

VITAL BIBLICAL ISSUES

VITAL BIBLICAL ISSUES

*Examining Problem
Passages of the Bible*

ROY B. ZUCK
GENERAL EDITOR

WIPF & STOCK • Eugene, Oregon

Wipf and Stock Publishers
199 W 8th Ave, Suite 3
Eugene, OR 97401

Vital Biblical Issues
Examining Problem Passages of the Bible
By Zuck, Roy
Copyright©1994 by Zuck, Roy
ISBN 13: 978-1-61097-399-1
Publication date 4/1/2011
Previously published by Kregel, 1994

Contents

Contributors	7
Preface	9
About <i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>	10
1. The Curse of Canaan <i>Allen P. Ross</i>	11
2. Saul and the Changing Will of God <i>J. Barton Payne</i>	26
3. A Fresh Look at the Imprecatory Psalms <i>J. Carl Laney</i>	30
4. Structure, Style, and the Prophetic Message: An Analysis of Isaiah 5:8–30 <i>Robert B. Chisholm, Jr.</i>	40
5. The Virgin Birth in the Old Testament and Isaiah 7:14 <i>Charles Lee Feinberg</i>	51
6. Modern Rationalism and the Book of Daniel <i>Gleason L. Archer, Jr.</i>	57
7. The Temple Vision of Ezekiel <i>Merrill F. Unger</i>	74
8. The Use of Hosea 11:1 in Matthew 2:15: An Alternative Solution <i>Tracy L. Howard</i>	86
9. The Meaning of Cross-Bearing <i>Michael P. Green</i>	98
10. The Significance of the First Sign in John's Gospel <i>Stanley D. Toussaint</i>	109
11. Abiding Is Remaining in Fellowship: Another Look at John 15:1–6 <i>Joseph C. Dillow</i>	116

12.	Paul's Use of "About 450 Years" in Acts 13:20 <i>Eugene H. Merrill</i>	125
13.	"God Gave Them Up": A Study in Divine Retribution <i>S. Lewis Johnson, Jr.</i>	134
14.	Romans 8:28–29 and the Assurance of the Believer <i>D. Edmond Hiebert</i>	142
15.	Should Women Wear Headcoverings? <i>Kenneth T. Wilson</i>	156
16.	The Chronological Problem of Galatians 2:1–10 <i>Stanley D. Toussaint</i>	174
17.	The Mystery in Ephesians 3 <i>Charles C. Ryrie</i>	180
18.	"The Husband of One Wife" Requirement in 1 Timothy 3:2 <i>Ed Glasscock</i>	187
19.	The Thorn-Infested Ground in Hebrews 6:4–12 <i>Thomas Kem Oberholtzer</i>	200
20.	An Exegetical Study of 2 Peter 2:18–22 <i>Duane A. Dunham</i>	209
	Chapter Notes	221

Contributors

Gleason L. Archer, Jr.

Professor of Old Testament and Semitic Languages, Emeritus,
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois

Robert B. Chisholm, Jr.

Professor of Old Testament Studies, Dallas Theological
Seminary, Dallas, Texas

Joseph C. Dillow

President, Biblical Education by Extension, International,
Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong

Duane A. Dunham

Professor of New Testament Language and Literature,
Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, Oregon

Charles Lee Feinberg

Dean, Emeritus, and Professor of Semitics and Old
Testament, Emeritus, Talbot School of Theology, La
Mirada, California

Ed Glasscock

Associate Professor, Moody Graduate School, Chicago,
Illinois

Michael P. Green

Associate Professor, Moody Graduate School, Chicago,
Illinois

D. Edmond Hiebert

Late Professor of New Testament, Mennonite Brethren
Biblical Seminary, Fresno, California

Tracy L. Howard

Attorney, Vinson and Elkins, The Woodlands, Texas

S. Lewis Johnson, Jr.

Professor of New Testament Studies, Emeritus, Dallas
Theological Seminary, Dallas Texas, and Teacher, Believers
Chapel, Dallas, Texas

J. Carl Laney

Professor of Biblical Literature, Western Conservative
Baptist Seminary, Portland, Oregon

Eugene H. Merrill

Professor of Old Testament Studies, Dallas Theological
Seminary, Dallas, Texas

Thomas Kem Oberholtzer

Associate Professor of Bible Exposition, Western
Seminary—Phoenix, Phoenix, Arizona

J. Barton Payne

Late Professor of Old Testament, Emeritus, Wheaton
College, Wheaton, Illinois

Allen P. Ross

Associate Professor of Biblical Studies, Trinity Episcopal
School for Ministry, Ambridge, Pennsylvania

Charles C. Ryrie

Professor of Systematic Theology, Emeritus, Dallas
Theological Seminary, Dallas, Texas

Stanley D. Toussaint

Professor of Bible Exposition, Emeritus, Dallas Theological
Seminary, Dallas, Texas

Merrill F. Unger

Late Professor of Old Testament, Dallas Theological
Seminary, Dallas, Texas

Kenneth T. Wilson

Instructor in Bible and Theology, Colorado Christian
University, Denver, Colorado

Preface

Every Bible student recognizes the life-giving power of God's Word. The authoritative, inerrant Scriptures provide spiritual birth (1 Peter 1:23) and offer spiritual nourishment and growth (1 Peter 2:2). No one can read the Bible without acknowledging its uniqueness as God's divine truth, given by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

While the Bible—as God's message to mankind—stands in its simplicity as a book easily understood by children, youth, and adults, it also challenges the most astute, scholarly minds.

