

# The Kinist Heresy: A Biblical Critique of Racism

## Chapter 2: Specific Scriptural Refutations

[Brian Schwertley](#)

Not only does the racist and or kinist use of Scriptures as proof texts completely fail to prove their position, but there is abundant proof from Scripture that race alone apart from considerations of faith is not some kind of barrier between Christians or believers. We will look at several general passages on this and then we will look at interracial marriages of believers as well. This also refutes racist or kinist heretics.

*Biblical Examples that allow for the Absorption of Non-Jews into the Covenant People with Full Rights as God's People*

In the Old Testament the central issue was faith not blood; the covenant not race. It is crucial that we do not fall into the heresy of the Pharisees which saw a great importance in race or descent from Abraham. While a direct genealogical line from Abraham to David to Christ was crucial, in both Testaments any race could adopt a biblical worldview and culture, join themselves to God's people and intermarry with ethnic Jews. The important issue is not race, but rather faith in Jehovah and His Word. Note the following.

(1) When God called out Abraham, his extended household, which included 318 fighting men, their wives and children and probably a large number of servants, were all circumcised and placed under the covenant. Their race is not specified, but the covenant people were not simply direct descendants of Abraham.

(2) In Exodus 12:38 we read, "A mixed multitude went up with them [the Jews] also, and flocks and herds—a great deal of livestock." There was a motley group that accompanied the Israelites in the Exodus from Egypt. Although this group would all die in the wilderness with the possible exception of Caleb the Kenizzite (Gen. 15:19; Josh. 14:6), their children entered the promised land and were absorbed into the non-Levitical tribes of Israel. The fact that this group is called a mixed multitude indicates that "some were Egyptians, and some of other nations that had resided in Egypt, and who on various accounts, might choose to go along with the children of Israel; some through intermarriages with them, being loath to part with their relations...others on account of righteousness, being proselytes of righteousness, and others through worldly interest, the land of Egypt being by the plagues a most desolate place."<sup>1</sup>

Some kinists attempt to get around these kinds of passages by arguing that non-Jewish peoples who converted to Jehovah did not intermarry with Jews and were not absorbed into the Jewish nation. They had their own separate communities and remained separate racially. If this scenario really happened, then what happened to these communities? Did they all apostatize and fall away? Were they simply lost to history? Did millions of people vanish or move away? Kinists are quick to attempt to circumvent the clear teaching of Scripture with arbitrary assertions. But, they do not think things through. If there were very large communities of non-racial Jews living segregated from the Jews in the suburbs or in ghettos or on the outskirts, then

---

<sup>1</sup> John Gill, 1:377.

they would be known to history. But, they are never mentioned. The reason is they never existed. They were all absorbed into the nation and lost their separate racial and national identity. For them *faith and salvation was more important than blood and the fatherland*.

(3) That non-Israelites—even Egyptians who were descendants of Ham—could join Israel and be absorbed into the covenant nation is proven by the Law (as we will see in a moment) and historical examples. Take Caleb, for example. He is clearly identified as a Kennizite. The Kennezeitites were a prominent Edomite clan that claimed Eliphaz, the oldest son of Esau (Gen. 36:11, 15, 42; 1 Ch. 1:36, 53), as ancestor. Jephunneh, the father of Caleb, was a Kennizite (Nu. 32:12; Josh. 14:6, 14). At some point in their history, they settled in the Negeb area. While it is true that they were still essentially Semites, this point is irrelevant in that only Canaan received the curse, not all the descendants of Ham. We are told explicitly in Numbers 13:6 that Caleb's family was incorporated into the tribe of Judah.

(4) There is also Rahab the harlot, who because of her faith in God betrayed her own people and joined herself to Israel. In Matthew 1:5, we are told that she married Salmon, a man of Judah, and begot Boaz. We are not sure of the racial characteristics of the residents of Jericho at the time of its conquest. The city had been conquered a number of times and had at one time been completely dominated by Canaanites. It is likely that Jericho was a rag-tag combination of Canaanite with perhaps some nomadic Semitic blood. But, the point is that Rahab was absorbed into the tribe of Judah, even though she was not a Jew. This example is such a clear case of a godly Jew (Salmon) marrying outside of his race that kinists claim that Rahab was a Jew who just happened to live in Jericho. Aside from the fact that this assertion is purely arbitrary and has no basis in Scripture or a shred of support from biblical scholars, it contradicts the account in Joshua. Rahab was not a godly Jewess who lived undercover in Jericho, she was a whore. She made a living through pagan ritual prostitution. To argue that she was a Jew is ludicrous.

