THE ORIGIN OF RACES AS IT RELATES TO GENESIS 11:1-9, THE TOWER OF BABEL

by
Ervin O. Whitaker

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Master of Divinity in
Grace Theological Seminary
May 1982

Title: THE ORIGIN OF RACES AS IT RELATES TO GENESIS 11:1-9, THE TOWER OF BABEL
Author: Ervin O. Whitaker
Degree: Master of Divinity
Date: May, 1982
Adviser: John J. Davis

Since the passing of time, man has always been accountable to the Torah for his response to God and his fellowman. However, man, since the fall, has desired to be independent from God and others of his sort. As a result, a sense of biological unity with his sort has been lost. The writer has endeavored to present a reasonable, scientific and biblical approach to the origin of races.

The approach presented in this thesis explains the origin of races from a genetic point of view. Genes for a multitude of variations were placed in Adam upon creation. They were passed on to Noah and his family who were the only human survivors from the flood. From this family, namely Noah's sons, the world was repopulated. However, because of the intermixing of the three sons' lines, their recessive genes were not able to be expressed. It is at this point the gene pool is unlimited.

Nevertheless, at the Tower of Babel, God confused and dispersed Noah's descendants because of their pride and rebellion. God scattered them providentially into many localities. Because Noah's descendants were broken up into different groups, and some went to isolated placed, the isolated group inbred with their own group. This process made it possible for the recessive genes of the isolated group to be expressed. Therefore, this process, also, accounts for the many variations today, some more recent than others.

The key passage for this thesis, Gen. 11:1-9, is only a narrative continuation of what is discussed in Genesis chapter 10 (Gen. 10:32). This passage explains the reason for the effect in chapter 10, namely, the dispersion and separation of Noah's descendants into groups. Each group was providentially directed to certain localities (Deut. 32: 8). Therefore, since Noah's family was the only survivors from the flood (Gen. 9:1, 18), and since they were the separate groups in chapter 10, they also are the unified group in Gen. 11:1. Therefore, chapter 10 of Genesis shows an limited gene pool of Noah's descendants and chapter 11 reveals an unlimited gene pool. These two chapters are the biblical basis for the writer's approach to the origin of races.

Accepted by the Faculty of Grace Theological Seminary

in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree

Master of Divinity

Adviser

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SA	Scientific American
JASA	The Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation
TWOT	Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament
AA	American Anthropologicist
IMP	Impact (Institute for Creation Research)
AS	American Scientist

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Direction of This Paper

Throughout history there have been various civilizations. They portrayed cruelty and brutality to their enemies as well as to their captives, endeavoring to rule all. These rulers of humanity were insensitive to the hidden wisdom of God when their descendants crucified the ultimate ruler-Messiah, Jesus Christ (I Cor. 2:6-8). They had little, if any, regard for the welfare of the Messiah's chosen people. Consequently, each possessed a national pride in order to prolong their existence as a nation.

This national pride has been exhibited through many facets: arrogance, slavery, imperialism, racism, etc. Because of this national pride appreciation for diversity is often lost, especially outside the norm or standard of acceptance. Frequently the facts about other civilizations, nations, races, etc., are distorted.

Therefore, the writer has attempted in this thesis to present a fair and reasonable foundation for the origin of the races. The writer begins with the Bible as the only true foundation and source for developing a format for the origin of the races.

The Proposition

Upon investigating scientific information and studying the biblical text, the writer believes the potential for racial variation was latent in Adam and Eve upon creation, and was preserved in Noah and his family who survived the great flood. All animal variations were latent in the select animals in the ark as well (Gen. 7:14-51; 8:19). Human variations became more pronounced after the dispersion at the Tower of Babel. God scattered the people for failing to carry out His plan to populate the whole earth (Gen. 9:1, 7). As a result of their pride and rebellion, they were dispersed into many geographical locations.[1]

In some regions where inbreeding was not the norm but intermarrying, the distinguishing traits became less pronounced, even recessive.[2] Nevertheless, in other areas where inbreeding was common, some recessive genes were expressed, thus producing more distinguishable racial traits. This isolation, along with the providence of God activating

---

[1]Modern anthropological evidence doesn't point to a gradual distribution of the modern races during hundreds of thousands of years. See James C. Southall, The Recent Origin of Man (London: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1875), p. 27, 30-31; John C. Whitcomb and Henry M. Morris, The Genesis Flood (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961), p. 47; and William Howells, Mankind So Far (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1944), pp. 295-300. The writer does not agree with Howell's conclusions concerning the original distribution of mankind.

[2]See Henry M. Morris, "Origin of the Races," a transcript from the Science, Scripture, and Salvation Radio Broadcast 52,(San Diego, California):1-2; and Hilbert R. Siegler, Evaluation or Degeneration Which? (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1972), pp. 16-29.

particular genes, provided the necessary ingredients for the various races today. Some racial features are more recent than others.

Some Considerations

In evaluating the need to investigate the origin of the races, some things need to be considered. First, Noah's sons, especially as seen in the Table of Nations, represented the beginning of ethnic groups, not races. In Genesis 11:1, there is evidence that the people were of one language and origin. There was a rich and full gene pool in which no dominant racial variations appeared because of intermarrying which allowed the genes to circulate readily. Thus the gene pool was used in a more broader way. It is the writer's intent to develop this thought over the other approaches that have been presented in this thesis.

It is important that all approaches which fail to uphold the unity of the races, the Scriptures and scientific facts, be relinquished. Since it will be proven that human variations are only traits (and not separate human beings, as the polygenesists advocate nor are they on a gradation model, as the evolutionists propagate) there is no justification biologically for one race to be exalted over another. All claims for intellectual and racial superiority would be invalid if mankind was seen through the eyes of God.

However, scientism[1] is on the increase and its offspring is evolution. This has incorporated a tremendous amount of subjectivity: it is not the true, objective, and factual science. Therefore, there remains in the history of science a distorted picture of races and their origins.[2] However, prior to this, racial prejudice had firmly anchored itself in Western society. This attitude resulted in many formulating the presuppositions that either God created separate beings (races) or that some races evolved from others: with the former being inferior to the latter.[3]

Many believe in variant systems and doctrines concerning the origin of races.[4] A Cherokee Indian's myth about racial origins is an example.

> When the time came to make man, the Creator built an oven. Then he molded three figures, much like gingerbread men, out of dough. But the Creator had no idea how long the dough figures had to bake. The first one he took out too soon; it was underdone. Pale and inpleasant in color, 'half-baked' if you will, this was the ancestor of the white man. The Creator waited a bit, then removed the second figure from the oven. This one was just right--light brown and pleasing to the eye of the Creator. From this figure all Indians

---

[1]William J. Tinkle, Heredity (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970) pp. 12-13. Read under the heading "Facts as Stupid Things" on these pages.

[2]L. Duane Thurman, How to Think about Evolution & Other Bible-Science Controversies (Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter Varsity Press, 1978), pp. 59-83.

[3]See Ernst Mayr, "Evolution," SA 239 (September 1978): 51, 53; and Theodosius Dobzhansky, Genetics and the Origin of Species (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951), pp. 77-79, 282-283.

[4]See William Stanton, Leopard's Spots (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960).

> are said to descend. So pleased was the Creator with his second effort that he forgot to watch the oven, and when he finally pulled the third figure out it was too late. From this scorched and blackened figure, say the Cherokees, all black men are descended.[1]

This myth illustrates the type of information with which one is confronted when studying the origin of races. The origin of races, if argued from wrong presuppositions will no doubt result in questionable and biased conclusions. If approached from God's Word, one's position would be stable and in harmony with the scientific facts. This would also lead to a greater appreciation for the creativity of God in making man so complex.

The writer will not only deal with Scriptural passages, but scientific material which is pertinent to the issue. Consequently, the writer will prove that scientific facts and the Scriptures are in harmony concerning the origin of the races. However, neither the whole field of genetics nor every passage which relates to this subject has been exhausted. The writer will be using the term "race" interchangeably with "variation" (unless specified) having the biological sense in mind.

Some Difficulties

Some of the difficulties in such a work as this are: (1) The problem of finding unbiased material dealing with the origin of races; (2) the Bible does not emphasize variations, but ethnic groups and/or nations; (3) the problem with

---

[1]Morton Klass and Hal Hellman, The Kinds of Mankind (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1971), p. 9.

words which have many connotations and have gone through a tremendous amount of subjective use. In spite of these difficulties, the writer has deemed this research a rewarding and enlightening effort.

An Examination of Some Significant Terms

Race

Through the centuries, music has had a tremendous amount of influence in the society of mankind. Even so, racial concepts have had similiar effects. Presently, the word race entails several meanings and connotations. The word can be used culturely (the European race), geographically (the Icelanders), nationally (the Frenchmen), etc. However, in the scientific world, the word basically is used in a biological sense.[1]

Theodosius Dobzhansky, an evolutionist, defined race as "a Mendelian population, not a single genotype; it consists of individuals who differ genetically among themselves."[2] Another defines race in a similar way: "a breeding population characterized by certain gene frequencies that are different from other breeding populations of the same species."[3] One of the prominent creation scientists, Henry

---

[1]Today, such study of biological traits is called physical anthropology. See The World Book Encyclopedia, 1980, s.v. "Races, Human," by Stanley M. Garn.

[2]Dobzhansky, Genetics of the Evolutionary Process, p. 268.

[3]Richard A. Goldby, Race and Races (New York: MacMillian Publishing Co., Inc., 1977), p. 86.

Morris states that "biologically a race is generally thought of as a variety, or sub-species, within a given species."[1] Another prominent creationist defines the word as follows:

> A population of humans which share certain morphological characteristics in common which they do not generally share with the remainder of the human population. These characteristics would include, of course, skin color, hair, stature, shape of face and head, and so forth.[2]

The dictionary definition of the term race is:

> A breeding stock of animals; a family, tribe, people, or nation belonging to the same stock; a class or kind of individuals with common characteristics, interests, or habits; any of various infraspecific taxonomic groups: a: SUBSPECIES; b: a permanent or fixed variety; c: BREED; d: a division of mankind possessing traits that are transmissible by descent and sufficient to characterize it as a distinct human type. . . ."[3]

This definition contains the idea of race being formed by similar morphological characteristics or derivation from the same stock. Robert Spear puts it this way, "races are but parts of one human race," and he continues, "a race is simply an enlarged family."[4] Also,

> The term 'race' or 'variety' is used in general biology to designate a group of organisms that physically resemble one another by virtue of their descent from the same ancestors. To classify human beings as a race on any other than a purely biological basis destroys the

---

[1]Henry M. Morris, "The Origin of Races," p. 1.

[2]Duane T. Gish, personal correspondence with him dated September 21, 1981.

[3]Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield: G & C Merriam Company, 1971), p. 704.

[4]Robert E. Speer, Race and Race Relations (New York: Negro Universities Press, n.d.), p. 11.

proper meaning of the term. . . .[1]

Lastly, included in this biological sense of race is the concept that races are genetically inherited characteristics. Barker puts it this way, "A race is a human population group that is sufficiently inbred to reveal a distinctive genetic composition manifested in a distinctive combination of physical traits."[2] Thus the writer will be employing the biological sense of the word race in this paper, unless otherwise explained or stated.[3]

Nation

It is not enough to define the word race and to establish a standard definition for it alone, it is equally important to address the word "nation." Is the word synonymous with the biblical term "race?"

The word "nation" is mentioned sixty-four times in the King James Version and ninety-three times as "Gentiles." The Greek word for nation is ἔθνος and the Hebrew word is

---

[1]Clyde Kluckhohn, et al., Religion and our Racial Tensions (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945), p. 8.

[2]Kenneth L. Barker, personal correspondence with him dated September 12, 1981.

[3]"Physical anthropology investigates man's biological variability, but the structure of the field is not as clearly defined nor agreed upon as is the structure of cultural anthropology." (A. J. Kelso, Physical Anthropology (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1970), p. 2.

גּוֹי.[1] This is the same word, גּוֹי,[2] employed in the Genesis Table of Nations (chapter 10, vv. 5, 20, 31, 32). It describes the sum total of the geography of people.

The word "nation," denotes a political structure more than a kinship:

> In usage this term stresses the impersonal political and social aspects rather than kinship bonds. Often parallel 'to kingdom,' it is the state, the institution of nationhood, the crowd, the masses of humanity.[3]

Furthermore, between the word עַם, "people" and גּוֹי, "nation":

> People tend to emphasize a common cultural and social characteristics, while nation is mainly a political designation associated as a rule with state and government. In neither instance is there any explicit stress on racial origins.[4]

A nation describes what holds a people together, whereas, a "people" is the necessary ingredient to form a "nation." "People" is personal, whereas, "nation" is impersonal.

The term "nation" is bound often by geography and administrative values. A nation may contain one dominant race or a variety of races. A nation may often times consist of one race because of its locality.[5] The importance

---

[1]This Hebrew word is used more for nation than עַם or לְאֹם, and it corresponds to the Greek word ἔθνος: It is translated either "nation" or "Gentile." The English word closely corresponding to it is "ethnic."

[2]In Genesis chapter 10, it is used in the plural. Nations aroused out of each of Noah's sons descendants.

[3]The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, s. v. "Nation."

[4]E. A. Speiser, "'People' and 'Nation' of Israel," JBL 79 (1960):157. He gives a good treatment on the two usage עַם and גּוֹי; he also compares the two.

[5]Locality in the sense of remoteness, isolation plus inbreeding, without outside interference, aided in the realization of this racial variation.

of locality in creating a particular race will be discussed in chapter 4 of this thesis, under the heading Geography.

Species

Interestingly enough, this word does not have a settled definition today: "That the idea of species is not clear cut is demonstrated by the fact that at its annual meeting in 1955, the American Association for Advancement of Science sponsored a symposium on 'The Species Problem.'"[1] Again, "exactly what constituted a species is largely a matter of opinion of authorities who classify and name it."[2]

Because of these varied definitions, the writer will present several approaches to species as presented by Ernst Mayr: (1) the typological-morphological species concept, (2) the conceptual view, (3) the biological species concept.

The typological-morphological species concept argues that "all animals having certain characteristics (usually as represented by certain "type specimens, on file in a designated museum) constitute a certain species."[3] One specimen became the model for all other similar characteristic specimens.

The conceptual view is the more common classification when a certain name is given to an object or thing. For

---

[1]J. Frank Cassel, "Species Concepts and Definitions," JASA 12 (June 1960):3.

[2]Clark, Genesis and Science, p. 10.

[3]"The Species Problem," publ. 50, "cited by" Cassel, "Species Concepts and Definitions," p. 3.

example,

> When you see or hear the word "robin," you get a mental picture of a robin. You may think of robins in your backyard, of robins flying around Ames, or wherever else you've seen them. You get a certain idea of Robin as a group of animals actually living in nature.[1]

The last approach is the biological species concept.[2] It surveys the origin, development, actuality and future of a "group of animals." "It presents the species as being a group of animals or plants which are interchanging their genes."[3]

What all these variant definitions of species have in common is the grouping of life forms according to certain similarities. "Among the earliest concepts of species is that which considers the species to be a group of animals of similiar morphology and not overlapping in this respect with any other group."[4] "A species has been described broadly as a group of individual organisms which are as much alike (similar) as the offspring of the same parents."[5]

Some go a step further and define species as "the smallest unit of the plant or animal kingdom which breeds

---

[1]Ibid. The writer disagrees with this view because just the name robin without any pre-background about the robin bird does not bring to mind a robin bird.

[2]This approach has more to do with variations.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Wilbur L. Bullock, "The 'Kind of Genesis and the Species' of Biology," JASA 4 (June 1952):5. For a further discussion on these two terms see Cassel, "Species Concepts and Definitions."

[5]Cassel, "Species Concepts and Definitions," p. 3.

true to its own kind and will not generally crossbreed with other species.[1] Robertson adds, "Thus a species is a group of organisms between which there is a more or less free exchange of genes and which is isolated from any similar group by a reproductive barrier."[2] In the definitions mentioned in this paragraph, a reproductive capacity is emphasized rather than morphology.

