

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

NUMBER III.

JANUARY, 1850.

ARTICLE I.

1. *Address of the Southern members of Congress to their constituents, Washington City, Jan. 1849.*
2. *Lecture on the North and the South, delivered before the Young Men's Mercantile Library Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, January 16th, 1849: by ELWOOD FISHER. 8vo. pp. 24.*
3. *Mussey's review of Fisher, on the North and the South. Cincinnati: 1849. 8vo. pp. 98.*
4. *Practical Hints on the comparative cost and productiveness of the culture of Cotton, and the cost and productiveness of its manufacture. Addressed to the Cotton planters and capitalists of the South. By CHAS. T. JAMES. Providence: 1849. 12mo. pp. 68.*

We cannot repress a sigh from our very heart, as we take up the pen to discuss the subject of these publications. Its magnitude and difficulties are enough to make any mind serious and even sad. We are almost ready to despair, too, of a satisfactory and peaceful settlement of the questions it involves. The conviction that the season for discussion has passed, and the time for action come, is also growing upon us. We have scarcely a hope that aught we shall say, will influence the result so much as a

earth on man. Hence the cup of wine over which this *giving of thanks* was pronounced, was called *the cup of praise or thanksgiving* ποτηριον ευλογιας that is ευχαριστιας." Justin Martyr says. "The bread and a cup of wine is brought to the president of the brethren, and he taking them, offers *praise and glory* to the Father of all, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and maketh a very long *thanksgiving*, because he hath thought us worthy of these gifts; and when he has concluded the *prayers* and *thanksgiving*, all the people present approve it with acclamation, saying Amen."

From these opinions of good and learned men in every age of the Church, we are forced to the conclusion, that this passage does not support the doctrine that the sacramental elements were blessed by the Saviour, or subsequently by the Apostle Paul.

Therefore we have no warrant from Scripture for the practice which many adopt of *consecrating* the bread and wine.

We might continue this discussion to an indefinite length, but we have said enough to convince any impartial inquirer after truth, what is the Bible view of the subject.

I hope that for the future, our dear brethren in the bonds of the Gospel will avoid every expression at the Lord's table, that might be tortured into the idea that the elements are any thing more than simply *common* bread and wine.

ARTICLE IV.

THE MARK OF CAIN AND CURSE OF HAM.

It has been our object in former pages of this Review, to defend the teachings of the Scriptures, as to the unity of the human race, and to point out those causes which may have operated, in the special Providence of God, to produce the varieties found existing in the family of man.

We see nothing in the views then expressed, that we would wish to retract, nor any other hypothesis, better sustained by facts and probabilities, to account for the diversities which have arisen among men. In the positions we assumed, nothing is advanced which the most judicious and learned divines of the Protestant and Romish faith have not in all ages maintained, and nothing which has not approved itself to the great body of the intelligent and sober minded men of other learned professions. We are not ashamed, therefore, of the company we are in, nor in the least moved by the learning and science of the men who oppose us. On the one side is the word of God; and the common belief of those who receive it. On the other is philosophy, carping at the declarations of the divine word, and convulsively striving to prove them false. It is the same contest, though on different ground, with that waged between the early Christians, and Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian, the Apostate; the contest between Reason and Revelation, the philosophy of men, and that Heaven-descended philosophy which is found embalmed in the language of inspiration. The old leaven of infidelity, once active in our own community and elsewhere, has never been wholly expelled. It is working yet, showing itself now here, and now there. We have believed that it would manifest itself in unexpected developements whenever a favourable opportunity should arrive. Did not the Scriptures reveal to us the existence of a watchful and wary Spirit, the fomenter and presiding genius in all evil, who, outliving the various generations of men, recruits from among them his often baffled hosts; and at every fitting juncture, leads on his new levies, themselves unconscious of defeat, in a new onset against the truth, we would be forced by the course of events, to believe it. Here, behind this question, the most exciting of all others amongst us at present, we have feared that we should find him planting his old batteries, which have been dismantled in many a former war, but which have been now again refitted, and that they would be served by new, zealous, and confident assailants, vainly waiting for their hour of anticipated triumph. By assuming false grounds in defence of that which is just and true, we may give our

enemies an advantage over us. And we have regarded it peculiarly incumbent on right minded men, to avoid being led away by the glare of seeming learning and science on the one hand, and on the other, to see to it that they take no positions which will weaken a good cause by their being compelled afterwards to abandon them.