Is this surprising? Not really—its profundity of thought testifies to its divine origin. How can humans fully comprehend God? Seeking to plumb the unfathomable depths of Scripture is like a child trying to measure the ocean by his bucket on the shore.

The chapters in this book address some of the problem passages in the Bible. Why did Noah curse Canaan? Did God change his will about Israel having a king? Why did the psalmists pray for vengeance on their enemies? Is the book of Daniel a fraud? What did Jesus mean when He commanded His followers to take up their own crosses? What does abiding in Christ mean? In what sense did God “give up” sinners? Did Paul teach that women should wear head coverings? In what sense is the church a “mystery”? What is the meaning of the phrase “the husband of one wife”?

The writers of these chapters, reprinted from *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Dallas Seminary's quarterly journal, suggest answers to these and other difficulties in the Scriptures. Hopefully these studies will enhance reader's understanding of the Bible while at the same time providing spiritual nourishment for the soul.

ROY B. ZUCK

About *Bibliotheca Sacra*

A flood is rampant—an engulfing deluge of literature far beyond any one person’s ability to read it all. Presses continue to churn out thousands of journals and magazines like a roiling, raging river.

Among these numberless publications, one stands tall and singular—*Bibliotheca Sacra*—a strange name (meaning “Sacred Library”) but a journal familiar to many pastors, teachers, and Bible students.

How is *Bibliotheca Sacra* unique in the world of publishing? By being the oldest continuously published journal in the Western Hemisphere—1993 marked its 150th anniversary—and by being published by one school for sixty years—1994 marks its diamond anniversary of being released by Dallas Seminary.

Bib Sac, to use its shortened sobriquet, was founded in New York City in 1843 and was purchased by Dallas Theological Seminary in 1934, ten years after the school’s founding. The quarterly’s one-hundred and fifty year history boasts only nine editors. Through those years it has maintained a vibrant stance of biblical conservatism and a strong commitment to the Scriptures as God’s infallible Word.

I am grateful to Kregel Publications for producing a series of volumes, being released this year and next, commemorating both the journal’s sesquicentennial (1843–1993) and its diamond anniversary (1934–1994). Each volume in the Kregel *Vital Issues Series* includes carefully selected articles from the thirties to the present—articles of enduring quality, articles by leading evangelicals whose topics are as relevant today as when they were first produced. The chapters have been edited slightly to provide conformity of style. As Dallas Seminary and Kregel Publications jointly commemorate these anniversaries of *Bibliotheca Sacra*, we trust these anthologies will enrich the spiritual lives and Christian ministries of many more readers.

ROY B. ZUCK, EDITOR
Bibliotheca Sacra

For *Bibliotheca Sacra* subscription information, call Dallas Seminary, 1–800–992–0998.

CHAPTER 1

The Curse of Canaan

Allen P. Ross

The bizarre little story in Genesis 9:18–27 about Noah's drunkenness and exposure along with the resultant cursing of Canaan has perplexed students of Genesis for some time. Why does Noah, the spiritual giant of the Flood, appear in such a bad light? What exactly did Ham do to Noah? Who was Canaan and why should he have been cursed for something he did not do? Though problems like these preoccupy much of the study of this passage, their solutions are related to the more basic question of the purpose of the account in the theological argument of Genesis.

Genesis, the book of beginnings, is primarily concerned with tracing the development of God's program of blessing. Blessing was pronounced on God's creation, but sin (with its subsequent curse) brought deterioration and decay. After the Flood there was a new beginning with a renewal of the decrees of blessing, but once again corruption and rebellion left the human race alienated and scattered across the face of the earth. Against this backdrop God began His program of blessing again, promising blessing to those obedient in faith and cursing to those who rebel. The rest of the book explains how this blessing developed: God's chosen people would become a great nation and inherit the land of Canaan. So throughout Genesis the motifs of blessing and cursing occur again and again in connection with those who are chosen and those who are not.

An important foundation for these motifs is found in the oracle of Noah. Ham's impropriety toward the nakedness of his father prompted an oracle with far-reaching implications. Canaan was cursed; but Shem, the ancestor of Israel, and Japheth were blessed. It seems almost incredible that a relatively minor event would have such major repercussions. But consistently in the narratives of Genesis, one finds that the fate of both men and nations is determined by occurrences that seem trivial and commonplace.

The main characters of these stories acted on natural impulse in their own interests, but the narrator is concerned with the greater significance of their actions. Thus it becomes evident that out of the virtues and vices of Noah's sons come the virtues and vices of the families of the world.¹

The purpose of this section in Genesis, then, is to portray the characteristics of the three branches of the human race in relation to blessing and cursing. In pronouncing the oracle, Noah discerned the traits of his sons and, in a moment of insight, determined that the attributes of their descendants were embodied in their personalities.² Because these sons were primogenitors of the families of the earth, the narrator is more interested in the greater meaning of the oracle with respect to tribes and nations in his day than with the children of Shem, Ham, and Japheth.³

Shem, the ancestor of the Shemites to whom the Hebrews belonged, acted in good taste and was blessed with the possession of the knowledge of the true God, Yahweh. Japheth, the ancestor of the far-flung northern tribes which include the Hellenic peoples,⁴ also acted properly and thus shared in the blessing of Shem and was promised geographical expansion. In contrast, Ham, represented most clearly to Israel by the Egyptians and Canaanites, acted wrongly in violating sexual customs regarded as sacred and as a result had one line of his descendants cursed with subjugation.⁵

So the oracle of Noah, far from being concerned simply with the fortunes of the immediate family, actually pertains to vast movements of ancient peoples.⁶ Portraying their tendencies as originating in individual ancestors, the book of beginnings anticipates the expected destinies of these tribes and nations. Vos fittingly notes that it occurred at a time when no event could fail to influence history.⁷

The Prologue (Gen. 9:18–19)

Genesis 9:18–19 provides not only an introduction to this narrative but also a literary bridge between the Flood narrative and the table of nations. The reader of Genesis is already familiar with the listing of the main characters of this story: Noah and his three sons Shem, Ham, and Japheth (5:32; 6:10; 7:13; 9:1; and later in 10:1). But in this passage two qualifications are supplied. They were the sons of Noah who came out of the ark, and they were the progenitors from whom all the nations of the earth originated. The first description connects the characters to the

Flood account, and the second relates them to the table of nations.

