MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

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

A Study for Judaism · Christianity · Islam

DOCUMENT 224

Winds of Bondage

A Covenant Deep Dive into the Indian Ocean Slave Trade

Applying the Covenant's Own Law of Servitude, Kidnapping, and the Sojourner to Four Centuries of Portuguese, Dutch, French, British, Omani, and Malagasy Bondage Across the Monsoon World

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 and a capital penalty for kidnapping a person to sell them (Shemot 21:16). The Torah never authorizes a permanent, race-based, or maritime trade in stolen human beings — regardless of which civilization runs it.	Portuguese, Dutch, French, and British trading companies were the dominant European carriers on these specific Indian Ocean routes for over three centuries, profiting from Mascarene plantation slavery even as later British power became the trade's chief naval opponent.	The Qur'an (24:33; 90:13) urges manumission and charitable release of the enslaved. Slavery in the Gulf and East African littoral operated for over a millennium under a shared regional legal and commercial framework involving Muslim, Hindu, and Christian merchants alike.

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 The Talmud, New Testament, and Qur'an are cited as historical reference and comparative witness — never as superseding authority.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 Indian Ocean slave trade — the maritime network of bondage that moved captive people across the western Indian Ocean, the Mozambique Channel, the Red Sea, and the Persian Gulf for over a millennium. **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 is the third in a planned covenant series on the world's historical slave trades. Document 222 ("The Millennium of Bondage") examined the Arab-Islamic legal and religious framework governing bondage from the 7th to the 20th century, including its trans-Saharan and Red Sea branches. Document 223 ("Ships in the Middle Passage") examined the Transatlantic trade. This document examines a third, distinct system: the multi-civilizational commercial network — Portuguese, Dutch, French, British, Omani-Arab, Persian, Indian, and Malagasy — that trafficked human beings across the Indian Ocean basin itself, from Madagascar and the Mascarene Islands to the Swahili coast, the Persian Gulf, and South and Southeast Asia. Where the routes and actors overlap with Document 222 (the Zanzibar-Oman axis), this document cross-references rather than repeats that material, and instead focuses on the ocean-wide commercial system as a whole.

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, Nachum	Prophetic witness against oppression, man-stealing, and merchant exploitation
Ketuvim (Writings)	Tehillim (Psalms), Iyov (Job), Mishlei (Proverbs)	Wisdom witness to the dignity of the bondsman and the cry of the oppressed

I. WORD STUDY — BONDAGE ACROSS A MULTI-CIVILIZATIONAL OCEAN

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." As established in Document 222, the Torah's word for bondservant carries built-in legal limits: release, provision, and protection. What distinguishes the Indian Ocean system from the Arab-Islamic and Transatlantic systems already examined is not a single legal vocabulary but a *confluence* of vocabularies — Arabic ***'abd*** (عبد) and ***raqiq*** (رقيق, "tender/enslaved one"), Persian ***gholam*** (غلام), Swahili ***mtumwa*** ("one who is sent/commanded"), Malagasy ***andevo***, Dutch ***slaaf***, French ***esclave***, and English "slave" — operating simultaneously within a single trading zone stretching from the Cape of Good Hope to the Indonesian archipelago. No single religious or civil legal code governed the whole system; the Indian Ocean trade was, above all, a *commercial* network first, one that Muslim, Hindu, Christian, and traditional-religion merchants and rulers all participated in.

I-B. Arur (אָרוּר) and the Absence of a Curse-of-Ham Framework in This Trade

Document 223 examined at length how the "curse of Ham" (properly, the curse on Canaan — **Bereishit (Genesis) 9:18–27**) was misapplied by 17th–19th century American clergy to construct a race-based theology for Transatlantic chattel slavery. That specific theological distortion is largely *absent* from the Indian Ocean trade's own justifying literature. Enslavement across the Indian Ocean basin was justified in its own historical documents chiefly on grounds of captivity in war, debt, birth-status, and — within the Islamic legal sphere — non-Muslim status at the point of capture (a framework already examined in Document 222), not on a genealogical curse tied to skin

color. This is a material difference worth naming honestly: the theological error documented in Document 223 was a particular Western Christian development, not a universal feature of every slave-trading system in history.

