

The Popes and Slavery

The Popes and Slavery

By Joel S Panzer

The substantial teaching against slavery that was provided by the Papal Magisterium rightly should give Catholics a great sense of pride.



**The Church in History
Information Centre**

www.churchinhistory.org

When did the Catholic Church condemn slavery? According to some notable figures, the Church did not finally condemn slavery until recently. Federal judge and scholar John T. Noonan states that it was not until 1890 that the Church condemned the institution of slavery. [1] He and others argue that slavery is one of the areas in which the Church has changed its moral teaching to suit the times, and that the time for this change did not come until near the end of the last century. Theologian Laennec Hurbon may be cited as representing a belief among many authors that no Pope before 1890 condemned slavery when he states that, "... one can search in vain through the interventions of the holy See—those of Pius V, Urban VIII and Benedict XIV—for any condemnation of the actual principle of slavery." [2] Author John F. Maxwell wrote in his 1975 work on slavery that the Church did not correct its teaching on the moral legitimacy of slavery until 1965, with the publication from the Second Vatican Council of the Constitution *Gaudium et Spes*. [3]

There existed of course the practice of various types of slavery before the 15th century. However, it was not until the 15th century, and with growing frequency from the 16th to the 19th centuries, that racial slavery as we know it became a major problem. It is this form of servitude that is called to mind when we think today of the institution of slavery, and is the type which was to prevail in parts of the New World for over four centuries.

This brings us back to our initial question: When did the Church condemn this slavery? If it was not until 1890, or even 1965, then a great shadow has indeed been cast upon the Magisterium. If, however, it can be shown that the Magisterium condemned from the beginning the colonial slavery that developed in the newly discovered lands, then it may be necessary for some historians and others to revise their opinions of that teaching office, and of the Catholic Church as well.

In fact, from 1435 to 1890 numerous bulls and encyclicals were written by several Popes to both bishops and the whole Christian faithful for the sole purpose of condemning slavery and the slave trade. The very existence of these many papal teachings during particular period of history is a strong indication that from the viewpoint of the Magisterium there must have developed a moral problem of a different sort than any previously encountered. In this article we will address three—from many more—of the responses of the Papal Magisterium to the widespread enslavement that accompanied the Age of Discovery and beyond.

Eugene IV: *Sicut Dudum*, January 13, 1435

On January 13, 1435, Eugene IV issued from Florence the bull *Sicut Duhum*. Sent to Bishop Ferdinand, located at Rubicon on the island of Lanzarote, this bull condemned the enslavement of the black natives of the newly colonized Canary Islands off the coast of Africa. The Pope states that after being converted to the faith or promised baptism, many of the inhabitants were taken from their home and enslaved:

They have deprived the natives of their property or turned it to their own use, and have subjected some of the inhabitants of said islands to perpetual slavery (*subdiderunt perpetuae servituti*), sold then to other persons and committed other various illicit and evil deeds against them . . . Therefore We ... exhort, through the sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ shed for their sins, one and all, temporal princes, lords, captains, armed men, barons, soldiers, nobles, communities and all others of every kind among the Christian faithful of whatever state, grade or condition, that they themselves desist from the aforementioned deeds, cause those subject to them to desist from them, and restrain them rigorously. And no less do We order and command all and each of the faithful of each sex that, within the space of fifteen days of the publication of these letters in the place where they live, that they restore to their pristine liberty all and each person of either sex who were once residents of said Canary Islands ... who have been made subject to slavery (*servituri subicere*). These people are to be totally and perpetually free and are to be let go without the exaction or reception of any money. [4]

The date of this Bull, 1435, is very significant. Nearly sixty years before the Europeans were to find the New World, we already have the papal condemnation of slavery as soon as this crime was discovered in one of the first of the Portuguese geographical discoveries. Eugene IV is clear in his intentions both to condemn the enslavement of the residents of the Canary Islands, and to demand correction of the injustice within fifteen days. Those who do not restore the enslaved to their liberty in that time incur the sentence of excommunication *ipso facto*.

With *Sicut Dudum*, Eugene was clearly intending to condemn the enslavement of the people of the Canaries and, in no uncertain terms, to inform the faithful that what was being condemned was what we would classify as gravely wrong. Thus, the unjust slavery that had begun in the newly found territories was condemned, condemned as soon as it was discovered, and condemned in the strongest of terms. [5]

Paul III: Sublimis Deus, June 2, 1537

The pontifical decree known as *The Sublime God* has indeed had an exalted role in the cause of social justice in the New World. Recently, even the Peruvian liberation theologian Gustavo Gutierrez noted this fact: "The bull of Pope Paul III, *Sublimis Deus*, is regarded as the most important papal pronouncement on the human condition of the Indians," [6] It is moreover addressed to all of the Christian faithful in the world, and not to a particular bishop in one area, thereby not limiting its significance, but universalizing it.