Of greater significance for the present narrative, however, is the circumstantial clause in verse 18, "Now Ham was the father of Canaan." Many have thought that this is a primary example of a redactor's attempt to harmonize the deed of Ham and the curse of Canaan portions of this narrative.⁸ If that were the case, it could have been done more effectively without leaving such a rough trace. The point of this clause seems rather to show the connection of Canaan with Ham. However, far from being merely a genealogical note, which would be superfluous in view of chapter 10, the narrative is tracing the beginnings of the family and shows that Ham, acting as he did, revealed himself as the true father of Canaan.⁹ The immediate transfer of the reference to Canaan would call to the Israelite mind a number of unfavorable images about these people they knew, for anyone familiar with the Canaanites would see the same tendencies in their ancestor from this decisive beginning. So this little additional note anticipates the proper direction in the story.

The Event (Gen. 9:20–23)

NOAH'S BEHAVIOR

The behavior of Noah after the Flood provided the occasion for the violation of Ham. Noah then acted so differently from before the Flood that some commentators have suggested that a different person is in view here.¹⁰ But the text simply presents one person. The man who watched in righteousness over a wicked world then planted a vineyard, became drunk, and lay naked in his tent. Or, as Francisco said it, "With the opportunity to start an ideal society Noah was found drunk in his tent."¹¹

This deterioration of character seems to be consistent with the thematic arrangement of at least the early portion of Genesis, if not all of the book. Each major section of the book has the heading *אלה תולדות*, commonly translated "these are the generations of." The narratives that follow each heading provide the particulars about the person, telling what became of him and his descendants. In each case there is a deterioration from beginning to end. In fact the entire Book of Genesis presents the same pattern: The book begins with man (Adam) in the garden under the blessing of God, but ends with a man (Joseph) in a coffin in Egypt. The *תולדות* of

Noah began in 6:9 with the note that Noah was righteous and blameless before the Lord, and ended in 9:18–27 with Noah in a degraded condition. But it was a low experience from which God would bring brighter prospects in the future.

Noah, described as a “man of the soil” (9:20), began by planting a vineyard. This epithet (אִישׁ הָאֲדָמָה) is probably designed to say more than that he was a human farmer. In view of the fact that he is presented as the patriarch of the survivors of the Flood, Noah would be considered as the master of the earth, or as Rashi understood it, the lord of the earth.¹²

The two verbs (וַיֵּצֵא . . . וַיִּטֵּעַ) in the sentence are best taken as a verbal hendiadys, “he proceeded to plant” a vineyard. Whether he was the first man in history to have done so is not stated, but he was the first to do so after the Flood. The head of the only family of the earth then produced the vine from the ground that previously produced minimal sustenance amid thorns.

The antediluvian narratives represent various beginnings, none of which appear particularly virtuous. Besides Noah’s beginning in viticulture, the first “hunter” is mentioned in 10:8. Nimrod was the first (הַחֹלֵל) “to be a mighty warrior on the earth.” And in 11:6, concerning the activities of Babel, the text reads, “they have begun (הִתְחִלּוּ) to do this.” The use of the same verb in all these passages provides an ominous note to the stories.

The planting of the vineyard, however, appears to be for Noah a step forward from the cursed ground. Since Lamech, Noah’s father, toiled under the curse,¹³ he hoped that his son would be able to bring about some comfort (5:29) and so he called him Noah, which means “comfort.” Perhaps Noah hoped that cheer and comfort would come from this new venture.

The vine in the Bible is considered noble. The psalmist described the vine as God’s provision, stating that it “gladdens the heart of man” (104:15). A parable in Judges has a vine saying, “Should I give up my wine, which cheers both gods and men?” (9:13). Not only did the fruit of the vine alleviate the pain of the cursed, but also it is the symbol of coming bliss in the Messianic age. Zechariah 8:12 and Isaiah 25:6 describe the future age by employing this idea.¹⁴

But while it may be that wine alleviates to some degree the painful toll of the ground, the Old Testament often warns of the moral dangers attending this new step in human development. Those taking strong vows were prohibited from drinking wine

(Num. 6); and those assuming responsible positions of rulership were given the proverbial instruction that strong drink is not for kings, but for those about to die (Prov. 31:4–5).

The story of Noah shows the degrading effects of the wine—drunkenness and nakedness. No blame is attached in this telling of the event, but it is difficult to ignore the prophetic oracles that use nakedness and drunkenness quite forcefully. Habakkuk, for one, announced, “Woe to him who gives drink to his neighbors, pouring it from the wineskin till they are drunk, so that he can gaze on their naked bodies” (2:15). Jeremiah also used the imagery for shame and susceptibility to violation and exploitation, lamenting, “You will be drunk and stripped naked” (Lam. 4:21).