Furthermore, in all the definitions mentioned, lies the problem of the fixity of species,[3] and what are the definite criteria for classifying them.

The word species itself comes from a Latin word meaning similar "appearance," "form," "outward appearance," and "kind." Genus, in Latin, is translated the same as species. It has been used with the idea of "class," "kind," and "variety."[4] This is the definition Linneaus, the father of the classifications of variations, adopted except he added that they were fixed.[5]

---

[1]Clark, Genesis and Science, p. 10.

[2]Donald S. Robertson, "The Species as a Field for Gene Recombinations," JASA 11 (June 1959):2.

[3]Does a species have the capability of producing outside of its species, and can a species produce another species? Fixed species cannot reproduce another species nor breed effectively with another species. See Marshall and Sandra Hall, The Truth: God or Evolution? (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974), pp. 41-43.

[4]B. P. Simpson, Cassel's New Latin Dictionary (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1968), pp. 264, 564.

[5]Klass and Hellman, The Kinds of Mankind, p. 20.

In conclusion, Wilbur L. Bullock says:

> The species concept in modern biology is far from settled. The prevailing opinion is that there is a real entity in the species but whether this can be defined to satisfy all plant and animal groups is problematical. Consequently, the species, at present, is basically a human concept. It is an interesting biological problem but probably does not bear any real relationship to the 'kind' of Genesis.[1]

Because of the various definitions of species in this paper, it will be employed in the "biological species concept." Entailed in this concept is the idea of non-fixity of species.[2]

Kind

In considering the meaning of kind, the writer will limit the definition to the context of the Bible, especially in the book of Genesis. The Hebrew word for "kind" is מִין. It has three distinct characteristics when it is employed in the Old Testament: (1) It is not used with the scientific precision of today. For example לְמִינֵהֶם and לְמִינֵהוּ in Genesis 1:21, are not signifying the collective group of the great sea monsters, "living creatures," in the water and "winged birds."[3] (2) "Kind" is always used in the singular

---

[1]Bullock, "The 'Kind of Genesis and the Species' of Biology," p. 6.

[2]The non-fixity of species has the idea of old species being able to develop new species through procreation. It also means species can interbreed with species effectively.

[3]The New American Standard Version of the Bible translation is used. See also J. Barton Payne, "The Concept of 'Kinds' in Scriptures," JASA 10 (June 1958): 19, for further discussion.

when describing the type of life. In Ezekiel 47:10, it is translated after its "kinds" or "their kinds," but it is really used in the collective sense for recognizing the varied fish of the sea (cf. Eccles. 43:25; Lev. 11:14).[1] (3) "Kind" is always said to be followed by a suffixal pronominal ending: "The consistent appearance of these pronoun suffixes further substantiates Driver's conclusion that the purpose of "kind" is to provide specification, in a formal 'document-style.'"[2]

"Kind" is employed thirty-one times in the Old Testament: thirty-three times by Moses and one time by Ezekiel. In Leviticus and Deuteronomy, it is possible that species is implied but in Genesis, especially chapter 1, a subdivision of the basic types is implied and not the general types themselves. Trees, whales, plants, etc., are the general types. "Genesis 1:11, for example, cannot mean 'fruit trees in their general class of Dicotyledones,' but, from the nature of the term "kind," must mean 'fruit trees in their various subdivions that make up the class Dicotyledones.'"[3] It would be better to say that God created the family of great whales

---

[1]J. Barton Payne, "The Concept of 'Kinds' in Scriptures," JASA 10 (June 1958):18. See also Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, s.v. "Mankind," by Walter C. Kaiser, 1:503-04.

[2]Ibid. [3]Ibid., p. 18.

in their many subdivision.[1] The word "kind" is used seventeen times in Genesis chapters 1, 6 and 7. In these contexts it is used with לְמִינֵהוּ.[2] (cf. 1:11-12, 21, 22, 24-25; 6:20; 7:14; 8:19.) Thus, the idea of subdivision is brought out. One kind in a family is created by the mode of that particular kind and not another. The plant and animal kingdoms only are commanded by God to come into existence by the mode or norm of their designated kind. Delitzsch states, "in collective notions מִין does not so much signify kind as distinction of kinds, is correct."[3]

It is interesting that the word kind is not used in reference to man because there is no subdivision of mankind. Marsh comments, "At the time of creation the kinds of basic types were each created after a distinguishing pattern in form and structure, and they were able to produce other individuals like themselves." He then goes on to say that "We have over 500 varieties of the sweetly scented pea and over

---

[1]The word מִין has the idea of "kind" or "species" (BDB, p. 568). However, Kaiser believes there are other places where מִין has a broader idea (TWOT, s.v. "Mankind" by Walter C. Kaiser, 1:503). Tinkle suggests that (in most cases) "the biblical kind," . . . may have segregated into smaller groups" in which he implies a broader group for "kind." Tinkle, Heredity, pp. 88, 155.

[2] לְ in this case has the idea of "Norm, expressing mode or manner." Ronald J. Williams, Hebrew Syntax: An Outline (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1980), p. 49.

[3]Frantz Delitzsch, A New Commentary on Genesis, vol. 1, trans. Sophia Taylor (Minneapolis: Klock & Klock Christian Publishers, n.d.), p. 90.

200 breeds of dogs."[1]

These kinds are fixed, that is, they do not produce new types or kinds. Marsh explains:

> The fixity is not one which produces identical individuals, but rather is one which produces groups which enjoy considerable variation within their boundaries. These original groups demonstrate that they have no power to produce any new basic types.[2]

This is the extent of fixity the writer is placing on "kind." One particular kind cannot reproduce a different kind of the same family or of another family. This is one of the areas in which evolutionists err; this is why the word species differs from the biblical word מִין; species has no real boundaries.[3]

A Historical Survey of the Race Concept

The concept of race, as it is thought of today in the field of science, does not have a long existence.[4] The following survey of this concept shows just how recent the idea is.

---

[1]F. L. Marsh, "The Genesis Kinds in our Modern World," JASA (June 1960):7, 8.

[2]Ibid., pp. 11, 13.

[3]Ibid., p. r. Even among creationists, there is a difference of opinion as to what the English word "kind" is. Marshall and Sandra Hall use it interchangeably with species, in their book The Truth: God or Evolution? (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974), p. 42.

[4]The meaning of the word race and the writer's use of the word race has been established on page 6, under the heading of "Race."

In the Ancient World

The concept of race was not evident in the ancient world. In fact, Morris firmly states:

> The concept of 'race' is biological, not biblical. There is no mention of different races, as such, in the Bible, nor even the very concept of a 'race.' Evidently, there is no biblical or theological meaning to the term, and we must conclude, therefore, that races are purely arbitrary entities invented by man for his own convenience in biological and anthropoligcal studies.[1]

The Old Testament World

In the Old Testament world, racial distinctions were not made as they are today. According to Curt Rylaardsom, "modern nations of race did not exist in the biblical world."[2] There was so much mixing and intermarrying that racial identities were not established by biological factors, but by nationality and culture. Grant's statement is a fitting discussion of race as viewed in the ancient world.

> . . . the fact that nearly all the racial groups to which names have been affixed are elaborately mixed, and the mixture has been proceeding ever since the earliest times. . . . It would, therefore, be as true of ancient times--and of any region--as it is of today, to say that 'in every single nationality of Europe the various elements of the continental population are represented. . . . And the effort of distinguishing and identifying the different blends is not made any easier when the people concerned have long been dead.[3]

---

[1]Henry Morris, "Origin of the Races," 52, a transcript from the Science, Scripture and Salvation Radio Broadcast:1.

[2]Ebony (March 1969), p. 118, cited by Richard Bradley, "The Curse of Canaan and the American Negro," CTM 42 (February 1971):101.

[3]Michael Grant, Ancient History (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965), pp. 34-35.

The people were related to each other because of the same descent. Therefore, biologically, they were not able to claim supremacy over the other. The characteristics of each succeeding generation came from the inherited genes of the former Adam and Eve.[1] This mixing has been taking pace ever since man had begun to multiply on the face of the earth:

> Every civilized group of which we have any record has been a hybrid one (B. Linton). Despite the restrictive effect of social sanctions, wherever and whenever men have met they have mingled their ancestral strains (Trevor).[2]

Diller confirms that, "All discussions of race differences and race mixtures must deal in terms of pure races, and yet a superficial survey of history shows at once that races and peoples have moved and mixed from time immemorial."[3]

In the Old Testament, identities were established more on national rather than racial grounds. Superiority came from national victory and/or cultural advancement, not racial differences.[4]

The Greek World

In the segment of time, the Greeks awareness covered a wide canvas of history and culture. The writer will touch

---

[1]Gary E. Parker, "Creation, Mutation, and Variation," Impact no. 89 (November 1980):1-4.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Aubrey Diller, Race Mixture Among the Greeks before Alexander (Westport: Greenwood Press, n.d.), p. 10.

[4]Hermann Bengtson, Introduction to Ancient History (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), pp. 49-50.

on this awareness briefly. He will show why the Greeks concept of race was mainly that of class and culture distinctions and not that of a biological distinction.[1] This period of time covers the Greeks' concept before Alexander the Great.

When the Greeks encountered people from other areas, they looked upon them as curiosities more so than unchangable entities.[2] In fact, the biological differences of mankind were not the thing that loomed most in the Greek's mind, but their state:[3]

> On the whole, the biological conceptions of the Greek thinkers were not very clear or vivid, especially in respect to mankind. They tended to regard them as intellectual curiosities rather than as the immutable facts of existence. They knew nothing about the technical biology of races and race mixture.[4]

The Greeks considered peoples other than themselves as barbarians. They conceived of their state as the supremeness of

---

[1]John Brisco, "Rome and the Class Struggle in the Greek States 200-146 B.C.," in Studies in Ancient Society, ed. M. I. Finley (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974), pp. 53, 55. "For the State, to them (the Greeks), was more than a machinery, it was not a thing to be taken up and laid aside at pleasure, but a necessary and essential phase of the existence of a complete man (G. Lowes Dickinson, The Greek View of Life (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1958), pp. 72, 76-80). The state was the main reason for class distinction in which those who were not citizens of it were considered inferior, especially the slave.

[2]Dickinson, The Greek View of Life, p. 83.

[3]The state was their government interwoven into and dictating their way of living.

[4]Diller, Race Mixture Among the Greeks before Alexander, p. 17.

life, even at the expense of others.[1] This conception of the state created a class distinction. Socrates and Plato believed that the better should govern the worse.[2] This is what a Greek by the name of Antiphon thought, "those born of fine families we revere and honor."[3]

The Greeks felt more indifferent, intolerant and culturally superior in their thinking toward other people.[4] Part of this thinking was due to their ignorance of other people. Even though the Greek State was of the upmost of importance, nonetheless, the Greeks' culture during this time had not covered as vast a territory as was the case during the conquests of Alexander the Great. Another reason was due to their intellectual snobbishness:

> Hence their sociological system and political organization placed foreign peoples and races in a position quite different from the one in which we are accustomed to regard them--their existence was an inconsequential

---

[1]"Now nature has distinguished between the female and the slave . . . But among barbarians no distinction is made between women and slaves, because there is no natural ruler among them: they are a community of slaves, males and females. Wherefore the poets say - "It is meant that Hellenes should rule over barbarians as if they thought that the barbarian and the slave were by nature one." Aristotle, "Politics, Poetics," trans. Benjamin Jowett and Thomas Twining, in The World's Great Classics (New York: Grolier, n.d.), pp. 4-5.

[2]Diller, Race Mixture Among the Greeks before Alexander, pp. 15-16.

[3]Ibid., p. 15.

[4]Encyclopedia Judaica, s.v. "Race, Theory of," by Leon Poliakov, 13:1483. Plato and Aristotle were "racists" in the sense of "ethnocentrism" or human races differ in innate intelligence or land virtue.

> matter that required and received little serious attention.[1]

Therefore, it is to be observed that when the Greeks conceived of race, it was strictly from a social standpoint. "The customs of barbarians were given far more attention than were their physical characters."[2] Diller adds:

> . . . it must be born in mind that the problems of race was not conceived as vividly among the Greeks before Alexander as in modern times. The sources are vague and indirect, containing no strong and even few plain expressions that bear upon the subject.[3]

After Alexander the Great, Herodotus was a leading authority on other peoples among the Greeks.[4] This is said about Herodotus:

> In distinguishing one tribe from another, Herodotus observed customs and languages, his notes on physical differences being interspersed among other descriptive details. He was unwilling to give biological variables any more attention than he thought they deserved, since he did account of human diversity.[5]

The Roman World

There was not much difference in the Romans' concept of race than that of the Greeks. However, the Romans did extend their boundaries and in so doing they encountered other peoples:

---

[1]Ibid., p. 18.

[2]Kenneth A. R. Kennedy, Human Variation in Space and Time (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1970), p. 8.

[3]Diller, Race Mixture Among the Greeks before Alexander, p. 160.

[4]Kennedy, Human Variation in Space and Time, p. 8.

[5]Ibid.

> The expansion of Roman influence in the later part of antiquity brought little that was new to speculations about human variations, even though the borders of the known world became extended considerably beyond the spheres of Greek influence. . . . The popular interest in foreign peoples with bazaar customs and hideous aspects led the soldier and statesman Pliny the Elder . . . to compile an entensive encyclopedia . . . Combining notes from his diary of travels and the accounts of earlier writers, Pliny set about to describe all known tribes and monstrous halfmen in epithetic form.[1]

Much of the Roman culture was borrowed from the Greeks: "The natural features of Southern Italy and Sicily are very similiar to those of Greece, but the original inhabitants of these countries created no culture; the Greeks brought it to them. The Greek people, not the Greek country, created the culture, which is and ever will be the basis of Western civilization."[2] Concerning this borrowed culture, the Romans were not as state conscious and distinctive of class as the Greeks. In fact, after, "the peoples that had created the ancient culture and the Roman Empire diminished in number, and the gaps were filled up by provincials. This

---

[1]Kennedy, Human Variation in Space and Time, p. 13. Basically, the Romans received the Greeks' culture and thinking which heavily influenced them in their attitude toward other peoples. After Alexander the Great had conquered the world and extended the culture of the Greeks, wild speculations about other peoples developed, it started with the Greeks, and the Romans continued this thinking to some degree. "The Hellenic intellectual heritage was preserved by the Romans, travelers and scribes elaborating upon the tales of monstrous tribes handed down to them by the Greeks' authors" (Kennedy, p. 13).

[2]Martin P. Nillsson, "The Race Problem of the Roman Empire," Hereditas 2 (1921):371. However, the writer disagrees with this authors belief that each race has a hereditary disposition that is distinct from other races. He says that these dispositions are at a greater or lesser value. "There are dispositions which enable a people to organize a state and create a culture," p. 371.

process led to sinking of the culture, in proportion as the less civilized provincials ousted the old citizens. . . . The old races were ousted by races of lesser value."[1]

The Roman Empire was, for the most part, mixed with other races: "The Greeks and the Romans of history are a product of a blending of races."[2] Therefore, racial distinctions became less obvious especially when the slave was able to become a top official.[3]

However, foreign people who were unnoticable and were outside the confides of the Roman Empire, were described in exaggerated terms.[4]

In the Middle World

The Medieval World

The wild speculations and explanations for human variations were passed on from the Roman world to the Medieval world:

> Races displaying even more abnormal characteristics were described as residents of the remoter East. Some of these were noseless; others enjoyed a protruding lower lip under which they took shelter while they dozed; still others had mouths so tiny that the only nourishment they

---

[1]Ibid., p. 372.

[2]Ibid., p. 387. The writer does not believe the blending of races caused the fall of Rome, p. 388.

[3]For an example see R. A. Barrow, The Romans (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, n.d.), p. 101.

[4]John H. Rowe, "The Renaissance Foundations of Anthropology," AA 67 (February 1965):5. See also M. F. Ashley Montagu, Man's Most Dangerous Myth the Fallacy of Race (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), p. 11.

