Slaves in the Middle Eastern Islamic World and Mediterranean Slavery

SHIMIZU Kazuhiro

1. Mediterranean-type Slavery Viewed against Islamic Slavery

This paper discusses the slavery practiced in pre-modern Islamic society, mainly from the perspective of the continuity of status between slaves and free people as social beings, and the integration of slavery into society as its essential element. At the same time, we offer the concept of Mediterranean-type slavery, by positioning the slavery of medieval Islamic society as its key representative, and suggest viewing the global history of slavery and servitude as a history of conflicts between local slavery/servitude systems and Mediterranean-type slavery, which spread and evolved globally and affected the local systems.

In recent years, with the rise of many international research projects focusing on historical slavery systems, many facts have been clarified about the Atlantic slave trade that connected Europe, Africa, and the Americas since the early modern period. Inspired by these studies, comparative historical research studies are also underway to delve into non-Atlantic slavery, or slavery in Islamic societies and other parts of the world, which is thought to be markedly different from Atlantic slavery.

Summarizing these research trends, D. A. Pargas and F. Roşu point out that "scholars of slavery in non-Atlantic societies have strongly cautioned the academic community against viewing the Atlantic experience of slavery as 'typical' in world history." Citing the works of Christine Sears and Gwyn Campbell, they say that "Gwyn Campbell has also warned scholars against viewing Atlantic slavery as a model for understanding various forms of unfreedom in the Indian Ocean world, a sentiment echoed by many scholars who work on slavery in Asia and the Pacific."[1]

While the advice of these scholars is correct, it does not address the key question: how to break away from the Atlantic-centric view of slavery? We suggest here three possible approaches to this subject.

First, Atlantic slavery in early modern and modern era must be evaluated correctly by recognizing its relation to ancient slavery and medieval slavery in

the Mediterranean and Mesopotamian worlds. Traditionally, the emergence of Atlantic slavery has been discussed as if Europeans suddenly resumed slave trade after the fall of the ancient Greek-Roman world through the "dark medieval period," and established modern plantation systems in Africa. However, that narrative is inaccurate. Recent findings on ancient and medieval Islamic societies have led to the understanding that the societies of antiquity had direct continuation with Islamic societies in the Mediterranean and Mesopotamian world, which eventually brought about the prosperity of medieval Islamic civilization. It reveals that the medieval Islamic civilization paved the way for the formation of the modern European civilization through the gateway from Andalus and Italy and through the Crusader movements. The same is true of slavery; the characteristics of slavery in the pre-modern Islamic society discussed in this article were inherited from the ancient Mediterranean and Mesopotamian societies, and continued to the Andalusian society after the Reconquista.

According to this approach, Atlantic slavery was a branch that grew out of the slavery practiced in early modern and modern times in Mediterranean and Mesopotamian societies, which continued from the ancient world to modern times. It was the Islamic society that established Africa as a key source of slaves as it expanded from the Arabian Peninsula to the Mediterranean. As plantation labor systems emerged in the New World, a slave trade relationship formed between the Americas, the Mediterranean region, and Africa, and the Atlantic slave system was born. In other words, Atlantic slavery should be positioned in the historical development of slavery in the Mediterranean-Mesopotamian world, which is directly connected to the ancient world.

Second, the connection between the development of Mediterranean slavery and systems of slavery and servitude in surrounding regions and other human societies must also be explored. In areas that have long been unrelated to Mediterranean slavery, such as Southeast Asia, Japan, and China, local forms of servitude and personal control systems that corresponded to "slavery" were practiced. The issue of whether or not to call them "slavery" is important. Mediterranean-type slavery, as we will discuss through examples from Islamic society, must be discussed in context of the diversity of slaves and free people. It is a fact that in different ages and regions various forms of servitude existed in societies, some of which were very close to the concept of Mediterranean slavery. However, it does not make much sense to simply compare such forms of servitude with Atlantic or Mediterranean slavery because relationships based on domination and servitude are extremely common in human society. Instead, we should examine the peculiarity of systems of slavery or servitude

in different regions and investigate their global transformation processes.