Some who admit substantially the unity of the human race, deny that there have been any natural causes in operation at any time, adequate to produce the diversities existing among men, and maintain that there has been a miraculous intervention of Deity, by which he has directly, and in violation of existing laws, produced changes of complexion, conformation, and constitution, stamped inferiority upon one particular race, and doomed it, by this very circumstance, to perpetual servitude. It is in these assertions usually forgotten that the red, yellow, tawny, and melanous complexions are all to be accounted for, as well as the deep black of the Ethiop, and that the conformation of the Chinese and Peruvian heads is just as wide an aberration from the Grecian or Caucasian type as that of the negro. The mind dwells alone upon the latter, and men of high distinction are found to satisfy themselves with saying that God has put the *mark of Cain* and the curse of Ham upon the Ethiopian race, and therefore doomed them to perpetual degradation. We could wish that these things were more considerately said. Surely if the Ethiopian hue and features came from the curse of Ham, they do not come from the curse of Cain, and if from the malediction of Cain, then not from that pronounced upon the descendants of Ham. If the peculiarities of the negro constitute that mark which was set upon Cain, how, we ask, have they been transmitted?—If the deluge was universal, the Cainites were all destroyed in the flood. One family alone was preserved in the Ark, and that descended from Seth and not from Cain. If, as has been suggested, Ham, the second son of Noah, might have married a daughter of Cain, and she have been preserved in consequence of her connexion with the family of Noah, even then, by the supposition, the posterity of Ham would have been but mulattoes, and not negroes of full blood, and their peculiarities by intermarriage would soon have disappeared.

But why reason on such absurdities? There is not the least evidence that if a mark was set upon Cain, it was transmitted to his descendants. His daughters at least were fair.* Nor is there the least proof that any note or mark was really set upon the person of Cain, by which he was distinguished from other men. It is only by what is, in our view, an evident mistranslation, that this idea was ever originated. It was not God's design that Cain should be cut prematurely off. It was His intention that he should be the parent of a numerous progeny, and the founder of States and cities in the Antediluvian world.— And when his mind was occupied with that dread of an untimely end, which he was conscious he deserved, and which almost subverted his powers, God, to reassure him, appointed him a sign,† or gave him a token, by which he might be convinced that his life would be spared; and at the same time, he denounced sevenfold punishments upon whomsoever he might be, who should take his life. A notion which has nothing to sustain it but a misinterpretation of Scripture, might as well be buried in oblivion for the future.

We have long thought it equally futile to trace the physical peculiarities of the Ethiopian to "*the curse of Ham.*" Indeed, if we attend to the language of the Scriptures themselves, we do not read in them of any curse pronounced upon Ham. Ham had offended in exposing the nakedness of his father, Noah. But the curse is pronounced; not upon Ham, but upon Canaan, his son. "And he said cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren." "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant." It has been believed by many, that though this curse seems to be connected with the preceding incidents in the narrative, this apparent connection arises from the extreme brevity of the story, in which the events of years, and even of centuries, are, of necessity, placed in immediate juxtaposition. It is argued that the name of *Canaan*

* Gen. vi. 2.

† See lxx. Gen. iv. 15, and Stackhouse Hist. 46, note.

being introduced, who was the *youngest* son of Ham, implies that this curse was pronounced long after the flood, and shortly before Noah's death, while the incident of Noah's supposed drunkenness occurred long before. But if the two were connected, the conduct of Ham, in which, probably, Canaan participated, so that he was even the chief offender, was the occasion and not the ground of the curse, which had been all along present, as a pre-determined event, in the mind of God. Now, before it can be shown that the physical peculiarities of the African negro, and his alleged intellectual inferiority, have resulted from this curse, it must be shown that he is descended from Canaan. This is a task to which we commend the advocates of this opinion. When they have proved it, there will be some more ground for their hypothesis than they have now to stand upon. From Canaan were descended the Sidonians, or Phœnicians, the Arkites, Sinites, Arvadites, Zemarites and Hamathites; the Hittites, Jebusites, Amorites, Girgasites and Hivites; the Amalekites, the Rephaim and the sons of Anak, the Kenites, Kenezites and Kadmonites. Most of these last tribes occupied Palestine in the times of Abraham, and were either dispossessed or subjugated by Joshua.

