
Suria: Its Relevance to Slavery in Zanzibar in the Nineteenth Century

Saada Omar Wahab

Although much research has been undertaken on slavery in the Indian Ocean, Africa, the Americas and elsewhere, few studies have been produced on the history of female slavery. A major problem has been the lack of written sources, compared to those available for male slaves who were traded and required for labour and are therefore more fully documented in written sources. A gendered approach to the study of slavery reveals that much of their lives were not documented because it centred on personal relationships, family life and activities centred in or around the home. Even cultural practices maintained largely by women, were not documented when it was not publicly exhibited. Slave-owners, travellers, colonial officials during the time of slavery rarely ventured into slave camps nor questioned slaves about family affairs. There were few maroon women, few involved in criminal cases, and few with economic activities which entered financial records. Although to attempt to study a topic that is not well documented is to step on hazardous ground, two chapters in this project are devoted to making the first steps in reconstructing the lives of a group of women who did enter the historical record through their association with men, slave and free. This chapter will examine the particular and unique role of the *suria*, a particular Islamic institution in slavery as practiced in Zanzibar and the post-emancipation experience.

The *suria* are slaves and 'secondary wives' and must be distinguished from the term 'concubine' which has often been used in existing literature to describe them. The system itself had a long history as far as the system of slavery is concerned. The *suria* was part of the Arab social and family life system that was accepted in Islam in a modified form. In Zanzibar and elsewhere in East Africa where Muslim Arabs penetrated, the institution of the *suria* was also practiced as part of the family system. In the nineteenth century, it clashed with European perceptions

of freedom, and the emancipation of *suria* as proclaimed by the British disturbed the family system of the Arabs and Muslims who owned slaves in Zanzibar.

The term *suria*, rather than the term 'concubine', is used in this project as there is difference between the two. While 'concubine' refers to extra-legal wives who were possessed by a man of high social status only, the *suria* refers to women who were bought, acquired as a gift, captured in war, or domestic slaves, and who established cohabitation with the slave masters as secondary wives with certain legal rights and social status.

The word *suria* originates from Arabic language and is believed to be related to the word *ajrab* (meaning 'a stranger in the community'). In Islam, this term was used to identify a female slave who established cohabitation with her owner and bore his children. However, a female slave became a *suria* only when her owner recognised the child.

The study of *suria* becomes important and relevant for this comparative study of slavery in Mauritius and Zanzibar, as it shows the extent of the Arab and Islamic influence on slavery in Zanzibar. In comparison with Mauritius, this institution in Zanzibar provides an insight into the process of ascending mobility of some female slaves and their offspring who shifted from a lower social position to a higher one as they were integrated with the free people of the community by becoming a *suria*. In Mauritius, this institution did not exist as a legal practice because until 1810, only Roman Catholicism was allowed on the island and most slave owners were Europeans and Christians. Although relationships did develop between female slaves and their owners, these were illicit relationships as the law forbade any sort of relationships, marital or otherwise, between slave and free, or between white and non-white inhabitants.

The Historical Context of the *Suria*

The *suria* as part of the Arab social system had its history long before the seventh century AD when Prophet Muhammad proclaimed Islam. It is believed that different Arab communities were engaged in capturing and developing relationships with female captives whose legal status was uncertain. However, the advent of Islam modified this practice. Islam like other social organisations regarded slaves as property that the owner possessed. This is referred to in the Qur'an as '*ma malakat aymanukum*' or 'what your right hand possesses'.¹ Due to this right of ownership, it became lawful for the owner of a slave girl to have intercourse with her. Consequently, *surias* were women who were available to their masters, but not formally married to them. A man could have as many *surias* as he could afford. However, there were some restrictions on the owner: he would not co-habit with a female slave belonging to his wife, and he could not have relations with a female slave if she was co-owned, or already married.²

The *suria* system as proclaimed by Islam has some ‘benefits’ for both slaves and owners. If the slave girl gave birth to her owner’s child, her status immediately improved, notably as she became ‘*umm walad*’ or ‘mother of the child’.³ She could not thereafter be sold, pawned, or given away, and when her owner died she automatically became free. This meant that the *suria* system as practiced by Islam had its own way of emancipating the slave women gradually. It started after she gave birth, and then completed after the death of her owner. In this sense, the status of the *suria* was different from that of other slaves.