Since the prophets view drunkenness and nakedness as signs of weakness and susceptibility to shameful destruction, many have condemned Noah’s activities. The Talmud records that Noah was to be considered righteous only when compared with his wicked generation.¹⁵ All that Rashi would say was that Noah degraded himself by not planting something else.¹⁶ Most commentators at least view it as an ironic contrast in Noah’s character¹⁷ if not an activity that is in actual disharmony with the picture of the man given earlier.¹⁸

On the other hand there have been many who have attempted to exonerate Noah in one way or another. Medieval Jews took it in an idealistic way, saying that Noah planted the vine in order to understand sin in a better way and thus to be able to warn the world of its effects.¹⁹ Various scholars have tried to free Noah from blame by viewing the passage as an “inventor saga.”²⁰ Noah, the inventor of wine, was overpowered by the unsuspected force of the fruit and experienced the degradation of the discovery.²¹

Cohen takes the exoneration a step further. Observing that the motif of wine in the ancient world was associated with sexuality, he argues that Noah was attempting to maintain his procreative ability to obey the new commission to populate the earth. To substantiate his view, Cohen drew on the analogy of Lot with his daughters (Gen. 19:30–38) and David with Uriah and Bathsheba (2 Sam. 11:12–13), since wine was used in each case to promote sexual activity.²² Cohen acclaims the old man for playing the role so well.

It cannot be denied that wine has been used in connection with sex. However, Cohen’s theory, no matter how fascinating, must be rejected as a highly speculative interpretation. It is more plausible to proceed on clear evidence and to take a normal,

sensible approach. Later biblical allusions show drunkenness and nakedness to be shameful weaknesses, often used figuratively for susceptibility before enemies. Noah is thus not presented in a good light.

In view of this, it appears that along with the primary intent of the narrative to set the stage for the oracle, the passage also presents a polemic against pagan mythology.²³ The old world saw Armenia as the original home of wine, but Egyptian literature attributed the invention of wine to the god Osiris, and Greek literature attributed it to Dionysius. The Genesis account, by contrast, considers the beginning of wine and its effect on man as less than divine. It has the trappings of depravity. Cursing and slavery, rather than festive joy, proceed from its introduction into the world. Any nation delighting in the vices of wine and nakedness, this polemic implies, is already in slavery.

HAM'S VIOLATION

Noah's condition prompted the sin of his son Ham. Ham, who again is said to be the father of Canaan, "saw his father's nakedness and told his two brothers outside" (9:22). They in response carefully came in and covered the old man. When Noah learned what Ham had done to him, he cursed Canaan but he blessed Shem and Japheth.

What did Ham do that was serious enough to warrant such a response? One answer is that Ham did nothing at all to deserve such a blistering curse. Many writers believe that two traditions have been pieced together here, one about Ham and another about Canaan. Rice asserts, "All the tensions of Genesis 9:18–27 are resolved when it is recognized that this passage contains two parallel but different traditions of Noah's family."²⁴ In fact he states that no interpretation that considers the story to be a unity can do justice to the text. But it must be noted in passing that positing two traditions in no way solves the tension; instead it raises another. If the parts of the story were from two irreconcilable traditions, what caused them to be united? To assert that two differing accounts were used does not do justice to the final, fixed form of the text. The event was obviously understood to be the basis of the oracle that follows in 9:24–27.

Some commentators attempt to reconstruct what took place. Figart suggests that Ham and his brothers came to see Noah, and that Ham went in alone, discovered his father's condition, and

reported it to his brothers who remedied the situation. Figart's point is that there was no sin by Ham.²⁵ He suggests that Canaan, the youngest, must have been responsible for the deed that incurred the curse.

But it seems clear enough that the story is contrasting Ham, the father of Canaan, with Shem and Japheth regarding seeing or not seeing the nakedness. The oracle curses Ham's descendant, but blesses the descendants of Shem and Japheth. If Canaan rather than Ham were the guilty one, why was Ham not included in the blessing? Shufelt, suggesting also that Canaan was the violator, reckons that Ham was reckless.²⁸ But it seems that the narrative is placing the violation on Ham.

Many theories have been put forward concerning this violation of Ham. Several writers have felt that the expression "he saw his nakedness" is a euphemism for a gross violation. Cassuto speculates that the pre-Torah account may have been uglier but was reduced to minimal proportions.²⁷ Greek and Semitic stories occasionally tell how castration was used to prevent procreation in order to seize the power to populate the earth.²⁸ The Talmud records that this view was considered by the rabbis: "Rab and Samuel [differ], one maintaining that he castrated him, and the other that he abused him sexually."²⁹ The only possible textual evidence to support such a crime would come from Genesis 9:24, which says that Noah "found out what his youngest son had done to him." But the remedy for Ham's "deed" is the covering of Noah's nakedness. How would throwing the garment over him without looking undo such a deed and merit the blessing?

Bassett presents a view based on the idiomatic use of the words "uncover the nakedness."³⁰ He suggests that Ham engaged in sexual intercourse with Noah's wife, and that Canaan was cursed because he was the fruit of that union. He attempts to show that to "see another's nakedness" is the same as sexual intercourse, and that a later redactor who missed the idiomatic meaning added the words in 9:23.

But the evidence for this interpretation is minimal. The expression *רָאָה עֶרְוָה* is used in Scripture for shameful exposure, mostly of a woman or as a figure of a city in shameful punishment, exposed and defenseless. This is quite different from the idiom used for sexual violation, *גִּלָּה עֶרְוָה*, "he uncovered the nakedness." This construction is used throughout Leviticus 18 and 20 to describe the evil sexual conduct of the Canaanites. Leviticus

20:17 is the only occurrence where רָאָה is used, but even that is in a parallel construction with גָּלָה, explaining the incident. This one usage cannot be made to support Bassett's claim of an idiomatic force meaning sexual intercourse.

