

STUDIES ON SLAVERY,

In Easy Lessons.

COMPILED INTO EIGHT STUDIES, AND SUBDIVIDED INTO
SHORT LESSONS FOR THE CONVENIENCE
OF READERS.

By JOHN FLETCHER,

OF LOUISIANA.

FOURTH THOUSAND.

NATCHEZ:

PUBLISHED BY JACKSON WARNER.

CHARLESTON: McCARTER & ALLEN.—NEW ORLEANS: JOHN BALL.

PHILADELPHIA: THOMAS, COWPERTHWAIT & CO.

1852.

vants (עֲבָדִים *va ebadim*, and male slaves), and maid-servants (שִׁפְחוֹת *va shephahoth*, and female slaves), and camels and asses.”

“And Sarah, my master’s wife, bare a son to my master when she was old : and unto him hath he given all that he hath.”

And of Isaac it is said—

“Then Isaac sowed in that land, and received in the same year a hundred fold : and the Lord blessed him, and the man waxed great, and went forward and grew until he became very great : for he had possessions of flocks, and possessions of herds, and great store of servants (עֲבָדָה *va ebuddah*, and a large family of slaves) : and the Philistines envied him.” We pray that no one in these days will imitate those wicked Philistines !

And of Jacob it is said—

“And the man increased exceedingly, and had much cattle, and maid-servants (שִׁפְחוֹת *vu shephahoth*), and female slaves and men-servants (עֲבָדִים *va ebadim*, and male slaves), and camels, and asses.” “And the Lord said unto Jacob, Return unto the land of thy fathers, and to thy kindred ; and I will be with thee.”

“*He that is* despised, and hath a servant (עֶבֶד *ebed*, a slave), is better than he that honoureth himself, and lacketh bread.” *Prov.* xii. 9.

“I know that whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever ; nothing can be put to it, nor any thing taken from it : and God doeth it that men should fear before him. That which hath been is now ; and that which is to be, hath already been ; and God requireth that which is past.” *Eccl.* iii. 14.

LESSON XV.

WE shall, in the course of these studies, with some particularity examine what evidence there may be that Ham took a wife from the race of Cain ; and we propose a glance at that subject now. Theological students generally agree that, in *Genesis* vi. 2, “sons of God” mean those of the race of Seth ; and that the “daughters of men” imply the females of the race of Cain. The word “fair,” in our version, applied to these females, does not justly teach us that they were white women, or that they were

of a light complexion. It is translated from the Hebrew טֹבוֹת *tovoth*, being in the feminine plural, from טוֹב *tov*, and merely expresses the idea of what may seem *good* and *excellent* to him who speaks or takes notice: it expresses no quality of complexion nor of beauty beyond what may exist in the mind of the beholder; it is usually translated *good* or *excellent*. Immediately upon the announcement that these two races thus intermarry, God declares that his spirit shall not always strive with man, and determines to destroy man from the earth. Is it not a plain inference that such intermarriages were displeasing to him? And is it not also a plain inference, these intermarriages were proofs that the “wickedness of man had become great in the earth?” Cain had been driven out a degraded, deteriorated vagabond. Is there any proof that his race had improved?

The fact is well known that all races of animals are capable of being improved or deteriorated. A commixture of a better with a worse sample deteriorates the offspring of the former. Man is no exception to this rule. Our position is, that sin, as a moral poison, operating in one continued strain in the degradation and deterioration of the race of Cain, had at length forced them down to become exceedingly obnoxious to God. Intermarriage with them was the sure ruin of the race of Seth: it subjected them at once to the curses cleaving to the race of Cain. Even after the flood, witness the repugnance to intermarry with the race of Ham often manifested by the descendants of Shem; and that the Israelites were forbidden to do so.

Now, for a moment, let us suppose that Ham did marry and take into the ark a daughter of the race of Cain. If the general intermixture of the Sethites with the Cainites had so deteriorated the Sethites, and reduced them to the moral degradation of the Cainites, that God did not deem them worthy of longer encumbering the earth before the flood, would it be an extraordinary manifestation of his displeasure at the supposed marriage of Ham with one of the cursed race of Cain, to subject the issue of such marriage to a degraded and perpetual bondage?

But again, in case this supposed marriage of Ham with the race of Cain be true, then Ham would be the progenitor of all the race of Cain who should exist after the flood; and such fact would be among the most prominent features of his history. It would, in such case, be in strict conformity with the usages of these early times for his father to have called him by a name indi-

cative of such fact: instead of calling him Ham, he would announce to him a term implying his relationship with the house of Cain. If such relation did not exist, why did he call him *Canaan*?