Moreover, this system enabled the *suria* to bear children who were legitimate and free as they issued from her owner. They would therefore inherit property from their fathers as any other children from the other legal wives. In other words, the *suria* system gave female slaves relative security, and a chance to rise socially, and even gain power through their sons. It also provided a measure of economic security for the woman involved, although she did not acquire inheritance rights from her owner/husband except through her children.

This system also enabled the slave-owners to enjoy sexual relations with many women without being accused of harassing girl slaves or *zinaa*, or violating the Islamic *sharia*. It also enabled them to have children with other women apart from their wives; and these women were accepted by the Islamic *Sharia* and were not treated as illegitimate.

It is a fact that under Islam a *suria* enjoyed many privileges that other normal slaves, whether within or outside Muslim communities, could never imagine. At the same time, in comparison with other cultures, Islam tried to modify the condition of slaves, recognised the social reality of cohabitation with slave women, and went on to explicitly acknowledge their status and rights and those of their offspring.

In protecting *suria* from being a prostitute, the *Sharia* put it clearly that she could have sex only with her master/owner, and anyone else who had sex with her was guilty of adultery. A *suria* was not given any kind of payment for her services. Her status in a man’s life was that of a wife. If she was owned by the father of the house, then his brothers or sons had absolutely no rights toward her.

However, the *Sharia* did not prescribe equality of time and sustenance between wives and *suria*. This means a man was not forced to share his time equally between his *surias* and his wives.⁴ This distinguished a *suria* from a wife of the owner: she was a secondary slave wife whose rights were defined by the *Sharia*.

The *suria* lived in a *harem*. This was a private part of any Muslim household where the *suria* was required to live together with the family of her owner. The *suria* rarely lived in a separate harem from the owner’s wife/ wives. But *surias* were treated far better than other female slaves.

From the rise of Islam in the seventh century AD, *surias*, as other groups of slaves, were obtained through different ways. But the most common one was

through *jihad*, a religious war with those who were unbelievers in the mission of Muhammad. The war captives were used in different ways such as becoming *surias*. Prophet Muhammad declared it a sin to kidnap any free man, woman or child and make them slaves unless they had warred against the Muslims. After a war, he used to exchange prisoners of war if the warring parties agreed to it. If not, the captives were set free by taking a ransom, and if they could not afford the ransom, he showed generosity and released them without condition. If the captives had nowhere to return to, they were made slaves, and all efforts were made to socialise them into the existing Islamic society. Other *surias* were acquired as gifts which some Muslims received from their fellow Muslims or foreign rulers.

In general, seventh century Islam banned the ill-treatment of slaves, especially the slave girls. Prophet Muhammad taught that slaves were to be regarded as human beings with dignity and rights and not just as property, and that freeing slaves was a virtuous thing to do. This created a culture in which slaves became much more assimilated into the Islamic community.

The *Suria* System and the Reality of Zanzibar Slavery

As noted earlier, the *suria* was part of a social and family practice of Arab and Muslim communities in different parts of the world. It is not known exactly when this system was practiced in Zanzibar, but it flourished in the nineteenth century in Zanzibar and other city states of East Africa. There are different factors that explain why this practice developed during that time. From 1744, the Omani ruler had installed his governor in Zanzibar, but the local ruler, the *Mwinyi Mkuu*, remained as the chief of the native subjects. This gradually affected not only the political setup, but also the social and economic system.⁵ The situation changed drastically in 1840 when Sultan Said transferred his capital from Muscat to Zanzibar.⁶ This was the starting point of the Omani Arab Sultanate in Zanzibar, which was characterised by the opening up of large clove and coconut plantations. It resulted in a large inflow of Arabs from the Arabian world who came to establish their settlement in Zanzibar.⁷ When they moved to East Africa and Zanzibar, they came in with their own family system as they had practiced it at home.

Secondly, in the nineteenth century slave trade and slavery became a lucrative and essential feature of Zanzibar's social and economic structure. Following the prosperity of the slave trade and the plantation economy, many businessmen and planters accumulated enough profits from these two sectors. At that time, local slaves in Zanzibar were very cheap, ranging from as little as \$10 to \$20.8 As a result of this, upper and middle-class Arabs, Indians as well as Swahili Muslims, were in a position to own slaves, including *surias*.