According to Genesis 9 Noah uncovered himself (the stem is reflexive). If there had been any occurrence of sexual violation, one would expect the idiom to say, "Ham uncovered his father's nakedness." Moreover, Rice observes that if Ham had committed incest with his mother, he would not likely have told his two brothers, nor would the Torah pass over such an inauspicious beginning for the detested Canaanites (see Gen. 19:30–38).³¹

So there is no clear evidence that Ham actually did anything other than see the nakedness of his uncovered father. To the writer of the narrative this was apparently serious enough to incur the oracle on Canaan (who might be openly guilty in their customs of what Ham had been suspected of doing).

It is difficult for someone living in the modern world to understand the modesty and discretion of privacy called for in ancient morality.³² Nakedness in the Old Testament was from the beginning a thing of shame for fallen man. As a result of the Fall, the eyes of Adam and Eve were opened, and, knowing they were naked, they covered themselves. To them as sinners the state of nakedness was both undignified and vulnerable.³³ The covering of nakedness was a sound instinct for it provided a boundary for fallen human relations.

Nakedness thereafter represented the loss of human and social dignity. To be exposed meant to be unprotected; this can be seen by the fact that the horrors of the Exile are couched in the image of shameful nakedness (Hab. 3:13; Lam. 1:8; 4:21). To see someone uncovered was to bring dishonor and to gain advantage for potential exploitation.

By mentioning that Ham entered and saw his father's nakedness the text wishes to impress that seeing is the disgusting thing.³⁴ Ham's frivolous looking, a moral flaw, represents the first step in the abandonment of a moral code. Moreover this violation of a boundary destroyed the honor of Noah.

There seems to be a taboo in the Old Testament against such "looking" that suggests an overstepping of the set limits by identification with the object seen (Gen. 19:26; Ex. 33:20; Judg. 13:22; 1 Sam. 6:19). Ham desecrated a natural and sacred barrier by seeing his father's nakedness. His going out to tell his brothers

about it without thinking to cover the naked man aggravated the unfilial act.³⁵

Within the boundaries of honor, seeing the nakedness was considered shameful and impious. The action of Ham was an affront to the dignity of his father. It was a transgression of sexual morality against filial piety.³⁶ Because of this breach of domestic propriety, Ham could expect nothing less than the oracle against his own family honor.³⁷

SHEM'S AND JAPHETH'S REVERENCE

Shem and Japheth acted to preserve the honor of their father by covering him with the garment (Gen. 9:23). The impression is that Ham completed the nakedness by bringing the garment out to his brothers.

The text is very careful to state that the brothers did not see their father's nakedness. Their approach was cautious, their backs turned to Noah with the garments on their shoulders. In contrast to the brevity of the narrative as a whole this verse draws out the story in great detail in order to dramatize their sensitivity and piety. The point cannot be missed—this is the antithesis of the hubris of Ham.

The Oracle (Gen. 9:24–27)

With the brief notice that Noah knew what his youngest son³⁸ had done to him, the narrative bridges the event and the oracle. The verb יָדַע would suggest either that Noah found out what had transpired or that he knew intuitively. Jacob suggests that “the different ways of his sons must have been known to him.”³⁹ Certainly Noah knew enough to deliver the oracle, as Jacob much later had such knowledge about his sons (Gen. 49).

The essence of the oracle is the cursing of Canaan: “Cursed be Canaan! The lowest of slaves will he be to his brothers.” Even when the blessings are declared for the brothers, the theme of Canaan's servitude is repeated both times.

The very idea of someone cursing another raises certain questions as to the nature of the activity. Scharbert points out that (a) the curse was the reaction of someone to the misbehavior of another in order to keep vigorously aloof from that one and his deed; (b) the one cursed was a subordinate who by the cursing would be removed from the community relationship in which he had enjoyed security, justice, and success; (c) the curse was no

personal vendetta but was used to defend sacral, social, and national regulations and customs; and (d) the curse was effected by divine intervention.⁴⁰

In the ancient world the curse was only as powerful as the one making it. Anyone could imprecate, but imprecation was the strongest when supernatural powers were invoked.⁴¹ The Torah had no magical ideas such as sorcery and divination (Ex. 22:17–18). The curse found its way into Israel as part of an oath to protect its institutions. One who committed a serious transgression against covenant stipulations was delivered up to misfortune, the activation of which was Yahweh's (Deut. 28; Josh. 6:26; 1 Sam. 26:19).

So the curse was a means of seeing that the will of Yahweh was executed in divine judgment on anyone profaning what was sacred. It is an expression of faith in the just rule of God, for one who curses has no other resource. The word had no power in itself unless Yahweh performed it.⁴² Thus it was in every sense an oracle. God Himself would place the ban on the individual, thus bringing about a paralysis of movement or other capabilities normally associated with a blessing.⁴³

In this passage the honor of Noah and the sanctity of the family, one of God's earliest institutions, are treated lightly and in effect desecrated. Noah, the man of the earth, pronounced the oracle of cursing. It is right, and Yahweh would fulfill it.

The second part of verse 25 specifies the result of the curse—abject slavery. This meant certain subjugation, loss of freedom for autonomous rule, and reduction to bondage.⁴⁴ A victor in war would gain dominion over the subjugated people so that they might be used as he pleased. However, in the Old Testament slaves were to be treated favorably, protected by law, and even freed in the sabbatical year (Ex. 21:2, 20).

