MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

508(c)(1)(a) Free Church • Sole Tanakh Authority

A Study for Judaism · Christianity · Islam

DOCUMENT 222

The Millennium of Bondage

A Covenant Deep Dive into the Arab-Islamic Slave Trade

Applying the Covenant's Own Law of Servitude, Kidnapping, and the Sojourner to Fourteen Centuries of Trans-Saharan, Red Sea, and Indian Ocean Slavery

August 2026

Elder Kepha Arcemont, Founder

miqdashbethel.org • miqdashbethel@gmail.com

Texas and Louisiana

REACHING JUDAISM, CHRISTIANITY, AND ISLAM

✡ JUDAISM	† CHRISTIANITY	☪ ISLAM
The ***eved*** (עֶבֶד) of Torah is bounded by six-year release, mandatory provision, and a capital penalty for kidnapping a person to sell them (Shemot 21:16). The covenant regulates servitude — it never authorizes a trade in stolen human beings.	Christian territories both suffered under and profited from the corsair and Caucasus branches of this same trade for a millennium, while also producing the abolitionist movement — rooted in Exodus 21:16 — that helped end it worldwide.	The Qur'an (2:177; 90:13; 24:33) urges manumission of slaves already held and frames slavery within wartime captivity (***milk al-yamin***, "what the right hand possesses"). A trade of trans-Saharan, Red Sea, and Indian Ocean scope operated under that classical framework for over a millennium.

DOCTRINAL AUTHORITY — STANDING RULE OF MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

The sole binding authority of Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution is the *Tanakh* — the written covenant of **Yahweh**. No Talmudic tractate, Church council decree, papal encyclical, hadith collection, or extra-biblical tradition carries doctrinal weight equal to or greater than the written Torah. Where any tradition conflicts with the written covenant, the written covenant governs without exception. The Talmud, New Testament, and Qur'an are cited as historical reference and comparative witness — never as superseding authority. Miqdash Bethel uses the Written Tanakh as its sole source for four reasons: it is the only text Judaism, Christianity, and

Islam all recognize as originally given by **Yahweh**; it predates and underlies the Talmud, New Testament, and Qur'an, so testing those traditions against it follows the evidentiary direction of **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** — the earlier witness governs the later commentary; every later tradition that departs from the Tanakh does so by addition or reinterpretation, never by overturning the text itself, so the text remains the fixed standard; and **Yahweh**'s own words declare the covenant unchanging (Malachi 3:6; Tehillim (Psalms) 119:89), making the written covenant — not evolving institutional interpretation — the only stable ground for doctrine. All three great covenant traditions — Judaism, Christianity, and Islam — are addressed simultaneously and equally in every Miqdash Bethel document, because **Yahweh**'s covenant belongs to every nation that will receive it. The **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15** two-or-three-witness evidentiary standard governs all textual claims in this document.

HOW TO READ THIS DOCUMENT

This document applies the sole authority of the written *Tanakh* to the historical record of the Arab-Islamic slave trade. **Yahweh (יהוה)** and **Elohim (אֱלֹהִים)** appear in bold throughout. Hebrew book names are given with English in parentheses. Hebrew transliterations appear in ***bold italic*** with English meaning in parentheses at every occurrence. Scripture references are bold. Three audiences are addressed simultaneously: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Rabbinic commentary, the Qur'an, and hadith are cited as historical and comparative reference — never as binding authority. This document does not present a comprehensive history of slavery in every civilization; it examines one historical slave-trading system — the Arab-Islamic trade of the 7th through 20th centuries — against the Torah's own law of servitude, kidnapping, and the sojourner. Other historical slave trades, including the Transatlantic trade, are addressed in separate covenant deep dives.

TANAKH BOOKS CITED IN THIS DOCUMENT

DIVISION	BOOKS CITED	PURPOSE IN THIS STUDY
Torah	Bereishit (Genesis), Shemot (Exodus), Vayikra (Leviticus), Devarim (Deuteronomy)	Foundation text — the covenant's own law of servitude, kidnapping, and the sojourner
Nevi'im (Prophets)	Yeshayahu (Isaiah), Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah), Yechezkel (Ezekiel), Amos	Prophetic witness against oppression, man-stealing, and the exploitation of the vulnerable
Ketuvim (Writings)	Tehillim (Psalms), Iyov (Job)	Wisdom witness to the dignity of the bondsman and the cry of the oppressed