The splendour, wealth and commerce of Tyre and Sidon, and their numerous colonies, are known to all. Tyre was the Liverpool of these ancient times, and Carthage, her most flourishing colony, the rival of Rome. Her colonies were scattered over Cyprus, Cilicia, Pisidia, Chios, Lesbos, Tenedos, Bithynia, Paphlagonia, Thrace, the Eubœa, Crete, Beotia, Illyria, Malta, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, Tuscany and Spain. Their vessels are said to have passed out of the Mediterranean, to Ireland, England, and the islands north of Great Britain. Hanno, the Carthaginian, sailed along the western coast of Africa, perhaps as far as the bight of Benin. They traded with India, on the east, and the Island of Ceylon, and under Pharaoh Necho, circumnavigated Africa. The race of Phœnician shepherd kings reigned, according to Manetho, for many years over Egypt, and Cadmus, the Phœnician, gave letters to Greece. The language spoken by all these tribes of men, varied scarcely at all from that spoken by the Jews, as the fragments and inscriptions

on monuments and coins collected by Bochart, and still more perfectly by Gesenius abundantly show. Does any one believe that Hiram, King of Tyre, or Pygmalion, that Hannibal, Hanno, and Hasdrubal were negroes? Were they black, woolly haired men, with thick lips, projecting jaws, and retreating forehead? If any one doubts, let him examine the coins of Tyre, Sidon, Acco, Laodicea, Marathus, Berytus, Cilicia, Panormus, Heraclea, Syracuse, Cossura, Gades, Sexti, Belo, Mallaga and Siga; each bearing the effigies of some distinguished ruler, and a legend in the Phœnician or Punic tongue; and see if he can trace the least approximation to the Ethiopian type.* There could not be found, we are persuaded, a collection of coins of any Northern European people, exhibiting a wider departure from the features and conformation of the negro. Whatever connection the tribes of northern Africa may have with this ancient stock, it is impossible to show, historically, any such connection between Canaan and those tribes of middle and south Africa who are represented in the slave population of America.† As to the complexion of the ancient descendants of Canaan, there is no reason to believe that it was in any respect darker than that of the descendants of Abraham. The European portion of these people have long since mingled with the inhabitants of southern Europe, and are lost among them. The Arkites, Sinités, Arvadites, Zemarites, and Hamathites are commingled with the inhabitants of Asia Minor and Syria. The ancient Carthaginians, and those

* See Gesenius *Monumenta Phœnicia*. Tab. 34—44.

† The testimony of Procopius (*de Bello Vandalico*, 2.10) is suspected by some, perhaps unjustly. He relates that the Canaanites, after they perceived that they could not maintain their ground against Joshua, fled first into Egypt, and there not finding space to settle in so crowded a population passed over into (North) Africa. He then adds that, occupying many cities, they held the whole of Libya to the pillars of Hercules. They then came and dwelt near me, and built a citadel in Numidia, where now is the city called Tigisis. There are two pillars made of white stone, near a large fountain, having Phœnician letters inlaid, saying, in the Phœnician tongue, "we are those who fled from Joshua, the robber, the son of Naue." The use of this language prevailed in North Africa till the sixth century. St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, often mentions it as spoken by the country people in his day, complains of it as one of the obstacles which prevented the inculcation of Christianity, and rejoiced when he found a presbyter skilled in the Punic, who could take charge of the new bishopric of Fussa, a short distance from Hippo.

who had taken refuge in those lands when fleeing from the face of Joshua, the son of Nun, are, doubtless, still found among the native tribes of Mauritania, of Mt. Atlas, and other regions of north Africa. The name Canaan, may signify the "*knee-bender*." And he has bent the knee to Shem and Japheth in former times and on other shores, but he has never bent the knee, nor been a servant of servants to Shem and Japheth, unless, perhaps, in a few stray individuals on the shores of America. He was humbled by Joshua, conquered by Alexander, subjugated by the Romans, and has been oppressed by the Tartars and Saracens, but if he has contributed to swell the ranks of the enslaved Africans, it is probably the ranks of the more northern tribes, and if he has, in any of his branches acquired the hue of the Ethiop, which we are not inclined to doubt, it has been within the period of authentic history, and, probably, since those sculptures were made on the Egyptian monuments, which exhibit the Ethiopian contour and complexion as they now are. At the time of the voyage of Hanno, the Carthaginian, the Ethiopians are spoken of as distinguished from his own people, who were of the Canaanitish stock.

This dilemma then presents itself to those who so strenuously identify the Ethiop with Canaan. Either they must admit that the negroes have shown themselves to have been among the most intelligent and enterprising nations of antiquity, who thundered under the lead of Hannibal at the gates of Rome, and vexed with their prows the waters of every sea navigated by the ancients, or if they were at that time white men and are now black, they must admit that they have become so within the moderate period of 2200 years, and 2400 years at least since the prophecy of Noah was pronounced. We care not which horn of the dilemma they may take. So far as the natives of maritime Nigritia are concerned, from whom our slaves are derived, the argument is historically a failure.

It is extremely doubtful if the curse has respect to any of Ham's descendants excepting Canaan. The Canaanites stood in aftertimes in the way of the chosen people of God. They were a race even now doomed in the sovereignty of God to be defeated, conquered and subjugated.

