ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to characterize how religious language, discourse and practices, in contexts of Catholic missionary work during the so-called colonial period of Latin American history, reveal ethical and political contents and presuppositions which are central to understand social-historical phenomena and human relationships such as Black slavery. What I briefly analyze in the work of Alonso de Sandoval S.J. (De instauranda Aethiopum salute, 1627) are some levels of religious discourse and description of standard religious practices that may reveal how the connection between colonization and Christian mission both subverted and corrupted religion and how Christian mission, by its own terms, help structuring and confirming the politics of colonization, particularly contributing, at the level of social-political ideas and mental framework, to the long prevailing system of Black slavery in Latin America.
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RESUMO

O propósito deste estudo é caracterizar de que modo a linguagem religiosa, o discurso religioso e as práticas religiosas, em contextos de trabalho missionário católico, durante o assim chamado período colonial da história da América Latina, revelam conteúdos e pressuposições éticas e políticas que são centrais para entender fenômenos sócio-históricos e relações humanas tais como a escravidão negra. O que eu analiso brevemente na obra de Alonso de Sandoval S.J. (De instauranda Aethiopum salute, 1627) são alguns níveis de religioso discurso e descrição de práticas religiosas padrão que podem revelar como a conexão entre colonização e missão cristã tanto subverte quanto corrompeu religião e como a missão cristã, por seus próprios termos, ajuda a estruturar e a confirmar as políticas de colonização, contribuindo, particularmente no nível de ideias sócio-políticas e estrutura mental, para o sistema de longa duração da escravidão negra na América Latina.
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A comprehensive introduction

The purpose of this study is to characterize how religious language, discourse and practices, in contexts of Catholic missionary work during the so-called colonial period of Latin American history (roughly from the 16th to the 19th centuries), reveal ethical and political contents and presuppositions which are central to the understanding of social-historical phenomena and human relationships such as Black slavery. What I briefly analyze in the work of Alonso de Sandoval S.J. (*De instauranda Aethiopum salute*; see below) are not the objects or recipients of a given religious discourse and practice, and the various ways they critically react against it – again on the level of language and practices. I rather analyze levels of religious discourse and descriptions of standard religious practices in the work of a *lato sensu* – colonial Latin American author who conceived narratives that we can properly call a “treatise on mission and catechetical theology.” The study may reveal how the connection between colonization and Christian mission both subverted and corrupted religion, while also revealing how, from the internal contents of critical and complex works by Christian thinkers – which, strictly speaking, are neither theological, philosophical, juridical, nor political works –, a singular potential both for political subversion and for political legitimation could be found in a seminal way. Such potential can surely be illuminating for the (then) future history of religion and society in Latin America. By highlighting religious and political ideas to be found in theological literature, the present study can contribute from a different, but nonetheless central, perspective to the philosophical project “[Scholastica colonialis: Reception and Development of Baroque Scholasticism in Latin America, 16th to 18th Centuries](#)”.

On the one hand, a guiding path for investigating the ways in which conquest, colonization, religion and language relate in the history of theological and philosophical ideas of colonial Latin America are the views that quite different thinkers, from different religious Orders and Catholic traditions, characteristically held on the seminal reflections on mission and religious truth offered by Francisco de Vitoria O.P. (1483-1546) in his *De indis recente inventis relectio prior* (1539) (see Francisco de Vitoria, 1960, p. 641-726; Urdanoz, 1960, p. 491-640). Regardless of the respectful and non-violent missionary method he conceived, Vitoria of course worked with a different, but nonetheless central, perspective to the philosophical project “Scholastica colonialis: Reception and Development of Baroque Scholasticism in Latin America, 16th to 18th Centuries”.

On the one hand, a guiding path for investigating the ways in which conquest, colonization, religion and language relate in the history of theological and philosophical ideas of colonial Latin America are the views that quite different thinkers, from different religious Orders and Catholic traditions, characteristically held on the seminal reflections on mission and religious truth offered by Francisco de Vitoria O.P. (1483-1546) in his *De indis recente inventis relectio prior* (1539) (see Francisco de Vitoria, 1960, p. 641-726; Urdanoz, 1960, p. 491-640). Regardless of the respectful and non-violent missionary method he conceived, Vitoria of course worked with a different, but nonetheless central, perspective to the philosophical project “Scholastica colonialis: Reception and Development of Baroque Scholasticism in Latin America, 16th to 18th Centuries”.

...
hosted, both principles understood within a jussnaturalistic version of the law of peoples (see Pich, 2015b, p. 320-348; Francisco de Vitoria, 1960, p. 705-706) – the barbarians were of course not obliged to believe. After all, it should be quite understandable that they would not believe in such invident religious contents unless there were supernatural signs of their truth, such as miracles, or at least strong natural means for proving them rationally persuasive and for showing objective aspects of goodness in the new religion that could attract any human will towards it. At any rate, the mere proposal or the mere preaching of the new faith would never be a convincing argument for believing in it (see Francisco de Vitoria, 1960, p. 692; 695-696).

Arguably, Bartolomé de Las Casas O.P. (1484-1566) radicalized Aquinas’s and Vitoria’s views on the epistemology of faith acquisition and proposed, moreover, a strict “apostolic method” of preaching and announcing true religion, centered on theological personal virtues and an exemplary life (which includes consistent practices of social and political justice [see Josaphat, 2005a, p. 19-23]), cutting off any link between preaching, mission and coercion or violence – such a connection was what Las Casas saw in the evangelization practiced in the social establishment of the encomienda. Las Casas’s apostolic pedagogy of faith is exemplarily developed in Chapter V of his De unico vocationis modo omnium gentium ad veram religionem (On the Sole Way of Attracting All Peoples to the True Religion), written ca. 1537, unknown until the end of the 19th century, and published for the first time 1942. These are the fundamental theses for missionary work: following Christ, the Apostles, the saints, the Church, and the doctors, the Gospel – the Good News of faith – must be preached with clarity, in good or even perfect practical testimony of life and persuasive words. There is only one way of announcing the Christian faith for the good of the infidels and the conversion of their souls (see Josaphat, 2005b, p. 36-40). Given that the object or recipient of Christian mission is an entity with the dignity of rational potencies – intellect and will – and that recipient is, thus, subject of his own decisions, this is the only acceptable method of evangelizing (enuunciated by Las Casas in the form of a “conclusion”): “The method established by divine Providence to teach human beings the true religion was only one, exclusive and identical in the entire world and in all times, namely: to persuade the understanding with reasons, to attract and admonish the will with mildness. This way must be common to all inhabitants of the Earth, with no discrimination in virtue of sectarian groups, errors or corrupted habits” (see Bartolomeu de Las Casas, 2005, p. 59). Essentially, in order to reach the good of faith, the will must see it as a good thing; that can only happen without the perturbation caused by fear and violence – for these conceal any form of goodness and affect the voluntariness of the act of faith. Moreover, faith comes to a human being – especially if we keep in mind the situation of an adult person who is unacquainted with its contents and, at any rate, did not receive baptism – through reasons that are clear and persuasive to the intellect, since the will can only bring the intellect to an assent, and so to a free decision, regarding what the will does love. Las Casas proves his point by means of interpretations of Aristotle, Augustine and Aquinas concerning the idea of giving an assent to what is not rationally evident (see Bartolomeu de Las Casas, 2005, p. 64-78). Las Casas’s texts seem to be a unique case, in 16th century theological literature, of a discourse on religion – and for the sake of the only true religion – that includes a radical tolerance of and respect for the other as an intrinsic value, for the sake of peaceful communication and perhaps of freedom of conscience (see Josaphat, 2005b, p. 26). In that regard, Las Casas proposed, in a certain way, a language of resistance to colonization, for he thought that the Christian religious language had to be a language of peace.

