

Justified and Unjustified Slavery



R. J. M. I.

By

The Precious Blood of Jesus Christ;
The Grace of the God of the Holy Catholic Church;
The Mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary,
Our Lady of Good Counsel and Crusher of Heretics;
The Protection of Saint Joseph,
Patriarch of the Holy Family and Patron of the Holy Catholic Church;
The Guidance of the Good Saint Anne,
Mother of Mary and Grandmother of God;
The Intercession of the Archangels Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael;
The Intercession of All the Other Angels and Saints;
and the Cooperation of

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

To Jesus through Mary

*Júdica me, Deus, et discérne causam meam de gente non sancta:
ab hómine iníquo, et dolóso érué me*

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

“Let your bondmen and your bondwomen be of the nations that are round about you. And of the strangers that sojourn among you, or that were born of them in your land, let them be to you for a possession.”

(Leviticus 25:44-45)

“Slaves, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle but also to the froward.”

(1 Peter 2:18)

Original version: 2/2022; Current version: 2/2022

Mary's Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

Truth or Consequences, New Mexico 87901-2878, USA

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	7
OLD TESTAMENT	8
NEW TESTAMENT	9
COUNCILS, CANONS, AND OTHER LAWS	10
<i>Apostolic Constitutions, 1st to 4th centuries:</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Ancient Epitome of Canons.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Council of Gangra, 340</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Council of Chalcedon, 451 and thus Pope St. Leo the Great</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Council of Epaon, 517</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Ninth Council of Toledo, 655.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Council of Chalons, 813:.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Council of Melfi, 1089</i>	<i>11</i>
CHURCH FATHERS AND OTHER CATHOLICS.....	12
<i>St. Irenaeus, 2nd century</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>St. Augustine, 4th and 5th centuries.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Raherius of Verona, 10th century</i>	<i>17</i>
POPES.....	18
<i>Pope St. Leo the Great</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Pope St. Gregory I</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Pope Martin I</i>	<i>19</i>
NOMINAL CATHOLIC SOURCES	20
<i>Apostate Basil of Cesarea</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Heretic John Chrysostom.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Invalid Third Lateran Council, 1179</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Apostate Thomas Aquinas</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Apostate Antipope Nicholas V</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Apostate Antipope Gregory IX</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Nominal Holy Office Decree, 1866, under apostate Antipope Pius IX.....</i>	<i>24</i>
ARTICLE ON SLAVERY BY FREDERIK PIJPER	25
SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES.....	47
APOSTATE ANTIPOPES DENIAL OF DOGMAS REGARDING SLAVERY	48
<i>When the heresy began</i>	<i>48</i>
<i>Tricks and ploys.....</i>	<i>51</i>
Ploy 1: Use examples of unjustified slavery and conclude that all slavery is unjustified.....	52
Ploy 2: Use examples of unjust punishment of slaves and conclude all punishments of slaves is unjust	52
Ploy 3: Use examples of the freedom of certain slaves to mean that all slaves must be freed.....	53
Ploy 4: They believe, at least by implication, that there is no sin during the New Covenant era.....	54
Ploy 5: Some teach heresy that the dogmas regarding slavery evolved	54
Ploy 6: They contradict themselves by teaching the dogma in one place then denying it in another	56
<i>The heretics are not fit to judge which kinds of slavery are just or unjust.....</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>Apostate Antipope Paul III, Sublimus Dei, 1549.....</i>	<i>58</i>
<i>Apostate Antipope Leo III, In Plurimus, 1888.....</i>	<i>60</i>
His willful ambiguity and wilful contradictions.....	60
His heresy that slavery, at least during the New Covenant era, is intrinsically sinful.....	60
His heresies that Christ's redemption benefited all men and that this earth is or should be a paradise	63
He takes a teaching from Pope St. Gregory I out of context	67

Introduction

What follows is the section of slavery contained in the Profession of Faith for the Days of the Great Apostasy, composed by myself:

1. Slavery (which includes making slaves of several generations of men, women, and children) is not intrinsically evil and hence there are just reasons for slavery. God uses either his faithful chosen people or even unbelievers to justly enslave people. For example,

God ordained that his faithful chosen people should have slaves: *“Let your bondmen and your bondwomen [slaves] be of the nations that are round about you. And of the strangers that sojourn among you or that were born of them in your land, these you shall have for slaves.”* (Lev. 25:44-45)

But God has also ordained many times that his obstinately sinful chosen people be made slaves by unbelievers for many generations, such when they were enslaved by the Egyptians, Syrians, Babylonians, and Persians.

St. Peter says, *“Slaves, be subject to your masters with all fear.”* (1 Pt. 2:2:18) St. Paul likewise says, *“Slaves, obey in all things your masters.”* (Col. 3:22)

And St. Paul even condones Catholics owning Catholic slaves: *Whosoever are slaves under the yoke, let them count their masters worthy of all honour lest the name of the Lord and his doctrine be blasphemed. But they that have believing masters, let them not despise them because they are brethren; but serve them the rather because they are faithful and beloved who are partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort.”* (1 Tim. 6:1-2)

2. One of God’s punishments is that he ordains that children be separated from one or more of their parents against the will of their parents when either one or both of the parents are taken into slavery but not the children or when the whole family is taken into slavery and the children are separated from one or both of their children. For example,

One of the curses God promised would come upon the Israelites if they did not obey his commandments is as follows: *“But if thou wilt not hear the voice of the Lord thy God, to keep and to do all his commandments and ceremonies, which I command thee this day, all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee... May thy sons and thy daughters be given to another people, thy eyes looking on and languishing at the sight of them all the day, and may there be no strength in thy hand.”* (Deut. 28:15, 32)

And the Word of God also says, *“Thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I also will forget thy children.”* (Osee 4:6) *“Let his children be carried about vagabonds, and beg; and let them be cast out of their dwellings.”* (Ps. 108:10)

Many Israelite children were forcefully separated from their parents during the Babylonian exile, which God ordained. For example, Daniel and the three other Hebrew children were made slaves and separated from their parents against the will of their parents: *“And the king spoke to Asphenez the master of the eunuchs, that he should bring in some of the children of Israel, and of the king’s seed and of the princes, children in whom there was no blemish... And the king appointed them a daily provision, of his own meat, and of the wine of which he drank himself, that being nourished three years, afterwards they might stand before the king. Now there was among them of the children of Juda, Daniel, Ananias, Misael, and Azarias. And the master of the eunuchs gave them names: to Daniel, Baltassar: to Ananias, Sidrach: to Misael, Misach: and to Azarias, Abdenago.”* (Dan. 1:3-7)

Esther was forcefully separated from her foster father, Mardochai, and brought into the harem of the pagan king of Persia. (See Esther, Chapter 2)

One punishment from God is to forcefully separate women from their husbands and children: *“Therefore will I give their women to strangers.”* (Jer. 8:10)

And death is a worse punishment than slavery in which God ordains that even evil children be put to death. Regarding the Babylonians, the Prophet Isaias says, *“Their infants shall be dashed in pieces before their eyes...”* (Isa. 13:16) And King David says, *“Blessed be he that shall take and dash thy little ones against the rock.”* (Ps. 136:9)

3. Slavery that is ordained by God to punish and humble the wicked or to try the righteous is good slavery, but slavery that is not ordained by God is evil and thus sinful slavery.
4. Slaves must be treated justly, and thus the unjust treatment of slaves is sinful. Hence slaves must be punished not more or less severely than they deserve. And slaves must never be immorally abused.

For example, if a slave is not killed for a crime worthy of death, then this is unjust treatment of the slave because he deserves death. However, if a slave is put to death for a crime not worthy of death, then this is murder and unjust treatment of the slave: *“Torture and fetters are for a malicious slave... And if he be not obedient, bring him down with fetters, but be not excessive towards any one; and do no grievous thing without judgment. If thou have a faithful slave, let him be to thee as thy own soul; treat him as a brother because in the blood of thy soul thou hast gotten him.”* (Ecclus. 33:28-31) *“Hurt not the slave that worketh faithfully nor the hired man that giveth thee his life. Let a wise slave be dear to thee as thy own soul, defraud him not of liberty nor leave him needy.”* (Eccus. 7:22-23)

What follows are examples of unjust treatment (cruelty) in a justified war and unjust slavery: *“And the children of Israel carried away of their brethren two hundred thousand women, boys, and girls, and an immense booty; and they brought it to Samaria. At that time there was a prophet of the Lord there whose name was Oded, and he went out to meet the army that came to Samaria and said to them: Behold the Lord the God of your fathers being angry with Juda, hath delivered them into your hands and you have butchered them cruelly so that your cruelty hath reached up to heaven. Moreover you have a mind to keep under the children of Juda and Jerusalem for your bondmen and bondwomen, which ought not to be done, for you have sinned in this against the Lord your God. But hear ye my counsel and release the captives that you have brought of your brethren because a great indignation of the Lord hangeth over you.”* (2 Par. 28:8-11)

Beware, then, of the heretics who believe that physical slavery is intrinsically sinful either for both the Old and New Testament eras or intrinsically sinful only during the New Testament era. And beware of the heretics who believe that no slaves should ever be punished or at least severely punished. And beware of the heretics who believe that it is intrinsically sinful to forcefully removed children from their parents.

The only allowable opinions regarding slavery are what kinds of slavery or treatments of slaves under particular circumstances are just or unjust. And in many cases, men may not know for certain when slavery or the treatment of slaves is just or unjust until the General Judgment.¹

Old Testament

“And he [God] said, Cursed be the servant Chanaan, a slave shall he be to his brethren. And he said: Blessed be the Lord God of Sem, be Chanaan his bond-

¹ See in this book “The heretics are not fit to judge which kinds of slavery are just or unjust,” p. [54](#).

servant. May God enlarge Japheth, and may he dwell in the tents of Sem, and Chanaan be his slave.” (Gen. 9:25-27)

“If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve thee; in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. With what raiment he came in, with the like let him go out; if having a wife, his wife also shall go out with him. But if his master gave him a wife, and she hath borne sons and daughters, the woman and her children shall be her master’s; but he himself shall go out with his raiment. And if the servant shall say: I love my master and my wife and children, I will not go out free. His master shall bring him before the judgment seat of God, and he shall be set to the door and the posts, and he shall bore his ear through with an awl: and he shall be his servant forever.” (Ex. 21:2-6)

“He that striketh his bondman or bondwoman with a rod, and they die under his hands, shall be guilty of the crime. But if the party remain alive a day or two, he shall not be subject to the punishment, because it is his money.” (Ex. 21:20-21)

“Let your bondmen, and your bondwomen, be of the nations that are round about you. And of the strangers that sojourn among you, or that were born of them in your land, let them be to you for a possession.” (Lev. 25:44-45)

But God has also ordained many times that his obstinately sinful chosen people be made slaves by unbelievers for many generations, such when they were enslaved by the Egyptians, Syrians, Babylonians, and Persians.

New Testament

Jesus says,

“Who, thinkest thou, is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath appointed over his family, to give them meat in season. Blessed is that servant, whom when his lord shall come he shall find so doing.” (Mt. 24:45-46)

“But which of you having a servant ploughing or feeding cattle, will say to him, when he is come from the field: Immediately go, sit down to meat. And will not rather say to him: Make ready my supper and gird thyself and serve me whilst I eat and drink and afterwards thou shalt eat and drink? Doth he thank that servant for doing the things which he commanded him? I think not.” (Lk. 17:7-10)

St. Peter says,

“Slaves, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle but also to the froward. For this is thankworthy, if for conscience towards God, a man endure sorrows, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it, if committing sin, and being buffeted for it, you endure? But if doing well you suffer patiently; this is thankworthy before God.” (1 Pt. 2:18-20)

St. Paul likewise says,

“Slaves, obey in all things your masters.” (Col. 3:22)

“Slaves, be obedient to them that are your lords according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in the simplicity of your heart, as to Christ:” (Eph. 6:5)

“Exhort slaves to be obedient to their masters, in all things pleasing, not gainsaying: Not defrauding, but in all things shewing good fidelity, that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things:” (Titus 2:9-10)

“For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we are bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.” (1 Cr. 12:13)

And St. Paul even condones Catholics owning Catholic slaves:

“Whosoever are slaves under the yoke, let them count their masters worthy of all honour lest the name of the Lord and his doctrine be blasphemed. But they that have believing masters, let them not despise them because they are brethren; but serve them the rather because they are faithful and beloved who are partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to the sound words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to that doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but sick about questions and strifes of words; from which arise envies, contentions, blasphemies, evil suspicions, conflicts of men corrupted in mind, and who are destitute of the truth.” (1 Tim. 6:1-5)

Councils, Canons, and other Laws

For more information, see in this book, “Article on Slavery by Frederik Pijper,” [25](#).

Apostolic Constitutions, 1st to 4th centuries:

Apostolic Constitutions, 1st to 4th centuries:

“[Book 4, Section 2] XII. But as to servants, what can we say more than that the slave bring a good will to his master, with the fear of God, although he be impious and wicked, but yet not to yield any compliance as to his worship? And let the master love his servant, although he be his superior. Let him consider wherein they are equal, even as he is a man. And let him that has a believing master love him both as his master, and as of the same faith, and as a father, but still with the preservation of his authority as his master: ‘not as an eye-servant, but as a lover of his master; as knowing that God will recompense to him for his subjection.’ In like manner, let a master who has a believing servant love him as a son or as a brother, on account of their communion in the faith, but still preserving the difference of a servant.

“[Book 8, Section 4] XXXII. I also, Paul, the least of the apostles, do make the following constitutions for you, the bishops, and presbyters, and deacons, concerning canons. Those that first come to the mystery of godliness, let them be brought to the bishop or to the presbyters by the deacons. Let them be examined as to the causes wherefore they come to the word of the Lord; and let those that bring them exactly inquire about their character, and give them their testimony. Let their manners and their life be inquired into, and whether they be slaves or freemen. And if any one be a slave, let him be asked who is his master. If he be slave to one of the faithful, let his master be asked if he can give him a good character. If he cannot, let him be rejected, until he show himself to be worthy to his master... XXXIV. ...Let Christians, whether men or women, who have connections [sexual relations] with slaves, either leave them off, or let them be rejected.”

Ancient Epitome of Canons

Ancient Epitome of Canons, Canon 3: “Anathema to him who persuades a slave to leave his master under pretence of religion.”

These texts are likewise cited by Balsamon and Zonaras. This Canon is found in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, Gratian's *Decretum*, Pars. II., Causa XVII., Q. IV., c. xxxvii; in the version of Isidore, and again in c. xxxviii. from the collections of Martin Bracaraensis (so says Van Espen) and assigned to a Council of Pope Martin, Canon xlvii.

Council of Gangra, 340

Council of Gangra, 325: "Canon 3. IF any one shall teach a slave, under pretext of piety, to despise his master and to run away from his service and not to serve his own master with good-will and all honour, let him be anathema."

Council of Chalcedon, 451 and thus Pope St. Leo the Great

Council of Chalcedon, 451, confirmed by Pope St. Leo the Great: "Canon 4. ...No slave is to be taken into the monasteries to become a monk against the will of his own master. We have decreed that anyone who transgresses this decision of ours is to be excommunicated, lest God's name be blasphemed..."

Council of Epaon, 517

Council of Epaon, in Burgundy, 517: "34. If anyone has killed his slave without permission of the judge, he must be excommunicated for two years."

Ninth Council of Toledo, 655

In an attempt to persuade priests to remain celibate, the *Ninth Council of Toledo* ruled that all children of clerics were to be automatically enslaved. This ruling was later incorporated into the canon law of the church.

Council of Chalons, 813:

Council of Chalons, 813: "The indisputable truth is that persons of different classes, such as nobles, freemen, slaves, bondmen, tenants, and the like, belong to the Church. Therefore, it is fitting that all, clerics as well as laymen, who are placed over others should treat them with consideration and mercy, not only in the demanding of statute labor and taxes, but also in the collecting of debts. For they must not forget that these are their brethren, that they both have one God and Father, to whom they pray: 'Our Father Who art in Heaven ' and a single holy mother, the Church."²

Council of Melfi, 1089

The *Council of Melfi*, 1089, under Pope Urban II, imposed slavery on the wives of priests."

² Synod of Chalons (813), c.. 5I, in Mansi, XIV. 104.

Church Fathers and Other Catholics

St. Irenaeus, 2nd century

St. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, inter. 180-199: “1. All things therefore are of one and the same substance, that is, from one and the same God; as also the Lord says to the disciples “Therefore every scribe, which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old.” He did not teach that he who brought forth the old was one, and he that brought forth the new, another; but that they were one and the same. For the Lord is the good man of the house, who rules the entire house of his Father; and who delivers a law suited both for slaves and those who are as yet undisciplined; and gives fitting precepts to those that are free, and have been justified by faith, as well as throws His own inheritance open to those that are sons...³

“3. ...Christ should raise up sons of God, both from freemen and from slaves after the flesh, bestowing upon all, in the same manner, the gift of the Spirit, who vivifies us.⁴”

Beware of heretics who hold the heresy that physical slavery is intrinsically evil at least during the New Covenant era and defend their heresy by taking the following quotes from St. Irenaeus out of context. Firstly, the quotes are from the same book in which St. Irenaeus upholds the dogma regarding justified slavery during the New Covenant era; and thus if he were teaching that physical slavery during the New Covenant era is intrinsically evil, then he would be contradicting his teaching in the same book that justified physical slavery during the New Covenant era is good and thus not evil.

The trick the heretics use is to make the reader believe that St. Irenaeus is speaking of physical slavery when he is actually speaking of spiritual slavery, the slavery to the Devil men are under because of sin.

Hence St. Irenaeus is speaking of spiritual slavery, the slavery that even the Old Testament elect were under until Christ redeemed them and set them free so that they could have their forgiven sins remitted and enter heaven.

St. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, inter. 180-199: Book 4, Chapter 13:

“(2) For the law [Old Covenant], since it was laid down for those in bondage [spiritual], used to instruct the soul by means of those corporeal objects which were of an external nature, drawing it, as by a bond, to obey its commandments, that man might learn to serve God. But the Word [as preached in the New Covenant] set free the soul, and taught that through it the body should be willingly purified. Which having been accomplished, it followed as of course, that the bonds of [spiritual] slavery should be removed, to which man had now become accustomed, and that he should follow God without fetters [because their sins were remitted and thus not longer fettered by the Devil].”

He then goes on to say that just because Christ has made men free does not mean that men, including slaves, must not obey their rulers and masters but instead should obey them all the more.

Ibid: “moreover, that the laws of liberty should be extended, and subjection to the king increased, so that no one who is converted should appear unworthy to him who set him free [from spiritual bondage], but that the piety and obedience due to the

³ b. 4, c. 9.

⁴ b. 4, c. 21.

Master of the household should be equally rendered both by servants [slaves] and children: while the children possess greater confidence [than the slaves], inasmuch as the working of liberty is greater and more glorious than that obedience which is rendered in slavery'.”

Hence he teaches that the obedience that freemen give to their parents or other rulers is greater than the obedience slaves give to their masters. He does on to say,

“(3) ...For He did not set us free [from spiritual slavery] for this purpose that we should depart from him (no one, indeed, while placed out of reach of the Lord's benefits, has power to procure for himself the means of salvation), but that the more we receive his grace, the more we should love him...”

“(4) Inasmuch, then, as all natural precepts are common to us and to them (the Jews), they had in them indeed the beginning and origin; but in us they have received growth and completion. For to yield assent to God, and to follow his Word, and to love Him above all, and one's neighbour as one's self (now man is neighbour to man), and to abstain from every evil deed, and all other things of a like nature which are common to both [covenants], do reveal one and the same God. But this is our Lord, the Word of God, who in the first instance certainly drew [spiritual] slaves to God, but afterwards he set those free who were subject to him, as he does himself declare to his disciples:

‘I will not now call you servants [spiritual slaves], for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth; but I have called you friends, for all things which I have heard from My Father I have made known.’

For in that which he says,

‘I will not now call you servants.’ ”

Hence Jesus is clearly saying that his disciples and other believers were servants (slaves) before he set them free. And we know that they were not in physical bondage and thus St. Irenaeus is speaking of spiritual bondage, spiritual slavery. The very next sentence also verifies this:

Ibid: “He indicates in the most marked manner that it was himself who did originally appoint for men that [spiritual] bondage with respect to God through the law [Old Covenant], and then afterwards conferred upon them [spiritual] freedom [under the New Covenant]. And in that he says, ‘For the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth,’ he points out, by means of His own advent, the ignorance of a people in a servile condition [spiritual slavery].

And the other quote you sent me from St. Irenaeus teaches that same thing:

St. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, Book 4, Chapter 36: “2. Whom these men did therefore preach to the unbelievers as Lord, him did Christ teach to those who obey Him; and the God who had called those of the former dispensation [under the Old Covenant], is the same as he who has received those of the latter. In other words, he who at first used that law [the Old Covenant] which entails [spiritual] bondage, is also he who did in after times [call His people] by means of adoption.”

Surely, St. Irenaeus is not teaching that everyone who was under the Old Covenant was in physical bondage! So what bondage were they under, as spoken of by St. Irenaeus? Spiritual bondage, spiritual slavery to Satan because their sins could not be remitted under the Old Covenant.