In addition, the Zanzibari commercial system of the nineteenth century facilitated the development of slavery and slave trade. Slaves were considered by Arabs and Swahilis as property that could be bought and sold. Although pawning

a slave was forbidden by the *Sharia*, it operated as a local practice among Arab and Indian slave-owners. By traditional usage, a person who was heavily indebted or in urgent need of cash was allowed to make a pledge and put his slaves in a pawn to pay his debts or obtain cash.⁹ However, the slaves were not allowed to be pawned for more than one month.

The *suria* were required to be healthy and energetic to serve the sexual desires of their owners as well as reproduce. If a master found anything suspicious, he would withdraw his offer, and the slave would continue to serve as *mjakazi* (a female domestic slave) instead of a *suria*. An example was Maryam binti Abdallah who was a slave from Abyssinia. She had been raped by a Nubian slave dealer who brought her to Zanzibar when she was only 12 or 13 years old. She suffered internal injuries that made it impossible for her to bear children. She was bought by the Sultan as she was very beautiful. The Sultan intended to make her one of his *surias*, but her injuries made this impossible.¹⁰ Therefore she became one of the hand-maidens of Seyyid Ali bin Said bin Sultan, living in the palace along with other slave girls. Although one cannot generalise using only one example, this case showed that in this family system, the problem was not in her social status but what she could bring in terms of family. The owners expected to have children with their *surias* who could take on the family name and supervise their business in the future.

Another important theme is the ethnic origin of Zanzibar *surias*. There were local *surias* who came from East and Central Africa, as well as foreign *surias*. It is hard to establish the total number of *surias* who came from the different tribes. Sheriff's study on the social composition of Zanzibar slaves (1860-61) shows that many slaves who were used in Zanzibar were coming from the southern tribes in eastern Africa, including the Yao, Nyasa, Ngindo and others who constituted 68 per cent of the slave population in Zanzibar. The northern tribes included the Sagara, Mrima, and the Nyamwezi who contributed 18 per cent of the slave population (see Figure 3, p. 30). The remaining slaves included *vizalia* (born slaves).¹¹ This study, however, cannot be reliable in explaining the *suria* population of Zanzibar as many *surias* were not registered to obtain freedom. Generally speaking, these were the cheapest, and were owned by the middle as well as upper classes.

Apart from local *surias* there were also 'foreign *surias*'. They included Galla, Habshi (Ethiopians), Indian, and Circassian slaves from south-eastern Europe. The latter were the most expensive, with prices ranging between \$50 and \$250. For example, Ethiopian slaves sold for 50 to 150 German Crowns, 'the females being higher', and a 'superior Abyssinian female may sell at 300 Crowns in 1830'. In 1847, Kemball reported the price of between \$60 and 200 for 'Habshi females'.¹² From Hejaz, girls ranged from \$60 to \$150.¹³ Burton, as quoted by Sheriff, says Ethiopian slaves were 'exceedingly addicted to intrigue', but they

were favourites with men, 'and, it is said, with Arab women'. Rigby reported in 1859 that an Indian had purchased a Galla slave woman for \$159, while in 1871 a young Iranian had offered \$250 for a Pathan (Indian) slave woman Fatima or Mariam.¹⁴ White slave women were exceedingly rare and expensive, and were confined to the *harems* of the rulers and the upper class.

The *suria* in nineteenth century Zanzibar constituted the highest rank among domestic female slaves. At the beginning of the process, a man would buy a woman slave when her status would be that of *mjakazi* (woman slave) and keep her at home as a *suria*.¹⁵ In some instances, a man would buy a *kijakazi* (young slave girl) and bring her home to be taught the customary housework. When the girl reached puberty, she was separated from other female slaves and was given a room for herself. She thus became a *suria* and was not allowed to go out alone. She then commanded the same respect from other slaves as the wife of the master did.¹⁶