> could receive had to be sucked through a straw of wheat. There was also Satyrs and Sciopods: the former notable for their turned-up noses, the latter for one outsize foot under which its fortunate owner could rest in the shade during torrid weather.[1]

There was not much objective thinking on the external characteristics of mankind. However, the Church Fathers[2] had a racial concept of people that was based upon the environment. They explained the diversities of people as:

> . . . a continuing process through the influence of environmental pressures. Human diversity could be interpreted only as a consequence of moral decline.[3]

The scientific world conceived of human variations

---

[1]Margaret T. Hodgen, Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964), p. 57. The perspective of other peoples was sterotyped and exaggerated. "On still another island were a people of immense stature, like giants, with but one eye in the middle of their foreheads, and consequently even more hideous to look upon than their neighbors, who were merely headless and carried their eyes in their chests," (Hodgen, p. 70).

[2]"the intellectual climate of medieval Europe was not favorable to comparative studies. European Christians were much concerned about religious differences but only for the purpose of suppressing them. After cultural differences were assigned little importance; it was differences in character and morality among individuals which were considered significant." (Rose, "The Renaissance Foundations of Anthropology," p. 6. As another outlook on theological thinking, Anderson states, ". . . the great theologians of the Middle Ages concluded--largely from the Tower of Babel . . . that if it were not for sin there would be no diversity in the human condition" (Bernhard W. Anderson, "Unity and Diversity in God's Creation," Currents in Theology and Mission 5 (April 1978):70. Also there was a tendency in Europe to attribute preeminence to "Germanic blood" because most of Europe's reigning monarchs were of Germanic origin (see Poliakov, "Race, Theory of," p. 1483).

[3]Kennedy, Human Variation in Space and Time, p. 16.

as a chain of being, a stepping ladder, from the smallest organism to the most civilized man. Along with this idea was the Greek's philosophy that the world was an illusion.[1] The world was not the real but the ideal.

The Renaissance

Spanish exploration of other lands was prominent about 1492. At this time, knowledge and inquiry into ethnology began to increase. Some called this "the ethnographic present."[2] Explorers started taking notes about natives of other lands. Therefore, the race concept slowly developed.[3] During the Renaissance, the majority of people in Europe were more open toward ethnographic material. With this grew the desire to know more about a man's physical makeup.

However, romantization of the repeopling of the earth continued to highly influence the thinking of many men.

---

[1]A belief in the world being flat instead of round hindered explorations of other places and people: Lactantius and other Fathers held this belief. However, venerable Bede argued for a Pythagrean theory of the sphercity of the earth with its several zones and climates. ". . . it was everywhere unorthodox to suggest that the sons of Adam and the progeny of Noah had ever, or could have ever, lived everywhere on its surface" (Hodgen, Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, p. 52).

[2]"The ethnographic present is roughly defined as the time when a particular people was first discovered by Europeans" (Grover S. Krantz, Climatic Races and Descent Groups (North Quincy: The Christopher Publishing House, 1980), p. 37). Systematic Scholarship became prominent in the fifteenth century. It was the inroad to anthropological studies. Scholarship and exploration were blossoming at the same time.

[3]Rowe, "The Renaissance Foundations of Anthropology," pp. 10-14.

Annius was the proponent of this thinking. It was highly fabricated and quickly denounced, but many loved the essence of it and held on to it. It explained the development of Noah's sons.[1]

In the Modern World

During the time span from the eighteenth to the twentieth century, the concept of race took on a different form. Not only was the biological aspect emphasized, but it became the basis for the classification of races. During this time, there was an intense interest in human variation, namely because of slavery and the question of the place of the Negro in the human race.

Montagu states that:

> The modern conception of 'race' is of fairly recent origin. Neither in the ancient world nor in the world up to the latter part of the Eighteenth Century did there exist any notion corresponding to it.[2]

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were the eras of three approaches which will be mentioned in Chapter II of this thesis: monogenesis, polygenesis and evolution.[3] Monogenesis was emphasized during the eighteenth century

---

[1]For details read Don Cameron Allen, The Legend of Noah: Renaissance Rationalism in Art, Science, Letters (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949), pp.114-119.

[2]M. F. Ashley Montagu, Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), p. 10. See also Jacques Barzun, Race: A Study in Superstition (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), pp. 34-35.

[3]John C. Green, The Death of Adam: Evolution and Its Impact on Western Thought (Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1959), p. 238.

whereas, the early nineteenth century was inclined to a theory that moved more away from the environmental forces as determining the variations. "The eighteenth century gathered much new material from travelers and colonists all over the globe . . ."[1] The latter part of the nineteenth century moved toward an ascribing of human variation "to inborn, natural causes."[2]

The twentieth century brought about the study of genetics:

> . . . Count . . . divided the history of raciology into four periods--the Eighteenth Century (to 1815), the pre-Darwinian period (1815-1860), the post Darwinian period (1860-1914), the Twentieth Century (since 1914--and went on to describe the leading developments of the second period, with some reference to the earlier work of Blumenback and Kant.[3]

Darwin's book on evolution overpowered the thinking of the late nineteenth century on race and today it still has devastating effects:

> How Darwin's famous book swept out of court the old arguments about the creation of man need not be retold here. Suffice it to say that the rising generation trained in science between 1830 and 1850 no longer felt the necessity of squaring their scientific beliefs with Scripture. In consequence, the period from 1859 to 1914 was given over to materialistic and mechanistic anthropology.[4]

---

[1]Jacques Barzun, Race: A Study in Superstition (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 35.

[2]Kennedy, Human Variation in Space and Time, p. 34.

[3]John C. Greene, "Some Early Speculations on the Origin of Human Races," American Anthropologist 56 (1954):31.

[4]Barzun, Race, p. 116.

The biological idea of the race concept and its effects had more popularity during the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The way many, especially Americans, viewed the different variations, displayed a distorted knowledge of the origin of races and their relation to one another.[1]

---

[1]This distortion was the product of a strong bias toward ones favored race. (See also Poliakov, "Race, Theory of," p. 1484.)

CHAPTER II

THE VARIOUS APPROACHES TO THE ORIGIN OF RACES

Some Scientific Approaches

During the time when the quest for racial studies became prominent,[1] many endeavored to explain the origin of races from three different approaches: monogenesism, polygenesism, or evolution.[2] All these approaches sought to prove their viewpoint by science.[3] There were unprovable presuppositions,[4] and conclusions that were drawn from these three approaches. There was also tension between staying true to the Scriptures and contradicting scientific research and natural science.[5] The writer will discuss these three

---

[1]It was the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth century that these studies were numerous.

[2]Stanton, The Leopard's Spots (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), pp. 1-44. Slotkin states that between the mongenesis and polygenesis, the controversy was not so much between scientists as it was between the fundamentalists and advanced thinkers during that time (J. S. Slotkin, Readings in Early Anthropology [Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965], p. x).

[3]Ibid.

[4]For example, three outstanding scientific monogenesist believed Adam and Eve were white "(God's image!)": John Blumenbach, Georges Louis Leclerc and Comte de Buffon (See Harris, The Rise of Anthropological Theory [New York: Thomas Y. Cromwell Co., 1968], p. 84).

[5]Ibid.

approaches to the origin of races.

Monogenesism

The view

This view advocates that the races had their descent in one ancestral strain, Adam and Eve. They substantiated their view by the Scriptural account of the creation of the man, Adam (Gen. 1:26, 27; 2:7).[1] Only one man was created and one woman, Eve. Harris adds:

> Oddly enough, one of the principal sources of inspiration for the eighteenth century's belief in the modifiability of human nature[2] was the book of Genesis. In the Mosaic account of creation, all humanity shares a common ancestry with Adam and Eve. This was the doctrine of monogenesis. . . .[3]

He continues his discourse by quoting the authority, Slotkin:

> No man who contemplated the whole human race as it is now spread over the face of the earth, without a predilection for hypothesis, can doubt of its having descended from a single pair, that were formed by the immediate hand of God, long after the world itself had been created and had passed through numberless changes. From this pair all the habitable parts of the earth were gradually propagated. . . .[4]

---

[1]There were a few, during the monogenesist popularity, who were naturalist monogenesist in their approach to the origin of races, but because of the popular trend of the monogenesist, even they tried to make their approach religious.

[2]Between 1750-1850, the majority of scholars who did write on racial variation were monogenesists. They tried to uphold the doctrine of the unity of the races while explaining the racial diversities.

[3]Harris, The Rise of Anthropological Theory, p. 83.

[4]Readings in Early Anthropology, cited by Harris, The Rise of Anthropological Theory, p.83.

So indeed the monogenesists were the ones who believed that all mankind, regardless of the numberous variations, came from one species, Homo sapiens.[1]

However, the way the monogenesists explained racial variations was from a deterministic environmentalism.[2] They believed skin color was caused by environmental influences, mainly the climate. The stature of a man was caused by diet, climate, location, disease, etc. They believed once a particular trait was acquired, it was inherited by the following generations.[3]

The main American proponents of this view are Samuel S. Smith, James C. Prichard, Immanuel Kant,[4] and William Lawrence.[5] There were some international proponents also:

---

[1]Kennedy, Human Variation in Space and Time, p. 28.

[2]The belief that the environmental influences, for example, climate and diet, brought about the diversity in humanity: skin color, height, health, etc.

[3]Ibid. See also Stephen Molvar, Races, Types and Ethnic Groups (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), p. 119. In particular, as time passed, the monogenesists differed in their external approach to human diversity. Some were looking to other sources, apart from the environment, to account for the hues and differences in humanity. There was also added to this belief an evolutionary process "involving more or less rapid environmental feedback." This evolutionary process was that of change of the variation and change of the species. With this process was the idea of degeneration from the original to a lesser variation.

[4]"He suggested that man's racial variations must be due to the emergence of particular latent powers that could be activated in individuals as essential adaptions under novel environmental pressures. Once expressed physically, these traits became a part of the hereditary constitution of a population" (Kennedy, Human Variation in Space and Time, p. 31).

[5]Smith employed the Scriptures to sustain his suppositions whereas Prichard approached the matter of racial

John Blumenbach of Germany, along with Georges L. Leclerc, Comte de Buffon, both of France.

An evaluation

The advantage of this approach is that it upholds the Scriptural teaching concerning the unity of mankind and his descent from one ancestral strain (Gen. 9:19; Acts 17:26; cf. Gen. 2:7, 22, 23, 24; 3:20).

Nevertheless, the disadvantages are several. First, there is a strong emphasis on environmental influences. These influences are in an evoluationary and degenerating process. Therefore, it is difficult to fit this approach, explaining racial variations, into the biblical chronology.[1] Secondly, it incorporates a type of evolution[2] that is defined in grades or stages. It is like a stepping stone which can ultimately lead to racism. Moreover, even though there are mutations within mankind, there still is not a definite

---

origin strictly from scientific reasoning. They both agreed that environment alone is not the cause of racial variation. However, Smith believed culture behavior was a main factor, along with climate, to consider for racial variation: people that lived with little clothing in a hot climate would be darker skinned. Therefore, once this dark skin was acquired, it was inherited by the children of that group. Prichard, on the other hand, believed it was more than environment or cultural behavior.

[1]For at about 1500 B.C. on Egyptian tomb paintings, there were distinct racial variations of mankind. In reference to the monogenesist view, there is not enough time allotted in biblical chronology for racial variation to have developed. (Stanton, The Leopard Spots, p. 88. See also J.C. Nott and Geo. R. Gliddon, Types of Mankind (Philadelphia: Mnemosyne Publishing Co., Inc., 1969).

[2]Harris, The Rise of Anthropological Theory, p. 83.

formation in the racial type. There is the overlapping of the racial types: "Populations are open and changing genetic systems that do not crystalize as sharply defined racial types due to the sudden appearance of one or a few novel variations."[1] Thirdly, the "permanent varieties" refutes this view. That is, those groups that have been inbreeding for centuries are the same, and will only change by interbreeding with other varieties of mankind.[2] Fourthly, there is no explanation why individuals of the same locality differ in color, even in the most arid conditions.[3]

Polygenesism

The view

There were many who questioned the monogenesist's approach to the origin of races. They formulated an approach that God created separate races,[4] and placed each race in the specific environment for which they were intended. They believed that men went from their native regions in which

---

[1]Kennedy, Human Variation in Space and Time, p. 31.

[2]J. L. Campbell, The Testimony of Modern Science to the Unity of Mankind (New York: Robert & Brothers, 1859), p. 24.

[3]Paul Boca, "On the Phenomena of Hybridity in the Genus Homo," in This is Race, ed. Earl Count (New York: Henry Schuman, 1950), p. 68. Boca is a polygenesis. However, this point against the monogenesis should be considered.

[4]Charles White, one of the main proponents of this view, concluded that different species of men were made. He had to appeal from the scientific angle to a religious (Stanton, The Leopard's Spots, p. 16).

God had created them into other places by migration.[1] Such belief was contrary to the biblical account of the Tower of Babel where men were dispersed from one common place.

Even though these advocators admitted that environment had something to do with the diversity among mankind,[2] they did not believe it was the cause for racial variations: that is Negroid, White, Mongloid, etc. Indeed the evidence of many naturalists was "that climate, operating within the limited period allotted to man's existence, could not account for racial diversities."[3] Moreover, they believed that species were immutable productions.[4]

The main proponents were George R. Glidden, Josiah C. Nott, Charles Caldwell, and George Morton. It is believed that Emil Brunner was also leaning toward the polygenesistic view.[5]

An evaluation

The advantage of this approach is that it reveals the inconsistencies of deterministic environmentism.[6] It

---

[1]J. C. Nott and Geo. Glidden, Types of Mankind, pp. 67, 73-74.

[2]Such as height, health, weight, etc.

[3]Stanton, The Leopard's Spots, p. 88.

[4]Charles Darwin, The Origin of Species (Dutton, New York: Everyman's Library, n.d.), p. 7.

[5]Paul K. Jewett, "Brunner's Doctrine of the Origin and Unity of the Race," JASA 11 (June 1952):8.

[6]Things caused by the environment like such pigmentation can be inherited or passed on to the succeeding generations.

admits that God is responsible for the races of man, even though this work is supernatural rather than providential.

However, it has many disadvantages. First, if God created varieties then the unity of mankind[1] is broken. Nevertheless, they believed man did not come from one source as the biblical account states (Gen. 3:20; 9:19; 40:1, 32; 11:1; Acts 5:12-21; 17:26; Rom. 5:12-21; 1 Cor. 15:21-22; cf. Gen. 2:17).[2] Secondly, there were several distributions of mankind in this approach, and it is in total disagreement to the biblical account of the Tower of Babel:

> The traditions of the race of men point decisively to a common origin and ancestry in Central Asia. The history of the migrations of man tends to show that there has been a distribution from a single center.[3]

Thirdly, it goes totally against the Genesis account concerning the creation of man (Gen. 1:27; 2:7). Why are the distinct species able to interbreed and transfer skin color invariably in each case of crossing?[4]

---

[1]"The mere fact that people were able to learn other languages is itself evidence of the uniqueness and fundamental unity of the human race. No possibility exists as between man and animals" (Henry Morris, "Language, Creation, and the Inner Man," IMP [October 1975]: 1).

[2]God only made one man, Adam, and the Scriptures state that through him all the people of the earth are cursed to word and die (Gen. 3:17-19; Rom. 5:12-21). If different races were created, why were they cursed and condemned because of one man's sin or one races' sin?

[3]L. Berkhof, Systematic Theology (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949), p. 189.

[4]Greene, "Some Early Speculations on the Origin of Human Races," American Anthropologist 56 (February 1954):37.