St. Augustine, 4th and 5th centuries

St. Augustine, *City of God*, 413: “This is prescribed by the order of nature: it is thus that God has created man. For ‘let them,’ He says, ‘have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every creeping thing which creepeth on the earth.’ He did not intend that his rational creature, who was made in his image, should have dominion over anything but the irrational creation—not man over man, but man over the beasts. And hence the righteous men in primitive times were made shepherds of cattle rather than kings of men, God intending thus to teach us what the relative position of the creatures is, and what the desert of sin; for it is with justice, we believe, that the condition of slavery is the result of sin. And this is why we do not find the word ‘slave’ in any part of Scripture until righteous Noah branded the sin of his son with this name. It is a name, therefore, introduced by sin and not by nature. The origin of the Latin word for slave is supposed to be found in the circumstance that those who by the law of war were liable to be killed were sometimes preserved by their victors, and were hence called servants. And these circumstances could never have arisen save through sin. For even when we wage a just war, our adversaries must be sinning; and every victory, even though gained by wicked men, is a result of the first judgment of God, who humbles the vanquished either for the sake of removing or of punishing their sins. Witness that man of God, Daniel, who, when he was in captivity, confessed to God his own sins and the sins of his people, and declares with pious grief that these were the cause of the captivity. The prime cause, then, of slavery is sin, which brings man under the dominion of his fellow; that which does not happen save by the judgment of God, with whom is no unrighteousness, and who knows how to award fit punishments to every variety of offence. But our Master in heaven says, ‘Every one who doeth sin is the servant of sin.’ And thus there are many wicked masters who have religious men as their slaves, and who are yet themselves in bondage; ‘for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage.’ And beyond question it is a happier thing to be the slave of a man than of a lust; for even this very lust of ruling, to mention no others, lays waste men's hearts with the most ruthless dominion. Moreover, when men are subjected to one another in a peaceful order, the lowly position does as much good to the servant as the proud position does harm to the master. But by nature, as God first created us, no one is the slave either of man or of sin. This servitude is, however, penal, and is appointed by that law which enjoins the preservation of the natural order and forbids its disturbance; for if nothing had been done in violation of that law, there would have been nothing to restrain by penal servitude. And therefore the apostle admonishes slaves to be subject to their masters, and to serve them heartily and with good-will, so that, if they cannot be freed by their masters, they may themselves make their slavery in some sort free, by serving not in crafty fear, but in faithful love, until all unrighteousness pass away, and all principality and every human power be brought to nothing, and God be all in all.”⁵

St. Augustine, Letters, Letter 24, to Eustochius , early 420s: “1. ...Therefore, since the Apostle commanded that legal disputes in this world, if they take place among Christians, be settled not in court but in church, there is a necessity for us to put up with wrangling over such issues. There even earthly judgments are sought from us, especially concerning the temporal lot of men, because we are able, according to the apostolic discipline, to command slaves to be subject to their masters, but not to impose the yoke of slavery on free men. With this in mind, I ask your most pure charity to be so kind as to instruct me what is to be observed concerning those who are born of a free woman and a male slave. For I am already aware that those born of a slave girl and a free man are slaves.”

⁵ b.19, c. 15.

While condoning slavery, St. Augustine teaches that he does not condone treating slaves as material objects such as animals or gold:

St. Augustine, *Sermon on the Mount*, 393-394: “59. ...For, if this command is given with reference to something necessary, how much more does it behoove us to have no care for what is superfluous? However, those things which I have called ‘our own’ are to be confined to that category of goods to which the Lord himself confines the injunction, when He says: ‘anyone who wishes to go to law with thee and to take thy tunic.’ Consequently, let those goods be understood as the things which can be the object of a lawsuit against us, for the purpose of having them pass from our ownership to the ownership of the one who goes to law with us, or the one on whose behalf the lawsuit is entered. Such goods would be clothing, a house, landed property, a beast of burden, and all kinds of property in general.

“But, it is very doubtful whether the injunction is to be understood as applying to slaves as well; for it does not befit a Christian to possess a slave in the same way as he would possess a horse or money, even though it may happen that a horse and to far greater degree, an object of gold or silver is valued at a higher price than a slave. Moreover, if a slave is receiving from you, his master, a better moral training or a guidance more correct and better adapted to the worship of God than can be given him by the man who wishes to take him away, I doubt whether anyone would venture to say that this slave like a garment ought to receive no consideration.”

In the following quote, St. Augustine teaches that believers who own slaves should treat them equally to their family members in regards to their spiritual well being, as they all have souls that can be saved:

St. Augustine, *City of God*, 413: “And therefore, although our righteous fathers had slaves and administered their domestic affairs so as to distinguish between the condition of slaves and the heirship of sons in regard to the blessings of this life, yet in regard to the worship of God, in whom we hope for eternal blessings, they took an equally loving oversight of all the members of their household. And this is so much in accordance with the natural order, that the head of the household was called paterfamilias; and this name has been so generally accepted, that even those whose rule is unrighteous are glad to apply it to themselves. But those who are true fathers of their households desire and endeavor that all the members of their household, equally with their own children, should worship and win God, and should come to that heavenly home in which the duty of ruling men is no longer necessary, because the duty of caring for their everlasting happiness has also ceased; but, until they reach that home, masters ought to feel their position of authority a greater burden than servants their service.”⁶

Beware, then, of heretics who deny one or more dogmas regarding slavery and take the following quote from St. Augustine out of context to defend their heresies that either all slavery is evil or it is evil to sell children as slaves or it is evil to buy and sell slaves. The quote is from St. Augustine’s letter to Alypius, bishop of Thagaste, in c. 422. What follows is an introduction to the letter by Robert Eno who translated the letter:

Robert B. Eno, S.S., *Saint Augustine, Letters Volume VI (1-29)*, Published by The Catholic University of America Press, Wash. DC., 1985. Introduction to Letter 10, to Alypius, Bishop of Thagaste, c. 422:

“This incident in Hippo was very unusual. It is almost always held that Christian antiquity simply took slavery for granted as a social institution. While it might be possible to lighten the burden of the slaves, there was to be no abolitionist movement among the fathers of the Church. Indeed some have suggested that Christianity made the fate of slaves worse by stressing the need for slaves who were

⁶ b. 19, c. 16.

Christians to be good and exemplary slaves, obedient to their masters. Even here Augustine is not so much attacking slavery in itself but the reduction of men, women and children, who were supposed to be free, to the de facto state of being slaves.”

It is clear as daylight that this letter of St. Augustine does not condemn slavery but only unjust slavery. In Hippo, they were making men slaves contrary to Roman law with the added problem of depopulating Hippo. They were making freemen slaves whom they had to right to make slaves according to Roman law. And, contrary to Roman Law, they were making children slaves who were not sold as such by their parents. Conversely, the quote condones slavery in cases in which Roman Law allows, which included parents selling their children into slavery.⁷

St. Augustine, Letters, Volume 6, Letter 10, to Alypius, Bishop of Thagaste c. 422:

“(2)... There are so many of those in Africa who are commonly called ‘slave dealers’, that they seem to be draining Africa of much of its human population and transferring their ‘merchandise’ to the provinces across the sea. Almost all of these are free persons. Only a few are found to have been sold by their parents and these people buy them, not as Roman laws permits, as indentured servants for a period of twenty-five years, but in fact they buy them as slaves and sell them across the sea as slaves. True slaves are sold by their masters only rarely. [Hence he condones slavery] Now from this bunch of merchants has grown up a multitude of pillaging and corrupting ‘dealers’ so that in herds, shouting, in frightening military or barbarian attire they invade sparsely populated and remote rural areas and they violently carry off those whom they would sell to these merchants...

“3. ...I don't in the least believe that this evil that goes on in Africa is entirely unknown where you are. It was infinitely less serious earlier when the emperor Honorius sent a decree to the prefect Hadrian, repressing traffic of this sort, [Hence slavery is allowed of another sort] sentencing such wicked ‘businessmen’ to be flogged with leaden thongs, proscribed, and sent into perpetual exile...

“4. ...And it is necessary in order to constrain these same people that this law be promulgated, lest we, being afraid of the consequences, hold back, and unfortunate free persons continue to be carried off into perpetual servitude...”

In the following quote, St. Augustine teaches that these traders were not selling animals but human beings who were citizens of Rome and thus not barbarians. And they were making them slaves contrary to Roman law. For example, some were stealing men and making them slaves, the penalty of which is death: “He that shall steal a man and sell him, being convicted of the guilt, shall be put to death.” (Ex. 21:16)

“(5) Whatever authorities or offices have responsibility for this law, or for whatever law may be made on this matter, it is up to them to see to it that it is enforced in order that Africa will cease being emptied of its native inhabitants and that in large groups, like a never ending stream, a great multitude of people of both sexes will no longer lose their freedom in a form of captivity worse than that experienced among the barbarians... But who resists these traders who are found everywhere, who traffick, not in animals but in human beings, not in barbarians but in Romans from the provinces?”

He then goes on to give some example of unjust slavery:

“(6) No one can state satisfactorily how many fall into this same nefarious business because of the incredible blindness of greed and some kind of infection by this

⁷ That is not to say that it is intrinsically sinful for children to be taken forcefully into slavery against the will of their parents if the law allows it. And this is one of the worst kinds of slavery that God condones for those who are worthy of it. (See in this book “Introduction,” p. 7, Point 2.)

disease. Who would believe, for instance, that there is a woman among us here in Hippo who, as a matter of course, lures women from Gidda under the pretext of buying wood and then confines, beats and sells them? Who would believe that one of the church's tenant farmers, apparently a good man, would sell his wife, the mother of his sons, not because of any fault on her part [RJMI: hence by a certain fault of her own she may be sold into slavery], but stirred solely by this feverish pestilence? A young man, scarcely twenty, an intelligent fellow, who kept the accounts for our monastery, was led astray and sold; only with the greatest difficulty was the church able to procure his freedom.”

“(7) ... There was not lacking a faithful Christian who, knowing our custom in missions of mercy of this kind, made this known to the church. Immediately, partially from the ship in which they had already been loaded, partially from the spot where they had been hidden prior to boarding. About 120 were freed by our people, though I myself was absent. Scarcely five or six were found to have been sold by their parents [RJMI: These were true slaves]; of all the others [false slaves who were thus taken unjustly into slavery], hardly a person could keep himself from tears on hearing all the various ways by which they were brought to the Galatians by trickery or kidnapping.

“(8) Your Holy Prudence can imagine how much similar trafficking in unfortunate souls goes on in other coastal areas, if at Hippo Regius, where in God's mercy the great vigilance of the church is on the watch so that poor people can be freed from captivity of this **sort**... [Hence slavery of another sort is justified]”

St. Augustine's other teachings on slavery, as quoted above, also uphold the dogmas regarding justified slavery.

Raherius of Verona, 10th century

Ratherius, *Praeloquia*, 10th century: “Art thou slave? Let it not grieve thee. If thou hast served thy master faithfully, thou shalt be a freedman of God, the Lord of us all, for in Christ are we all brethren. Hear what the Apostle says (i Pet., ii, i8): ‘Servants be subject to your masters with all fear’. Both God and your earthly masters ye can fear in two ways, first with the fear of blows, scourging and imprisonment, and the eternal fire, since whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God’ (Rom., xiii, 2). But of this first fear it is said that love casteth it out. The other fear is of a purer kind and endures eternally. It is the fear of indolence and idleness, the fear of the loss of that glory which awaits those who labor vigorously. If now thou hast stolen hours from thy master, return them to thy Creator [i. e., in the form of alms, etc.]. And do not think that thou art slave accidentally and without the will of divine providence. Hear what Isidore says: ‘Because of the first man's sin, slavery was imposed by God on mankind as a punishment in such a way that he mercifully destined those to slavery for whom he saw that freedom would not be fitting.’ Though this be a result of original sin, still God has determined the lot of all men with perfect justice, in making one a slave and another a master, in order that the slave's opportunity of doing evil may be limited by the power of the master.”⁸

⁸ 1. i., tit. 14; in Martene, *Veteres Scriptores*, IX, 81, 812 ff.

Popes

Pope St. Leo the Great

Pope Leo the Great, *Sermon XL*, On Lent, II: “V. And still further it should lead to personal amendment and domestic harmony. But, beloved, in this opportunity for the virtues exercise there are also other notable crowns, to be won by no dispersing abroad of granaries, by no disbursement of money, if wantonness is repelled, if drunkenness is abandoned, and the lusts of the flesh tamed by the laws of chastity: if hatreds pass into affection, if enmities be turned into peace, if meekness extinguishes wrath, if gentleness forgives wrongs, if in fine the conduct of master and of slaves is so well ordered that the rule of the one is milder, and the discipline of the other is more complete. It is by such observances then, dearly-beloved, that God's mercy will be gained, the charge of sin wiped out, and the adorable Easter festival devoutly kept.”

Pope St. Leo the Great, *Council of Chalcedon*, 451: “Canon 4. ...No slave is to be taken into the monasteries to become a monk against the will of his own master. We have decreed that anyone who transgresses this decision of ours is to be excommunicated, lest God's name be blasphemed...”

Pope St. Gregory I

In his Pastoral Rule, Pope St. Gregory I upheld the dogma of justified slavery:

Pope St. Gregory I, *The Book of Pastoral Rule*, 7th century: “Differently to be admonished are servants and masters. Servants, to wit, that they ever keep in view the humility of their condition; but masters, that they lose not recollection of their nature, in which they are constituted on an equality with servants. Servants are to be admonished that they despise not their masters, lest they offend God, if by behaving themselves proudly they gainsay his ordinance; masters, too, are to be admonished, that they are proud against God with respect to his gift, if they acknowledge not those whom they hold in subjection by reason of their condition to be their equals by reason of their community of nature. The former are to be admonished to know themselves to be servants of masters; the latter are to be admonished to acknowledge themselves to be fellow-servants of servants. For to those it is said, ‘Servants, obey your masters according to the flesh’ (Col. 3:22); and again, ‘Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their masters worthy of all honour’ (1 Tim. 6:1); but to these it is said, ‘And ye, masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening, knowing that both their and your Master is in heaven’ (Eph. 6:9).”⁹

Pope St. Gregory also upheld the law of mercy in which certain slaves, depending on their dispositions, should be set free, as in the following letter he records his setting two slaves free.

Pope St. Gregory I, *Letters*, Letter to Montana and Thomas, 4th or 5th century: “Since our Redeemer, the Maker of every creature, vouchsafed to assume human flesh for this end, that, the chain of [spiritual] slavery wherewith we were held being broken by the grace of His Divinity, he might restore us to pristine liberty, it is a salutary deed if men whom nature originally produced free, and whom the law of nations has subjected to the yoke of slavery, be restored by the benefit of manumission to the liberty in which they were born. And so, moved by loving-kindness and by consideration of this case, we make you, Montana and Thomas,

⁹ p. 3, c. 5.

servants of the holy Roman Church which with the help of God we serve, free from this day, and Roman citizens, and we release to you all your private property.

[RJMI: This proves that up until the point they were slaves, in physical bondage, of the holy Roman Church.]

“And, inasmuch as thou, Montana, declarest that thou hast applied thy mind to monastic profession, we therefore this day give and grant to thee two unciae, which the presbyter Gaudiosus by the disposition of his last will is known to have left to thee in the way of institution[5], provided that all go in all respects to the advantage of the monastery of Saint Laurence, over which the abbess Constantina presides, and in which by the mercy of God thou art about to make profession. But, if it should appear that thou hast in any way concealed any part of the property left by the above-written Gaudiosus, the whole of this must undoubtedly be transferred to the possession of our Church.

“Moreover to thee, Thomas above-written, whom for enhancement of thy freedom we desire also to serve among the notaries, we in like manner this day give and grant by this writ of manumission the five unciae which the aforesaid presbyter Gaudiosus by his last will left to thee under the title of inheritance, together with the dowry which he had bestowed upon thy mother; to wit with this annexed law and condition, that, in case of thy dying without legitimate children, that is children born in lawful wedlock, all that we have granted thee shall revert without any diminution to the possession of the holy Roman Church. But, if thou shouldst have children both in wedlock, as we have said, and recognized by the law, and shouldst leave them surviving thee, then we appoint thee to remain master of this same property without any condition, and give thee full power to make a will with respect to it. These things, then, which we have appointed and granted by this charter of manumission, know ye that we and our successors will observe without any demur. For the rule of justice and reason suggests that one who desires his own orders to be observed by his successors should undoubtedly keep to the will and ordinances Of his predecessor. This writ of manumission we have dictated to the notary Paterius to be put in writing, and for the fullest security have subscribed it with our own hand, together with three chief presbyters and three deacons, and have delivered it to you. Done in the city of Rome.”¹⁰

Beware of the heretics who take the above quote out of context to make it seem that Pope St. Gregory I believed that all slaves must be set free and thus he did not uphold the dogma on justified slavery. Those who do so omit his teaching on justified slavery in his Pastoral Rule, as quoted above.

Pope Martin I

A Council under Pope Martin I, 7th century: Canon 47: “Anathema to him who persuades a slave to leave his master under pretence of religion.”

This Canon is found in the Corpus Juris Canonici, Gratian's Decretum, Pars. II., Causa XVII., Q. IV., c. xxxvii; in the version of Isidore, and again in c. xxxvii. from the collections of Martin Bracarenensis (so says Van Espen) and assigned to a Council of Pope Martin, Canon xlvi.

¹⁰ b. 6, let. 12.

Nominal Catholic sources

Apostate Basil of Cesarea

Apostate Basil of Cesarea, *On the Holy Spirit*, 4th century: “51. He is not a slave, it is said; not a master, but free. Oh the terrible insensibility, the pitiable audacity, of them that maintain this! Shall I rather lament in them their ignorance or their blasphemy? They try to insult the doctrines that concern the divine nature by comparing them with the human, and endeavour to apply to the ineffable nature of God that common custom of human life whereby the difference of degrees is variable, not perceiving that among men no one is a slave by nature. For men are either brought under a yoke of slavery by conquest, as when prisoners are taken in war; or they are enslaved on account of poverty, as the Egyptians were oppressed by Pharaoh; or, by a wise and mysterious dispensation, the worst children are by their fathers’ order condemned to serve the wiser and the better; and this any righteous enquirer into the circumstances would declare to be not a sentence of condemnation but a benefit. For it is more profitable that the man who, through lack of intelligence, has no natural principle of rule within himself, should become the chattel of another, to the end that, being guided by the reason of his master, he may be like a chariot with a charioteer, or a boat with a steersman seated at the tiller. For this reason Jacob by his father’s blessing became lord of Esau, in order that the foolish son, who had not intelligence, his proper guardian, might, even though he wished it not, be benefited by his prudent brother. So Canaan shall be ‘a servant unto his brethren’ because, since his father Ham was unwise, he was uninstructed in virtue. In this world, then, it is thus that men are made slaves, but they who have escaped poverty or war, or do not require the tutelage of others, are free. It follows that even though one man be called master and another servant, nevertheless, both in view of our mutual equality of rank and as chattels of our Creator, we are all fellow slaves. But in that other world what can you bring out of bondage? For no sooner were they created than bondage was commenced. The heavenly bodies...are unmoved by ambition, but all bow down to God, and render to him alike the awe which is due to him as Master and the glower which fails to him as Creator. For ‘a son honoureth his father and a servant his master,’ and from all God asks one of these two things; for ‘if I then be a Father where is my honour? and if I be a Master where is my fear?’ Otherwise the life of all men, if it were not under the oversight of a master, would be most pitiable; as is the condition of the apostate powers who, because they stiffen their neck against God Almighty, fling off the reins of their bondage, not that their natural constitution is different but the cause is in their disobedient disposition to their Creator. Whom then do you call free? Him who has no King? Him who has neither power to rule another nor willingness to be ruled? Among all existent beings no such nature is to be found. To entertain such a conception of the Spirit is obvious blasphemy. If he is a creature of course he serves with all the rest, for ‘all things,’ it is said ‘are thy servants,’ but if he is above Creation, then he shares in royalty.”¹¹

Heretic John Chrysostom

Heretic John Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Timothy*, 4th or 5th century, Homily 16” “Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their masters worthy of all honor, (1 Tim. 6:1) that the Name of God and His doctrine be not blasphemed.’ Let them count them ‘worthy of all honor,’ he says; for do not suppose, because thou art

¹¹ c. 20.

a believer, that thou art therefore a free man: since thy freedom is to serve the more faithfully. For if the unbeliever sees slaves conducting themselves insolently on account of their faith, he will blaspheme, as if the Doctrine produced insubordination. But when he sees them obedient, he will be more inclined to believe, and will the rather attend to our words. But God, and the Gospel we preach, will be blasphemed, if they are disobedient. But what if their own master be an unbeliever? Even in that case they ought to submit, for God's Name's sake.

“And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them because they are brethren, but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved partakers of the benefit.’ (1 Tim. 6:2) As though he had said, If ye are thought worthy of so great a benefit, as to have your masters for your brethren, on this account ye ought more especially to submit...

“Masters contribute greater benefits to their servants, than servants to their masters. For the former furnish the money to purchase for them sufficient food and clothing; and bestow much care upon them in other respects, so that the masters pay them the larger service, which is here intimated, when he says, ‘they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. They suffer much toil and trouble for your repose, ought they not in return to receive much honor from their servants?’

Heretic John Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Corinthians*, c. 397, Homily 19: “Let each man abide in that calling wherein he was called... Hast thou been called, having an unbelieving wife? Continue to have her. Cast not out thy wife for the faith's sake. Hast thou been called, being a slave? Care not for it. Continue to be a slave. Hast thou been called, being in uncircumcision? Remain uncircumcised. Being circumcised, didst thou become a believer? Continue circumcised. For this is the meaning of, ‘As God hath distributed unto each man.’ For these are no hindrances to piety. Thou art called, being a slave; another, with an unbelieving wife; another, being circumcised. Astonishing! where has he put slavery? As circumcision profits not: and uncircumcision does no harm; so neither doth slavery, nor yet liberty. And that he might point out this with surpassing clearness, he says, ‘But even if thou canst become free, use it rather:’ that is, rather continue a slave. Now upon what possible ground does he tell the person who might be set free to remain a slave? He means to point out that slavery is no harm but rather an advantage.”

Strangely, in this next quote, the heretic John Chrysostom undermines his teaching on justified slavery as quoted above by teaching that believers should have no slaves or at least only one or two. But if they can have one or two, why can they not have more.

Heretic John Chrysostom, *Homilies on First Corinthians*, c. 397, Homily 40: “For why hast thou many servants? Since as in our apparel we ought to follow our need only, and in our table, so also in our servants. What need is there then? None at all. For, in fact, one master need only employ one servant; or rather two or three masters one servant.

But if this be grievous, consider them that have none and enjoy more prompt attendance. For God hath made men sufficient to minister unto themselves, or rather unto their neighbor also. And if thou believe it not, hear Paul saying, ‘These hands ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me.’ (Acts 20: 34.) After that he, the teacher of the world and worthy of heaven, disdained not to serve innumerable others; dost thou think it a disgrace, unless thou carriest about whole herds of slaves, not knowing that this in truth is what most of all brings shame upon thee? For to that end did God grant us both hands and feet, that we might not stand in need of servants. Since not at all for need's sake was the class of slaves introduced, else even along with Adam had a slave been formed; but it is the penalty of sin and the punishment of disobedience. But when Christ came, He put an end also to this. ‘For in Christ Jesus there is. neither bond nor free.’ (Gal. iii. 28.) So that

it is not necessary to have a slave: or if it be at all necessary, let it be about one only, or at the most two. What mean the swarms of servants? For as the sellers of sheep and the slave-dealers, so do our rich men take their round, in the baths and in the forum. However, I will not be too exact. We will allow you to keep a second servant. But if thou collect many, thou dost it not for humanity's sake, but in self-indulgence. Since if it be in care for them, I bid thee occupy none of them in ministering to thyself, but when thou hast purchased them and hast taught them trades whereby to support themselves, let them go free. But when thou scourgest, when thou puttest them in chains, it is no more a work of humanity. And I know that I am giving disgust to my hearers.”