Sublimis Deus was intended to be issued as the central pedagogical work against slavery. Two other bulls would be published to implement the teaching of *Sublimis*, one to impose penalties on those who fail to abide by the teaching against slavery, and a second to specify the sacramental consequences of the teaching that the Indians are true men.

The first central teaching of this beautiful work is the universality of the call to receive the Faith and salvation:

And since mankind, according to the witness of Sacred Scripture, was created for eternal life and happiness and since no one is able to attain this eternal life and happiness except through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, it is necessary to confess that man is of such a nature and condition that he is capable to receive faith in Christ and that every one who possesses human nature is apt for receiving such faith . . . Therefore the Truth Himself Who can neither deceive nor be deceived, when He destined the preachers of the faith to the office of preaching, is known to have said: "Go, make disciples of all nations." "All," he said, without any exception since all are capable of the discipline of the faith. [7]

The teaching of *Sublimis* continues:

Seeing this and envying it, the enemy of the human race, who always opposes all good men so that the race may perish, has thought up a way, unheard of before now, by which he might impede the saving word of God from being preached to the nations. He has stirred up some of his allies who, desiring to satisfy their own avarice, are presuming to assert far and wide that the Indians of the West and the South who have come to our notice in these times be reduced to our service like brute animals, under the pretext that they are lacking the Catholic Faith. And they reduce them to slavery (*Et eos in servitutem redigunt*), treating them with afflictions they would scarcely use with brute animals. [8]

The common pretext of the allies of "the enemy of the human race," i.e. Satan, for enslaving the Indians was that they lacked the Faith. Some of the Europeans used the reasoning that converting the Indians should be accomplished by any means necessary, thus making the Faith an excuse for war and enslavement. Paul III states that the practice of this form of servitude was "*unheard of before now.*" This clearly indicates that the practice of enslaving an entire ethnic group of people—the Indians of South America—for no morally justifiable reason was indeed different from anything previously encountered.

The second core teaching of *Sublimis Deus* which follows from this is the necessity of restoring and maintaining the liberty of the Indians:

Therefore, We.... noting that the Indians themselves indeed are true men and are not only capable of the Christian faith, but, as has been made known to us, promptly hasten to the faith, and wishing to provide suitable remedies for them, by our Apostolic Authority decree and declare by these present letters that the same Indians and all other peoples—even though they are outside the faith who shall hereafter come to the knowledge of Christians have not been deprived or should not be deprived of their liberty or of their possessions (*sua libertate ac serum suarum dominio privatos seu privandos non esse*). Rather they are to be able to use and enjoy this liberty and this ownership of property freely and licitly, and are not to be reduced to slavery (*nec in servitatem redigi debere*), and that whatever happens to the contrary is to be considered null and void. These same Indians and other peoples are to be invited to the said faith in Christ by preaching and the example of a good life. [9]

Paul states that the Indians are "true men" who are able to accept the Faith, and in fact do so eagerly. Thus, "the same Indians and *all other peoples—even though they are outside the faith*" (emphasis added), [10] are not to have their possessions taken or their lives reduced to slavery. This teaching is not to be limited to Christians or Indians only, and is to be applied to any and all peoples who may be encountered in the future. Anything done or taught contrary to this universal Bull is null and void. The conversion, not the domination, of the Indians is to be the goal of the Europeans; this goal is not to be attained by violence, but rather "by preaching and the example of a good life." [11]

Thus we see that Eugene IV and Paul III did not hesitate to condemn the forced servitude of Blacks and Indians, and they did so once such practices became known to the Holy See. Their teaching was continued by Gregory XIV in 1591 and by Urban VIII in 1639.

Indeed Urban in his document *Commisum Nobis* appeals to the teaching of his predecessors, particularly Paul III. The pontifical teaching was continued by the response of the Holy Office on March 20, 1686 under Innocent XI, and by the encyclical of Benedict XIV, *Inmensa Pastorum* on December 20, 1741.

This work was followed by the efforts of Pius VII at the Congress of Vienna in 1815 to have the victors over Napoleon outlaw slavery.