In addition, if you read what Rahab says to the spies in Joshua 2:9-13, it is crystal clear that she was not a Jew:

And she said unto the men, I know that the LORD hath given you the land, and that your terror is fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land faint because of you. For we have heard how the LORD dried up the water of the Red sea for you, when ye came out of Egypt; and what ye did unto the two kings of the Amorites, that were on the other side Jordan, Sihon and Og, whom ye utterly destroyed. And as soon as we had heard these things, our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more courage in any man, because of you: for the LORD your God, he is God in heaven above, and in earth beneath. Now therefore, I pray you, swear unto me by the LORD, since I have shewed you kindness, that ye will also shew kindness unto my father's house, and give me a true token: And that ye will save alive my father, and my mother, and my brethren, and my sisters, and all that they have, and deliver our lives from death.

Note: a) Rahab contrasts *us* (the people of Jericho) with *you* (Israel). b) Her knowledge of Israel and their God is only hearsay from what has happened. Clearly she had no prior knowledge of the true God. c) She speaks about *your* God (i.e. Israel's God). She does not yet regard herself as one of God's people. d) She begs them to allow her and her family to join themselves to God's people and avoid God's judgment on Jericho. If she and her family were Jewish this conversation would have not taken place. The kinists are grasping at straw in order to support the unsupportable. By the way, Matthew Henry says she was a woman of Canaan, as does John Gill and Matthew Poole.

This example alone completely destroys racist ideas against interracial marriages between people of the same faith, who live in obedience to God's law-word. The racist or kinist must assert the absurd otherwise their whole racist paradigm falls to the ground. The example of Rahab the harlot accords well with Paul's statement in Romans 2:28-29: "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God."

(5) We also have the example of Uriah the Hittite. Hittites are Indo-Europeans who came from Asia Minor. They at one time conquered the northern area of Syria and incorporated it into their territory. They were not Semitic, although there may have been some intermarriage with Canaanites and Semites in the Syrian dependencies. Uriah the Hittite was an officer in David's army who was one of the elite corps called "the thirty." Many scholars do not believe Uriah was his original name, but he changed his name to Uriah (which means Jehovah is light) when he became a full Israelite citizen. He adopted the name to indicate that he was a worshiper of Jehovah. Interestingly, his wife Bathsheba was the daughter of Eliam who was also a member of the elite "thirty" (2 Sa. 23:34). That Uriah was a godly man is without question (see 2 Sam. 11:11). So there is the example of Uriah the Hittite who married into the tribe of Judah, who owned property in the capital and was an important military official. He is even mentioned by Matthew as the husband or former husband of Bathsheba in the genealogy of Christ (1:6). Now if interracial marriage was wrong, and other races could not become part of Israel's nation and culture and people, then how can Uriah the Hittite be explained?

If the racist kinist paradigm were correct, would not King David who wanted Bathsheba for himself have pressed the issue of the immorality of Bathsheba's marriage to a non-Jew, a non-Semite? Yet, we see none of this because the racist kinist view is not taught in the Scriptures. We should rather follow John the baptizer who explicitly told the Pharisees and Sadducees that descent from Abraham was worthless if it is not accompanied by obedience to the covenant law that flows from genuine conversion (i.e. regeneration and saving faith). "Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: And think not to say within yourselves, 'We have Abraham to our father': for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham" (Mt. 3:8-9).

(6) There is also the example of Ruth the Moabite who married Boaz, a godly Jew and was a direct ancestor of Jesus Christ. The racist kinist will argue that this marriage and incorporation was okay because Ruth was fellow Semite—they were technically of the same people. This argument which is racial and therefore racist is easily refuted by the text. Ruth and Naomi did not think in terms of race, but rather in terms of faith in the true God. Listen to Ruth's argument as to why Naomi should take her back to Israel:

And she [Naomi] said, "Behold, thy sister in law is gone back unto her people, and unto her gods: return thou after thy sister in law." And Ruth said, "Intreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee: for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge: thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God: Where thou diest, will I die, and there will I be buried: the LORD do so to me, and more also, if ought but death part thee and me."