There were two types of harem in Zanzibar. The first was a shared harem, where the *surias* shared a house with the wife (wives) of their owners. This was a common practice among sultans of Zanzibar and other slave-owners; a good example being the Royal Harem of Sultan Said bin Sultan. In this context, however, the *surias* did not have any say in the presence of the owner's wife.¹⁷ The owner's wife/ wives ruled over everyone and everything within her reach in the harem. Bibi Azze, Sayyed Said's wife was feared by young and old, high and low, but liked by no one.¹⁸ As the wife of the owner, she controlled everyone including her husband. The second type of harem was rare where only *surias* lived within it especially if the owner was single or widower. Under this type, some *surias* were said to have a greater say than the others. A woman's status depended on attracting the eye of her royal master. A study by Martin concluded that 'in most harems, important positions were held largely by women who came from other important families'.¹⁹ These included white slaves (European) who were said to be expensive compared to black slaves.

Age was also an important factor in shaping a *suria's* life within the harem. The number of years one served the system led to being considered experienced. Furthermore, older *surias* who had older children were more influential than new *surias* with younger children.

Nevertheless, the two types of harems shared the whole idea of social dissimilarity which is sharply noticeable in both. This classification was done not only between the *surias* on one side and the owner's family on the other, but also among *surias* themselves. In the shared harem, though *surias* had good opportunities and better position compared to other slaves, it seems that they could not share the same meal with the owner's wife and children (even those born by *surias* themselves). Sayyida Salme, one of the Sultan's daughters, who wrote the first surviving autobiography by a Zanzibari on life within royal harem, explained that all her older brothers came in from their houses to take their breakfast jointly

with the father. No *suria* was permitted to take meals with the father; no matter how favoured she might be over others in other respects. Only his wife, Azze bint Seif, and his sister, Aashe, sat at his table.²⁰

Skin colour among *surias* was also a differentiating factor. The white slaves such as Circassians, Persians and Turks thought of themselves as beautiful and expensive, hence they did not want to share anything with other slaves, even to take meals jointly with black slaves such as Abyssinians, or others from East and Central Africa.²¹ While the price for a local slave ranged between \$10 and \$20, the foreign slave's price was between \$50 and \$250.²² With this price variation, social distinctions existed within the harem, as the expensive (foreign) *surias* were treated far better than the local African *surias*.

Another kind of classification in the harem was observed among the *surias*' offspring. This classification was based on the ethnic origin of their mothers. As Salme stated in her book that, 'We, the children of the Circassian women, were usually called 'cats' ... because some of us had the misfortune of possessing blue eyes. Derisively, they called us "Highness", a proof of how annoyed they were about us having been born with lighter skin.'²³ However, this classification was not shared by their father. He treated them equally, with no colour distinction.

Socialisation of the *surias* was present in the harem. They were forced to adapt to the one or two common cultures accepted by their owners. When they came into the harem, they adapted to the new culture and maintained some of the elements of their original culture such as language, dress and food. In the royal harem, for instance, Sayyida Salme, explained:

For us children the Babel of languages in this society was particularly diverting. In fact only Arabic should have been spoken and in my father's presence this order was strictly followed. But no sooner had he turned his back, than a kind of babel-like confusion of tongues prevailed. Persian, Turkish, Circassian, Swahili, Nubian and Abyssinian were heard promiscuously next to Arabic, not to mention the various dialects of these languages...

As for the kitchen ... meals were cooked in the Arabic as well as in the Persian and Turkish fashion. In both houses [Mtoni and the town palaces] the various races were indeed living together and the most fascinating beauties as well as their opposites were abundantly represented. But among us only the Arabic fashion was permitted, and among the negroes the Swahili one. When a Circassian woman arrived in her clothes of ample shirts, or an Abyssinian woman in her fantastic attire, within three days she had to lay aside everything and to wear the Arabic clothes assigned to her. ... Immediately after she had been purchased, a newly arrived *suria* also received the necessary jewels as a present; at the same time the chief eunuch assigned her servants to her.²⁴

Information provided by Salme explaining what was going on in the Royal Harem in Zanzibar was most probably experienced in many other ordinary harems. Another important fact observed from Salme's statements was that in the harem, tolerance seemed to prevail.