Nothing is said in the narrative of any other descendants of Ham. We do not doubt that the African negro descended from this son of Noah. But if the posterity of Ham were accursed *without exception*, the same degradation, and the same physical marks of it should be manifested by all.

Who then are the descendants of Ham? In the first place, Cush was his son. Nothing is more clear from history, than that his descendants settled in Asia, along the Euphrates and the Persian Gulf, in South Arabia, along the Red Sea, especially towards its southern part, where they crossed over into Africa, and extended themselves at length westward on that continent. The word Cush is usually translated in the Septuagint by the word Ethiopia, and *this* word as used by the Greeks denoted both an Asiatic and African people. Homer speaks of them as a divided race of men, living at the extreme east and the extreme west.* Strabo, as a two-fold people, lying extended in a long track from the rising to the setting sun; and Herodotus† distinguishes the Eastern Ethiopians in Asia from the Western Ethiopians in Africa by the straight hair of the former and the curly hair of the latter. There was probably no regard had to the Ethnological derivation of men in the application of this term by the Greeks. But there is the most abundant evidence from the Scriptures, that the Cush or Ethiopia of the Bible referred sometimes to Asiatic and sometimes to African tribes. The descendants of Cush were Nimrod, the first king of Shinar, i. e. Babylon and Mesopotamia, where he founded Babel, his metropolis on the Euphrates, Erech and Accad on the Tigris, and Calneh, afterwards called Cesiphon by the Greeks. According to one interpretation, he was the founder also of Nineveh, Rehoboth, Calah and Resen, thus laying the foundation of what subsequently were two great empires, the Babylonish and Assyrian. Another son of Cush was Havilah, who settled in Arabia, probably in the vicinity of Mecca; another, Sabtah, settled in southern Arabia; another, Ragma, settled in eastern Arabia on the Persian Gulf, and his sons Sheba and Dedan in the same vicinity or in South Arabia. Two sons only of the numerous

* Odyss. 1, 23,

† vii. 69, 70.

family of Cush appear to have settled originally in Africa, Seba, who probably settled in Meroe within the Astaboras, its eastern branch, and the main stream of the Nile, between Egypt and Abyssinia; and Sabtecha, who seems to have occupied the eastern coast of Africa. The second son of Ham was Mizraim, the father of the Egyptians, from whom came the Ludim, probably of central Africa, the Annamim, who inhabited the deserts around the temple of Jupiter Ammon, the Lubim or Libyans, the Pathrusi of upper Egypt, the Casluhim or Colchians, from whom came the Philistines, and the Capthorim or inhabitants of Crete. The third son of Ham was Phut, believed to have inhabited Mauritania, and some regions also of central Africa. The celebrated Archaeologist and Geographer Ritter says, that hordes of people have been poured out of Futa in central Africa, and both Josephus and Pliny mention Phutes as a river of Africa.

Let us enquire now what are and have been the physical characteristics of these various sons of Ham. Have these various nations, as long as they have been known in history, possessed the same physical type and complexion? Have not their typical forms varied from that of the Caucasian through every degree of change to the Ethiopian? Do we not find among them, at this day, the yellow, brown, or black Arab, the red or copper coloured Copt or Egyptian, the swarthy Moor, the comparatively light coloured Galla and Abyssinians, and the black natives of Nigritia? We are not informed that the Philistine or Tyrian was distinguished at all from the Jew by complexion, in the days of David and Solomon, two thousand years after the prophecy of Noah was pronounced.

What we now ask is, that those who extend the curse pronounced upon Canaan, over the whole race of Ham, and ascribe to this curse the variations of these men from the prevalent type, should inform us how it is that the curse has affected them so variously; giving to the full Ethiop the prominent lips, the flat nose, the retreating forehead, the long heel, the woolly hair; giving to others, frizzled hair, Grecian features, and a black skin; to others straight hair, and a yellow complexion; to others a brown, to others a red or copper coloured tint; and leaving others probably no darker than the dark complexioned white

man. Truly the curse entering into the bones of different members of the family of Ham has affected them differently. If we judge by colour, some of them are no more accursed than the Chinese, or the American Indian, or the Hindoo. If you judge by features without reference to colour, some of them are no more cursed than many a European. The facts in the case, we beg leave to say, render our minds entirely skeptical as to any connection between the physical characteristics of the race of Ham and the curse pronounced by Noah upon Canaan. The only thing indicative of any connection between the physical peculiarities of Ham's descendants and the prophetic declaration of Scripture, is in the name of Ham himself. As Japheth signifies *enlargement* and Shem renown, so Ham signifies, *warm, hot*, and possibly by association *black*. Egypt is called in Scripture the land of Ham, and on the monuments, even on the Rosetta stone itself, CHEME, which Plutarch took to signify blackness, and referred to the dark colour of the soil. De Iside et Osir. vii. The name Ham may refer to the fact that Ham's descendants would occupy southern and warm countries, and may possibly refer to the physical effect the glowing heat, which should beat upon them, would at length produce.