Note that both Ruth and Naomi do not think like kinists. If Ruth were a kinist we would expect this kind of argumentation: "Look, Naomi, I am a Semite like you. Your people are my people.

We are one blood. You must take me in for we are of the same race; and, because we are the same race I can intermarry with Jews. Kith and kin baby—all the way.”

No. Ruth and Naomi did not think that way. The assumption behind Ruth’s amazing statement is that people are defined by faith. “Look, Naomi, I know my people are a bunch of unbelieving idolaters; that, therefore, they are not the covenant people. But, I believe in the God of Israel. Therefore, your people [the Jews] shall be my people. I can join your people by a profession of faith and by submitting to your law.”

The kinist goes to Scripture not to be instructed by it, but rather comes with a set of racist presuppositions. Thus, he must repeatedly ignore its great exaltation of Christ’s grace and mercy in saving and integrating heathen non-Jews like Rahab and Ruth into the nation and the crucial role of faith in these passages. Instead, the passages are twisted and perverted to accommodate a racist paradigm. The lesson of these non-Jews coming into the covenant nation is that *faith is far more important than race or nationality*. As Paul says,

...For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel: Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.... And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory, Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? As he saith also in Hosea, “I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved” (Romans 9:6-8, 23-25; cf. 9:26-33).

John Murray writes,

The Israel distinguished from the Israel of natural descent is the *true Israel*. They are indeed “of Israel” but not coextensive with the latter. It is in accord with our Lord’s usage to make this kind of distinction within a designated class. He distinguished between those who were disciples and those *truly* disciples (cf. John 8:30-32). He spoke of Nathanael as “truly an Israelite” (John 1:47). If we use Paul’s own language, this Israel is Israel “according to the Spirit” (Gal. 4:29) and “the Israel of God” (Gal. 6:26), although in the latter passage he is no doubt including the people of God of all nations. The purpose of this distinction is to show that the covenantal promise of God did not have respect to Israel after the flesh but to this true Israel and that, therefore, the unbelief and rejection of ethnic Israel as a whole in no way interfered with the fulfillment of God’s covenant purpose and promise.<sup>2</sup>

Galatians 3:6-9 says,

Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham... There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.

---

<sup>2</sup> John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959, 65), 2:9-10.

“Clearly, the apostle once again stresses the fact that ‘belonging to the seed of Abraham’ is not determined by physical descent but by faith (Ridderbos, *op. cit.*, p. 150) ‘In Christ’ the wall of separation between Jew and Gentile no longer exists.... Throughout the whole vast earth the Lord recognizes *one*, and *only one*, nation as his own, namely, the nation of believers (1 Peter 2:9). These are Abraham’s seed.”<sup>3</sup> Further, Paul connects the covenant promise not to Israel indiscriminately but to Christ directly: “Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ” (Gal. 3:16). (We will discuss Ruth some more in conjunction with our consideration of the law’s provisions.)

(7) The book of Esther records that during the exile a large group of Gentiles joined themselves to the Jewish people. Esther 8:17 says, “And in every province and city, wherever the king’s command and decree came, the Jews had joy and gladness, a feast and a holiday. Then many of the people of the land became Jews, because fear of the Jews fell upon them.” Note the text says they became Jews. That is, they embraced the Jewish religion, submitted to the rites and ceremonies and were circumcised. They went through the necessary process to become part of the Jewish people. D. J. Clines writes,

Here they are the various nations of the Persian empire. Their conversion to Judaism cannot be represented as insincere, for there is still no advantage to be gained in being a Jew; the first decree still stands, and the second decree gives the Jews rights only against those who attack them. Their **fear** is not that they will suffer at the hands of the Jews, for they are safe if they are not enemies of the Jews. Their fear must be a religious awe such as falls upon the inhabitants of Canaan (Jos. 2:9) and Transjordan (Exod. 15:16) and Egypt (Ps. 105:38). This uninvited proselytism is presented by the narrator as the climax of the success story that has occupied the chapter...that the unseen hand of God should so conspicuously rescue the Jews from disaster that even Gentiles should discern where the divine favour lay and spontaneously convert to Judaism—what more fitting climax to the story of the rise of a Jewish girl to the Persian throne?<sup>4</sup>

This passage in Esther reminds us of the great prophecy of Zechariah 8:23: “Thus saith the LORD of hosts; In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard that God is with you.”