Evolutionism

The view

Evolution is a natural approach to life and more so to the origin of races. It argues for the modification of forms leading to the highest complex being that exists on earth, man.[1] "Evolution may be defined as the theory that plants and animals have undergone gradual changes in structure and function from simple species to complex creatures, the greatest complexity being found in man."[2] Molnar describes it as "descent with modifications a definition which refers to alteration of organisms throughout thousands of generations."[3] In relation to the origin of races, there was a "change in gene frequency through time."[4] Charles Darwin, a main proponent of this view in the nineteenth century, called it "descent with modification through variation and natural selection."[5]

The word "gradual" intimates time. Time is the main factor in presenting the development of races. It took time

---

[1]Evolutionists explain the gaps between species by the process of mutation. See Clavin Kephart, Races of Mankind (New York: Philosophical Library, 1960), pp. 18-20.

[2]G. Richard Culp, Remember Thy Creator (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1975), p. 46.

[3]Stephen Molnar, Races, Types, and Ethnic Groups (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), p. 38.

[4]Ibid., p. 39.

[5]Darwin, The Origin of Species, p. 437.

and natural selection for the races to come into formation.[1] The races that survived lived on, and through a process called mutation, new races were developed.[2] Therefore, the races evolved from the simplest form to the most complex variations of mankind.[3] Evolutionists call the races of mankind microevolutionary changes, that is, change within a species and/or similar group. However, they cannot explain microevolutionary changes, except by mutation.[4]

The proponents of this view are many and include Charles Darwin, Adolph Hitler, Karl Marx, Charleston S. Coon, Theodosius Dobzhansky,[5] and Friedrich Nietzsche.[6]

---

[1]Marsh, "The Genesis Kinds in our Modern World," p. 8.

[2]The World Book Encyclopedia, vol. 16, p. 56.

[3]Henry M. Morris, A Biblical Manual on Science and Creation (San Diego: Institute for Creation Research, 1972), p. 41.

[4]As has been explained in Chapter 1, species have no fixed boundaries like the kind; therefore, it is believed by evolutionists that one species produced another by time, natural selection, survival of the fittest, and mutation. However, geneticists concur that mutations are mostly harmful (Rom. 8:19-23). Moreover, the mutation that are useful, the writer believes, are not really mutations but the recombining of genes or some potential variation that had not yet been expressed (See Parker, "Creation, Mutation, and Variation," pp. 1-4; and John C. Sinclair, "The Nature of the Gene and the Theory of Evolution," JASA 6 [September 1954]:4).

[5]A widely referred evolutionist. See Dobzhansky, Genetics and the Origin of Species (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951).

[6]"The philosopher, Friedrich Nietzsche, a contemporary of Charles Darwin and an ardent evolutionist, popularized in Germany his concept of the superman and then the master race. The ultimate outcome was Hitler, who elevated this philosophy to the status of a national policy" (H. M. Morris, D. T. Gish, and G. M. Hillstead, eds., Creation (San Diego: Institute for Creation Research, 1974), pp. 160-61.

An evaluation

It strongly emphasizes the inner causes of variation, namely genetics.[1] This inner cause is something that monogenesist missed and the polygenesist acknowledged but could not reconcile with the Scriptures.[2]

However, evolution distorts the facts of science concerning race. First, it leaves out God in its evaluation of race formation.[3] Secondly, there is no linguistic connection between animal and man like there is between the various races.[4] Thirdly, it rejects the biblical implication of fixed kinds because one kind is able to produce a totally different kind; one subspecies of animals producing another subspecies (Gen. 1:25; 1 Cor. 15:38-39).[5] Lastly, there is no reasonable explanation for the gaps between families of animals nor between man and the animal kingdom.

---

[1]Evolutionists were confronted with genetics and the problems it posed on their view. As a result, they modified their position and now it is called neo-Darwinism (Richard H. Overman, Evolution and the Christian Doctrine [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967], pp. 117-121).

[2]Natural science and the Scriptures were a struggle with some polygenesists. The monogenesist had so dictated their time that those who were polygenesists felt it safe to conform to Scriptures, even out of hypocrisy.

[3]Morris, A Biblical Manual on Science and Creation, p. 54.

[4]Morris, "Language, Creation, and the Inner Man," p. 1. Evolutionist George G. Simpson admitted to this.

[5]Kenneth N. Taylor, ed., Evolution (Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, n.d.), p. 19.

The fossil remains show no overlapping of kinds.[1]

Thus, in determining the origin of races, animal and plant demarcation cannot be applied because man is a family himself with no subdivision like other creations. God made animals of various kinds with diversity within their kinds, but man is not a kind (or a subdivision), even though variations are seen within him.[2]

The Hamic Curse Approach

The view

A whole thesis itself could be devoted to the exegesis of Genesis 9:18-27, but the writer will briefly touch upon this subject because of the ramification it may have with the Table of Nations and racial origin.

In dealing with Genesis 9:18-27, one definitely needs to keep God's sovereignty by way of election in mind. When Adam sinned, he disqualified himself as the mediator through which God would work out His moral righteous rule; therefore, He began to slowly reveal His plan of redemption in the midst of judgment. Election was the process in which God selected the avenue for His own Son to come into the world and ultimately be the redemption for mankind: The seed of the woman

---

[1]Marsh, "The Genesis Kinds in Our Modern World," p. 16. There are no transitional forms between a fish and a dog. However, there is transition between one variation to another.

[2]See Chapter 1, "Kind."

against the seed of the serpent.[1]

So, after narrowing the old world down to Noah and his family by the flood, the text indicates that Noah cursed one of his descendants.[2] This descendant was canaan (Gen. 9:25), the son of Ham.

However, many pro-slavery advocates, during the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, believed that racial change was the result of this curse being pronounced by Noah to Ham and his descendants:

> To a large group of thinkers it seemed sufficient to attribute racial differences to a direct act of God. Reinforced by biblical authority, many asserted the occasion to have been the curse on Canaan. Dr. Cartwright thought that such a miraculous explanation was essential for even the scientist to understand diversity.[3]

This curse was prophetic and valid only on Canaan[4] as a nation. This curse was applied in spite of its multivariants of people.[5] The curse was basically accomplished

---

[1]J. Sidlow Baxter, Explore the Book, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1960), p. 24.

[2]This prompting is due to the incident in which Noah's son, Ham, saw his nakedness. Ham then went and told his brothers about the situation (Gen. 9:24-25).

[3]William S. Jenkins, Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South (Mass.: Peter Smith, 1935), p. 252.

[4]L. Richard Bradley, "The Curse of Canaan and the American Negro," Concordia Theological Monthly 42 (February 1971):110.

[5]Robert Brow, "The Curse of Ham--Capsule of Ancient History," Christianity Today 18 (October 26, 1973):10. Those people who chose to align themselves with the Canaanites and their ungodliness were judged too, but Rahab was an exception only because she realized where her redemption came from. She had faith in God and demonstrated this faith by aligning herself with God's people.

when Israel, led by Joshua, took control of Palestine and forced the Canaanites into subjugation.[1] However, this servitude was more realized during David's time than Joshua's.[2] The curse involves no racial implications to justify American Negro slavery and racial segregation.[3]

There are proponents who believed that Ham was either cursed alone or along with Canaan and his descendants. These men include Martin Luther;[4] C. F. Keil and Franz Delitzsch;[5] Arthur W. Pink;[6] the radical Josiah Priest,[7] and others.

Rice comments about the professing church-goer on this subject:

> Many a person has used this text to justify to himself and others his prejudice against people of African descent. . . . Often the location of the passage is unknown and one is not familiar with the details, but with the certainity of unexamined truth, it is asserted that the Bible speaks of a curse on black people. And this notion has exercised so powerful an influence precisely because its adherents by and large have been

---

[1]John J. Davis, Paradise to Prison (Winona Lake: BMH Books, 1975), p. 129.

[2]Gene Rice, "The Curse That Never Was," Journal of Religious Thought 29 (1972):15.

[3]Bradley, "The Curse of Canaan and the American Negro," p. 110.

[4]Bradley, "The Curse of Canaan and the American Negro," p. 102.

[5]C. F. Keil and Franz Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, vol. 1: The Pentateuch (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949), pp. 157-58.

[6]Arthur W. Pink, Gleanings in Genesis, vol. 1 (Chicago: Moody Press, 1922), p. 125.

[7]Bradley, "The Curse of Canaan and the American Negro," p. 102.

'good church people.'[1]

In all fairness to the mentioned proponents, not all held to a strictly racist position but in all sincerity, they incorrectly interpreted and applied Genesis 9:24-27. However, in the ancient world, the interpretation of the Genesis 9:18-27 passage was free from color tones.[2]

An evaluation

There are several arguments against this view:

1) The context does not call for a racial interpretation of Genesis 9:24-27. Ham is the father of Canaan, signifying to the Jewish reader the ancestor of a wicked people who will have shameful vices.[3] Moreover if one did interpret Genesis 9:24-27 as having implications that are racial, the fact remains that the Canaanites were mixed racially as a nation (Gen. 9:18).

2) The Israelites, in dealing with the Egyptians, did not mention in their records of any curse on the Africans. "Simon from the North African city of Cyrene (Luke 23:36) was not regarded as unworthy to bear Jesus' cross."[4]

---

[1]Gene Rice, "The Curse That Never Was," Journal of Religious Thought 29 (1972):5. See also Henry M. Morris, The Genesis Record (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1947), p. 238.

[2]Rice, "The Curse That Never Was," p. 17.

[3]Allen P. Ross, "The Curse of Canaan," BSAC 137 (July-September 1980):225, 229-30. Their shame could be traced back to Ham.

[4]Rice, "The Curse That Never Was," p. 18. Egyptians are definitely Hamitic, but God said that He would restore them in the future (Isa. 19:24-25; Ps. 87).

3) The curse was a prophetic utterance: "the curse of Noah was a prophetical utterance of the moral depravity of, and judgment on, Canaan and his descendants."[1]

4) The Jews later intermixed with the Canaanites, so racially they were mixed,[2] but as nations, the judgment of God was still upon the Canaanites because of their wicked deeds.[3]

Some Babel Approaches

An Immediate Linguistic and Anthropologic Change

The view

The holders of this view believe that God, at the Tower of Babel, miraculously changed the language and physical features of mankind, thus creating the diversity of mankind. "The races had actually been transformed by God at the Tower of Babel by the same instantaneous feat by which He had confounded the languages and dispersed mankind throughout the world."[4] Holdcraft, in his commentary, expressed

---

[1]Theodore H. Epp, "Ham's Sin and Canaan's Curse," Good News Broadcaster 33 (September 1975):18-19. See also T. B. Maston, The Bible and Race, p. 116.

[2]Encyclopedia Judaica, s. v. "Anthropology, Physical," by Harry L. Shapiro, 3:45.

[3]Bradley, "The Curse of Canaan and the American Negro," p. 110. See also Ross, "The Curse of Canaan," p. 236 for a more detailed and exegetical work.

[4]Jenkins, Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South, p. 253.

his view on this matter: "The distinctive physical traits and color of each of the three major types of mankind can probably best be accounted for as an outcome of direct divine intervention on the occasion of the confounding of the languages at Babel."[1]

Most defending this view are segregationists. They believe that God judged the people by segregation and the races today are to stay separated.[2]

An evaluation

There are several advantages to this approach. First, there is no need to reconcile science with the Scriptures: "God stepped in, immediately changing one language into many and one people into many at the same time."[3] Secondly, it would do away with the idea of "environmental determinism"[4]:

> . . . If God intervened and miraculously changed man's looks, as well as his language, then there is no need to account for these changes through isolation, environment, or culture. . . . Yet, if God did the initial changing of genetic structure, then these other factors were only modifying means within the limits set by God.[5]

---

[1]Thomas Holdcraft, The Pentateuch (Oakland, California: Western Book Company, 1961), p. 19. See also Kennedy, Human Variation in Space and Time, p. 33.

[2]James O. Buswell III, Slavery, Segregation, and Scriptures (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), p. 569. See also J. J. F. Durand, "Bible and Race: The Problem of Hermeneutic," Journal of Theology for Southern Africa 24 (September 1978):5-6.

[3]Thomas O. Figart, A Biblical Prospective on the Race Problem (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973), p. 45.

[4]The environment controls and governs physical changes.

[5]Figart, A Biblical Prospective on the Race Problem, p. 45.

Thirdly, analogies can be made of other forms of judgment that were executed because of sin, namely: the fall, death and the corruptible creation. Also, the ground changed as a result of judgment to barrenness; the serpent changed from having legs to crawling on his belly.[1]

However, the disadvantages are substantial. For one thing, if God intervened to confound the languages and the physical aspect of mankind, why is the plant kingdom and animal kingdom permeated with variations? Was there a Babel for them also? Secondly, the Scripture clearly states that it was a linguistic and not a physical change. Also this judgment was to punish disobedience and to prevent unified wickedness[2] (Gen. 11:6-9; cf. 9:1, 7). Thirdly, the sequence of the dispersion, the Table of Nations, mentions no racial happening or effect.[3] Lastly, if a judgment prompted this change, it implies an evil or curse in variation.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 46.

[2]Allen P. Ross, "The Dispersion of the Nations in Genesis 11:1-9," BSAC 138 (April-June 1981):129. See also Herschel H. Hobbs, The Origin of All Things (Waco: Word Books, 1975), p. 93, and Buswell III, Slavery, Segregation, and Scripture, p. 59.

[3]Figart, A Biblical Prospective on the Race Problem, pp. 29, 31. See also Allen P. Ross article, "The Table of Nations in Genesis 10, Its Structure," BSAC 137 (October-December 1980):340-53, and his article on "The Table of Nations in Genesis 10, Its Content," BSAC 138 (January-March 1980):22-35, and John C. Whitcomb and Henry M. Morris, The Genesis Flood (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961), p. 45.

An Immediate Linguistic Change, but a Progressive Anthropologic Change

The view

The holders of this view believe that there was an actual linguistical change at the Tower of Babel, but the variations of mankind came as a result of dispersion and interbreeding. The potential for variations was in Noah's sons and the population that developed at Babel. The scattering and consequential isolation of some peoples and the interbreeding brought to realization this potential.[1] Of course, it did not have to take billions of years[2] for these variations to develop as has been proven on the Egyptian paintings.

The following men suggest that this change occurred through mutations: Bolton Davidheiser, John C. Whitcomb, Henry Morris, etc.[3] This writer holds to this view with some modifications which will be discussed in Chapter III.

The proponents of the direct linguistical change but a gradual anthropological change are: John C. Whitcomb,

---

[1]Figart, A Biblical Prospective on the Race Problem, pp. 42, 44.

[2]Whitcomb and Morris, The Genesis Flood, p. 45. If so, then, that does not allow time for mutations to occur.

[3]Figart, A Biblical Prospective on the Race Problem, pp. 42-43. See also Whitcomb and Morris, The Genesis Flood, p. 46. Mutation is today considered a process which occurs rarely and over a long period of time. It is harmful for the most part. Dobzhansky, Genetics and the Origin of Species, p. 31.

Henry Morris, William Tinkle, etc. This is the approach this writer will take with modifications.

An evaluation

This approach has many advantages,and less disadvantages than the other approaches that are mentioned in this paper. To begin with, it does not deny the doctrine of the unity of mankind (Acts 17:26). Next, it holds to the biblical account of kinds being created by God in their order, but yet it recognizes that God made mankind specially (Gen. 1:21, 24-28, 31; 2:7, 21). Finally, it agrees with the factual scientific and historical evidence about the variations of mankind allowed by the biblical doctrine of creation.[1]

The disadvantages are that there is not enough fossil and pictorial evidence about races to explain what particular physical characteristics were determined in the past or if they were ever dominant.

This seems to be the best view of those presented so far. It lacks only in dogmatism.

The writer will modify this particular view. He will not adhere to the mutation concept as being the main cause for racial changes. Isolation is a factor in prompting the realization, but the writer believes this process was not done haphazardly. The environmental influences are not the main cause of racial diversity neither. Racial formation was

---

[1]Figart, A Biblical Prospective on the Race Problem, pp. 42-44.

sovereignly controlled by the Lord and providentially guided each step of the way.