II. THE COVENANT'S OWN LAW OF SERVITUDE, KIDNAPPING, AND THE SOJOURNER

This section restates, briefly, the Torah standard developed at length in Documents 222 and 223, so this document stands on its own. The full word studies and legal analysis are found there; the texts themselves are restated here because they govern the historical evaluation that follows.

II-A. Eved Ivri — The Six-Year Release (Shemot 21:2–6; Devarim 15:12–18)

"If you buy a Hebrew ***eved*** (עֶבֶד), he shall serve six years, and in the seventh he shall go out free, for nothing." (**Shemot (Exodus) 21:2**) The Torah's own domestic servitude law is bounded, temporary, and terminates in freedom with material provision (**Devarim (Deuteronomy) 15:13–14**). No provision anywhere in Torah authorizes an open-ended, hereditary, or permanently renewable institution of bondage for a Hebrew.

II-B. The Death Penalty for Man-Stealing (Shemot 21:16; Devarim 24:7)

"Whoever steals a man and sells him, or if he is found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." (**Shemot (Exodus) 21:16**) This is the single most direct Torah verdict on the commercial machinery this document documents — a network whose entire supply chain from the Swahili and Malagasy coasts to the Mascarenes, the Cape, the Gulf, and the Indonesian archipelago began, overwhelmingly, in raid and capture. **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 24:7** restates the same penalty specifically for the kidnapping and sale of a fellow Israelite. The principle — that man-stealing for commercial sale is a capital crime, not a regulable trade — stands as the Torah's verdict on the trafficking apparatus itself, independent of what any receiving society's law permitted.

II-C. The Fugitive-Slave Protection Law (Devarim 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... you shall not oppress him." (**Devarim (Deuteronomy) 23:15–16**) The Torah commands sanctuary and protection for the escaped bondsman — the diametrical opposite of the extensive Indian Ocean apparatus of manumission-suppression, recapture, and (as documented below) the deliberate British underreporting of ongoing Gulf slavery well into the 20th century in order to preserve regional political relationships.

II-D. The Sojourner Law (Shemot 22:20–21; Vayikra 19:33–34)

"You shall not wrong a sojourner or oppress him, for you were sojourners in the land of Egypt." (**Shemot (Exodus) 22:20**) The Torah's standard for the foreigner living within a community — mandatory equal legal protection, explicitly grounded in Israel's own memory of enslavement — stands in direct contrast to every legal regime surveyed in this document, all of which constructed permanent legal subordination for a foreign-born or foreign-descended class rather than a path to protected equal standing.

III. HISTORICAL WITNESS — SCOPE, ROUTES, AND DURATION

III-A. Scope and Duration: The Oldest Continuously-Operating Slave Trade in Recorded History

The Indian Ocean slave trade is documented from antiquity — Sumerian, Egyptian, and Roman-era Indian Ocean and Red Sea trade already moved captive people — but its sustained commercial form runs from roughly the 8th century through the 1970s: over eleven centuries, the longest continuously-operating slave trade of any documented in world history. Historian Robert Collins estimated that approximately 11.3 million Africans were transported across the Atlantic between 1450 and 1900, while roughly 12.5 million were sent eastward across the Indian Ocean, Red Sea, and trans-Saharan systems combined between 800 and 1900 — comparable totals across a far longer span of time. Because the Indian Ocean trade lacks an equivalent to the Transatlantic trade's extensively documented shipping manifests (the SlaveVoyages database project), its numbers remain far less precisely known and are still being actively researched.