There is no doubt that the models of how colonization, religion and language connect in Latin American Scholasticism are complex and various. Las Casas’s attempt was both unique and object of conscious – and, up to a certain point, fair – criticism. About two decades after Las Casas’s death, the Jesuit José de Acosta (1540-1600) claimed (a) that there is a strict truth in Christian religion (see José de Acosta, 1984, I, i, p. 74-83) and (b) there are pragmatic limits to tolerance if that means full acceptance of – or respect for – differences in religious matters up to the point of a completely uncoerced process and proposition of life change. Such a

---

6 See Thomas Aquinas (1956, Summa theologiae Ilaiae, q. 1, a. 4-5); Francisco de Vitoria (1960). Clearly, Francisco de Vitoria (1960, p. 695-696), realizes that the effect of any preaching that causes “fear” – or makes use of instruments of “fear” – will not achieve proper believing, for believing is voluntary, and fear and coercion harm or even impede what is voluntary. Stüben (1997, p. 743, footnote 170), is probably right when he refers to the Aristotelian background of Vitoria’s view; see also Aristotle (1956, Ethica Nicomachea, III 1, 1109b-1110a; III 3-4).

7 Las Casas’s criticism of the Spanish project of conquest and his understanding and attitude towards the Spanish project of colonization were finely assessed by Westhelle (2010, p. 1-8).

8 At any rate, the work that came to us, today, is fragmentary and incomplete; see Josaphat (2005b, p. 34-35). The first four chapters of Book I, where Las Casas supposedly presented his “method of evangelizing”, are missing. Chapters V-VII of Book I are the only remaining texts of the work. Las Casas alludes to a Book II, which is missing too.

9 This a common topic in the entire work of Las Casas, which is theologically and philosophically explained and defended in Book I (V); see Bartolomeu de Las Casas (2005, p. 57-220). In Books II and III (VI and VII), Las Casas applies his previous analysis and conclusions to emphatically reject any idea of a war of conquest against the “Indians” as a sound means of evangelization and Christianization (see Bartolomeu de Las Casas, 2005, p. 221-309; Tosi, 2007; Sousa, 2014).
peaceful view would make the successful proclamation of the Christian faith practically inconsistent and unachievable. Concretely, this means that, as far as Latin American colonial, criollo, mixed and native societies – a kind of multicultural, though not pluralistic societies in modern terms –, where indigenous populations lived under the authority and legal jurisdiction of the Spanish empire, are concerned, again, (a) the Christian faith is true, (b) native religion is idolatry and, above all, (c) idolatry is both intolerable and must be confronted concretely (see José de Acosta, 1987, V, ix, p. 247-255; V, x, p. 267-269; V, xi, p. 273-277; V, xii, p. 279-285; V, xiii, p. 289-291; V, xiv, p. 337). Accordingly, Acosta articulated in his extraordinary work De procuranda indorum salute, published 1576 in Latin, in Madrid, concrete measures to change the situation of more than 70 years of missionary labor in the Indias, which he considered a notorious failure as regards the proclamation and expansion of the only true religion (see José de Acosta, 1984, I, xi, p. 169ff.), a religion with an explicit universal appeal. For the goal of conversion of the soul, including here the real desideratum of an explicit faith in or knowledge of the Christ of the Christian Creed (see José de Acosta, 1987, V, i-v, p. 176-229), Catholic missions until then, including Las Casas with his apostolic, peaceful, and benevolent method, had done nothing significant. A presupposition for such a criticism was a deep understanding about religion, close to what we would call today a deep “symbolic system” of beliefs and practices, a “form of life” perhaps – making a quite free use of Wittgenstein’s expression for the framework of thought and action (see Wittgenstein, 1995, § 23, § 66, p. 250, 277-278; Glock, 1997, p. 124-129; Pich, 2011b, p. 185-186; see also José de Acosta, 1984, I, vii, 151, 155) –, which individuals and groups do not abandon easily and are only able to change through strong mental ruptures.

Precisely by seeing in Acosta’s work an articulated reflection on the historical possibility of acquiring the Christian belief and the recognition that that would imply a substitution – if that is possible at all! – of one religion, as a deep symbolic system or form of life, for another, we can understand his implicit conviction that a religion with a claim to universal truth and a missionary command (see José de Acosta, 1984, I, i, p. 74-83; I, iii, p. 99-105; I, vi, p. 127-137) can practice tolerance only up to a certain point: in Christian states, idolatry is an unacceptable error. It must be tolerated if that means that infidels who are not heretics and apostates cannot be simply forced into conversion – but if tolerance is full respect for differences, peaceful dialogue and a persuasive exemplary life for the sake of voluntary conversion, that won’t work. Idolatry must be systematically combated, also by means of proselytistic confrontation.

Acosta’s “epistemology of faith acquisition” is theoretically sound – again very much influenced by Aquinas and the missionary thought of the Apostle Paul (see José de Acosta, 1984, I, iii, p. 99; I, iv, p. 105-115; I, xi, p. 169-185; I, xii, p. 185-191; I, xiii, p. 199; I, xv, p. 207; José de Acosta, 1987, V, xiii, p. 341) – and anthropologically intelligent: if a successful proclamation of the Christian message happens with the cooperation of the Church and has to take into account human beings as they are, besides confidence in supernatural assistance, missionaries need a common-sense view of how religious beliefs are acquired. So although Acosta endorses the apostolic method of evangelization, he sees in it a more concrete and confronting attitude towards religious falsity in its cognitive and moral meanings. It is impossible to bring the Christian faith as true religion to the indigenous people without suppressing idolatry from their minds, and it is only by knowing their religions more fully that it will be possible to find ways of actually replacing their worldviews. The occurrence of a new religion in the human heart is something enormously difficult: it demands active measures. It is not surprising that Acosta gives form to a kind of literature that, in the first decades of the 17th century, would multiply: remedies against idolatry and ways of eradicating it (see Saranyana et al., 1999, p. 156). Mission and religious persuasion cannot be a mere destruction of idols. If a religion with a universal truth claim is going to replace another, it must find means through which the intellect and the will change. If persuasion of the understanding is desirable, perhaps it should be in many cases a matter of teaching, not dialoguing; if an exemplary life and the explanation of the

10 Although Acosta was in strict opposition to any method of violence and aggressive coercion to bring people to the truth of the Gospel, he had a more pragmatic view on the task of preparing people for the Good News and the teaching of the Christian faith. He offers concrete reports and brings concrete analyses in order to show that such a utopic methodology was a failure: Las Casas’s method was unrealizable. It led to unnecessary and actually even false martyrdom. Las Casas’s method, by separating evangelization from any use of force or more concretely military protection, was dangerous and caused unnecessary losses of lives. Acosta did propose that missions of evangelization should have the form of “entradas” or missionary expeditions that used the protection provided by soldiers (see José de Acosta, 1984, II, viii, p. 303-311; II, xii-xiii, p. 338-349). This approach must certainly be understood under a deeper level of convictions. Generally speaking, the “barbarians” would need, for many generations, some authority or concomitant pressure in order to understand, accept and practice the new religion. For the concrete world of the Indias – or of any part –, Las Casas’s view was a naïve one.