As a secondary slave wife, a *suria* was required to face *edda* following the death of her owner just like the wives did in Islam. *Edda* was a special religious mourning period that lasted four months that all the wives of the deceased had to submit to. Salme wrote that 'all the wives of the deceased without exception, the legitimate female slaves as well as the purchased ones, have to submit to special religious mourning, which last a full four months. They have to mourn their husbands or masters in a dark room; they are not allowed to step out intentionally into the brightness of the day... If [she] has to leave, she must throw a thick, black cloak over her mask, and cover self in such a manner that she is just able to see her way.'²⁵

Concerning inheritance, Islam stated clearly that legal wives were entitled to inherit a quarter of the owner's wealth if the husband did not leave any child or grandchild, and if he did, the wife/wives inherited only one-eighth (*thummi*). However, the *surias* were not entitled to inherit the wealth of their masters unless they were identified in his *wasia* (will) out of the one-third that the person was allowed to allocate any way he wished.²⁶ Because of this law, there was hardly any *suria* who inherited from her owner directly, but archival records show *surias* received payments and civil allowances as allotted by their owners after their death.

In one instance, four *surias* who identified themselves as *surias* of Seyyid Ali bin Said, namely Sayaran bint Yussuf, Norein bint Abdallah, Fatma bint Yussuf and Rasha bint Abdullah, approached the British Resident to increase their monthly allowances.²⁷ In their letter they claimed that 'since the death of the Late Seyyid Ali bin Said, we have been left here under the hands of the Zanzibar government and Rs.15 each per month cost of our maintenance have been granted to us until about a year ago when it was increased to Rs.17.40 each.'²⁸ However they claimed that since the cost of living had greatly increased, they begged the government to increase their allowance. In response, the British resident approved that the allowance paid to one among them, Fatma bint Yussuf, who had died in August 1923, to be distributed equally amongst the surviving three wives from the total allowance of Rs.69.²⁹

When one of them, Rasha binti Abdullah, passed away, the surviving *surias* placed another application in July 1929 in which Sayara binti Yussuf and Noreen binti Abdullah claimed that 'now one of the beneficiaries...Rasha binti Abdulla, who was drawing 1/3rd of the amount allotted to us, unfortunately through a motor accident she met her death..' They therefore requested that 'this amount be divided amongst us proportionately the two surviving beneficiaries'.³⁰ This was approved and the government distributed Rs.34 (Shs.51.50) equally among the surviving two *surias* from the date of Rasha's death.

Thirteen years later Sayara binti Yusuf submitted a similar request. She was now alone and seventy years of age as her fellow *suria* Nurein binti Abdallah had died. In her request, she asked that the pension of her fellow *suria* and friend be either wholly or partially amalgamated with hers, as she had lived with her departed friend all these past years and they had always pooled their resources together. As her friend had passed away, her life would be difficult without the extra allowance and that with only her pension, she could barely cook one meal a day.³¹ In response, the Chief Secretary stated that Sayara who was 76, and the last survivor of the five *surias* of the Late Sayyed Ali bin Said, ‘petitions that she be allowed to take the allowances of all the *surias* who have predeceased her’.³²

The above observation portrayed an important theme that even after the decree for the abolition of slavery, the *suria* owners still felt that they had a responsibility to maintain their *ex-surias*, as they had to supply their basic needs although in this case it was the British colonial authorities had to decide on this, but they were probably following existing custom. This shows there were very special bonds that existed between the *surias* and their owners even after the death of the owners. Many *surias* maintained their relation with their owners and their families, as they regarded themselves as part of the owners’ families.

Emancipation of the Suria in Zanzibar

The emancipation of *suria* started far back when this system was introduced. They obtained their freedom as a matter of course following the death of their owners, although this was at an individual level. The suppression of the slave trade between 1822 and 1873 and the slavery emancipation decree of 1897 did not disturb this aspect of social and family system of the Arabs and Swahili Muslims. The slavery emancipation decree intended to give the slaves the right to claim their freedom whenever they needed it. Article 5 of this decree stated clearly that, ‘Concubines shall be regarded as inmates of the Harem in the sense as wives, and shall remain in their present relation unless they should demand their dissolution on the ground of cruelty, in which case the District Court shall grant it if the alleged cruelty has been proved to its satisfaction.’³³ The implication of this article was that the British who led these campaigns against slavery and slave trade were very much aware of the fact that the *suria* was part of Afro-Arab life and culture, and to abolish it meant to disrupt Muslim/Arab family structure and break the bond between the *suria* and her children who may stay with the father. Britain assured the Sultan that this decree would not interfere with the family life of the *suria* owners, but they soon realised that it would inevitably do so.