I. WORD STUDY — THE VOCABULARY OF BONDAGE IN HEBREW AND ARABIC

I-A. Eved (עֶבֶד) and Avad (עָבַד) — H5650 / H5647

The Hebrew noun ***eved*** (עֶבֶד) — Strong's H5650 — derives from the verbal root ***avad*** (עָבַד) — H5647 — "to work, serve, labor, worship." The same root produces ***avodah*** (עֲבוֹדָה, "service, labor, worship") — the word used for both bondservice to a master and covenant service to **Yahweh**. Per BDB, ***eved*** spans a range from "slave, servant, bondsman" to "subject, vassal" to the honorific "servant of **Yahweh**" applied to Moshe (Moses), the prophets, and Israel corporately (Yeshayahu (Isaiah) 41:8; 49:3). The word itself does not specify chattel status, race, or permanence — the Torah's legal texts do that work by statute, distinguishing sharply between categories of ***eved*** and the terms of their release.

I-B. ʿAbd (عَبد), Raqiq (رَقيق), and Milk al-Yamin (مِلْك اليَمِين)

Classical Arabic uses ***ʿabd*** (عَبد) — cognate to the Hebrew ***eved*** through the shared Semitic root ***ʿ-b-d*** — for "slave" or "servant," and, as in Hebrew, also as a term of humble self-designation before Allah (ʿabd Allah, "servant of God"). ***Raqiq*** (رَقيق) and its plural ***riqab*** (رِقَاب, literally "necks") name the legal category of the enslaved in classical jurisprudence — the same image of the bound neck that recurs in the Qur'anic manumission vocabulary (see Section V). The distinct legal-theological category ***milk al-yamin*** (مِلْك اليَمِين, "what the right hand possesses," Qur'an 4:24, 23:6, 33:50) governed the concubinage relationship between a master and an enslaved woman under classical fiqh — a category with no direct Torah counterpart and addressed comparatively, not as binding doctrine, in Section V below.

II. THE TORAH'S OWN LAW OF SERVITUDE — THE COVENANT STANDARD

Before any historical trade can be evaluated, the covenant's own terms must be heard — honestly, including where the Torah itself distinguishes between categories of servitude rather than abolishing the institution outright. The Torah does not present a uniform law of "slavery." It presents at least four distinct legal regimes, each with different terms, and it attaches the harshest single penalty in its entire civil code — death — to the specific act that a trans-continental slave *trade* necessarily requires: taking a human being by force to sell.

II-A. Eved Ivri (עֶבֶד עִבְרִי) — The Hebrew Bondservant's Six-Year Limit

Shemot (Exodus) 21:2–6 establishes that a ***eved ivri*** ("Hebrew servant") — typically a debtor working off an obligation — serves six years and **"in the seventh he shall go out free, for nothing" (Shemot (Exodus) 21:2, JPS 1985).**

Devarim (Deuteronomy) 15:12–18 sharpens the law further: on release, the master must not send the servant away empty-handed but must ***ha'anek ta'anik*** (הַעֲנֵק תַּעֲנִיק, **"surely furnish/adorn him"**) from flock, threshing floor, and winepress — a mandatory severance provision explicitly grounded in Israel's own memory of Egyptian bondage:

"you shall remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt, and Yahweh your Elohim redeemed you" (Devarim (Deuteronomy) 15:15)

A servant who prefers to remain permanently may do so only by his own declared choice, formalized at the door-post with an awl through the ear (Shemot (Exodus) 21:5–6) — a voluntary, witnessed, and physically marked act, not a status imposed by force.

II-B. Eved Kena'ani (עֶבֶד כְּנַעֲנִי) — The Foreign Bondservant, Named Honestly

Vayikra (Leviticus) 25:44–46 permits Israel to acquire bondservants "of the nations round about you" and "of the children of the sojourners," treating them as inheritable property in a way the Torah does not permit for a fellow Israelite. This document does not soften or reinterpret this text: the Torah's own law contains a category of foreign, hereditary bondservice, and honest covenant scholarship does not erase it to make the comparison with the Arab-Islamic trade cleaner than the source text allows. What the text also does, however, is bound even this category by surrounding law — the sojourner protections of Shemot (Exodus) 22:20–21 and Vayikra (Leviticus) 19:33–34, the Sabbath rest extended to "your manservant and your maidservant" (Shemot (Exodus) 20:10), and the capital prohibition on kidnapping addressed next — which governs the *means of acquisition* for any bondservant, foreign or Israelite, and forecloses the raid-and-sell model this document documents in Sections III–IV.