Indeed, the heretic John Chrysostom has disgusted believers who had more than two slaves by unjustly condemning them. And his hypocrisy caused confusion and he discredited himself because of his other correct teachings on justified slavery in which he set no such limits. Who is he to say how many slaves believers can have? No pope, Church Father, or other Catholic teaching or law set such limits.

He is also suspect of heresy for denying the dogma that God uses slavery to punish obstinate evildoers, and not just one or two of them.

And he is suspect of heresy for denying the dogma that men do not have slaves only for their own needs but also the help expand their enterprises, or to tame obstinate evildoers, or to bring law and order to society by giving slaves a means of sustenance, work, and order. In essence, he is denying many obstinate evildoers slavery as a remedy for their sins in which they will have chance to be humbled and civilized and thus to convert and be saved or to become good Catholic if they were bad Catholics.

The heretic John Chrysostom is just one more theologian infected to one degree or another by the Greek philosophers who were weak on hell, capital and corporal punishment, and slavery and who preached a utopia in this fallen earth and thus denied some or all of the dogmas regarding sin and its effects on mankind and this fallen world and denied some or all of God's judgments and punishments of sinners.

Invalid Third Lateran Council, 1179

The Third Lateran Council of 1179 imposed slavery on those helping the Saracens. The legitimacy of slavery was incorporated in the official *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, based on the *Decretum Gratiani*, which became the official law of the Church since Pope Gregory IX in 1226:

Invalid Third Lateran Council, 1179:

“Canon 24. Cruel avarice has so seized the hearts of some that though they glory in the name of Christians they provide the Saracens with arms and wood for helmets, and become their equals or even their superiors in wickedness and supply them with arms and necessaries to attack Christians. There are even some who for gain act as captains or pilots in galleys or Saracen pirate vessels. Therefore we declare that such persons should be cut off from the communion of the Church and be excommunicated for their wickedness, that Catholic princes and civil magistrates should confiscate their possessions, and that if they are captured they should become the slaves of their captors. We order that throughout the churches of maritime cities frequent and solemn excommunication should be pronounced against them.”

“Canon 27. With regard to the Brabanters, Aragonese, Navarrese, Basques, Coterelli and Triaverdini, who practise such cruelty upon Christians that they respect neither churches nor monasteries, and spare neither widows, orphans, old or young nor any age or sex, but like pagans destroy and lay everything waste, we

likewise decree that those who hire, keep or support them, in the districts where they rage around, should be denounced publicly on Sundays and other solemn days in the churches, that they should be subject in every way to the same sentence and penalty as the above-mentioned heretics and that they should not be received into the communion of the church, unless they abjure their pernicious society and heresy. As long as such people persist in their wickedness, let all who are bound to them by any pact know that they are free from all obligations of loyalty, homage or any obedience. On these and on all the faithful we enjoin, for the remission of sins, that they oppose this scourge with all their might and by arms protect the Christian people against them. Their goods are to be confiscated and princes free to subject them to slavery. Those who in true sorrow for their sins die in such a conflict should not doubt that they will receive forgiveness for their sins and the fruit of an eternal reward.”

Apostate Thomas Aquinas

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, 13th century: “I answer that, vengeance is lawful and virtuous so far as it tends to the prevention of evil. Now some who are not influenced by motive of virtue are prevented from committing sin, through fear of losing those things which they love more than those they obtain by sinning, else fear would be no restraint to sin. Consequently vengeance for sin should be taken by depriving a man of what he loves most. Now the things which man loves most are life, bodily safety, his own freedom, and external goods such as riches, his country and his good name. Wherefore, according to Augustine’s reckoning (*City of God*. Book 21), ‘Tully writes that the laws recognize eight kinds of punishment’: namely, ‘death,’ whereby man is deprived of life; ‘stripes,’ ‘retaliation,’ or the loss of eye for eye, whereby man forfeits his bodily safety; ‘slavery,’ and ‘imprisonment,’ whereby he is deprived of freedom; ‘exile’ whereby he is banished from his country; ‘fines,’ whereby he is mulcted in his riches; ‘ignominy,’ whereby he loses his good name.”¹²

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, 13th century: I answer that: ...Now slavery is a condition of the body, since a slave is to the master a kind of instrument in working; wherefore children follow the mother in freedom and bondage.”¹³

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, 13th century: “Reply to Objection 2. Considered absolutely, the fact that this particular man should be a slave rather than another man, is based...on some resultant utility, in that it is useful to this man to be ruled by a wiser man, and to the latter to be helped by the former.”¹⁴

Apostate Antipope Nicholas V

Pope Nicholas V, *Romanus Pontifex*, 1455: “We weighing all and singular the premises with due meditation, and noting that since we had formerly by other letters of ours granted among other things free and ample faculty to the aforesaid King Alfonso—to invade, search out, capture, vanquish, and subdue all Saracens and pagans whatsoever, and other enemies of Christ wheresoever placed, and the kingdoms, dukedoms, principalities, dominions, possessions, and all movable and immovable goods whatsoever held and possessed by them and to reduce their persons to perpetual slavery, and to apply and appropriate to himself and his successors the kingdoms, dukedoms, counties, principalities, dominions,

¹² II-II, q. 108, art. 3.

¹³ suppl., q. 52 art. 4.

¹⁴ II-II, q. 57, art. 3.

possessions, and goods, and to convert them to his and their use and profit -- by having secured the said faculty, the said King Alfonso, or, by his authority, the aforesaid *infante*, justly and lawfully has acquired and possessed, and doth possess, these islands, lands, harbors, and seas, and they do of right belong and pertain to the said King Alfonso and his successors.”

Apostate Antipope Gregory IX

Apostate Antipope Gregory IX, 13th century: “It is certainly a matter of faith that this sort of slavery in which a man serves his master as his slave, is altogether lawful. This is proved from Holy Scripture. It is also proved from reason for it is not unreasonable that just as things which are captured in a just war pass into the power and ownership of the victors, so persons captured in war pass into the ownership of the captors. All theologians are unanimous on this.”¹⁵

And the legitimacy of slavery was incorporated in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, promulgated by apostate Antipope Gregory IX.

Nominal Holy Office Decree, 1866, under apostate Antipope Pius IX

Nominal Holy Office Decree, 1866, under apostate Antipope Pius IX: “Slavery itself, considered as such in its essential nature, is not at all contrary to the natural and divine law, and there can be several just titles of slavery and these are referred to by approved theologians and commentators of the sacred canons. ... It is not contrary to the natural and divine law for a slave to be sold, bought, exchanged or given. The purchaser should carefully examine whether the slave who is put up for sale has been justly or unjustly deprived of his liberty, and that the vendor should do nothing which might endanger the life, virtue, or Catholic faith of the slave.”¹⁶

¹⁵ Source: Leander, *Quaestiones Morales Theologicae*, Lyons 1668 - 1692, Tome VIII, De Quarto Decalogi Praecepto, Tract. IV, Disp. I, Q. 3.

¹⁶ Source: Instruction 20, The Holy Office (Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith), June 20, 1866.

Article on Slavery by Frederik Pijper

The Christian Church and Slavery in the Middle Ages, by Frederik Pijper. Source: *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Jul., 1909), pp. 675-695.
Published by: The University of Chicago Press on behalf of the American Historical Association.

Even though Frederik Pijper was not Catholic and even though he held the heresy that slavery should be abolished and thus by implication held the heresy that slavery is intrinsically evil at least during the New Covenant era, he presents truthful evidence regarding the true Catholic Church's teachings, laws, and practices regarding slavery. His evidence proves that the Catholic Church's ordinary magisterium (the unanimous consensus of the apostles and other Church Fathers) and the solemn magisterium (infallible papal decrees) and laws of the Catholic Church and Catholic nations uphold and enforce the dogmas and laws regarding justified slavery.

Beware of Pijper's taking out of context a letter of Pope St. Gregory I to defend his heresy, as contained in Pijper's article on pages 676 to 677. In that letter, the pope speaks of how he freed two slaves that were worthy of being freed and that it is a good thing to do so. Pijper wants the reader to believe that the pope wanted all slaves to be freed and thus abolish slavery. However, he conveniently left out a quote for Pope St. Gregory I in his Pastoral Rule that upholds justified slavery. (See in this book "Pope St. Gregory I," p. [18](#)) And if Pope St. Gregory I did condemn all forms of slavery during the New Covenant era, then he would be a heretic for denying the dogmas on justified slavery that were upheld by all the past popes and Church Fathers.

The
American Historical Review

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND SLAVERY IN THE
 MIDDLE AGES¹

THE abolition of slavery is one of the fair fruits of the Christian religion. The question is: To what extent did the medieval Church aid in the process?

¹ The text of this article [by Professor F. Pijper of the University of Leyden] was read before the International Historical Congress in Berlin in 1908. With the foot-notes, it forms a chapter in the forthcoming second volume of the author's "History of Penance and Confession in the Christian Church" (*Geschiedenis der Boete en Biecht in de Christelijke Kerk*, the Hague, Martinus Nijhoff). For the literature, see: H. Wallon, *Histoire de l'Esclavage dans l'Antiquité* (Paris, 1879), three vols.; J. Yanoski, *De l'Abolition de l'Esclavage Ancien au Moyen Age, et de sa Transformation en Servitude de la Glèbe* (Paris, 1860); Rivière, *L'Église et l'Esclavage* (Paris, 1864); Margraf, *Kirche und Sklaverei seit der Entdeckung Amerikas* (Tübingen, 1866); H. Wiskemann, *Die Sklaverei* (Leiden, 1866) in the *Werken* of the Haagsch Genootschap; J. Buchmann, *Die unfreie und die freie Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zur Sklaverei, zur Glaubens- und Gewissenstyrannie und zum Dämonismus* (1875); Overbeck, *Ueber das Verhältniss der alten Kirche zur Sklaverei im Römischen Reiche*, in the *Studien zur Geschichte der alten Kirche* (Schloss Chemnitz, 1875), pp. 158 ff.; Th. Zahn, *Sklaverei und Christentum in der alten Welt* (1879), in his *Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche* (Leipzig, 1908), pp. 116-159; G. Uhlhorn, *Die christliche Liebesthätigkeit in der alten Kirche* (Stuttgart, 1882), pp. 184-189, 362-375; M. Fournier, *Les Affranchissements du V^e au XIII^e Siècle*, in the *Revue Historique* (Paris, 1883), vol. XXI., pp. 1-58; Th. Brecht, *Kirche und Sklaverei, Beitrag zur Lösung des Problems der Freiheit* (Barmen, 1890); G. Abignente, *La Schiavitù nei suoi Rapporti colla Chiesa e col Laicato, studio storico-giuridico, pubblicato in occasione della Conferenza Antischiavista di Bruxelles* (Turin, 1890); O. Langer, *Sklaverei in Europa während der letzten Jahrhunderte des Mittelalters, Programm des Gymnasiums zu Bautzen* (Bautzen, Ostern, 1891); G. F. Knapp, *Die Landarbeiter in Knechtschaft und Freiheit, Vier Vorträge* (Leipzig, 1891); E. Teichmüller, *Der Einfluss des Christenthums auf die Sklaverei im griechisch-römischen Alterthum, Ein Vortrag* (Dessau, 1894); J. K. Ingram, *History of Slavery and Serfdom* (London, 1895); A. Jerovšek, *Die antik-heidnische Sklaverei und das Christentum* (Marburg, 1903); L. Vanderkindere, *Liberté et Propriété en Flandre du IX^e au XII^e Siècle* (Académie Royale de Belgique, *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres*, 1906, pp. 151 ff.); Rob. Roberts, *Das Familien- Sklaven- und Erbrecht im Quorân* (Leipzig, 1908) in the *Leipziger Semitistische Studien*, edited by Fischer and Zimmern, II. 6.

Throughout the Middle Ages slavery existed in the Christian lands of Europe, although from the thirteenth century onward serfdom replaced it to a considerable degree. There is no evidence that the Christian Church made any serious effort to abolish either slavery or serfdom in that age. There were slaves in all countries, and the Church seemed to approve of it; at least she gave no evidence of regret at being unable to reconcile this condition with the spirit of the Gospel. Sporadic individuals, to be sure, did express their conviction that the words of Christ, "All ye are brethren", would find an admirable practical application in the freeing of slaves. Church assemblies issued a small number of decrees intended to improve the lot of slaves. The Church, too, took the emancipated under her protection. Still the number of slaves was not noticeably decreased thereby. Unfortunately it cannot be denied that the Church made provisions whereby in certain cases freemen were reduced to slavery, and under some circumstances aided in establishing slavery where it did not before exist. Indeed the Church herself held many slaves, and opposed their emancipation.

The beginning of a letter of emancipation by Pope Gregory the Great is famous. Two slaves, Montana and Thomas, both belonging to the Roman Church, were freed by him. He alludes to the love of the Saviour, who did not hesitate to become man, in order to free us from the chains of bondage in which we lay, and restore us to our original freedom. "Man", he continues, "was created free in the beginning by Nature; he does well, therefore, who restores to men the freedom in which they were born."² A similar spirit breathes from a letter of emancipation issued, five centuries later, by the abbot and chapter of the abbey of St. Père in Chartres. It begins with the words: "In the name of Him, Who, to redeem a slave, did not spare His Son, but surrendered Him for us all, Jesus Christ our Lord".³ Another document of similar origin recalls the prophecy of Jeremiah (xxxiv.) in the time of King Zedekiah, when Jerusalem was being besieged by Nebuchadnezzar. The more prom-

² Gregory the Great, *Epistolae*, l. vi., ep. 12, in *Opera*, ed. J. B. Galliccioli (Venice, 1770), t. VII., p. 359. "Cum redemptor noster, totius conditor creaturae, ad hoc propitius humanam voluerit carnem assumere, ut divinitatis suae gratia disrupto quo tenebamur capti vinculo servitutis, pristinae nos restitueret libertati: salubriter agitur si homines, quos ab initio natura liberos protulit, et jus gentium jugo substituit servitutis, in ea qua nati fuerant, manumittentis beneficio, libertate reddantur."

³ *Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de St-Père de Chartres*, ed. Guérard, t. II. (Paris, 1840, in *Collection des Cartulaires de France*), no. 27, p. 286. "In ejus nomine qui, ut servum redimeret, filio non pepercit, sed pro nobis omnibus tradidit illum Jhesum Christum Dominum nostrum". The document dates from 1130 to 1150.

inent Israelites had agreed to proclaim a year of jubilee, that is, to free all slaves of Hebrew origin. The agreement however was not kept. For this reason the prophet declared that God would bring back the Babylonians, from whom the Jews had had a short respite, and would proclaim for Judah "a liberty to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine". This story teaches us, so says the letter of emancipation, how pleasing a sacrifice to God is the restoration of liberty to a man languishing in slavery.⁴ Again, a certain Richeldis is freed both for the love of the highest Emancipator, Almighty God, and because of the desire of her father.⁵ About the same time Count Fulk of Anjou and his sister Ermengardis promise to give a certain slave his liberty, "for the good of the soul of their father Fulk, and for the forgiveness of their sins".⁶

Nevertheless there is no evidence that many shared the religious views which found expression in these utterances. Whatever may have influenced the hearts of some of the best and noblest persons, they were powerless over against the majority, powerless in the face of the incalculable economic importance of slavery in the medieval world. Indeed there is no trace of serious effort, on any considerable scale, to change conditions. In the biographies of certain saints, one reads that before they entered the monastery they freed many slaves;⁷ of others, that they redeemed war-captives and sent them back to their homes free men.⁸ Such deeds may have provoked sympathy and even admiration, but they had no notable effect on the persistence of slavery as an institution.

It is necessary to consider the matter more in detail. One finds

⁴ *Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de St.-Père de Chartres*, ed. Guérard, t. II., no. 51, p. 507. "Quam gratum et acceptabile Deo sit sacrificium, hominem servituti mancipatum, restituere libertati prophetica illa sancti Jeremiae indicat historia." The document is from the time between 1130 and 1150.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Baluze, *Capitularia Regum Francorum* (Paris, 1677), t. II., col. 146. Cf. the formula of emancipation in E. de Rozière, *Recueil Général des Formules usitées dans l'Empire des Francs du V^e au X^e Siècle* (Paris, 1859), t. III., no. 65, p. 90: "Qui debitum sibi nexum relaxat servitium, praemium in futuro apud Dominum sibi retribuere confidat. Igitur ego, in Dei nomine, ille, pro remedio animae meae vel aeterna retributione, servum iuris mei, nomine illum, ingenuum esse praecipio." Another formula, *ibid.*, no. 69, p. 95 reads: "In nomine sanctae et individuae Trinitatis. Si quis ex servientibus sibi aliqua mancipia ad sanctorum loca tradiderit, mercedem ob hoc in futuro ei provenire veraciter crediderit. Quapropter ego, in Dei nomine, N., servum iuris mei N. ad sanctum [illum] trado et ab omni iugo servitutis absolvo."

⁷ From the *Vita S. Romarici*, in Bouquet, *Recueil des Historiens de la France* (Paris, 1741), III. 495. A certain Florus does similarly, *Vita S. Mauri*, *ibid.*, p. 417.

⁸ From the *Vita S. Eptadii*, in Bouquet, III. 381; *Vita S. Balthildis*, *ibid.*, p. 573.

slaves among the Christians of the seventh⁹ and eighth centuries;¹⁰ they are not lacking in the tenth¹¹ and eleventh;¹² in the twelfth,¹³ thirteenth,¹⁴ fourteenth,¹⁵ and later¹⁶ they still exist.

At a council held in Toledo (656) complaint was made that clerics sold Christian slaves to Jews. With many quotations from the Scriptures, the council prohibited this practice.¹⁷ Why did not the *Patres conscripti* condemn the whole slave-trade? They appeal to such a text as I *Corinthians*, xii, 13: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we are bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." But they did not draw the conclusion: Slavery is contrary to the Gospel. No more did RATHERIUS of Verona, when about three centuries later he wrote his *Praeloquia*. In it he addresses all classes of society. On the one hand he comforts the slave with the assurance that all men are brethren, on the other he exhorts him to see in his bondage an ordinance of divine providence.¹⁸

Art thou slave? Let it not grieve thee. If thou hast served thy master faithfully, thou shalt be a freedman of God, the Lord of us all, for in Christ are we all brethren. Hear what the Apostle says (I *Pet.*, ii, 18): "Servants be subject to your masters with all fear". Both God and your earthly masters ye can fear in two ways, first with the fear of blows, scourging and imprisonment, and the eternal fire, since "who-soever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God" (*Rom.*, xiii, 2). But of this first fear it is said that love casteth it out. The other fear is of a purer kind and endures eternally. It is the fear of indolence and idleness, the fear of the loss of that glory which awaits those who labor vigorously. If now thou hast stolen hours from thy master, return them to thy Creator [i. e., in the form of alms, etc.]. And do not think that thou art slave accidentally, and without the will of divine providence. Hear what ISIDORE says: "Because of the first man's sin, slavery was imposed by God on mankind as a punishment, in such a way that He mercifully destined those to slavery for whom He saw that freedom would not be fitting." Though this be a result of original sin,

⁹ Tenth synod of Toledo (656), c. 7, in Mansi, XI, 37 ff.

¹⁰ Synod of Dingolfing (769-771), c. 5, *ibid.*, XII, 851.

¹¹ Synod of Coblenz (922), c. 7, in Pertz, *Mon. Germ., Leges*, II, 17.

¹² Synod of Rome (1078), in Mansi, XX, 506.

¹³ Synod of Gran (1114), c. 29, *ibid.*, XXI, 106.

¹⁴ Peter of Exeter, *Summula seu Modus Exigendi Confessiones*, *ibid.*, XXIV,

845.

¹⁵ Synod of London (1328), c. 4, *ibid.*, XXV, 831.

¹⁶ Many evidences of the existence of slaves in the fifteenth century and later have been collected by Dr. Langer, *o. c.*, pp. 18 ff., 29 ff.

¹⁷ Tenth synod of Toledo (656), c. 7, in Mansi, XI, 37 ff.

¹⁸ RATHERIUS, *Praeloquia*, l. 1., tit. 14, in Martene, *Veteres Scriptores*, IX, 812 ff. The doctrine that the reason for the existence of slavery is to be sought in the fall of man and original sin is also found in Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, pt. 1., qu. 96, art. 4 (Lyons, 1686), p. 217. Cf. Langer, *o. c.*, p. 41.

still God has determined the lot of all men with perfect justice, in making one a slave and another a master, in order that the slave's opportunity of doing evil may be limited by the power of the master.

Finer words expressed the sentiments of the synod of Châlons (813):¹⁹

The indisputable truth is that persons of different classes, such as nobles, freemen, slaves, bondmen, tenants, and the like, belong to the Church. Therefore, it is fitting that all, clerics as well as laymen, who are placed over others should treat them with consideration and mercy, not only in the demanding of statute labor and taxes, but also in the collecting of debts. For they must not forget that these are their brethren, that they both have one God and Father, to whom they pray: "Our Father Who art in Heaven" and a single holy mother, the Church.

How did one become a slave? One way was by selling oneself because of poverty. It might so happen that a married pair sank into such need that the husband was compelled to sell himself, and did so with his wife's consent. In this way he secured sustenance for himself, and with the purchase-money he was in a position to keep his wife from starving. Sometimes the conditions were reversed, and the wife sold herself with the same intentions and with her husband's consent. In such cases the marriage was usually dissolved; to be sure the Church opposed this, but could not prevent and therefore yielded to it.²⁰ Besides this, one could mortgage himself. A synod at Paris early in the seventh century ordained that freemen who had sold or mortgaged themselves should if they repaid the money at once be restored to their former status. To demand back a greater sum than what had been paid for them, was not allowed.²¹ It is true that a synod at Rheims (about 624) forbade that anyone persuade a freeman to become a slave.²² Was much accomplished by it? It is only too true that the slave-trade continued to exist. Formulas of certificates of sale have been preserved in considerable numbers.²³ An estate is sold together with its slaves and serfs.²⁴ The penitential of Theodore of Canterbury secures to

¹⁹ Synod of Châlons (813), c. 51, in Mansi, XIV. 104.