11 A masterpiece on mission, religion, culture, and social living together in a multicultural society of the 16th-17th centuries; the work was a result of his first years as a visitor and inspector of the Jesuit Catholic missions in the viceroyalty of Peru. See Saranyana et al. (1999, p. 161-164).

12 See José de Acosta (1984, I, ii, p. 89; I, iii, p. 99). Acosta is fully aware that the task of cooperating in a work which is God’s work – i.e., faith and salvation; see José de Acosta (1984, I, iii, p. 99-105) – and whose result depends only on God’s will (see José de Acosta, 1984, I, v, p. 115-125), demands something particular from the Church: teaching human beings a Christian worldview. Such a teaching or education has an element of force or authority, which cannot tolerate any form of idolatry.
goodness of Christian faith to peacefully attract the will are desirable, they must confront other people’s attitudes, preferences, and choices with firm conviction, motivating the newly converted to sacramental practice and adoption of customs, as well as examination of conscience and confession (see José de Acosta, 1984, I, vii, p. 141; I, vii, p. 149; I, ix, p. 159-163; José de Acosta, 1987, V, xiv, p. 291-293; V, xv, p. 295-299; V, xix, p. 319-325), from a position of active authority. And it is also strategically wise to invest in the conversion of authorities and representative persons. The task of extirpating idolatry from the heart demands such an attitude (see José de Acosta, 1987, V, x, p. 263-265).

On the other hand, it is important to stress that the views of (Colonial) Second Scholastic authors about the religiously different are, of course, plural. It is wrong to believe that Vitoria’s lines of reasoning settled the matter or were even the predominant view regarding a fundamental respect for the humanity of the other and a “human,” well-reflected and minimally peaceful way of proposing one’s own religious truth. As a matter of fact, the investigation of the ways in which conquest, colonization, religion and language related in the history of theological and philosophical ideas of colonial Latin America changes substantially when we consider the evangelization of African slaves or, more concretely, of Blacks. After all, such a connection of ideas and stances has to take into consideration that the slavery of Blacks was endorsed together with the conviction that the Catholic Church had a missionary task towards them. Baroque Scholastic thinkers, with the same intellectual tools and inspired by the same philosophical-theological traditions and resources as those of Vitoria and his followers – who convincingly rejected natural slavery and the slavery of aboriginal peoples –, both accepted and supported, for roughly three centuries, Black slavery.

The combining of evangelization and Black slavery was in fact one of the ways in which the ideology of Black slavery was conceived and settled – the ideology of Black slavery was significantly conceived within the terms of the Catholic evangelization of Blacks. In the following, I pursue the characterization of one of its most important representatives.

Persisting ideologies

Until today there have been no studies that pursue an exhaustive chronological account of theological, juridical, and philosophical assessments of Black slavery and so might help reconstructing, with completeness and exactness, the etiology of such a social-political institution (see Pich et al., 2015, p. 11-13). It seems that the first authors who reflected on Black slavery were Domingo de Soto O.P. (1494-1560), Fernando Oliveira O.P. (1507-1581), Tomás de Mercado O.P. (1525-1575), and the jurist, active in Mexico, Bartolomé de Frias y Albornoz O.P. (+ 1553) (see for example Davis, 1966, p. 187-190; Thomas, 1997, p. 146ff.; Andrés-Gallego, 2005, p. 32-35; Boxer, 2007, p. 45-53; Restrepo, 2010, p. 39-42). But there is a major consensus that the Jesuit Luis de Molina (1535-1600) was the first intellectual to extensively consider the topic of Black slavery, and after him there were many others, such as Tomás Sánchez S.J. (1550-1610), Fernando Rebello S.J. (1546-1608), Alonso de Sandoval S.J. (1576-1577-1652), and Diego de Avendaño S.J. (1594-1688) (see Andrés-Gallego, 2005, p. 35-42; see also Vila Vilar, 1990, p. 25-31; García Añoveros, 2000, p. 307-329; Hespanha, 2001, p. 937-960). It is theoretically – and perhaps morally – important to understand how, on the superstructural level or the level of ideas, such a profound and long prevailing ideology of intolerance towards the different, in this case the “Blacks” or “Africans,” was ever possible. The reasons that explain the ideology of Black slavery, beyond the traditional juridical points that explain how and why slavery was accepted in civil law, are various, and here we find notorious connections between (in)tolerance, Christian religion, and race.

13 Only in the second half of the 19th century both the social institution of slavery and the practice of slave trade – at last in Brazil and Cuba – were finally abolished (see Turley, 2000, p. 391). On the abolition of slavery in the 19th century, see for example the several studies in: Solano y Guimerá (1990, p. 25-31). See Scott (1988); Turley (1991); Blackburn (2011). On slavery in Brazil and in Cuba, see for example Goulart (1949); Freitas (1980); Solano y Guimerá (1990, p. 345-527, “6. La dimensión colonial: Cuba”, with several studies); Mendonça (1999); Maestri (2002). It is worth mentioning that only as late as 1839 the Roman Catholic Church published an official document, the Apostolic Letter In Supremo Apostolatus, issued by Pope Gregory XVI, condemning slavery as a social institution, and particularly every form of slave trade. See Pope Gregory XVI (1839, In Supremo Apostolatus). See also Maxwell (1975). On the unconditional condemnation of slavery in today’s Christian social ethics, see the notes by Hebblethwaite (2000, p. 394-396).

14 I use the word “ideology”, here, in a sufficiently general meaning; it should be taken as a complex set of philosophical, theological, legal, and cultural ideas and discourses, which can be collectively shared or adopted and is essentially constructed and endorsed, for any given purposes, by a group, class or nation; it helps, thus, understand the emergence and continuity of given historical and political processes and situations.