II-C. The Fugitive-Slave Protection Law — Devarim (Deuteronomy) 23:15–16

Devarim (Deuteronomy) 23:15–16: "You shall not hand over to his master a slave who has escaped from his master to you. He shall dwell with you, in your midst, in the place that he shall choose within one of your towns, wherever it pleases him; you shall not wrong him." This law stands in direct and striking contrast to the dominant ancient Near Eastern legal pattern. The Code of Hammurabi (§16) prescribes **death** for anyone who harbors a fugitive slave and conceals him from his seekers. The Torah inverts this: the escaped bondservant is to be given refuge, settled where he chooses, and protected from oppression. No other major law code of the ancient Near East contains a comparable provision. This is the Torah's clearest structural check against any large-scale, force-based trade in human beings — a fugitive from such a system finds covenant sanctuary, not extradition.

II-D. The Death Penalty for Man-Stealing — Shemot (Exodus) 21:16; Devarim (Deuteronomy) 24:7

Shemot (Exodus) 21:16: "Whoever steals a man and sells him, or is found in possession of him, shall surely be put to death." **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 24:7** repeats and sharpens it: "If a man is found stealing one of his brothers of the people of Israel, and if he treats him as a slave or sells him, then that thief shall die." This is not a regulation of servitude — it is the Torah's capital prohibition on the **acquisition method** that defines a slave *trade* as distinct from lawful servitude: the seizure of a free person, by force or fraud, for sale. The historical record examined in Sections III–IV — mass raiding of West and East African villages, Barbary corsair seizures of Mediterranean coastal populations, and the Caucasus and Central Asian captive markets — is, by the Torah's own standard, the crime of Shemot (Exodus) 21:16 conducted at civilizational scale across fourteen centuries. The covenant does not require a comparison to a modern human-trafficking statute to condemn this; it names the act and fixes the Torah's maximum penalty on it directly.

II-E. The Captive Woman Law — Devarim (Deuteronomy) 21:10–14

Where the Torah does address a woman taken captive in war, it imposes conditions markedly different from the concubinage and harem systems documented in Section IV: a full month of mourning for her parents before any relations (Devarim (Deuteronomy) 21:13), and — critically — if the man is not pleased with her, "you shall let her go where she wants, but you shall not sell her for money; you shall not treat her as a slave, since you have humiliated her" (Devarim (Deuteronomy) 21:14). Sale of a captive woman after intimate use is expressly forbidden. This is the Torah's comparative benchmark against which the eunuch, harem, and ***milk al-yamin*** systems of Section IV are measured in the audit of Section VIII.

III. HISTORICAL WITNESS — SCOPE, TIMELINE, AND ROUTES

III-A. Scope and Timeline

The Arab-Islamic slave trade operated across North Africa, the Sahara, the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and the Indian Ocean from roughly the 7th century — predating and then accelerating with the Arab conquests of North Africa — into the 20th century, a span of some thirteen to fourteen centuries. Scholarly estimates of the total number trafficked vary widely because of the trade's decentralized structure and the scarcity of the kind of systematic shipping records that document the Transatlantic trade, but the range is substantial by any measure. Ronald Segal (*Islam's Black Slaves*, 2002) estimates 11.5 to 14 million; Olivier Pétré-Grenouilleau, building on the work of historian Ralph Austen, puts the figure near 17 million; economic historian Paul Bairoch has suggested as many as 25 million. Historians Paul Lovejoy and John Hunwick, whose work forms the scholarly baseline for the field, situated the trade within this same broad range, spread across the trans-Saharan, Red Sea, and Indian Ocean corridors combined. These are wide confidence intervals, honestly reported as such — not a single precise figure — but every serious estimate places the trade in the multiple millions, sustained over a longer span of time than the Transatlantic trade.

III-B. The Trans-Saharan Route

Caravans moved captives from West Africa — the Niger Valley, the Sahel, the Gulf of Guinea hinterland — across the Sahara Desert to the slave markets of the Maghreb and the Nile Basin, journeys that could last up to three months through extreme heat, thirst, and exhaustion. Most scholarly estimates for this single route alone center nearly nine million people over the life of the trade. Mortality in transit was severe; multiple sources report roughly half of those forced onto trans-Saharan caravan routes did not survive the crossing.