Some suppose that this question would be answered by saying that the term was applied to the youngest son of Ham; but all the sons of Ham were born after the flood; yet the planting of the vineyard and the drinking of the wine are the first acts of Noah which are mentioned after that deluge; and further, Canaan, the son of Ham, was most certainly not the individual whose ill-behaviour was simultaneous with and followed by the curse of slavery. Have we any proof, or any reason to believe, that Canaan, the son of Ham, was then even born? But in the catalogue of Noah's sons, even before the planting of the vineyard is mentioned, Ham is called the father of Canaan, even before we are told that he had any sons. Why was he then so called the father of Canaan, unless upon the fact that by his marriage he necessarily was to become the progenitor of the race of Cain in his own then unborn descendants?

Under all the facts that have come down to us, we are not to suppose that there was any Cainite blood in Noah, or in Noah's wife. Why then did Ham choose to commemorate the race of Cain, by naming his fourth son Cain, a term synonymous with Cainite, or Canaanite? And why did the race of Ham do the same thing through many centuries, using terms differently varied, sometimes interchanging the consonant and vowel sounds, as was common in the language they used? These variations, it is true, when descending into a language so remote as ours, might not be noticed, yet the linguist surely will trace them all back to their root, the original of "Cain."

God never sanctions a curse without an adequate cause; a cause under the approbation of his law, sufficient to produce the effect the curse announces. The conduct of Ham to his father proved him to possess a degraded, a very debased mind; but that alone could not produce so vital, so interminable a change in the moral and physical condition of his offspring. And where are we to look for such a cause, unless in marriage? And with whom could such an intermarriage be had, except with the cursed race of Cain? The ill-manners of Ham no doubt accelerated the time of the announcement of the curse, but was not the sole cause. The cause must have previously existed; and the effect would necessarily have been produced, even if it had never been announced.

But again, the condition of slavery imposed on the descendants of Ham, subjected them to be bought and sold; they became objects of purchase as property, for this quality is inseparable from the condition of the most abject slavery. Now the very name *Cain* signifies "*one purchased.*" "*I have gotten a man from the Lord.*" The word "*gotten,*" in the original, is the word his mother Eve gave her son for his name, "*Cain.*" *I have purchased, &c.,* evidently shadowing forth the fact that his race were to be subjects of purchase.

The history of man since the flood is accompanied with a sufficiency of facts by which we are enabled to determine that the descendants of Ham were black, and that the black man of Africa is of that descent.

"And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him would kill him."

The word "*mark*" is translated from *אוֹת oth*; its signification is, *a mark by which to distinguish; a memorial or warning; miraculous sign or wonder, consisting either in word or deed, whereby the certainty of any thing future is foretold or known; and hence it partook of the nature of a prophecy.* In the present case it was the mark of sin and degradation; it was the token of his condition of slavery, of his being a vagabond on the earth. It distinguished his rank of inferiority and wickedness, proclaiming him to be the man whose greatest punishment was to live and bear his burthens, *below all rivalry.*

Hence its protective influence. Now, by the common consent of all men, at all times, what has been the mark of sin and degradation? Were we even now, among ourselves, about to describe one of exceedingly wicked and degraded character, should we say that he looked very white? Or should we say that his character was black? And so has been the use of the term since language has been able to send down to distant times the ideas and associations of men.

"Their visage is blacker than a coal."

"Our skin was black."

"I am black: astonishment hath taken hold on me."

"For though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord God."

And who shall say that the wicked, disgusting mode of life, the practices deteriorating the physical and mental powers imputed to the Cainites, do not constitute what some may call a philosophical

cause of the physical development of the mark of sin? Does not our own observation teach us that a single lifetime, spent in the practice of some degrading sins, leaves upon the person the evidence, the mark, the proof of such practice? We are under no compulsion of evidence or belief to suppose that the mark set upon Cain was the product of a moment; but the gradual result of his wicked practices, as a physical and moral cause.

But allow the fact to have been that, in the case of Cain, the physical change was instantaneous, God had the power to institute in a moment what should thereafter be produced only by progression or inheritance. God created man; but, thereafter, man was born and became mature through the instrumentality only of physical causes.

“The shew of their countenance doth witness against them; and they declare their sin as Sodom, they hide it not.” *Isa.* iii. 9. In fact, “The faces of them all gather blackness.” *Nahum* ii. 10.

But we know that the descendants of Ham were black; nor is it stated that any personal mark was placed upon him, although the name applied to his first-born son, “Cush,” signifies that he was black, giving proof that the colour was inherited; but from whom? Not from his father!

“Can the *Ethiopian* (כְּשִׁי *Cushi, the Cushite, the black man*) change his skin?”

The evidence forced on the mind leads to the conclusion that the descendants of Ham were black, not by the progressive operation of the laws of God on the course of sin which they doubtless practised, but that they were so at birth,—consequently an inheritance from parentage. And a further conclusion also is, that the wife of Ham must have been black, of the race of Cain, inheriting his *mark*, and that *that mark* was black.