But Noah was not content to give a simple pronouncement of Canaan's slavery. By using the superlative genitive עֶבֶד עֲבָדִים ("servant of servants"), he declared that the one who is cursed is to be in the most abject slavery. Canaan would serve his "brothers" (normally understood to refer to Shem and Japheth since the main idea of the curse is repeated in the next lines).

The fact that Canaan, and not Ham, received the curse has prompted various explanations. Of course there are those, as already discussed, who posit separate traditions and see two distinct stories that were later fused into a single account. Others have

found reason for excusing Ham on the basis of the blessing in 9:1. Not only would it be unusual for a person to curse what God had blessed, but also one would not normally curse his own son.⁴⁵ While this may partially explain Noah's choice, it cannot be the whole explanation.

Kidner sees the principle of talionic justice in the passage. For Ham's breach of family, his own family would falter and that through the youngest.⁴⁶ But is it right to curse one for the action of another?

The Torah does incorporate this measure-for-measure judgment from one generation to another, but in such cases the one judged is receiving what he deserves. A visitation of the sins of the fathers on later generations will be on those who hate Yahweh (Ex. 20:4). A later generation may be judged for the sin of an ancestor if they are of like mind and deed. Otherwise they may simply bear the fruit of some ancestor's sin.

It is unlikely that Canaan was picked out for cursing just because he was the youngest son of Ham. On the contrary, the Torah, which shows that God deals justly with all men, suggests that Noah saw in him the evil traits that marked his father Ham. The text has prepared the reader for this by twice pointing out that Ham was the father of Canaan. Even though the oracle would weigh heavily on Ham as he saw his family marred, it was directed to his descendants who retained the traits.

In this regard it must be clarified that Canaan the people, not the man, are in view for the fulfillment of the oracle. The names Canaan, Shem, and Japheth all represent the people who were considered their descendants. So by this extension the oracle predicts the curse on the Canaanites and is much wider than a son's being cursed for his father, although the oracle springs from that incident in the family. Therefore the oracle is a prophetic announcement concerning the future nations. To the Hebrew mind, the Canaanites were the most natural embodiment of Ham.⁴⁷ Everything they did in their pagan existence was symbolized in the attitude of Ham. From the moment the patriarchs entered the land, these tribes were there with their corrupting influence (Gen. 13:18; 15:16; 18:32; 19:38).

The Torah warned the people of the Exodus about the wickedness of the Canaanites in terms that call to mind the violation of Ham (Lev. 18:2–6). There follows a lengthy listing of such vile practices of the Canaanites (18:7–23) that the text must

employ euphemisms to represent their deeds ("nakedness" alone is used 24 times). Because of these sins the Canaanites were defiled and were to be driven out before the Israelites.

The constant references to "nakedness" and "uncovering" and even "seeing" in this passage, designating the people of Canaan as a people enslaved sexually, clearly reminds the reader of the action of Ham, the father of Canaan. No Israelite who knew the culture of the Canaanites could read the story of their ancestor Canaan without making the connection. But these descendants of Ham had advanced far beyond his violation. The attitude that led to the deed of Ham came to full fruition in them.

Archaeology has graphically illustrated just how debased these people were. Bright writes, "Canaanite religion presents us with no pretty picture. . . . Numerous debasing practices, including sacred prostitution, homosexuality, and various orgiastic rites, were prevalent."⁴⁸ Wright and Filson add that "the amazing thing about the gods, as they were conceived in Canaan, is that they had no moral character whatever. In fact, their conduct was on a much lower level than that of society as a whole, if we can judge from ancient codes of law. . . . Worship of these gods carried with it some of the most demoralizing practices then in existence."⁴⁹ Albright appropriately adds to this observation.

It was fortunate for the future of monotheism that the Israelites of the conquest were a wild folk, endowed with primitive energy and ruthless will to exist, since the resulting decimation of the Canaanites prevented the complete fusion of the two kindred folk which would almost inevitably have depressed Yahwistic standards to a point where recovery was impossible. Thus, the Canaanites, with their orgiastic nature worship, their cult of fertility in the form of serpent symbols and sensuous nudity, and their gross mythology, were replaced by Israel, with its nomadic simplicity and purity of life, its lofty monotheism, and its severe code of ethics.⁵⁰

So the text is informing the reader that the Canaanite people, known for their shameless depravity in sexual matters and posing a continual threat to Israel's purity, found their actual and characteristic beginning in Ham. Yet these descendants were not cursed because of what Ham did; they were cursed because they acted exactly as their ancestor had. That moral abandon is fully developed in the Canaanites. The oracle announces the curse for this.

In actual fact Noah was supplicating God to deal with each group of people as they deserved, to the ancestor and descendants

alike. Since this request was in harmony with God's will for the preservation of moral purity, He granted it.⁵¹ If the request had not been in harmony, Noah's curse would have had no result.

Canaan, then, is the prototype of the population that succumbed to enervating influences and was doomed by its vices to enslavement at the hands of hardier and more virtuous races.⁵² Because Ham, the "father" of Canaan, had desecrated the honor of his father by seeing his uncovered nakedness, this divine and prophetic oracle is pronounced on the people who would be known for their immorality in a shameful way, a trait discernible in this little story in the history of beginnings.

The blessing aspect is given to Shem, but the wording is unexpected: "Blessed be the LORD [Yahweh], the God of Shem." The emphasis on the possession of God by his name is strengthened in this line in a subtle way. Delitzsch says, "Yahweh makes Himself a name in becoming the God of Shem, and thus entwines His name with that of Shem, which means 'name.'"⁵³

By blessing one's God, the man himself is blessed. The idea is that Shem will ascribe his good fortune to Yahweh his God, for his advantage is not personal merit; his portion is Yahweh.⁵⁴ The great line of blessing will be continued through Shem from Noah to Abram, the man of promise.