Shortly afterwards, in 1909, the Slavery Decree No. 11 was imposed in Zanzibar. This time the decree focused mainly on giving the *suria* their freedom and maintaining their rights over their children. This led to the emergence of a colossal contradiction between *suria*-owners on one side, and the British government on the other. The British now regarded *suria* as a category of slavery

practiced within Zanzibar. They were in no position to let this practice continue as it had been a long-standing source of grievance with the British public that there still existed a form of slavery on the coast of Africa.

The *suria*-owners viewed the situation differently, as this was part of their social setup. Because of this, the *suria*-owners did not see the need to emancipate the *surias* as this would disturb their family structure. To ask slave owners to grant freedom to their *surias* was against their religion and it was referred to with great indignation among them. They argued that it would lead to a great increase in prostitution. Thus when the Sultan was asked to sign this decree, he replied that he had not understood how the British government could expect him to sign this in view of its former promises not to interfere with the family life of the Arabs.³⁴

The following day the Sultan discussed the matter with his First Minister, General Lloyd Mathews, and legal member of the Protectorate Council, and he informed them that he was not going to sign the decree. The main argument for this objection was the fact that the owners would not wish that their *suria* leave, and went on to discuss the question of their rights to take away their children.³⁵

The *suria* themselves stated that it would be difficult for them to ask for their freedom, and live outside their *harem*. As they argued, if freedom meant that they had to leave their children behind and go outside looking for their livelihood, they would prefer to stay as slaves for the rest of their lives.³⁶

Under Islam a woman could claim the children's custody only if she did not marry again, and that if it was proved that she was leading an immoral life, she would sacrifice her rights. In this respect, the rights of custody would revert to the father in most cases. The sharia varied according to the sects. According to the *Ibadhi* law, the father had the right of custody of his sons, and the mother of the daughters only. So if this decree was implemented the *suria* would be allowed to have custody of their daughters only. According to the Sunnis, however, a free woman would have the right of custody of her children of both sexes.³⁷ The *Sharia* put it clearly that whether the mother or the father became custodian of the children, their inheritance rights from both of their parents remained.

However, regardless of the Sunni or *Ibadhi* point of view, the *suria* were in a position to take with them their children if they wanted to. But, again, it is important to consider their economic wellbeing. Were they in an economic position to sustain their children? The answer was that they were not in a position to maintain even themselves, even less their children. It was obvious that the decree would result in the disintegration of Arab families.

Moreover, under the *Sharia* no Muslim was allowed to hold a free woman as a *suria*. The owners would, after the issue of the decree, be compelled to either turn out their *surias* or to marry them. But this posed a problem: how could they marry more than what Islam allowed? A man was allowed to marry up to four wives while he could own as many *surias* as he could afford. The decree was thus adapted to accommodate the social structure of the Arabs.

Conclusion

Enslaved women's experiences in the two areas studied differed. In Zanzibar, the *suria* practice signified the upward mobility of some women slaves and their offspring from a lower social class to an upper level that was comparable to that of free men. In Mauritius, the French and later the British slave laws did not allow slave women to marry their owners nor could their children inherit from a white father. In Mauritius, female slaves and their children always experienced a descending mobility, unless they were freed and they married non-white freed persons.

In the earlier anti-slavery campaigns in Zanzibar, the British conceded the *suria* system as a social institution in Arab and Muslim lives. It was a family structure that had nothing to do with economic profits to the owners. Hence they had promised not to abolish it, as they believed abolition would disturb family structure of the Muslim slave-owners. This promise, however, did not last long; in early twentieth century, the *suria* system was abolished.

The abolition of the *suria* system in Zanzibar did not disturb the economic wellbeing of the Zanzibaris but rather the social setup. Arabs regarded this process as a breach of faith on the part of the British government against Zanzibaris after having given a definite assurance that they would not interfere with the family life of the Arabs.