A further proof that Ham took to wife a daughter of the race of Cain is found in the traces of evidence indicating her person, who she was. Lamech, of the race of Cain, had a daughter, Naamah; her name is given as the last in the genealogy of Cain. Why did the inspired penman think it necessary to send her name down to us? Why was the genealogy of Cain given us, unless to announce some fact important for us to know? If this whole race were to be cut off by the flood, we see nothing in the genealogy teaching any lesson to the descendants of Noah. Why was the particular line from Cain to Naamah selected, unless she was the particular object designed to be pointed out? Hundreds of other

genealogies, commencing in Cain and terminating in some one just at the coming of the flood, existed; but not written down nor transmitted, for the obvious reason that such list could be of no benefit to posterity. Are we not, then, led to believe that there was some design in the preservation of the one terminating in Naamah? But this genealogy could only be preserved through the family of Noah; through whom we also have a genealogy of the line from Seth, terminating in Noah's youngest son. These two stand in a parallel position, at the foot of each separate list. But it is so extremely unusual for ancient genealogies to give the name of a female, who had brothers, that it becomes strong evidence, when such catalogue terminates in the name of such a female, that she personally was the individual on whose account the catalogue was formed. Is not this consideration, and the fact that it could only be preserved by the family of Noah, evidence that they attached sufficient importance to it to make its preservation by them a desirable object?

Inasmuch as Naamah belonged to a race distinct from that of Seth, could the family of Noah have any desire to preserve her lineage from any other cause than that of her having become a member of that family?—in which case the cause of its preservation is obvious, and a thing to have been expected. On any other state of facts, would they have carefully handed down the genealogy, so far as we are informed, of a mere uninteresting woman of the cursed race of Cain, and neglected to have given us the *name and genealogy of Noah's wife*, of the more holy race of Seth?

The presumption then being that she did become the wife of one of Noah's sons, the first inquiry is, to which was she attached? A sufficient answer to this question, for the present moment, will be found in the fact that Ham was doomed to perpetual and bitter slavery, while his brothers were blessed and ordained to be his masters. Now since an amalgamation of the races of Seth and Cain was deemed a most grievous sin before the flood, if Japheth or Shem had either of them taken Naamah to wife, it would be past understanding to find them both highly blessed and made the masters of Ham.

But a more direct evidence that Ham did take to wife Naamah, of the race of Cain, is found in the fact that the descendants of Ham commemorated her name by giving it to persons of their

race, as descendants might be expected to do, who wished to keep it in remembrance. The name of her mother also is found in similar use.

These names are varied, often, from the original form, as are a great number of proper names found in use among the ancient nations. These words we shall have hereafter occasion particularly to examine. We shall merely add, that in the marriage of Ham and Naamah we may find a reasonable explanation for the otherwise inexplicable speech of Lamech to his two wives,—since such marriage would have produced, what we find was produced, the ruin and degradation of Ham,—we might say, his moral death, his extinguishment, from the race of Seth. Some commentators deduce the name Naamah from the root “*nam*,” and consequently make it signify *beautiful*. We give it quite a different origin, which we shall explain at large elsewhere. It is to be expected that men will differ in opinion as to the historical facts of these early days. Some have made Naamah a pure saint; some, the wife of Noah; some, of her brother, Tubal-Cain; some make her the heathen goddess Venus; others, the mother of evil spirits.

Thus diversified have been the speculations of men. We present our view, because we believe it better sustained by Scripture and known facts than any we have examined: but we deem it no way important in the justification of the ways of God to man; for, whatever the truth may be, this we know, that the curse of slavery was, if Scripture be true, unalterably uttered against the race of Ham,—in which condition, as a people, they ever have been and still are found: a condition so well adapted to their physical and mental organization, the result of ages spent in bad, degenerating habits, that when held in such relation by the races of Japheth or Shem, the race of Ham is found gradually to emerge from its native brutality into a state of comparative elevation and usefulness in the world; a condition without which they, as a race, have never been found progressing, but ever exhibiting the desire of wandering backward, in search of the life of the vagabond, in the midst of the wilderness of sin;—unless in this author, Dr. Channing, we find an exception; for he more than intimates that he found the negro women of Jamaica rather to excel the white ones of New England. We believe, according to his own taste and judgment, what he said was true; but we also believe his taste was very depraved, and his judgment of no value on this

subject; yet we feel less astonishment at the degenerate sons of Seth before the flood, on the account of their admiration of the black daughters of the race of Cain; and we should feel it a subject of curious solicitude, if Dr. Channing's taste and judgment on this subject were to become the standard among his disciples, whether they will, by their practice, illustrate the habit of these antediluvians!