; Exod 23:20-30; 1 Sam

17:45; Longman III 2013:120, 794; Aboagye-Mensah 2006:967-68; Christensen 2002:543; Madeleine and Lane 1978:270-271; Matthews 2006:58; Sumrall 1982:150). Significantly, divine warfare as an absolutely metaphorical military combat that is mandated by God is fought by Him with or wholly through the agency of His people (Asumang 2011:18). This is because, Scripture emphasises God equipping His people to wage wars against spiritual enemies (2 Cor 10:3-6; Eph 6:10-18; 1 Tim 1:18).

Therefore, all believers should be part of organised intensive intercessory prayers themselves and also for the salvation of people who are entangled in and/or wrestling to overcome various forms of sin that defile the land, especially those that are connected to bloodshed for sacrifices to idols and all forms of demonic practices. As Nwankpa (2006:840) also argues, the land which has also become defiled through various immoral practices, particularly and for our purposes, improper faeces disposal, and also through other detestable sins like idolatry, has to be redeemed and cleansed through the blood of Jesus as the people of God pray (cf. 2 Chr 7:14-16).

To execute such an assignment victoriously and also experience the fullness of God's promised salvation, Christians must not overlook His assurance of abiding presence to protect and grant them victory over their enemies. As has already been argued, the warfare of Christians is first of all a spiritual struggle that goes on within them as a result of the desire to overcome sin (Rom 7:23; 8:37; 13:11-14; cf. Christensen 2002:157). This struggle is described as a constant moral battle or 'war against the soul' (Jas 4:1-3; 1 Pet 2:11).

Thus, like the requirement of the open defecation law of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 to the Israelite army, Christians should

be obedient to God's instructions to stay pure so that He would not depart from them. By so doing, they will not only fulfil the requirements of the law but will also enjoy its promises.

On top of this, the instructions of Deuteronomy 23:12-14 were set out for those who would enjoy divine promises of protection from their enemies as well as victory over them. Thus, once Christians live in interface with some of the modern forms of satanic/demonic practices 'which through multiculturalism are also increasing in traditionally 'Christian' countries' (Barnett 1997:358; cf. Kibor 2006:1562; Thes 2:9-12), there is the need for divine intervention to deal with such enemies. The following proposals are very likely to be helpful.

First, Christianity should not be seen as only a way to religiosity, that is, as a set of rules, promises, rituals, and other outward displays (cf. Kombo 2003:80). Not just faith in Christ but the preparedness to rely on the power of the Holy Spirit should permeate into people's consciousness in order for them to experience continuous victories over sin. It is not strange to find professing Christians who have a shallow knowledge of the Scriptures and consequently they cannot comprehend what Scripture teaches concerning the operations of demonic powers.

The recognition of satanic powers over both unbelievers and spiritually weak believers makes it important for such people to seek refuge in the power of God. Messages on demonology must not be shelved from new converts. Rather, because of the tendency to backslide, there should be systematic teachings on such subjects to create better awareness (cf. Kibor 2006:159).

Second, is the unfortunate observation that in spite of the many references of Scripture to operations of demons, many people continue to live daily without serious engagement in prayer through the power of the Holy Spirit. We need to come to

terms with the reality of the schemes of satanic forces, and what Scripture means when it says that we are not fighting against flesh and blood (Eph 6:10-12). On the basis of Christ's triumph over Satan and all the powers of his kingdom, the Christian is encouraged to be fully armed for battle against demons, especially people who are possessed by these demons. The story of the sons of Sceva in Acts 19 reveals some of the challenges people encounter when they dabble in demonic issues without a strong spiritual foundation. Therefore, Christians need to know the efficacy of prayer in overcoming evil forces (Eph 6:10-18).

Third, Christians who are trying to be relevant to their culture must accept that practices like witchcraft, magic, and the like, have negative consequences on people. It is thus not an exaggeration, as Kunhiyop (2002:133, 138) notes, 'that church leaders are now painfully aware that the mere dismissal of witchcraft as superstition no longer carries weight with many of their members'. Once satanic chains continue to hold some people, they have to be delivered through effective prayers (cf. Kibor 2006:160).

Consequently, Asamoah-Gyadu's (2007:309) observation that Pentecostalism is growing faster in Africa because people have captured the correspondence between issues of spiritual warfare, deliverance, and healing that are connected to the movement, must be duly explored. That is, if the awareness of spiritual encounters between the divine and demonic forces can produce the positive effect of making people open up to experience freedom in Christ, then organising crusades on the basis of spiritual warfare on African soils can be an effective strategy to win people for God's kingdom, as Moreau (1990:123) similarly argues.

Finally, enough awareness must be created, since some people, in their desperate search for spiritual solutions, may end up being misled by tricks of false prophets and “wolves in sheep’s clothing” to fall deeper into the trap of satanic practices. And so those who seek for spiritual solutions must do so from genuine sources. Concerted public awareness campaigns should be engaged with the aim of informing the public on what the evils of witchcraft are. Such campaigns must be approached from concepts that are rooted in Scripture, as Kunhiyop (2002:140-142) similarly argues. This is where persons who have had some experience of witchcraft should be encouraged to testify to its harmfulness (cf. Kombo 2003:80-83).

Chapter Conclusion

Per the passage under study, that is, Deuteronomy 23:12-14, the Israelites were assured of God’s protection and victory over their enemies as long as they followed the ‘camp’ instructions. It would definitely pave the way for ‘holy war’ to become operational because the Lord God himself would come into the ‘camp’ or ‘vicinity’ of His people and fight for them. Particularly, it has been argued that the verb rendered by versions like RSV and ESV as ‘and (to) give (up to you)’ and NJB and NAB as ‘and put (at your mercy)’ portray the idea that the victory God promises His people means He will lead them to overcome their enemies.

This may be achieved when His people are engaged in spiritual warfare against their enemies. This is a clarion call for prayer. All the discussions move to the call on everyone to help stop open defecation in order to avoid any catastrophe that may come as divine judgement.

Chapter 16

Thus says Yahweh, the LORD God:

‘No Open Defecation, else...’

This final chapter of the discussions in this volume is committed to drumming home the fundamental objective of this book. All the foregone discussions have centred on the instructions that God gave the covenant community of Israel contained in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 concerning how the people should desist from practicing open defecation in their camp. Deuteronomy 23:12-14, requires the holiness of the camp not only for Israel to have unhindered access to **Yahweh** and continue to enjoy His promises, but to also avert His wrath which could lead to calamities like defeat in wars, sicknesses, and death.

Perhaps a more interesting section of our discussion on sanitation which has implications for holiness of a geographical area is the ‘name theology’ which has also given birth to the concept of ‘place theology’ or ‘the theology of holiness of a place’. ‘Place’ has been shown as referring not only to the special inner court of the sanctuary called ‘the most holy place’ or the other space within the shrine called the ‘holy place’, but to any geographical space. Therefore, it has been argued that the interpretation of the pericope extends beyond cultic boundaries. Besides the Lord God Almighty, the idea of holiness is extended to cover the people as a community in the camp as well as the camp as a geographical space (cf. Sprinkle 2000:654-656; Valiquette 1999:53).

Wright (1999:355-358; cf. Baker and Arnold 1999:136) notes how the Holiness School’s extension of issues relating to holiness and pollution and the sanctifying effect of **Yahweh’s**

presence cover not only the sanctuary and the camp but the whole land. He reveals from both the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School that the sanctuary is rather the primary place of holiness. Inge (2003:35-40) refers to some of the arguments by Brueggemann and O'Donovan on the importance of land to the Yahweh-Israel covenant. For both, the role of land as a promised gift from the Lord God Almighty and the faithfulness required of the people towards it constitute the fulcrum of the OT narratives. Thus, in terms of the call for holiness, the emphasis is on all the geographical spaces: the whole land, the congregational or military camp for the people, and the sanctuary. Nevertheless, there are clear indications that Deuteronomy 23:12-14 emphasis on holiness of the congregation and military camp.

Israel's faithfulness to the Almighty God lay in its obedience to the laws regarding consecration of self and maintenance of holiness of the land, but of significant concern here is the camp within which the sanctuary was erected. 'Place theology' is associated with the sanctuary and specific places of the land such as the camp, as revealed in chapters 5-27 of Deuteronomy, specifically, in passages such as 12:5-11; 14:2-6; 26:2. It is thus not surprising that the text, which is primarily concerned with the military camp, but lies within this section of the book, also contributes to the concept. This is because this camp is also a specially designated geographical space where the holiness of the Lord God is extended to cover.

It was argued that one of the headaches of theologians is the observable lack of consensus among them with regards to the interpretation of the Laws. One such area of disagreement centres on the different types of concerns addressed by the laws. Lioy (2004) is a key defender of the tripartite interpretation of the pentateuchal laws. He is convinced of three distinct concerns

that are evident within the Mosaic code, namely, morality and ethics (Exod 20:1-26); social and civil; and religious and ceremonial (24:12-31:18). Lioy describes moral laws as that which specifies the type of individual and community behaviour 'that always is the duty of God's people, regardless of when and where they live' (2004:17-21). He emphasises with respect to the laws that 'ethical, social, and religious distinctions are detectable within it'.

Lioy (2004:17-21) continues: 'The aim of such division into three parts is to catalogue the constituent elements of the law, just as one might classify different types of literature according to their genre'. Thus he insists: 'There is an essential unity to the law, it is not a juridical monolith'. Continuing, Lioy mentions how McQuilkin also recognises the difficulty of differentiating between the moral, ceremonial, and civil aspects of the laws. Lioy notes that a major concern of those who argue against the tripartite division of the laws is that it is difficult to draw a line between moral precepts and other laws, and that they can be overly subjective and arbitrary in nature. However, he rebuffs this position and argues that 'the division though hard, is worth the effort', because 'it is convenient and a valid interpretation of the data present in the Old Testament'.

Hill and Walton's (2000:105-6) submission also make great contribution here. Their argument that applying the concepts of the holy, common, clean, and unclean to the physical, moral, and spiritual realms of life as basic to the ancient Hebrew worldview is one that is clearly indicative of Lioy's tripartite position. The distinctions, for Hill and Walton, allowed the people to order their relationship to the natural world in such a way that they might indeed 'be holy' just as the Creator of the whole universe is.

No doubt, Liroy's (2004:17-21) position can be considered as a clear development over the usual dichotomous approach; it is like combining some of the social and physical elements of the symbolic view. His articulation captured some important areas that make for a classification beyond just a dichotomy: morality/ethics (Exod 20:1-26); religious/ceremonial (24:12-31:18) and social/civil; and that they are evident within the Mosaic code. Beside ritual and moral holiness which Domeris calls 'peripheral', he proposes that holiness is not only a virtue but a 'numinous power' that emanates from God. His elucidation brings to the fore the fact that there are more concepts that need to be incorporated into such classification to take it even beyond a tripartite interpretation as will be shown by the study.

Moreover, I identify with Domeris' (1986:35) position that the ethical and cultic aspects of holiness do not constitute the central core of the word, and appreciate his proposal of another dimension to the interpretation of the laws. He typically identifies a divine function, especially that of 'holy war', which though it has not been explored, and 'has been either lost or ignored', has made great contribution to the discussions in this book.

Notwithstanding the observation that the OT pentateuchal laws on holiness are underlined by many concepts, there is currently lack of consensus among Christian theologians on exactly how to approach some of these laws. Put differently, there is no agreement among scholars on the various Christian methodological approaches to the contemporary application of OT laws. Better still, what Christians should make of, say, the historical, literary, theological, and sociological functions of the OT laws, should be clarified. While some like Bahnsen (cf. Gundry 1996:93-143) think of a theonomic reformed approach where the OT laws are very central to the application of the NT, others

like Strickland (cf. Gundry 1996:229-279) argue against any form of continuity between the Law and the Gospel.

Overall Conclusion

In the Volume Three: *Fellow Ghanaians, Let's Stop Open Defecation, else...*, attempts will be made at bringing out the implications of sanitation and open defecation to a specific context. The choice of Ghana as a case study for such a discussion is likely to offer lots of grounds for practical application of such a text to not only a current society but a larger community as well.

Works Consulted

- Aboagye-Mensah R 2006. War. In *ABC*, by Adeyemo T (ed), 967-968. Nairobi, Kenya: WordAlive Publishers.
- Adeyemo T (ed) 2006. *ABC*. Nairobi, Kenya: WordAlive Publishers.
- Adler A 2009. What's in a name? Reflections upon divine names and the attraction of god to Israel. *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 37/4:265-69.

- Adler H 1893. Sanitation as taught by the Mosaic Law: a paper read before the Church of England Sanitary Association. 1-12. Online article: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/60240182>, 2012-08-01.
- Adjei B M and Nsiah J 2000. *Old Testament History I and II*. Accra, Ghana: Ghana Christian University College.
- Aker B, Bennett J, Hausfeld M, Hemando J, Hodum T, Nunnally W and Simnowitz A 2012. The Necessity for Retaining Father and Son terminology in Scripture translations for Muslims *AJPS* 5-2:171-243.
- Aklikpe-Osei F S 2014 (8 Jul). Let's keep our environment clean. *Ghanaian Times*, 9. Website: www.ghanaiantimes.com.gh, 2015-05-07.
- Akrong A 2001. Symposium: Towards a theological perspective on culture and tradition: Towards a theology of evil spirits and witches. *JACT* 4/1:18-26.
- Albl C M 2002. 'Are Any Among You Sick?' The Health Care System in the Letter of James. *JBL* 121/1:123-143.
- Angel R A 2011. *Crucifixus Vincens*: The 'Son of God' as Divine Warrior in Matthew. *CBQ* 73:299-317.
- Anonymous 2014. Review of Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians by Yulin Liu. Online article: <http://www.mohr.de/en/theology/subject-areas/all-books/buch/temple-purity-in-1-2-corinthians.html>, 2014-09-08.
- _____ 2012 (23 Nov). Piloting faecal sludge to biodiesel begins. *Daily Graphic*, 53. Website: www.graphic.com.gh, 2014-04-05.
- _____ 2011. Why does God hate faeces? Online article: <http://answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20110624191949AAPk1TA>, 2014-27-01.

- _____ 2010. Ghana News Agency - General News on Ghana. (25 Apr). Online article: www.ghanaweb.com, 2011-23-02.
- _____ 2007. Goal 7 - Ensure environmental sustainability. *The Millennium Development Goals Report*, 22-27.
- _____ 2006. Biblical Latrine: ancient parasites show that cleanliness may have been next to sickness. *ScienceDaily*. (14 Nov). Online article: www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2006/11/061113180523.htm, 2014-30-01.
- _____ 2002. Analysis of Health development in the region. In *Health-for-all Policy for the 21st Century in the African Region: Agenda 2020*. AFR/AC50/8 Rev.1:3-7.
- Ao A T 2014. The 'Day of the Lord' as an Eschatological Paradigm in the Old Testament *New Life Theological Journal* (NLTJ) 4/1 (Jan):19-32.
- Arberry J A 1955. *The Koran translated*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Archer Jr G L 1982. *New International Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties* (based on NIV and NASB) Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Asamoah-Gyadu J K 2007. Pulling Down Strongholds. *International Review of Mission* 96(382/3):306-317.
- Ascough S R 1997. Review of *The Name and Way of the Lord: Old Testament Themes, New Testament Christology*. *CBQ* 59:766-68.
- Asumang A 2014. Strive for Peace and Holiness: The Intertextual Journey of the Jacob Traditions from Genesis to Hebrews, via the Prophets. *Conspectus* 17:1-52.

- _____ 2011. 'Resist him' (1 Pet 5:9): Holiness and Non-Retaliatory Responses to Unjust Suffering as 'Holy War' in 1 Peter. *Conspectus* 11:1-46.
- _____ 2010. 'The formation of the disciples as agents of divine power and revelation: a comparative study of the gospels according to Mark and John': A dissertation submitted to SATS in candidacy for the degree of PhD in Theology, 1-509.
- _____ 2008. Powers of darkness: an evaluation of three hermeneutical approaches to the evil powers in Ephesians. *Conspectus* 5:1-19.
- _____ 2007. Put on the Lord Jesus Christ, Put on the Last Adam: The Background of Paul's Ethical Instructions in Romans 13:11-14. *Conspectus* 4:1-22
- _____ 2006. *Hearing the Voice of God: Principles for Life Changing Bible Study*. London: Lulu.
- _____ 2005. 'The Tabernacle as a Heuristic Device in the interpretation of the Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews': A Thesis submitted to the SATS in candidacy for the degree of Master of Theology. *Conspectus*.
- Asumang A and Domeris W R 2007. The migrant camp of the people of God: a uniting theme for the Epistle to the Hebrews. *Conspectus* 3:1-33.
- _____ 2006. Ministering in the Tabernacle: Spatiality and the Christology of Hebrews. *Conspectus* 1:1-26.
- Augustine *City of God* VII.30, 291, 292; XXII.6, 1030.
- Aune E D 1998. *WBC: Revelation 17-22*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

- Bainton H R 1960. *Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-Evaluation*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Baker D W and Arnold B T 1999. *The face of Old Testament studies: a survey of contemporary approaches*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Barker K N and Kohlenberger III J R 1994. *EBC: Old Testament* (Abridged ed). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Barnhouse D G 1974. *The Invisible War*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Beale K G 2012. *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academics.
- Bell Jr M D 2009. *Just War as Christian Discipleship: Recentering the Tradition in the Church rather than the State*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press.
- Berkhof H 1977. *Christ and the Powers*. Scottdale, PA: Mennonite Publishing House.
- Berry L D n.d. Revisioning Christology: The Logic of Messianic Ascription. *Anglican Theological Review* 70/2:129-140.
- BibleWorks.com 2006 WTT - *BHS Hebrew Old Testament* (4th ed). BibleWorks, LLC.
- Black M and Fawcett B 2008. Eliminating sanitation problems in the Third World: the search for sustainable solutions. *The Futurist* (September-October):1.
- Block I D 2011. Bearing the Name of the LORD with honor. *BSac* 168 (Jan-Mar):20-31.
- _____ 2005. The Joy of Worship: The Mosaic Invitation to the presence of God (Deuteronomy 12:1-14) *BSac* 162 (Apr-Jun):131-49.

- Blomberg C 1994. *The NIV Application Commentary: From biblical text...to contemporary life*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Bock L D 1991. The Son of Man in Luke 5:24 *BBR* 1:109-121.
- Boring E M n.d. The Christology of Mark: Hermeneutical issues for Systematic Theology. *Semeia* 125-151.
- Borowski O 2003. *Daily Life in Biblical Times*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Briley T 2000. The Old Testament 'Sin Offering' and Christ's Atonement. *Stone-Campbell Journal* 3 (Spring):89-101.
- Broadhead K E 1993. Jesus the Nazarene: Narrative Strategy and Christological imagery in the Gospel of Mark. *JSNT* 52:3-18.
- Brown F, Driver S and Briggs C 1997. *BDB: with an appendix containing the biblical Aramaic*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.
- Brown K J 2007. *Introducing Biblical Hermeneutics: Scripture as Communication*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Bruce F F 1979. *NIBC* (Based on the NIV). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Bruce F F, Harrison K R, Youngblood R and Ecklebarger K 1986. *Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary*. Nashville; TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Bruckner J K n.d. A Theological description of Human Wholeness in Deuteronomy 6 *Ex Audita* 1-15.
- Brueggemann W 2013. *Truth speaks to Power: The Countercultural nature of Scripture*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Bunyan J 2002. The Holy War: Made by Shaddai upon Diabolus for the regaining of the Metropolis of the World or The

- Losing and Taking again of the Town of Mansoul.
Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Carnes T 2001 (22 Oct). Day of Terror, Day of Grace: In the wake of fatal attacks killing thousands, Christians steer America toward prayer, service, and reconciliation. *Christianity Today*, 16-22.
- Christensen D L 2002. *WBC: Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12* (vol 6B). Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Clines J A D 1979. Introduction to the Pentateuch. In *NIBC* by Bruce F F (ed), 78-83. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Cothey A 2005. Ethics and Holiness in the Theology of Leviticus. *JSOT* 30/2:131-151. Online article: <http://JSOT.sagepub.com>, 2011-18-03.
- Cotter C R 1945. The Divinity of Jesus Christ in Saint Paul. *CBQ* 7/3:259-289.
- Cox M H and Holmes A C 2000. Loss, Healing, and the Power of Place *Human Studies* 23:63-78.
- Craigie C P 1976. *NICOT: The book of Deuteronomy*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- _____, Kelly H P and Drinkard Jr F J 1991. *WBC: Jeremiah 1-25* (vol 26). Dallas, TX: Word Books, Publisher.
- Cromwell B 2014 Old Testament Toilets. Online article: <http://www.toilet-guru.com/biblicalold.php>, 2014-27-01.
- Crowther J (ed) 1998. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* (5th ed), Great Clarendon Street, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crüsemann F 2001. The Torah and the unity of God. *Word & World*: XXI, 3:243-252.
- Cumming J 2012. Is Jesus Christ the Son of God? Responding to the Muslim view of Jesus *AJPS* 15:2:133-142.

- Davis G P 1989. Mark's Christological Paradox. *JSNT* 35:3-18.
- Deirdre 2006. Results from Excavations of Toilets at Qumran.
Online article: <http://notbeingasausage.blogspot.com/2006/11/results-from-excavations-of-toilets-at.html>, 2014-30-01.
- DeWitt C B 2000. *The Care of creation: Focusing concern and action*. Leicester, England: IVP.
- Domeris W R 1986. The office of the Holy One. *JTSA* 35-38.
- Dougherty E J 1984. *The Bishops and Nuclear Weapons*. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Book.
- Douglas J. D. and Tenney M C. 1986. *NIDB*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Douglas M 2003. *Purity and Danger: An analysis of concept of pollution and taboo*. Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- _____ 2002. *Purity and Danger: An analysis of concept of pollution and taboo*. NY: Routledge.
- _____ 1966. *Purity and Danger: An analysis of the concepts of pollution and taboo*. NY: Routledge.
- Dozeman T 1998. The wilderness and salvation history in the Hagar story. *JBL* 117:23-43.
- Earl D S 2009. The Christian Significance of Deuteronomy 7. *JTI* 3/1:41-62.
- Egan A and Rakoczy F S 2011. Critiquing Just War Theory in the light of contemporary war. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 14 (Nov):45-60.
- Ellens H J 2006. The Unique Son of Man in John. *Proceedings EGL & MWBS* 26:69-78.
- Ellis E E n.d. Background and Christology of John's Gospel: Selected motifs *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 24-31.

- Faniran A and Nihinlola E. 2007. *A Creation Sacred to God: Proceedings of 1st Sacred Earth Workshop*. Jericho, Ibadan: Daybis Ltd.
- Ferda S T 2013. The Soldiers' Inscription and the Angel's Word: The Significance of 'Jesus' in Matthew's *Titulus*. *Novum Testamentum* 55:221-231.
- Finger T 1994 (14 Nov). In the name of *Sophia*: Seeking a biblical understanding of holy wisdom. *Christianity Today*, 44.
- Firestone R 1996. Conceptions of holy war in biblical and qur'ānic tradition. *JRE* 24/1:99-123.
- Funk RW 1959. The wilderness. *JBL* 78:206-214
- Galli M 2001. Now what? A Christian response to religious terrorism. *Christianity Today* 22 (October):24-27.
- Gianotti C R 1996. The Meaning of Divine Name YHWH. In *Vital Old Testament Issues: Examining Textual and Topical Questions*, by Zuck B R (ed), 30-38. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Resources.
- _____ 1985. The Meaning of the Divine Name YHWH. *BSac* (Jan-Mar):38-51.
- Gibson JB 1994. Jesus' wilderness temptation according to Mark. *JSNT* 53:3-34.
- Gieschen A C 2003. The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology. *Vigiliae Christianae* 57/2:115-158.
- _____ n.d. Confronting Current Christological Controversy. *Concordia Theological Seminary* 3-32.
- _____ n.d. The Real Presence of the Son Before Christ: Revisiting an Old Approach to Old Testament Christology. *Concordia Theological Seminary* 105-126.

- Goldingay J 2011. *Key Questions about Biblical Interpretation: Old Testament answers*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Gombis T 2004. Ephesians 2 as a narrative of divine warfare. *JSNT* 26/4:403-418.
- Grabbe L L 1997. The Book of Leviticus. *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 5:91-110.
- Grudem W 1994. *Systematic Theology*. Leicester, England: IVP.
- Gundry S N (ed) 1996. *Five views on Law and Gospel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Hafemann S J 2001. *The God of promise and the life of faith: understanding the heart of the Bible*. Wheaton: Crossway Books.
- _____. 2000. *2 Corinthians: The NIV Application Commentary from biblical text...to contemporary life*: Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Hall H G 2000. *The College Press NIV Commentary: Deuteronomy*. Joplin, Missouri: College Press Publishing Company.
- Hasel M G 2008. Assyrian Military Practices and Deuteronomy's Laws of Warfare. In *Writing and Reading War*, by Kelle B E and Ames R F, 67-81. *SBL*.
- Hart M 1995. Moses the Microbiologist: Judaism and Social Hygiene in the Work of Alfred Nossig *Jewish Social Studies*, New Series 2/1:72-97. Online article: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4467461>, 2012-08-01.
- Hartley J E 1992. *WBC: Leviticus* (vol 4). Dallas, Texas: Word Books.
- Henry M 1961. *Matthew Henry's Commentary in one volume*: Grand Rapids, MI; Zondervan.

- Hertog C D 2002. The Prophetic Dimension of the Divine Name: On Exodus 3:14a and its Context. *CBQ* 64:228.
- Hill A E and Walton J H 2000. *A Survey of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Holladay W L 1988. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Holman J 2003. Good Health through the Bible! *Investigator* 89 (March). Online article: <http://ed5015.tripod.com/biblehealthHolman89.htm>, 2014-27-01.
- Hundley M 2009. To Be or Not to Be: A reexamination of name language in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history. *VT* 59:533-555.
- Inge J 2003. *A Christian theology of place*. Burlington, USA: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Johnsson W G 1978. The pilgrimage motif in the Book of Hebrews. *JBL* 97:239-251.
- Kaiser Jr W C 2001. *The Old Testament Documents: Are they Reliable & Relevant?* USA: IVP.
- _____ 1971. Leviticus 18:5 And Paul: Do this and you shall live (Eternally?). *JETS* 14/1:20-28.
- Kawashima R S 2006 The Priestly Tent of meeting and the problem of divine transcendence: An 'archaeology' of the sacred. *The Journal of Religion* 226-257.
- _____ 2003. The Jubilee year and the return of cosmic purity. *CBQ* 65:372.
- Kee C H n.d. Christology and Ecclesiology: Titles of Christ and models of Community. *Semeia* 1171-1192.
- Keener C S 2000. *Revelation: The NIV Application Commentary: from biblical text...to contemporary life*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

- Kelley P H 1992. *Biblical Hebrew: an introductory grammar*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Kibor E J 2006. Witchcraft & Socery: A biblical Perspective with implications for Church Ministry. *AJET* 25/2:151-160.
- Kirchhevel D G 1999. The 'Son of Man' passages in Mark. *BBR* 9:181-187.
- Klawans J 2003. Ritual purity, moral purity, and sacrifice in Jacob Milgrom's Leviticus. *Religious Studies Review* 29 January 1:19-28.
- Klein W 1998. Evangelical Hermeneutics. In *Initiation into Theology: The rich variety of Theology and Hermeneutics*, by Maimela S and König A (eds), 319-336. Hatfield, Pretoria: J L van Schaik Publishers.
- Klein W W, Blomberg C L and Hubbard Jr R L 2004. *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Kombo R K 2003. Witchcraft: A Living Vice in Africa. *AJET* 22/1:73-84.
- Köstenberger A 2009. *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters: Biblical theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Kudadjie J N and Aboagye-Mensah R K 1992. *Christian Social Ethics*. Accra, Ghana: Asempa Publishers.
- Kunhiyop W S 2012. *African Christian Theology*. Nairobi, Kenya: WordAlive Publishers.
- _____ 2008. *African Christian Ethics*. Nairobi, Kenya: WordAlive Publishers.
- _____ 2006. Witchcraft. In *ABC*, by Adeyemo T (ed), 374. Nairobi, Kenya: WordAlive Publishers.
- _____ 2002. Witchcraft: A Philosophical and Theological Analysis. *AJET* 21/2:133-143.

- Lee P S 2007. *Intervention, Terrorism, and Torture: Contemporary challenges to Just War Theory*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- LeMarquand G 2012. The Bible as Specimen, Talisman, and Dragoman in Africa: A Look at some African uses of the Psalms and 1 Corinthians 12-14. *BBR* 22/2:189-199.
- Lenihan A D 1995. 'The Origins and Early Development of the Notion of a Just War: A Study in the Ideology of the Later Roman Empire and Early Medieval Europe' (a PhD dissertation presented to University of Massachusetts-Amherst, 1995), 15.
- Levenson J D 1994. *Creation and the persistence of evil: the Jewish drama of divine omnipotence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lind M C 1980. *Yahweh is a warrior: The theology of warfare in ancient Israel*. Scottsdale: Herald Press.
- Lioy D T 2013. A Comparative Analysis of the Song of Moses and Paul's Speech to the Athenians. *Conspectus* 16:2.
- _____ 2010. The Garden of Eden as a Primordial Temple or Sacred Space for Humankind. *Conspectus* 10:25-57.
- _____ 2007. Jesus as Torah in John 2:1-22. *Conspectus* 4:23-39.
- _____ 2007. The Unique Status of Jesus as the Divine Messiah: An Exegetical and Theological Analysis of Mark 1:1, 9-13. *Conspectus* 3:34-53.
- _____ 2005. Progressive Covenantalism as an Integrating Motif of Scripture. Online article: https://bible.org/article/progressive-covenantalism-integrating-motifscripture#P7_148, 2014-14-03.

- _____ 2005. *The search for ultimate reality: Intertextuality between the Genesis and Johannine prologues*. New York: Peter Lang.
- _____ 2004. *The Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount*. NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Liu Y 2013. *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.
- _____ 2012. Preview of 'Purity in 1-2 Corinthians in the Context of the Jewish and Greco-Roman World'. *TrinJ* 33/2 (Fall):289.
- Longman III T 2013. *The Baker Illustrated Bible Dictionary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- _____ 2006. *Making sense of the Old Testament: Three crucial questions*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academics.
- _____ 2003 (May). The God of War: God seems to sanction raw violence in the Old Testament. Does his character change in the New Testament? *Christianity Today*, 62.
- _____ 1982. The divine warrior: The New Testament use of an Old Testament motif. *WTJ* 44:290-307.
- _____ and Dillard R B 2006. *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (2nd ed) Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Macdonald N 2006. The Literary Criticism and Rhetorical Logic of Deuteronomy I-IV. *VT LVI/2*:203-224.
- MacLeod J D 2005. Eternal Son, Davidic Son, Messianic Son: An Exposition of Romans 1:1-7. *BSac* 162 (Jan-Mar):76-94.
- Madeleine S and Lane M J 1978. *Harper's Encyclopedia of Bible Life*. San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Magness J 2004. Two notes on the Archaeology of Qumran. *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on its*

- Archaeology 69-71. Online article: www.springerlink.com/index/6352737837120810.pdf, 2014-30-01.
- Martin P R 1986. *WBC: 2 Corinthians* (vol 40). Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Matthews V H 2006. *Manners and Customs in the Bible: An Illustrated Guide to Daily Life in Bible Times*. (3rd ed) Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.
- Mattox M J 2006. *Saint Augustine and the Theory of Just War*. London: Continuum.
- Maugh II H T 2006. Latrine practices posed health risks to sect: Archeologists look at the toilet rituals that shortened the lives of the men who created the Dead Sea Scrolls. *Los Angeles Times*. Online article: <http://articles.latimes.com/2006/nov/14/science/sci-qumran14>, 2014-30-01.
- McConville J G 1986. *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*. Trowbridge, Wiltshire; Great Britain: Redwood Burn Ltd.
- McKenzie S L 2002. *The theological legacy of Deuteronomy*. Vergegenwärtigung, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Milbank J 1991. The Name of Jesus: Incarnation, Atonement, Ecclesiology. *Modern Theology* 7 (Jul):311-333.
- Milgrom J 1991. *Leviticus 1-16: A new translation with introduction and commentary* (Anchor Bible, vol 3); *Leviticus 17-22; Leviticus 23-27*. Online book: <http://www.amazon.com/Leviticus-1-16>, 2011-03-12.
- _____. n.d. Encroaching on the Sacred: Purity and Polity in Numbers 1-10, *Interpretation* 241-253.

- Millar J G 1995. The Ethics of Deuteronomy: An Exegetical and Theological Study of the Book of Deuteronomy (unpublished D.Phil. Thesis, University of Oxford). *Tyndale Bulletin* 46/2:389-92.
- Miller H L 1964. The Contemporary Significance of the Doctrine of Just War. *World Politics* 16 (Jan):255.
- Minear P S n.d. Holy People, Holy Land, Holy City: The Genesis and Genius of Christian Attitudes *Interpretation* 18-31.
- Moo D 1988. Divine Healing in the Health and Wealth Gospel. *TrinJ* 9:191-209.
- Moskala J 2000. Categorization and Evaluation of Different Kinds of Interpretation of the Laws of Clean and Unclean Animals in Leviticus II. *Adventist Theological Society* 1-41.
- Moreau A S 1990. *The World of the Spirits: A Biblical Study in the African Context*. Nairobi, Kenya: Evangel Publishing House.
- Naugle K D 2002. *Worldview: The History of a Concept*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Nolland J 1996. No Son-of-God Christology in Matthew 1:18-25. *JSNT* 62:3-12.
- Nesbitt C F 1942. An Inquiry into the Physical Health of Jesus. *The Journal of Religion* 22/3 (July):302-312. Online article: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1198032>, 2012-08-01.
- Newmyer S 2001. Climate and Health: Classical and Talmudic Perspective. *Judaism* 426-438.
- Nkansah-Obrempong J 2006. Angels, Demons and Power. In *ABC*, by Adeyemo T (ed), 1454-1455. Nairobi, Kenya: WordAlive Publishers.

- Nolland J 1996. No Son-of-God Christology in Matthew 1:18-25. *JSNT* 62:3-12.
- Nwankpa E 2006. Idolatry. In ABC, Adeyemo T (ed), 840. Nairobi, Kenya: World Alive Publishers.
- Ocampo A J 2007. Overview: Progress at the MDG mid-point. *The Millennium Development Goals Report* 4-5.
- O'Donovan O 2003. *The Just War Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ohlig K-H 1996. What Is Christology? *Theology Digest* 43/1(Spring):15-20.
- Okom M 2010. *Supernatural Weapons for Spiritual Warfare*. Calabar, Cross River State; Nigeria: Kings View Publishing House.
- Onyinah O 2004. Contemporary 'witchdemonology' in Africa. *International Review of Mission* 93:330-345.
- Osborn L 1993. *Guardians of creation: Nature in theology and the Christian life*. Leicester: Apollos.
- Owiredun C 2005. Blood and Life in the Old Testament (A Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Department of Theology, University of Durham), 1-190.
- Packer J I 2002 (7 Jan). Wisdom in a Time of War: What Oswald Chambers and C.S. Lewis teach us about living through the long battle with terrorism. *Christianity Today*, 45-49.
- Parrinder E G 1974. *African Traditional Religion*. London: Sheldon Press.
- Peay A S 2005. Heart to heart: Congregationalism as a Post-Denominational Ecclesial Spirituality Expressed through Relational, Worship and Fellowship. *International Congregational Journal* 4/2:17-40.

- Poythress S V 1995. *The Shadow of Christ in the Law of Moses*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing.
- Radmacher E D, Allen R B and Wayne H H (eds) 1997. *The Nelson Study Bible* (NKJV). Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Rast E W 1972. *Tradition History and the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Regev E 2001. Priestly dynamic holiness and Deuteronomic static holiness, VT 51/2:243-261. Online article: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1585253>, 2011-23-02.
- Richter S L 2010. Environmental Law in Deuteronomy: One Lens on a Biblical Theology of Creation Care. BBR 20/3:355-376.
- _____ 2007. The Place of the Name in Deuteronomy. VT 57:342-366.
- Saxey R n.d. A Physician's Reflections on Old Testament Medicine. *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*. Online article: www.dialoguejournal.com/wpcontent/.../Dialogue_V17N03124.pdf, 2012- 01-07.
- Scurlock J A and Anderson B R 2005. *Diagnoses in Assyrian and Babylonian Medicine*. Online book: <http://books.google.co.uk/books>, 2011-03-12.
- Seebass H 2004. 'Holy' Land in the Old Testament: Numbers and Joshua VT LVI:103-04.
- Shepherd B M 2006. Daniel 7:13 and the New Testament Son of Man. WTJ 68:99-111.
- Sprinkle J M 2000. The rationale of the Laws of clean and unclean in the Old Testament. JETS 43/4:637-657.
- Stevenson J S 2002. Judah's successes and failures in holy war: an exegesis of Judges 1:1-20, RQ 44/1:43-54.

- Stiltner B 2010. Review of Just War as Christian Discipleship: Recentring the Tradition in the Church rather than the State. *Studies in Christian Ethics* 23/4:455-57.
- Stott J 1999. *New Issues Facing Christianity Today* (fully rev ed). London: HarperCollins Publishers.
- _____ 1990. *Decisive Issues facing Christians Today: your influence is vital in today's turbulent world*. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H Revell Company.
- Strong J n.d. *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*. Nashville: Broadman & Holdman Publishers.
- Sumrall L 1982. *The Names of God: God's name brings hope, healing, and happiness*. New Kensington, PA: Whitaker House.
- Thayer H J 1980. *BDAG* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Thielman F 2005. *Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Unger M F 1988. *New Unger's Bible Dictionary* (rev and updated ver). Chicago: The Moody Bible Institute.
- _____ 1994. *Biblical Demonology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications.
- Valiquette H P 1999. Exodus – Deuteronomy as discourse: Models, Distancing, Provocation, Paraenesis. *JSOT* 85:47-70.
- van der Woude A S (ed) 1989. *The World of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Vine W E 1996. *Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words* (with topical index). London: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Volf M 1996. *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

- Wagner P C 1990. Territorial spirits. In *Wrestling with Dark Angels*, by Wagner P C and Pennoyer D (eds), 73-91. Regal Books.
- 'War; Warfare': *ISBE Bible Dictionary*; Electronic article: BibleWorks.com 2006 WTT (4th ed).
- 'War': Unger M F 1988. *New Unger's Bible Dictionary* (rev and updated ed). Chicago: The Moody Bible Institute.
- Watt P G 2011. God's judgement upon Egypt in Isaiah 19:1-15: its probable reasons and some implications for contemporary Africa (A thesis submitted for the degree of MTh at the SATS). *Conspectus* 2014-07-22.
- Watts J W 1999. Reader identification and alienation in the legal rhetoric of the Pentateuch. *Biblical interpretation* 7/1:101-112.
- Weedman M 2011. Augustine's *De Trinitate* 5 and the problem of the Divine Names 'Father and Son'. *Theological Studies* 72:768-786.
- Weeks L A 2010. *The Choice of War: The Iraq War and the Just War tradition*. Santa Barbara, California: Praeger Security International (an imprint of ABC-CLIO, LLC).
- Wells J B 2000. *God's Holy People: A Theme in Biblical Theology*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press Ltd.
- Wink W 1986. *Unmasking the Powers*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Woodbridge N 2006. A Biblical critique of the twofold theory of dispensationalism: the distinction between Israel and the Church. *Conspectus* 2:86-109.
- Wright D F 1996. Hermeneutics. In *NDT*, by Sinclair B F, Wright F D, and Packer J I (eds), 680-81. Leicester, England: IVP.

- Wright D P 1999. Holiness in Leviticus and beyond: differing perspectives. *Interpretation* 53:355-364.
- _____ 1987. *The disposal of impurity*. SBLDS 101: Atlanta Scholars.
- Wright J H C 2011. *The Mission of God: unlocking the Bible's grand narrative*. Norton Street, England: IVP.
- _____ 2010. The Whole Church – A brief Biblical Survey in the whole gospel, the whole church, the whole people (A three-year project of The Lausanne Theology Working Group in collaboration with The World Evangelical Alliance Theological Commission, vol 2). In *Evangelical Review of Theology* 34/1, by Justin Thacker, 16-19. Great Britain: Paternoster.
- _____ 2008. *The God I don't understand: Reflections on tough questions of faith*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- _____ 2006. *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's grand narrative*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- _____ 2004. *Old Testament ethics for the people of God* (a fully rev updated and integrated ed of *Living as the people of God and walking in the ways of the Lord*). Leicester, England: IVP.
- Yamoah J 2012. *Pacesetters of Divine Ministry: Let us learn from them*. Kumasi, Ghana: Classic Graphics.
- _____ 2012. *Suffer to gain: How the righteous should overcome difficult times*. Kumasi, Ghana: Classic Graphics.
- Yoder H J 1975. *The Politics of Jesus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Zodhiates S 1996. Old Testament Lexical Aids: *Hesed*. *The Hebrew-Greek Key Study Bible: NIV*. Chattanooga, TN: AMG Publishers.

_____ 1996. Old Testament Lexical Aids: *Mahaneh*. *The Hebrew-Greek Key Study Bible: NIV*. Chattanooga, TN: AMG Publishers.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



Rev James Yamoah (PhD), Vice President and Lecturer of Old Testament and Biblical Hebrew of Ghana Christian Univ. College (GhanaCU), Accra, has since 1989 been in the teaching ministry. As ordained minister of the Lord Jesus Christ, he has travelled the length and breadth of Ghana preaching in many denominations and speaking at various Youth, Leadership, and Ministers' seminars and conferences. Affectionately called Rev Dr JY by his students, the author is married to Florence since 1991 and they are blessed with Jemima, Emmanuel and Joseph.

In ***"Holy War": The Consequence of Open Defecation***, he discusses what he observes as the overall motivation of the OT law on **Open Defecation** which is stated in Deuteronomy 23:12-14 to determine its implications for society in general and the Ghanaian context in particular. The arguments in this book establish "holy war" as the theological consequence of this negative social-cultural practice for any society at any time. Rev Dr JY has also authored other books which are:

- ***Always Ready: Over 150 Messages to Help you Study, Teach, Preach, & Live the Bible Systematically***
- ***Pacesetters of Divine Ministry: Let us learn from them!***
- ***Can You Be God's Transformational Leader? Yes You Can!***
- ***Amazing Grace: A Guide to Spiritual Formation & Disciplines***
- ***Suffer to Gain: How the Righteous should overcome Difficult Times***
- ***A Model for Hebrew - English Translation and Application: The Biblical Hebrew Student's Companion***
- ***Arise & Shine! Be a Youth with Vision and Mission***
- ***A model for Old Testament Exegetical Dissertation***
- ***Thus says the LORD: 'No Open Defecation, else...'***
- ***Fellow Ghanaians, "Let's Stop Open Defecation, else..."***

The central government and its agencies, NGOs, Religious groups, especially, Christians, and the larger society, are encouraged to find application from the issues of Sanitation in this book. It is a must read; you definitely need a copy!

For more details please contact: 024 446 2843; jimmyamoah@yahoo.com