The major feature of the Mediterranean-style slavery system was its extremely expansive character, seen in the Greek-Roman world, the Islamic world, and the modern European world. It easily spread to other neighboring communities as peripheral societies were "Hellenized," "Romanized," "Islamized," and "Europeanized" because it constituted one of the basic social structures on which these societies rested. This expansiveness and erosiveness easily brought Mediterranean-style slavery to peripheral societies that already had their own original servitude customs. In many cases, these local structures of servitude were incorporated into the mainstream Mediterranean system to facilitate sourcing of slaves. Thus, those peripheral areas would accept the foreign Mediterranean slavery "as a main system of servitude," while simultaneously maintaining their original forms of servitude. As a result, these societies would become a part of the expanding global Mediterranean slavery and discover "slavery" within their own societies, or begin to define their original servitude as "slavery." In some cases, they would also build a new system of "slavery" based on the newly acquired concept.

Japan, for example, practiced its own form of servitude under the influence of the Chinese civilization up to the modern times; it joined the world of global slave trade after contact with Portugal in the 15th century. In the modern Meiji era, the Japanese coined a new word "dorei" to refer to the newly acquired European concept of "slavery," which later came to be used as the most common word to express the idea of servitude. This can be considered a typical example of a society being influenced by the Mediterranean slave trade.

Third, we should be aware of the factors that resulted in the emancipation of slaves and the changes in the society that took place before and after emancipation. Since this article deals with pre-modern Islamic society, I will not delve into this issue, but as can be seen from the studies of Yoshiyuki Kidō and Hideaki Suzuki, the movement of liberation of slaves in modern times never ended the ubiquitous existence of servitude.[2] Just as the abolition of the American slavery system was followed by the servitude of Asian immigrants, societies that have lost the labor force of slaves in the past tend to continuously recreate new forms of servitude that are different from the old Mediterranean style. Using this perspective to look at the global history of slavery, we can see the "historical continuity of a broad system of servitude and its ubiquity" that incorporates the concept of "slavery." "Slavery" could be abolished, but it was only after its definition, or its separation from other types of servitudes. When we understand slavery and servitude as a continuous phenomenon, abolition

only means the end of one particular form of slavery. Even if Atlantic slavery was abolished in the 20th century, the abolition is limited in terms of its impact on the deep-rooted, ubiquitous practice of servitude, and it must be seen as a part of a larger picture that makes up the whole history of servitude. Building on the discussion above, I would like to describe one aspect of slavery in pre-modern Islamic society in the Middle East and West Asian world.

2. Slave Women and Children of Mixed-Race Origins in Islamic Society

We will start the discussion from the role of female slaves and the issue of "mixed races." In Islamic society in the Middle East, slavery has existed as a building block of society since its establishment. In the societies of Mecca and Medina in which Prophet Muḥammad started his movement, as we can see from some of our sources, wealthy people possessed a certain number of slaves. Such people were small in number but by no means rare[3] (slaves were to be widely and generally owned after the Great Conquest). These slaves seemed to have been used in commerce, handicrafts, etc. as well as some agricultural labor, but the main purpose of purchasing both male and female slaves was domestic labor, and especially, sexual intercourse.

Chapter 4, Section 25 of the Qur'ān says "Among you who cannot marry faithful free women due to financial limits, marry from the faithful girls owned by your right hand." "A servant possessed by your right hand" refers to a slave woman, and it can be seen that marriage with a slave woman was officially and religiously recognized from Islam's earliest days. However, in the Islamic law that developed after that, although a master has a right to have sexual intercourse with his own slaves, it was illegal for him to marry them; a master could only marry a slave owned by another person. At the same time, as we mentioned above, per pre-Islamic customs, the master had the legal right to have sexual intercourse and children by his own slave, which was called *firāsh* (right of sexual intercourse).[4] In other words, even outside the marriage, sexual intercourse with a slave owned by him was not considered adultery.

It is clear from Ibn Buṭlān's *Book of Slave Purchase*, written in the 11th century in Syria, that one of the intentions driving slave owners was the acquisition of slave women for sexual intercourse and begetting children from them. This book, a handbook that explained how to buy slaves, was one of the most famous works in this genre.[5] One of the major characteristics of this book is that each slave is described basically by a female pronoun. Each racial group was also referred to as a female group such as "Indian women" and "Berber women," not "Indians" or "Indian men."[6] It also describes which race

is "suitable for pleasure" or "suitable for having children," which race is "not suitable for pleasure" and why, and which race is suitable to be used as nannies. It advises readers at the beginning that "slaves are expensive and must be purchased carefully, so refrain from making hasty decisions. It is known that if you buy a slave while being driven by lust, you will regret it." Apart from these evidences, a medieval Islamic law scholar also asserted that the main purpose of purchasing slave women was "pleasure," and constructed the theory of Islamic law on that premise.[7]

Under such social circumstances and customs, it is clear that slave women had to endure forced sex and exploitation by their masters. At the same time, in spite of these painful facts, we cannot deny that such relationships between masters and female slaves played a certain role in enabling these women and their children to be integrated into the host society and contributed to racial diversity in the Muslim states.