Gregory XVI, *In Supremo*, December 3, 1839

The 1839 Constitution *In Supremo* of Gregory XVI continued the antislavery teaching of his predecessors, and was in the same manner not accepted by many of those bishops, priests and laity for whom it was written.

As we will see, even today many authors do not have an accurate understanding of this work. First, however, let us consider the content of *In Supremo* itself.

The introduction of *In Supremo* tells us that it was written to turn Christians away from the practice of enslaving Blacks and other peoples. Gregory first mentions the efforts of the Apostles and other early Christians to alleviate out of the motive of Christian charity the suffering of those held in servitude, and that they encouraged the practice of emancipating deserving slaves. At the same time, he notes that:

There were to be found subsequently among the faithful some who, shamefully blinded by the desire of sordid gain, in lonely and distant countries did not hesitate to reduce to slavery (*in servitutem redigere*) Indians, Blacks and other unfortunate peoples, or else, by instituting or expanding the trade in those who had been made slaves by others, aided the crime of others. Certainly many Roman Pontiffs of glorious memory, Our Predecessors, did not fail, according to the duties of their office, to blame severely this way of acting as dangerous for the spiritual welfare of those who did such things and a shame to the Christian name. [12]

Gregory then cites the various predecessors and their antislavery teachings, even recalling the familiar phrase *in servitutem redigere* contained in the work of Paul III and his successors. He mentions the efforts of Clement I, Pius II, Paul III, Benedict XIV, Urban VIII and Pius VII, before concluding this historical summary:

Indeed these sanctions and this concern of Our Predecessors availed in no small measure, with the help of God, to protect the Indians and the other peoples mentioned from the cruelties of the invaders and from the greed of Christian traders. [13]

However, Gregory is well aware that there is still much work to be done:

The slave trade, although it has been somewhat diminished, is still carried on by numerous Christians. Therefore, desiring to remove such a great shame from all Christian peoples . . . and walking in the footsteps of Our Predecessors, We, by apostolic authority, warn and strongly exhort in the Lord faithful Christians of every condition that no one in the future dare to bother unjustly, despoil of their possessions, or reduce to slavery (*in servitutem redigere*) Indians, Blacks or other such peoples. Nor are they to lend aid and favor to those who give themselves up to these practices, or exercise that inhuman traffic by which the Blacks, as if they were not humans but rather mere animals, having been brought into slavery in no matter what way, are, without any distinction and contrary to the rights of justice and humanity, bought, sold and sometimes given over to the hardest labor. [14]

Thus, the historical papal teaching against unjust servitude and the slave trade is upheld, and in 1839 is once again presented to the Christian faithful for their adherence. In Gregory's time, as with the previous papal efforts, there was obviously widespread nonacceptance on the part of Catholic clergy and laity. Thus In *Supremo* also contains a closing prohibition against clerics as well as laity who were attempting to defend slavery or the slave trade:

We prohibit and strictly forbid any Ecclesiastic or lay person from presuming to defend as permissible this trade in Blacks under no matter what pretext or excuse, or from publishing or teaching in any manner whatsoever, in public or privately, opinions contrary to what We have set forth in these Apostolic Letters. [15]

The primary area of contention with *In Supremo* lies in determining what was actually being condemned by Gregory. The text of the Papal Constitution itself is clearly condemning both the slave trade *and slavery*, as is apparent from the preceding paragraph citations. Both of the above citations prohibit the slave trade, Likewise, in the first paragraph we read that *slavery itself* is also condemned: “. . . no one in the future dare to . . . reduce to slavery (*in servitutem redigere*) Indians, Blacks or other such peoples.” [16]

In the second paragraph, the prohibition of “opinions contrary to what We have set forth in these Apostolic Letters” indicates that no one may hold that slavery itself is somehow not condemned. The question that should be asked, then, is why have many bishops, historians and others interpreted *In Supremo* as condemning the slave trade, *but not slavery itself*?

Besides the previous quotation from Laennec Hurbon, we may further illustrate the problem by citing also the American Church historian James Hennesey. The following is taken from his consideration of the Church's efforts, or lack thereof, to obtain the abolition of slavery in the United States:

Opponents of slavery found slight support in official church teaching. Pope Gregory XVI in 1838 [sic] condemned the slave trade, *but not slavery itself* [emphasis added]. [17]

John T. Noonan also believes that Gregory condemned only the slave trade, and that there were exceptions even to this condemnation:

In 1839 Gregory XVI condemned the slave trade, but not so explicitly that the condemnation covered occasional sales by owners of surplus stock. [18]

The American bishops in the last century, who were charged with applying the teaching of *In Supremo* to the slavery institution that existed in our country, as a teaching body fell into this same error regarding what was condemned.