We are as little disposed to rest the Scripture *defence* of slavery on this prophecy of Noah. First, because, as we have already said the argument is, historically speaking, an entire failure. The slaves amongst us are not Canaanites, or if there should be now and then a descendant of Canaan among them, there is probably scarcely one in a thousand. And secondly, because prophecy forms no rule of duty to man, but is a revelation of that secret will of God according to which things are ordered, and not of that revealed will which is our law and guide. If prophecy were a rule of duty, Judas ought to have betrayed Christ, and both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, did right in gathering together against the holy child Jesus, to do whatsoever the hand and counsel of God determined before to be done. If prophecy be a rule of duty, the most unseemly and atrocious acts may be freely performed. The institution of domestic slavery has its surest defence in the sacred Scriptures. And it is a pity that its defence should

be marred by forced interpretations and insecure arguments, which the opponents of the institution may triumphantly overthrow.

It has been indeed alleged that the race of Ham has ever been in subserviency to the descendants of Japheth and Shem; and Mede says that "there never hath been a son of Ham who hath shaken a sceptre over the head of Japheth; Shem hath subdued Japheth, and Japheth hath subdued Shem, but Ham never subdued either."—But this assertion of Mede is not strictly true, for Ham founded the splendid monarchies of Assyria and Babylonia. The Egyptians long held the Hebrews in bondage, and Shishak, the Sheshonk of the monuments, subsequently subdued them. Sesostris conquered a great part of Europe and Asia, and the Carthaginians often defeated the Romans in battle. If Heeren's opinion be true, (which we doubt,) Ethiopia gave civilization to Egypt. According to all Antiquity, Egypt or Phœnicia gave literature to Greece. These are some of the instances in which Ham, in past ages, has shown his superiority over Japheth and Shem. These things must not be forgotten amid the degradation into which the race of Ham has now sunk.

It is a fact, too, which we desire those who oppose us to account for, that nations, historically and genealogically of the most different descent, should be reckoned by Physiologists among one and the same variety of men. We are told that the Jews, Arabs, Hindoos, Egyptians, and European nations are all of the Caucasian type. Yet these men descended, some from Ham, some from Japheth, and some from Shem. Does not this fact go to show that the several types are not derived from the three sons of Noah respectively, but are varieties which have arisen in each of these lines of descent, and having once arisen, been perpetuated in the lines in which they are now found? Another striking fact is, that the Jews, Babylonians, Assyrians, Arabians, Egyptians, Phœnicians, and Carthaginians, spoke the same tongue, and needed no interpreter between them, for a thousand years after the confusion of tongues at Babel; and the Phœnicians, Carthaginians, and Hebrews, while their distinctive language lasted, always spoke the same tongue, with almost no di-

alectic variations.* Yet a part of these nations were descended from Shem, and another part from Ham. Indeed the argument which proves our race to have a common origin and parentage, is one of vast variety and strength. Like those fibres in some objects of nature, which, crossing each other like a net work in every direction, hold together in one body the mass they interpenetrate and enclose, so this many sided argument, these physiological, linguistic, antiquarian, and historic proofs, show the family of man to be one, and though separate in themselves, mutually confirm and sustain each other.

The opinions in reference to which we have thus briefly expressed our dissent, are no otherwise injurious than as they present an unsound basis on which to rest the Scripture defence of slavery. They imply no disrespect to the sacred volume, but the reverse. Some of the remarks, therefore, with which this brief article is prefaced, are unsuitable if applied to them. They were designed to refer rather to a third hypothesis, which will be considered in the following article, to which this may be regarded, if the reader will, as introductory, an hypothesis which we are obliged to reject, if we continue to receive the Scriptures as the oracles of God.

ARTICLE V.

Two Lectures on the Connection between the Biblical and Physical History of Man. Delivered by invitation, from the Chair of Political Economy, etc. of the Louisiana University, in December, 1848. By JOSIAH C. NOTT, M. D. of Mobile, Alabama. New York, 1849.

The closing words of the preceding article, have spoken of it as originally designed to be introductory to the one upon which we now enter. We, therefore, ad-

* See Gesen. Monumenta Phœnicia.