²⁰ Synod of Vermeria (753), c. 6, in Pertz, *Mon. Germ., Leges*, I. 22.

²¹ Synod of Paris (613?), c. 14, in Mansi, X. 548.

²² Synod of Rheims (624-625), c. 17, *ibid.*, p. 596, "si quis ingenuum aut liberum ad servitium inclinare voluerit".

²³ Rozière, *Formules*, pt. 1, nos. 290-297. No. 291, p. 347, begins: "Magnifico fratri illi, ego ille. Constat me tibi vindedissee et ita vindedi servum iuris mei, nomine illum, non furem, non fugitivum, sed sanum corpore moribusque bonis constructum. Unde accepi a te pretium in quod mihi bene complacuit, valentem solidos tantos: ita ut ab hodierna die quicquid de supradicto servo facere volueris, liberam habeas potestatem."

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pt. 1, no. 270, p. 331.

the father the power to sell his son in case of need, provided the latter is not fourteen years old; after that the consent of the son is required. Whoever was fourteen years old could surrender himself into slavery.²⁵ According to Vinniaus the married freeman who had consorted with a slave should be compelled to sell the woman; if he had one or several sons by her he must set her free, and was not allowed to sell her.²⁶

While the slave-trade in general was not prohibited by the synod of Châlons (644), the selling of slaves outside the kingdom (that is outside of the dominions of King Chlodwig II.) was forbidden; the purpose was to prevent the delivery of Christian slaves into the power of Jewish masters.²⁷ Similar prohibitions were repeatedly issued. For instance the synod of Liftinä, under the presidency of Boniface, declared that it was unlawful to sell Christian slaves to heathen.²⁸ The English synod of Berkhamstead (697) is an exception. It decreed that if a slave had stolen, his master must at the discretion of the king either pay a sum of seventy *solidi* as compensation, or sell the slave beyond the sea.²⁹ Of prohibiting the trade in Christian slaves among Christians, there was never a word; no one thought of protesting against it, or at least, showed any inclination to do so. Duke Tassilo of Bavaria summoned a synod to Neuching (772). The first decree reads: "Duke Tassilo with the consent of the whole assembly [of bishops and abbots] has determined that no one may sell a slave outside the boundaries of his province, no matter whether the slave is his property, or has come into his power as a fugitive."³⁰ But observe, "the boundaries of his province"; everything hinges on that.

According to Regino of Prüm, too, not the slave-trade as such but slave-trade under certain conditions is punishable. For he enjoined that the bishop should inquire in his synodal court: "Has any one stolen, or by means of enticement secured possession of a freeman, another's slave, or a foreigner, and sold him into bondage out of the country? Has any one sold a Christian slave to Jew or heathen? Are the Jews selling Christian slaves?"³¹ It is always the same thing: only certain kinds of slave-trade are condemned. A

²⁵ *Poenitentiale Theodori*, c. 13, par. 1, 2, in Wasserschleben, p. 217.

²⁶ *Poenitentiale Vinniai*, par. 39, 40, *ibid.*, p. 117; *Poenitentiale Cummeani*, c. 3, par. 32, *ibid.*, p. 474.

²⁷ Synod of Châlons (644), c. 9, in Mansi, X. 1191.

²⁸ Synod of Liftinä (743), c. 3, in Pertz, *Mon. Germ., Leges*, I. 18.

²⁹ Synod of Berkhamstead (697), c. 27, in Mansi, XII. 114.

³⁰ Synod of Neuching (772), c. 1, *ibid.*, p. 853.

³¹ Regino, *De Ecclesiasticis Disciplinis*, l. 11., interr. 41, p. 210.

foreign Christian, who had fled from his home because of persecution, had been taken in by another Christian, whom he served for many years for wages; he was finally rated as a slave by his master, and sold. Regino of Prüm, in whose time this occurred, disapproved of it very strongly.³² But who ever protested against the slave-trade as such?

A slight change of opinion seems to be evident at the synod summoned to Coblenz by the Frankish King Charles the Simple and Henry I. of Germany. It was there asked what should be done with one who sold a Christian. The unanimous answer was, that he should be considered guilty of murder.³³ But note well that there is no mention of the selling of non-Christians. Even the evil specifically mentioned in the decree was not extirpated by it, as is evident from an *Ordo Poenitentiae* of the time of Otto III.³⁴ In 1009 in England, the only censure is that Christians, sometimes innocent ones, were sold out of the country, even to heathen people.³⁵ In the time of Gregory VII., the Scots still sold their wives.³⁶ According to the synod of Szabolcs (1092), if a priest instead of taking a wife had chosen a servant or a slave as a companion, she was to be sold and the proceeds were to be given to the bishop.³⁷ A shocking condition is revealed by a decree of the synod of London (1102): "Let no one dare hereafter to engage in the infamous business, prevalent in England, of selling men like animals."³⁸ The stern prohibition provokes sympathy, and reflects credit on the English bishops. Still, it is to be observed that the slave-trade, not slavery, was condemned. And did this sentence affect every form of slave-trade, or only that particular form then prevalent in England? Be that as it may, the slave-trade continued in England. The English, even before they suffered from poverty and starvation, were in the habit of offering their sons and relatives for sale in Ireland. The Irish obtained English slaves not only from merchants, but also from robbers and pirates. On the other hand the English penetrated into Ireland and made slaves of the Irish.³⁹

³² Regino, *De Ecclesiasticis Disciplinis*, l. II., interr. 77, p. 214.

³³ Synod of Coblenz (922), c. 4, in Pertz, *Mon. Germ., Leges*, II. 17.

³⁴ See the *Ordo*, with questions, in Schmitz, p. 748.

³⁵ Synod of Aenham (1009), in Mansi, XIX. 300.

³⁶ Gregory VII., *Ad Lanfrancum Cantuariensem*, *ibid.*, XX. 374.

³⁷ Synod of Szabolcs (1092), c. 2, *ibid.*, p. 759.

³⁸ Synod of London (1102), c. 27, *ibid.*, p. 1152: "ne quis illud nefarium negotium, quo hactenus in Anglia solebant homines sicut bruta animalia venundari, deinceps ullatenus facere praesumat."

³⁹ Synod of Waterford, according to Giraldus Cambrensis (1158), *ibid.*, XXI. 861; synod of Armagh (1171), *ibid.*, XXII. 123 ff.

The synod of Herstal (779) under the presidency of Charlemagne decreed that slaves could be sold only in the presence of a representative of the ecclesiastical or temporal power, that is, of the bishop or count, the archdeacon or the *centenarius*.⁴⁰ What was the object of this order? Perhaps it was to regulate the slave-trade, to subject it to hard and fast rules.

Some came under the power of others through theft; both freemen and slaves were stolen.⁴¹ Slavery was also ordained as a punishment for theft, prostitution or other sins.⁴²

From all appearances, medieval society must have contained a much larger number of slaves than has been generally supposed.⁴³ In spite of all prohibitions Christian slaves served Jewish masters.⁴⁴ Mothers had their children nursed by slaves.⁴⁵ Monasteries possessed slaves. From the penitential of the Greek Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, it appears that the Greek monks did not have slaves, but that the Roman monks did.⁴⁶

A shocking fact is that the Church herself often possessed slaves. We find slaves of the Church in Spain,⁴⁷ in the kingdom of the Franks,⁴⁸ in Germany,⁴⁹ in Hungary,⁵⁰ in Italy.⁵¹ Occasionally slaves of the Church were admitted to holy orders. The synod of Toledo (655) required, however, that they must first have secured emancipation through the bishop.⁵² Clerics of this kind were forbidden to acquire private property. They could not inherit or buy anything from parents or relatives. Should they in the name or through the assistance of some free man succeed in acquiring anything, they were to be whipped and imprisoned until the Church recovered the

⁴⁰ Synod of Herstal (779), c. 19, in Pertz, *Mon. Germ., Leges*, I. 38.

⁴¹ Synod of Neuching (772), c. 3, in Mansi, XII. 854; Regino, *De Ecclesiasticis Disciplinis*, I. 11., interr. 41, p. 209; *Poenitentiale Valicellanum I.*, c. 62, in Schmitz, p. 296.

⁴² *Poenitentiale Theodori*, c. 12, par. 8, in Wasserschleben, p. 214.

⁴³ Synod of Soissons (853), c. 10, in Pertz, *Mon. Germ., Leges*, I. 418; Nicolas I., *Responsa ad Consulta Bulgarorum*, c. 21, in Mansi, XV. 412; synod of Mainz (888), c. 12, *ibid.*, XVIII. 81 ff.; synod of Rome (1078), *ibid.*, XX. 506.

⁴⁴ Twelfth synod of Toledo (681), c. 9, *ibid.*, XI. 1035 ff.; Regino, *De Ecclesiasticis Disciplinis*, I. 11., interr. 41, p. 210.

⁴⁵ *Epistola Pastoralis Vulfadi*, in Mabillon, *Vetera Analecta*, p. 102.

⁴⁶ *Poenitentiale Theodori*, c. 8, par. 4, in Wasserschleben, p. 210.

⁴⁷ Synod of Emerita (666), c. 15, in Mansi, XI. 83 ff.; synod of Toledo (675), c. 6, *ibid.*, p. 141; synod of Saragossa (691), c. 4, *ibid.*, XII. 44 ff.

⁴⁸ Synod of Aachen (817), *Capitula ad Episcopos*, c. 6, in Pertz, *Mon. Germ., Leges*, I. 207; *Hudovici I. Capitulare*, c. 13, *ibid.*, p. 216.

⁴⁹ Synodal statutes of Boniface, c. 7, in Mansi, XII., app., p. 108.

⁵⁰ Synod of Gran (1114), c. 29, *ibid.*, XXI. 106.

⁵¹ Synod of Pavia (1018), c. 3, in Pertz, *Leges*, II. 562.

⁵² Synod of Toledo (655), c. 11, in Mansi, XI. 29.

deeds to the acquired property.⁵³ It was cruel law that sons and daughters of such ecclesiastics, of whatever rank, even though born of a free mother, were, together with all their property, regardless of how it was acquired, to remain the property of the Church, never to be freed from their sad state.⁵⁴

A pronouncement of the great synod of Aachen discloses something astonishing: "Many bishops admit into the number of the clergy only bondmen, who dare not complain of any treatment because they fear hard blows or a cruel reduction to slavery. This is not to say that persons of good reputation among the slaves of the Church may not be admitted to holy orders, but, that no prelate shall entirely exclude the nobles."⁵⁵ Church slaves could accept no protection from another authority.⁵⁶ No one might buy the inheritance of a slave of the Church; if he did, he lost both the purchase money and the object bought.⁵⁷ It was Charlemagne who, probably at the mixed assembly of princes and bishops at Paderborn (785), issued the capitulary, which among other things was designed to secure revenue for local churches. The peasants were to vacate for the church to which they belonged a farm-yard and two *mansi* of land, and each one hundred and twenty of them were to give the church a male and a female slave.⁵⁸

The Trullan synod (692) decreed that the freeing of a slave must occur before three witnesses.⁵⁹ A synod of Berkhamstead assumed that emancipation took place at the altar.⁶⁰

Did the Church earnestly promote the freeing of slaves? She decreed that Jews might not buy or possess Christian slaves; if they

⁵³ Synod of Pavia (1018), c. 5, in Pertz, *Leges*, II. 562.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, c. 4, *ibid.* At the synod of Gran (1114), c. 29, in Mansi, XXI. 106, it is said that children of such clerics "inter liberos ecclesiae habeantur". This probably has the same meaning, but Hefele has translated it in another sense: they "werden freie Angehörige der Kirche". *Conciliengeschichte*, second ed., V. 323.

⁵⁵ Synod of Aachen (816-817), c. 119, in Mansi, XIV. 230 ff.

⁵⁶ Synod of Worms (783), c. 12, in Pertz, *Leges*, I. 47.

⁵⁷ Synod of Leon (1012), c. 7, in Mansi, XIX. 337. A similar idea is contained in a decree of the synod of Aschaffenburg (1292), c. 22, *ibid.*, XXIV. 1093: "De servis et mancipiis ecclesiarum in civitatibus residentibus, post eorumdem servorum mortem ecclesiae debita jura quorum servi et mancipia fuerunt, recipere minime prohibeantur." Hefele translates as follows: "Ist der Knecht oder Sklave einer Kirche, der in einer Stadt wohnte, gestorben, so darf die Kirche nicht gehindert werden, das in Empfang zu nehmen, was ihr bei solchem Todfalle zusteht."

⁵⁸ *Capitulare*, c. 15, in Pertz, *Leges*, I. 49.

⁵⁹ Synodus quinisexta (692), c. 85, in Mansi, XI. 980.

⁶⁰ Synod of Berkhamstead (697), c. 9, *ibid.*, XII. 112.

did, such slaves became free.⁶¹ Vinniaius fixes as one of the punishments of a perjurer the manumission of a slave; but he allows the substitution of a donation to the poor equivalent to the slave's price;⁶² elsewhere the punishment was emancipation and a fine.⁶³ The female slave who bore her master one or more sons,⁶⁴ or in general who bore him children, was freed.⁶⁵

Otherwise the freeing of slaves was hindered rather than helped. If a father in his will granted freedom to all his slaves, his daughter could require the restoration of one-third of them on the ground of the illegality of the testament.⁶⁶

From the fact that the Church was not disposed to give her freedmen entire independence, and nearly always attached severe conditions to liberation, it can be most easily seen that she was not inclined to adopt mild policies toward her slaves. Bishops could not free slaves of the Church, unless they reimbursed the Church out of their own property. Otherwise, it was said, they would be taking from the poor what they did not themselves give. A bishop's successor might reclaim men freed by him.⁶⁷ In the eleventh century these regulations were included by Burchard of Worms⁶⁸ and Ivo of Chartres⁶⁹ in their collections of canons. They were inserted by Gratian⁷⁰ and in the decretals of Gregory IX.⁷¹ If a bishop desired to free a church slave, without reserving the right of protection to the Church, he must in council give the Church, in place of the one freed, two other slaves equally valuable and disposing of an equal amount of money. This exchange was made permanent through a document signed by the priests who were present. Under such conditions manumission was unhindered, the theory being that the bishop had previously acquired possession of the slave. Should such a freedman later complain or testify

⁶¹ Synod of Toledo (633), cc. 59, 66, in Mansi, X, 633, 635; Burchardus Wormaciensis, *Decretorum Libri XX.*, l. iv., c. 85, fol. 128^{vo}; Ivo, *Decretum*, pt. I., c. 279, fol. 41^{vo}; pt. XIII., c. 99.

⁶² Vinniaius, *Poenitentiale*, c. 22, in Wasserschleben, p. 113.

⁶³ *Poenitentiale Cummeani*, c. 5, par. 4, *ibid.*, p. 477.

⁶⁴ Vinniaius, *Poenitentiale*, c. 40, *ibid.*, p. 115; *Poenitentiale Valicellanum I.*, c. 21, in Schmitz, p. 277; *Poenitentiale Casinense*, c. 22, *ibid.*, p. 404.

⁶⁵ *Poenitentiale Bedae*, c. 3, par. 16, in Wasserschleben, p. 222.

⁶⁶ *Capitulare Francicum*, synod of Diefenhofen (783), c. 9, in Pertz, *Leges*, I, 47.

⁶⁷ Synod of Toledo (633), c. 67, in Mansi, X, 635.

⁶⁸ Burchardus Wormaciensis, *Decretorum Libri XX.* (Paris, 1550), l. III., c. 189, fol. 106^{vo}.

⁶⁹ Ivo, *Decretum* (Louvain, 1561), pt. III., c. 249, p. 109^{vo}.

⁷⁰ C. 39, C. XII., qu. 2.

⁷¹ C. 4, X., de rebus ecclesiae (3, 13).

against the church to which he had belonged, he again became a slave of that church.⁷² Bishops who left property to the Church, or who had acquired properties, lands or slaves for their church could manumit slaves of the Church to the value of that property.⁷³

Frequently emancipation was coupled with conditions. Idana's son, who in his testament confirmed freedom formerly granted, limited this freedom by the words, "only under observance of the conditions set down in the brief of emancipation".⁷⁴ In general the conditions made by the Church were oppressive. The chapter of the abbey church of St. Père in Chartres required of the freedman the perpetual performance of his former duties as a bondager (*homo*).⁷⁵ The chapter of Notre Dame in Paris often granted freedom on conditions of the payment of a large sum, either in one payment or in annual installments. The inhabitants of the village of Wissous paid at one time a thousand Parisian pounds for their freedom, those of Orly four thousand pounds.⁷⁶ The same chapter freed more than one *homo* (slave or bondman) with the purpose of admitting him to the clergy. If, however, such an one married or withdrew from the clerical status, he fell back into his former condition. In order to prevent the property of any church slave or bondman from falling into the hands of free men, no freedman was allowed to inherit, buy, or in any way acquire property from parents or relatives. Finally, he was required to take an oath that he would not summon to court any one subject to the jurisdiction of the chapter without the chapter's consent.⁷⁷

The assertion that these limitations on the freedom of the emancipated were not designed to be burdens⁷⁸ can hardly be considered more than a cheap evasion. A few illustrations will best show how hard the treatment occasionally was. A certain Haimo

⁷² Synod of Toledo (633), c. 68, in Mansi, X. 635; Burchardus, *o. c.*, l. III., c. 176, fol. 105; Ivo, *o. c.*, pt. III., c. 237; pt. XVI., c. 65; c. 68, C. XII. qu. 2. Gratian adds a detailed commentary. This is evidence that at that time the matter still had practical significance.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, cc. 69, 70, 71, in Mansi, X. 636.

⁷⁴ *Diplomata*, ed. J. M. Pardessus (Paris, 1843), t. I., no. 413, p. 212: "quos de servientibus meis per aepistolam ingenuetatis laxavi, in integra ingenuetate resedeant; tamen secundum quod eorum aepistolas loquetur."

⁷⁵ *Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de Saint Père de Chartres*, ed. Guérard (Paris, 1840), (*Collection des Cartulaires de France*), t. II., no. 27, p. 286: "fidelitate erga ecclesiam nostram et libero hominio ex more retento".

⁷⁶ *Cartulaire de l'Église de Notre-Dame de Paris*, ed. Guérard (Paris, 1850), t. I., préf., pp. cci ff.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, t. II., no. 45, pp. 66 ff.; cf. no. 97, p. 88.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, t. II., no. 4, p. 378, *De manumissione Hugonis Olearii*: "non tamen causa honorande libertatis".

was the son of a free father and a slave mother belonging to a monastery. Children of such marriages were slaves.⁷⁹ When this Haimo sought emancipation for himself, his sisters Ermengardis and Roscelina, and their children, he secured it only on condition of the complete surrender of their inheritance, consisting of plots of ground in two villages.⁸⁰ Are the opening words of the document recording this transaction, "In nomine sanctae et individuae Trinitatis", more than a commonplace? Radulf Conduit married the daughter of Hugo of Villa Nova, a slave of the abbey of St. Père in Chartres. *Ipsa facto* he and his children sank to the status of a slave. What were the conditions of his freeing? First, he was to be under the obligations of a bondager of the monastery (*hominium*); secondly, he was to present to the abbey a shop having an annual income of eight to ten *solidi*; finally, he was to divest himself in advance of all property he should have at his death.⁸¹ A similar surrender of the paternal inheritance was required of the Richeldis mentioned on an earlier page.⁸²

Freedmen were often placed under the protection (*patrocinium*) of the Church.⁸³ This protection naturally extended first to freedmen of the Church. Was it of advantage to them? They and their children must give assurance of their emancipation to each new bishop upon his accession to office. If they withdrew themselves from the protection of the Church, they lost their freedom.⁸⁴ These provisions were incorporated in canon law together with the above described limitations of a bishop's rights to emancipate.⁸⁵ They were however soon found to be inadequate, and the synod of Toledo (638) decreed that freedmen of the Church and their children must, at the accession of each new bishop, exhibit the certifi-

⁷⁹ This was according to the book of the canon law, c. 15, C. XXXII, qu. 4. But see c. 8, X. (1. 18) in the Decretals of Gregory IX. According to these regulations the son of a slave and a free mother can be ordained. The rubric of the canon: "natus ex patre servo et libera matre, liber est, et licite promovetur", does not quite agree with its contents.

⁸⁰ *Cartulaire de St. Père de Chartres*, t. I., c. 8, p. 9 (about 1001).

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, t. II., no. 36, pp. 293 ff. (about 1101-1129).

⁸² *Ibid.*, t. II., no. 51, pp. 507 ff.

⁸³ Synod of Paris (614-615), c. 5, in Mansi, X. 539 ff.; in Pardessus, *Diplomata*, I., testament of Remigius (533), p. 88, "hos totos, filii fratris mei, Lupe episcopo, sacerdotali auctoritate defensabis"; *ibid.*, t. II., testament of Desiderius (653), p. 101: "libertos meos tibi matri Ecclesiae tuoque advocato commendo. Semper quaeso virtute sanctitatis tuae ab insidiis quorumcumque defendentur, ut sub tuo se patricinio pervenisse congaudeant."

⁸⁴ Synod of Toledo (633), cc. 69, 70, 71, in Mansi, X. 636.