CHAPTER III

THE POTENTIALITY FOR THE ORIGIN OF RACES

In Chapter II, various approaches were presented along with an evaluation of each with regard to the origin of the races. The writer indicated the better approach, an immediate linguistic change, but followed by a progressive anthropological change. This approach will be expanded upon in this chapter and Chapter IV. In this chapter, the potential for racial diversity will be considered.

The Bible states that all flesh died when the flood came except Noah and his family which consisted of eight people. Also, some animals, and plants were preserved from the flood (Gen. 6:13, 17, 18-22; 7:1-10, 13, 14-24; 8:21; Heb. 11:7; I Pet. 3:20; II Pet. 3:3-7). Therefore, the racial variations in the world today could only have come from those who were preserved from the flood.[1]

Furthermore, the "species" today are not all the Genesis "kinds."

> If they were, where would space be found in the ark for seven individuals of most of the 8,500 species of birds, 14,464 "species" and subspecies of mammals, 675,000 "species" of arthropods, plus reptiles, mollusks, annelids, flatworms, roundworms, etc.?

---

[1]See John C. Whitcomb and Henry M. Morris, The Genesis Flood (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961).

> Again, the logical conclusion is that vast numbers of our modern "species" have arisen since the Noachian Flood."[1]

Noah

In discussing Noah, it is important to trace Noah's generation back to the people before the flood. Observe ". . . that the Bible consistantly traces the race to Adam, and never traces the race to Noah."[2] Eight generations had passed from Adam to Noah. Noah's father was the ninth generation and Noah the tenth (Lu. 3:36-38). From these generations, it was possible, if conditions were right, to have produced numerous diversed physical characteristics.[3] Geneticists have concluded that there are:

> Of the 46 chromosomes in every human cell, 23 are copies of those originating in the sperm of the father and the other 23 are copies of those originating in the egg of the mother. The genes thus occur in pairs, one on a maternal chromosome and the other on the homologogous chromosomes that codes for eye color. Each chromosome may comprise many thousands of gene loci. . . . natural populations do have large stores of genetic variation.[4]

A geneticist has mathematically calculated that "every parent can theoretically produce 16,777,216 combinations of

---

[1]Frank L. Marsh, Evolution Creation and Science (Washington: Review and Herald Publishing Ass., 1947), p. 206.

[2]William S. LaSor, "Was the Flood Universal?" Eternality 11 (December 1960):13.

[3]Geneticists have discovered that in the living species there are "hidden variation, enabling them to adapt to changing environments." Invertebrates have more genetic variation potential than vertebrates (Franciso J. Ayala, "The Mechanisms of Evolution," SA 239 September 1978:56, 61, 62.

[4]Ibid., p. 60, 61.

hereditary factors, each different from any other."[1] Therefore, Adam could conceiveably have had 16,777,216 combinations of hereditary factors. Keeping this in mind, Eve had the same potential, namely, 16,777,216 combinations. This would be 33,554,432 potential characteristics that could have been passed down from Adam and Eve to Seth, Cain and their other children (Gen. 4:1, 2, 8, 25-26; 5:1-5).[2] It is likely that not all these potentials were expressed (or brought to realization).[3]

According to "Mendelain Laws" the inherited characteristics are produced by genes. These genes, in the case of Adam and Eve, were passed from one generation to the next largely unchanged. These genes in an individual "are found in pairs, and where the two genes in a pair are different in their effects, one gene dominates the other as a "recessive."[4] These genes are passed on, one of every two mated genes, to the offspring.[5] In other words, the offspring receives one gene from each parent.

---

[1]Amaram Scheinfeld and Morton D. Schweitzer, You and Heredity (Garden City: Garden City Publishing Co., Inc., 1939), p. 28. Because of recent discoveries in genetics, this rate of potentiality for numerous varaition, none being identical, is estimated higher (Parker, "Creation, Mutation and Variation," p. 2).

[2]Ibid., p. 29. The Psalmist realized the multiple human differences of his day, eyes, height, thumbs, etc. He wrote that God prescribed these differences (Psa. 139:13-16).

[3]Ayala, "The Mechanisms of Evolution," p. 61.

[4]Scheinfeld and Schweitzer, You and Heredity, p.52.

[5]Ibid. For contrary opinion see Ayala's article, p. 61.

Indeed "there are strong genes, weak genes, alert genes, and inactive genes; temperamental genes and freak genes; constructive genes and destructive genes; in fact, if we endow them with personalities genes individually have almost as many different characteristics as have the people they create."[1]

From Seth to Noah, there were many other children and descendants[2] who had certain potential characteristics from the gene combination of Adam and Eve. Noah received a certain amount of genes from Lamech which were different from the others of Lamech's descent. One can only receive "half of the genes of each parent."[3] Therefore, there were untold millions of potential variations in Adam. Noah only received some of this potential. All the rest of mankind with potential variations were annihilated by an universal flood.[4]

His Sons

Noah's sons populated the earth after the flood (Gen. 9:1, 7, 11, 19; 10:1, 32). The phrase in Gen. 9:1, פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמִלְאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ, is connected with Noah and his sons and is translated "multiply, be fruitful in number and fill the earth." The verbs employed, in

---

[1]Ibid., p. 54.

[2]John C. Whitcomb and Henry M. Morris, The Genesis Flood (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961), pp. 25-26.

[3]A. M. Winchester, Human Genetics, p. 39.

[4]See Whitcomb and Morris, The Genesis Flood.

this phrase, are imperatives. This junction was not given to any other group during this time. However, in Ge. 9:7, the same words are employed, except וּמִלְאוּ, where it is translated "fill."[1] Nevertheless, וְשִׁרְצוּ is added in its place. It is translated "teem or swarm."[2] Noah's sons were to swarm the earth with their descendants. The point the writer is making is that the earth after the flood was populated with Noah's descendants only.[3] It was these descendants who each received a certain gene potential for diversity both internally and externally.

Since each child receives two genes of each kind, the chance that the first gene will be recessive is 1/100. This chance is the same for the second. Therefore, the chance for both genes being recessive is 1/10,000. The frequency of the carriers of the gene is 1/50.[4] There would have had to been something which later caused the recessive genes of Noah's sons to be expressed.

---

[1]BDB, pp. 569-570.

[2]TWOT, s.v. " שָׁרַץ (shāraṣ) teem, swarm," Hermann J. Austel 2:956-957. See also Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, ed., Lexicon in Veteris Testament Libros, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., n.d.), p. 1011. He translates the word "swarming things, small animals to be found in large numbers."

[3]Because Noah's sons were commanded to populate the earth, validates the fact that the earth was void of living flesh. It even confirms the universal flood view.

[4]Winchester, Human Genetics, p. 167.

It cannot not be proven that Noah's sons were racially different.[1] This is true especially in the light of the Table of Nations. All nations came from Shem, Ham and Japheth (Gen. 10:5, 20, 31).[2] Nevertheless,

> ". . . we need not adopt the view that has sometimes been expressed that the three sons were black, yellow and white. If they were so, what were their wives? Rather we would say that in these six people were all the genes which have separated out into the modern race. Ham could have been white and his wife yellow."[3]

Neither should there be an attempt to derive racial differences between the sons by the meaning of their names.[4]

---

[1]Notice, the names Cush, and Ethiopian were used interchangeably. Ethiopians were considered Negroes but the term Cush was used interchangeably for Ethipians and went beyond them to a people who were not considered Negroes: "It should be remembered, moreover, that there were nations who were black, and yet were not Negroes. And the only distinction amongst all these people, who are branches of the Hamitic family, is the texture of the hair. 'But it is equally certain, as we have seen, that the term 'Cushite' is applied in Scripture to other branches of the same family; as, for instance, to the Midianites, from whom Moses selected his wife, and who could not have been Negroes. The term 'Cushite,' therefore, is used in Scripture as denoting nations who were not black, or in any respect Negroes; and also countries south of Egypt, whose inhabitants were Negroes; and yet both races are declared to be the descendants of Cush, the son of Ham" (George W. Williams, History of the Negro Race in America New York: Bergman Publishers, 1968, pp. 12-13).

[2]Only the line of Seth was preserved through the flood. Noah and his three sons represent that line.

[3]R. Laird Harris, "Racial Dispersion," JASA 7 (September 1955):52. See also Marsh, Evolution Creation and Science, pp. 204-205.

[4]See Encyclopedia Biblica, s.v. "Shem," T. K. Cheyne 4:4449; Encyclopedia Biblica, s.v. "Ham," T. K. Cheyne 2:1944; Encyclopedia Biblica, s.v. "Japheth," T. K. Cheyne 2:2330; and F. C. Burkitt, "Note on the Table of Nations (Genesis X)," JTS 21 (October 1919):235.

The Animal and Plant Kingdom

God did not destroy all the creatures He made (Gen. 6:7). He stated that only the land and air creatures would He destroy. However, Noah preserved a sample of every land and air creature of its "kind," (Gen. 6:19-20; 7:2-4).

All the land and air creatures of their "kind" were represented in the ark, but not every variety.

> It is unwarranted to insist that all the present species, not to mention varieties and sub-varieties of animals in the world today, were represented in the Ark. Nevertheless, as a gigantic barge, with a volume of 1,396,000 cubic feet/assuming one cubit=17.5 inches), the Ark had a carrying capacity equal to that of 522 standard stock cars as used by modern railroads or of eight freight trains with sixty-five such cars in each."[1]

The kinds placed in the ark were responsible for the many varieties that are present today. These varieties are the result of gene potential and eventually expressed combinations within certain limits.

> The total number of genes necessary for us to assume for this concept is by no means infinite, or even very large. Possibly a total of less than 100,000 would suffice. Even only 12 different gene pairs use 4,096 different combinations of true breeding organisms. Not only were all species created almost simultaneously according to our concept, but also all the potentially possible individual variations were anticipated and their limit set.[2]

In relation to the survival of plants, some plants were placed in the ark, possibly as food (Gen. 6:21). Marsh

---

[1]Whitcomb and Morris, The Genesis Flood, pp. 67-68.

[2]Walter E. Lammerts and John C. Sinclair, "Creation in Terms of Modern Concepts of Genetics and Physics," JASA 5 (September 1953):9.

believes, "there were doubtless a considerable number of plants which were carried through the Flood in the form of seeds which composed a portion of the large store of food cached in the ark. But most of the vegetation sprang up wherever the propagules were able to survive the Flood."[1]

Lammert and Sinclair believe there were in the species "genes capable of responsive adaptation, the resulting character expression being greatly influenced by the environment."[2]

Therefore, one can safely conclude that not all today's varieties of species were in the ark during the Flood. If such potential for variation existed in animals and plants, how much more the sons of Noah from whom present humanity came.[3]

---

[1]Marsh, Evolution, Creation, and Science, p. 213. See also Whitcomb and Morris, The Genesis Flood, pp. 69-70.

[2]Lammert and Sinclair, "Creation in Terms of Modern Concepts of Genetics and Physics," p. 9. This idea still looks to hereditary not environment as the main factor for the change in species. The genes were created in such a way, by God when He made man and other earthly creations, that they were able to adapt to the locality thus causing a variant in the species (or kind). However, Linnaeus, "concluded that the varieties of plants of the same species must be due more so to the environment and geography whether than their 'hereditary properties alone'" (Kennedy, Human Variation in Space and Time, p. 23).

[3]Goldby, Race and Races, p. 22.

CHAPTER IV

THE PROCESS OF THE REALIZATION FOR THE ORIGIN RACES

The Table of Nations

There are several views on the placement of Genesis 10. Some, like Von Rad, believe there is no external connection between Genesis 10 and 11:

> Obviously, with this beginning (Gen. 11), we have entered into an originally independent narrative complex. There is no external connection with the preceding table of nations, which has already spoken of several nations and has even mentioned the historical Babylon (ch. 10.10).[1]

There are others, like Pfeiffer, who believe that Genesis 10 occurred before 11:1-9. Therefore, it is in its right place logically and chronologically.[2] However, the writer believes, along with Ross and a host of others, that chapter 10 follows, chronologically, after chapter 11 of Genesis.[3] In other words, the 10th chapter is the result of the dispersion, 11:1-9.

---

[1]Gerhard Von Rad, Genesis, trans. John H. Marks (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952), p. 144.

[2]Charles F. Pfeiffer, The Book of Genesis (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, n.d.), p. 36.

[3]Ross, "The Dispersion of the Nations in Genesis 11:1-9," BSAC 138 (April-June 1981):128. Ross states that chapter 10, 10:25, implies that there was a division and chapter 10 is the result of it. See also Bernhard W. Anderson, "Unity and Deversity in God's Creation," CurTM 5 (April 1978).

It is important that this position is taken, not only for contextual reasons, but to prove that the singleness of language was universal.[1] Whatever the population was during that time, it was totally unified in language.[2] If this is agreed upon than the argument for a common, universal gene pool can be easily accepted.

Nevertheless, the Table of Nations is an interesting portion to study. There have been many approaches to the passage,[3] but the writer will take Cassuto's approach to Genesis that God dispersed the nations around Israel providentially.[4]

---

[1]Dale S. Witt, "The Historical Background of Genesis 11:1-9: Babel or Ur?" JETS 22 (March 1979):17. He believes 11:1 doesn't represent a universal singleness of language after the flood.

[2]Ross, "The Dispersion of the Nations in Gen. 11:1-9," p. 129. See also Von Rad, Genesis, p. 144; John Sinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, n.d.), pp. 223-224.

[3]Ross, "The Table of Nations in Genesis-Its Structure," BSAC 137 (October-December 1980):341-342. There are some who follow the critical interpretation, and there are others who follow the traditional interpretation. Ross mentions these interpretations and their proponents briefly.

[4]U. Cassuto, "From Noah to Abraham," A Commentary on the Book of Genesis trans. Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, the Hebrew University, n.d.), pp. 172-225. This approach is in keeping with Deut. 32:8 and Gen. 9:18-26, plus the contents of the passage. He states the purpose of the Table of Nations, "(a) to show that Divine Providence is reflected in the distribution of the Nations over the face of the earth not less than in other acts of the world's creation and administration; (b) to determine relationship between the people of Israel and the other people; (c) to teach the unity of postdilvian humanity, which, like antediluvian mankind, was wholly descended from one pair of human beings" (p. 175).

The Table of Nations gives one an idea of where Noah and his descendants were distributed after the flood. "So the sons of Noah are sectioned off by means of anthropological, linguistic, political, and geographical criteria. This is why the Table includes names of people, tribes, countries, and cities."[1] The Table is a select table of nations because of their relationship to Israel:

> That the promised land is the central to the Table can be seen from the arrangement of the descendants. The Japhethites are spread from east to west across the northern frontier; the Hamites surround the land from south to west; and the Semites are traced from the eastern to the southern borders of the land. Moreover, the preoccupation with the Canaanites in the land of promise shows the concern of the writer to fit the Table to the message of the book: the fulfillment of God's promise to bless Israel as a nation in that land, and to bless those nations that bless her, and curse those who are antagonistic to her.[2]

Therefore, the biological concept of race is not the emphasis nor focus in this Table. "That the Table of Nations in Genesis 10 speaks only of Caucasian peoples,[3] is at best merely an argument from silence. Since the tenth chapter of Genesis doesn't claim to speak of races at all, but rather of nations and families and languages it would be rash indeed to insist that the ancestor of Negroid and Mongoloid peoples are not included in this chapter.[4]

---

[1]Ross, "The Table of Nations in Genesis 10-Its Structure," p. 349.

[2]Ibid., pp. 29-31.

[3]This is the view of Bernard Ramm.

[4]Whitcomb and Morris, The Genesis Flood, p. 45. See also Laird Harris, "Racial Dispersion," JASA 7 (September 1955):52-53.