III-B. The European Trading Companies: Portugal, the Dutch VOC, France, and Britain

Beginning with Portuguese traders in the early 16th century, four successive European maritime powers became major carriers within the Indian Ocean slave system — a fact distinct from, and in addition to, the Arab-Islamic network examined in Document 222. Historian Richard Allen's widely-cited estimate places European vessels carrying between 567,900 and 733,000 people within the Indian Ocean world between 1500 and 1850. A separate review of British, Dutch, French, and Portuguese company records found a minimum of 431,000 to 547,000 people of African, Indian, and Southeast Asian origin shipped by Europeans to destinations within the Indian Ocean basin across the same period. The Dutch East India Company (VOC) alone is estimated to have imported between 660,000 and 1,135,000 enslaved people into its Indian Ocean and Indonesian Archipelago settlements — including Cape Town, Batavia, and Ceylon — across the 17th and 18th

centuries, drawing captives from Madagascar, East Africa, India, and Indonesia (with roughly 100,000–150,000 exported from Bali alone).

III-C. Madagascar and the Merina Kingdom: A Slave-Supplying State

Madagascar functioned simultaneously as a major source of enslaved people and, through the rise of the Merina (Imerina) kingdom in the highlands around Antananarivo, as an organized slave-trading state in its own right. From the 18th century, Merina civil wars and military campaigns under ***Andrianampoinimerina*** (c. 1785–1810) and his son ***Radama I*** (1810–28) supplied captives to the neighboring Mascarene Islands (Mauritius and Réunion), the Cape of Good Hope, and Arab and Persian merchants trading up the East African coast. Scholarly estimates place total Madagascar-origin slave exports at approximately 392,000 people to Indian Ocean world destinations across the 16th through 18th centuries, with a further roughly 400,000 East Africans passing through or via Madagascar into the French Mascarenes in the 19th century alone under contracts that functioned as slavery in practice. Roughly a quarter of enslaved people held at the Cape of Good Hope during the 18th and 19th centuries were of Malagasy origin. Radama I's alliance with the British governor of Mauritius, Robert Farquhar, led to treaties nominally banning slave exports from Merina territory beginning in the 1820s — treaties his successor Queen Ranavalona I is recorded to have resisted as economically damaging to a kingdom whose wealth had been substantially built on the trade.

III-D. The Mascarene Plantation Economy: Mauritius and Réunion

The French Compagnie des Indes established sugar and coffee plantations on Réunion (then Bourbon) in 1663 and on Mauritius (then Île de France) in 1721, and became — in the assessment of specialist historians — as significant a slave-trading power in the Indian Ocean as the Dutch. The enslaved population of Mauritius and Réunion grew from roughly 7,221 in 1735 to 13,599 by 1807–08. One widely-cited estimate places total slave arrivals into the Mascarenes at approximately 243,000 people between 1670 and 1810; a further study places French-flagged slave imports at between 311,383 and 358,215 across 1670–1848. Captives for the Mascarene plantations were drawn from Madagascar, the East African coast, the Horn of Africa, the Persian Gulf, India, Indonesia, and — reflecting the French East India Company's dual Atlantic and Indian Ocean operations — even West African ports such as Ouidah and Gorée. Richard Allen estimates that 165,000 to 173,000 additional people, mostly East African and Malagasy, were imported into the Mascarenes between 1800 and 1848 alone, many transported under the fiction of "contract labor" after the formal French abolition of the slave trade in 1817 — a fiction historians have long since discredited as a continuation of the trade in all but name.