15 That is, all people with black skin color, which for Sandoval are Africans and also, for example, inhabitants of India, Oceania, and the Philippines. See also Souza (2006, p. 38). On the Philippines and their inhabitants, see Alonso de Sandoval (1987, I, vii-ix, p. 93-100). Sandoval’s description of places in Africa focuses on Cape Verde, Sierra Leone, Guinea, Angola, and Congo, as well as St. Thomas (São Tomé e Príncipe) and Mozambique. A map of some “African Cultural Groups” that are important in Sandoval’s reports can be found in Alonso de Sandoval (2008, p. XXXII).

16 Although, for the purpose of understanding and interpreting Sandoval’s views on Black slavery, I use the words “race” and “ethnicity” throughout this essay, my focus is not on what Sandoval thinks about the ideas of “race” and “ethnicity” – ideas which he knew in a not very well defined sense (he makes use, for example, of the words “raça” [which can be related to “race”], and “nación” and “casta” [which can be related to “ethnicity”]). In fact, such notions were just emerging and being conceived at Sandoval’s times, and they in
For the understanding of these quite complex connections in Baroque Scholasticism, I will highlight and explain in more detail some central stances to be found in the seminal work about the theologically and philosophically based ideology of slavery by Alonso de Sandoval (1576/1577-1652)\textsuperscript{17}, i.e., in his De instauranda Aethiopum salute\textsuperscript{18}, in the first edition of it, published 1627 in Seville\textsuperscript{19}.

The Jesuit Alonso de Sandoval has a special place in the history of ideas on Black slavery. His account has multiple sides; his mission as a Catholic priest was carried out in Cartagena de Indias\textsuperscript{20}, in today’s Colombia, which was then the main harbor for the trade of Black slaves in the Hispanic colonies (see Von Germeten, 2008b, p. IX-XIII). There is no doubt that Sandoval showed a sui generis dedication to the ministry of Blacks in Cartagena\textsuperscript{21}, with a singular concern for the right administration of the sacraments, especially baptism, the preparation for baptism by means of a proper and sufficient catechesis (see below), and the concrete problem of getting information whether the slaves had already been baptized in order to avoid their rebaptism\textsuperscript{22}.

Some aspects of Sandoval’s justification of black slavery

The interest here is not on Sandoval’s rich collection of information about Africa and Africans, nor on the debate about the moral examination of conscience concerning the practice of slave trade – a topic he examines in dialogue with Luis de Molina (Ludovicus Molina, 1611, I, tract. 2, disp. 34; see also disp. 32-40; Pich, 2015a, p. 60-65). In order to support a thesis about colonization, language and the religiously different, I will focus first on the singular way Sandoval searches for the etiology of black skin color. After reviewing some traditional theories in his times, he expresses his belief that the reason for blackness in skin is to be found in the following two theses: (a) black people are so because they were made up of certain “intrinsic qualities”; (b) black people are so because of the will of God (see Alonso de Sandoval, 1987, I, ii, p. 74ff.). Intrinsic qualities are comparable to what philosophers would call “second qualities” of living beings such as “whiteness” and “blackness,” the former deriving from “cold-

\textsuperscript{17} On Alonso de Sandoval’s life, see the notes in Pich (2015a, p. 51-54).

\textsuperscript{18} The title of Alonso de Sandoval’s work reveals an obvious acquaintance with José de Acosta’s treatise De procuranda Indorum salute, which, as I pointed out to in the Introduction (see above, in the main text), is Acosta’s central exposition of the doctrinal basis for Catholic missions among the indigenous peoples of America (see also Saranya et al., 1999, p. 252-255).

\textsuperscript{19} The edition used as a source for this study was the one that originally appeared in 1627 in Seville, which is today taken as a rare book. Following Vila Vilar (1987, p. 38-40), there is a consensus that Sandoval prepared those materials in the period between 1616 and 1623. One must have in mind that a much larger version was published in 1647 by Alonso de Sandoval, this time in Madrid, where the part on which Sandoval most worked upon was Book I, both by enlarging its volume of information for the “chronicles” of Africa and by including new chapters discussing – with new interlocutors – the legitimacy of slavery and slave trade. Apparently, Sandoval promised several new Books in his 1649 edition, but he actually worked upon and amplified only Book I. The 1672 version of Sandoval’s work was (re)published 1877 in Madrid with an introduction, transcription and “translation” into (a more) contemporary Spanish by Enriqueta Vila Vilar. See again Vila Vilar (1987, p. 40-41; as well as p. 42-43) (Bibliografía de Sandoval – Obras Inéditas y Obras Impresas). See also Von Germeten (2008b, p. XXIX-XXX; Olsen, 2004, p. 7-9). This is the full information of the main work under consideration: “Naturaleza, policia sagrada e profana, costumbres e ritos, disciplina e catecismo evangélico de todos etapoes, por el padre Alonso de Sandoval, natural de Toledo, de la Compañía de Jesús, rector del Colegio de Cartagena de las Indias, en Sevilla por Francisco de Lyra, impresor, año MDCLXXI”. The title “De instauranda Aethiopum salute” appears directly on the front page of the amplified edition of 1647. At any rate, the name by which the book used to be referred to, i.e., “De instauranda Aethiopum salute”, appears also in the 1627 edition, namely in the “Suma del Privilegio”, previous to the several “Aprovaciones”. See Alonso de Sandoval (1987, p. 27): “Este libro intitulado De instauranda Aethiopum Salute compuesto por el P. Alonso de Sandoval, Rector del Colegio de la Compañía de Jesús, de Cartagena de las Indias; tiene privilegio para que ninguna persona lo pueda imprimir, ni vender sin licencia de su autor, como consta de su original, que está en poder de D. Sebastián de Contreras, Secretario del Rey nuestro señor. Su fecha en 3 de febrero de [1625].

\textsuperscript{20} It was an appropriate context to reflect upon the Catholic and Jesuit mission among Africans indeed, since from 1595 to 1640 about 135,000 slaves were trafficked to Cartagena (see Vila Vilar, 1987, p. 18; 1977, p. 127-238, 239-283). Nearly 9 million slaves were transported to the New World; out of them nearly 4 million were imported to Brazil, which was also the last independent country to suppress traffic in the Americas, forced by England, as well as slavery as an institution as such (see Freitas, 1980, p. 8).

\textsuperscript{21} The mission of spiritual salvation of Blacks was understood by Sandoval as a special task of evangelization and conversion given to the Company of Jesus, whose best spiritual guides should be seen in the founder Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556) and in Francis Xavier (1506-1552), who can be taken as Alonso de Sandoval’s best religious models. This is explicitly developed by Sandoval in Book IV of his De instauranda Aethiopum salute, which might be viewed as an addition to the original purpose of the book after it was finished. Book IV is an apology of the missionary work of the Company of Jesus in general and the mission among Blacks in particular. In this regard, see Zolli (1991) and Bénassy (1995).

\textsuperscript{22} These aspects of Sandoval’s thought, which will also be partially touched upon in this study (see below, in the main text), receive an extensive treatment in Book III of his De instauranda Aethiopum salute (see also Cenci, 2015).
ness’, and the latter from “extreme heat” in the corresponding “matter of the mother”. By means of such a quality that God created and planted in a human being – i.e., in the character “Ham”, son of Noah, from the Book of Genesis –, children were generated having in their appearance black skin color as a true mark of a peculiar descent: as a mark of descent from a cursed human being, thus as a punishment for Ham’s having rudely treated his own father, as we read in Genesis 9:20-29.