III-C. The Red Sea and Indian Ocean / Swahili Coast Route

Arab and Omani traders operating from strongholds on the Swahili coast — above all the island of Zanzibar, which by some estimates held enslaved people as up to two-thirds of its population at the peak of its 19th-century clove-plantation economy — shipped captives across the Indian Ocean to the Arabian Peninsula, the Persian Gulf, and India. The slave trade constituted roughly a third of the Zanzibar Sultanate's income alongside ivory and cloves. Unlike the Transatlantic trade's preference for able-bodied men for plantation labor, demand on this route ran heavily toward women and girls, at ratios reported as high as two or three to one, reflecting the trade's concentration in domestic service and concubinage (Section IV).

III-D. Mediterranean and Barbary Corsair Raids on Europe

From at least the 7th century and intensifying from the 16th through 18th centuries, corsairs operating from the Barbary Coast city-states of Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli raided shipping throughout the Mediterranean and coastal towns of Italy, Spain, France, and as far as Ireland and Iceland, seizing men, women, and children. Historian Robert C. Davis, in *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters* (2003), estimates that between 1 million and 1.25 million Europeans were enslaved by Barbary corsairs between 1500 and 1800 — a figure Davis argues exceeds earlier scholarly estimates. This is the Arab-Islamic trade's Mediterranean-facing branch, running in the opposite geographic direction from the sub-Saharan trade but under the same broad legal and commercial framework.

III-E. The Zanj Rebellion (869–883 CE)

The most significant recorded slave revolt within this system was the Zanj Rebellion, in which enslaved East Africans ("Zanj") laboring under brutal conditions in the salt marshes of southern Iraq rose against their masters. The rebellion lasted roughly fourteen years before being suppressed by Abbasid forces — a scale and duration that stands as its own historical witness to the severity of the conditions that produced it.

IV. ROLES, TREATMENT, AND DISTINCTIVES

IV-A. Domestic Service, Military Service, and Concubinage

Where the Transatlantic trade was overwhelmingly organized around agricultural field labor, the Arab-Islamic trade distributed the enslaved across a wider range of roles: domestic servants, agricultural laborers, palace and harem guards, soldiers, and concubines. Military slavery produced two of the trade's most durable institutions: the Mamluk system of Egypt and the Levant, in which enslaved soldiers rose to rule as a military caste (and eventually a sultanate) in their own right, and the Ottoman ***devshirme*** ("collection") system, which conscripted Christian boys from the Balkans into the Janissary corps and imperial administration. Both systems demonstrate a genuine, well-documented pathway from bondage to high status — a distinctive of this trade with no real Transatlantic parallel — without changing the coercive, non-consensual origin of the status.

IV-B. Eunuchs and the Practice of Castration

A particularly severe feature of this trade was the deliberate castration of enslaved boys and young men destined for palace-guard and harem-attendant service as eunuchs, intended to render them incapable of fathering children with women under their guard. Mortality during the castration procedure itself was high. This practice was not confined to Africans: in medieval Europe, so-called "castration houses" operated in Venice and the French city of Verdun specifically to produce eunuchs — primarily enslaved Slavic boys, taken by Viking raiders and sold onward — for export to Muslim markets in Egypt and North Africa; the English word "slave" itself derives from "Slav" by way of this trade. Classical Islamic jurisprudence did not mandate castration, and hadith literature elsewhere emphasizes humane treatment of the enslaved (Section V), but the practice was widespread and commercially entrenched across the trade's history regardless of its uncertain standing in formal law.

IV-C. Manumission Pathways in Practice

Manumission was genuinely available and, per multiple historical accounts, more common than under the Transatlantic system: enslaved people could sometimes purchase their freedom, be freed as an act of piety or atonement, or rise to positions of real authority (viziers, generals, sultans in the Mamluk case). This is a documented, honest distinctive of the trade and is addressed on its own terms in Section V. It coexists with, rather than erases, the severity documented in Sections III–IV — both are part of the historical record, and Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15 requires that neither be suppressed to make the other easier to argue.