Isolation

The writer believes that isolation was a major factor in activating (or making real) the latent genes (recessive genes) in the sons of Noah.[1] Siegler confirms this, 'it is an ascertained fact, empirically, that isolation does favour differentation.'[2] What the isolation of a group does is it prompts inbreeding: "Isolation would be most conducive to inbreeding by keeping closely related individuals in close contact with each other and thus in some instances forcing individuals to reproduce through inbreeding."[3] "Hence, the maintenance of species and races as distinct populations is contingent on their isolation. Race and species formation without isolation is impossible."[4] Two main factors toward isolation is geography[5] and language: לְשֹׁנֹתָם בְּאַרְצֹתָם

---

[1]Kennedy, Human Variation in Space and Time, p. 39. Usually, this isolation is caused by geography but sometimes it is caused by a group or nation isolating themselves from others: eg. people, in the U.S.A. who live in the mountains. See also Hilbert R. Siegler, Evolution or Degeneration Which?, p. 23.

[2]Ibid. [3]Ibid.

[4]Dobzhavsky, Genetics and the Origin of Species, p. 179. Darwin believed isolation, along with natural selection, was an important element in the modification of species. However, the conditions of the isolation had to be just right for natural selection to come into effect (Darwin, The Origin of Species, pp. 100-101). The writer disagrees with Darwin's chance system. The providence of God is beyond natural selection. Weak species, environmentally wise, still exist with species that are harmful to them.

[5]Ross, "The Table of Nations in Genesis 10--Its Scripture," pp. 348-349.

(Gen. 10:5, 18, 31, 32). Morris adds,

> Each little family group now had its own language, and therefore, they could no longer communicate with other groups. Consequently, each had to separate and go its own way and make its own living, finally to develop its own culture, and eventually its own nation. . . . Forced separation, then, was the cause not only of these racial distinctives, but also of the cultural and national distinctives which eventually developed.[1]

Gish comments, "When God confounded the language at the Tower of Babel, this forced the human population to split up into relatively small groups. Each group that shared a common language became isolated from all other groups."[2] In Gen. 10:5, 18, and 31, even though the people of the earth came from Noah's sons and were separated from them, there were certain elements which distinguished them from one another. Included in these elements, were language and land.[3] The writer will now discuss the geographic and linguistic isolation of Noahic descendants.

Geography

The Hebrew construction used in summing up Noah's sons' genealogy is לְגוֹיֵהֶם (Gen. 10:5, 20, 31). When the earth was divided at the Tower of Babel, there was not only

---

[1]Under the section "The Tower of Babel," the writer will discuss more in detail about the causes of these linguistic and geographic barriers.

[2]Morris, "Developing Populations, Languages and Cultures." A Transcript from Science, Scripture, and Salvation, Radio Broadcast 407, p. 3.

[3]Duane Gish, personal correspondence with him, September 21, 1981 (in response).

a confusion of languages (Gen. 11:7), but "the division of the families uses national boundaries for some of the distinctions."[1]

The fact that the Scripture says the descendants of Noah were scattered according to a particular area suggests that the scattering at the Tower of Babel was providental (Deut. 32:8). Even the structure of the order of the sons' descendants were different: Japheth: lands, languages, families, nations; Ham: families, languages, lands, nations; Shem: families, languages, lands, nations. Shem and Ham's order are identical in the Table of Nation, but Japheth's order has the lands at the beginning. Ross suggest that Shem and Ham's order emphasizes the tribal details whereas Japheth's order emphasizes geographical and linguistical details. All, however, have a national and political affiliation.[2]

The writer is suggesting that geographical distribution was a factor in activating the recessive genes:

> For political units in the ancient world were generally geographically continuous, or, even when they were not, were usually linked by some physical means of communication such as the Mediterranean. . . . One of the greatest gains of research in the present century has been to show the immense influence, on the development of peoples, of physical geography-in its wider sense, including geological structure.[3]

---

[1]Ross, "The Table of Nations in Genesis-Its Structure," p. 349.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Grant, Ancient History, p. 42.

Moody adds, "Usually, the physical differences between one geographic race and another are more marked than are the differences between microgeographic races."[1]

Therefore, because Shem and Ham's descendants were more tribally[2] inclined than geographically, they tended to inbreed among their own tribes. However, because of their nomatic tendency, they interbred with each other. Therefore, they exchanged genes--genetists today call this gene frequency--readily.[3]

Japheth descendants were more geographical (Gen. 9:25). They were blessed to expand (Gen. 9:27). Murphy adds,

---

[1]Paul A. Moody, Genetics of Man (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1967), p. 370. Microgeographic races are those that are subpopulations that occupy a small area. These geographic races differ as to their distinctiveness, due to territorial invasion and intermarriage by other races. "Differences usually reflect differences in gene frequencies in the gene pools of the various geographic races," (Moody, p. 417).

[2]Garn, "Races, Human," p. 51. A gene frequency is the degree in which a gene is present in a population or group (p. 51).

[3]Mišpāhōt, translated "families," most commonly refers to physically related clans. Frequently it is used of a clan or tribe in a loose sense; it is a national subdivision. The fact that it may refer to subordinate groups or persons can be seen in the derived word, šiphāh, "maidservant," which describes an inferior position. We take the word here [Gen. 10] to be referring to a tribe in an anthropological sense, a subdivision of the goy" before this quote Ross had expressed, "One element found in each of the endings is 1e mišphehotam, 'according to our families.' The lamed, expressing direction or reference, is taken here as reference to a norm or standard for the purpose of classification." Ross, "The Table of Nations in Genesis" (Th. D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1977), p. 191.

> Japheth . . . descendants were the most numerous and most widely spread from the birthplace of mankind. The general description of their territory is "the isles of the nations." These were evidently maritime countries, or such as were reached by sea. These coast-lands were preeminently but not exclusively the countries bordering on the north side of the Mediterranean and its connected waters.[1]

Since Japheth's descendants spreaded out in remote geographical places,[2] this was a great situation for inbreeding and the expression of recessive genes: "They [Japheth's descendants] dwell in remote lands and distant isles."[3] However, because Japheth's descendants had more territory than the other sons of Noah, Gen. 10:5 cf. 9:27,[4] there was more room for the expansion of their gene pool. This was dur partly because of national formation and conquest: for example, the Greeks in Hellenistic imperialism and the Romans in territorial expansion.[5]

---

[1]J. G. Murphy, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Genesis (Minneapolis: James Publications, n.d.) p. 218. Elsewhere simply The Book of Genesis.

[2]When the writer speaks of geography, he speaks of "land masses, bodies of water, mountains, and the like" (John W. Klotz, Genes Genesis and Evolution [Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955], p. 412.

[3]Ross, "The Table of Nations in Genesis-Its Content," p. 24.

[4]The Hebrew word פתה, means spacious, wide, open and is used in this passage, Gen. 9:27, in the Hiphil: "may God make wide for Japheth." BDB, p. 834. The causitive idea is brought out in this Hiphil form. By prophecy, Japheth was promised more land than Shem and Ham. Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, translates, פתה, "be spacious," in Lexicon in Veteris Testament Libros, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.), p. 786.

[5]"The chief evidences of the importance of isolation in the origin of modern 'species' are derived from the study of geographic distribution of animals" (Marsh, Evolution, Creation, Science) p. 296.

Ham and Shem may have exchanged genes more frequently among themselves because of their easy access to one another. However, even though Japheth was more isolated[1] there still was an exchange of genes between Japheth, Ham and Shem. On the one hand, some of the descendants of Ham went into the interior of Africa thus inbreeding among themselves and the same with the Japhethites[2] but on the other hand, these two lines mixed because of national war and conquest. Therefore, some variations were discovered on Egyptian pictures:

> The first definite evidence of people with fair hair, fair skin and blue eyes is given in certain pictures in an Egyptian temple of Seti the Great, built in the Nineteenth Dynasty, about 1300 B.C. In this temple at Abydos four varieties of mankind are represented. In addition to Egyptians there are Negroes from the South, and Syrians from the East, and fair-haired, blue-eyed people from Libya, the North coast of Africa. The Libyans present a striking contrast to all the others.[3]

Therefore, as the writer pointed out in the introduction of this paper, the ancient world because of racial mixing and the crossing of Noah's sons lines, there was no biological external emphasis.[4]

Although the variable expressions were due to isolation, as in the case of Noah's sons, it did not mean that

---

[1]Ibid., p. 230.

[2]Shapiro, "Anthropology, Physical," pp. 44-48.

[3]G. Elliot Smith, Human History (New York: W. Norton & Co., 1929), pp. 157-518. It is possible that these racial variations were the result of isolation, such as the African interior and the Japhethites geographical isles. The recessive genes were express: blue eyes, wooly hair, black skin, white or pale skin, etc.

[4]Harris, "Racial Dispersion," pp. 52, 54.

the fertility of variations in species was lost. Notice,

> the geographical races of the lion or of the zebra are completely fertile, not to mention the various races of man. Not only is this commonly true in geographical races of the same "species," but various pleasants, the red deer of Europe, the American wapiti, or elk, and the American and European bisones."[1]

Language

Language is another factor causing isolation. Since groups of people, namely Noah's descendants, could not communicate with each other, the groups separated according to their language or communication agreement. This was true regardless of the biological appearance of the individuals (Gen. 11:7-8). Therefore, the groups which inter-married, after the Tower of Babel, had more chance of carrying a free flow of genes among themselves where as the isolated groups were limited in their flow of genes. However, the isolated groups were more likely to express the recessive genes. Not only were they campable of expressing the recessive genes, but some groups had latent genes from the mixed group which genes had been recombined in the mixed group to form a new variation: "Indeed, recombination alone is sufficient to enable a population to expose its hidden variation for many generations without the need for new genetic input by mutation."[2]

There were other factors that encouraged the isolation

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Ayala, "The Mechanisms of Evolution," p. 63. See also pages 57 and 58.

of groups: for example, groups selecting their mates and people to live among, culture, ecological factors, etc.

However, Klotz makes an important point:

> The amount of variability to be found in different organisms. Some species are said to be relatively stable, and thus provide little chance for the development of new forms even if they are geographically isolated. . . . Robson and Richards point out that this makes it very difficult to study the effects of isolation, since isolation can work only on varieties species. If these do not exist, then isolation in itself cannot bring about evolution.[1]

A Limited Gene Pool[2]

When the people at the Tower of Babel were separated, the gene frequency[3] was limited: "One does not require any particularly keen powers of observation to know that gene distribution varies among the different populations of the earth. Facial features, body build, skin pigmentation, and other inherited characteristics are all so distinctive that it is easy to recognize the major races. Then, there are variations within the races."[4] Such divided and limited gene frequency proves that there was something that caused the widely and limited distribution of genes. Widely in the sense that all of the racial variations had some common gene characteristics and limited in that all the racial

---

[1]Klotz, Genes, Genesis, and Evolution, p. 258.

[2]"The total of all genes in a population" (Winchester, Human Genetics, p. 173).

[3]The degree in which a gene is present in a population or group. Garn, "Races, Human," p. 51.

[4]Winchester, Human Genetics, p. 155.

variations had some distinctive gene characteristics.[1]

Evolutionists, like Winchester, believe natural selection, sexual selection, and genetic drift[2] were the causes for gene frequency. The writer believes God alone is responsible for the gene frequency in various populations (Deut. 32:8).[3]

However, evolutionist, Dobzhansky, has this to say about gene limitation within a group: "Variations in gene frequencies in colonies with limited effective population sizes would produce genetic differences between these colonies. Such variations are also expected between local populations of a species in a continuously inhabited territory, provided that the effective population density within the

---

[1]All of the racial variations of man have an inward person (soul/spirit). They all possess the same reasoning power. They all can communicate and they all possess the same basic body structure. However, they do not all have the same eye color, hair texture, body size, etc. Some variations have distinctively more potential for blue and green eyes whereas another has the potential for darker skin. This is gene frequency.

[2]Natural selection is the forces of nature working upon all living, eliminating the less fit and establishing those best fit for the environment in which they live. Sexual selection is the exchanging (or distribution) of genes in choosing a mate. Genetic drift is a chance process in which the gene frequency fluctuates.

[3]The Hebrew word in this verse for separate is פָּרַד. Out of the many ways this word is employed, one is the dispersal of peoples (Gen. 10:5, 32; 25:23; Deut. 32:8). In this particular text, פָּרַד is used in the Hiphil which denotes cause. See J. Williams, Hebrew Syntax, p. 28 and also TWOT, s.v. " פָּרַד (pārad) I, divide, separate," by Victor P. Hamilton, 2:733.

ambit of activity of an individual is in the average small."[1]

Providence

It is the writer's conviction that God providently directed the formation of racial variations. Chafer comments, "The sovereignty of God is discerned in the absolute manner in which all things have been assigned their respective places in creation, in appointing to men their day and generation as well as the bounds of their habitation" (Deut. 32: 8).[2] Strong believes there is "a general providential government and control . . . over things seemingly accidental or insignificant. . . . (Prov. 16:33; Matt. 10:30; Jer. 1:5; Ps. 139:16; Matt. 6:30; Ps. 135:6, 7)."[3] Charnock views providence from God's attributive goodness, "His goodness is seen, in preserving all things. . . . He continues the species of all things."[4]

Even in the Mendelian concept[5], there are certain

---

[1]Dobzhansky, Genetics and the Origin of Species, p. 168.

[2]Lewis S. Chafer, Systematic Theology, vol. 1 (Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1947), p. 222.

[3]Augustus H. Strong, Systematic Theology (Old Tappan: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1907), p. 421. This is contrary to Darwin's theory of evolution.

[4]Stephen Charnock, Discourses upon the Existence and Attributes of God, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, n.d.), p. 296.

[5]George and Muriele Beadle, The Language of Life: An Introduction to the Science of Genetics (Garden City: Doubleday, 1966), pp. 56-57. "Mendel's basic (and original) idea was that there might be simple mathematical relationships among the characteristic forms of plants in different generations of hybrids."

latent characteristics that are inherited by the child from the parent. They are expressed in ratio. This ratio is called chance by Winchester. Chance is the cause for one individual having blue eyes over another, in the same family, having brown.[1] Nevertheless, genetics have proven that when a plant or animal is domestically bred and selected it produces more varieties.[2] If this is done by man, how much could God, in the natural world, control the multiple potential for racial variations. Therefore, all the variations, in the natural world, did not occur by chance. God definitely steered these recessive characteristics to expression. "The statistician R. D. Fisher has calculated that if one were to repeat Mendel's total series of experiments in the same manner that he did, one would have a negligible chance of getting as close a fit as Mendel reported."[3]

The Tower of Babel

Since Noah's sons and daughters-in-law were preserved from the universal flood, as has been discussed in chapter 3, they were the only descendants left from Adam to populate the earth.[4] They had latent the potentiality for

---

[1]Winchester, Human Genetics, p. 167.

[2]Moody, Genetics of Man, pp. 10-22, 54, 88. See also Tinkle, Heredity, pp. 55-61; and Klotz, Genes, Genesis, and Evolution, pp. 235-237.

[3]Beadle, The Language of Life, pp. 73-75.

[4]Nahum M. Sarna, Understanding Genesis, vol. 1, The Melton Research Center Series: The Heritage of Biblical Israel (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 65.

for racial variations.[1] Consequently, this potentiality was expressed, to some degree, as opportunities were created. The process by which they were expressed will be discussed in this section.

An Unlimited Gene Pool

There are two Hebrew sentences which strongly suggest the existence of an unhindered and unlimited gene pool within a group of people, namely Noah's descendants (Gen. 9:1, 7, 8-9, 18-19; 10:1, 32).[2] The first sentence is in Gen. 11:1: וַיְהִי כָל־הָאָרֶץ שָׂפָה אֶחָת וּדְבָרִים אֲחָדִים and the whole earth was of one lip and the same words. The second sentence is in Gen. 11:6: הֵן עַם אֶחָד וְשָׂפָה אַחַת לְכֻלָּם they (are) one people and to all of them (is) one lip. Here in these two sentences there is a oneness of the people by language (Gen. 11:1) and purpose (Gen. 11:6).[3]

The construction, וַיְהִי, and it came to pass, is

---

[1]See Whitcomb and Morris, The Genesis Flood.