So, although blackness as second quality is an effect of “extreme heat” in the (‘embryonic’) stuff that is planted in the mother, the latter was ultimately caused by God as a punishment for Ham’s insolent behavior toward his father Noah. By so causing a new intrinsic and, hence, a new secondary quality in human beings, God himself turned a new aspect of nature into a permanent instrument for punishment – i.e., of the Ethiopians, descendants of Ham.

Clearly, the theses (a) of “intrinsic qualities” and (b) punishment by God’s will are connected. Such connection allows both the understanding of a given “naturalness” in Black slavery, which Sandoval partially supports, and a supernatural grounding of the condition of Blacks. In special, the (b) idea that what originally explains black skin color is a punishment by God is found by Sandoval in Scripture and Patristic interpreters – explicitly in accounts by Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine (see Alonso de Sandoval, 1987, I, ii, p. 75; see also Santo Agostinho, 1990, XIX, 15, p. 405-406; Rist, 2000, p. 236-239 - exploring also the topic in the Enarrationes in Psalmos –; Glancy, 2011, p. 87ff). As noted above, the

fact that Ham’s lineage was black skinned is a mark of such punishment and condition of subjection. When slaves were introduced in the world, so were Blacks, and the cause of their skin color is a punishment for a wrongdoing that deserved an external signal (see Alonso de Sandoval, 1987, I, ii, p. 74-76). In fact, in Book II of De instauranda Aethiopum Salute Sandoval’s position comes close to a sort of factual slavery condition of Blacks that is caused by the will of God. He recalls Aristotle, who had affirmed that some human beings are naturally born to be slaves and subjects, and we could think that he implies that this condition applies to Blacks, although the condition as such would be supernaturally caused by God only after human being’s sin (see Alonso de Sandoval, 1987, II, ii, p. 235-238). According to this kind of explanation, evils of nature such as diseases and weaknesses, evils of fate such as tragedies and misfortunes in life, and evils of the soul such bad inclinations and vices suffered by Blacks in a much larger scale than other human being – including what might be called Aristotelian side-effects such as lack in understanding, congenial incapacity for prudence, and mere corporeal aptness to hard work –, have all a common cause, which is sin and the corresponding divine punishment (see Alonso de Sandoval, 1987, II, i, p. 234-235; Souza, 2006, p. 41). In fact, Alonso de Sandoval seems to think that, by a divine action of punishment, there is a new condition in creation regarding the Blacks, which means a condition or a state of subjection, if not immediately or necessarily factual, at least in terms of a “natural” tendency in general terms: Blacks are depicted as

The name “Ham” itself becomes an object of an etymological experiment by Alonso de Sandoval (1987, I, ii, p. 74). Sandoval’s account of the etymology of the word “Charm” and the etiology of slavery based on Genesis 9:20-29 is influenced by the biblical commentaries by Alonso Fernández de Madrigal or “el Tostado” (ca. 1410-1455), who was a professor at the University of Salamanca and later became bishop of Ávila. On accounts of slavery by Fathers of the Church, see Gülzow (1969); Sainte-Croix (1975, p. 1-38); Harrill (1995); Garnsey (1996); Klein (2000, p. 380-381).

See also Alonso de Sandoval (1987, II, ii, p. 75-76). Alonso de Sandoval has explained their behavior as the result of a divine action of punishment, and that “the cause of their skin color is a punishment for a wrongdoing that deserved an external signal”. In fact, in Book II of De instauranda Aethiopum Salute Sandoval’s position comes close to a sort of factual slavery condition of Blacks that is caused by the will of God. He recalls Aristotle, who had affirmed that some human beings are naturally born to be slaves and subjects, and we could think that he implies that this condition applies to Blacks, although the condition as such would be supernaturally caused by God only after human being’s sin (see Alonso de Sandoval, 1987, II, ii, p. 235-238). According to this kind of explanation, evils of nature such as diseases and weaknesses, evils of fate such as tragedies and misfortunes in life, and evils of the soul such as bad inclinations and vices suffered by Blacks in a much larger scale than other human being – including what might be called Aristotelian side-effects such as lack in understanding, congenial incapacity for prudence, and mere corporeal aptness to hard work –, have all a common cause, which is sin and the corresponding divine punishment (see Alonso de Sandoval, 1987, II, i, p. 234-235; Souza, 2006, p. 41). In fact, Alonso de Sandoval seems to think that, by a divine action of punishment, there is a new condition in creation regarding the Blacks, which means a condition or a state of subjection, if not immediately or necessarily factual, at least in terms of a “natural” tendency in general terms: Blacks are depicted as

23 The name “Ham” itself becomes an object of an etymological experiment by Alonso de Sandoval (1987, I, ii, p. 74). Sandoval’s account of the etymology of the word “Charm” and the etiology of slavery based on Genesis 9:20-29 is influenced by the biblical commentaries by Alonso Fernández de Madrigal or “el Tostado” (ca. 1410-1455), who was a professor at the University of Salamanca and later became bishop of Ávila. On accounts of slavery by Fathers of the Church, see Gülzow (1969); Sainte-Croix (1975, p. 1-38); Harrill (1995); Garnsey (1996); Klein (2000, p. 380-381).

24 See Genesis 9:20-29 (here 20-27; Good News Bible, Today’s English Version, American Bible Society 1976): “Noah, who was a farmer, was the first man to plant a vineyard. After he drank some of the wine, he became drunk, took off his clothes, and lay naked in his tent. When Ham, the father of Canaan, saw that his father was naked, he went out and told his two brothers. Then Shem and Japheth took a robe and held it behind them on their shoulders. They walked backwards into the tent and covered their father, keeping their faces turned away so as not to see him naked. When Noah was sober again and learnt what his youngest son had done to him, he said, “A curse on Canaan! He will be the slave of his brothers. Give praise to the Lord, the God of Shem! Canaan will be the slave of Shem. May God cause Japheth to increase! May his descendants live with the people of Shem! Canaan will be slave of Japheth” (see Alonso de Sandoval, 1987, I, ii, p. 74-75; see also Bénassy, 1981, p. 49-60).