V. THE ISLAMIC LEGAL-RELIGIOUS FRAMEWORK — COMPARATIVE WITNESS, NOT BINDING AUTHORITY

Per the Doctrinal Authority standing rule above, the Qur'an and hadith are cited here as historical and comparative reference only — never as binding doctrine for this institution. They are essential, however, to fairly evaluating what the trade documented in Sections III–IV did and did not have textual sanction to do.

V-A. Qur'anic Regulation of an Existing Institution

The Qur'an did not introduce slavery into 7th-century Arabia; it entered a society where the institution was already ancient and widespread, and regulated it rather than abolishing it outright. Its regulatory thrust runs consistently toward mitigation and release: kindness to "those your right hands possess" is commanded alongside kindness to parents and neighbors (Qur'an 4:36); freeing a slave ("tahrir raqabah", "untying a neck") is named among the highest acts of piety and a prescribed means of atoning for specific sins (4:92; 5:89; 90:13); zakat — obligatory almsgiving — is legislated in part to fund manumission (9:60, "wa fi al-riqab," "and for (freeing) necks"); and Qur'an 24:33 establishes ***mukataba*** (مُكَاتَبَة), a contractual right for a capable slave to work and purchase his or her own freedom, which the text instructs masters to grant. Classical commentators such as Ibn Kathir treat manumission as a form of ascending a "steep path" toward salvation (commentary on Surah al-Balad, 90:11–13).

V-B. Hadith on Kindness and Manumission

The hadith collections reinforce this trajectory. Sahih al-Bukhari records the Prophet Muhammad stating that whoever frees a Muslim slave, "Allah will save all the parts of his body from the (Hell) Fire, as he has freed the body-parts of the slave" (Sahih al-Bukhari 49). Multiple traditions report that the Prophet's final exhortations included instruction to "guard those whom your right hands possess." Taken together with the Qur'anic material in V-A, the textual trajectory of the source material is toward mitigation, humane treatment, and multiplied pathways out of bondage — a genuinely different textual starting point than a system organized around a maximal, permanent, race-based chattel status.

V-C. The Prohibition on Enslaving Free Muslims

Classical Islamic law held that a free Muslim could not lawfully be enslaved, and that valid enslavement required either birth to an enslaved mother or capture as a non-Muslim combatant (or non-combatant, in the practice documented below) in the context of legitimate war. This is the doctrinal source of the widely reported historical claim that African Muslims were nominally exempt from enslavement — a rule with genuine textual and legal standing that, per Section VI, was routinely violated in practice at the scale the trade required.

V-D. Milk al-Yamin and Concubinage — Comparative, Not Endorsed

Classical fiqh recognized a master's right to sexual relations with a female captive or slave held as ***milk al-yamin*** without a marriage contract — the legal-theological category underlying the harem and concubinage systems documented in Section IV. This document does not adjudicate internal Islamic legal debate on this category; it notes it as comparative fact and measures it, per the Doctrinal Authority rule, against the Torah's own captive-woman law in Section II-E, which forbids sale after use and mandates a full month of

mourning before any relations — a materially different and more restrictive standard than the institutionalized, ongoing concubinage economy the historical record documents at scale across the trade's Zanzibar, Ottoman, and North African centers.

V-E. The Gap Between Text and Trade

The honest tension this section must name: a legal-religious framework whose own textual center of gravity runs toward manumission, kindness, and the illegitimacy of enslaving free Muslims coexisted for thirteen centuries with a trade whose actual operation — mass village raiding, castration, lifelong hereditary concubinage, and continued trafficking of Muslim populations across ethnic and political lines — departed from that textual center at industrial scale. This is not a contradiction unique to Islam; Section VII's audit applies the identical honest standard to Judaism's own eved kena'ani law and to Christianity's centuries of complicity in and eventual opposition to slave trading. A tradition's stated legal ideal and its historical practice are two different things, and the Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15 standard requires both to be examined rather than only the more flattering of the two.