Specifically, when a slave woman gave birth to a child with her master and he recognized the child (accepted and took responsibility for the child), that child and all the children she gave birth to after that were recognized as the master's sons or daughters and were free-standing Muslims from birth. Their slave mother was also promised to be released at the death of her master in the future. That means, she was to be treated as a semi-free person. Such a mother was called an *umm al-walad* (a mother of the child). As it was very common for a master to recognize a slave woman's children, even if children were born from a slave-mother, they were accepted by society without any distinctions from children by free-born wives.[8]

In the Islamic society, legally purchased slaves came from the following three groups: (1) wartime prisoners from non-Muslim states, (2) people brought in from non-Islamic areas by slave traders, and (3) children of slave status, that is, children of slave mothers who were not recognized by the master or whose both parents were slaves. After the Islamic conquest in the early Islamic period, the principal source of slaves was the second group while the third had become very limited.[9] For this reason, the slaves of the Islamic society were basically people from remote, non-Islamic regions with vast cultural and racial differences. In other words, sexual intercourse and childbirth between the master and the slave almost automatically meant multi-ethnic sexual intercourses and the birth of mixed-race children. Recognition of the child by the father automatically meant that the child whose veins contained the blood of "others" was accepted into the society. In fact, the number of such children increased in accordance with the number of slave women.

Of course, discrimination against these children has not been absent since the establishment of Islam. During the period of the early Arabic Empire, there was persistent discrimination against mixed-race Arabs by purebred Arabs. However, the progress of the Arabic Islamic conquests led to a dramatic increase in the slave population, and at the same time, as a result of the inevitable acquisition of slave women, especially in the influential social class, mixed-race Arabs came to be recognized as free-born,[10] and to be increasingly active and influential. A prime example was Manṣūr, the de facto builder of the Abbasid Caliphate, who was the son of a Berber slave woman. Since then, the majority of successive caliphs had mothers who were slave women from various regions, which resulted in the Abbasids having a remarkably varied mixed-race genetic lineage. They attached no importance to keeping the lineage pure-blooded.

The Islamic society developed a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural character as time progressed. Of course, this change was not necessarily a phenomenon caused by slave imports, but undoubtedly, sexual intercourse and reproduction with racially diverse slaves had spurred the situation. Furthermore, the acceptance of "others" through such a system of slavery extended not only to children but also to the female slaves themselves who were mothers. For example, in 12th century Syria, a woman from a Crusader town was taken prisoner by a Muslim general and presented to a Muslim lord. She experienced the hardship of having a child as the property of the lord, but was released after his death because she had become an *umm al-walad*. After her little son became the successor of his fief, she took full control of the castle and its territory on behalf of her son. As a result, a slave woman from the Crusader states became the de facto owner of a Muslim fief, fighting the Crusades, but the Muslims around her did not seem to have any objections. When the woman escaped from the position of acting castle owner and married a shoemaker from a village in the Crusade states, one Muslim who knew this story wrote that he could not understand her behavior.[11] For Muslims, the "other" was an entity that could be easily integrated into society through a circuit of sexual intercourse and reproduction. There were countless people who were assimilated into the society in this way. However, the story of the slave woman who went on to rule a castle suggests that life of a slave woman or an ex-slave woman, even in the middle of riches, was not desirable. She chose to escape from the Muslims and returned to her original community.

3. Slavery in Islamic Law and Society

What does it mean to be a slave in Islamic law?

Islamic law assumed that ordinary human beings were born as "free people." For this reason, unidentified orphans were always treated as free humans.[12] This was a big difference between the Islamic people and the Romans, for whom abandoned children were a major source of slave supply.

For the Muslim states, "slaves" were those who had lost the "freedom" inherent in all human beings. In other words, "slaves" were unnatural beings, who socially were regarded as being "dead." And because of losing "freedom" and becoming "dead," "slaves" did not have ownership of their bodies, and they were treated as things.[13] In fact, in the property disposal lists from the pre-modern Islamic society, we can see that slaves were treated exactly like other household goods and livestock.[14] Legally, "things" were broadly divided into "non-speaking things" and "speaking things," and slaves were classified into "speaking things" like livestock.

