“And the sons of Noah, that went forth of the ark, were Shem, and Ham, and Japheth: and Ham is the father of Canaan. These are the three sons of Noah: and of them was the whole earth overspread.”

~ Genesis 9:18-19

Our purpose in this study is to introduce the student to the “ethnic” layout of Bible times and correct faulty racial attitudes and inconsistencies.

This is an important subject because inspired and profitable information (II Timothy 3:16) has been given to us by God concerning the “races.”

**Definitions**

Before going further, let us look at two definitions from the Webster’s 1828:

**Ethnic:** Etymology – “nation”

Definition – “heathen; pagan; pertaining to the gentiles or nations …”

**Race:** Definition – “the lineage of a family, or continued series of descendants from a parent who is called the stock... Thus all mankind are of the race of Adam, Israelites are of the race of Abraham and Jacob.”
ORIGIN OF MAN

All men are descendants of Adam (Genesis 1:26-28; 3:20). There is no record, prior to the flood, of any racial distinction.

All men are descendants of Noah (Genesis 9:1, 19).

ORIGIN OF THE “RACES”

The first record in Scripture of “racial” divisions is found in Genesis chapter 10 (see :1, 5, 20, 31).

This passage is often known as the “Table of the Nations.” The divisions were made through the three sons of Noah. These divisions make up, by-and-large, the three basic classifications of mankind:

- Japheth – European Caucasian (:2-5)
- Ham – African Negroid (:6-20)
- Shem – Asian Mongoloid [Semitic] (:21-32)

After Genesis chapter 12 God made a simple TWO-FOLD division of the “races” (or mankind), identified as the Circumcised and the Uncircumcised, or Hebrews and Gentiles.

Hereafter the “Old Testament” is basically a detailed account of one “race,” the Hebrews.

The nation of Israel did have Gentiles that were “strangers within thy gates” (Exodus 20:10; Deuteronomy 5:14; 24:24).

- These Gentiles were entitled to the sign of circumcision (Exodus 12:48).
- They had a right to the cities of Refuge (Numbers 35:15).
- They had a right to an inheritance among the Hebrews (Ezekiel 47:22-23).

Thus Heathen “joined themselves to the Lord” and became Jews (i.e., proselytes, Isaiah 56:3-8; Esther 8:17).

PREJUDICIAL, THEORETICAL INTERPRETATIONS

Sadly, Christianity has had its share of prejudice and racism. Some have incorporated it into their teaching. But there is no justification for such shameful practices. Let us look very briefly at some of the erroneous teachings:
Related to Adam

Presented:

This theory teaches that the Hebrew word for Adam means “able to blush.” And since, as the theory goes, only caucasians are capable of blushing, that “whites” are the only descendants of Adam.

Refuted:

But the name Adam means “red,” speaking of the reddish/brown dirt from which he was formed (which is far from being “white”).

This supposition will not stand the test of Scripture:

- It denies Adam’s headship.
- It denies the imputation of Adam’s sin upon all (c.f. Romans 5:12; I Corinthians 15:22).

Related to Cain

Presented:

In this theory the mark upon Cain was “blackness” and it is passed to his descendants.

Refuted:

- The Scriptures do not tell us what the mark was. Any attempt to identify it is pure conjecture.
- The mark given to Cain was for protection.
- This mark was limited to Cain, and was not said to be hereditary.
- Cain’s descendants were killed in the flood of Noah.

Related to Ham

Presented:

This is the most popular of the theories. Supposedly based on Genesis 9:23-27, stating that God cursed Ham’s son Canaan and made him and his descendants black servants (i.e., slaves). This passage is said to be a “prophecy of the races.” This teaching usually involves an incestuous sodomizing of Noah by Ham.

Refuted:

- This passage is nowhere in Scripture stated to be a prophecy.
God is said to curse no one. This passage is a record of Noah’s actions (as a patriarch), not God’s.

God never mentions the “curse” anywhere.

Noah clearly pronounced the “curse” (judgment) upon Canaan, not his descendants (Ham had four sons: Cush, Mizraim, Phut and Canaan – Genesis 10:6).

There is nothing anywhere in the passage about anyone being black in relationship to the curse.

Nimrod, a descendant of Canaan, was some slave wasn’t he (Genesis 10:8-10)?

The clear decree of Noah was that Canaan would be a servant to his brothers as well as Shem and Japheth. He lost his power (authority) and ranking position. There is no reference to him being a servant to anyone else.

**Alternate View**

The Scripture is silent as to the “technical” detail of how the sons of Noah became the stock of such a wide range of racial divisions. But we shall offer to you a “possibility” as suggested by Timothy Fellows of the Angelus (Vol. 15, No. 5):

“Physical differences must have been present in the [genes of the] first man just as the different species of animals must have been present in the genes of the first of their kind. When Noah took dogs aboard the ark, he did not take 2 Sheep Dogs, 2 Beagles, 2 Wolf Hounds, 2 Pomeranians, 2 Poodles, 2 Collies, 2 German Shepherds, etc. -- he took two dogs, and from these all other breeds have derived.”