VI. ABOLITION — A SLOW AND INCOMPLETE TIMELINE

Formal abolition came late, unevenly, and — by the historical record — largely under external diplomatic pressure rather than internal doctrinal reform, spread across more than a century:

YEAR(S)	EVENT
1830–1847	A series of Ottoman firmans progressively restrict the slave trade — banning the Circassian/Georgian Caucasus trade, closing the Istanbul slave market, and suppressing the Persian Gulf trade — under sustained British diplomatic pressure.
1857	The Firman of 1857 formally bans the African slave trade empire-wide, but explicitly exempts the Hejaz province (the main destination of the Red Sea trade) and is, by the Ottomans' own later admission, largely unenforced.
1873–1897	Zanzibar's sultans issue a sequence of decrees under British pressure — Barghash bin Said's 1873 ban on sea transport of slaves, Ali bin Said's 1890 Slave Trade Prohibition Decree, and Hamoud bin Mohammed's 1897 Abolition Decree — formally ending the Zanzibar slave trade and, by 1909, slavery itself in the Sultanate.
1880	The Anglo-Ottoman Convention formally bans the Red Sea slave trade; enforcement in the Arabian provinces remains minimal into the 20th century.
1950–1951	The UN Ad Hoc Committee on Slavery finds legal chattel slavery still in force in Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Trucial States, and Yemen.

1962	Saudi Arabia and Yemen formally abolish slavery by law.
1963 / 1970	Dubai (1963) and Oman (1970, the last Gulf state to do so) formally abolish slavery.
1981 / 2007	Mauritania becomes the last nation on earth to formally abolish slavery in 1981; criminal prosecution of slaveholding is not established in Mauritanian law until 2007, and credible reports of de facto slavery there continue into the 21st century.

VII. THREE-RELIGION AUDIT — SLAVERY AND THE COVENANT TRADITIONS

ELEMENT	JUDAISM	CHRISTIANITY	ISLAM
Primary Text	Torah distinguishes eved ivri (6-year release, mandatory severance) from eved kena'ani (foreign, hereditary), and fixes death for man-stealing (Shemot 21:16).	The New Testament does not abolish Roman slavery outright but relativizes it (Galatians 3:28; Philemon) and never authorizes raiding or man-stealing; 1 Timothy 1:10 explicitly lists "menstealers" (andrapodistai) among the lawless.	The Qur'an regulates an existing institution toward manumission (2:177; 90:13; 24:33) and forbids enslaving free Muslims, while permitting captivity of non-Muslims taken in war.
Covenant Strength	The fugitive-slave protection law (Devarim 23:15–16) and the death penalty for kidnapping are structural checks against a raid-and-sell trade with no real ancient Near Eastern parallel.	Biblical abolitionism — Wilberforce, the Clapham Sect, and American abolitionists — grounded its case directly in Exodus 21:16 and drove the 19th-century international pressure that produced the Ottoman firmans and Zanzibar decrees documented in Section VI.	Manumission was genuinely frequent and doctrinally rewarded; enslaved people had documented pathways to high status (Mamluk sultans, viziers) with no real Transatlantic parallel.
Covenant / Textual Departure	Vayikra 25:44–46's foreign-bondservant category is not erased by this document; it is named honestly as the Torah's own concession to the surrounding ancient Near	Christian territories — Mediterranean Europe under corsair raid, and later colonial powers — were simultaneously victims of and participants in overlapping slave economies (the Barbary trade, the	The trade's actual scale required mass raiding, castration, and continued trafficking of Muslim populations — conduct the Qur'an's own textual trajectory and the classical prohibition on enslaving

	Eastern world, bounded but not abolished.	Caucasus trade, and eventually the Transatlantic trade) for centuries before abolition took hold.	free Muslims did not sanction.
Covenant Witness	The Torah's own capital law against man-stealing (Shemot 21:16) is the direct textual verdict on the trade's central mechanism, independent of any other tradition's self-assessment.	The same scripture that was misused to justify slavery (Ephesians 6:5; misapplied "curse of Ham" readings) produced, from within, the abolitionist reading of Exodus 21:16 that helped end this trade — a pattern of scripture correcting its own historical misuse.	Where the Qur'an's manumission ethic (V-A–B) was actually applied, it produced real, if partial, mitigation; where it was ignored under commercial and military pressure, the trade of Sections III–IV is the result — a gap the tradition's own modern reformers and scholars (see V-E) have increasingly named.