These "slaves" had not completely lost their humanity. They were granted the right to live as human beings, though at a minimum, and their masters had to guarantee food, clothing, shelter, and physical protection. When the master failed to provide the slaves with adequate clothing, food, and shelter, or committed life-threatening abuse or punishment, a judge could order the master to sell the slaves to others. However, Marmon pointed out that such an order was rarely passed.[15]

In this way, slaves had both social characters, of a thing and of a human being. That is why slaves were able to recover from the status of "being dead" by various means, such as "liberation," and abandon their character as things, to live as free human beings, which they naturally were.

Slaves had to be "liberated" by their masters to be free persons. Since human beings were supposed to be "free people" by nature, liberation of slaves was seen as restoring human beings from unnatural beings to natural beings, and helping them return from the dead. Thus, emancipation was considered a good deed for a Muslim, and people were encouraged to emancipate slaves not only to do good deeds but also to atone for their sins. In particular, when the master died, it was very common for his family to emancipate a certain number of slaves to guarantee his way to heaven, using a part of his heritage. In addition, the liberation was carried out as a good deed comparable to disposition or ṣadaqa at various moments of celebration in life. As a result, slaves in the Islamic society were known to be very likely to be liberated. It could be said that slaves were reserve forces for society that could become free

men in the future.[16]

This is clearly shown by the social continuity between the status of slaves and free people. The "slave" status and the "free person" status were legally clearly delineated, but the difference was not always clear in social relationships. It was not uncommon for free people to be subjugated by others in many ways. Subordination to others was common for born-free people, freed slaves and slaves, though the degree of subordination was different. Strong coercion against slaves was continuous with the weak coercion against free people, it was in continuum like a spectrum.

According to one law school, if a master gave an instruction, before his death, to emancipate a slave upon his death (this is called *tadbīr*), he was prohibited from selling the slave in question. Additionally, the *tadbīr* declaration itself was irrevocable once declared. Even in the absence of a *tadbīr*, an *umm al-walad* was supposed to be emancipated at the death of her master. The *umm al-walad* also became unsaleable when her first child was recognized, and children born after that automatically acquired free status without any cognitive procedures.[17]

Furthermore, under the *mukātab* system in the Islamic society, a slave could sign a contract with his master and buy his own ownership. To that end, they reached a written agreement about the slave's price and period for payment. Then, the slave was allowed to do wage labor, save money to buy freedom, and accumulate property, while the master was prohibited from selling the slave. If the slave was a woman, the *mukātab* cancelled the master's right of *firāsh*, that is, he was prohibited from demanding sexual intercourse from her.[18] All of these provisions served as preliminary steps to the emancipation of slaves, loosening the grip of slavery and facilitating transition to a free life.

The rights and powers of "slaves" were not uniform legally and socially. Even in situations that did not presuppose their liberation, slaves in the Islamic society were often given great discretion. Since slaves could basically not be legal entities, they could neither own property nor make legal contracts. However, in practice, it was not uncommon for slaves to be used as agents or partners in commercial transactions, especially for wealthy merchants. In such cases, the master gave special permission to his slave and outlined the extent of the slave's right to act as a legal entity. Such slaves were called *ma'zūn*s, or "permitted ones," and some schools allowed them unlimited legal conduct. That is, their income was to some extent their own and their debt was also at their own risk.[19] These provisions mirrored the ones in the *mukātab*. The *ma'zūn*s' financial activities were limited by their legal status as "slaves," but

their social lives were similar to those "free people." The big difference was that the master's "permission" was the source of their "freedom." In that sense, the relationship of masters and *ma'zūn*s could be compared to those of minors and guardians in modern societies.

By contrast, in many situations we can find slavery in a "free person." This issue could be developed in various ways, but what should be noted here is the slave attribute of a "freedman" (freed slave). When slaves were liberated, they gained free status, while their social bondage with their masters was maintained at a certain level. That is, the freedmen were obliged to serve their masters, and the masters had to take responsibility for their clothing, food, and shelter. Such a relationship was called *walā'* in Arabic, and both the master and the freedman with this relationship were called *mawlā*. The master could leave this *walā'* as his legacy, in which case the freedman would belong to the decedents. In other words, freedmen had free status legally but were socially enslaved to their ex-masters.[20]

This fact is very interesting when considering the social slavery of "free people." As freedmen built forced patron-client relationships with their ex-masters through this *walā'* bondage, this same relationship can be found in the relations between the caliphs and influential bureaucrats, who were ex-slaves of the monarchs or fictitious slaves. In other words, the slavery relationship between the "master" and the "slave" had a strong influence on the construction of social relationships between free people as well as slaves. Without such a relationship, it is impossible to understand the formation of the Mamluk dynasty under the rule of ex-slave sultans and generals, and the political structures of the Abbasid and Ottoman dynasties, in which the harem slaves had strong power. In ancient times, the activity of freedmen in the Roman Empire can be seen as a similar example.[21]

In this way, the development of systems of slavery for those with "slave" status and "free person" status was extremely diverse and also had continuity between them; it further defines the social relationship between "free people." In a society where slaves were ubiquitous, the barrier between slaves and free people was lower than one might imagine, and it had a complexity that cannot be classified in a simple way.