25 In a further passage, i.e., Book II, Chapter III (“Of the evils that these Blacks suffer in the supernatural”; see Alonso de Sandoval, 1987, II, iii, p. 239-242), Sandoval still depicts (iv) the evils suffered by the Blacks in the sphere of the supernatural. What he means is that, although Christ died for all humankind, including all of Black, unfortunately their owners seem not to like that slaves are instructed in the doctrine and baptized. They make no efforts for that, they even avoid it in all possible ways, persuading African slaves that they should refuse to be indoctrinated and to learn about Christian religion. A partial reason for that was the belief by the owners that the slaves were unable to learn the matters of faith through catechesis, thus any attempt to baptize them and bring them to confession and relief and help. The name “Ham” itself becomes an object of an etymological experiment by Alonso de Sandoval (1987, I, ii, p. 74). Sandoval’s account of the etymology of the word “Charm” and the etiology of slavery based on Genesis 9:20-29 is influenced by the biblical commentaries by Alonso Fernández de Madrigal or “el Tostado” (ca. 1410-1455), who was a professor at the University of Salamanca and later became bishop of Ávila. On accounts of slavery by Fathers of the Church, see Gülzow (1969); Sainte-Croix (1975, p. 1-38); Harrill (1995); Garnsey (1996); Klein (2000, p. 380-381).

26 See Alonso de Sandoval (1987, II, i, p. 232ff). The threefold typology of evils so far is Aristotelian. See Aristotle (1941, Rhetorica II, 8, 1386a3-16, 1396-1398). Truly, such evils, for Aristotle, should be viewed as reasons for having or exciting “pity” towards those who suffer them (see Nehamas, 1994, p. 269-176; Busche, 2005). Sandoval has the purpose of exciting pity towards Blacks in his readers indeed, which might be seen as a way of persuading the Church and slaveholders of the Christian moral task of bringing Blacks some relief and help.

being prone to or inclined by nature to slavery, even if they actually live in civil liberty – and for any given reasons come to “legally” lose it.

We should also pay attention to a further example of the patterns of demeaning language that Alonso de Sandoval makes concerning the “race” and, broadly speaking, “ethnicity” of Blacks or “Africans”: he emphasizes and explains their utter “ugliness” and “monstrosity” not only because of the poor conditions of the local “paediatrics” and, as it were, the various policies of beauty and body care, but, further reflecting “on the cause of the extraordinary monsters and other marvelous things that are found in Africa, […]”, Sandoval is able to formulate theses about the “cause of the generation of monsters”. He seems to follow an Aristotelian line of reasoning, i.e., that the principle of “monstrosity” is that there are cases in nature in which nature itself does not reach its perfect end – it fails, in a certain respect at least, regarding the expected teleology of a given species. So, a living being of nature does not generate a descendant as a “fellow” or “similar”, but rather as a different one (see Alonso de Sandoval, 1987, I, iii, p. 77). Thus, Sandoval can view in a “monster” a sort of “sin by nature”, which can be understood either in terms of “defect” or of “excess”, for in both ways the generated item does not acquire its specific “completeness” (see Alonso de Sandoval, 1987, I, iii, p. 78).

Although this is not – at least at this point of Sandoval’s work – a devaluation of the spirit, it is a depreciation of bodily trac-es of the “different” Africans.

If civil slavery, in spite of possible injustices, is taken to be an acceptable social institution, Sandoval is both able to recognize that it is caused by human weakness and, at same time, to affirm that there is a more important sense of freedom and servitude. Why is liberty lost by people? In “the beginning”, people were not put into the world, by God, as “masters” and “slaves”. People began to tyrannize others by taking away their liberty, “because of malice”. Sandoval expresses his belief that human being is “naturally” “free”, and any human being is made slave “because of iniquity”.[28] He suggests that both the powerful and the poor have the same “principle” and “finality”, and is able to affirm with Seneca that all people live under the same sky, the same sun shines on everyone, all people breathe the same air and share the other elements, which amounts to say that, naturally (and originally), all have the same share.[29]

Truly, malice explains why this does not happen in practice. But, again, the Good News are equally destined to all human beings as most excellent creatures of God, and even though there can be masters and slaves they are equally called to the salvation of their souls through the redeeming deeds of Christ (see Alonso de Sandoval, 1987, I, xviii, p. 150-151). At the end, it is at this level that there is the same freedom for all: a freedom, through faith, of the servitude of sin, which brings to anyone a “highest nobility” (because of virtues) in the eyes of God, as well as the same dignity of equally being serves of Christ. At the end – in an eschatological sense –, everyone will receive a prize only because of their good or evil deeds spiritually. People should care most about the healing of their souls, which need to be redeemed by Christ.

Clearly, we can see here both how tolerance and respect for the religiously different, under the previous or concomitant recognition of the universal dignity of the other human, would still be a morally secondary value – if compared, for example, with the absolute significance of the salvation of the soul –, and how a language of respect towards the other, or even of resistance or criticism to any colonialist project, would be made impossible by prejudiced opinions about the other-ness of human beings, particularly, in our case, regarding a level of discourse on “race” and “ethnicities”. But perhaps we find the strongest and most revealing aspects concerning a – religiously based – language of subjection in Sandoval’s work in passages where he explicitly connects religion and race, religion and skin color. These passages, the analysis of which is the second focus of this study of De procuranda Aethiopum salute and which certainly, on the doctrinal level, characterize the Jesuit missions among Blacks, are those where Alonso de Sandoval explains the key contents of a Christian catechesis. We must remember that Sandoval’s book – in the 1627 edition – has a total of Four Parts; Parts One and Two are those that I have roughly described so far, and the topics related to the correct administration of sacraments, especially baptism, which must be preceded by proper catechesis, appear in Book III.

Alonso de Sandoval on the catechesis of Blacks or: On religion and race

In fact, we cannot analyze the catechesis of Blacks without also considering that its performance presupposed an ethics of masters and slaves inspired on the Bible (in particular on St. Peter’s and St. Paul’s Letters), reflecting the exemplary role of Christian masters, both lay people and clergymen, as people chosen by God to discipline their “children” and teach.

---

[28] Alonso de Sandoval (1987, I, iii, p. 76-82) is an intriguing text indeed, in which we find evidences for the emergence of an ideology of “monstrosity” and external “ugliness” among Blacks caused by sin and defects of nature. See also Tardieu (1984); Olsen (2004, p. 92-104).

[29] See Alonso de Sandoval (1987, I, xviii, p. 149-150). If this fits generally the discourse that the slavery of Africans as tendency and historical “destiny” was supernaturally introduced by God as a form of punishment or curse because of Ham’s offence, here Sandoval also explores the Patristic idea that slavery was introduced in the world by sin, because of human being’s iniquity towards their fellow human creatures.

[30] Roman Stoics such as Seneca usually located the legitimacy of slavery in the ius gentium, not in a given natural condition; see the remarks by Flaig (1995, col. 977-978).
them the true religion – according to St. Paul’s ethics, in particular, true believers and redeemed people live under the same (spiritual) freedom and in a sense the same (spiritual) servitude towards each other in love and subjection to Christ as Lord. In such a state there are no masters and slaves, although the apostle himself did not direct any words against the social-political state of slavery or civil servitude. What St. Paul says about Christian masters and (Christian) slaves must be understood under the perspective of an eschatologically inspired pedagogy that should – at least might! – be conducted in a master-slave relationship. In fact, Sandoval makes a careful application of this kind of human relationship with the purpose of introducing religious views and habits into the Blacks, i.e., for the goal of the salvation of their souls.