VIII. SEVEN COVENANT DECLARATIONS ON THE ARAB-ISLAMIC SLAVE TRADE

#	COVENANT DECLARATION	BASIS
I	The Torah fixes death as the penalty for stealing a human being to sell him. By this standard alone — independent of any other tradition's self-assessment — the raid-and-sell mechanism documented across fourteen centuries of this trade stands condemned by the written covenant.	Shemot (Exodus) 21:16; Devarim (Deuteronomy) 24:7
II	The Torah's law of the fugitive bondservant — refuge and protection, never extradition — stands as the covenant's structural opposite to a trade economy that depends on returning captured people to their captors.	Devarim (Deuteronomy) 23:15–16
III	Where the Torah permits bondservice, it bounds it by time, provision, and dignity — the eved ivri's six-year release and mandatory severance gift stand in direct contrast to the hereditary, lifelong, and often mutilating bondage documented in this trade's military and harem systems.	Shemot (Exodus) 21:2–6; Devarim (Deuteronomy) 15:12–18
IV	The Torah's captive-woman law forbids sale after use and mandates a full month of mourning before any relations — a materially higher standard than the concubinage and harem economies this trade institutionalized at scale.	Devarim (Deuteronomy) 21:10–14

V	A tradition's textual ideal and its historical practice are not the same thing, and honest covenant scholarship names the gap in every tradition rather than only in the one under discussion — the Torah's own eved kena'ani concession, Christian complicity in overlapping slave economies, and the departure of this trade's actual conduct from the Qur'an's manumission ethic are all part of the same honest record.	Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15
VI	Abolition, where it finally came, came late and largely under external pressure rather than internal doctrinal reform — a fact the covenant community should weigh honestly rather than credit to any tradition's self-narrative.	Historical record, Section VI
VII	The dignity of the bondsman is not conditioned on his usefulness, his ethnicity, or his captor's convenience. Every enslaved person trafficked across these routes bore the image in which Yahweh made humanity, and the covenant community's task today is to name that history accurately, not to minimize it for any tradition's comfort.	Bereishit (Genesis) 1:27; Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15

IX. WHAT DOES THE COVENANT REQUIRE OF THE PERSON WHO INHERITS THIS HISTORY?

The Torah does not leave the covenant community with a purely historical verdict. It requires a present response.

First: Name the crime by its covenant name. Shemot (Exodus) 21:16 does not require a modern human-trafficking framework to condemn man-stealing — the written covenant named it a capital offense thirty-three centuries ago. The covenant community owes the historical record its correct name, not a euphemism.

Second: Refuse the comparative-suffering trap. Naming the Arab-Islamic trade's scale and duration honestly does not require minimizing the Transatlantic trade or any other; the Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15 standard does not ration moral attention. Miqdash Bethel intends to examine each historical trade in its own study, on its own record.

Third: Apply the same honesty to every tradition, including one's own. This document has not exempted the Torah's eved kena'ani law, Christianity's corsair-era complicity, or Islam's classical concubinage law from scrutiny. A covenant community that only audits traditions other than its own has not actually applied Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15.

Fourth: Honor the descendants of the trafficked. The peoples of West, Central, and East Africa, the Caucasus, and the European Mediterranean coast carry this history in their family lines. The covenant community's task is remembrance and honest witness — not guilt theater, and not silence.

SCRIPTURE INDEX

REFERENCE	SUBJECT	SECTION
Bereishit (Genesis) 1:27	Humanity made in the image of Elohim	VIII
Shemot (Exodus) 20:10	Sabbath rest extended to manservant and maidservant	II-B
Shemot (Exodus) 21:2–6	Eved ivri — six-year release and voluntary permanent service	II-A
Shemot (Exodus) 21:16	Death penalty for man-stealing	II-D / VIII
Shemot (Exodus) 22:20–21	Sojourner protection law	II-B
Vayikra (Leviticus) 19:33–34	Sojourner protection law	II-B
Vayikra (Leviticus) 25:44–46	Eved kena'ani — the foreign bondservant category	II-B
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 15:12–18	Mandatory severance provision at release	II-A
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15	Two-or-three-witness evidentiary standard	Doctrinal Authority / VII
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 21:10–14	The captive woman law	II-E / VIII
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 23:15–16	Fugitive-slave protection law	II-C / VIII
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 24:7	Death penalty for man-stealing, repeated	II-D

"Whoever steals a man and sells him, or is found in possession of him, shall surely be put to death."

Shemot (Exodus) 21:16 — The Written Covenant of Yahweh

MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

Document 222 • Called and Chosen: The Anointing of the Elder in the Family of Yahweh • August 2026

miqdashbethel.org • miqdashbethel@gmail.com • Texas and Louisiana

508(c)(1)(a) Free Church • Sole Tanakh Authority • Reaching Judaism, Christianity, and Islam