

I also feel that he puts far too much stress on the incidental matter of physical blood, instead of on what the blood signifies, namely, life given over to death as a substitute for the guilty sinner, and also life given to the redeemed sinner as a means of sanctification, communion with Christ, and glorification.

Personally, I am unable to condemn the book. Yet I feel that its material is mostly now outdated, and that the impression given by its Biblical discussions is somewhat unfortunate.

LETTER 37

1948

THE CURSE OF CANAAN

I am always glad to do anything I can to help people to understand the Word of God better.... As to the particular question which you ask: what the basis is for the popular notion that negroes are descended from Noah's son Ham -- it is my personal opinion that it has no basis whatever. It is, however, easy to see how such an idea might have originated. The Hamitic races as described in Genesis 10:6 and the following verses include people from northern Africa and western Asia. Thus Cush doubtless represents the Ethiopians who, by the way, are white and not negroid, Mizraim represents Egypt, and Canaan represents the Canaanites who were conquered by the Israelites at the time of Joshua. There is a large group of languages spoken by various peoples of northern Africa which scientists today designate as Hamitic languages. As far as I know no one of these groups of people is negroid, but all of them are white. However, as one goes further south into Africa one comes to various negro races all of which have languages entirely unrelated to the Hamitic languages. It is, therefore, altogether proper to speak of Egypt as the land of Ham but the Egyptians never were negroes. I see nothing whatever to connect up negroes with Ham. As a matter of fact it does not seem to me that the list of peoples in Genesis 10 gives us any idea as to which of the three sons of Noah would