#### *The Provision of God’s Law for the Incorporation of Non-Jewish Peoples*

He that is wounded in the stones, or hath his privy member cut off, shall not enter into the congregation of the LORD. A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the LORD; even to his tenth generation shall he not enter into the congregation of the LORD. An Ammonite or Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the LORD; even to their tenth generation shall they not enter into the congregation of the LORD for ever: Because they met you not with bread and with water in the way, when ye came forth out of Egypt; and because they hired against thee Balaam the son of Beor of Pethor of Mesopotamia, to curse thee. Nevertheless the LORD thy God would not hearken unto Balaam; but the LORD thy God turned the curse into a blessing unto thee, because the LORD thy God loved thee. Thou shalt not seek their peace nor

---

<sup>3</sup> William Hendriksen, *Galatians and Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1967-68), 1:151.

<sup>4</sup> D. J. Clines, *The New Century Bible Commentary: Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984, 1992), 318-319.

their prosperity all thy days for ever. Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; for he is thy brother: thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian; because thou wast a stranger in his land. The children that are begotten of them shall enter into the congregation of the LORD in their third generation (Deuteronomy 23:1-8).

Here is a section of Scripture that explicitly contradicts the racist concepts of nationalism and the church found within kinism. In verses one through eight we have a discussion dealing with the right of full citizenship in the congregation of Israel. Before we comment on how it disproves kinism we need to make some observations.

Regarding the Ammonites or Moabites, there seems to be a complete prohibition on them ever joining the assembly of Israel. This seems to contradict the book of Ruth and her marriage to Boaz that we considered earlier. The Talmud and a number of commentators following the Talmud argue that the prohibition of citizenship only extends to the males of these lands but not the females. The problem with this interpretation is that in Nehemiah 13, Jews who had married *women* of Ashdod, Ammon and Moab had to put away their wives.

Another offered solution is that Ruth and her children were extraordinary instances and that God whenever He pleased could make certain exceptions in this law. This would then seem to apply to cases of great faith and notable occasions. There is not the slightest hint of anyone objecting to David as the King because his grandmother was a Moabite. Moreover, the book of Ruth presents Boaz as an intelligent, godly man whose act of kindness and marriage to Ruth is commendable. Thus, we need to proceed with extreme caution in our interpretation of Deuteronomy 23:3ff.

In addition, it is noteworthy that the account in Nehemiah 13 makes it perfectly clear that these foreign women were *pagan* (i.e. unbelieving) women. Nehemiah 13:27 says, "Should we hear of your doing all this great evil, transgressing against our God by marrying pagan women?" Ruth was a Moabite by birth but she was no longer a pagan woman. We must be careful not to interpret Scripture in a manner in which it contradicts itself. Also note Nehemiah 13:30, "Thus I cleansed them of everything pagan."

Still others argue that although full citizenship could be denied for 10 generations, true converts could attach themselves to the nation without full rights. (Does one define *forever* in terms of 10 generations? [the word "forever" in Hebrew can refer to an indefinite lengthy period of time] Or does 10 generations symbolize forever [i.e. time without end]?)

Whatever interpretation one holds the prohibition is not based on race (indeed the Moabites and the Ammonites were Semites closely related to Israel being descended from Lot [Gen. 19:30-38]). The prohibition is based on *ethics* not race. The Moabites are criticized for their attempt to use Balaam to bring down the curse of God on the Israelites (see Num. 22-24). The Ammonites are criticized because in a time of real need they harshly refused to offer hospitality (bread and water) to the Israelites. Thus, even though Semitic and much closer to Israel racially than the Egyptians, they receive harsher judgment.

The treatment of Edomites and Egyptians was to quite different. P. C. Craigie writes,

Edomites and Egyptians were not to be abominated, and could be granted access to the assembly of the Lord in the course of time (vv. 8-9). The verb *abominate* indicates an attitude directly opposite to the loving kindness (*hesed*) to be expressed and experienced within the covenant community. Neither Edomites nor Egyptians were to be abominated, but they were to be treated with some respect. The Edomite was a *brother* of the Israelite; according to Hebrew tradition, the Edomites were descendants of Edom/Esau. The sojourn in Egypt, though in its

latter days a time of hardship, had nevertheless been the period in which the growth toward Israel's nationhood had begun (26:5). Thus, for varying reasons, Edomites and Egyptians were to be treated differently from Ammonites and Moabites. If either Edomites or Egyptians took up residence in Israel, then the children of the third generation of immigrants could be granted admission to the assembly of the Lord. After the lapse of three generations, there would be no doubt that the Edomites and Egyptians resident in Israel were genuine in their desire to become full members of the worshipping family of God.<sup>5</sup>