⁸⁵ Burchardus, *o. c.*, l. III., cc. 176, 184, 185, fol. 105^{vo}, 106; Ivo, *o. c.*, pt. III., cc. 238, 244, 245, fol. 108^{vo}, 109; in *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, c. 3, X., de rebus ecclesiae (3. 13); c. 61, C. XII., qu. 2.

cates of their emancipation before him, in the presence of the assembled faithful. The bishop must confirm them anew, and the freedmen must again declare that they would render the *obsequium* due to the Church.⁸⁶ A synod held at the same place in 655 determined that neither freedmen of the Church nor their descendants could ever marry free-born persons ("Romani" or "Gothi"). What they had from the Church they might not transfer to another; if they wished to sell it, they must first offer it to the bishop. But they might at any time sell or give it to their children or relatives, provided they were slaves or freedmen of the same church.⁸⁷ In the light of the foregoing there is nothing strange about the complaint made at the synod of Aachen (809) that many priests devoted themselves both day and night to worldly matters, to slaves, to the vineyard and to the garner.⁸⁸

That the Church did not admit the slaves of others to holy orders, unless their emancipation was incontestable, was no doubt salutary. Only those freedmen, says the synod of Toledo (633), whose patrons have retained no *obsequium* may become clerics; otherwise, they would still be subject to one who could reduce them to slavery.⁸⁹ No one was to persuade a slave to become a clerk or monk, without his master's consent.⁹⁰ Emancipation must precede ordination. Thus, no one may dedicate the servant of another to the service of the Church before he is freed;⁹¹ that is, the bishop is forbidden to ordain any man who is not freed.⁹² The *colliberti*, a class between the freemen and the slaves, were subject to similar rules. The synod of Bourges (1031) declared that neither slaves nor *colliberti* could become clerics, until their masters had granted them freedom in the presence of witnesses.⁹³

In the Oriental Church, the rules differed somewhat. If a slave, who had fled to a monastery because of theft or insubordination, were seized and proved guilty, the *Nomocanon* of John of Antioch provided that he and the stolen goods should be returned; but if in the meantime more than three years had elapsed this need not be done. If the slave left the monastery, his master could again make him a slave. A slave ordained with his master's knowledge,

⁸⁶ Synod of Toledo (638), c. 9, in Mansi, X. 666; included in Gratian's *Decretum*, c. 64, C. XII., qu. 2.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* (655), cc. 13, 17, in Mansi, XI. 29 ff.

⁸⁸ Synod of Aachen (809), c. 2, in Pertz, *Leges*, I. 160.

⁸⁹ Synod of Toledo (633), c. 73, in Mansi, X. 637.

⁹⁰ Synod of Aachen (789), cc. 23, 57, in Pertz, *Leges*, I. 57, 62.

⁹¹ Synod of Riesbach (799-800), c. 30, *ibid.*, p. 79.

⁹² Synod of Tribur (895), c. 29, in Mansi, XVIII. 146 ff.

⁹³ Synod of Bourges (1031), c. 9, *ibid.*, XIX. 514.

and without his protest, remained free. If it occurred without the master's knowledge, the latter could reclaim the slave at any time within a year. If for any reason the ordained slave returned to the worldly status, he must be restored to his owner.⁹⁴

Rights derived from prescription in these matters were also recognized in the Occident. If a girl under twelve years of age voluntarily took the veil, and her master did not reclaim her within a year, he lost all rights to her.⁹⁵ In spite of the laws, many irregularities occurred in the ordination of former slaves. For instance, witnesses were bribed to testify to the actual manumission of a given person; tricks of every kind were used. The ordination of a man, whose father or grandfather had come from elsewhere, made an especially difficult case because information as to whether the ancestor was free-born, freedman or slave, was not obtainable. If the legal master appeared and granted freedom, all was well; but if the master refused to do so, the clerk was compelled to become a slave once more. In case the master agreed to the ordination, he could retain all property of which the person ordained⁹⁶ was disposing.

Ratherius of Verona insisted that every slave seeking ordination should show his certificate of emancipation.⁹⁷ A decree of the synod of Hohenaltheim (916) discloses peculiar conditions. A master had had his slave educated and ordained, and in the meantime, had given him clothing and sustenance. In the course of time the priest became arrogant and refused to say mass for his former master or to sing the canonical hours or the psalms; he did not pay proper respect to his master and boasted: "I am free. I can serve at my pleasure whom I choose." Whose part did the synod take; the master's or the priest's? The former's; it anathematized the priest and excluded him from communion, until he should mend his ways and obey his master. If he continued stubborn, the bishop who ordained him was to degrade him and restore him to his former owner. Whoever had knowledge of this condition of affairs and received such a priest or failed to restore him to his master, or refused to give him up, was to suffer a like anathema, and be excluded from communion, be he bishop or count, clerk or layman.⁹⁸

⁹⁴ *Joannis Scholastici, Patriarchae Constantinopolitani, Nomocanon*, tit. 33, in G. Voellius and H. Justellus, *Bibliotheca Iuris Canonici Veteris* (Paris, 1661), t. II, pp. 639 ff.

⁹⁵ Synod of Tribur (895), c. 24, in Mansi, XVIII. 144 ff.

⁹⁶ "Capitulum ex Augustorum nostrorum libro", in the letter *Hincmari Laudunensis ad Remensem*, in *Hincmari Remensis Operum tomus posterior* (Paris, 1645), p. 343.

⁹⁷ Ratherius, *Synodica ad Presbyteros*, in D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, p. 378, col. 2.

⁹⁸ Synod of Hohenaltheim (916), c. 38, in Pertz, *Leges*, I. 560.

The English king, Henry II., extended the prohibition against ordaining unfree persons to include bondmen, in the decree: "sons of peasants may not be ordained without the consent of the lord on whose domain they were born."⁹⁹ The most humane position is that taken by the synod of Worms (868): If a bishop ordains a slave as priest or deacon, knowing that he is unfree, the slave shall remain clerk, but the bishop must give his master double compensation. If the bishop did not know he was a slave, those must pay the compensation who testified that he was free and sought his ordination.¹⁰⁰

Despite all prohibitions, there were always among the clergy actual slaves, that is, persons over whom others could exercise rights and from whom statute labor could be required.¹⁰¹ Naturally there was strong opposition to such an one's becoming bishop.¹⁰² Indeed, it occurred that certain laymen claimed an archdeacon on the ground that he was not free but their slave.¹⁰³

Occasionally the Church opposed the advancement of slaves to important positions. Since it had happened that slaves or freedmen had through royal favor risen to palatine offices, and had then persecuted their former masters, the synod of Toledo (683) forbade such an advancement in the future. Only freedmen or slaves of the fisc could thereafter be promoted to such offices. (Hefele adds: because they belonged to no other master than the king, and were not bound to private service.)¹⁰⁴

The worst feature of all is that the Church created slavery where it did not already exist. Since conspiracy and high treason were frequent, they were threatened by the synod of Toledo (693) with heavy penalties. Not only the guilty but also their descendants were condemned to perpetual slavery as subjects of the fisc.¹⁰⁵ Whoever took vows at springs, trees or groves, or made heathen offerings, and ate of them in honor of the gods, was sentenced, the noble to a fine of sixty, and the serf to fifteen *solidi*. If he

⁹⁹ Constitutions of Clarendon (1164), c. 16, in Mansi, XXI, 1190.

¹⁰⁰ Synod of Worms (868), c. 40, *ibid.*, XV, 876.

¹⁰¹ Synod of Poitiers (1078), c. 8, *ibid.*, XX, 498; synod of Melfi (1089), c. 11, *ibid.*, p. 723: "nullum jus laicis in clericos esse volumus et censemus. Unde cavendum est, ne servilis conditionis, aut curialium officiorum obnoxii ab episcopis promoveantur in clerum."

¹⁰² Synod of Toledo (633), c. 19, *ibid.*, X, 624; synod of Poitiers (1078), c. 8, *ibid.*, XX, 498.

¹⁰³ Synod of Valence (855), c. 23, *ibid.*, XV, 12.

¹⁰⁴ Synod of Toledo (683), c. 6, *ibid.*, XI, 1068 ff.; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, III, 321.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* (693), c. 10, in Mansi, XII, 78.

could not pay the fine, he became a slave of the Church until he had paid. Soothsayers and diviners were to be given to the Church or to priests (as slaves) according to a capitulary framed by Charlemagne at the synod of Paderborn (785).¹⁰⁶

If after his ordination any cleric, from a bishop down to a subdeacon, should have children by a servant, or a free woman, the parents should be canonically punished, the children lose their inheritance and become perpetual slaves of the Church in which the father served.¹⁰⁷ Some churchmen, not living in honorable wedlock, consorted with strange women or their own slaves. Bishops were instructed to secure such women and sell them. This hard law was promulgated in Spain, at the beginning of the seventh century.¹⁰⁸ If a subdeacon refused to give up his wife, he was to be removed from his ecclesiastical office and benefice. If, however, after being warned by his bishop, he still failed to yield, his wife was to be made a slave by the prince.¹⁰⁹ In England not only the movable property of priests, deacons, subdeacons and canons, who had wives, became the property of the bishop, but also the "concubines" themselves.¹¹⁰ The synod of Cologne (1083) threatened everyone who broke the Peace of God, or was guilty of murder or assault, with dire punishment. In the first place he must be banished and his property confiscated by his heirs. If these ventured to give him any assistance, the property must be taken from them, and he himself must thereafter belong as a slave to the royal domain.¹¹¹ A woman of noble rank who had deserted her husband three times was to be put under penance, and was to be prohibited from marrying again; but if she was a woman from the people she must be sold without hope of regaining her freedom. A noble who wrongly accused his wife of infidelity must pay an adequate fine. If he would not, or could not do so, his head must be shorn and he must be sold as a slave. If anyone abducted the bride of another without her consent, she must be returned to her betrothed; but the robber, if of noble rank, must give the canonical compensation, do penance, and lose all hope of marriage. If he could not pay the required sum, he must be sold into perpetual

¹⁰⁶ *Capitulare*, c. 21, in Pertz, *Leges*, I. 49.

¹⁰⁷ Synod of Toledo (655), c. 10, in Mansi, XI. 29; synod of Ofen (1279), c. 26, *ibid.*, XXIV. 283.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* (633), c. 43, *ibid.*, X. 630.

¹⁰⁹ Synod of Melfi (1089), c. 12, *ibid.*, XX. 724: "principibus licentiam indulgemus, ut eorum feminas mancipent servituti."

¹¹⁰ Synod of London (1108), c. 10, *ibid.*, XX. 1231. Cf. synod of London (1127), c. 7, *ibid.*, XXI. 356.

¹¹¹ *Constitutio Pacis Dei*, in Pertz, *Leges*, II. 56.

bondage. If anyone abandoned his wife, and refusing to come to terms with her, permitted himself to be put into prison for debtors, he became a slave forever on the ground of his hatred for his wife. And should he be seen at any time enjoying liberty, he must again be sold.¹¹²

According to a synod in Palestine, in the time of the Crusades, a thief who could not restore stolen properties became the slave of the man whom he had robbed.¹¹³ Certain Christians furnished the Saracens with arms, iron and ship-timber, helped them in their wars against Christians, and even took service on their piratical craft; the property of such was to be confiscated by the civil authorities, and they themselves became the slaves of those who captured them.¹¹⁴ Baptized Jews could have no intercourse with the unbaptized. If they did, and persisted in their relations with the infidels, the latter became the property of the Christians and the former were publicly whipped.¹¹⁵ This law was incorporated in the canon law; it is found in Burchard, in Ivo, and in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*.¹¹⁶

Elizaeus was a slave of the church of Egabra. His bishop freed him. Afterwards he became proud and rebellious and attempted to poison the bishop and otherwise harm the church. The sentence of the synod of Seville (619) was that he should again become a slave, because anyone who had rebelled against his bishop and his former mistress, the Church, did not deserve to have his emancipation recognized.¹¹⁷ This sentence was adopted by Ivo¹¹⁸ and Gratian.¹¹⁹ If a female slave belonging to the Church was freed in church, or by letter of emancipation, and thereafter married a slave, she again became the slave of the Church. But if a free Bavarian woman married a slave and refused to render service to the Church, she might go her way, according to the synod of Neuching (772); but children born of such marriage were slaves and could not go with their mother.¹²⁰ The decree of the synod of Toulouse (1119): No churchman or layman may

¹¹² Synod of Gran (1114), c. 53, in Mansi, XXI, 109.

¹¹³ Synod of Nablus (Neapolis) (1120), c. 23, *ibid.*, p. 266.

¹¹⁴ Third council of the Lateran (1179), c. 24, *ibid.*, XXII, 230 ff.; synod of Montpellier (1195), c. 2, *ibid.*, p. 668; fourth council of the Lateran (1215), *ibid.*, p. 1066; council of Lyons (1245), *ibid.*, XXIII, 631.

¹¹⁵ Synod of Toledo (633), c. 62, *ibid.*, X, 634.

¹¹⁶ Burchardus, *Decretorum Libri XX*, l. IV., c. 84, fol. 128^{rs}; Ivo, *Decretum*, pt. I., c. 278, fol. 41^{rs}; c. 12, C. XXVIII, qu. 1.

¹¹⁷ Synod of Seville (619), c. 8, in Mansi, X, 559 ff.

¹¹⁸ Ivo, *Decretum*, pt. XVI., c. 66, p. 437.

¹¹⁹ C. 62, C. XII., qu. 2.

¹²⁰ Synod of Neuching (772), c. 10, in Mansi, X, 854.

enslave a freeman, whether clerical or lay¹²¹—is fairly to be noticed. Obviously, there were those who opposed making free men slaves. Did their opinions excite sympathy in wider circles? There is no evidence of it.

In 1376 Gregory XI., at enmity with the Florentines, excommunicated them and ordered them to be plundered, captured and reduced to slavery in all places whatsoever.¹²² And Nicholas V. in 1452 empowered Alphonso V. of Portugal to make war on all Saracens, heathen and other foes of Christ, to despoil them and reduce them to slavery.¹²³

What was the condition of slaves in this period? From the materials at hand there is no reason to believe that their condition was one easily borne.

Some precepts can indeed be adduced which manifest a humane spirit; but there are only slight indications that the Church seriously attempted to ameliorate the lot of slaves. Kindness no doubt promoted the instruction for confessors found in a penitential: "If slaves come to you, do not burden them as you would their masters, since slaves are not independent, but reduce their penance to one-half."¹²⁴ Considerably after this, Bishop Peter of Exeter, in his guide for confessors, prescribed that confessors should carefully note whether they are dealing with slaves or freemen.¹²⁵ A slave who perjured himself at his master's instigation should have a light penance, according to the decree of the synod of Hohenaltheim.¹²⁶ Theodore of Canterbury declared it illegal to take from a slave the money he earned by his own work.¹²⁷ To work on Sundays, whether voluntarily or at the command of a master was (to slaves) forbidden. If, however, a slave worked on Sunday by the order of his master, an English synod ruled that the slave became free, and that the master should be fined thirty *solidi*.¹²⁸ On the Monday,

¹²¹ Synod of Toulouse (1119), c. 5, in Mansi, XXI, 227.

¹²² The document in O. Raynaldus's continuation of the *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Baronius (Lucca, 1752), t. VII. (XXVI.), ad ann. 1376, num. 5, p. 280: "personas ipsorum omnium . . . exponimus fidelibus, ut capientium fiant servi." Cf. Langer, p. 39.

¹²³ A document of June 18, 1452, in Raynaldus, *o. c.*, t. IX. (XXVIII.), ad ann. 1452, num. 11, p. 600: "tibi Saracenos et paganos . . . subiugandi illorumque personas in perpetuam servitutum redigendi concedimus facultatem."

¹²⁴ *Poenitentiale Casinense*, c. 105, ad calcem, in Schmitz, p. 429. Cf. *Poenitentiale Valicellanum I.*, prolog., in Schmitz, p. 243.

¹²⁵ Peter of Exeter, *Summula*, in Mansi, XXIV, 845.

¹²⁶ Synod of Hohenaltheim (916), c. 25, in Pertz, *Leges*, II, 558.

¹²⁷ *Poenitentiale Theodori*, c. 13, par. 3, in Wasserschleben, p. 217.

¹²⁸ *Capitula Dacheriana*, c. 15, *ibid.*, p. 146; English synod (691-692), c. 3, in Mansi, XII, 57; synod of Berkhamstead (697), cc. 10, 11, *ibid.*, p. 112.

Tuesday and Wednesday before Christmas all slaves were to be excused from work in order to be free to take part in the general fasting.¹²⁹

In the late Middle Ages, at least, "bondmen and others of unfree status" were considered qualified to make a last will.¹³⁰ The threat of the synod of Szabolcs (1092) to punish with a twelve days' penance on bread and water any master, who failed to bring the corpse of his slave to church, indicates a laudable sentiment.¹³¹ Regino of Prüm required the investigation in the synodal court of those cases in which persons were accused of adultery in their own homes with their maids or slaves.¹³² This procedure no doubt afforded slaves some protection. Something similar was aimed at in the rule ordering the removal of all female slaves and freedwomen from monasteries and the residences of clerks.¹³³ Nicholas I. demanded that fugitive captive slaves be pardoned, and faithful slaves be leniently treated.¹³⁴ It was illegal to restrain a slave who ran away during the Peace of God.¹³⁵ Pippin, king of Lombardy, issued a capitulary at a synod about 781 which gave detailed instructions for the recovery of fugitive slaves.¹³⁶

Over against this stands the law that no slave could be the plaintiff in court.¹³⁷ Neither could freedmen testify in court against freemen; only in the third generation did their descendants become competent to act as witnesses.¹³⁸ In all probability no one opposed the corporal punishment of slaves for centuries.¹³⁹ They were punished by being stripped of their clothing and beaten with rods. Regino of Prüm relates that several persons protested against this to the bishop or his servants. The way in which he tells of it, however, makes it appear quite unlikely that he considered these complaints justified; rather the contrary.¹⁴⁰ Slaves who engaged in idolatrous practices, worshipped stones, lighted torches, made offer-

¹²⁹ *Leges Ecclesiasticae Aethelredi Regis*, c. 2, in Mansi, XIX, 319.

¹³⁰ Synod of London (1328), c. 4, *ibid.*, XXV, 831; "ascriptitorum vel aliorum servilis conditionis testamenta vel ultimas voluntates".

¹³¹ Synod of Szabolcs (1092), c. 25, *ibid.*, XX, 772.

¹³² Regino, *De Ecclesiasticis Disciplinis*, l. 11., interr. 37, p. 209.

¹³³ Synod of Mainz (851-852), c. 7, in Pertz, *Leges*, I, 416.

¹³⁴ *Nicolai I. Responsa ad Consulta Bulgarorum*, cc. 21, 97, in Mansi, XV, 412, 431.

¹³⁵ *Constitutio Pacis Dei in Synodo Coloniensi*, in Pertz, *Leges*, II, 59.

¹³⁶ *Capitulare*, c. 9, *ibid.*, I, 43 ff.

¹³⁷ Synod of Rheims (624-625), c. 15, in Mansi, X, 596.

¹³⁸ Synodal statutes of Boniface, c. 15, *ibid.*, XII., app., p. 109.

¹³⁹ John of Antioch, *Nomocanon*, tit. 36, in Voellius and Justellus, *Bibliotheca Juris Canonici Veteris*, II, 644 ff.

¹⁴⁰ Regino, *De Ecclesiasticis Disciplinis*, l. 11., interr. 76, p. 214.

ings at trees or springs, were to be whipped by the bishop or judge, and given in shackles to their masters; if he failed to punish them he was excommunicated.¹⁴¹

That churchmen mutilated their slaves with their own hands, or made others do so (*truncationes membrorum aut per se inferant aut inferenda praecipiant*), is a hideous fact.¹⁴² There are instances of slaves dying of hunger.¹⁴³ Whoever killed his slave without the foreknowledge of the judge was excommunicated for two years.¹⁴⁴ The object of this law was commendable; but the frequent reiteration of it leads one to surmise that the evil persisted for a long time.¹⁴⁵ One penitential extends its prohibition to cases in which the slave was actually guilty, and a judicial sentence had been rendered; even the master who killed his slave must do a year's penance.¹⁴⁶ "If thou art free and hast killed an innocent slave at thy master's command, thou shalt do penance a whole year, and three times forty days in each of the two following years", says an opinion of Regino of Prüm. If the slave deserved death only forty days' penance was necessary.¹⁴⁷ In the period immediately succeeding the conversion of the Germans, it sometimes happened that Christians sold their slaves to heathen for human sacrifices.¹⁴⁸ Happily nothing is heard of it later; indeed the capitulary of Charlemagne at the synod of Paderborn threatened death to anyone making human sacrifice.¹⁴⁹

Whoever knowingly took a slave to wife must keep her;¹⁵⁰ the

¹⁴¹ Synod of Rouen (682), c. 11, in Mansi, XI. 1037. Cf. synod of Berkhamstead (697), c. 14, *ibid.*, XII. 113. Further information on the punishment of slaves: *Constitutio Pacis Dei in Synodo Coloniensi* (1083), in Pertz, *Leges*, II. 56-58.

¹⁴² Synod of Emerita (666), c. 15, in Mansi, XI. 83 ff.; synod of Toledo (675), c. 6, *ibid.*, p. 141; Rabanus Maurus, *Poenitentium Liber*, c. 30, printed together with his *De Clericorum Institutione* (Cologne, 1532), quat. R., fol. 1.

¹⁴³ Synod of Frankfurt (794), c. 4, in Pertz, *Leges*, I. 72.

¹⁴⁴ *Poenitentiale Cummeani*, c. 7, par. 29, in Wasserschleben, p. 480.

¹⁴⁵ Rabanus Maurus, *Poenitentium Liber*, c. 14, printed together with his *De Clericorum Institutione* (Cologne, 1532), quat. Q., fol. ii^{ro}; also his *Epistola ad Heribaldum*, c. 2, printed together with Regino, *De Ecclesiasticis Disciplinis*, ed. Baluze (Paris, 1671), p. 473; Regino, *o. c.*, l. 11, interr. 1, 10, pp. 205 ff.; *Poenitentiale Parisiense*, c. 53, in Schmitz, p. 687; *Poenitentiale Halitgarii*, l. iv., c. 4, *ibid.*, p. 723; *Poenitentiale Valicellanum III.*, *ibid.*, p. 783; *Poenitentiale Laurentianum*, c. 42, *ibid.*, p. 788 (five years' penance).

¹⁴⁶ *Poenitentiale Arundel*, c. 7, in Schmitz, p. 440.

¹⁴⁷ Regino, *De Ecclesiasticis Disciplinis*, l. 1., c. 300, *Ordo ad dandam Poenitentiam*, p. 141.

¹⁴⁸ *Gregorius III. Papa Bonifatio* (732), in Jaffé, *Monumenta Moguntina* (*Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum*, t. III.), p. 94.

¹⁴⁹ Synod of Paderborn (785), c. 9, in Pertz, *Leges*, I. 49.