No (American) Catholic bishop spoke for abolition in the prewar years. In 1840 [the Bishop of Charleston] John England explained to [president Martin] Van Buren's Secretary of State, John Forsyth, that Pope Gregory XVI had condemned the trade in slaves, but that *no pope had ever condemned domestic slavery as it had existed in the United States* [emphasis added]. [19]

Thus, the misreading of *In Supremo* that exists among scholars today actually has its roots in the partial rejection of that papal Constitution by the American hierarchy over a century and a half earlier.

On the other hand, John Maxwell is quite right in his statement of what Gregory actually taught in *In Supremo*: "It is clear that the Pope is condemning *unjust enslavement* and unjust slave-trading" [emphasis added]. [20]

Also correct is the papal historian, J.N.D. Kelly, who states, "In the brief *In Supremo* (3 Dec. 1839) he denounced *slavery* and the slave-trade as unworthy of Christians" [emphasis added]. [21]

From the documents we have considered --- and we have given a much abbreviated treatment --- it is clear that the forced enslavement of Indians and Blacks was condemned from the time that the "Age of Discovery" began, and that as this problem continued and expanded in the territorial finds of the New World, the same teaching of the Roman pontiffs was reiterated time and again. Likewise, the buying and selling of slaves unjustly held was also condemned by 1435. The development of this teaching over the span of nearly five centuries was occasioned by the unique and illicit form of servitude that accompanied the Age of Discovery. The just titles to servitude were not rejected by the Church, but rather were tolerated for many reasons. [22] This in no way invalidates the clear and consistent teaching against the unjust slavery that came to prevail in Africa and the Western Hemisphere, first in Central and South America and then in the United States, for approximately four centuries.

The substantial teaching against slavery that was provided by the Papal Magisterium rightly should give Catholics, and indeed all Christians, a great sense of pride. This teaching was founded in the teachings of Our Lord that all people are loved immensely by God the Father, and have received redemption and the vocation to eternal happiness in Christ the Son. At the same time, it must be remembered that Christians themselves, and notably members of the clergy, frequently and sometimes blatantly violated this same teaching. Nevertheless, the Catholic tradition of opposition to unjust servitude was a great help in eventually bringing about an end to the enslavement of the Indians and Blacks in many parts of Latin America, as well as of the peoples in the Philippines and other areas.

The prevalent attitude of the American hierarchy in the last century, with some notable exceptions in both directions, was that many aspects of slavery were evil, but that to change the law would be, practically speaking, a greater evil. Some put forth strong arguments in favor of the institution of slavery, such as Bishop John England of Charleston, who believed it to be among the accepted practices of the early Church:

The right of the master, the duty of the slave, the lawfulness of continuing the relations, and the benevolence of religion in mitigating the sufferings . . . are the results exhibited by our view of the laws and facts during the first four centuries of Christianity. [23]

Answering the charge that Catholics were widely supporting the abolitionist movement which sadly was far from accurate—England noted that Gregory XVI was condemning only the slave trade and *not slavery itself*, especially as it existed in the United States. To prove his opinion, England had *In Supremo* translated and published in his diocesan newspaper, *The United States Catholic Miscellany*, and even went so far as to write a series of eighteen extensive letters to John Forsyth, the Secretary of State under President Martin Van Buren, to explain how he and most of the other American bishops interpreted *In Supremo*. In one of these letters we learn of the events of the 1840 Council of Baltimore, where the bishops read and discussed this Apostolic Letter:

Thus, if this document condemned our domestic slavery as an unlawful and consequently immoral practice, the bishops could not have accepted it without being bound to refuse the sacraments to all who were slave holders unless they manumitted their slaves; yet, if you look to the prelates who accepted the document, for the acceptance was immediate and unanimous: you will find, 1st the Archbishop of Baltimore . . . 2nd, the Bishop of Bardstown . . . 3rd, the Bishop of Charleston . . . 4th. the Bishop of St. Louis . . . 5th, the Bishop of Mobile . . . 6th, the Bishop of New Orleans . . . and, 7th the Bishop of Nashville . . . they all regarded the letter as treating of the "slave-trade," and not as touching "domestic slavery." I believe, sir, we may consider this to be pretty conclusive evidence as to the light in which that document is viewed by the Roman Catholic Church. [24]

