It's September ('81), and we're still jumping almost daily into the Atlantic, joining other "black" skinbags--some naturally black, others sun-blackened (the melanin having come to the surface to give natural shade to the hypodermis). White skinbags, most white folks in America agree, are prettier when sun-darkened, and chemical aids thereto is a billion-dollar industry. Illogically, most white folks consider natural blackness an inferior condition....This thinksheet is (1) specifically about Song of Songs 1.5f and (2) generally about becoming more wary and sophism ated about prejudicial in-readings both in Scripture translation and in folks' reading of Scripture.

- 1. Song of Songs has, in Hebrew/Greek/Latin, a title with no sex reference-but most Bibles now refer to a man, Solomon. This book of the Bible begins, however, with a girl's song, not a boy's or a man's. She's been put out to guard the ripening grapes and has fallen in love with a passing shepherd. She wants to get married, and passing city-girls are taunting this peasant girl: At the wedding, everybody will know you're low-class, a peasant; just look at your sun-darkened skin! She replies: I'm beautiful; how come you to think that my exposure to the sun mars that?
- 2. It is certain that S.S.1.5f has nothing to do with race; the prejudice it does have to do with is urban/rural. In America, however, bethese two prejudices are interwined--most urban blacks being rural in themselves, their parents, or their grandparents. I have a deep concern that we sort out prejudices, and not call an element race prejudice when it is something else.
- 3. Consciousness-raising on race appears in that the original article of THE INTERPRETER'S DICT. OF THE B. (1.444, Abingdon/62) is only 3" and begins "A word describing...calamity, gloom, and mourning"; but the SUPPL. VOL. (Abingdon/76) has 3 pages (pp.111-114)! In the biblical period, most slaves were white, so their was no slavery-based prejudice against blacks: an enormous difference from the American situation. Again, biblical peoples did not see themseles as "white": that's how they saw, e.g., the pale Sythians. EurAmerican whites rightly see themselves as history's most "successful" (=dominating) humans, and success tends to breed arrogance (the reverse side of this being prejudices against all "inferiors," viz. browns, blacks, yellows, reds). Till Kingdom comes, little can be done about this perversity of fallen humankind: top dog pride-blinded against the rest of dogdom. Note, however, that this prejudice is only secondarily skin-color in reference -- a fact obscured when one speaks of "white prejudice." We "Sythians" do dominate the earth, God help us, from Moscow and Washinton and other white-ruled centers of power. (Nonwhites in U.S.S.R. do not participate in the central power.) In early Christian symbolism, the church is black (like Moses' Ethiopian wife, and the girl at the beg. of S. of S.) and beautiful--here, S.S.1.5f referring, as in classical [G-R] civilization, to blacks as sun-burnt, the environmental-genetic theory of race).
- 4. I studied Hebrew, Greek, Latin words in our text, + 41 English translation. Here are my conclusions: (1) Inevitably (because of fear of eye-control loss [night, darkness, blindless] and of death [dried corpses]), blackness is used as a negative metaphor; (2) Hebrew and Greek are not adversative ("but") in our text, but Latin is ("sed")--as are a myriad of English translations. (The Hebrew can be "but.")

blookend on I, but couly" CAYA RSV: " many dark, that country"
NEB: "clark but loudy" we yasha ic da servin of JB -> " That lovely" NASP. Proff: " dark, but I am a hearty Know (us +): "Darky skei, + yet I have Therty. Confidenty: "dark - but lovely" - (6) smarthy,"
The sun Tas Tund me" in the uniques in : " to, but amaly me vez.

intim reflection our text, a II listle reflection our text, a II listle can be an extended of a consecution of factors and contraction of the cont