4. Integration into Society

Next, we need to consider again the sexual role of slave women, as discussed in Section 1, and the social role of slaves regardless of gender, in relation to the continuity between "slave" status and "free person" status.

In the Islamic society, the duties of slaves were mainly domestic labor, and the sexual role of slave women was an important part of this. We do not have enough information about the actual situation of manual labor in agricultural production in the early Islamic period. The proportion of slaves used for agricultural labor varied from society to society. It was rare in Mecca, which was a commercial center, but not so much in some places in Medina known to cultivate dates; in the Arabian Peninsula, we see some slave women engaged in nomadic activities.[22] In the lower reaches of Mesopotamia, where irrigated agriculture required human power, many black slaves called Zanj were engaged in salt removal.[23] In modern times, slaves and free laborers were engaged in agriculture in Sijistān district in southern Iran.[24] Thus, the type of slave labor was highly dependent on the environment. However, in the society in which slaves were expensive and treated as symbols of prestige, those who owned a large number of slaves were, of course, wealthy city dwellers, for whom the possession of slaves indicated their wealth and social status as slave masters. These influential people in the city used slaves for domestic or sexual purposes rather than production labor. Also, as long as slaves were imported from across the border of the Islamic society, that is, from the outer non-Muslim world, slave markets were held in the large cities, in which, apart from wealthy people, commercial and industrial workers and intellectuals in the cities could purchase one or two slaves as their assistant workers or for domestic labor.

According to the book on purchasing slaves mentioned before, the uses of slaves were extremely diverse. It mentioned almost all kinds of skills as the abilities that slave-owners looked for while purchasing slaves. For example, some of these skills were military technology, knowledge of governance, arithmetic skills, singing and playing musical instruments, childbirth, service and pleasure, hard labor, child support, making handicrafts, wealth acquisition, rational knowledge, speaking skills, property management, and office capacity.[25]

In fact, other than taking care of their masters, slaves often assisted their masters in their professional work. If the master was a craftsman or an artist, then the slave would be an apprentice. A merchant's slave would help manage the store as the chief or helper, and intellectuals often gave their slaves clerical work. It was not uncommon for slaves to be entrusted with long-distance trade or remote branch management on behalf of leading merchants, who often managed their master's property and made money. It was also not uncommon for the master to release the slave in response to such loyalty and to welcome him as his son-in-law by marrying him to his daughter. In addition, there were

many cases in which slaves who learned arts and received mentoring from intellectual masters eventually made a name for themselves as first-class intellectuals of the time.[26] In addition, in the court, tens of thousands of slaves, including military personnel, eunuchs, and bureaucrats, served the monarch and succeeded in their careers with his patronage.

The slave women took care of their masters and mistresses at home and gave birth to their heirs. The most prominent example of such slaves were the women in the courts inner palace (harem).[27]

To understand the roles of these slaves, the most important thing is their relationship with the "master" and the issue of household and patriarchal rule.

Slaves were, almost without exception, "foreigners" imported from remote areas into Islamic societies, often thrown alone into a completely foreign world of language and culture. Moreover, they were in a situation where they could not satisfy their needs of food, clothing, and shelter without the protection of their masters, nor could they legally claim their rights as human beings. For this reason, their survival had to depend solely on the existence and will of the "master." It has been pointed out that slaves in the Islamic society have traditionally been treated as families. P. G. Forand, for example, in a well-known paper studying the protector-protected relationship between slaves and masters, showed that slaves were welcomed as "children" of their families.[28] There was an example of celebrating the purchase of slaves as an analogy of the birth of a son. The act, mentioned above, of accepting a reliable slave as a son-in-law is a clear indicator of the closeness of "slave" and "family."

In Islamic society in the Middle East, slaves, along with relatives, assisted the family business of their masters as members of the household and managed it. This idea of "maintenance and management of household" included a variety of works, from domestic work such as cooking and laundry to labor in the workshop, management of stores, management of private estates, and guarding against enemies or intruders. Slave women, like housewives, were expected to have sexual relations with their masters and to contribute to the maintenance and prosperity of households from the aspects of breeding as well as "pleasure."