Amazingly, it was decided that papal pronouncements against slavery, particularly Gregory XVI's *In Supremo*, did not apply to the institution as it existed in the United States, thus yielding on this issue a sort of Americanized Gallicanism. However, it is clear that Gregory wrote *In Supremo* to condemn precisely what was occurring in the United States, namely the enslavement of blacks:

We, by apostolic authority, warn and strongly exhort in the Lord faithful Christians of every condition that no one in the future dare to bother unjustly, despoil of their possessions, or reduce to slavery (*in servitutem redigere*) Indians, Blacks or other such peoples. [25]

England evidently felt justification for this dissent lay in the episcopal [mis]interpretation of *In Supremo*. These arguments are not dissimilar to the widespread dissent from the Church's teachings against slavery by bishops, priests and laity that was common from the 17th to 19th centuries.

For the Catholics of the United States---as for Catholics everywhere---there was the consistent historical teaching of the Church, as presented through Eugene IV, Pius II, Paul III, Gregory XIV, Urban VIII, Innocent XI, Benedict XIV, Pius VII and others. For the early 19th century, in the midst of the volatile decades before the Civil War, Gregory XVI issued *In Supremo*, with its clear condemnation of both the slave trade and slavery itself. Since that Constitution mentioned the documents of the previous pontiffs, it is hard to understand how the American hierarchy was not aware of the consistency of the teaching and its nature. All of these teachings nonetheless went unknown to the Catholic faithful of the U.S., perhaps through willed ignorance, or were explained away by many of the American bishops and clergy. Thus we can look to the practice of dissent from the teachings of the Papal Magisterium as a key reason why slavery was not directly opposed by the Church in the United States.

Today, we are faced with a new form of slavery brought on by the "culture of death." In the light of *Humane Vitae* of Pope Paul VI, and *Veritatis Splendor* and *Evangelium Vitae* of John Paul II, our prayer should be that the present shepherds of the Church will not fall into the same mistakes of their predecessors. Otherwise, the full teaching of Christ's Church may remain unknown to many of those who seek the truth that will indeed set them free.

ChurchinHistory notes

[For Endnote References see end of this page]

a. A book 'The Popes and Slavery' by Joel S. Panzer was published in 1997 by Alba House. It provides more details than contained in the article above. (see our **USEFUL BOOKS** page).

b. Since the publication of Joel Panzer's works, critics have claimed that the Popes specifically omitted to condemn 'Just title' slavery. They assert that all slavery was not condemned until 1890, by which time it had been outlawed nearly everywhere.

This is not correct. 'Just title' servitude referred to criminals, prisoners of war and voluntary indenture servitude. This last situation arose when a person freely sold his labour for a number of years in return for training, or other benefit. These forms of 'just title' servitude are still seen by the Church as permissible, although in each case certain limits and basic rights are still to be honoured.

c. The events and petitions leading up to the Declaration of the Holy Office dated 20th. March 1686, under Pope Innocent XI, and its subsequent lack of impact on Africa, are detailed in 'Black Christians and White Missionaries' by Richard Grey, 1990. (ISBN 0

300 049102).

d. It is possible that some echoes of these petitions were heard by king James II of England, who had become a Catholic in 1673. In September 1685 James told some friends that he had raised the matter of slavery at the Privy Counsel to the effect: "That the Negroes in the Plantations should all be Baptised, exceedingly declaiming against the impiety, of their Masters prohibiting it, out of a mistaken opinion, that they were then ipso facto free: But his Majestie persists in his resolution to have them Christn'd, which piety the Bishop, deservedly blessed him for; . . .". ((The Diary of John Evelyn, edited by E.S. de Beer, 1959, page 824)).

Such a policy would not have freed the American Negro slaves. But by recognizing the right to worship, rest on Sundays, have a Christian marriage and keep their family together, their human dignity would have been accepted. This would have been an important step towards eventual emancipation.

But in 1688 the Dutch invaded and their leader, William of Orange, seized power. In 1698 the Whig Party, with which William shared power, abolished the limitations on slavery and, in 1713, Britain assumed first place in the slave trade. ((See 'The Whig Supremacy' by Basil Williams, 1974, page 51)).

e. William's invasion force of 1688 included a battalion of Negro slaves. ((See 'History Today', July 1988, page 49)).