¹⁵⁰ Synod of Vermeria (753), c. 13, *ibid.*, I. 23.

same is true of a free woman who deliberately married a slave. But if a freeman married a wife, believing that she was free, and later learned that she was unfree, he could dismiss her and marry another.¹⁵¹ It has been stated that a free man who sold himself into slavery could reacquire his former status by paying the sum he had received. If he had a free wife, his children by her were forever free.¹⁵² Slaves who have united themselves with female slaves without a nuptial ceremony shall, says Nicephorus Chartophylax, be excommunicated and parted from their wives until the ceremony is performed.¹⁵³ This order seems harsh, but it unquestionably fostered respect for the marriages of slaves. The same thing is true of the following, respecting marriages between slaves of different masters: such unions, to be valid, required the consent of both masters.¹⁵⁴ It is true also of the decision of the synod of Vermeria (753): "If through sale a slave be separated from his wife, also a slave, each should be urged to remain thus (*i. e.*, not to marry again) in case we cannot reunite them."¹⁵⁵ An excellent attitude is that of the synod of Châlons (813):¹⁵⁶

We have learned that certain masters, acting on usurped authority, dissolve the legitimate marriages of their slaves, thus ignoring the word of the Gospel: "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder". Let no such marriages be dissolved, even if the slaves do not belong to the same master, provided the marriage was legally performed and both masters gave their consent.

On the whole, however, there are good reasons for believing that the marriage ties of slaves were pretty loose. If, for example, two slaves were joined in wedlock by their common master, and one of them was thereafter freed, that one was permitted to marry again, if the freedom of the other could not be bought.¹⁵⁷

FREDERIK PIJPER.

¹⁵¹ Synod of Compiègne (757), cc. 7, 8, in Pertz, p. 28. Cf. synod of Dingolfing (769-771), c. 10, in Mansi, XII. 852.

¹⁵² Synod of Bonneuil (Paris, 618 ?), c. 14, *ibid.*, X. 548.

¹⁵³ Nicephorus Chartophylax, *Ad Monachum Theodosium*, in *Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, III. 48.

¹⁵⁴ Ahyto Basiliensis, *Capitulare*, c. 21, in D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, I. 398.

¹⁵⁵ Synod of Vermeria (753), c. 19, in Pertz, *Leges*, I. 23.

¹⁵⁶ Synod of Châlons (813), c. 30, in Mansi, XIV. 99.

¹⁵⁷ *Poenitentiale Theodori*, c. 13, par. 4, 5, in Wasserschleben, p. 217.

Slavery in the United States

Official Act of the Colony of Virginia, 1670: “All servants not being Christians, imported into this colony by shipping, shall be slaves for their lives.”¹⁷

Reverend Thomas Stringfellow, *A Brief Examination of Scripture Testimony on the Institution of Slavery*, Locust Grove, VA, 1841: “It is to be hoped, that on a question of such vital importance as this to the peace and safety of our common country, as well as to the welfare of the church, we shall be seen cleaving to the Bible, and taking all our decisions about this matter, from its inspired pages. With men from the North, I have observed for many years a palpable ignorance of the divine will, in reference to the institution of slavery. I have seen but a few, who made the Bible their study, that had obtained a knowledge of what it did reveal on this subject. Of late, their denunciation of slavery as a sin, is loud and long.

I propose, therefore, to examine the sacred volume briefly, and if I am not greatly mistaken, I shall be able to make it appear that the institution of slavery has received, in the first place,

1st. The sanction of the Almighty in the Patriarchal age.

2d. That it was incorporated into the only National Constitution which ever emanated from God.

3d. That its legality was recognized, and its relative duties regulated, by Jesus Christ in his kingdom; and

4th. That it is full of mercy.

... Now, my dear sir, if, from the evidence contained in the Bible to prove slavery a lawful relation among God's people under every dispensation, the assertion is still made, in the very face of this evidence, that slavery has *ever been* the greatest sin—*everywhere, and under all circumstances*—can you, or can any sane man bring himself to believe, that the mind capable of such a decision, is not capable of trampling the Word of God under foot upon any subject?”

Reverend Thomas Stringfellow, *A Scriptural View of Slavery*, Culpeper County, Virginia, 1856: “Jesus Christ recognized this (i.e. slavery) institution as one that was lawful among men, and regulated its relative duties. ... I affirm then, first (and no man denies) that Jesus Christ has not abolished slavery by a prohibitory command; and second, I affirm, he has introduced no new moral principle which can work its destruction.”

Reverend Dr. Richard Furman, President of the Baptist State Convention, *Exposition of the Views of the Baptists, Relative to the Coloured Population in the United States in a Communication to the Governor of South Carolina*, 1838: “...The right of holding slaves is clearly established by the Holy Scriptures, both by precept and example. In the Old Testament, the Israelites were directed to purchase their bond-men and bond-maids of the Heathen nations; except they were of the Canaanites, for these were to be destroyed. And it is declared, that the persons purchased were to be their ‘bond-men forever’; and an ‘inheritance for them and their children.’ They were not to go out free in the year of jubilee, as the Hebrews, who had been purchased, were: the line being clearly drawn between them...

“In the New-Testament, the Gospel History, or representation of facts, presents us a view correspondent with that which is furnished by other authentic ancient histories of the state of the world at the commencement of Christianity. The powerful Romans had succeeded, in empire, the polished Greeks; and under both empires, the countries they possessed and governed were full of slaves. Many of

¹⁷ Quoted in David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1966), p. 180.

these with their masters, were converted to the Christian Faith, and received, together with them into the Christian Church, while it was yet under the ministry of the inspired Apostles. In things purely spiritual, they appear to have enjoyed equal privileges; but their relationship, as masters and slaves, was not dissolved. Their respective duties are strictly enjoined. The masters are not required to emancipate their slaves; but to give them the things that are just and equal, forbearing threatening; and to remember, they also have a master in Heaven. The ‘servants under the yoke’ (bond-servants or slaves) mentioned by Paul to Timothy, as having “believing masters,” are not authorized by him to demand of them emancipation, or to employ violent means to obtain it; but are directed to ‘account their masters worthy of all honor,’ and ‘not to despise them, because they were brethren’ in religion; ‘but the rather to do them service, because they were faithful and beloved partakers of the Christian benefit.’ Similar directions are given by him in other places, and by other Apostles. And it gives great weight to the argument, that in this place, Paul follows his directions concerning servants with a charge to Timothy, as an Evangelist, to teach and exhort men to observe this doctrine.

“Had the holding of slaves been a moral evil, it cannot be supposed, that the inspired Apostles, who feared not the faces of men, and were ready to lay down their lives in the cause of their God, would have tolerated it, for a moment, in the Christian Church. If they had done so on a principle of accommodation, in cases where the masters remained heathen, to avoid offences and civil commotion; yet, surely, where both master and servant were Christian, as in the case before us, they would have enforced the law of Christ, and required, that the master should liberate his slave in the first instance. But, instead of this, they let the relationship remain untouched, as being lawful and right, and insist on the relative duties.

In proving this subject justifiable by Scriptural authority, its morality is also proved; for the Divine Law never sanctions immoral actions...

“If the holding of slaves is lawful, or according to the Scriptures; then this Scriptural rule can be considered as requiring no more of the master, in respect of justice (whatever it may do in point of generosity) than what he, if a slave, could consistently, wish to be done to himself, while the relationship between master and servant should still be continued.”

George Fitzhugh, *Cannibals All! or Slaves without Masters*, Richmond, VA, 1857: “If we prove that domestic slavery is, in the general, a natural and necessary institution, we remove the greatest stumbling block to belief in the Bible; for whilst texts, detached and torn from their context, may be found for any other purpose, none can be found that even militates against slavery. The distorted and forced construction of certain passages, for this purpose, by abolitionists, if employed as a common rule of construction, would reduce the Bible to a mere allegory, to be interpreted to suit every vicious taste and wicked purpose.”

Apostate Antipopes Denial of Dogmas Regarding Slavery

When the heresy began

Four hundred years into the Great Apostasy, which began in 1033, the dogmas on slavery were still upheld. For example, Pope Nicholas V issued the papal bull *Dum Diversas* in 1452. It authorized Alfonso V of Portugal to reduce any “Saracens (Muslims) and pagans and any other unbelievers” to perpetual slavery. This facilitated the Portuguese slave trade from West Africa. The same pope wrote the bull *Romanus Pontifex* on January 5, 1455 to the same Alfonso. As a follow-up to the *Dum diversas*, it extended to the Catholic nations of Europe dominion over discovered lands during the Age of Discovery. Along with sanctifying the seizure of non-

Christian lands, it encouraged the enslavement of native, non-Christian peoples in Africa and the New World.

Apostate Antipope Nicholas V, *Romanus Pontifex*, 1455: “We weighing all and singular the premises with due meditation, and noting that since we had formerly by other letters of ours granted among other things free and ample faculty to the aforesaid King Alfonso—to invade, search out, capture, vanquish, and subdue all Saracens and pagans whatsoever, and other enemies of Christ wheresoever placed, and the kingdoms, dukedoms, principalities, dominions, possessions, and all movable and immovable goods whatsoever held and possessed by them and to reduce their persons to perpetual slavery, and to apply and appropriate to himself and his successors the kingdoms, dukedoms, counties, principalities, dominions, possessions, and goods, and to convert them to his and their use and profit.”

In 1493 Alexander VI issued the bull *Inter Caetera* stating one Christian nation did not have the right to establish dominion over lands previously dominated by another Christian nation, thus establishing the Law of Nations. Together, the *Dum Diversas*, the *Romanus Pontifex* and the *Inter Caetera* came to serve as the basis and justification for the Doctrine of Discovery, the global slave-trade of the 15th and 16th centuries, and the Age of Imperialism.

From the information I have, the denial of dogmas regarding slavery by a so-called pope began with apostate Antipope Paul III in the 16th century. Hence the heresies regarding slavery (as is the case with all heresies) have no link with the infallible tradition of the Catholic Church, with the ordinary magisterium and the solemn magisterium. And the apostate antipopes who taught one or more heresies regarding slavery inadvertently acknowledge this in their attempt to find precedence for their heretical teachings in which they only bring forward apostate antipopes to confirm their heresies. Some quote one pope, Pope Gregory I, to defend their heresy; but they take the words of one of his letters out of context and ignore his Pastoral Rule in which he upholds the dogma regarding justified slavery.¹⁸

Some of the apostate antipopes they bring to their defense (such as, Pius II (1458-1464) and Leo X (1513-1521)) did not deny dogmas regarding slavery but taught that it is good thing to free slaves who are worthy of being freed or who condemned unjust slavery or unjust treatment of slaves. The heretics, then, want you to believe that just because they taught and condemned these things that they condemned all slavery or harsh treatment of slaves as unjust and thus intrinsically sinful.

From the information I have, the first so-called pope who denied dogmas regarding slavery was apostate Antipope Paul III in 1549 in his encyclical *Sublimus Dei*. However, in it, he does not bring forward any defense of his heresy by quoting those who held the heresy before him. After him, other apostate antipopes also denied one or more dogmas regarding slavery. One such apostate antipope was Gregory XIV in 1839 in his encyclical *In Supremo Apostolatus Fastigio*. In it, he quotes past so-called popes (all of them apostate antipopes) to try to prove that his heresy has a link with tradition, the earliest being Pius II (1458-1464), who actually did not condemn slavery but only making neophytes slaves:

Apostate Antipope Gregory XIV, *In Supremo Apostolatus Fastigio*. 1839: “Certainly many Roman Pontiffs of glorious memory, Our Predecessors, did not fail, according to the duties of their charge, to blame severely this way of acting as dangerous for the spiritual welfare of those engaged in the traffic and a shame to the Christian name; they foresaw that as a result of this, the infidel peoples would be more and more strengthened in their hatred of the true Religion. It is at these practices that are aimed the Letter Apostolic of Paul III, given on May 29, 1537, under the seal of the Fisherman, and addressed to the Cardinal Archbishop of

¹⁸ See in this book “Pope St. Gregory I,” p. [17](#).

Toledo, and afterwards another Letter, more detailed, addressed by Urban VIII on April 22, 1639 to the Collector Jurium of the Apostolic Chamber of Portugal...

“Benedict XIV confirmed and renewed the penalties of the Popes above mentioned in a new Apostolic Letter addressed on December 20, 1741, to the Bishops of Brazil and some other regions, in which he stimulated, to the same end, the solicitude of the Governors themselves. Another of Our Predecessors, anterior to Benedict XIV, Pius II, as during his life the power of the Portuguese was extending itself over New Guinea, sent on October 7, 1462, to a Bishop who was leaving for that country, a Letter in which he not only gives the Bishop himself the means of exercising there the sacred ministry with more fruit, but on the same occasion, addresses grave warnings with regard to Christians who should reduce neophytes to slavery.

“In our time Pius VII [1800-1823], moved by the same religious and charitable spirit as his Predecessors, intervened zealously with those in possession of power to secure that the slave trade should at least cease amongst the Christians.”

Hence the tradition that upholds the heresy of slavery, according to Gregory XIV, begins with apostate Pius II in the 15th century. But Pius II did not actually deny any dogmas regarding slavery. Therefore the actual tradition upholding heresies regarding slavery, according to Gregory, begins with Paul III in the 16th century. If Gregory XIV was to go back any further (which he wilfully did not), he would have discovered that the tradition of the Catholic Church upholds the dogmas regarding justified slavery from the time of the apostles until the 15th century and thus condemns all of the new heresies regarding slavery that began in the 16th century.

The most extensive and thus influential encyclical before the apostate Second Vatican Council that taught heresies regarding slavery was *In Plurimus* by apostate Antipope Leo XIII in 1888.¹⁹ In his attempt to link his heresy with tradition, he uses examples of popes and Church Fathers who condemned what they believed to be unjust slavery or the unjust treatment of slaves or who had freed slaves who they believed were worthy of being freed to make you believe that they condemned all slavery. For example,

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII, *In Plurimus*, 1888: “13. Moreover, the Roman Pontiffs, who have always acted, as history truly relates, as the protectors of the weak and helpers of the oppressed, have done their best for slaves. St. Gregory himself set at liberty as many as possible [RJMI: He freed two slaves], and in the Roman Council of 597 desired those to receive their freedom who were anxious to enter the monastic state. Hadrian I maintained that slaves could freely enter into matrimony even without their masters’ consent. It was clearly ordered by Alexander III in the year 1167 to the Moorish King of Valencia that he should not make a slave of any Christian, because no one was a slave by the law of nature, all men having been made free by God. Innocent III, in the year 1190, at the prayer of its founders, John de Matha and Felix of Valois, approved and established the Order of the Most Holy Trinity for Redeeming Christians who had fallen into the power of the Turks. At a later date, Honorius III [1216-1227], and, afterwards, Gregory IX [1227-1241], duly approved the Order of St. Mary of Help, founded for a similar purpose, which Peter Nolasco had established, and which included the severe rule that its religious should give themselves up as slaves in the place of Christians taken captive by tyrants, if it should be necessary in order to redeem them. The same St. Gregory passed a decree, which was a far greater support of liberty, that it was unlawful to sell slaves to the Church, and he further added an exhortation to the faithful that, as a punishment for their faults, they should give their slaves to God and His saints as an act of expiation... 16. When Pius II had become assured of these matters without delay, on October 7, 1462, he gave a letter to the bishop of the place in which he reproved and condemned such wickedness. Some time afterwards, Leo X lent, as far

¹⁹ See in this book “Apostate Antipope Leo III, *In Plurimus*, 1888,” p. [52](#).

as he could, his good offices and authority to the kings of both Portugal and Spain, who took care to radically extirpate that abuse, opposed alike to religion, humanity, and justice.”

In none of the above examples does any of the men quoted condemn all slavery as unjust and thus intrinsically sinful, even though some of them may have been weak; for instance, apostate Antipope Gregory IX’s not allowing the Church to buy slaves (that is, if that is what he actually taught) was a weak and thus bad law. But that is of no consequence because he was an apostate antipope.

The so-called popes whom he quotes who did hold heresies regarding slavery only go back as far as apostate Antipope Paul III:

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII, *In Plurimus*, 1888: 16. ...Then Paul III, anxious with a fatherly love as to the condition of the Indians and of the Moorish slaves, came to this last determination, that in open day, and, as it were, in the sight of all nations, he declared that they all had a just and natural right of a threefold character, namely, that each one of them was master of his own person, that they could live together under their own laws, and that they could acquire and hold property for themselves... 17. With the same forethought and constancy, other Pontiffs at a later period, as Urban VIII, Benedict XIV, and Pius VII, showed themselves strong asserters of liberty for the Indians and Moors and those who were even as yet not instructed in the Christian faith. The last, moreover, at the Council of the confederated Princes of Europe, held at Vienna, called their attention in common to this point, that that traffic in Negroes, of which We have spoken before, and which had now ceased in many places, should be thoroughly rooted out. Gregory XVI also severely censured those neglecting the duties of humanity and the laws, and restored the decrees and statutory penalties of the apostolic see, and left no means untried that foreign nations, also, following the kindness of the Europeans, should cease from and abhor the disgrace and brutality of slavery.”

Hence the tradition that upholds the heresies regarding slavery, according to Leo XIII, actually began with apostate Antipope Paul III in the 16th century. Therefore, not only does his heresy have no link with the true tradition of the Catholic Church from the time of the apostles, but the true tradition condemns the heresies by upholding the dogmas regarding justified slavery.

Some of the heretics were at least honest regarding tradition as they admit that the heresies regarding slavery are new and thus have no link with tradition. But they hold the heresy that dogmas evolve and thus change their meaning in order to defend heresies regarding slavery.²⁰

For the sake of brevity, I will only refute the heresies taught by apostate Paul III because he was the first to teach them and then Leo XIII because he was most influential pre-Vatican II apostate to teach them. And I will not waste my time refuting those who taught the heresy since the apostate Second Vatican Council.

It is interesting to note that the Salvation Dogma also began to be denied in the 16th century.²¹ Unfounded sympathy for and the glorification of the pagan heathens of the Americas, then, lead to not only the denial of dogmas regarding slavery but also to the denial of the Salvation Dogma.

Tricks and ploys

Some of the tricks and ploys used by some of the heretics who hold the heresy that slavery is intrinsically evil, at least during the New Covenant era, are as follows.

²⁰ See in this book “Ploy 5: Some teach heresy that the dogmas regarding slavery evolved, p. 49.

²¹ See RJMI book *Bad Books and Salvation*.

Ploy 1: Use examples of unjustified slavery and conclude that all slavery is unjustified

The heretics refer to examples of unjust slavery and conclude that all slavery is unjust. The dogma is that while God condemns unjustified slavery, he approves of justified slavery not only during the Old Covenant era but also during the New Covenant era.

And God ordains that some slaves are to be separated from their spouses or from their children and thus this is justified slavery while others are not and thus this is unjustified slavery, all depending on the disposition the people being taken as slaves.

So do not be fooled by the sympathy ploy when the heretics use examples of unjustified slavery to turn you against all slavery and thus against justified slavery. That would be like using examples of unjustified excommunications in order to condemn all excommunications. In fact, that is what we see today when nominal Catholic pro-abortion politicians, such as Joe Biden and Nancy Pelosi, are not excommunicated but instead are referred to as good Catholics who are thus allowed to receive Holy Communion. Or that would be like using examples of prisoners who were unjustly imprisoned in order to condemn all imprisonments. In fact, that is what we see today when lefty liberals are trying to free all men from prisons and thus end all imprisonments. After all, all prisoners are slaves and thus some who are against slavery are also against imprisonments.

Ploy 2: Use examples of unjust punishment of slaves and conclude all punishments of slaves is unjust

The heretics refer to examples of the unjust punishment of slaves (which is cruelty) and conclude that all punishment of slaves is unjust and thus cruel. While some of the examples they use are true cruelty toward slaves others are not but are justified punishments, which the heretics refer to as cruelty.

The dogma is that slaves with good dispositions should not be punished while slaves with rebellious or otherwise sinful dispositions should be punished and some more than others, even unto death if they deserve it; and that is not cruelty because they deserve it. For example,

“Make the side of a wicked slave to bleed.” (Eccus. 42:5) “Torture and fetters are for a malicious slave... And if he be not obedient, bring him down with fetters, but be not excessive towards any one; and do no grievous thing without judgment. If thou have a faithful slave, let him be to thee as thy own soul; treat him as a brother because in the blood of thy soul thou hast gotten him.” (Eclcus. 33:28-31)

So beware of the sympathy ploy (which only works with those who deny or are weak regarding capital or corporal punishment) who use examples of unjust punishment of slaves without any regard to the dispositions of the slaves and thus if they deserve it or not to turn you against all punishment of slaves. The thrust of their ploy is that punishment itself is evil and sinful regardless if the slaves deserve it. Hence these heretics are also guilty of denying dogmas regarding justified punishments of sinners. They are infected with the heresy of non-punishmentalism to one degree or another.

For example, apostate Antipope Leo XIII refers to slavery itself as cruel and thus condemns slavery itself as intrinsically sinful:

Apostate Antipope Leo III, *In Plurimis*, 1888: “But this was specially acceptable and sweet to Us because it lent confirmation to the belief, which is so welcome to Us, that the great majority of the people of Brazil desire to see the cruelty of slavery ended, and rooted out from the land.”

Note that he did not say “cruel slavery” (which could be true) but the “cruelty of slavery” and thus that slavery itself is cruel and thus unjustified. This is confirmed in other parts of his letter in

which he teaches that all slavery during the New Covenant era must be abolished and thus is intrinsically evil and sinful. (See in this book “**Error! Reference source not found.**,” p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**)

In the following quote, Leo XIII teaches the heresy that no slaves should be punished and thus presumes all slaves are good. And he lies when he says that all pagans who had slaves treated them cruelly and thus unjustly:

Apostate Antipope Leo III, *In Plurimis*, 1888: “9. Whoever compares the pagan and the Christian attitude toward slavery will easily come to the conclusion that the one was marked by great cruelty and wickedness and the other by great gentleness and humanity, nor will it be possible to deprive the Church of the credit due to her as the instrument of this happy change.”

Slaves who commit certain crimes must be punished to one degree or another even unto death if they are worthy of it. And this applies not only to slaves but also to freemen, adults and children, who commit certain crimes. Hence we see Leo XIII’s heresy of non-punishmentism in full bloom!

And he lies when he says that all pagans treated their slaves cruelly. The opposite is true. Most pagans did not treat their slaves cruelly. For example, the Babylonians and Persians treated their Israelite slaves very well unless they were worthy of punishments. And even some pagans who may have been inclined to treat their slaves cruelly did not because it would harm their investment; it would hamper their slaves well being and thus their productivity and usefulness.