The master was allowed to force slaves to work, punish them freely to some extent, and sexually exploit slave women indefinitely. He was socially sanctioned to control and exploit slaves. It was his right, which represented his possession of the slave's body, and he could naturally exercise it at will. But what is important is that this right not only showed his "ownership of slaves" but also imposed a "duty to protect slaves" on him. As mentioned earlier, the

master was obliged to provide his slaves with food, clothing, and shelter. Also, excessive abuse was not allowed. Socially speaking, the master was required to provide a place for slaves to exercise their abilities appropriately in society. Slaves worked and showed loyalty to their masters in response to their patronage. This showed that a circuit beyond simply "control and exploitation based on the possession of slaves" had been established. In this circuit, the master's right of "control and exploitation" required his obligation of "protection" toward his slave, while the master's "grace" to the slave created slave's "loyalty" to the master. This relationship shows both positive and negative aspects of the patron-client relationship, but it should be noted here that this same relationship existed in a kin system of the family under the strict patriarchal rule of the medieval Middle East Islamic world. In this society, being a "family" member meant that in some respects the person was under the control of the "patriarch" and was exploited by the patriarchal power. In the family, minors, women, and other dependents were placed under the control of the patriarch, and it was natural that they would be subject to custody/paternity control and a kind of "exploitation" in return for the protection of dependents and upbringing. The patriarch had the obligation to protect and the right to exploit and control the family, and, at the same time, had the right to protect and the obligation to exploit and control them (by social demand). This is especially evident in the patriarch's right to discipline minors and wives, the right to marry off underage sons and daughters, and the de facto right to force sexual intercourse with wives. It was normal in society at the time for sons, daughters, and wives to be subject to patriarchal control. In the Middle East, fathers still have a strict control over their daughter's virginity, which is another example of how the patriarch controls even the bodies of his family members. Such punishment rights, forced marriage rights, and forced sexual intercourse were phenomena that were quite common to slaves.[29] From this viewpoint again, we can say that "slaves" were regarded as members of the family and that the master's control and exploitation of slaves were on the same line.

The fact that a slave is considered a "child" means that the master was responsible for instructing, correcting, and punishing the "immature" child until he becomes independent as a member of society. In fact, slaves were legally incompetent, "half-serving" persons who could not engage in social legal acts without the "permission" of their masters. When they committed a legal sin, the punishment was halved.[30] All of this means that slaves were social "children" and that their masters should punish and correct them while protecting and nurturing them. In fact, as Bernard Lewis points out, one of

the general terms for slavery, *ghulām*, means "boy" and *jāriya* means "girl." They were called by this term, even after they reached physical and mental maturity.[31] *Ghulām* is also the term for the slave soldiers in the Abbasid dynasty.[32]

Therefore, their "liberation" meant that such "children" of the household became adults by the hands of their masters and then became ordinary adults. Their bodies now became their own properties, and they could carry out legal acts at their own risk, sometimes compensating for themselves. The "boy" was no longer called *ghulām*, but *mawlā*, and the "girl" was not *jāriya*, but the "mother" called *umm al-walad* as the mother of her son.

In this way, the "slaves," who came from a community of "others" in a foreign country, were purchased by the masters and spent their time as members of the household, under the masters' protection and control, sometimes under great exploitation. After providing services through labor or childbirth, many of them were emancipated at the time of the death of their masters and were welcomed as members of the society. Many of them assimilated into the host society in this process and eventually left behind the memory of their "otherness." In many cases, mixed-race children born to slave women also played a meaningful part in society as free people, as sons and daughters of their masters, and as family members. However, slaves who did not have such an opportunity would continue to be ruled and exploited as "dead," "incompetent," and "children" who have ceased functioning as humans. Such a difference depended solely on the "luck" of what kind of master they had, and in this sense, slaves were wholly dependent on their "master."

The slave attributes of slaves in the Islamic society of the Middle East developed according to the systems of protection and control of the patriarch as one progenitor. At the same time, the system, through its practice of protection, control, and exploitation, accepted foreigners who were "others" and forced them to assimilate with mixed races, regardless of their will. The basis for this was in the social situation and customs in which the existence of slaves was ubiquitous, the social barriers between slaves and free people were low, and slaves who were now "children" would become the same "adults" as themselves as free people in the future.

