

# “How Could a Compassionate God Order the Genocide of the Canaanites?”

My eldest daughter and I have been discussing portions of the Bible with which she is struggling. One of the problem passages she asked about is “Why does God order the genocide of the Canaanites?” Now of course I can give her the answer in the Bible, i.e., that God gave them 400 years to repent and that their sins were horrible, etc.; but her real question is ethical. How can God who has such compassion for the innocents in Ninevah order the wholesale killing of innocent children in Palestine? Is the God of the OT and the God of the NT the same Person? How can I reconcile these, in modern terms, “unthinkable” crimes against humanity with the God of compassion revealed by Jesus?

We’re also looking for good articles regarding “why I can trust the Bible” and the “relevance of the Bible” for today.

Thanks for your help.

Great questions!

We need to revisit the assessment of the Canaanites as “innocent.” From God’s perspective, there is no such thing as an innocent human being (apart from Jesus Christ). Every human heart is evil and bent on sin and rebellion. I see a strong parallel between God’s actions against the Canaanites and the actions of an oncology surgeon. He has to cut out what may appear to be healthy tissue but which is actually infected with cancer cells. The Canaanites were infected with sin. I don’t understand about the children, but I do know that a compassionate God ordered it. Something to consider, then, is the question of “Do children go to hell?” Probe’s founder, Jimmy Williams, addresses this issue [here](#).

Yes, the God of the New Testament is the same as the God of the Old Testament, a God of love and grace. Evidence of His love and grace are rampant throughout both testaments. I think we need to cultivate a spirit of humility before an infinite God we cannot fully understand because “all the available facts are not all the facts.” God never committed any crimes against humanity, much less unthinkable ones, because we cannot see ourselves, or Him, accurately. We have to depend on God’s revelation of human nature—which is that, apart from God, we are wicked and rebellious and evil, even at the same time that we are His image-bearers. And on His revelation of His own nature—which is that He is holy and just, and He would have been completely within His rights to allow every single human being to go to hell because that is what we deserve. But He didn’t.

I’m afraid there is no “silver bullet” answer to these questions, \_\_\_\_\_, because we don’t have all the facts and just have to trust that God is good all the time, and He knows things we don’t. Along these lines, may I also suggest you read the article [“I Can’t Forgive God for Taking All Those People in the WTC!”](#).

My colleague Rick Wade goes into great detail on this question in these two articles:

[God and the Canaanites](#)

[Yahweh War and the Conquest of Canaan](#)

Probe’s founder, Jimmy Williams, explores the question here:

[“How Can a Just God Order the Slaughter of Men, Women and Children?”](#)

Concerning your question about apologetics articles, we have:

[Are the Biblical Documents Reliable?](#)

[Authority of the Bible](#)

[The Christian Canon](#)

[Archaeology and the Old Testament](#)

[Archaeology and the New Testament](#)

[The Relevance of Christianity: An Apologetic](#)

You might also find it helpful to browse our [Theology/Apologetics](#) Topics pages.

Hope this helps!

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

## **“Is the Bible Wrong About the Cleansing of the Temple?”**

In John 2:13-25 is the story of when Jesus cleansed the temple. It immediately follows Jesus turning the water into wine, and immediately precedes the conversation with Nicodemus. In Matthew 21:12-16 is the same story immediately precedes the cursing of the barren fig tree. In Mark 11:15-18 the cleansing of the temple takes place immediately after the cursing of the fig tree.

**Now, as I see it, there are only three possibilities.**

1. The text in either Matthew and Mark or in John is in error about the time of the cleansing of the temple. And either the text in Matthew or Mark is wrong about the time of the cursing of the fig tree.
2. The gospels were not written in chronological order.
3. The same incident happened more than once (highly unlikely).

**What is your take on this? Did I overlook something?**

Thanks for your question! You have raised an important (and relatively common) difficulty in interpreting the gospels. Let me first say that the gospels were not necessarily written in chronological order. In fact, it is generally accepted that many of the incidents recorded in the gospels were NOT written in chronological order. As a general rule, the only exception to this is Luke's gospel, in which he specifically states his intention "to write it out...in consecutive order" (Luke 1:3).

A good book which you may want to consult about some of these issues of gospel interpretation and harmonization is Craig Blomberg's *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels* (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1987). Since this is not an area of personal expertise for me, I will simply give you Blomberg's observations on possible ways in which the difficulties you have noticed might be resolved.