**Ham’s Descendants in the Bible**

Often when a Caucasian reads through the Bible he presumes “whiteness.” We all must diligently study the Bible, not to carry our own ethnic viewpoint into the Bible, but to see what the Bible has to say for itself! Many Anglos (“An English speaking white American” – Oxford) would be sore amazed at the true “racial” nature of the Bible.

**Black** Genealogy

*Ham* – “hot, burnt, black,” corresponding to Egypt (Psalm 78:51; 105:23, 27; 106:21-22)

*Cush* – “black,” also translated “Ethiopia”

*Mizraim* – also translated “Egypt”

**Black** Nations

*Canaanites* – corresponding to Canaan.

*Egyptians* – (Genesis 12:12, 14; Exodus 1:13, 19; Leviticus 24:10).


*Midianites* – (Genesis 37:28, 36; Numbers 10:29; 25:6; Judges 6-7).

*Hittites* – (Genesis 15:20; 23:10; Exodus 3:8; Joshua 1:4; I Kings 10:29).
“Black” Individuals

Abraham – married an Egyptian, Hagar (Genesis 16:1-3).
Judah – married two Canaanites, Shuah and Tamar (Genesis 38:2; I Chronicles 2:3, 4).
Moses – had an Ethiopian wife (Numbers 12:1-13): Israel was forbidden to intermarry among other nations for RELIGIOUS reasons, not “RACIAL” reasons. The issue was one of religious unequal yoke (Deuteronomy 7:3-6). One searches the Scriptures in vain for a divine condemnation of inter-racial marriages.
Bathsheba – David’s Wife (II Samuel 11:3; Bath (daughter of) Sheba – Great-grandson of Ham; Genesis 10:7). She was the mother of Solomon and this probably explains why the Queen of Sheba visits him (I Kings 10:1-13).
Solomon’s Queen is black (Song of Solomon 1:5, 6).
Cushi – Zephaniah’s father (Zephaniah 1:1).
Tamar, Rahab, Bathsheba – three “Black” Gentile women in Christ’s ancestry: (Matthew 1:3-6 – even the genealogy of Christ demonstrates the simple fact that there are no “pure races!” Not even Jesus Christ was a racial “pure breed”).
Simon – one of Christ’s apostles, was a Canaanite (Matthew 10:1-4; Mark 3:18).
Simon – of Cyrene, a North African province (Mark 15:21).
Ethiopian Eunuch (Acts 8:26-40).
Simeon and Lucius – two of the five teachers at Antioch, were “black” (Acts 13:1). Simeon was called “Niger” which means “black.” Lucius was from “Cyrene” of North Africa. There was no racial segregation practiced at Antioch.

The Great “Proof Text”

Acts 17:26 is supposed to be the GREAT “proof text” for the “Bible segregationist.” One of the first “problems” with this passage is identifying its extended context. The context of this passage is not Genesis 11 as many would think, but Deuteronomy 32:8 instead. It is the bounds of the LAW and KINGDOM, which have been destroyed and in abeyance respectively!

(Our “racist” brethren should do a little more “reasoning” at this point. EVEN IF the bounds of habitation were set and in force today, did our “Black” brothers VOLUNTARILY leave the “bounds” of their habitation to pick “our” cotton? Who violated whose bounds of habitation? Shall we explore this logic further? Shall we too return to the “bounds” of our habitation and leave this land to the “native Americans.” Who violated whose bounds of habitation once again?)

Our Proper Attitude Toward Those of Other “Races”

Our “Relative” Attitude:

“Since all mankind are of one family, and nearly related in Adam and Noah, how reasonable is it that we should love and do good to each other! Whenever I behold a human being,
whatever is his language and garb, or wherever he was born, I should recognize a near relation, and behave accordingly. In this view, how unnatural and absurd is that prejudice against foreigners, and that contempt of them which generally prevails! How can it consist with love to our neighbors, our brethren ... to treat then, with rigor or hold them in unwilling slavery?!” Thomas Scott, The Holy Bible With Notes (1807).

OUR “BODY” ATTITUDE:

The great BIBLICAL division between people in “time past” was circumcision and uncircumcision. (Not black and white, or indian, or oriental etc.) Now this is a part of “right division” (II Timothy 2:15). “But now” this separation – the only one authorized by God – has been done away in Christ (Ephesians 2:11-19). Grace has brought about a great change for ALL Gentiles (not just “white” Gentiles).

The Result:

“So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and EVERY ONE members one of another” (Romans 12:5).

“... We are members one of another” (Ephesians 4:25).

“For by one Spirit are we ALL baptized into ONE body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free ...” (I Corinthians 12:13).

Conclusion:

God loves ALL men (Romans 5:8; Ephesians 2:4-5) and it is His will that they ALL be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth (I Timothy 2:4).