In closing, we can say that slavery in the Islamic society occupies a particularly important position in the Mediterranean/Mesopotamian slavery system, a series of global historical slavery systems that linked together slavery practices in ancient Greece and Rome, Portugal, the British Empire, and the United States.

Notes

1) D. A. Pargas and F. Roşu, "Introduction: Global Perspectives on Slavery," in idem eds., *Critical Readings on Global Slavery*, vol. 1, Leiden: Brill, 2017, pp. 6–7.

2) Hideaki Suzuki, *Slave Trade Profiteers in the Western Indian Ocean: Suppression and Resistance in the Nineteenth Century*, Cham: Palgrave, 2017.

3) J. E. Brockopp, "Slaves and Slavery," in *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān*, vol. 5, Leiden: Brill, 2006, pp. 58–59.

4) Hiroyuki Yanagihashi, *Isurāmu Kazokuhō: Kon'in, Oyako, Shinzoku* (*Islamic Family Law*), Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 2001, pp. 468–471.

5) Tsugitaka Satō, *Mamurūku* (*Mamluk*), Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1991, pp. 24–31.

6) Kazuhiro Shimizu, "Chūsei Isurāmu Sekai no Kokujin Dorei to Hakujin Dorei" ("Blackness" and "Whiteness" in Medieval Islamic Slavery), *Shien* 146, pp. 171–172, 2009.

7) Yanagihashi 2001, *op. cit.*, p. 543.

8) S. E. Marmon, "Domestic Slavery in the Mamluk Empire: A Preliminary Sketch," in idem ed., *Slavery in the Islamic Middle East*, Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1999, p. 8; J. Schacht, "Umm al-Walad," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1st ed., vol. 4, Leiden: Brill, 1927.

9) V. Vaglieri "'Abd," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New ed., vol. 1, Leiden: Brill, 1954, pp. 31–32; Satō 1991, *op. cit.*, pp. 4–5.

10) Kazuhiro Shimizu, "Yazudegirudo no Musumetachi: Shahuru Bānū Denshō no Keisei to Shoki Isurāmu Sekai" (Daughters of Yazdegerd: The Formation of Shahr Bānū Traditions and the Early Islamic World), *Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 67-2, 2008.

11) P. K. Hitti (trans.), *An Arab-Syrian Gentleman and Warrior in the Period of the Crusades: Memoirs of Usāmah Ibn-Munqidh*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987 (1st ed. 1929), pp. 159–160.

12) Marmon 1999, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

13) Ibid., pp. 3–5.

14) Al-Ṭabarī, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Jarīr, *Ta'rīkh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk*, ed. M. J. de Goeje et al., ser. III, 1880–1890, pp. 1374, 1376; Kazuhiro Shimizu, *Gunji Dorei, Kanryō, Minshū* (*Slave Soldiers, Bureaucrats and the People: Iraqi Society during the Disintegration of the ʿAbbāsid Dynasty*), Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha, 2005, p. 71.

15) S. E. Marmon, "Slavery, Islamic World," in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, vol. 11, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1988, p. 331.

16) Satō 1991, *op. cit.*, pp. 7–8.

17) Vaglieri 1954, *op. cit.*, pp. 28, 30.

18) Hiroyuki Yanagihashi, *Isurāmu Zaisanhō no Seiritsu to Henyō* (*Formation and Transformation of Islamic Property Law*), Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 1998, pp. 457–483; Vaglieri 1954, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

19) Marmon 1999, *op. cit.*, p. 6; Vaglieri 1954, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

20) Shimizu 2005, *op. cit.*, pp. 60–61.

21) Makoto Shimada, *Korosseumu kara Yomu Rōma Teikoku* (*Roman Empire as Grasped from the Colosseum*), Tokyo: Kōdansha 1999, pp. 138–186.

22) Ibn Hishām, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Malik, *al-Sīra al-Nabawīya*, vol. 1, al-Qāhira: Dār al-Fikr, 1980, pp. 139, 237.

23) A. Popovic, *La révolte de esclavage en Iraq au IIIe/IXe siècle*, Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1976.

24) W. Floor, "Barda and Bardadārī, iv. From the Mongols to the Abolition of Slavery," in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1989, p. 770.

25) Shimizu 2009, *op. cit.*, pp. 157–169; H. Müller, *Die Kunst des Sklavenkaufs: Nach arabischen, persischen und türkischen Ratgebern vom 10. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert*, Freiburg: K. Schwarz, 1980.

26) Marmon 1999, *op. cit.*, pp. 16–18.