Ploy 3: Use examples of the freedom of certain slaves to mean that all slaves must be freed

The heretics refer to examples of slaves that were freed and then conclude that all slaves should be freed and hence regardless of the dispositions of the slaves.²² That some slaves are worthy of being freed is true, but that all slaves are worthy of being freed is not true. Some slaves are not worthy or capable of being freed and some slaves who are worthy of being freed do not want to be freed and thus want to remain slaves.

God ordained that Israelites be slaves in Babylon for seventy years:

“For thus saith the Lord: When the seventy years shall begin to be accomplished in Babylon, I will visit you: and I will perform my good word in your favour, to bring you again to this place... I will bring back your captivity, and I will gather you out of all nations, and from all the places to which I have driven you out, saith the Lord: and I will bring you back from the place to which I caused you to be carried away captive.” (Jer. 29:10-14)

Hence any attempt to free the captive Israelites before the seventy-year exile would have been unjust.

In the following example, Judith freed her slave:

“And she [Judith] abode in her husband’s house a hundred and five years, and made her handmaid free, and she died, and was buried with her husband in Bethulia.” (Judi. 16:28)

Just because Judith freed her slave does not mean all slaves should be freed. And it does not mean that slavery is intrinsically evil or else Judith would have sinned for having a slave in the first place.

The following is an example of a slave who was worthy of being freed but chose to remain a slave forever:

²² See in this book “Pope St. Gregory I,” p. [12](#).

“If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve thee; in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. With what raiment he came in with the like let him go out. If having a wife, his wife also shall go out with him. But if his master gave him a wife and she hath borne sons and daughters, the woman and her children shall be her master’s but he himself shall go out with his raiment. And if the servant shall say, I love my master and my wife and children I will not go out free, his master shall bring him to the judgment seat of God. And he shall be set to the door and the posts, and he shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall be his servant for ever.” (Ex. 21:2-6)

Ploy 4: They believe, at least by implication, that there is no sin during the New Covenant era

All of the heretics, at least by implication, believe that the earth, at least during the New Covenant era, is already paradise and thus no one is worthy of being made a slave because Christ redeemed all men and thus by this fact alone, the heretics conclude, that all men are forgiven and thus pleasing to God. This heresy denies the dogma that men must cooperate with their redemption to benefit from it and thus to be pleasing to God and hence to be saved. And it denies the dogma that only Jesus Christ upon his second coming will rid the world of sin and bring paradise on earth.

Ploy 5: Some teach heresy that the dogmas regarding slavery evolved

Some heretics who acknowledge that the Church Fathers, popes and even apostate antipopes, and Church laws for the first 1500 years of the Church upheld the dogmas regarding justified slavery teach the heresy that dogmas evolve and thus change their meaning over time. Hence they teach that the dogma that slavery is not intrinsically sinful, as upheld for the first 1500 years of the Church, evolved and thus changed its meaning into the dogma that slavery is intrinsically sinful. This dogmas-evolve heresy also teaches that as men progress in time they become more wise, moral, virtuous, and holy. Hence, according to this heresy, the early popes and Church Fathers were not as wise, virtuous, and holy as modern men. Take the example of the following dogma-changer, the apostate Stephen Krason:

Catholic Makers of America, by Stephen M. Krason, 1993: Chapter 6. Roger Brooke Taney, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (1777-1864):

“The fact that slavery is a great evil and is prohibited by the natural law is not something which was readily apparent for most of human history and was not even certainly taught by the Church, the guardian and interpreter of the natural law. The content of the natural law remains almost entirely as it always has been, but it is only over time, as man has become more civilized and morally sophisticated, that he has been able to fathom certain aspects of it. This is the way it was with slavery. Statements had been made against it by eminent Catholic teachers and Churchmen over the centuries, but it had never authoritatively been taught as wrong by the Magisterium up to Taney’s time. Taney lived at a time when the Church’s teaching was only beginning to come down firmly against slavery.”²³

There are as many heresies in this quote as ally cats have flees. I will address the main ones. Krason teaches that slavery is prohibited by the natural law. That was only true when Adam and Eve were in the Garden of Paradise. However, once they were cast out of the garden and sin came into the world, slavery became part of the natural law in which it was used to punish obstinate sinners. Hence, since the fall of Adam and Eve and thus since sin entered the world, it is very

²³ Published by Christendom Press, Fort Royal, VA. 1993. Chap. 6 (Roger Brook Taney), p. 158.

natural and reasonable that obstinate sinners must be punished to maintain justice, deter others from sinning, and to maintain law and order. And slavery happens to be one of those punishments, and less of a punishment than death in war or by execution.

St. Augustine, *City of God*, 413: “This is prescribed by the order of nature: it is thus that God has created man. For ‘let them,’ He says, ‘have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every creeping thing which creepeth on the earth.’ He did not intend that his rational creature, who was made in his image, should have dominion over anything but the irrational creation—not man over man, but man over the beasts... The prime cause, then, of slavery is sin, which brings man under the dominion of his fellow; that which does not happen save by the judgment of God, with whom is no unrighteousness, and who knows how to award fit punishments to every variety of offence... For it is with justice, we believe, that the condition of slavery is the result of sin... But by nature, as God first created us, no one is the slave either of man or of sin. This servitude is, however, penal, and is appointed by that law which enjoins the preservation of the natural order and forbids its disturbance; for if nothing had been done in violation of that law, there would have been nothing to restrain by penal servitude.”²⁴

Even as late as 1866, a nominal Holy Office Decree under apostate Antipope Pius XI correctly taught that slavery, since the fall of Adam and Eve, is not contrary to the natural and divine law and thus is not intrinsically sinful:

Nominal Holy Office Decree, 1866, under apostate Antipope Pius IX: “Slavery itself, considered as such in its essential nature, is not at all contrary to the natural and divine law, and there can be several just titles of slavery and these are referred to by approved theologians and commentators of the sacred canons. ... It is not contrary to the natural and divine law for a slave to be sold, bought, exchanged or given. The purchaser should carefully examine whether the slave who is put up for sale has been justly or unjustly deprived of his liberty, and that the vendor should do nothing which might endanger the life, virtue, or Catholic faith of the slave.”²⁵

Krason teaches the opposite: “Slavery is a great evil and is prohibited by the natural law.” And he teaches that this applies to all times and thus even after the fall of Adam and Eve and thus he teaches heresy. If that were true that slavery has always been intrinsically sinful, then God, the Old Testament Fathers, Jesus Christ (God the Son), the apostles and other Church Fathers, all Catholics for the first 1500 years of the Catholic Church sinned and were heretics for teaching that slavery is not intrinsically sinful.

Krason also teaches another heresy by implication: that there is no sin in this world (or at least no man is guilty of sin) and thus there is no need to punish sinners, as slavery is one such punishment. And this leads to another heresy, that all men benefit from Christ’s redemption and thus are pleasing to God and thus not worthy of punishment.

And this leads Krason into another heresy, that Jesus Christ (God the Son), the apostles and other Church Fathers, and all Catholics for 1500 years were not aware of the dogma that slavery is intrinsically sinful and thus were not as wise, moral, and virtuous as modern men are, as the all wise, holy, moral, and virtuous Krason is. The Word of God condemns them:

“There is... a generation that are pure in their own eyes, and yet are not washed from their filthiness.” (Prv. 30:12)

“There is a way that seemeth to a man right and the ends thereof lead to death.” (Prv. 16:25)

“The way of a fool is right in his own eyes.” (Prv. 12:15)

²⁴ b.19, c. 15.

²⁵ Source: Instruction 20, The Holy Office (Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith), June 20, 1866.

Indeed, Krason and those like him are fools. The very evidence before their eyes condemns them as not only heretics but idiots without the use of reason, as utopians and humanists who pretend man is living in paradise or at least he can bring paradise upon earth before the second coming of Jesus Christ. The evidence shows that from the time the Great Apostasy began in the 11th century, wisdom, virtue, and morality has been on a steady decline. Just look at the world we live today! Yet the apostate bastard Krason has the audacity to say, “over time...man has become more civilized and morally sophisticated.”

If it were not for that fact that Krason is a dogma-changer heretic, all Catholics for the first 1500 years of the Church would have been heretics for denying the dogma that slavery is intrinsically sinful. But because he believes that their belief was a dogma then but is not a dogma now, he does not believe they were heretics.

In the following quote, Krason acknowledges that the Church up until Taney’s time in the 19th century upheld the dogma that slavery is not intrinsically sinful and thus has never condemned the belief that slavery is not intrinsically sinful as heresy:

Krason: “The fact that slavery is a great evil and is prohibited by the natural law is not something which was readily apparent for most of human history and was not even certainly taught by the Church, the guardian and interpreter of the natural law... This is the way it was with slavery.... It had never authoritatively been taught as wrong by the Magisterium up to Taney’s time. Taney lived at a time when the Church’s teaching was only beginning to come down firmly against slavery.”

Krason admits that his belief that slavery is intrinsically sinful was not taught by the Church and was even condemned by the Church up until the 19th century. Consequently, he not only admits that his belief is a new and novel doctrine but also that it was condemned by the Church up until the 19th century. The reason he can admit this is because of his heresy that dogmas evolve and thus change their meaning over time.

Ploy 6: They contradict themselves by teaching the dogma in one place then denying it in another

Beware of the ploy that many heretics use to sneak in their heresy among the faithful, which is to speak the dogma in one place and deny in another or to speak words that can be taken in the orthodox or heretical sense. This ploy is known as wilful contradictions and wilful ambiguity. Their clearly heretical statements (ones that cannot be taken in any other context) are sufficient to condemn them as heretics no matter how many other times they teach the dogma. But their wilful ambiguity can only be taken in the heretical sense by considering their other teachings on the topic or by questioning them as to what they mean.

An example of wilful contradictions is as follows. In one place, apostate Antipope Leo XIII teaches that the apostles upheld the dogma regarding justified slavery in which it could be implied that he too believes the same:

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII, *In Plurimus*, 1888: 7. From the beginning the Church spared no pains to make the Christian people, in a matter of such high importance, accept and firmly hold the true teachings of Christ and the Apostles... She clearly defined and strongly enforced the rights and mutual duties of masters and slaves as they are laid down in the letters of the Apostles. It was in these words that the Princes of the Apostles admonished the slaves they had admitted to the fold of Christ. ‘Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the forward’. ‘Servants, be obedient to them that are your lords according to the flesh, with fear and trembling in the simplicity of your heart, as to Christ. Not serving to the eye, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart. With a good will serving as to the Lord, and not to men. Knowing

that whatsoever good thing any man shall do, the same shall he receive from the Lord, whether he be bond or free' St. Paul says the same to Timothy: 'Whosoever are servants under the yoke, let them count their masters worthy of all honor; lest the name of the Lord and his doctrine be blasphemed. But they that have believing masters, let them not despise them because they are brethren, but serve them the rather, because they are faithful and beloved, who are partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort'²⁶. In like manner he commanded Titus to teach servants 'to be obedient to their masters, in all things pleasing, not gainsaying. Not defrauding, but in all things showing good fidelity, that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things.'

But in many other places in the same encyclical, he clearly condemns slavery as intrinsically sinful and thus denies the dogma regarding justified slavery:

Apostate Antipope Leo III, *In Plurimis*, 1888:

"1. But this was specially acceptable and sweet to Us because it lent confirmation to the belief, which is so welcome to Us, that the great majority of the people of Brazil desire to see the cruelty of slavery ended, and rooted out from the land."

"9. ...The Church has cut out and destroyed this dreadful curse of slavery."

"10...Do not, then, call any Christian man a slave, unless, indeed, he is in bondage again to sin."

"12. The care of the Church extended to the protection of slaves, and without interruption tended carefully to one object, that they should finally be restored to freedom."

"14. ...the Catholic Church, the banisher of slavery and causer of true liberty, fraternity, and equality among men."

"21. ...every vestige of slavery should be speedily obliterated..."

The heretics are not fit to judge which kinds of slavery are just or unjust

Slavery and the treatment of slaves must be judged as God sees it. Hence only a good and faithful Catholics are fit to judge when slavery or the treatment of slaves is just or unjust. And, in some cases, not even good and faithful Catholics can make the right judgments. Hence nominal Catholics and non-Catholics are not fit to judge when slavery or the treatment of slaves is just or unjust.

For example, faithful and good Catholics are fit to judge that the enslavement of some American Indians and of slaves brought from Africa to America is justified slavery in punishment for their paganism and with the hope to civilize them. And once they are civilized, it would be much easier to convert them or their offspring to the Catholic faith when they learn about it; because before men can be converted, they must first be civilized. However, in some cases God merely enslaves men to punish them regardless if they convert or not. Hence even though some non-Catholics (who were thus evil men) enslaved Africans and American Indians, the slavery was justified, even if they enslaved them for wrong reasons. For example, the reason some of the slave traders enslaved these pagans was merely to make money; but God's reason was to justly punish them for their paganism, and thus it was justified slavery. Many times God uses evil men to justly enslave other men. For example, God used the pagan King of Babylon, Nabuchodonosor, to justly kill and enslave the Israelites of the Southern Kingdom of Juda in punishment for their obstinate sins:

²⁶ I Tim. 6: 1-2.

“For among my people are found wicked men... They are grown gross and fat: and have most wickedly transgressed my words... Shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord? or shall not my soul take revenge on such...” (Jer. 5:26, 28-29) “For I have set my face against this city for evil, and not for good, saith the Lord: it shall be given into the hand of the king of Babylon, and he shall burn it with fire...” (Jer. 21:10) “And now I have given all these lands into the hand of Nabuchodonosor king of Babylon my servant...” (Jer. 27:6) “For the sins that you have committed before God, you shall be carried away captives into Babylon by Nabuchodonosor the king of Babylon.” (Baruch 6:1) “Gird thee with sackcloth, O daughter of my people, and sprinkle thee with ashes: make thee mourning as for an only son, a bitter lamentation...” (Jer. 6:26)

And good and faithful Catholics are also fit to judge that the treatment of slaves in the Americas, in most cases, was justified, which also applied to slaves who were worthy of severe punishments even unto the death penalty. However, several apostate antipopes and other nominal Catholics disagree. They believe this enslavement was unjustified and thus was sinful and that the treatment of these slaves in all or most cases was unjustified and sinful. However, they are not fit to make such judgments! Even good-willed non-Catholics who look at the evidence can see that these nominal Catholics are lying in regards to the treatment of slaves in the Americas. And many nominal Christians, such as conservative Protestants, can make the right judgement that this enslavement was justified, even though they are not fit as authoritative judges to make such judgments.

Apostate Antipope Paul III, *Sublimus Dei*, 1549

In the first part of his following encyclical, apostate Antipope Paul III correctly teaches that no man and thus no slave should be treated as a real animal and that no man, no matter how sinful and uncivilized, is incapable of being civilized and thus of being converted to Christianity.

Apostate Antipope Paul III, *Sublimus Dei*, 1549: “The sublime God so loved the human race that He created man in such wise that he might participate, not only in the good that other creatures enjoy, but endowed him with capacity to attain to the inaccessible and invisible Supreme Good and behold it face to face; and since man, according to the testimony of the sacred scriptures, has been created to enjoy eternal life and happiness, which none may obtain save through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, it is necessary that he should possess the nature and faculties enabling him to receive that faith; and that whoever is thus endowed should be capable of receiving that same faith. Nor is it credible that any one should possess so little understanding as to desire the faith and yet be destitute of the most necessary faculty to enable him to receive it. Hence Christ, who is the Truth itself, that has never failed and can never fail, said to the preachers of the faith whom He chose for that office Go ye and teach all nations.’ He said all, without exception, for all are capable of receiving the doctrines of the faith.

“The enemy of the human race, who opposes all good deeds in order to bring men to destruction, beholding and envying this, invented a means never before heard of, by which he might hinder the preaching of God’s word of Salvation to the people: he inspired his satellites who, to please him, have not hesitated to publish abroad that the Indians of the West and the South, and other people of whom We have recent knowledge should be treated as dumb brutes created for our service, pretending that they are incapable of receiving the Catholic Faith.

“We, who, though unworthy, exercise on earth the power of our Lord and seek with all our might to bring those sheep of His flock who are outside into the fold committed to our charge, consider, however, that the Indians are truly men and that

they are not only capable of understanding the Catholic Faith but, according to our information, they desire exceedingly to receive it.”

So far, so good! But a comment needs to be made. Some men are so evil and uncivilized that they act like animals. The Word of God teaches that some men are like senseless beasts:

“One of them a prophet of their own, said, The Creteans are always liars, evil beasts, slothful bellies.” (Titus 1:12)

“But these men, as irrational beasts, naturally tending to the snare and to destruction, blaspheming those things which they know not, shall perish in their corruption,” (2 Pt. 2:12)

“But these men blaspheme whatever things they know not: and what things soever they naturally know, like dumb beasts, in these they are corrupted.” (Jude 1:10)

God even said that some of his evil chosen people were worse than animals:

“Hear, O ye heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken. I have brought up children, and exalted them: but they have despised me. The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel hath not known me, and my people hath not understood. Woe to the sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a wicked seed, ungracious children: they have forsaken the Lord, they have blasphemed the Holy One of Israel, they are gone away backwards.” (Isa. 1:2-4)

Therefore, men that act like animals or worse than animals must be treated as animals or worse than animals until they stop acting like animals. But they are nevertheless not real animals but are human and thus can be civilized and converted. The heresy that some men are real animals is contained in apostate Judaism, which teaches that all Gentiles are real animals, soulless beasts.

The trick that Paul III plays is that after he correctly teaches that all men are human no matter how evil can be civilized and converted is that he changes the topic by banishing all slavery and thus, by implication, he believes that all slavery is unjust and that all slaves are looked upon as real animals:

Cont: “Desiring to provide ample remedy for these evils, We define and declare by these Our letters, or by any translation thereof signed by any notary public and sealed with the seal of any ecclesiastical dignitary, to which the same credit shall be given as to the originals, that, notwithstanding whatever may have been or may be said to the contrary, the said Indians and all other people who may later be discovered by Christians, are by no means to be deprived of their liberty or the possession of their property, even though they be outside the faith of Jesus Christ; and that they may and should, freely and legitimately, enjoy their liberty and the possession of their property; nor should they be in any way enslaved; should the contrary happen, it shall be null and have no effect.”

Hence apostate Antipope Paul III denies the dogma regarding justified slavery which God uses to justly punish obstinate sinners, especially those who act like or even worse than animals. Consequently, he deprives these obstinate sinners of justified slavery and thus of the opportunity to be civilized, converted, and saved.

Lastly, apostate Antipope Paul III is not competent to judge what kind of slavery is just or unjust and what kind of treatment of slaves is just or unjust or whether slaves are treated as real animal or are only treated as animals because they act like animals.

Apostate Antipope Leo III, In Plurimus, 1888

His willful ambiguity and wilful contradictions

Upon reading apostate Antipope Leo XIII letter *In Plurimus*, it is clear that he is trying to introduce the heresy that slavery is intrinsically sinful; in some places he teaches it was sinful even during the Old Testament era; but in other places, he teaches that it is only sinful during the New Covenant era. Yet, in other places he seems to teach that slavery is not intrinsically sinful. Hence he uses the tricks that all heretics use when introducing their heresy of willful ambiguity and willful contradictions. The conclusions some can make (provided they ignore Leo's statements that undermine their conclusions) are as follows:

1. All slavery at all times is intrinsically sinful and thus during the Old and New Testament eras. And this is heresy.
2. All slavery only during the New Testament era is intrinsically sinful. And this is heresy.
3. All slavery is not intrinsically evil but only unjustified slavery and unjust treatment of slaves is intrinsically evil. Hence justified slavery and the just treatment of slaves are not sinful. And this is the dogmatic teaching.

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII wants you to believe 1 or 2, but he can say he believes in 3 if challenged by one who holds the dogma. Hence on one hand he can profess the heresy to those who are inclined to believe the heresy, but on the other profess the dogma to those who hold the dogma.

His heresy that slavery, at least during the New Covenant era, is intrinsically sinful

In the following quote, Leo XIII teaches that all slavery is intrinsically sinful:

Apostate Antipope Leo III, *In Plurimis*, 1888: "But this was specially acceptable and sweet to Us because it lent confirmation to the belief, which is so welcome to Us, that the great majority of the people of Brazil desire to see the cruelty of slavery ended, and rooted out from the land."

Note that he did not say "cruel slavery" (which would be true) but the cruelty of slavery and thus that slavery itself is cruel and thus unjustified, and that is heresy. This is confirmed in other parts of his letter in which he teaches that all slavery must be abolished and thus is intrinsically sinful:

Ibid: "9. ...The Church has cut out and destroyed this dreadful curse of slavery.

In the following quote, Leo teaches that the only justified slavery during the New Covenant era is spiritual slavery to sin and the Devil and thus physical slavery is sinful and thus to be abolished:

Ibid: "10...Do not, then, call any Christian man a slave, unless, indeed, he is in bondage again to sin."

In the following quote Leo teaches that all slavery should be abolished:

Ibid: "21. ...every vestige of slavery should be speedily obliterated..."

In the following quote he teaches that all slaves should be freed:

Ibid: “12. The care of the Church extended to the protection of slaves, and without interruption tended carefully to one object, that they should finally be restored to freedom, which would greatly conduce to their eternal welfare.”

The complete opposite is true regarding justified slavery. One purpose of justified slavery is to humble and civilize obstinate sinners with the hope that they may convert and save their souls and thus “conduce to their eternal welfare.” Even though Basil of Cesarea was an apostate, he teaches the truth in this regard:

Apostate Basil of Cesarea, *On the Holy Spirit*, 4th century: “51. ...For men are either brought under a yoke of slavery by conquest, as when prisoners are taken in war; or they are enslaved on account of poverty, as the Egyptians were oppressed by Pharaoh; or, by a wise and mysterious dispensation, the worst children are by their fathers’ order condemned to serve the wiser and the better; and this any righteous enquirer into the circumstances would declare to be not a sentence of condemnation but a benefit. For it is more profitable that the man who, through lack of intelligence, has no natural principle of rule within himself, should become the chattel of another, to the end that, being guided by the reason of his master, he may be like a chariot with a charioteer, or a boat with a steersman seated at the tiller.”²⁷

In the following quote, apostate Antipope Leo XIII teaches that it is a good thing that slavery among so-called Christian nations in the 15th century has been almost blotted out, which only proves how this heresy was so widespread and prevalent at the time during the Great Apostasy. And he teaches that in his days slavery was being revived in some areas and thus needs to be again abolished. He also says that all nations (and thus even pagan nations) are innocent and thus do not deserve to be subjected to slavery:

Ibid: “15. Toward the end of the fifteenth century, at which time the base stain of slavery having been nearly blotted out from among Christian nations, States were anxious to stand firmly in evangelical liberty, and also to increase their empire, this apostolic see took the greatest care that the evil germs of such depravity should nowhere revive. She therefore directed her provident vigilance to the newly discovered regions of Africa, Asia, and America; for a report had reached her that the leaders of those expeditions, Christians though they were, were wickedly making use of their arms and ingenuity for establishing and imposing slavery on these innocent nations.”