What the kinist or racist needs to explain is why are the Egyptians, which are descendants of Ham, not only treated much kinder than the Moabites and Ammonites who were Semites; but also how is it that Egyptian Hamites are allowed to be full Israelite citizens after only 3 generations? It is obvious from this section of Scripture that race is essentially irrelevant whereas ethics or the lack thereof especially in reference to the treatment of God's people is very important. The kinist attempts to deal with this devastating proof against their position by arguing that the Egyptians were Hyksos-Semites and this allowed them to be engrafted into Israel. This argument is pitiful for the following reasons.

First, while it is true that the Hyksos rulers bore Semitic names, the Hyksos domination was brief (about 150 years) and it was a small ruling class, not a mass migration of Hyksos into Egypt. In addition, the Hyksos were allied with the Nubians (a black empire) and if the kinist wants to assume assimilation between the Hyksos and the Egyptians, then there is no reason to rule out assimilation with the black Nubians also. In any case, the Egyptians were predominately Hamite in their stock, so the kinist must admit that race was not a crucial factor. In addition, many reputable scholars place the Hyksos in a time frame that makes the kinist argument irrelevant.

Second, the kinist argument is based on the assumption which we have already disproved that all the descendants of Ham were under some kind of curse. That is not true. The racist interpretation of the curse on Canaan lies behind a lot of their thinking.

Third, if the kinist or racist argument is that the Egyptians became acceptable for Israelite citizenship quickly because of Hyksos intermarriage and genetic mixture of Hamite and Hyksos peoples, then American blacks should be acceptable to them as well because the vast majority of blacks that descended from slaves have Scottish, Irish or English blood in them due to the sexual escapades of white slaveholders. In addition, how can the racist kinist worldview be applied to nations such as America that have been a melting pot of different races for 350 years? Should we turn over the nation to American Indians who are a different race and were here long before the Spanish, English and German peoples? How do you define the racial makeup of a person who is black, Chinese, Bulgarian, Portuguese and Swedish? I know people like that.

## Interracial Marriage in the Old Testament

One of the most offensive, unbiblical aspects of the racist kinist movement is their teaching that no interracial marriage is permitted even among solid professing Christians. This view as we shall see is unbiblical and absurd.

Since we have already noted the marriage of Rahab the harlot who was likely a Canaanite and Ruth the Moabitess, we will consider a few more. Joseph, whose two sons became tribes of Israel (Manasseh, the firstborn, and Ephraim) was married to an Egyptian, Asenath, the daughter

---

<sup>5</sup> P. C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 298.

of Poti-Pherah priest of On (Gen. 41:46). This name is not Hyksos or Semitic but Egyptian. Two tribes of Israel were half Semitic and half Egyptian; that is, Hamite blood flowed through their veins. I do not know how a kinist would explain how half ethnic Egyptians could be the basis of Israelite tribes. To an orthodox Christian it does not really matter because having the faith of Abraham is the crucial issue.

Then we have the marriage of Moses, who God used to write down His law, to an African, an Ethiopian (Nu. 12:1). When Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses' authority and used Moses' wife as an excuse, God struck Miriam with leprosy (Nu. 12:10).

The kinists, following Calvin and a few others, identify this wife of Moses as the Midianite (Ex. 2:16ff) and thus they argue that Moses married a Semite. This interpretation is highly unlikely, however, for the following reasons. First, although Habakkuk 3:7 and a few Assyrian texts seem to identify Midian and Cushan, Cush normally refers to Ethiopia. This is certainly how the word is used in Genesis. Thus we should not assign a different meaning to the word in Numbers also written by Moses. A. Noordlzi adds this important information:

Moses has married a Cushite woman. The rabbinical tradition has changed this into "a beautiful wife" to clear Moses of marriage to an Ethiopian (Onkelos, Rashi). Calvin and others believed that this refers to Zipporah (e.g., P. Heinisch, *Numeri*, p. 52; H. M. Weiner, *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, 1928, p. 309). But neither solution is possible. "Cush" is the Hebraization of the Egyptian Kosh, the name of the region between Assuan and Meru, north of what we call Ethiopia; this region has been inhabited by Nubian tribes with an African culture since 2200 B.C. It is indeed true that in the Old Testament a portion of southern Arabia is called Cush (see 2 Chron. 14:9; 21:16); but the Midianite woman Zipporah came from the northern region of the Sinai peninsula (Exod. 3:1; 18:1), and according to 1 Kings 11:18; Habakkuk 3:7 from near Paran. Moses has thus married a second time, probably a woman who belonged to the "many other people" of Exodus 12:38 (Rashi claims that Moses first divorced Zipporah). The Midrash states that the Cushite woman was Tharbis, daughter of the king of Ethiopia, from Meru (Josephus, *Antiquities*, II, 10. 2).