III-E. Zanzibar, Kilwa, and the Swahili Coast Entrepôt (Cross-Reference: Document 222)

Document 222 examined the Arab-Islamic legal and religious framework for the East African trade centered on Zanzibar in detail and is not repeated here. What this document adds is the commercial infrastructure: in 1811, Sultan ***Sayyid Said*** opened Zanzibar's Great Slave Market, and a year later introduced clove cultivation to the island — a labor-intensive cash crop that created sustained internal demand for enslaved labor on Zanzibar and Pemba themselves, in addition to the export trade northward to the Arabian Peninsula and Persia. The southern feeder route ran overland and by dhow from the interior through Kilwa; a British register of dhows passing the northern Persian Gulf in 1841 counted 1,217 enslaved people, roughly evenly divided between men and women. Scholarly estimates for the 19th-century northern (Red Sea/Gulf) and southern (Zanzibar-Kilwa) Swahili coast systems combined suggest total East African slave exports in that century alone may have reached 1.5 million people.

III-F. The Persian Gulf: Pearl Diving, Concubinage, and Late Survival

Enslaved Africans transported through Oman and Zanzibar supplied the Trucial Coast (present-day United Arab Emirates), Qatar, Bahrain, Kuwait, and the Arabian interior. Male captives labored chiefly as pearl divers, date-plantation workers, soldiers, sailors, dock workers, and domestic servants; female captives were held chiefly as domestic servants or concubines. The pearl-diving industry — the Gulf's dominant economic sector before the discovery of oil — depended heavily on enslaved and debt-bonded labor working in dangerous free-diving conditions. Oman was politically united with Zanzibar from the 1690s until 1856, making it the direct link between the Swahili coast supply and the Gulf demand documented here.

III-G. Roles and Treatment Across the System

As in the systems examined in Documents 222 and 223, enslaved people across the Indian Ocean basin filled a wide range of roles rather than a single uniform labor category: plantation field labor (Mascarenes, Zanzibar cloves), pearl diving (the Gulf), military service and ship-crewing, domestic service, and concubinage. The Torah's own captive-woman law (**Devarim (Deuteronomy) 21:10–14**) — which forbids sale of a captive woman taken into a household and requires her formal legal standing be addressed rather than left as unregulated concubinage — stands in direct contrast to the largely unregulated practice of concubinage documented across Gulf, Zanzibari, and Mascarene households alike.

IV. ABOLITION TIMELINE — THE LONG END OF THE INDIAN OCEAN TRADE

The Indian Ocean trade's abolition unfolded unevenly across four centuries of jurisdictions, and — as the record below shows — legal abolition and actual practice frequently diverged for decades.

YEAR	JURISDICTION / EVENT
1807	Britain abolishes its own transatlantic and Indian Ocean slave trade (Slave Trade Act)
1817	France formally abolishes its slave trade (widely evaded via "contract labor" fiction in the Mascarenes, documented above)
1822	Moresby Treaty — Sultan of Muscat/Zanzibar bans slave sales to Christian nations; Britain gains limited naval interdiction rights
1835	Britain abolishes slavery itself (not merely the trade) throughout its colonies, including Mauritius
1845	Hamerton Treaty — slave export restricted to the Sultan's own East African and Arabian dominions; internal/local trade remains legal
1848	France abolishes slavery itself in Réunion and all French colonies
1867 / 1873	Frere Mission and Sultan Barghash's decree formally close the Zanzibar slave market and restrict remaining internal trade (cross-ref Doc. 222)
1897	Zanzibar formally abolishes the legal status of slavery (informal bondage persisted longer)
1928 / 1937	Persia (Iran) abolishes slavery; Bahrain formally abolishes slavery
1949 / 1952 / 1962	Kuwait (1949), Qatar (1952), and Saudi Arabia (1962) formally abolish slavery
1963	Trucial States (later UAE) sign a decree against slavery — never formally promulgated, per historical record
1970	Oman formally abolishes slavery under Sultan Qaboos bin Said, following his deposing of his father in a palace coup — the last state in the system to do so by law

British enforcement in the Gulf was, by the Colonial Office's own later admission, deliberately understated: a 1936 British report to the League of Nations acknowledged ongoing slavery in the Trucial States, Oman, and Qatar while simultaneously downplaying its scale — a diplomatic choice historians attribute to Britain's interest in preserving stable political relationships with Gulf rulers over full enforcement of its own stated abolitionist commitments.