Under Islamic laws, a *suria* was entitled to food and clothing so long as she remained with her master. She also had certain rights of inheritance through her children. Thus if she gave birth to her master's child and her master then died, the child inherited; and if the child then died, the mother inherited through that child. These rights were articulated by the Sharia based on the Qur-an.

Nevertheless, one cannot deny the fact that viewed from a modern perspective, the *suria* was an institution within slavery which breached human rights, exploited women, including selling and buying them as commodities, and sometimes involving them in non-consensual sex (rape in today's life), which made women live with less or limited freedom. and suffer many other social limitations, all of which deny them their freedom and rights, regardless whether one is discussing Islamic or any other system of slavery.

Notes

1. Yussuf Ali Trns. AL-Baqra http://www.harunyahya.com/Quran_translation/Quran_translation_index.php.
2. Ibid.
3. Interview with Sheikh A. Moh'd, November 2011, Bububu, Zanzibar.
4. Question and Answer in Islamic forum, <http://www.Islamicforum.com>.
5. Abdul Sheriff, *Slaves, Spice and Ivory in Zanzibar: Integration of an East African Commercial Empire into the World Economy, 1770-1873*, London, James Currey, 1987, p. 26.

6. Ibrahim F. Shao, *The Political Economy of Zanzibar: Before and After Revolution*, Dar-es-Salaam, Dar-es-Salaam University Press, 1992, p. 6.
7. Saada Wahab, 'Nationalization and Re-Distribution of Land in Zanzibar: The Case Study of Western District, 1965-2008', M.A Thesis; University of Dar-es-Salaam, 2010, p.10.
8. A. Sheriff, 'suria: Concubine or Secondary Slave Wife? The case of Zanzibar in the nineteenth century' UB.
9. A.Y. Lodhi, *Institution of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba*, Research Report No. 16, Uppsala; Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, 1973, p. 10.
10. Maryam binti Abdallah to British Resident, 1921.ZNA AB10/116,surias of the Late Sd. Ali bin Said (i) Ajab [is it Rasha?] bint Abdullah (ii) Sayara bint. Yussuf, p. 18.
11. Sheriff, A. 'Localization and Social Composition of the East Africa Slave Trade, 1858-1873', in William Gervase Clarence-Smith, *The Economics of the Indian Ocean Slave Trade in the Nineteenth Century*, London: Frank Cass,1989, p.141.
12. A. Sheriff, *suria*, op.cit.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. Lodhi, Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. Sayyida Salme / Emily Ruete, *An Arabian Princess Between Two Worlds*, E. van Donzel, ed., Leiden, Brill, 1993, p.174.
18. Ibid., p.154.
19. Martin A. Klein, ' Sex, Power and Family Life in the Harem; A Comparative study', in Gwyn Campbell, et al., ed., *Women and Slavery: Africa, the Indian Ocean World, and the Medieval North Atlantic*, Athens: Ohio University Press. 2007, p. 65.
20. Salme, Ibid.
21. Ibid.
22. A. Sheriff in *suria*, op. cit. ; Wilson to Norris Bushire 28.1.1831, MAPD:1830-2/1/385 p.18-21. Kembal's Report, 12.11.1847, PRO:FO 84/692/15.
23. Salme, p.154.
24. Salme, pp. 175, 156-57.
25. Salme, p. 239.
26. Yusuff Ali, Ibid.
27. ZNA.AB/10/116, Sayara bint Yussuf, Norein bint Abdallah and Rasha bint Abdullah to British Resident. September, 1923, *suria* of the Late Seyyid Ali B. Said
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid., p. 15
30. ZNA.AB/10/116, Sayara bint Yussuf and Norein bint Abadallah to British Resident, July 1929, p.18.
31. Sayara bint Yusuf to British Resident, December 1944.ZNA AB.10/166, p.76
32. Chief Secretary to Sayara Yussuf January 1945.ZNA AB/10/166/ 77
33. Foreign Office Despatches: Inward. ZNA AC 5/1-
34. The Slavery Decree No. 11 of 1909.ZNA. AB 71/1-
35. Ibid.
36. ZNA. AB 10/ 108, Rosuna bint Tamimu ex-Sultan's Concubine.
37. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *al-Kaafi* (1/296); al-Mughni (8/194).www.online translation, Qur-an, 30.11.2011.