Here again, however, the point of the oracle looks to the descendants. It would then be clear to Israel, who found themselves in such a personal, covenantal relationship with Yahweh that they were the heirs of this blessing.

The announcement of Japheth's share in the blessing of Shem is strengthened by the play on his name "Japheth" (יָפֶֿתֿ) from the verb "to enlarge" (פָּתַח). Here too the descendants are in mind, for they would expand and spread out in the world. The second part of this verse is the resultant wish that Japheth would dwell in the tents of Shem. This is most likely an expression of the prospect of peaceful cohabitation.⁵⁵ Certainly the prospect of this unification is based on the harmony of the ancestors in the story. As a partner in covering up Noah, Japheth's descendants are granted alliance with Shem in the subjugation of Canaan.

The church fathers saw this as the first sign of the grafting in of the Gentiles in spiritual blessings, but later revelation speaks more of that. All that can be said of Genesis 9:27 in the oracle is that peaceful tenting of Japheth with Shem was a step toward that further ideal blessing.

The Epilogue (Gen. 9:28–29)

The narrative, as well as the תולדות, ends with verses 28 and 29 supplying the final note of the genealogy of Noah, the last name on the table of Genesis 5. A new תולדות begins in chapter 10.

The essential part of this narrative is most certainly the oracle, and the dominant feature of that oracle is the cursing of the Canaanites.⁵⁶ They are doomed to perpetual slavery because they followed in the moral abandon of their distant ancestor. Their subjugation would be contrasted by the blessing on the others: Shem has spiritual blessings by virtue of knowing Yahweh; Japheth has temporal blessings with the prospect of participation with Shem.

The curse narrative of Genesis 9 immediately precedes the listing of the families and their descendants in Genesis 10; if there were any question as to whom the narrator had in mind, the lines could be traced immediately.

Japheth, whose expansion was already anticipated in the oracle, represented the people who dominated the great northern frontier from the Aegean Sea to the highlands of Iran and northward to the steppes beyond the shores of the Black Sea. Those best known to the writer were the Hellenic peoples of the Aegean coastlands.⁵⁷

Shem also is pictured as expanding, dwelling in tents. The oracle looks beyond the ancestor to his descendants, among whom were the Hebrews. It would be difficult to understand the narrator's assuming Yahweh to be covenanted with any other people. The possession of the blessing would be at the expense of the Canaanites whom Israel would subjugate, thus actualizing the oracle.

Canaan represents the tribes of the Canaanites who were considered to be ethnically related to the other Hamites, but were singled out for judgment because of their perverse activities. The curse announced that they would be enslaved by other tribes, a subjugation normally accomplished through warfare.

On the whole, this brief passage expresses the recoiling of Israelite morality at the licentious habits engendered by a civilization that through the enjoyment and abuse of wine had deteriorated into an orgiastic people to whom nothing was sacred. In telling the story, the writer stigmatizes the distasteful practices of these pagans.⁵⁸

Being enslaved by their vices, the Canaanites were to be enslaved by others. This subjugation, effected through divine intervention, is just: the moral abandon of Ham ran its course in his descendants.

It is not possible to take the oracle as an etiology, answering the questions as to why the Canaanites had sunk so low, or why they were enslaved by others.⁵⁹ At no time in the history of Israel was there a complete subjugation of Canaan. Many cities were conquered, and at times Canaanites were enslaved, but Israel failed to accomplish her task. These Canaanites survived until the final colony at Carthage was destroyed in 146 B.C. by the Romans. So there was really no time in the history of Israel to fit a retrospective view demanded by an etiology.

Rather, the oracle states a futuristic view in broad, general terms. It is a sweeping oracle announcing in part and imprecating in part the fate of the families descending from these individuals. It is broad enough to include massive migrations of people in the second millennium as well as individual wars and later subjugations.

The intended realization, according to the design of the writer, would be the period of the conquest. Israel was called to conquer the Canaanites. At the same time as the Israelite wars against the Canaanites (down through the battle of Taanach), waves of Sea Peoples began to sweep through the land against the Hittites, Canaanites, and Egyptians. Neiman states, "The Greeks and the Israelites, willy-nilly, were allies against the Canaanites and the Hittites during the great world conflict which came down through the historical memory of many peoples by many different names."⁶⁰

In their invasions these people from the north sought to annex the coastland territory and make homes for themselves. Israel felt herself in the strongest moral contrast to the Canaanites (as Shem had felt to Ham). Any help from the Japhethites would be welcomed. Such a spirit of tolerance toward the Gentiles would not have been possible in the later period of Israel's history. Thus the curse oracle would have originated at a time *before the Conquest*, when the Canaanites were still formidable enemies.

In all probability the event and its oracle were recorded to remind the Israelites of the nature and origin of the Canaanites, to warn them about such abominations, and to justify their subjugation and dispossession through holy warfare. Israel received the blessing, but Canaan received the curse.

CHAPTER 2

Saul and the Changing Will of God

J. Barton Payne

As affirmed by both creed and catechism, God is a Personal Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in His being and attributes.¹ His divine Personality may then be appreciated as consisting of intellect, sensibility, and will. In reference to the third of these, “will” may be understood as that within God which puts into effect all that the two previous aspects of His Personality have designed.² Yet such divine will has become a subject of no little confusion, because of the various meanings with which the word can be employed. By “the will of God” one may designate His sovereignty: His kingly decision, efficaciously executed among the children of men, and thus free from all modification or change. But by His “will” we may also designate His preferences—His moral desires, as revealed to free men—or His subsequent responses to such men, whether of blessing or of penalty; and these latter obviously do change, in accord with the just deserts of those involved, indeed, because of the very unchangeability of His attributes! This article thus seeks to define, to apply, and to illustrate these distinctions as they appear in one of the problem passages of God’s Word, namely, 1 Samuel 8–15, on Saul’s rise to kingship over Israel.