Concerning the cursing of the fig tree, Blomberg believes that Matthew has simply telescoped the events of two days "into one uninterrupted paragraph which seems to refer only to the second day's events." He points out that Matthew's introduction, "Now in the morning," does "not specify which day is in view, and there is no reason to exclude an interval of time between verses 19 and 20." He continues by noting, "Mark does not deny that the fig tree withered immediately, only that the disciples did not see it until the next day." He concludes by pointing out that the gospels leave out a wealth of detail (indeed, John states this explicitly in 20:30), and such omissions simply become more evident when compared with a more detailed account in another gospel.

Blomberg offers a couple of solutions to the problem of the cleansing of the temple. The first solution holds that John has simply woven this incident into his gospel thematically, rather than chronologically. In other words, there is only one cleansing and John, for thematic considerations, has simply chosen to relay this incident in a manner unrelated to its actual chronological occurrence in the life of Christ. He

offers a couple of reasons in support of this view. The second solution (which commends itself to my mind) actually acknowledges two separate cleansings, one at the beginning and one near the end of Jesus' public ministry. He offers six arguments in support of this second position (172):

1. The details of the cleansing given in John's account are completely different from those given in the Synoptics (i.e. Matthew, Mark, Luke).

2. If Jesus felt strongly enough about the temple corruption to cleanse it once at the beginning of His ministry, it is not really too difficult to believe that He might do it again at the end of His ministry.

3. Since cleansing the temple was an overtly Messianic act, about which some of the Jews would have approved, it is not surprising that He could get away with doing this once at the outset of His ministry. However, when the Jews began to realize that Jesus was not really the sort of Messiah they were looking for, a second cleansing would have almost certainly sealed His fate (see Mark 11:18).

4. In the Synoptics, Jesus is accused of having said that He would destroy the temple and rebuild another in three days not made with human hands (Mark 14:58). But a similar comment by Jesus is only explicitly mentioned in John 2:19. Furthermore, since the witnesses in Mark's gospel get the statement slightly wrong, and cannot agree among themselves (Mark 14:59), it may be a confused memory of something Jesus said two or three years earlier, rather than just a few days earlier.

5. Jesus' statement in the Synoptics is more severe than that in John. Only in the Synoptics does He refer to the Gentiles need to pray at the temple, and only in the Synoptics does He refer to the Jews as "robbers."

6. In John 2:20 the Jews refer to the temple rebuilding

project having begun 46 years earlier. This would mark the date of the cleansing at around AD 27 or 28. But Jesus was almost certainly not crucified until at least AD 30. And it is most unlikely that John would have simply made up such a figure. Therefore, it is quite likely that John is describing a distinct (and earlier) cleansing from the one mentioned in the Synoptics.

When I approach the gospel narratives with the attitude that they are innocent until proven guilty, keeping in mind that they have been thoroughly demonstrated to be generally reliable historical sources, the six arguments listed above strongly incline me to the view that there were in fact two temple cleansings in the life of Christ—one at the beginning of His public ministry, the other at its conclusion. At any rate, that is my take on this particular issue.

Hope this helps!

Shalom,

Michael Gleghorn  
Probe Ministries

---

## **“Evidence that Jesus Didn’t Become the Christ Till Centuries Later?”**

I was recently at the A&E ([aande.com](http://aande.com)) website when I came across a set of videos that they offer. One of them titled “Unknown Jesus” caught my eye. I read the short description and they claim to have found evidence that Christ wasn’t

assigned the title of Christ until many centuries later by the Greeks and that he may not have existed until a couple of centuries after his proclaimed death. This is supposed archaeological evidence also. Can someone please write me back with your comments please? Thank you.

Thanks for your question. Although I have not seen the tapes, I am familiar with similar arguments. Unfortunately, these men are presenting poor and biased research. The claims they make will not be taken by any serious historian.

Jesus definitely existed in the first century. We have several Jewish and Roman sources clearly telling us so. Josephus, a Jewish historian, recorded the events of Israel for the Roman Empire from 37-100 AD. Not a follower of Christ, he wrote, "Now there appeared about this time Jesus, a wise man if it be lawful to call him a man. He was a doer of wonderful works ... He was the Christ and when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had him condemned to the cross..." Tacitus, a Roman historian who wrote in 115 A.D., recorded Nero's persecution of the Christians. He wrote, "Christus, from whom the name had its origin, suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of Tiberius at the hands of one of the procurators, Pontius Pilatus..."