V. THREE-RELIGION AUDIT — HOW EACH TRADITION ENGAGES THIS TRADE

ELEMENT	JUDAISM	CHRISTIANITY	ISLAM
Primary Legal Text	Shemot 21:2-6, 16; Devarim 15:12-18, 23:15-16, 24:7 — bounded servitude, capital penalty for man-stealing, mandatory sanctuary for the fugitive	Inherits the Torah's texts as historical canon; 19th-century abolitionist movements (British, French) drew directly on Exodus 21:16 and the broader Torah witness against man-stealing	Qur'an 24:33 (manumission by contract), 90:13 (freeing a slave named among the most meritorious acts), 4:36 (kind treatment); classical fiqh regulated but did not abolish the institution
Historical Participation	Jewish merchant communities (e.g., at Cochin, Aden) participated in regional Indian Ocean trade broadly; direct evidence of Jewish participation specifically in the slave trade documented in this study is comparatively minor next to the Christian-European and Muslim-Arab/Omani roles documented above	Portuguese, Dutch, French, and British Christian-flag trading companies were major carriers on these specific routes for over three centuries — the same nations that later led the naval suppression campaign (Moresby and Hamerton Treaties, the Frere Mission)	The Omani Sultanate of Zanzibar was the central political and commercial hub of the East African branch of this trade for over a century (cross-ref Doc. 222); the Gulf pearl-diving economy depended on enslaved labor into the 20th century
Covenant Departure	None documented — the Torah's own law was never the operative legal code for any actor examined in this study	The gap between abolitionist rhetoric (grounded partly in Exodus 21:16) and continued colonial-economic dependence on Mascarene and Cape slave labor for decades after each nation's own stated abolition date	The gap between the Qur'an's manumission exhortations and a legal-commercial system that persisted, with British diplomatic tolerance, into 1970 — the last formal abolition anywhere in the world documented in this series
Covenant Witness	The two-or-three-witness standard (Devarim 19:15) applied throughout this document: no single national or religious	British and French abolitionist movements, however belated and self-interested in part, produced the treaty and naval-suppression	Modern Omani, Emirati, Qatari, and Saudi law now formally prohibits slavery; the 1962 and 1970 abolitions closed the last

ELEMENT	JUDAISM	CHRISTIANITY	ISLAM
	tradition's self-report is taken uncorroborated	apparatus (Moresby, Hamerton, Frere) that eventually ended the maritime trade	chapter of the system this document documents

VI. SEVEN COVENANT DECLARATIONS ON THE INDIAN OCEAN SLAVE TRADE

#	COVENANT DECLARATION	BASIS
I	Man-stealing for commercial sale is a capital crime under the written covenant, regardless of which nation, religion, or maritime power organizes the trade. The Torah's verdict on the Indian Ocean system's supply chain is the same verdict rendered on every other slave trade examined in this series.	Shemot (Exodus) 21:16
II	The Torah's own servitude law is bounded by a six-year release and mandatory provision. No Indian Ocean legal system examined in this study — Omani, Dutch, French, or British colonial — incorporated a comparable mandatory release for the enslaved.	Shemot (Exodus) 21:2-6; Devarim (Deuteronomy) 15:12-18
III	The covenant commands sanctuary for the fugitive bondsman, not recapture. The extensive Indian Ocean apparatus of manumission-suppression and delayed British enforcement stands in direct contrast to this standard.	Devarim (Deuteronomy) 23:15-16
IV	The captive woman taken into a household must be given legal standing, not left as unregulated concubinage. The largely unregulated practice of concubinage documented across Gulf and Zanzibari households falls short of this standard.	Devarim (Deuteronomy) 21:10-14
V	The sojourner is owed equal protection, grounded in Israel's own memory of bondage in Egypt — not permanent legal subordination on the basis of foreign birth or descent, the pattern this entire trade constructed across four centuries and multiple legal systems.	Shemot (Exodus) 22:20-21; Vayikra (Leviticus) 19:33-34
VI	No civilization is exempt from this evaluation on the basis of its own religious self-description. European Christian trading companies, the Omani Islamic sultanate, the Merina kingdom, and Dutch and French colonial administrations are all held to the same textual standard in this document.	Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15 — two-or-three-witness standard applied evenly
VII	The long delay between stated abolition and actual practice — decades in the French and British cases, over a century in the Gulf — is itself a covenant-relevant fact: naming an evil in law is not the same as ending	Historical record, Section IV above