As Nicole von Germen correctly affirms, Book III of Sandoval’s De instauranda Aethiopum salute “highlights the fact that” he viewed his own work “as a manual for Jesuits who wanted to join his mission baptizing African slaves in Carthagena”. So, he offers several practical advices to those who want to join him in the ministry to Blacks. Sandoval carefully explains his approach to the Catholic sacraments, most especially to baptism – both of children and above all of adults –, showing particular interest in knowing about those who had been baptized already on the African coast and under which circumstances and criteria of proper administration (Chapters 4–6) (see Alonso de Sandoval, 2008, III, iv-vi, p. 111-125; 1987, III, iv-vi, p. 382-406); after that, he focuses on the examination of the Africans’ true status as baptized people and, if necessary, the prerequisites and due preparation for catechism (Chapters 7–9) (see Alonso de Sandoval, 2008, III, vii-x, p. 125-133; 1987, III, vii-x, p. 406-420). For those whose inspection reveals that they did not receive any baptism at all or at least of any valid baptism, Sandoval proposes, thus, a form of catechism (teaching of the fundamental articles and precepts of the Christian faith) which, irrespective of the presupposition that Blacks are both able to basically understand those contents and freely receive baptism afterwards (Chapter 3) (see Alonso de Sandoval, 2008, III, iii, p. 105-110; 1987, III, iii, p. 375-381), also reveals a remarkable connection between (Christian, and the only “true”) religion, “race” and “ethnicity”. Despite all hard – demeaning – description of the human status of Blacks done by Sandoval in Book II of his De instauranda Aethiopum salute, and granting that our author is neither always consistent nor usually precise in his expositions, according to his opinion in Book III Africans have free will and are able to at least understand the essentials of Christian faith before being actually baptized. Sandoval even affirms that they must be brought to Christian faith by some forms of induction (see Alonso de Sandoval, 2008, III, iii, p. 105-110; III, x, p. 133-137; 1987, III, iii, p. 375-381; III, x, p. 420-426), although we must also mention that the mysteries of faith, “due to the slaves’ ignorance”, should be explained in a quick and simple way, without “much detail” (see Alonso de Sandoval, 2008, III, x, p. 133; III, xi, p. 137-141; 1987, III, x, p. 420-421; III, xi, p. 426-433). But the aspect I really want to explore is Sandoval’s reflection on the amount of information to be received and supposed to be enough for Blacks to be properly catechized and rightly express the acquisition of faith before receiving the sacrament of baptism. What must they know?

Summarizing what Sandoval affirms in De instauranda Aethiopum salute III, 10, the African slaves (i) must first “be taught that without baptism, they cannot go to heaven” and they must be attentive to every instruction, because, without correctly answering questions later, “they will not have the water poured on them” (see Alonso de Sandoval, 2008, III, x, p. 133-134; 1987, III, x, p. 420-421). (ii) Second, they must know that “the water is not for washing their heads or refreshing them”; it is instead “God’s water, and baptism is a great thing that Jesus Christ commands to renew humankind”; in such a way that sinners and “slaves of the devil” become “children of God” (see Alonso de Sandoval, 2008, III, x, p. 134; 1987, III, x, p. 421-422). (iii) Third, the slaves must be taught that “God is watching us, even if we cannot see him”, hearing then an explanation in very simple words about the mysteries of omnipresence, eternity and omnipotence (see Alonso de Sandoval, 2008, III, x, p. 135; 1987, III, x, p. 422). (iv) Fourth, they must know, by means of comparisons, about the mystery of the Holy Trinity, that there are three persons and only one God (see Alonso de Sandoval, 2008, III, x, p. 135; 1987, III, x, p. 422-423). (v) Fifth, they must be told that “God has a son, also a God like him, who is the second figure” of the Holy Trinity (see Alonso de Sandoval, 2008, III, x, p. 135; 1987, III, x, p. 423). (vi) Sixth, they must be told “how this Son of God became a man and was born of Saint Mary”, whose status as “Mother of God” should be made explicit (see Alonso de Sandoval, 2008, III, x, p. 135; 1987, III, x, p. 423). (vii) Seventh, the African slaves must be told that “the great and all powerful God has two houses [sic!]”; one is heaven, “is very beautiful and is always full of happiness and is located up in the sky”, and the other is hell, a house below that “is nothing but fire, whips, and punishment”, with the warning that “Those who do not have water poured on them and who do not want to serve him go there, where they are tortured forever” (see Alonso de Sandoval, 2008, III, x, p. 135; 1987, III, x, p. 423). (viii) Eighth, African slaves must be told that “the Son of God died because he loves them and wants all of them to have their heads washed. After he died, he returned to life.”

31 See Alonso de Sandoval (1987, II, iii-v, p. 242-251). In Pich (2015a, p. 69-72), I explained several aspects of this ethics, which Sandoval develops and finds confirmed above all in passages of the New Testament. Sandoval makes honest efforts to protect the slaves and calls the attention of their white holders to their human and Christian responsibilities.

Sandoval here emphasizes that Christ wants Blacks to make everything he commands, and this is connected to a further will, i.e., that Christ wants them to dwell in his “upper house” (see Alonso de Sandoval, 2008, III, x, p. 135-136; 1987, III, x, p. 423-424). (ix) Ninth, they must be told about “the mystery of the Resurrection”, which requires an explanation of the immortality of the soul and its union with the resuscitated body in glory and in heaven (see Alonso de Sandoval, 2008, III, x, p. 136; 1987, III, x, p. 424-425). Again, in all these nine steps 33 of basic Christian catechism, Alonso de Sandoval follows a peculiar pedagogy: he recommends simplicity of language, patient repetition (like someone who is speaking with little children), as well as some use of force or pressure with words, so that Africans realize how important to their souls the sacrament of baptism is:

> It is sufficient to teach these mysteries in this simple way, because the slaves are in desperate need and understand so little. If they die, they have learned enough to be saved and to receive the other sacraments. If they live, little by little they will learn the rest and perfect themselves. After we finish instructing them, we ask their express permission for baptism, before passing to the other actions necessary for faith, hope, charity, and contrition. 34