Africa, Asia, and America were and still are infested with many pagans and he has the audacity to call them innocent nations, which is yet another of Leo’s heresies.

Leo, then, coyly changes the topic by speaking about what he believes was unjust slavery and the unjust treatment of slaves:

Ibid: “15. ...Indeed, since the crude nature of the soil which they had to overcome, nor less the wealth of metals which had to be extracted by digging, required very hard work, unjust and inhuman plans were entered into. For a certain traffic was begun, slaves being transported for that purpose from Ethiopia, which, at that time, under the name of ‘La tratta dei Negri,’ too much occupied those colonies. An oppression of the indigenous inhabitants (who are collectively called Indians), much the same as slavery, followed with a like maltreatment.”

According to Leo, very hard work is sinful, which is yet another heresy. It seems he believes the only work men should do is white collar work and not blue collar work, which is only more proof of his effeminacy. Without blue collar workers, men cannot survive. There would be no food, clothes, homes, buildings, cities, transportation, etc. The Word of God condemns Leo’s laziness regarding hard labor:

²⁷ c. 20.

“Hate not labourious works nor husbandry ordained by the most High.” (Eccus. 7:16)

And, again, Leo is a heretic for acting like man is already in paradise and thus should not do hard work. He has denied the dogma regarding the curse that God has put upon mankind because of original sin:

“And to Adam he said: Because thou hast hearkened to the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat, cursed is the earth in thy work; with labour and toil shalt thou eat thereof all the days of thy life. Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herbs of the earth. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return to the earth, out of which thou wast taken: for dust thou art, and into dust thou shalt return.” (Gen. 3:17-19)

Leo also condemns slaves being transported from one place to another, when in fact this is the case with many slaves. Hence slaves being transported from one place to another to do hard work is hardly intrinsically sinful but in many cases is the essence of justified slavery. Hence the mere fact that slaves are transported from one place to another to do labor is not intrinsically sinful, or else God would be evil for ordaining that almost the entire Northern Kingdom of Israel be transported into Assyria and put to labor:

“In the days of Phacee king of Israel came Theglathphalasar king of Assyria, and took Aion, and Abel Domum Maacha and Janoe, and Cedes, and Asor, and Galaad, and Galilee, and all the land of Nephtali: and carried them captives into Assyria.” (4 Ki. 15:29)

And God would be evil for ordaining that almost the entire Southern Kingdom of Juda to be transported into Babylon and put to labor:

“For the sins that you [the Israelites of the Southern Kingdom of Juda] have committed before God, you shall be carried away captives into Babylon by Nabuchodonosor the king of Babylon. And when you are come into Babylon, you shall be there many years, and for a long time, even to seven generations.” (Bar. 6:1-2)

In Leo’s above quote regarding slavery, he says the slaves were maltreated; which if true, would be the unjust treatment of slaves. But that does not mean all harsh treatment of slaves is unjust and thus maltreatment, as some slaves deserve to be harshly treated from the point of mild punishments, to severe punishments, and even to death. In the following quote, Leo, again, implies that all slaves are treated unjustly and thus all slaves should be freed on this point alone:

Ibid: “Having established these principles as beginnings and foundations, the Church, like a tender mother, went on to try to find some alleviation for the sorrows and the disgrace of the life of the slave;”

Justified slavery is precisely meant to disgrace and humble the slaves as a just punishment from God. But that does not mean that their life as slaves is a disgrace in the sense that all of them are unjustly treated by their masters. Hence Leo lies by implying that all slaves are treated unjustly by their masters and thus should be freed.

The disposition of the slaves and the reason for the slavery, in the eyes of God, is what determines if the slavery is just or unjust. And the unjust or just treatment of slaves must be judged as God sees it. Hence, because he is an apostate, the rebellious, humanist, and effeminate Antipope Leo XIII is not competent to judge what kind of slavery is just or unjust and what kind of treatment of slaves is just or unjust.

His heresies that Christ's redemption benefited all men and that this earth is or should be a paradise

All of the heretics who deny one or more dogmas regarding slavery, at least by implication, believe that the earth, at least during the New Covenant era, is already paradise. And thus no one is worthy of being made a slave because Christ redeemed all men and thus by this fact alone, the heretics conclude, that all men are forgiven and thus pleasing to God. This heresy denies the dogma that men must cooperate with their redemption to benefit from it and thus to be pleasing to God and hence to be saved.

For example, apostate Antipope Leo III teaches this heresy:

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII, *In Plurimis*, 1888: "7. ...And now through the new Adam, who is Christ, there is established a brotherly union between man and man, and people and people;"

Christ did not come to establish brotherly love among all men but only among those who believe in him and obey him and thus only among Catholics. Christ's following teaching, among many, condemns the heresy that the mere coming of Christ established brotherly love among all men:

"Do not think that I came to send peace upon earth: I came not to send peace, but the sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law." (Mt. 10:34-35)

The apostate lying Leo then goes on to imply that all men are saved:

Ibid: "just as in the order of nature they all have a common origin, so in the order which is above nature, they all have one and the same origin in salvation and faith;"

The fact that all men have the same common origin in Adam does not mean they also have the same origin in salvation and faith. Only those who believe in the true Jesus (the Catholic Jesus) have the same spiritual origin in salvation and faith. St. Paul says, "You are all the children of God by faith, in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3:26) The spiritual common origin of those who do not believe in the true Jesus is the Devil and hell because they have not cooperated with their redemption. Hence Leo teaches heresy when he says that "all have one and the same origin in salvation and faith."

But in the next sentence, Leo tells a truth:

Ibid: "all alike are called to be the adopted sons of God and the Father, who has paid the self-same ransom for us all;"

Here he correctly says that all men are called to be saved, which can imply that not all men will be saved. But this contradicts his previous sentence in which he implied that all men have faith and will be saved. In order to uphold his heresy, Leo could say that all men are called and all men will respond and be saved. In the above quote, Leo correctly says that Christ redeemed all men. But in the next sentence he says that all men are members of the same body" and thus implies the all men have benefited from the redemption:

Ibid: "all alike are called to be the adopted sons of God and the Father, who has paid the self-same ransom for us all; we are all members of the same body, all are allowed to partake of the same divine banquet, and offered to us all are the blessings of divine grace and of eternal life".

He goes from correctly saying that all men are called to be adopted sons of God to the heresy that all men are adopted sons of God when he says all men are "members of the same body."

Hence he teaches the heresy that Christ's redemption of all men equals the salvation of all men and thus men do not have to cooperate with their redemption to be saved.

Now all these heresies of Leo paved the road for his heresy that slavery, at least during the New Covenant era, is intrinsically sinful, as quoted above. However, in the following quote, Leo seems to contradict himself because it seems he is now teaching that slavery is not intrinsically sinful:

Ibid: "with this end in view she clearly defined and strongly enforced the rights and mutual duties of masters and slaves as they are laid down in the letters of the Apostles. It was in these words that the Princes of the Apostles admonished the slaves they had admitted to the fold of Christ. 'Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the forward.'²⁸ 'Servants, be obedient to them that are your lords according to the flesh, with fear and trembling in the simplicity of your heart, as to Christ. Not serving to the eye, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart. With a good will serving as to the Lord, and not to men. Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man shall do, the same shall he receive from the Lord, whether he be bond or free.'²⁹. St. Paul says the same to Timothy: 'Whosoever are servants under the yoke, let them count their masters worthy of all honor; lest the name of the Lord and his doctrine be blasphemed. But they that have believing masters, let them not despise them because they are brethren, but serve them the rather, because they are faithful and beloved, who are partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort.'³⁰. In like manner he commanded Titus to teach servants 'to be obedient to their masters, in all things pleasing, not gainsaying. Not defrauding, but in all things showing good fidelity, that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things.'³¹"

Leo now seems to teach slavery is not intrinsically sinful, which contradicts his teachings in the same letter where he teaches that slavery is sinful. When his other teachings on slavery, even in the same letter, are considered, Leo, in the above quote, means that slavery is still intrinsically evil but only that it is to be tolerated. Only sinful things are tolerated. Hence, Leo is consistent in his heretical belief that slavery is intrinsically evil even when he seems to contradict himself by using quotes that speak of slavery in an acceptable light. For example, The following statement from Leo is more proof of this when he says that the only reason the Church has not liberated slaves in all cases is because it would cause chaos by going against the current order of things:

Ibid: "9. ...She has deprecated any precipitate action in securing the manumission and liberation of the slaves, because that would have entailed tumults and wrought injury, as well to the slaves themselves as to the commonwealth, but with singular wisdom she has seen that the minds of the slaves should be instructed through her discipline in the Christian faith, and with baptism should acquire habits suitable to the Christian life."

The implication by Leo is that the Church only tolerated slavery and thus never condoned it as a justified punishment or trial from God.

Leo not only teaches that slavery is intrinsically sinful during the New Covenant era, but also during the Old Testament era. And, by implication, he teaches that man never committed the original sin and was never cast out of paradise:

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII, *In Plurimis*, 1888: "3. In the presence of so much suffering, the condition of slavery, in which a considerable part of the great human family has been sunk in squalor and affliction now for many centuries, is deeply to be deplored; for the system is one which is wholly opposed to that which was

²⁸ I Peter 2:18.

²⁹ Eph. 6:5-8.

³⁰ I Tim. 6: 1-2.

³¹ Titus 2:9-10.

originally ordained by God and by nature. The Supreme Author of all things so decreed that man should exercise a sort of royal dominion over beasts and cattle and fish and fowl, but never that men should exercise a like dominion over their fellow men.”

This is true when Adam and Eve were in the Garden of Paradise and thus before they committed the original sin. But Leo wants you to believe it is true even now (after the original sin, after Adam and Eve were cast out of the Garden of Paradise) and thus he wants you to believe slavery is intrinsically sinful and against the natural law. In 1866, Twenty-two years before Leo’s encyclical, a nominal Holy Office decree under apostate Antipope Pius IX correctly condemns Leo’s belief that slavery is intrinsically sinful and against the natural law:

Nominal Holy Office Decree, 1866, under apostate Antipope Pius IX: “Slavery itself, considered as such in its essential nature, is not at all contrary to the natural and divine law, and there can be several just titles of slavery and these are referred to by approved theologians and commentators of the sacred canons. ... It is not contrary to the natural and divine law for a slave to be sold, bought, exchanged or given. The purchaser should carefully examine whether the slave who is put up for sale has been justly or unjustly deprived of his liberty, and that the vendor should do nothing which might endanger the life, virtue, or Catholic faith of the slave.”³²

Leo then goes on to teach that after men sinned, sin came into the world, which is true. But he heretical says that two of the sins are that men began to look upon other men as inferior and that some men made other men slaves.

Ibid: “4. From the first sin came all evils, and specially this perversity that there were men who, forgetful of the original brotherhood of the race, instead of seeking, as they should naturally have done, to promote mutual kindness and mutual respect, following their evil desires began to think of other men as their inferiors, and to hold them as cattle born for the yoke. In this way, through an absolute forgetfulness of our common nature, and of human dignity, and the likeness of God stamped upon us all, it came to pass that in the contentions and wars which then broke out, those who were the stronger reduced the conquered into slavery; so that mankind, though of the same race, became divided into two sections, the conquered slaves and their victorious masters.”

While it is a sin to look upon men as or treat them as real animals (even though it is not a sin to say that some men act like animals and thus treat them as one would animals), it is not intrinsically sinful to enslave men. And while it is true that the physical brotherhood of all men comes from Adam because all man are human, it is heresy to teach or imply, as Leo does, that all men are spiritual brothers to one another since the fall of Adam and Eve. Since the fall of Adam and Eve, some men believe in and obey the one true God and thus are spiritual brothers while others do not and thus are not spiritual brothers to those who believe in and obey God. Those who believe in and obey God are spiritually superior to those who do not. And men are physically inferior to other men in natural order; such as, some men are born to serve and others to rule, and even those who rule are inferior to those who rule above them, wives are inferior to their husbands, children are inferior to their parents, some men are inferior in intelligence than other men, and some men are not as physically strong as other men. And even in heaven some are inferior to others, as all creatures are inferior to the Blessed Virgin Mary and Mary is inferior to God. Hence it is heresy when Leo says that men must not look upon some men as inferior. He holds the heresy that all men are equal, which is the mantra and heretical belief of the Freemasons and the democracies they invented:

³² Source: Instruction 20, The Holy Office (Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith), June 20, 1866.

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Freemasonry: “Even the programme of the Revolution expressed in the ‘rights of man’ was, as shown above, drawn from Masonic principles, and its device: ‘Liberty, Equality, Fraternity’ is the very device of Freemasonry.”

It is the apostate Jews who formed and control the Freemasons. And it is they that introduced the mantra of “Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity” in order to destroy the hierarchic order in the governments and families of the Gentiles and to create chaos in Gentile nations, which enabled them to come to power and increase in power. Note how these apostate Jews are not as stupid and gullible as the stupid and gullible Gentiles, nominal Catholic included, who swallow their lies:

Protocols of the Elders of Zion, 1897:

Protocol 4: “2. Gentile masonry blindly serves as a screen for us and our objects; but the plan of action of our force, even its very abiding-place, remains for the whole people an unknown mystery.”

“Protocol 1: “25. Far back in ancient times we were the first to cry among the masses of the people the words ‘*Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*,’ words many times repeated since these days by stupid poll-parrots who, from all sides around, flew down upon these baits and with them carried away the well-being of the world, true freedom of the individual, formerly so well guarded against the pressure of the mob. The would-be wise men of the goyim, the intellectuals, could not make anything out of the uttered words in their abstractedness; did not see that in nature there is no equality, cannot be freedom: that Nature herself has established inequality of minds, of characters, and capacities, just as immutably as she has established subordination to her laws: never stopped to think that the mob is a blind thing, that upstarts elected from among it to bear rule are, in regard to the political, the same blind men as the mob itself... 26. In all corners of the earth the words “*Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*,” brought to our ranks, thanks to our blind agents, whole legions who bore our banners with enthusiasm. And all the time these words were canker-worms at work boring into the well-being of the goyim, putting an end everywhere to peace, quiet, solidarity and destroying all the foundations of the goya States. As you will see later, this helped us to our triumph: it gave us the possibility, among other things, of getting into our hands the master card—the destruction of the privileges, or in other words of the very existence of the aristocracy of the goyim, that class which was the only defense peoples and countries had against us.”

“Protocol 9: “2. The words of the liberal, which are in effect the words of our Masonic watchword, namely, ‘*Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*,’ will, when we come into our kingdom, be changed by us into words no longer of a watchword, but only an expression of idealism, namely, into ‘The right of liberty, the duty of equality, the ideal of brotherhood.’ That is how we shall put it, —and so we shall catch the bull by the horns ... *de facto* we have already wiped out every kind of rule except our own, although *de jure* there still remain a good many of them. Nowadays, if any States raise a protest against us it is only *pro forma* at our discretion and by our direction.”

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII, in his same letter, utters this apostate Jewish, Freemasonic, and democracy mantra (heresy):

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII, *In Plurimis*, 1888: “14. Therefore, sufficient praise or thanks can never be returned to the Catholic Church, the banisher of slavery and causer of true liberty, fraternity, and equality among men, since she has merited it by the prosperity of nations, through the very great beneficence of Christ our Redeemer.”

This and many other things make Leo highly suspect of being a Freemason.³³ If he were not a Freemason, then he was a useful idiot to the apostate Jews, a “stupid poll-parrot,” a “would-be wise man,” and “upstart,” and a “blind agent...who bore our [apostate Jews’] banners with enthusiasm.”

Note also how Leo uses his heresy that all men are equal to defend his heresy that slavery is intrinsically evil and thus the Church should banish all slavery. And note how Leo uses his heresy that Christ’s redemption made all men are free (liberty), brothers (fraternity), and equal (equality) to defend his heresy that slavery is intrinsically sinful.

And this brings us back to Leo’s implied heresy, by logical conclusion, that Adam and Eve never committed the original sin; or if they did, Christ’s redemption during his first coming rid the world of original sin and its consequences and thus this earth is already paradise or, at least, it can and should be before the second coming of Jesus Christ. This is the utopian heresy of the humanist. In the following quote, Leo hints that before Christ came, slavery abounded because the world was not yet a paradise; and thus, by implication, after Christ came, the earth became or should become a paradise before his second coming:

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII, *In Plurimis*, 1888: “4. ...The history of the ancient world presents us with this miserable spectacle down to the time of the coming of our Lord, when the calamity of slavery had fallen heavily upon all the peoples, and the number of freemen had become so reduced that the poet was able to put this atrocious phrase into the mouth of Caesar: ‘The human race exists for the sake of a few’³⁴.

The dogma is that this earth will not be free from Satan and the other devils and evil human beings and sin until after the second coming of Christ. Hence it is a dogma that this world will not become a paradise until after the second coming of Christ. Consequently, justified slavery, which is a just punishment from God, will not be abolished under after the second coming of Christ, except for the slavery of devils and damned humans. Until then, Satan controls this world to one degree or another during both the Old and New Testament eras and that most of the men in this world were evil during the Old Testament era and most men are evil during the New Testament era, to the point that Jesus said,

“Yet the Son of man, when he cometh, shall he find, think you, faith on earth?” (Lk. 18:8)

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII, as well as the other humanists, are trying to bring paradise (utopia) upon this wicked earth before the second coming of Christ and thus without Christ and contrary to the Word of God which teaches that it is Jesus Christ who brings this paradise, this utopia, after his second coming.

He takes a teaching from Pope St. Gregory I out of context

Beware of Leo’s trick to defend his heresy by using Pope St. Gregory I following quote out of context.

Ibid: “2. ...The words of St. Gregory the Great are very applicable here: ‘Since our Redeemer, the Author of all life, deigned to take human flesh, that by the power of his Godhood the chains by which we were held in bondage being broken, he might restore us to our first state of liberty, it is most fitting that men by the concession of manumission should restore to the freedom in which they were born those whom

³³ See *RJMI Topic Index*: Leo XIII, apostate antipope.

³⁴ Lucan, “Phars.” 5, 343.

nature sent free into the world, but who have been condemned to the yoke of slavery by the law of nations.³⁵”

Pope St. Gregory wrote this letter upon his occasion of freeing two Catholic slaves that were worthy of being freed. He did not intend to teach that all slaves should be freed even though it may seem that he is teaching that all slaves should be freed. He is not teaching, as Leo had, that all men benefited from the redemption but only that all men *might* benefit from the redemption.

Pope St. Gregory I, *Letters*, Letter to Montana and Thomas, 4th or 5th century:
“Since our Redeemer, the Author of all life, deigned to take human flesh, that by the power of his Godhood the chains by which we were held in bondage being broken, he might restore us to our first state of liberty...”

And when Gregory’s other teachings on slavery are considered and when his own and previous popes’ practice of having slaves is considered, Gregory is not teaching that all slavery is intrinsically sinful. If Gregory believed slavery were intrinsically sinful during the New Covenant era, then he and all the previous popes, at least by sins of omissions, and other Catholics sinned by having slaves or by not condemning slavery. And, in his Pastoral Rule, Gregory upholds the dogma regarding justified slavery:

Pope St. Gregory I, *The Book of Pastoral Rule*, 7th century: “Differently to be admonished are servants and masters. Servants, to wit, that they ever keep in view the humility of their condition; but masters, that they lose not recollection of their nature, in which they are constituted on an equality with servants. Servants are to be admonished that they despise not their masters, lest they offend God, if by behaving themselves proudly they gainsay his ordinance; masters, too, are to be admonished, that they are proud against God with respect to his gift, if they acknowledge not those whom they hold in subjection by reason of their condition to be their equals by reason of their community of nature. The former are to be admonished to know themselves to be servants of masters; the latter are to be admonished to acknowledge themselves to be fellow-servants of servants. For to those it is said, ‘Servants, obey your masters according to the flesh’ (Col. 3:22); and again, ‘Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their masters worthy of all honour’ (1 Tim. 6:1); but to these it is said, ‘And ye, masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening, knowing that both their and your Master is in heaven’ (Eph. 6:9).³⁶”

Not only did Gregory defend slavery during the New Covenant era, as contained in his Pastoral Rule, but in no place did he ever condemn slavery, as Leo had. For example, Leo said the following regarding slavery.

Apostate Antipope Leo III, *In Plurimis*, 1888:

“1. But this was specially acceptable and sweet to Us because it lent confirmation to the belief, which is so welcome to Us, that the great majority of the people of Brazil desire to see the cruelty of slavery ended, and rooted out from the land.”

“9. ...The Church has cut out and destroyed this dreadful curse of slavery.”

“10...Do not, then, call any Christian man a slave, unless, indeed, he is in bondage again to sin.”

“12. The care of the Church extended to the protection of slaves, and without interruption tended carefully to one object, that they should finally be restored to freedom.”

³⁵ Epist., lib. 6, ep. 12 (PL 77, 803C-804A).

³⁶ p. 3, c. 5.

“14. ...the Catholic Church, the banisher of slavery and causer of true liberty, fraternity, and equality among men.”

“21. ...every vestige of slavery should be speedily obliterated...”

And in his following encyclical in, 1890, apostate Antipope Leo XIII said the following:

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII, *Catholica Ecclesiae*, 1890: “1. ...“The Church from the beginning sought to completely eliminate slavery, whose wretched yoke has oppressed many people... Our predecessors... applied every effort to eliminate the institution of slavery wherever it existed. 2. ... For this reason, We have taken every occasion to openly condemn this gloomy plague of slavery.”

Pope St. Gregory I never said any such thing regarding slavery. But apostate Antipope Leo XIII wants you to believe he did.