To access complete Encyclicals go to: www.papalencyclicals.net/

Enter name of papal author (e.g: Eugene IV , Paul III, Gregory XVI) and click: Find

Endnotes

1. "Only after the cultures of Europe and America changed through the abolitionists' agency and only after the laws of every civilized land eliminated the practice, did Catholic moral doctrine decisively repudiate slavery as immoral. Only in 1890 did Pope Leo XIII attack the institution itself, noting that slavery was incompatible 'with the brotherhood that unites all men'" (reference to Leo XIII, *Catholicae Ecclesiae*, November 20, 1890), John T. Noonan, Jr., "Development in Moral Doctrine," *Theological Studies* 54 (December 1993) 675.

2. Laennec Hurbon, "The Church and Afro-American Slavery," *The Church in Latin America: 1492-1992*, ed. by Enrique Dussel (Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis Books, 1992) 372.

3. "As is well known the common teaching on slavery was officially corrected

by the Second Vatican Council in 1965 [in *Gaudium et Spes*, nos. 27,29]," John F. Maxwell, *Slavery and the Catholic Church* (Chichester: Ross, 1975). This work is of course ground breaking, especially for the English-speaking world, and Fr. Maxwell dedicated several years of research to produce a sincere and complete study of the subject.

However, it must be read with caution, since, apart from his interpretation of the events and documents, his factual information is not infrequently wrong.

4. Eugene IV, *Sicut Dudum*, January 13, 1435 Found in Baronius' *Annales Ecclesiastici*, ed. O. Raynaldus (Luca, 1752) vol. 28, pp. 226-227. See also *Appendix B*, No. 1, Joel S. Panzer, "The Popes and Slavery," *Dunwoodie Review* (Yonkers, NY: St. Joseph's Seminary, vol.18,1995), pp. 117-118. This and all subsequent papal documents are translated in full in the second appendix of the same work.

5. Later bulls were to be issued by Pius II and Sixtus IV in defense of the residents of the Canary Islands, who were still being enslaved at the hands of the Christians. In the *Annales Ecclesiastici* (vol. 29, n. 42, 342 and vol. 29, n. 21, 575), we have the commentary of Baronius on these two bulls (no extant copy of the actual text of this section of Pius II's Bull is known), both penalizing the Europeans who were leading the newly baptized into slavery.

6. Gustavo Gutierrez, *Las Casas: In Search of the Poor of Jesus Christ*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993) 302.

7. Paul III: *Sublimis Deus*, June 2, 1537. Found in *Las Casas En Mexico: Historia y obras desconocidas*, by Helen-Rand Parish and Harold E. Weidman, Mexico City: Fondo De Cultura Economica, 1992, pp. 310-311. See also *Dunwoodie Review*, *Appendix B*, No. 2, pp. 118-119.

8. *Ibid.*, No. 2.

9. *Ibid.*, No. 2.

10. *Ibid.*, No. 2.

11. *Ibid.*, No. 2.

12. Gregory XVI: *In Supremo*, December 3, 1839. Found in *Coleccion de Bulas*, pp. 114-116. See also *Dunwoodie Review*, *Appendix B*, No. 8, pp. 124-125.

13. *Ibid.*, No. 8.

14. *Ibid.*, No. 8.

15. *Ibid.*, No. 8.

16. *Ibid.*, No. 8.

17. James Hennesey, S.J., *American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 145.

18. Noonan, "Development," *Theological Studies* 54, 666.

19. Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 145.

20. Maxwell, *Slavery*, 74.

21. J.N.D. Kelly, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Popes*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 308.

22. For a discussion of the issue of just titles to slavery, see *Dunwoodie Review*, pp. 71-73.

23. Michael V. Gannon, *Rebel Bishop: The Life and Era of Augustin Verot* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1964), 35.

24. Ignatius Aloysius Reynolds, editor, *The Works of the Right Rev. John England, III* (Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1849), Letter 11, 116-117.

25 *Coleccion de Bulas*, pp. 114-116. See also *Dunwoodie Review, Appendix B*, No. 8, pp. 124-125.

Reverend Joel S. Panzer was ordained a priest for the Diocese of Lincoln, Nebraska in 1994. He studied at St. Phillip's Seminary, Toronto, and theology at St. Joseph's Seminary in Yonkers, N.Y., where he received a master of arts degree in dogma. He was assigned to the Newman Center at the University of Nebraska. This was his first article for HPR.

This article has been reproduced with permission from the 'Homiletic & Pastoral Review' (December 1996), P.O.Box 591810, San Francisco, *CA. U.S.A.*

See ChurchinHistory notes above.

This Version: 22nd April 2008