Miriam and Aaron complain to Moses about this marriage (both, in spite of the singular verb; cf. Jer. 12:4b; Esth. 7:3b; 9:29a). But apparently Miriam was the instigator, while Aaron once again gives evidence of a weak character (cf. Exod. 32:2ff., 22ff.; Num. 16:11). Miriam cannot have been upset because Moses married a non-Israelite woman, since Zipporah was also an "alien." Nor can she have been hurt in her national pride, since such marriage were not at all uncommon in Israel (see 1 Chron. 2:34). I conclude from verse 2 that Moses' marriage to the Cushite woman was nothing more than an excuse.<sup>6</sup>

R. K. Harrison writes,

*kus* has been identified with a region of continental Africa, either Ethiopia (KJV) or Nubia by some authorities, but alternatively with the territory of the Kassites (Akk. *Kassu*) in Mesopotamia by others. According to Isa. 18:1 Cush was on the Nile, while in Esther 1:1 Cush represented the southern boundary of Egypt. If the "land of Cush" (Gen. 2:13) did indeed refer to Kassite holdings, it is rather curious that the Kassites are not mentioned elsewhere in the OT, whereas the peoples to the south of Egypt were. If the woman whom Moses had married was indeed a descendant of Cush, she could trace her line back to Ham, son of Noah (Gen. 10:1). The Hamites lived principally in Nubia or Ethiopia.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> A. Noordtzi, *Numbers* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 106-7.

<sup>7</sup> R. K. Harrison, *Numbers* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1990), 194-195.

Second, the Zipporah argument does not make any sense whatsoever. If it was Zipporah, Moses' first wife, then Miriam was complaining about a woman that Moses had been married to for decades. But, if Zipporah had died and Moses married an African woman, the complaint fits perfectly. In addition, the expression "whom he had married" or more literally, "for he had taken a Cushite wife" sounds as though this was a recent event. Keil & Delitzsch write,

Miriam found an occasion for the manifestation of her discontent in the Cushite wife whom Moses had taken. This wife cannot have been Zipporah the Midianite: for even though Miriam might possibly have called her a Cushite, whether because the Cushite tribes dwelt in Arabia, or in a contemptuous sense as a Moor or Hamite, the author would certainly not have confirmed this at all events inaccurate, if not contemptuous epithet, by adding, "*for he had taken a Cushite wife;*" to say nothing of the improbability of Miriam having made the marriage which her brother had contracted when he was a fugitive in a foreign land, long before he was called by God, the occasion of reproach so many years afterwards. It would be quite different if, a short time before, probably after the death of Zipporah, he had contracted a second marriage with a Cushite woman, who either sprang from the Cushites dwelling in Arabia, or from the foreigners who had come out of Egypt along with the Israelites. This marriage would not have been wrong in itself, as God had merely forbidden the Israelites to marry the daughters of Canaan (Ex. xxxiv. 16).<sup>8</sup>

Another argument is to admit that she was a Cushite but then to say that does not make it right. But, if it was wrong, then did not Miriam and Aaron have a legitimate complaint? Would not God honor his law-word? Kinist attempts to circumvent the passages that clearly teach the lawfulness of interracial marriages are desperate and foolish. If Joseph can marry an Egyptian, Moses an African, Boaz a Moabite, Bathsheba a Hittite, etc. without God's disapprobation because faith makes a person a true Jew (Rom. 9:6-8; Gal. 3:6-9; 6:16; Eph. 2:15; 1 Pet. 2:9-10, etc.), then it cannot be wrong today. Racism and bigotry should have no acceptance whatsoever in the church of Christ.

Copyright 2011 © Brian Schwertley

[HOME PAGE](#)

---

<sup>8</sup> C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 1:3:75.