27) L. P. Peirce, *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1993, pp. 3–12.

28) P. G. Forand, "The Relation of the Slave and the Client to the Master or Patron in Medieval Islam," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 2-1, pp. 59–66, 1971.

29) Marmon 1988, *op. cit.*, p. 331; Yanagihashi 2001, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

30) Satō 1991, *op. cit.*, p. 6; Vaglieri 1954, *op. cit.*, pp. 27–28.

31) B. Lewis, *Race and Slavery in the Middle East: An Historical Enquiry*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

32) Shimizu 2005, *op. cit.*, pp. 66–89.

Bibliography

Brockopp, J. E. 2006. "Slaves and Slavery." In J. D. McAuliffe ed., *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān*, vol. 5. Leiden: Brill.

Floor, W. 1989. "Barda and Bardadārī, iv. From the Mongols to the Abolition of Slavery." In E. Yarshater ed., *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, vol. 3. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Forand, P. G. 1971. "The Relation of the Slave and the Client to the Master or Patron in Medieval Islam." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 2-1, pp. 59–66.

Hitti, P. K. trans. 1987. *An Arab-Syrian Gentleman and Warrior in the Period of the Crusades: Memoirs of Usāmah Ibn-Munqidh* (1st ed. 1929). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ibn Hishām, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Malik. 1980. *al-Sīra al-Nabawīya*. 4 vols. al-Qāhira: Dār al-Fikr.

Lewis, B. 1990. *Race and Slavery in the Middle East: An Historical Enquiry*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Marmon, S. E. 1988. "Slavery, Islamic World." In J. R. Strayer et al. ed., *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, vol. 11. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Marmon, S. E. 1999. "Domestic Slavery in the Mamluk Empire: A Preliminary Sketch." In idem ed., *Slavery in the Islamic Middle East*. Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers.

Müller, H. 1980. *Die Kunst des Sklavenkaufs: Nach arabischen, persischen und türkischen Ratgebern vom 10. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert*. Freiburg: K. Schwarz.

Pargas, D. A. and F. Roșu. 2017. "Introduction: Global Perspectives on Slavery." In idem eds., *Critical Readings on Global Slavery*, vol. 1. Leiden: Brill.

Peirce, L. P. 1993. *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*. New York:

Oxford University Press.

Popovic, A. 1976. *La révolte de esclavage en Iraq, au IIIe/IXe siècle*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.

Satō Tsugitaka. 1991. *Mamurūku* (*Mamluk*). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Schacht, J. 1927. "Umm al-Walad." In M. Th. Houtsma ed., *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1st ed., vol. 4. Leiden: Brill.

Shimada Makoto. 1999. *Korosseumu kara Yomu Rōma Teikoku* (*Roman Empire as Grasped from the Colosseum*). Tokyo: Kōdansha.

Shimizu Kazuhiro. 2005. *Gunji Dorei, Kanryō, Minshū* (*Slave Soldiers, Bureaucrats and the People: Iraqi Society during the Disintegration of the ʿAbbāsid Dynasty*). Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha.

Shimizu Kazuhiro. 2008. "Yazudegirudo no Musumetachi: Shahuru Bānū Denshō no Keisei to Shoki Isurāmu Sekai" (Daughters of Yazdegerd: The Formation of Shahr Bānū Traditions and the Early Islamic World). *Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 67-2, pp. 362–333.

Shimizu Kazuhiro. 2009. "Chūsei Isurāmu Sekai no Kokujin Dorei to Hakujin Dorei" ("Blackness" and "Whiteness" in Medieval Islamic Slavery). *Shien* 146, pp. 153–184.

Suzuki Hideaki. 2017. *Slave Trade Profiteers in the Western Indian Ocean: Suppression and Resistance in the Nineteenth Century*. Cham: Palgrave.

Al-Ṭabarī, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Jarīr. 1879–1901. *Taʾrīkh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk*. ed. M. J. de Goeje et al. 16 vols. in III series. Leiden: Brill.

Vaglieri, V. 1991. "ʿAbd." In C. E. Bosworth ed., *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New ed., vol. 1. Leiden: Brill.

Yanagihashi Hiroyuki. 1998. *Isurāmu Zaisanhō no Seiritsu to Henyō* (*Formation and Transformation of Islamic Property Law*). Tokyo: Sōbunsha.

Yanagihashi Hiroyuki. 2001. *Isurāmu Kazokuhō: Konʾin, Oyako, Shinzoku* (*Islamic Family Law*). Tokyo: Sōbunsha.