[2]Henry Alford, The Book of Genesis and Part of the Book of Exodus (Minneapolis: Klock & Klock Christian Publishers, n.d.), p. 52.

[3]Harold G. Stigers, A Commentary on Genesis (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976), pp. 129, 130. Also before the flood the people freely inter-married because of no major barriers to hinder them (Gen. 6:1-2, 11-12; Luke 17:26-27).

a waw consective construction.[1] It continues the writer's thought from the Table of Nations, Gen. 10: "the story of the dispersion is a sequel to the Table of Nations and is designed to explain how the nations speak different languages in spite of their common origin and how they found their way to the farthest corners of the earth."[2] By virtue of the וַיְהִי being a waw consective, the shortened form of הָיָה in the imperfect called the jussive, is employed, וַיְהִי.[3] This jussive form expresses the biblical writer's intent[4] to continue from verse 32 of chapter 10 and explain the nations being separated.[5]

The phrase in Gen. 11:1 כָּל־הָאָרֶץ, is referring more

---

[1]E. Kautzsch, ed., Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar (Oxford: Clarendon Press, n.d.), pp. 132-135, 321-323. See also BDB, p. 224; A.B. Davidson, Hebrew Syntax, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, n.d.), pp. 70-78; and Williams, Hebrew Syntax, p. 33. The waw is a waw consective picking up on the previous sentence, Gen. 10:32, especially the verb נִפְרְדוּ. It is a perfect which is signifying the past, and this past expression is carried over into Gen. 11:1ff. It is in the biblical writer's mind to explain how the sons of Noah descendants were separated (or divided). From now on, Gesenius will simply be cited.

[2]Ross, "The Dispersion of the Nations in Genesis 11:1-9," p. 129.

[3]Gesenius, p. 133. See also BDB, p. 224.

[4]Davidson, Hebrew Syntax, pp. 71, 88-89.

[5]Skinner, Genesis, p. 224.

to the inhabitants than to the earth itself.[1] The immediate context bears this out. The earth, as a land mass, could not be of one lip and words. It would have to be people. Murphy adds, "the whole land evidently means the whole then known world with all its human inhabitants."[2] Therefore, the emphasis is not on an area (or mass of land) but people who were the descendants of Noah's sons (Gen. 9:19; 10:1, 32; 11:1, 6).[3] Also, because the waw consective connects verse 1 with 10:32, people are definitely implied (or indicated).[4]

To pick up the idea again that the people were one is important. They were one because of their communication system (11:1, 6-8). The two Hebrew words שָׂפָה and דְּבָרִים, with the two numerical adjectives[5] following them, אֶחָד and כֻּלָּם verify this. Ross comments, "the whole earth (= the inhabitants) had one "lip" (שָׂפָה to indicate speech) and vocabulary (דְּבָרִים to indicate the content of what was said). The point of this prologue is clear: The entire race was united by a common language."[6]

---

[1]Ross, "The Dispersion of the Nation in Genesis 11: 1-9," p. 129.

[2]Murphy, A Critical Commentary on the Book of Genesis, p. 329.

[3]Cassuto, The Book of Genesis, pp. 188-189.

[4]This waw consective is not only continuing from 10:32 to 11:1 but to 11:2-9 also.

[5]Davidson, Hebrew Syntax, pp. 41, 50.

[6]Ross, "The Dispersion of the Nations in Genesis 11:1-9," p. 129. See also Murphy, The Book of Genesis, p. 239 and Skinner, Genesis, pp. 224-225.

If the people were of one language and purpose (Gen. 11:1, 6), it is safe to say they were intermarrying and exchanging genes from the same gene pool. There were no other people around but them: "the general population of human beings . . . at that time was completely racially mixed . . . the people all had one language and were freely intermarrying. There was complete free flow of genes so that the people tended to be completely racially mixed."[1] Morris adds, "it is certainly true that the development of specific national, or even what we call 'racial' traits, could not take place as long as men lived together and intermarried freely."[2] Because the people were one and racially mixed, there was less chance of the recessive genes being expressed.

The Confusion of Languages

Because of the people's pride and rebellion[3] (Gen. 11:4, 6), God confused their language (or lip. שְׂפָתָם). It is interesting that only שָׂפָה is used in verse 7 and not לָשׁוֹן. Murphy believes,

---

[1]Gish, personal correspondence with him.

[2]Morris, "Origin of Races," p. 2.

[3]There will be a conversion in the future of nations. These nations will be given purified lips. Their pride will be taken away from them, also (Zeph. 3:9-11). At the Tower of Babel, the narrator is not directing attention to the tower as much as he is to the people's pride and rebellion and disobedience. They did not populate the earth as God commanded them (Gen. 9:1, 7 cf. Zeph. 3:9-11; Rev. 5:9-10). Therefore, it was not wrong for them to be unified and speak one language (Acts 2:1-13). See Ross, "The Dispersion of the Nations in Genesis 11:1-9," p. 119.

> the two terms are not synonymous or parallel, as they form the parts of one compound predicate. . . . The term "lip," which is properly one of the organs of articulation, is, on the other hand, used to denote the form, that is, the manner, of speaking; the mode of using and connecting the matter of speech; the system of laws by which the inflections and derivations of a language are conducted. . . . Thus the sacred writer has expressed the unity of language among mankind, not by a single term as before, but, with a view to his present purpose, by a combination of terms expressing the two elements which go to constitute every organic reality.[1]

However, Cassuto took the two terms to be synonymous, "we have here a simple parallelism, the same thought reiterated in different terms. Words is synonymous in this verse with speech."[2] Nevertheless both agree that the two terms are signifying the unity of the people's communication system. This would imply that the people were unified too.[3]

When verse 7 is examined, one can notice the threat of this unified system of communication. God has decided to deal with man again but not like the tragic flood. His decision is evident by Him confusing the people's lip, שְׂפָתָם (Gen. 11:7).

The Hebrew word נָבְלָה is a cohortative[4] with a waw

---

[1]Murphy, The Book of Genesis, p. 239.

[2]Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, p. 239. See also Skinner, Genesis, pp. 224-225.

[3]Von Rad, Genesis, pp. 142-144.

[4]The appending syllable נָ to the first person imperfect which expresses emphasis or effort (J. Weingreen, A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959], p. 88; see also Gesenius, p. 130. "While the corresponding forms of the indicative rather express the mere announcement that an action will be undertaken, the cohortative lays stress on the determination underlying the action, and the personal interedt in it" (p. 319).

copulative which follows another cohortative and an imperative. Therefore, in this construction, intention or intended consequences are expressed.[1] God, Himself, is going to do the confusing. The confusion[2] is done with the result that they will not understand each other's lip, שְׂפַת (Gen. 11:7): "Once the understanding of one another was confounded, the division would be effected."[3] Because the people are not able to understand one another, they are dispersed over the face of the earth (Gen. 11:8). The Hebrew word, מִשָּׁם, is pointing to the original place this dispersion occurred, the plain in the land of Shinar[4] (Gen. 11:2 cf. 8, the Hebrew word שָׁם).

The Dispersion of Peoples

There is a problem with verses 7 and 8. In verse 7, it gives the Lord's intention to confuse the people's lip but in verse 8, it states that the Lord dispersed[5] them.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 320. The translation could be come, let us go down that we may confound.

[2] The Hebrew word בָּלַל has the idea to mix, mingle, confuse, confound (BDB, p. 117). Skinner translates it as mix (Skinner, Genesis, p. 227).

[3] Ross, "The Dispersion of the Nations in Gen. 11:1-9," p. 132.

[4] This place corresponds to the region of Sumer and Akkad in the lwer Tigris-Euphrates Valley (Nahum, Understanding Genesis, p. 69).

[5] The Hiphil is used, וַיָּפֶץ, which is agreeing with the subject, יְהוָה, and it is acting upon the object, which is the people in the plain of Sinar (Gen. 11:2, 4, 6, 7, 8). It is interesting the biblical writer did not use the Hithpael (the reflexive stem). With the people as the subject, this stem would signify that the people left from Shinar on their own because of the confusion (Gesenius, pp. 118-119, 146).

Some commentators, like Murphy, Cassuto, and Keil and Delitzsch, etc. take the view that because God confused the language, he effected their dispersion.[1] Ross took the view that there was a confusion and dispersion but they did not necessarily have to occur instantaneously nor at the same time.[2]

However, the context seems to suggest that there was an confusion of tongues and then a scattering[3] of the people. In Gen. 10:25, the earth was divided[4] during Peleg's time implies Niph'al that something caused this division. In Gen. 10:32, the nations were separated on the earth after the flood. Here again the Niph'al is employed. The Hebrew word here, נִפְרְדוּ, has the idea of division too.

Moreover, in Gen. 11:7, 8, the phrase עַל־פְּנֵי כָל־הָאָרֶץ

---

[1]See Murphy, The Book of Genesis, p. 244; Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, p. 247; and Keil and Delitzsch, The Pentateuch, p. 174; and also Von Rad, Genesis, p. 145.

[2]Ross, "The Dispersion of Nations in Genesis 11: 1-9," p. 132.

[3]Nelson states that "Puts, in the sense of 'scattering,' often has an almost violent connotation to it," (Merrill F. Unger, and William White, ed., Nelson's Expository Dictionary of the Old Testament [Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1980], pp. 354-355). See also I Kings 22:17; II Kings 25:5; Ezek. 34:5-6; Zech. 13:7.

[4]The Hebrew word, נִפְרָדוּ, is used in the niph'al. It can denote the passive idea. In this case, the subject which is the earth, was acted upon by something else. Gesenius states, "Niph'al bears some resemblance to the Greek middle voice (a) primarily reflexive of Qal" (p. 137). However, "Niph'al comes finally in many cases to represent the passive of Qal" (p. 138). This division of the earth could have came by the confusion of the language. See also BDB, p. 811.

corresponds to the land and not the inhabitants. It is the entire earth[1] that the people will be dispersed into to populate. In Gen. 11:5, the people are fearful of a dispersion[2] inspite of being unified in language or communication. The same Niph'al idea is employed denoting the passive sense. Therefore, the point the writer is driving at is that they were no longer a single unit but many units. This idea would most naturally agree with Deut. 32:8. God set boundaries for the people according to the number of Israel. The biblical writer intimates that the boundaries were set when God divided the sons of man (בְּהַפְרִידוֹ בְּנֵי אָדָם).

God immediately directed mankind to different localities in general. This would explain certain phrases in the Table of Nations. In Gen. 10:5, Japheth's descendants (the nations of the coastlands) were separated, נִפְרְדוּ; in Gen. 10:18, the Canaanites were spread, נָפֹצוּ; in Gen. 10:20, Ham's descendants were in their lands, בְּאַרְצֹתָם; and in Gen. 10:31, Shem's descendants were in their lands, בְּאַרְצֹתָם also. These phrases imply not only a direct dispersion, but a gradual migration.

---

[1]Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis, p. 248.

[2]The same Hebrew word in Gen. 11:9, הֲפִיצָם, is employed in Gen. 11:4, נָפוּץ. However, a different conjugation is used. The Hebrew word פוּץ which BDB translates to "be scattered" or "dispersed" (p. 806) is employed in The LXX and by Josephus. The Greek word is διασπείρω. In the book of Genesis, the Hebrew word is employed in the Niph'al, Hiphil and Qal whereas in the LXX it is used generally in the aorist passive sense. Josephus generally used διασπείρω in the aorist passive sense. This aorist passive sense has the idea of "(intr.) to scatter, to be

In Gen. 11:9, the biblical writer concludes his explanation for the Table of Nations. He repeats what has been mentioned in verses 7 and 8. In verse 7, there was the mention of the confusion of tongues, and he reiterates this in verse 9 שָׂפַת כָּל־הָאָרֶץ שָׁם.[1] In verse 8, there is reference to the actual dispersion of the people, and he again repeats this point in verse 9, וַיָּפֶץ יְהוָה עַל־פְּנֵי כָל־הָאָרֶץ. In verse 9, the Lord is the subject of both the confusion and dispersion. He actually did both. As a result, the Tower of Babel cite was given a certain name.

The writer has suggested that the descendants of Noah were one, and therefore, had one gene pool. However, because of God's judgment, they were divided. Instead of

---

scattered, dispersed; to be distributed; to disperse, run away; to scatter (in all directions); to flee" (Karl H. Rengstorf, ed., A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus, vol. 1 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973], p. 472). Therefore, the whole idea of the passive is someone else doing the action, and the subject is being acted upon by this other source. See also Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint, vol. 1 (Graz-Austria: Akademische Druek- U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954), pp. 310-311. There are other places in Genesis where the LXX chose the Imperfect Active Indicative form of διασπείρω. It can denote continuous action in the past. In otherwords, "it was not just an event but a kind of action that was progressively done by the subject; for example: Gen. 11:8 διέσπειρεν and 11:9 διέσπειρεν (H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament [Toronto: The Macmillan Company, 1955], pp. 187-191). This usage could very well imply God's providence.

[1]The שָׁם is referring to Shinar. In reference to this locality Stigers comments, "the archaeological evidence is still that civilization has its roots in Mesopotamia (Stigers, A Commentary on Genesis, p. 131).

there being one gene pool, there were many gene pools. The more mankind migrated to more different locations, the more the gene pool was limited so that the recessive genes were able to be providentially expressed.

The writer also discussed the Tower of Babel account. He concluded that it was a narrative sequel to Gen. 10:32, in order to explain the cause of the Table of Nations.

CONCLUSION

Summary of the Data

A Re-statement of the Proposition

The writer's approach to racial origins is that all the known and potential racial variations came from Adam. They were passed from Adam to Noah and from Noah to his sons. This diversity was not as pronounced (or evident) before the scattering at the Tower of Babel. However, after the confusion of their language and the dispersement into general localities, the people began to inbreed within their own groups. This inbreeding, along with isolation from other groups, gave opportunity for the recessive genes to be expressed. After once being expressed, they became permanent.[1] Intermarrying with the other groups was the only way the recessive genes could become passive or expressed in a different way. Geneticists now have evidence of greater potential variation through re-combination of genes.[2]

---

[1]Tinkle, "Entropy in Relation to Genetics," JASA 7 (December 1955):19.

[2]Ayala, "The Mechanisms of Evolution," p. 63.

A Re-statement of the Main Arguments

Isolation

Geography

The writer has discussed the geographical element in giving opportunity for the recessive genes to be expressed. Geography was one factor in promoting isolation and the inbreeding of different groups among themselves. When a group occupied a mass of land, they naturally inbred, but, they sometimes, through war and imperialism, brought other people into their land and intermarried with them (Dan. 1; Esther 1, 2; Ezra 9:2). On other occasions, they went to other lands and intermarried with them (Neh. 13:23-30). Therefore, geography was not enough to hinder the limited genes from crossing.

Language

Language was another factor promoting isolation. When people were dispersed from the Tower of Babel, they went their own way according to their own group because they could no longer communicate with each other. Their oneness of purpose and communication was lost. They were thrown into disorder. Therefore, the people separated and gravitated to those of similar communication (or language). The Table of Nations is evidence that these people broke up into small groups according to each of Noah's descendants. They stayed within their own family group. Such action was done by the providence of God. They moved into their

own lands, according to their language, family, and nation.

Limited Gene Pool

Isolated groups were hindered by geography and language from interbreeding with other groups. These isolated groups became limited in their gene pool. The frequency of genes was not as great as with a non-isolated group who inbred with each other on a regular basis. This inbreeding with relatives brought out the potential latent in them for racial variation (or new features).[1] There was also potential in them to make them adaptable to their environment.[2]

Providence

Lastly, it has been stated and suggested that God is the mover and cause for genes combining to bring about certain characteristics of individuals (Ps. 139).

However, the evolutionists believe that chance is the cause for a particular variation coming into reality. This type of thinking has influenced many minds. It is the writer's hope that this thesis would give God's people greater insight into the sovereignty, creativity, and limitlessness of the great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Before

---

[1]"Such hidden variation can be revealed by breeding experimental organisms with their close relatives. When this inbreeding is done, some of the recessive alleles that have been concealed in the heterozygous state will become homozygous and will then be expressed" (Ayala, p. 61).