Here these historians confirm the existence of Jesus and even give him the title "Christ" in the first century. There are several other historical accounts outside the New Testament that verify the existence of Jesus. Pliny the Younger, Thallus, Suetonius, etc... We also have the gospels which were circulated in the first century. We have a fragment of the book of John dating as early as 125 A.D. This fragment proves how early the books were written and circulated by the first century. Finished copies of the gospels were around as early as 70 A.D. The gospels base their entire account on a historical person: Jesus and his acts, they clearly claim, happened in the context of history. If their claim was false and Jesus never existed, the gospels would have been refuted

by the enemies of Christianity and they would never have lasted because their claims would be proven false. They were written in the generation of the eye witnesses who could have easily disproven their accounts. It is amazing no one doubts or questions the historical existence of Jesus until many centuries later. It is not that Jesus did not exist till centuries later, it is the critics who make this assertion whose arguments do not appear till centuries later. If Jesus never existed, why was this argument not around in the first or second century?

Whatever new archaeology has been found, I do not believe can counter the overwhelming evidence for Jesus being a first century person.

Thanks for writing. I hope this helps.

Patrick Zukeran  
Probe Ministries

---

## **Are the Essene Gospels Real?**

**Are the Essene gospels (Gospel of Peace) real? How can you witness to someone who believes these are truer than the Bible? I have a father who says he believes in Jesus, but not the Bible. He says a loving God will not condemn man as long as he does mostly good. He also rejects that Christ is the only way. I know we are saved by grace not works and that Jesus is the way, but how do I explain and share the truth without arguing? My referring to the Bible only aggravates him since he rejects it as one of religion and man's creation.**

There are certainly many ancient "Gospels" that never made it into the Bible.

You can find out more about these on sites like the following: [wesley.nnu.edu/biblical\\_studies/noncanon/index.htm](http://wesley.nnu.edu/biblical_studies/noncanon/index.htm) and [www.gnosis.org/naghamm/nhl.html](http://www.gnosis.org/naghamm/nhl.html).

A search on the latter site for the “Gospel of Peace” produced no matches and I’ve actually never heard of this one. Regardless, however, the real questions we must ask are:

1. Who wrote these documents?
2. When were they written?
3. Are they historically reliable or trustworthy sources of information about Jesus and the early church?

Many of these documents were written by groups (like the Gnostics) who were later declared heretical by church councils and synods. They were written AFTER the time of the New Testament Gospels – sometimes by hundreds of years, sometimes by decades. And with the exception of certain portions of the Gnostic Gospel of Thomas, they’re generally regarded as late, legendary, and historically unreliable sources of information about Jesus and His early followers.

If your father doesn’t believe that the Bible is reliable, you might see if he’s willing to read some books which give evidence that it is. A very good general introduction is “A General Introduction to the Bible: Revised and Expanded” by Norman Geisler and William Nix. A book on the Old Testament is “The Old Testament Documents: Are They Reliable & Relevant?” by Walter Kaiser. And F.F. Bruce wrote, “The New Testament Documents: Are They Reliable?” Many other good books exist, but if your father would be willing to carefully read any of these, it would be a great start.

Regardless of whether he’s willing to read such books or not, however, the best thing you can do is pray for him and model Christlike love toward him. The Lord can work wonderfully to soften men’s hearts toward Christ and the Bible. Speak a good word for the Lord as you have opportunity, but mainly just

pray for him and show him God's love. It's a powerful combination.

Shalom,

Michael Gleghorn  
Probe Ministries

---

## **“Why Were Women Unclean During Their Period in the Old Testament?”**

**Why were women unclean during their period in the Old Testament? Also, why were the number of unclean days different for the birth of a male child vs. a female child? Why doesn't this apply today?**

*Why were women unclean during their period in the Old Testament?*

We need to remember that being in a state of “uncleanness” was not the same as sin. It's more like being put on the bench during a game. I believe the Old Testament's emphasis on cleanness and uncleanness was to weave the importance of holiness and “separation unto the Lord” into the everyday understanding of what it meant to serve the true and living God. The distinction between cleanness and uncleanness functioned as a continual reminder of the difference between God (holy) and God's people (sinful and fallen).

Actually, I believe the ritual uncleanness of a woman's menstrual period had two purposes. First, it kept the messiness more contained by restraining her activities,

especially sexually. Secondly, when sexual relations were forbidden for seven days each month, it was a built-in anticipation builder for both husband and wife for when they could come back together again. Many married couples know the joy of "reunion sex." God's "off-limits for seven days" rule insured "reunion sex" without somebody having to go away!  
<smile>

*Also, why were the number of unclean days different for the birth of a male child vs. a female child?*

I couldn't find a single commentator who could come up with a reason apart from God's right to make the rules. However, since the New Testament teaching is equal value of the sexes (Gal. 3:28, "In Christ there is no male or female"), it may be that the purpose of the gender INequity in the Old Testament was to set up the contrast for the glory of grace in the New Testament.