But in order to see the most interesting aspects of such pedagogy of salvation applied by Jesuit priests – I mean those aspects that can reveal new perspectives which help understand the ideology of Black slavery in the 16th-18th centuries –, we should give attention, again, to (ii) the second teaching recommendation or requirement mentioned above. This second step, as described by Sandoval, seems to be accompanied by a strong ritualism and remarkable (embarrassing?) connections between religion and race, religion and ethnicity, religion and skin color – although such connections appear in several other passages of Book III of De instauranda Aethiopum salute as well 35. Sandoval affirms that baptism cleans the slaves’ souls “of all stains of guilt”, it frees their souls “from the pain of hell and purgatory”, opening them the doors of heaven after their death. As a matter of fact, in order to characterize the soul’s states before and after baptism, Sandoval makes use of a simple (even childish) language that resorts to straight and emphatic oppositions such as “clean and dirty”, “peace and suffering”, “heaven and hell”, “true and false”, etc. But at the core of the contents of the Christian catechesis Sandoval makes explicit use of words that can characterize a discourse to be connected to the previous exposition of the conscious devaluation of black-skinned people (and peoples), i.e., the narrative where the skin color and “race” of Africans and their status of subjected – or subjectable – human beings were ultimately explained by a divine punishment 36. Such a devaluing narrative is related now to true religion (Christianity) and false religion (any religion practiced by Blacks), right or blessed skin color and race (white and whites) and wrong or cursed skin color or race (black and blacks), proving what I take to be one of the most powerful items of the “philosophy of Black slavery” generally speaking – thus, of the “ideology of Black slavery” more narrowly: there is a true religion, this is the religion of the whites, this a white religion, and this is Christian faith. After his exposition of the second step in teaching Blacks the essentials of Christian faith, and before describing how such teaching items should be repeated by the catechized slaves until they know by heart the answers to all questions put to them before receiving the sacrament, Sandoval affirms:

> This is how they will become Christians, like the whites, and how they receive the law of Jesus Christ in order to adore him and re-
member nothing more of the idols and false gods of their land. We repeat this point as many times as is necessary for them to understand, until they give the correct answers to these questions.37

In the following lines, in which Sandoval mentions a kind of litany of doctrinal repetitions that must be performed as simple questions and answers, regarding the essential meaning of the water of baptism poured over the slaves’ heads, it is impossible not to perceive the scandalous connections between religion and race that possibly characterized 16th-18th century Jesuit missions specifically and Christian missions in general:

[Q.] What is this water that will be poured over them? [A.] They respond that it is water of God. [Q.] Do they want to receive it with all their heart? [A.] Yes. [Q.] Where will they go if they receive it? [A.] To heaven with God. [Q.] Whose children are they after receiving that water? [A.] Children of God. [Q.] If they receive the water, will they be children of the devil or of God? [A.] Just children of God. [Q.] Which gods should they have from now on, the true God of the whites, Jesus Christ, his Son, or the false and lying gods of their land and of witchcraft and superstition? [A.] Only the God of the whites [que no quieren sino al Dios de los blancos, etc.]. [Q.] Do they want to be Christians obeying the law of Jesus Christ like the whites, living like them, serving and obeying the great God of the Christians, or be the Moors [穆斯林], gentiles, and barbarians, like they were in their land? [A.] Be like Christians.38

Truly, the lines next to this litany (see the quotation, below) might be seen as an mitigation of the thesis that Sandoval’s mission handbook works with an ideological association between true religion and “right” race – thus, false religion and “wrong” race –, but in fact it does not change anything concerning the emphasis that the religious attitude of whites is the one to be imitated (after all, they had already accepted the water of Christian baptism). Moreover, the personal value baptized slaves acquire and the social-spatial participation they will win for themselves after receiving the sacrament are explicitly presented by Sandoval as a very modest integration, by means of true religion, into a “white world”:

Also say to them at this point that the whites are important because they have accepted this water that makes them Christians. If they had not, they would be unimportant and without value. If the slaves receive the water, they will also be respected, and they will be able to go to the temples and houses of God, to associate and eat with the other Christians. If they are Christians, when they die they will be buried in the church. If they are not Christians, they will be thrown in the rubbish dump, where they will be eaten by dogs.39

Concluding remarks

It is likely that the connection between religion and skin color, religion and race, or in our case Christianity and whiteness as a connection between truth in religion and moral-religious correction, can be verified in several other cases of colonization in Western history or in the history of Christianity, of Western political powers and colonization systems around the world, especially in the period comprising the 16th–19th centuries. What we should emphasize here is how such connections, especially in the stories about instruction and the Christian catechism, have quite an ideological appeal and make strong political use of words, in the sense of sketching a contrasting picture very useful for colonization and the slavery system: true Christian religion and whiteness versus false African religion and blackness. These connections reinforced at a deep level a culture of devaluation of Blacks, of subjection to what is culturally and religiously white, the idea of a quite natural social status of Blacks as inclined by nature and divine blame.

37 See Alonso de Sandoval (2008, III, x, p. 134; 1987, III, x, p. 422: “[…] que con ella quedan Christianos como los blancos, y reciben la ley de Jesu Christo, para adorarlo y no acordarse mas de los idolos, Chinas y dioses falsos de su tierra, sino del Dios de los blancos y de Jesu Christo su hijo. Y este punto se les repita las vezes que fueren necesarias, para que entiendan y como tan principal y el fundamento de todo no se passe del[,]”].

38 See Alonso de Sandoval (2008, III, x, p. 134; 1987, III, x, p. 421-422): “[…], hasta que preguntados que agua es aquella con que les quieren levar respondan que es agua de Dios. Que si la quieren recibir de todo corazón, que si. Que donde han de ir con ella? Al cielo con Dios. Que cuyos hijos han de ser con aquella agua? Que hijos de Dios. Que si recibida aquella agua seran se alli adelante hijos del demonio, o de Dios? No, sino hijos de Dios. Que a quien quieren de alli adelante, al Dios verdadero de los blancos, a Jesu Christo su hijo, o al Dios falso, y mentira de su tierra, a sus Chinas, hechizeras y supersticiones? Que no quieren sino al Dios de los blancos, etc. Que si quieren ser Christianos, tener la ley de Jesu Christo como los blancos, vivir como ellos, sirviendo y obedeciendo al Dios grande de los Christianos? O ser Moros Gentiles, Barbaros como en su tierra y vivir como allá vivian? Que no, sino como Christianos, etc.”. “Q” = “Question” (by the catechist), and “A” = “Answer” (by the African slaves).

39 Cf. Alonso de Sandoval (1987, III, 10, p. 421-422): “Tambien se les dira luego en este punto que la causa de ser los blancos tan esti-mados de todos, es, por aver recibido esta agua con que se hicieron Christianos, que sino lo fueran no uviera quien hiziera caso dellos. Que la reciben ellos tambien y seran estimados, como ellos, podran ir a los templos y casas de Dios, tratar y comer, con los demas Christianos y cuando se mueran los enterraran en la Iglesia si son Christianos, o si no en el muladar, donde sean comidos de perros”.
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to live as subjects or slaves in the world, the acceptance of the status of slavery under white masters as a possibility of finding redemption for such a God-willed condition and the bonus of an eschatologically inspired freedom of sin and new slavery under Christ as a master. Religion strengthened the ideology of slavery through the powerful literal meaning, the linguistic performances or uses and the symbolic import of words biased by racial prejudice. In substantial parts of the Catholic rites conducted by Jesuit missionaries among Blacks in colonial South America, religion was quite often put into a language of racial supremacy – including here aspects of a superior moral, social, and political status. Religious language was conceived and used to establish, justify and confirm a status of inferiority, subjection and even natural or constitutive distance towards God: perhaps Black slavery was only possible for such a long time because it was supported and reinforced by religious views of superiority and truth which clearly had a color.40
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