#	COVENANT DECLARATION	BASIS
	it in practice, and the covenant community must not mistake a treaty for a repentance.	

VII. APPLICATION — WHAT THE COVENANT COMMUNITY DOES WITH THIS RECORD

First: Refuse the comfort of a single villain.

This document's own evidence resists a tidy narrative in which one civilization is guilty and the rest are innocent. Portuguese, Dutch, French, and British Christian-flag companies; Omani and Arab Muslim merchants and rulers; Malagasy Merina kings; and Hindu Gujarati and Indian financiers all appear in the historical record documented above as participants, in varying roles and at varying scale, in this system. The covenant standard of Deuteronomy 19:15 — multiple corroborating witnesses, applied evenly — forbids the comfortable move of assigning this history to one tradition alone.

Second: Distinguish naming an evil from ending it.

The gap documented in Section IV — between Britain's 1807 abolition and its own 1936 admission of continued tolerated slavery in the Gulf, or between France's 1817 abolition and the still-flourishing "contract labor" trade to the Mascarenes decades later — is a warning against mistaking a treaty, a law, or a stated doctrine for an accomplished repentance. The covenant community should ask the same question of its own institutions: what evils has this community formally condemned in word while tolerating in ongoing practice?

Third: Recover the specific texts this trade violated.

Shemot 21:16, Devarim 23:15-16, and Devarim 21:10-14 are not abstract legal trivia; they are the Torah's own direct verdict on man-stealing, the suppression of fugitives, and the unregulated concubinage of a captive woman — three of the defining features of the system documented in this study. Teaching these texts by name, rather than in vague moral generality, keeps the covenant community's historical memory anchored to the actual written standard rather than to shifting modern sentiment alone.

Fourth: Honor the descendants and the record honestly.

Afro-Omani, Afro-Emirati, Afro-Iranian, and Malagasy-descended communities throughout the Gulf, East Africa, and the Mascarenes today carry the living inheritance of this trade. The covenant standard set in Devarim 24:7 and Shemot 21:16 does not expire with the passage of centuries; the

historical dignity owed to the descendants of the trafficked is not diminished by the length of time since abolition, nor should the honest naming of this history be softened out of diplomatic deference to any modern nation whose founding wealth was built, in part, upon it.

VIII. SCRIPTURE INDEX

REFERENCE	SUBJECT	SECTION
Shemot (Exodus) 21:2-6	Eved ivri — six-year release	II-A
Shemot (Exodus) 21:16	Death penalty for man-stealing	II-B
Shemot (Exodus) 22:20-21	Sojourner law — no oppression of the foreigner	II-D
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 15:12-18	Mandatory provision at release	II-A
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15	Two-or-three-witness evidentiary standard	Throughout
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 21:10-14	The captive woman's legal standing	III-G
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 23:15-16	Fugitive-slave protection and sanctuary	II-C
Devarim (Deuteronomy) 24:7	Kidnapping and sale of a person — capital penalty	II-B
Vayikra (Leviticus) 19:33-34	Sojourner law restated	II-D
Bereishit (Genesis) 9:18-27	Curse on Canaan — contrasted with this trade's own justifications (cross-ref Doc. 223)	I-B

"Whoever steals a man and sells him, or if he is found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death."

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