*Why doesn't this apply today?*

It doesn't apply today because the purpose of the Old Testament civil law has been fulfilled. The laws were designed to protect and provide for the purity of the Jews until the Messiah came. Now, Christ has torn down the barrier between Jew and Gentile, and the Old Testament law was a huge part of that barrier—which is no longer necessary. (It should be noted that moral laws, such as what we find in the Ten Commandments, will never pass away because they are rooted in the very character of God.)

Hope this helps!

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

# **“Is the Genesis Story of ‘The Sons of God’ True?”**

**Pertaining to the old days when the watchers went astray and married women and bore giants—are these stories of any truth?**

**In the days of Noah, when a man in years was nearing his death, say a just man, are there any hints as to what awaited them in the afterlife of that period?**

**Is there something, or has there ever been something, commented on in scripture which disturbs the dead in their rest?**

Thank you for writing Probe Ministries. My own understanding of Genesis 6:1-4 leads me to believe that “the sons of God” mentioned here were indeed fallen angels. Whether or not the offspring of their union with the daughters of men were the giants referred to in v. 4 is difficult to say. The text may indicate that at least some of these giants existed prior to the sexual union of the sons of God with the daughters of men. For my part, I certainly believe these stories are true. It is quite possible that the sons of God in Genesis 6 are the angels referred to by both Jude (v. 6) and Peter (2 Pet. 2:4).

There is not a great deal of biblical revelation concerning the afterlife of the righteous in the days of Noah. But here is something to consider. In Genesis 5:21-24 we have the story of Enoch. Verse 24 states, “And Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him.” Although this verse does not give us much information, it certainly suggests an afterlife in the presence of God for the just and righteous who, like Enoch, walked with God. [Note: also see [Probe Answers Our E-Mail: Is There a Specific Reference to Heaven or Hell in the OT?](#) ]

Finally, although I’m not entirely sure what you are asking about in your third question, there is an account in 1 Samuel

28 about King Saul and a medium, in which Saul asks the medium to call up the prophet Samuel from the dead. In this case, God allowed Samuel to return to deliver to Saul a message of judgment against both he and Israel. When Samuel appears, he asks Saul, "Why have you disturbed me by bringing me up?" (v. 15). Thus, this may be the sort of example you were looking for. Of course, it's important to point out that this is an exceptional event. Normally, the dead are not permitted to return to the land of the living after death (see Luke 16:19-31). However, in particular cases the sovereign Lord may, for His own purposes, permit such a thing (as in the case of Samuel).

God bless you,

Michael Gleghorn  
Probe Ministries

---

## **"If Jesus Was Crucified on Friday, How Was He Dead for Three Nights?"**

I am looking for an answer to the "three days, three nights in the tomb" prophecy. Jesus was only in the tomb three days and TWO NIGHTS. I have seen the day portion of this prophecy explained. However, I have never heard a convincing explanation of how Friday and Saturday night can be three nights. Help!

There are several views that address this question. One view is that Jesus was crucified on Wednesday. 72 hours later later, Saturday evening, He rose and the empty tomb was

discovered on Sunday.

Another view is that Jesus died on Thursday. I take the view Jesus was crucified on Friday and rose on Sunday. All prophecies state He will rise on the third day. (Matthew 16: 21, 17:23, 20:19, 27:64, Luke 9:22, 18:33, etc...) The events of the gospels seem to correlate best with a Friday crucifixion. Only one passage talks about him being in the grave three days and three nights, Matthew 12:40. If not for this one passage, all scholars would agree on a Friday crucifixion. So we are really dealing with the question of one passage and how is that related in light of all the other passages?

In Jewish thinking, a part of a day is equivalent to a whole day. Genesis 42:17 states that Joseph held his brothers in prison for three days and in verse 18 states he spoke to them on the third day and released them. 1 Kings 20:29 says Israel and Syria camped for 7 days and then on the seventh day they began battle. Other passages—Esther 5:1, 1 Samuel 30:12—show similar thought. So Old Testament language shows the expression “three days,” “third day,” and “three days and three nights” are used to express the same period of time. Rabbinic literature shows the same thing. Rabbi Eleazar ben Azariah wrote in 100 A.D., “A day and night are an Onah (period of time) and the portion of an Onah is as the whole of it.”

So we conclude the expression “after three days,” “on the third day,” and the “three days and three nights” are all one and indicate the same time span.

Pat Zukeran  
Probe Ministries

---

# “How Did John the Baptist Get the Idea to Baptize People?”

Where did John the Baptist get the idea to dunk people in water and call it baptism? It can't be the same as our baptism today, depicting the death, burial, and resurrection; that hadn't happened yet. He preached baptism for the remittance of sin. But where did the idea come from?