Was it God’s will for Israel to have a king? The inspired words of Scripture seem to point in two ways. On the one hand the prophet Samuel said, “Behold, the Lord has set a king over you” (1 Sam. 12:13; cf. 9:16; 10:1); but on the other, and only a few verses later, He reprimanded His people as follows: “Your wickedness is great . . . by asking for yourselves a king” (12:17). Liberal writers conclude that 1 Samuel must be composed of conflicting sources, and they speak of “the diametrically opposed attitude toward the monarchy in the two accounts of its origin.”³ Evangelicals, however, object not simply because such an approach discredits the validity of God’s Word, but because its “easy way out” neglects some of Scripture’s deeper teachings about the

complexity of God's will, both as it affected Saul and as it affects believers today.

Most fundamentally, the Bible states that the Lord "works all things after the counsel of His will" (Eph. 1:11). Man cannot change what God has determined (Eccl. 3:14; Jer. 5:22; Dan. 4:35).

This reality may be identified as the sovereign will of God or, as it is often styled in systematic theologies, His decretive will.⁴ One rejoices, moreover, in the assurance it gives a believer. Jesus Himself explained how it applies to His flock: "They shall never perish. . . . My Father, who has given them me, is greater than all; and no one is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand" (John 10:28-29; Rom. 8:38-39). So too, Scripture speaks of God's eternal plan to send the Savior, whose "goings forth are from long ago, from the days of eternity," it identifies Him as the one who is "to be ruler in Israel" (Mic. 5:2). This means that a kingdom in Israel must also have been a part of God's changeless decree; in fact, prophecies dating back to Moses say that "a scepter shall rise from Israel" (Num. 24:17; cf. Gen. 49:10; Deut. 17:14), indicating that it *was* God's will for them to have a king.

Yet at the same time the Bible speaks of other categories within the will of God and of matters the Lord would like to see done but which may not actually come to pass. Such a divine desire appears in 2 Peter 3:9, which states that the Lord is "not wishing for any to perish but for all to come to repentance"; yet because of the power of choice that God has granted to men some do refuse to come (John 3:19-20; in contrast to nature, which must obey Him, Luke 8:25). When God's wish for men becomes concretely revealed in the form of precepts—which men may yet choose to violate—they are designated as the preceptive will of God. Moses, for example, in the passages just cited, laid down the need of recognizing God's kingship in the future kingdom of Israel (Num. 23:21; Gen. 49:18; Deut. 17:15-19); and he set before his people the option of choosing good or evil, with corresponding results, namely, of life or death (Deut. 30:15). Not that God would change His decree—the historical outcome was already settled (cf. 31:16-21), though often one does not know what it is (29:29)—but that Israel, on the basis of its own responses, would experience appropriate judgments from God, whether of added blessings or of curses (30:16-18). Moses concluded by exhorting, "So choose life" (v. 19), even as Jesus now says, "Come to Me and . . . rest" (Matt. 11:28).

In the days of Samuel, Israel could have submitted to God's kingship; but they did not (1 Sam. 8:8). They chose rather to conform to the standards of their pagan neighbors (v. 5). One can only speculate about the added blessings, about that "perfect will of God," which Israel might have experienced had they remained faithful—God might have set up David, "the scepter . . . from Judah" (Gen. 49:10), without those tragically intervening events with which all are familiar. But one does know that it *was not* God's will for Israel to have a king in the way they were asking for it. Still, God's resultant precept, what His "permissive will" came to be, was to direct Samuel to anoint Saul as king out of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Sam. 8:22; 9:17). Three important distinctions are to be observed. (1) God changed His preceptive will, but only because people had changed (cf. 8:3–5). In fact, it was because God's standard of righteousness had not changed that His precept *had* to change (Gal. 6:7). (2) God performed the very act that people wanted; but while their motive was wrong and in this act they became guilty, God's motive was right and in the very same act He did not become guilty. In fact, He used this man Saul to punish the people (1 Sam. 8:18), so that while they got what they asked for, they also got what they deserved! (3) God was grieved over the nation's apostasy (v. 7); and their act called forth His divine love. In spite of the sin-inspired situation of Saul, and in fact through it, God ministered a number of deliverances (9:16; 10:9, 24; 11:13). Saul had thus been a part of God's decree from the first, and God used the wrath of men to praise Him (Ps. 76:10). History's supreme parallel is stated in Peter's Pentecost sermon to the Jews: "Jesus . . . [being] delivered up by the predetermined plan and foreknowledge of God, you nailed to a cross by the hands of godless men. . . . And God raised Him up again, putting an end to the agony of death" (Acts 2:22–24); and because He lives, believers shall live also.

Israel was thus given another opportunity to submit to God, though at this point the personal career of Saul and the national reaction of Israel exhibited differing patterns of response. Despite Samuel's warnings to both king and people about the results of continued disobedience (1 Sam. 12:15, 25), Saul decided not to carry out God's commands (15:11) and even lied about it (v. 13). God again felt grief and regret (v. 11)⁵ but nevertheless He revealed a new precept: Samuel, who had once been instructed to anoint Saul, was now to tell him, "Because you have rejected the word of