[2]See Jeffrey R. Powell, "Genetic Variation in Ecologically Diverse Environments," AS 67 (September-October 1979):590-596.

closing this thesis the writer will discuss briefly some practical implications.

Practical Implications

Socially

In view of the fact that in the heavenly realm there is great diversity and this diversity is appreciated, God's creation here on earth need to realize that diversity is not sin. Without diversity in society, the world would be dull.

The fact that all of mankind came from Adam, is a reminder that he is both genetically and spiritually related. The doctrine of the unity of the human race (Acts 17:26-29) brings convicting thoughts to the society which harbors bias and prejudice.

Moreover, God's people should re-examine the Genesis account concerning the origin of races because there is no break in the genealogy of mankind. All of mankind is related, as has been proven in this thesis. Therefore, since relatives have things in common, they should live together in harmony. There is no reason socially for racial separation. That is, separation based on biological features.

Biologically

There is no biological reason for racial separation. "The study of genetics and the study of history proven without a question of a doubt that the mixing of races

cannot be considered biologically or culturally harmful."[1] Therefore, the intermarrying of races today is not a sin since it was done in the past and was not hindered (or forbidden) by God. The only forbidding element today is the sinful hearts of men. This is revealed through prejudice and biasness.

For the fact that one race can interbreed with another race and breed its characteristics to non-distinguishable notice, proves that mankind cannot classify the racial variations of man accurately. There have been cross lines of mankind for ages. There is no biological pure race but there are hybrids and races that have expressed some recessive traits.

Therefore, God's people ought to take heed to the deceptive teachings of man. There is a pertinent application from Colossians 2:8: "See to it that no one takes you captive through philosophy and empty deception, according to the tradition of men, according to the elementary principles of the world, rather than according to Christ" (NASV).

In Genesis, chapter 1, kinds were proven to be a subdivision which mankind is not. Therefore, racial variations are not separate human beings but characteristics such as blue or brown eyes. When all is said, God's Word

---

[1]James O. Buswell, "The Contribution of Anthropology to the Understanding of Race," JASA 5 (June 1953):4.

should dwell richly in all, especially His people, Christians (Col. 3:16).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alford, Henry. The Book of Genesis and Part of the Book of Exodus. Minneapolis: Klock & Klock Christian Publishers, n.d.

Allen, Cameron Don. The Legend of Noah: Renaissance Rationalism in Art, Science, Letters. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949.

Anderson, Bernhard W. "Unity and Diversity in God's Creation." Currents in Theology and Missions 5 (April 1978):69-81.

Aristotle. "Politics, Poetics," Translated by Benjamin Jowett and Thomas Twining. In The World's Great Classics. New York: Grolier, n.d.

Ayala, Francisco J. "The Mechanisms of Evolution." Scientific American 239 (September 1978):56-69.

Baker, Kenneth. Personal correspondence with him dated September 12, 1981.

Barzun, Jacques. Race: A Study in Superstition. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Baxter, Sidlow J. Explore the Book. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1960.

Beadle, George and Muriele. The Language of Life: An Introduction to the Science of Genetics. Garden City: Doubleday, 1966.

Bengtson, Hermann. Introduction to Ancient History. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.

Berkhof, L. Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1941.

Boca, Paul. "On the Phenomena of Hybridity in the Genus Homo." In This is Race. Edited by Earl Count. New York: Henry Schuman, 1950.

Bradley, Richard. "The Curse of Canaan and the American Negro." Concordia Theological Monthly 42 (February 1971):100-110.

Briscoe, John. "Rome and the Class Struggle in the Greek States 200-146 B.C." In Studies in Ancient Society. Edited by M. I. Finley. Boston: Reutledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.

Brow, Robert. "The Curse of Ham - Capsule of Ancient History." Christianity Today 18 (October 1973):8-10.

Brown, Francis; Driver, S. R., and Briggs, C.A., editors. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1978.

Bullock, Wilbur L. "The 'Kinds of Genesis and the Species' of Biology." The Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 4 (June 1952):5-6.

Burkitt, F. C. "Note on the Table of Nations (Genesis X)." The Journal of Theological Studies 21 (October 1919): 233-238.

Buswell, James O. Slavery, Segregation and Scriptures. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964.

_____. "The Distribution of Anthropology to the Understanding of Race." The Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 5 (June 1953):4-7.

Campbell, J. L. The Testimony of Modern Science to the Unity of Mankind. New York: Robert & Brothers, 1859.

Cassel, Frank J. "Species Concepts and Definitions." The Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 12 (June 1960):2-3, 5.

Cassuto, U. "From Noah to Abraham." A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Translated by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, the Hebrew University Press, n.d.

Chaffer, Lewis S. Systematic Theology. 8 vols. Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1947.

Charnock, Stephen. Discourses Upon the Existence and Attributes of God. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, n.d.

Clark, Harold W. Genesis and Science. Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1967.

Coon, Carleton S. The Living Races of Man. New York: Alfred A·knopf, 1965.

_____. The Story of Man. New York: Alfred·A·Knopf, 1962.

Culp, Richard G. Remember Thy Creator. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House,1975.

Darwin, Charles. The Origin of Species. Dutton, New York: Everyman's Library, n.d.

Davis, John J. Paradise to Prison. Winona Lake: BMH Books, 1975.

Delitzsch, Frantz. A New Commentary on Genesis, vol. 1. Translated by Sophia Taylor. Minneapolis: Klock & Klock Christian Publishers, n.d.

Dickinson, Lowes G. The Greek View of Life. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1958.

Diller, Aubrey. Race Mixture Among the Greeks before Alexander. Westport: Greenwood Press, n.d.

Dobzhansky, Theodosius. Genetics of the Evolutionary Process. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1970.

Durand, J. J. F. "Bible and Race: The Problem of Hermeneutics." Journal of Theology for Southern Africa 24 (September 1978):3-11.

Encyclopedia Biblica. S.v. "Ham," by T. K. Cheyne.

_____. S.v. "Shem," by T. K. Cheyne.

_____. S.v. "Japheth," by T. K. Cheyne.

Encyclopedia Judaica. S.v. "Anthropology, Physical," by Harry L. Shapiro.

_____. S.v. "Race, Theory of," by Leon Poliakov.

Epp, Theodore H. "Ham's Sin and Canaan's Curse." Good News Broadcaster 33 (September 1975):18-19.

Figart, Thomas O. A Biblical Prospective on the Race Problem. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973.

_____. "The Sons of Men in the Sight of God." Th. D. dissertation, Grace Theological Seminary of Winona Lake, 1971.

Gish, Duane T. Personal correspondence with him dated September 21, 1981.

Goldby, Richard A. Race and Races. New York: MacMillian Publishing Co., Inc., 1977.

Grant, Michael. Ancient History. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.

Greene, John C. "Some Early Speculations on the Origin of Human Races." American Anthropologist 56 (February 1954):31-41.

_____. The Death of Adam: Evolution and Its Impact on Western Thought. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1959.

Hall, Marshall and Sandra. The Truth God or Evolution? Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974.

Harris, R. L. "Racial Dispersion." The Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 7 (September 1955):52-54.

Harris, Marvin. The Rise of Anthropological Theory. New York: Thomas Y. Cromwell Co., 1968.

Hatch, Edwin and Redpath, Henry A. A Concordance to the Septuagint: and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books). 2 vols. Graz-Austria: Akademische Druek - U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

Hobbs, Herschel H. The Origin of All Things. Waco: Word Books, 1975.

Hodgen, Margaret T. Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964.

Holdcraft, Thomas. The Pentateuch. Oakland, California: Western Book Co., 1961.

Howells, William. Mankind So Far. Garden City: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1944.

Jenkins, William S. Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South. Mass: Peter Smith, 1935.

Jewett, Paul K. "Brunner's Doctrine of the Origin and Unity of the Race." The Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 11 (June 1952):7-10.

Kautzsch, E., ed. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Oxford: Clarendon Press, n.d.

Keil, C. F. and Delitzsch, Franz. The Pentateuch, vol. 1. Translated by James Martin. In Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949.

Kelso, A. J. Physical Anthropology. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1970.

Kennedy, Kenneth A. R. Human Variation in Space and Time. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co. Publishers, 1976.

Kephart, Calvin. Races of Mankind: Their Origin and Migration. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1960.

Klass, Morton and Hellman, Hal. The Kinds of Mankind. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1971.

Klotz, John W. Genes, Genesis, and Evolution. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955.

Kluckhohn, Clyde; Clinchy, Everett R.; Embrace, Edwin R.; Mead, Magaret; and Abernethy, Bradford S. Religion and Our Racial Tensions. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945.

Koehler, Ludwig and Baumgartner, Walter, editors. Lexicon in Veteris Testament Libros. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1951.

Krantz, Grover S. Climatic Races and Descent Groups. North Quincy: The Christopher Publishing House, 1980.

LaSor, William S. "Was the Flood Universal?" Eternality 11 (December 1960):11-13.

Lammerts, Walter E. and Sinclair, John C. "Creation in Terms of Modern Concepts of Genetics and Physics." Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 5 (September 1953):7-9.

Leupold, H. C. Exposition of Genesis. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1942.

Marsh, Frank L. Evolution Creation and Science. Washington: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1947.

_____. "The Genesis Kinds in our Modern World." The Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 12 (June 1960):4-8, 11, 13.

Maston, T. B. The Bible and Race. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1959.

Mayr, Ernst. "Evolution." Scientific American 239 (September 1978):46-55.

Molnar, Stephen. Races, Types and Ethnic Groups. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

Montagu, Ashley M. F. Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.

Moody, Paul A. Genetics of Man. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1967.

Morris, Henry. A Biblical Manual on Science and Creation. San Diego: Institute for Creation Research, 1972.

_____. "Biblical Creationism and Modern Science." Bibliotheca Sacra 125 (January-March 1968):20-28.

_____; Gish, Duane T.; and Hillstead, George M., editors. Creation: Acts. Facts. Impacts. San Diego: Institute for Creation Research, 1974.

_____. "Developing Populations, Languages and Cultures." A Transcript from the Science, Scripture, and Salvation Radio Broadcast 407. San Diego, California: Institute for Creation Research.

_____. "Language, Creation, and the Inner Man." Institute for Creation Research Impact 28 (October 1975):1-4.

_____. "Origin of the Races." A transcript from the Science, Scripture, and Salvation Radio Broadcast 52. San Diego, California: Institute for Creation Research.

_____. "The Bible is a Textbook of Science." Bibliotheca Sacra 122 (January-March 165):63-69.

_____. The Genesis Record. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976.

Murphy, J. G. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Minneapolis: James Publications, n.d.

McKitrick, Eric L., ed. Slavery Defended: The Views of the Old South. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1963.

Nilsson, Martin P. "The Race Problem of the Roman Empire." Hereditas 2 (1921):370-390.

Nott, J. C. and Gliddon, Geo. R. Types of Mankind. Philadelphia: Mnemosyne Publishing Co., Inc., 1969.

Orr, James, gen. ed. The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956.

Overman, Richard. Evolution and the Christian Doctrine of Creation. A Whiteheadian Interpretation. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.

Parker, Gary E. "Creation, Mutation, and Variation." Institute for Creation Research Impact 89 (November 1980): 1-4.

Payne, Barton J. "The Concept of 'Kinds' in Scriptures." The Journal of American Scientific Affiliation 10 (June 1958):17-19.

Pfeiffer, Charles F. The Book of Genesis. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, n.d.

Pieters, Albertus. Notes on Genesis. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954.

Powell, Jeffrey. "Genetic Variation in Ecologically Diverse Environments." American Scientist 67 (September-October 1979):590-596.

Prichard, James C. The Natural History of Man. London: Hippolyte Baillere, 1845.

Rad, Gehard Von. Genesis. Translated by John H. Marks. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952.

Ramsey, F. P. An Interpretation of Genesis. New York: The Neale Publishing Co., 1911.

Readings in Early Anthropology. Cited by Marvin Harris, The Rise of Anthropological Theory, p. 83. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968.

Regna, Darnell, Readings in the History of Anthropology. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1974.

Rengstorf, Karl H, ed. A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus. 3 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.

Rice, Gene. "The Curse that Never Was." Journal of Religious Thought 29 (1972):5-27.

Robertson, Donald S. "The Species as a Field for Gene Recombinations." The Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 11 (Junel959):

Ross, Allen P. "The Curse of Canaan." Bibliotheca Sacra 137 (July-September 1980):223-240.

_____. "The Dispersion of the Nations in Genesis 11:1-9." Bibliotheca Sacra 138 (April-June 1981):119-138.

_____. "The Table of Nations in Genesis 10, Its Content." Bibliotheca Sacra 138 (January-March 1981):22-35

_____. "The Table of Nations in Genesis 10, Its Structure." Bibliotheca Sacra 137 (October-December 1980):340-353.

_____. "The Table of Nations in Genesis." Th. D. Dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1977.

Rowe, John H. "The Renaissance Foundations of Anthropology." American Anthropologist 67 (February 1965):1-20.

Sarna, Nahum M. Understanding Genesis. 2 vols. The Melton Research Center Series: The Heritage of Biblical Israel. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

Scheinfeld, Amaram and Schweitzer, Morton, D. You and Heredity. Garden City: Garden City Publishing Co., Inc., 1939.

Schultz, Samuel J. "The Unity of the Race." Bibliotheca Sacra 113 (January 1956):46-52.

Siegler, Hilbert R. Evolution or Degeneration Which? Milwaukee: North-western Publishing House, 1972.

Simpson, B. P. Cassel's New Latin Dictionary. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1968.

Sinclair, John C. "New Genes." The Journal of American Scientific Affiliation (December 1955):12-13.

_____. "The Nature of the Gene and the Theory of Evolution." The Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 6 (September 1954):2-4.

Skinner, John. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. ICC. Edited by C. A. Briggs, et al. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, n.d.

Smith, Elliot G. Human History. New York: W. Norton & Co., 1929.

Southhall, James C. The Recent Origin of Man. London: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1875.

Speer, Robert E. Race and Race Relations. New York: Negro Universities Press, n.d.

Speiser, E. A. "'People' and 'Nation' of Israel." Journal of Biblical Literature 79 (1960):157-163.

Stanton, William. Leopard Spots. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Stigers, Harold G. A Commentary on Genesis. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976.

Strong, Augustus H. Systematic Theology. 3 vols. Old Tappen: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1907.

Taylor, Kenneth N., ed. Evolution. Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, n.d.

Tinkle, William J. "Entropy in Relation to Genetics." The Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 7 (December 1955):18-20.

_____. Heredity. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970.

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. S.v. "Mankind," by Walter C. Kaiser.

_____. S.v. " (parad) I, divide, separate," by Victor P. Hamilton.

_____. S.v. " (sharas) teem, swarm," by Hermann J. Austel.

The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia. S.v. "Nation."

The World Book Encyclopedia, 1980. S.v. "Races, Human," Stanley M. Garn.

Thompson, W. R. "A Critique of Evolution." The Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 12 (March 1960):2-9.

Thurman, Duane L. How to Think about Evolution & Other Bible-Science Controversies. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1978.

Unger, Merrill F. and White, William, editors. Nelson's Expository Dictionary of the Old Testament. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1980.

Washington, George W. History of the Negro Race in America. New York: Bergman Publishers, 1968.

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield: G & C Merriam Co., 1971.

Weingreen, J. A. Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1959.

Welsh, James R. Fundamentals of Plant Genetics and Breeding. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1981.

Whitcomb, John C. and Morris, Henry M. The Genesis Flood. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1961.

Williams, Ronald J. Hebrew Synatax: An Outline. Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1980.

Wills, Irvin A. "Genetic Evidence as to the Color of Adam and Eve." The Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 6 (June 1954):13-14.

Winchester, A. M. Human Genetics. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1971.

Witt, Dale S. "The Historical Background of Genesis 11:1-9: Babel or Ur?" Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 22 (March 1979):15-26.