Thanks for your question. D.S. Dockery has a good discussion of this issue in his article on “Baptism” in the *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* [eds. Joel Green and Scot McNight (Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 1992), 55-58].

Although the Jews practiced a form of proselyte baptism, “there is no clear evidence prior to A.D. 70 that proselytes underwent baptism as a requirement of conversion” (Ibid., 56). Dockery presents the following arguments against the view that Jewish proselyte baptism served as the model for John's baptism (ibid., 56):

1. There is no clear reference to Jewish proselyte baptism in the OT, Philo, or Josephus.
2. Jewish proselyte baptism was self-administered; John's baptism was administered by John.
3. There are grammatical differences between how the term “baptism” is used in the NT and how it is used in texts mentioning Jewish proselyte baptism.
4. John baptized *Jews*, conditioned on their repentance; Jewish proselyte baptism was only for Gentiles.

But if John did not get this idea from Jewish proselyte baptism, where did he get it? Dockery thinks a more likely borrowing occurred from the Qumran community. He does not, however, commit John to having been an Essene. In support of his thesis, Dockery offers the following arguments (Ibid., 57):

1. Both the Qumran community and John stressed the importance of repentance in relation to baptism.
2. Both viewed their ministries in terms of Isaiah 40:3.
3. Both baptized Jewish people.

However, there was one important distinction between the Qumran community and John regarding baptism: the Qumran rite was self-administered and practiced frequently, while John's baptism was administered by John and was a one-time rite of initiation.

Thus, Dockery believes John got his idea for water baptism from the Qumran community. Of course, it's important to note that if John originally received this idea from Qumran, he nonetheless revised and adapted it to fit his own unique purpose and calling as the one who was preparing the Jewish nation to receive her Messiah. Also, it's important to remember that this is simply one scholar's expert opinion. I happen to think it a good one, but as he himself observes, "...the background of John's baptism remains fiercely debated" (Ibid., 56).

God bless you,

Michael Gleghorn  
Probe Ministries

---

## **"Who Are the Angels Mentioned in the Bible?"**

You mentioned that there are only a few Angels mentioned in the Bible, and I was wondering if you could help me in relation to them. Would you give me a list of the Angels'

**names mentioned in the bible, and books or web sites where I can learn about them.**

Just two holy angels, Michael and Gabriel, are mentioned in the Bible. Here are the references:

Michael—Daniel 10:13, 10:21, 11:1, 12:1; Jude 1:9, Rev. 12:7.

Gabriel—Daniel 8:16-18; Luke 1:19, 1:26, 1:28.

Two unholy angels are named: Apollyon, the angel of the abyss in Revelation 9:11 (the Hebrew term is Abaddon), and Satan, who is an evil, fallen angel.

Hope this helps!

Sue Bohlin

Probe Ministries

---

## **“What Makes the Bible a Reliable Text on Angels?”**

You cite the bible as a source of insight into angels. What makes the bible a better source than any other fiction book that has been written by anyone at anytime? Say I wrote a book about angels because I wanted to get people to believe in something they have never seen or felt or touched or smelled or tasted. If I aged it 2 or 3 thousand years and there were people like you around, would they believe it? What if I gave it a prolific name like The Word, or Holy Text, or The Greatest Truest Book Ever Written, does it then become more plausible? What are your thoughts?

Hi \_\_\_\_\_,

My thoughts are that the Bible gives more than “insight” about angels; it gives actual revelation—information from “outside the box,” so to speak.

You can choose to call the Bible a book of fiction, but that would only be because you haven’t considered the evidence that shows it’s not. For instance, fulfilled prophecy alone is a staggering evidence that it was divinely inspired, for who else could write history in advance other than the God who is outside of time?

I invite you to try and debunk the truth and validity of the Bible. Many others have, and they have become its most convinced defenders. If it truly can be debunked, then it’s not worth believing in. But if it’s true, and I completely believe it is because of the evidence, then it’s worth paying attention to.

I have a suspicion you have an opinion of the Bible that is not based on anything more than a contempt for God and possibly for the people who believe in the Bible. (And allow me to concede, regretfully, that a lot of religious people say and do things that make God wince because they misrepresent Him so egregiously, and it has a negative impact on others who are watching—people like you? I think God grieves over this.)

You might consider shoring up your reasons. Our website is full of resources that provide good evidence that Christianity, and the Bible, are both true. If you don’t care to check anything out, then at least I would hope you would be honest enough to admit that your unbelief is based on a refusal to investigate and not because there are good reasons for it.

Respectfully,

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries