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… his only reason for running away is his wish to return home and live with his parents and relations.

—A British official writing of Salim, an Ethiopian slave manumitted from Saudi Arabia in 1935.

Reason for granting manumission certificate: A desire for freedom.

—A British official writing of Bilal bin Anbar, a manumitted slave from Bahrain, 1938.

From 1926 to 1938 Jeddah was the destination of hundreds of runaway slaves. During this period, Britain freed and repatriated these runaways through its rights of manumission as stipulated in the Treaty of Jeddah of 1927. Britain relinquished this right in 1936, the same year in which King Abd al Aziz ibn Abd ar Rahman Al Saud (r. 1902–53) decreed the Saudi Arabian slave regulations. Nevertheless, two years later, fugitive slaves continued to seek manumission from the British. Although these slaves were turned away, the British did record the incidents, and they showed that the slave regulations were not being enforced. The records Britain kept on manumitted slaves reveal many insights about the nature of slavery in the nascent state of Saudi Arabia. For bureaucratic reasons, officials at the British Legation in Jeddah—then the diplomatic capital of Saudi Arabia—had begun in 1929 to collect brief but detailed narratives from runaways and to fill out questionnaires for every person they freed and repatriated. Data from the narratives and questionnaires provide information such as
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1 Suzanne Miers, ‘Diplomacy versus Humanitarianism: Britain and Consular Manumission in Hijaz, 1921–1936,’ Slavery and Abolition, 10 (December 1989): 122. Miers analyzes the myriad of reasons, few humanitarian, for the British renunciation of this right. She also discusses the provisions of the slave regulations and their relationship to the renunciation. Officially it was not quid pro quo: Britain’s relinquishing the right to manumit slaves for the establishment of slave regulations. However, behind the scenes, the British saw several drafts of the regulations and negotiated with the Saudis until the regulations were deemed satisfactory and then Britain gave up consular manumission.

2 Fugitive slaves seeking manumission from 1936–38 were included in the data set and statistical tests.

3 T 161/300, Jeddah Charity Fund. 1930. This treasury file chronicles the correspondence between British officials in London and Saudi Arabia on the subject of who would pay the repatriation expenses of manumitted persons. It was determined that ‘For the future full details will be recorded in all cases where slaves of definite British origin are freed by this Agency.’ In that way expenses from repatriation of British subjects could be reclaimed from that territory’s government.
who was enslaved, how the enslavement came about, from where slaves originated, how long persons were enslaved, the kind of work performed by slaves, and the family lives of slaves. All together the Foreign Office files give information on 262 people. The files do not describe all slavery variables for each individual. However, for at least 84 percent of former slaves the gender, country of origin, occupation while enslaved, age at manumission, and method of enslavement is recorded; and the number of masters and number of years enslaved is established for 54 percent.

The rich information from these files provides answers to questions that scholars deem crucial for understanding slavery in Muslim lands. For example, John Hunwick has raised questions that need answers: ‘What was the ratio of men to women freed; how many were released in their prime as opposed to old age; … how many years did men or women serve in slavery; … what kinds of occupations did slaves undertake and what skills may they have acquired that prepared them for ensuring viability as free persons?’ Details from these narratives were subjected to statistical analyses to derive answers about freed slaves from Saudi Arabia. Shaun Marmon brings up an issue that can be investigated as a result of these data. That is, whether ‘slavery as constructed by Islamic law and slavery as practiced by Muslim communities seem to coincide with remarkable symmetry’ or whether individual slave owners in early twentieth century Saudi Arabia ‘blatantly violated’ the principles of benevolence in the shariah.

4 I have individual documents (narratives and/or questionnaires) for 59 former slaves. Data for the others are summarized in a 1934 report: F.O. 905/11, Slaves: General Question (206 are listed in the report, 6 of whom have individual documents); and in updated reports of manumissions from 1930 to 1935: F.O. 905/28, Slaves: Manumission: Individual Cases. 1935 (53 slaves are listed in the updates, 50 of whom have individual documents).
6 Information from the narratives and questionnaires for each fugitive slave was organized into a table. Table columns were set up for each variable—including name, gender, the country of origin, occupation, age at the time of manumission, method of enslavement, number of masters, number of years enslaved, reasons for running away, etc. All the raw data columns were analyzed to determine the number and percentage of each category within the variable (e.g., washerwoman, bodyguard, etc. within the occupation variable). Some of the variables, such as age, were continuous and numeric and did not need recoding in order to perform further tests. Other variables such as occupation were nominal with six or more categories. Those variables were recoded into columns, typically, with two to four categories. Chi-square tests were then performed on nearly all combinations of nominal, recoded variables. Chi-square is a nonparametric statistical test that compares actual to expected quantities of categorical data. Expected values are calculated for a given cell through the product of the marginal probabilities of the two categories defining the cell. For example, if women were 25 percent of a test of gender and occupation statistically, one would expect 25 percent of each occupation to be female. If there was a significant percentage more or less of women in an occupation, that would suggest strongly that gender affected who entered that trade. Chi-square probabilities of .05 or less were considered significant. However, probabilities less than .07 were also reported. One continuous variable, years enslaved, was recoded as ‘20 years or less’ and ‘more than 20 years.’ Years enslaved was tested both as a continuous variable (through a median test) and a nominal, recoded variable (chi-square test). Pairs of nominal and continuous variables were tested to determine mean, median, maximum, and minimum for each nominal category.
Description of the Data

A major question about the data and findings of this research will be: are they peculiar to Saudi Arabia or could they possibly point to general trends with respect to twentieth-century slavery in the Arabian Peninsula? In order to begin answering this question, the data will be compared with data collected by British officials in Bahrain, where possible. The British Agency in Bahrain manumitted runaway slaves from 1917 to 1965. From 1926 to 1936, the officials recorded information for 190 freed people, including the fugitives’ age, gender, and reason for receiving a manumission certificate. Because these statistics from Bahrain recorded similar data to those from Saudi Arabia, the two sets will be compared to see whether the conditions of slavery also were similar.

Because the British recorded the narratives and held an official anti-slavery position, questions about the data’s reliability are inevitable and proper. Suzanne Miers had such doubts when she used some of the same British documents in her 1989 article in *Slavery and Abolition*. Miers believed that, despite the first-hand narratives of fugitive slaves, the documents only reflected British perceptions of slavery in Arabia. I share some of her caution about the limitations of the data. However, I believe fugitive slaves’ accounts were not merely reflections of British policy. The British method of collecting and checking the data, their restraint in terms of assigning motives or offering interpretations, their ambivalence about the subject, and the diversity found in the documents, all indicate that the British did not attempt to skew the narratives to show Saudi Arabian slavery in either a negative or positive light.

The British officers rarely assigned motives to the slave’s or master’s actions. The primary focus and purpose of their questionnaire was to determine how and where slaves were captured, sold, and resold; the British spent little time documenting the why of escape, capture, or sale. Also the British were not accepting of, or sympathetic to, all the fugitives had to say. The officers investigated refugees’ stories for many reasons. Two reasons were primary: the British did not wish to incense the Saudi government by encouraging or seeking slaves to manumit; nor did they want to pay for the repatriation of people who were not slaves. In addition, some people applying for manumission were discovered to be free persons either seeking free passage back home or refuge from oppressive relatives and were turned away from the legation.

The ambivalence of the British to their role in manumission is alluded to by their marginal comments throughout the documents and evidenced by their
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8 F.O. 1016/464, Bahrain: Agency, Manumission Register. 1919–1965. Other information is recorded but without more documents it is impossible to understand its significance. For instance, some runaways are designated as ‘Bahrain’ or ‘Trucial states slave’ (Trucial States was the name for the British dependency that became the United Arab Emirates in 1971). This designation could mean they were born in those areas to slave parents or born free subjects of those areas. From where the rest of the slaves came is not recorded: without reports or accompanying papers it is impossible to determine their origins.


10 C.O. 732/62/8, Slavery in the Middle East. 1933; and F.O. 905/28, 3 September 1935.
renunciation of that role in 1936. Two examples from the margins demonstrate this ambivalence. One British official noted in the case of Nasra that her local manumission would be ‘most satisfactory for the girl (& our pockets) as she is not at all keen on going abroad.’\(^{11}\) When Feyruz, a fugitive slave from an aristocratic household, told a British officer that there were 30 more slaves in his master’s household who wished to be manumitted, one official responded ‘O Lord!’\(^{12}\)

The brief report summaries and final, typed questionnaires have a formulaic pattern to them. However, the officers’ interview notes give more details and are less formulaic, using a pattern usually only for recording name, demographic information, and an ending that registered their arrival at the legation. The tenor and diversity of the documents suggest that British ambivalence acted as a control; I believe it limited British distortion of slaves’ first-hand narratives. In contrast, nineteenth- and twentieth-century European travelers’ interpretations and the opinions of Arab slave owners and jurists, on which the current scholarship of Middle Eastern slavery is based, have definite biases. Although Islamic law designates slaves as ‘property with voice,’\(^ {13}\) their voices are largely missing from most scholarly interpretations of the Middle Eastern institution. But the narratives of freed men and women are from the other side of the power divide. Thus, these interviews give the enslaved a role in shaping our knowledge of twentieth-century slavery in Saudi Arabia.

Obviously the statistical data in this article do not come from a random sample. On the contrary, the subjects were self-selected and disgruntled with Saudi slavery. Therefore, the data may not be representative of the entire enslaved population in Saudi Arabia.\(^ {14}\) However, much of what has been written on slavery in the Middle East has been based on the mythical musings of free European orientalists and travelers. Bernard Lewis began debunking these myths, but the inadequacies of nineteenth-century writings on the subject go much deeper than he revealed.\(^ {15}\) Lewis suggested that although the method of enslavement, transportation, and sale of slaves were more than likely the same in Atlantic, Saharan, and Indian Ocean trading, ‘[i]t was in the treatment accorded to the slaves by their new masters, and the place assigned to them in the societies to which they had come, that the main contrast was to be seen.’\(^ {16}\) Even that contrast is yet to be proven by historians, for it cannot rest solely on European observations of the nineteenth or twentieth centuries. The data provided by runaway African slaves demonstrate the need to revise the historiography of slavery in Saudi Arabia and perhaps the Middle East.

Although the data from the British files are rich in many ways, they also have

---

\(^{11}\) F.O. 905/28, 12 February 1934.

\(^{12}\) F.O. 905/28, 15 May 1935.


\(^{14}\) The same holds true for Bahrain.


\(^{16}\) Ibid., p. 100.
some limitations. The size of the statistical samples for each slavery variable differs. As aforementioned, individual files do not record statistics for each aspect of slavery for each slave. The files were kept in such a manner that one cannot determine whether each individual was asked about all of the issues or whether some issues were recorded only if a runaway brought them up. For example, 90 individuals in the entire survey ($n = 262$) indicate their reasons for running away from their masters. However, there was no specific space on the questionnaire in which to record a reason for running away.  

Therefore, the $n$ values for the statistics quoted, tables, and chi-square tests presented throughout this paper denote the number of freed men and women for whom there are data on those particular variables or combination of variables. The data can test empirically for answers to crucial questions concerning the history of slavery in twentieth-century Saudi Arabia.

## Ratio of Men to Women Freed

Most scholarship on slavery indicates that more African women than men were sold into the trans-Saharan and other slave trades bound for the Arab Muslim world. Yet, in the Saudi Arabian statistics, men outnumbered women 2.64 to 1. Women accounted for 27.5 percent of those who sought refuge at the British Legation ($n = 72$), whereas men were 72.5 percent ($n = 190$). While women appear to be underrepresented, the number of women who ran away is a significant one and gives a female perspective on slavery (see Table 1). The number of women running away from Saudi slavery appears more significant when compared with the Bahraini statistics. The ratio of male to female refugee slaves in Bahrain was 5.55 to 1. Women were only 15 percent of those seeking freedom ($n = 29$) compared to 85 percent for men ($n = 161$).

The variation in the gender ratio between these two countries indicates that throughout the Middle East the ratio of men to women who gained freedom through escape varied. The variation may point to a difference in access to British diplomatic sites. But it is also plausible that it reflects differences in the

---

**Table 1. Total number of runaway slaves by gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Saudi Arabia ($n = 262$)</th>
<th>Bahrain ($n = 190$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of country survey</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

17 See the Appendix for photocopies of questionnaires from the Public Record Office.

treatment accorded to enslaved women, the type of labor women performed, rates of fecundity among women (and therefore opportunities for manumission by bearing children of masters), and rates of marriage to masters or slaves in each region. These variables all affected the options open to women upon manumission and may have played a large factor in whether women chose to run away and eventually to be manumitted from slavery. In Saudi Arabia, women had the option of being manumitted and repatriated to their homeland, with the possibility of finding relatives, or being manumitted locally.19

Women’s narratives illustrate the effect these variables had on their decisions. Marriage and family could determine a woman’s actions.20 One woman went to the legation seeking manumission; her master agreed to manumit her and then married her.21 Halima bint Mabruk Okkash, a woman enslaved in Jeddah, ran away with her young daughter, Zahra, and requested local manumission. At first she hid the fact that her master was Zahra’s father and claimed the child belonged to another slave; this claim was no doubt an attempt to keep her infant girl.22 Halima’s master agreed to manumit her and acknowledge the child as his own; therefore, we must assume that Zahra lived as a free person. Having secured free status for her daughter and herself, Halima returned to her master’s house, the only option she had to retain contact with her child.23

Jamila bint Abdullah ran away with her husband Salem, a Sudanese slave soldier, because their family life was threatened; their owner had threatened to sell Salem unless he divorced her.24 Jamila had already lost one family due to her enslavement. She was married and had a daughter when she was captured in Sudan and sold into slavery.25 Her previous marriage was nullified.26 Instead of allowing her second marriage to be torn apart by sale, Jamila and Salem ran away, were manumitted, and repatriated to Sudan together. Jamila specifically expressed her desire to find her daughter when she returned to Sudan.

19 Two women chose to leave the legation without manumission; presumably they returned to their masters.
20 Thirty-two women indicated the reason they ran away. Of those, 10 women (31.25 percent) cited family reasons; of the 10, six females, four from one family, chose manumission and repatriation. One was manumitted locally, but the fate of the other three women, one of whom had a child, is unknown.
21 F.O. 905/11; In F.O. 905/27, Slaves: Manumission: General Question. 1935, a British official reports that 23 other people were manumitted by their owners at the legation from 1929 to 1934 and continued to live in Saudi Arabia. Because they never expected to return to the African continent, no records were kept detailing their history or gender and they are not included in the data.
22 According to I. P. Petrushevsky, *Islam in Iran*, trans. Hubert Evans (London: Athlone Press, 1985), pp. 156–57, Islamic codes of law only allowed slave women to keep their children with them until the age of seven, at the latest. Women who bore their master’s children could not be sold or given away, but Islamic law only mandated their manumission upon the death of their masters and only if one of their children was still alive.
23 F.O. 905/28, 9 April 1935.
24 Jamila’s story is an example of a Muslim master exercising the right to force a slave to divorce his wife; Petrushevsky, *Islam in Iran*, p. 156, reports this right.
26 Both Petrushevsky, *Islam in Iran*, p. 156, and Imam Muslim, *Al-Jami’ al-sahih*, trans. Abdul Hamid Siddiqi (Lahore: Muhammad Ashraf, 1973), p. 743, discuss the nullification of a slave woman’s marriage in the context of being captured as a prisoner of war. Despite the fact that Jamila and other slaves were not pagan prisoners of war, their original families were discarded in the same way and perhaps justified by *hadith*. 
In another instance, three generations of slave women and girls ran away together, looking to be repatriated. The eldest woman of this family was named Bakhita. She knew well the tensions in slave society that could divide families; Bakhita’s husband had run away four years earlier and her daughter Kelyba’s husband had just been taken to another city to be sold. Upon her son-in-law’s removal from the house, Bakhita took the chance to run away in order to save what was left of her family: her daughter, Kelyba, and her two granddaughters, Aysha and Bureyka.27 Jamila’s and Bakhita’s stories indicate that those enslaved attempted to hold their families together while enslaved, to find their free families in their own lands, and would take bold moves to keep their families intact.

A few women also seem to have used flight as a strategy to secure a better status within their master’s families for themselves and their children. Halima’s story resulted in official recognition of her daughter’s father and therefore Zahra’s free status. In addition to Halima, another woman ran away because she had hoped to be freed after bearing her master a child. That woman’s fate is not indicated in the record, but her mention of this issue suggests that she was concerned about the effect of childbearing on women’s freedom.28

Slave men in the sample also expressed a desire for family in their narratives. Salim was an Ethiopian bodyguard who served Amir Muhammad Abd ar Rahman, a brother of King Abd al Aziz. Salim accompanied the amir from Riyadh to Mecca during the pilgrimage of 1935. His proximity to Jeddah gave him an opportunity to escape. In his interview with British officials, Salim clearly stated that as a soldier and a bodyguard he had been ‘well-treated.’ Regardless of his conditions while a slave, Salim wanted to ‘return home and live with his parents.’29 Although he had been captured as a preteen and enslaved for most of his young life, Salim remembered his father clearly. He knew his father’s name and occupation, the name of the quarter in Addis Ababa in which he lived, and the name of the official in charge of that section of the city. Salim took a dangerous chance in order to regain his family.

Although men did escape from Saudi Arabia with their families or to rejoin their families, a further exploration of the gender statistics shows that slave women were more likely than slave men to run away because their families were threatened in some way. A chi-square test of whether gender affected a slave’s reasons for running away proved significant.30 The test showed that women were 2.7 times more likely than men to run away for family reasons; 31.25 percent of women who ran away did so because of family or with family members, whereas only 11.5 percent of men who gave a reason ran away because of family concerns. That is, although women comprised only 27.5 percent of the total

27 F.O. 904/28, 14 October 1935.
28 F.O. 905/11.
29 F.O. 905/28, 15 April 1935.
30 \((n = 93, \chi^2 = 9.37, df = 3, p < .03)\).
survey, they represented 59 percent of those who stated they had run away for family reasons.

Slaves Released in the Prime of Life

The statistics from Saudi Arabia and Bahrain revealed that in an overwhelming percentage of cases, slaves ran away in their prime. In this study, the definition of ‘prime’ was between the ages of 15 and 45. For Saudi Arabia, 240 slaves reported their age. Of this number, 80 percent \((n = 195)\) were between 15 and 45 years of age. The mean age of freed men and freed women was 30.7, and the median was 30. The statistics for 188 runaways in Bahrain were similar; the percentage in their prime was higher, at 89 percent \((n = 167)\), but their mean age was 30, as was their median age.

The slaves’ actions, running away from their masters, suggest that they had no hope of being manumitted voluntarily during this time in their lives. The close correspondence between the mean and median ages of Saudi Arabian and Bahraini fugitive slaves indicates that slaves in other Middle Eastern societies may have been manumitted only after they reached middle age and were less capable of physical labor.

The two countries, however, showed a difference when gender statistics were compared. Gender had an effect on the age at which slaves ran away in Saudi Arabia but not Bahrain. As Table 2 illustrates, the mean and median ages for women in both countries are similar to those of men. But a lower percentage of female slaves in Saudi Arabia were in their prime when they made the decision to run away. These statistics hint at a problem that slaves might face in their older years, neglect. In 1930, Eldon Rutter, an expert on Saudi Arabia, documented this neglect:

As we move along in the cloisters we see two or three very old men and women who look like bleary black skeletons.…. These are the manumitted slaves—free men and women. While they retained sufficient strength to be of use they remained slaves. But when they became too old to work any more they were set free and turned out to fend for themselves.…. It is true that this heartless practice is seldom resorted to unless there is an additional reason for it.…. But whatever the reason, the fact remains as another evil effect of slavery…. It is usual for slave-owners to keep superannuated slaves in their houses, and maintain them until they die.\(^{31}\)

While this neglect was visited on both men and women, Table 3 shows that women enslaved in Saudi Arabia were more likely to run away when they were over the age of 45 than men.

In Bahrain, gender did not affect the older women’s rates of running away. A chi-square test of gender’s effect on the age of fugitive slaves in Saudi Arabia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
<th>Bahrain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest</td>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in their prime</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
showed that women who ran away were 2.1 times more likely to be over the age of 45 than were men.  

Older women’s stories explain the gender difference with regard to age. Sa’ida bint Ali’s situation illustrates the dire circumstances older women could face. Sa’ida was about 50 years old in 1935 when she sought refuge at the legation. Sa’ida had been enslaved for over 40 years and had been sold to four masters. She had been with her last master, Abdullah Rajab, five years when his wife and another slave woman began beating her. Abdullah was not concerned about her leaving his house and did not attempt to bring her back. In a rare instance, the British officer speculated on Abdullah’s motive—he was attempting to rid himself of a burden, a slave no longer capable of work. Her only possessions appear to have been some clothes and a bed; she was forced to leave those behind.

Khadija bint Gummiog had more material possessions than Sa’ida, but neither had kin, protection or care from their masters. At the age of 60, Khadija lived apart from her master, A’isha Huna. Khadija owned the following possessions: ‘2 huts [which] cost her £9 gold, … 1 yard [which] cost her £6 gold, … 1 box of clothes, … 1 [box] containing fans, … 1 bed, … 1 mat, … 1 barrel … [and] Some chickens[,] etc.’ with a combined valued of ‘about £1 gold.’ Khadija had been ill for months and was unable to work or defend herself when some Takrunis (people of West African descent) began threatening her life in order to steal her property. Because she feared for her safety and her master was not interested in her welfare, she attempted to take refuge with the British. Unfortunately, Khadija did so in 1938, two years after the British had given up their right to manumit slaves in 1936. Khadija was expelled from the legation and told of her rights to food and clothing from her master as established in the Saudi Arabian slavery regulations of 1936. A Saudi official informed the British that he would ensure she was well treated in the future by her master. Of course, Khadija’s fate is not recorded.

Sale, escape, and divorce explain why women like Khadija and Sa’ida lacked

---

Table 3. Runaway slaves over age 45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Saudi Arabia (n = 35)</th>
<th>Bahrain (n = 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number over age 45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of women/men in Table 2</td>
<td>23% of women</td>
<td>11% of men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of people over 45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of country survey</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

32 \(n = 244, \chi^2 = 4.80, \text{df} = 1, p < .03\).
33 F.O. 904/28, 10 October 1935.
34 F.O. 905/61, Slaves, Slavery and Slave Trade: General. 14 September 1938.
35 Ibid.
kinship ties; surviving to the age of 50 or 60 with a slave family intact was a difficult feat to accomplish. Older women probably no longer were seen as sexually productive or attractive, and they were seen as less productive in general. Sa’ida and Khadija’s circumstances show how these women were discarded by their masters and vulnerable to attack for what goods they did have. These women sought manumission and repatriation in order to leave terrible situations similar to those that many older slave women must have faced.

Older slave men were also vulnerable. The case of Faraj ibn Murjan illustrates the problems of older male slaves. Faraj was born to Sudanese slaves. He too married a slave and they had a daughter. After 60 years as a slave, Faraj was old and unable to work, so his master, Hazza bin Hamid, stopped feeding him. Old, disabled, and neglected, Faraj had no source of income or way of feeding himself. Pushed to the edge of starvation, Faraj was faced with the choice of staying with his family and starving or leaving behind his wife and daughter in order to seek manumission and repatriation at the British Legation. Before leaving, Faraj urged his family to follow when they could. After two weeks, Faraj left the legation without manumission; perhaps he thought of a third option.  

These narratives suggest several possible reasons for the gender difference in older fugitives. Being without kin in Middle East societies is not ideal for anyone; however, it is a particularly acute problem for women in male-dominated societies. In many societies women generally outlive men and therefore older men are less likely than women to be alone and kinless. Sa’ida’s and Khadija’s circumstances may be indications that enslaved women outlived slave men at this time in Saudi Arabia. The chi-square test and Table 3 indicate that older slave men may have had more options and been less vulnerable than women; enslaved men’s occupations and viability as free persons are discussed below and may explain further why older men were not seeking manumission at the same rate as older women.

Length of Servitude

After posing his question on the number of years slaves remained in bondage, Hunwick notes the following. ‘[S]ome sources hint that a slave would be freed after seven years by which time s/he had repaid their purchase price; others would argue that the economic benefit of slavery only begins at such a point and that purchasing a slave represents a long-term investment in labor.’ 37 The fugitive slaves of Saudi Arabia show that in their cases neither answer is complete. The majority of people in this study spent more than seven years in slavery but not with the same master. Of the 142 people for whom this information

---

36 F.O. 905/28, 12 December 1934.
37 Hunwick, ‘The Same but Different: Approaches to Slavery and the African Diaspora in the Lands of Islam,’ p. 5.
Table 4. Saudi Arabia: number of years enslaved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years enslaved</th>
<th>Women ($n = 37$)</th>
<th>Men ($n = 105$)</th>
<th>Born a slave ($n = 20$)</th>
<th>Captured ($n = 113$)</th>
<th>Total ($n = 142$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>Less than 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was recorded, the overwhelming majority—89.5 percent ($n = 127$)—spent more than seven years in slavery.

Table 4 shows that, on average, slaves served 22.9 years in slavery. Slaves were used as durable, portable commodities regardless of gender or familiarity.\textsuperscript{38} The mean for women and men was the same and the median varied by only one year. Nineteenth- and twentieth-century orientalists’ writings on slavery attest to great familiarity and therefore goodwill between slaves and their masters.\textsuperscript{39} Through these writings one might expect that those born as slaves in Saudi Arabia would have closer ties to their masters and therefore would have been manumitted sooner; they might have narrated stories of their parents’ manumission and might have been more likely to have only one master. That is not the case in this study. Table 4 shows that the mean number of years enslaved for those born in slavery ($n = 20$) is nearly 10 years longer than for those people who were captured and sold into slavery. The median was exactly a decade more. Few of the narratives record that parents were freed. Most are like Halima bint Okkash: their parents died as slaves.\textsuperscript{40}

Sixteen of the twenty people who said they had been born into slavery also reported the number of masters who had owned them during their enslavement. While those with one master were enslaved for an equal (median) or shorter period of time (mean) than those with more than one master; those who were born as slaves were equally as likely to have more than one master (see Table 5). Freed women and men seldom noted the reasons for their sale during slavery.

\textsuperscript{38} Marmon, ed., \textit{Slavery in the Islamic Middle East}, p. 5, argues that slaves were considered commodities in Islamic law as well as Saudi Arabian practice.

\textsuperscript{39} See Michel Le Gall, \textit{Translation of Louis Frank, ‘Memoire sur le commerce des negres au Kaire, et sur les maladies auxquelles ils sont sujets en y arrivant’} (1802) [Memoir on the traffic in Negroes in Cairo and on the illnesses to which they are subject upon arrival there]," in ibid., p. 81; Eldon Rutter, \textit{The Holy Cities of Arabia} (London: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1930), p. 397; and Garrett DeJong, ‘Slavery in Arabia,’ \textit{The Moslem World}, 24 (1934): 139.

\textsuperscript{40} F.O. 905/11 1934. Of course, the 10-year difference reflects the fact that those born slaves were with masters as infants and young children unable to do much work, and those captured were children or adults able to work. Nevertheless, the test still illustrates the point that familiarity between slaves and masters did not make for a climate conducive to early manumission.
Table 5. Those born a slave in Saudi Arabia ($n = 16$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years enslaved</th>
<th>One master ($n = 8$)</th>
<th>Two masters ($n = 4$)</th>
<th>Three or more masters ($n = 4$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

but a few passages from the narratives point to possibilities. One young woman’s experiences illustrate the durability and portability of slaves’ value:

A slave girl named Amna bint Muhammed ibn Abdulla of Sudanese origin, aged about 25 years, … has been kidnapped by some Bedwins [sic] in Mecca from her parents when she was 7 years of age, … they sold her to a certain [man] named ‘Ali ibn ‘Abdurrahman for a sum of 250 Riyals (M[aria ]T[heresa] dollars) with whom she stayed 9 years, & she was then sold at Lith to ‘Abdurrahman Ba-‘Afif for £G[old] 17. She stayed with ‘Abdurrahman Ba-‘Afif for about 7 years, and then [he] sold her to a certain Bedwin … for a sum of £G[old] 70 … . She stayed with her master 5 months & was resold … for a sum of £G[old] 80* … . She stayed with her last master for about 6 months, & at last on account of a quarrel which has arisen between her & her master’s wife, she was sent [to] the broker’s house for sale. A certain lady offered £G[old] 80 to purchase her, but her master refused & insisted on more.41

This passage suggests that slaves appreciated in value from childhood into their prime.

The durability of slaves’ value is also reflected in Abdul Razzaq bin Bakhit’s questionnaire. A native of Sudan, Abdul Razzaq was 50 years old when he escaped after 40 years of slavery:

He states that he was kidnapped from his home when he was about 10 years of age … he was sold to a Hadendowa … with whom he stayed about 5 years after which he was taken to Suakin and sold to another Hadendowa … who … sold him. … He remained with his master for about ten years who then sold him to a Beduin … with whom he also stayed about ten years when his Master died. The slave was inherited by his Master’s son … with whom he stayed for another ten years.42

He further adds that he married the female slave of his master, and from whom he got 3 children, but they died. His master at last sold the female slave last year and started to treat him (the slave) badly. He requested his master to sell him, but he (the master) refused.43

From the last part of the passage one can infer the factors that determined when a slave was no longer valued. Abdul Razzaq and his wife were past their primes;

41 F.O. 905/28, 10 January 1935. The asterisk is accompanied by a note that seems to correct the figure to £Gold 36, but the note is unclear.
42 F.O. 905/28, 17 March 1934.
43 F.O. 905/28, 10 March 1934.
he was 50 years of age (and probably not able to be sold for a profit) and she was unable to raise slave children successfully.

Jamila bint Khalil serves as a final example. Jamila was about 20 years old when she escaped the cycle of sale, which had included being sold four times—once to pay debts—and being given once as a gift.\textsuperscript{44}

In all, 147 men and women related the number of times they were sold. Only 20 percent ($n = 29$) had one master during their enslavement: 28 percent ($n = 41$) had two masters. Amna, Abdul Razzaq, and Jamila were in the majority (52 percent, $n = 77$) of slaves who were sold more than twice and had had three or more masters. The maximum number of masters was 10, the mean and median number was 3. A comparison of the mean of three masters with a mean of 22.9 years of enslavement suggests that those who purchased their labor did not necessarily invest for the long term.

**Slave Occupations**

Slaves’ occupations affected and interacted with many aspects of their lives. Chi-square tests of the data suggest that gender and country of origin influenced what occupation slaves plied. Their occupations also helped to determine how many years they were enslaved, patterned the number of masters they had, and were factors in their reasons for running away. Fugitive slaves reported 19 different occupations.\textsuperscript{45} In order to conduct chi-square tests, these 19 trades were recoded into three categories: domestic, agricultural, and commercial labor.\textsuperscript{46} Occupations are recorded for 221 fugitives. A total of 103 were domestic laborers (47 percent), 69 were commercial laborers (31 percent), and 49 were agricultural workers (22 percent). Gender had a highly significant effect on which category of labor a slave would perform.\textsuperscript{47} Table 6 shows that men were 2.6 times more likely than women to be agricultural workers; men were 6.5

\textsuperscript{44} F.O. 905/28, 23 July 1934.
\textsuperscript{45} The categories were domestic, agricultural labourer, camel driver, chauffeur, concubine, milkboy, miller, pearl diver, porter, sailor, shepherd, shop boy, soldier, stonecutter, water carrier, bodyguard, washerwoman, and motor driver.
\textsuperscript{46} Domestic, chauffeur, concubine, and washerwoman were categorized as Domestic Labor. Agricultural labourer, milkboy, and shepherd were deemed Agricultural Labor. Camel driver, miller, pearl diver, porter, sailor, shop boy, soldier, stonecutter, water carrier, bodyguard, and motor driver were considered Commercial Labor.
\textsuperscript{47} ($n = 221$, $\chi^2 = 41.82$, df = 2, $p < .001$).
times more likely than women to be commercial workers; and women were 2.4 times more likely than men to be domestic workers. Women were 8.4 times more likely to be domestic workers than agricultural workers and 14 times more likely to do domestic work rather than commercial work.

Men’s jobs in commerce gave them more mobility and opportunity to earn money and gain experience in the world. For example, Sa’id ibn Abdullah was a 30-year-old slave who worked as an agricultural laborer, sailor, and soldier in the Saudi–Yemen war. During that war he obtained a bag of sugar that he intended to sell. His master demanded the money from the sale and threatened to beat him.48 Apparently Sa’id’s experiences in commerce encouraged him to engage in trade for his own benefit. Such opportunities may have provided older male slaves more experiences and material wealth than women slaves could obtain. Those advantages gained from working in commerce may have made them more viable as free persons or sustained them in their old age when masters were unwilling to care for their needs.

A chi-square analysis showed with a 93 percent degree of confidence that a slave’s occupation depended in part on his or her country of origin.49 Perhaps stereotypes operated to channel slaves from certain regions into certain jobs. For example, Table 7 shows that even though slaves from Ethiopia comprised 34 percent of the total number of runaways, only 19 percent of agricultural workers were Ethiopian slaves. Ethiopian slaves were twice as likely to work as domestic laborers than as agricultural workers.

Slaves of Nigerian origin comprised only a small proportion of the sample (8 percent), but they were over-represented in commercial labor, 15 percent of commercial laborers in the sample being Nigerian. Conversely, slaves from Sudan comprised 62 percent of agricultural workers but only 47 percent of the sample. Thus, Ethiopian slaves tended to be utilized for domestic labor, Nigerian slaves tended to work in commerce, and Sudanese slaves made up the bulk of agricultural slaves.

Statistical tests were run to determine whether a slave’s occupation affected the number of years he/she was enslaved, that is, whether an agricultural or domestic worker was enslaved longer than the median (20 years). Table 8 shows that the results of chi-square and median tests were highly significant.50 Slaves engaged in agricultural labor were 2.3 times more likely to be enslaved more than 20 years than were commercial slave laborers. Agricultural slave laborers were only 27 percent of the sample, but comprised 37 percent of those enslaved for more than 20 years. Domestic slaves represented the highest proportion of those enslaved more than 20 years (47 percent), but they were also the highest percentage of the sample (43 percent).

48 Marmon, ed., *Slavery in the Islamic Middle East*, p. 3, and Petrushevsky, *Islam in Iran*, p. 155, attest to this master’s demand as being legal; anything slaves had could be claimed by their masters and used only with his or her consent.

49 \( n = 217, \chi^2 = 14.88, \text{df} = 8, p < .07 \).

50 Chi-square test \( n = 117, \chi^2 = 11.89, \text{df} = 2, p < .01 \); median test \( n = 117, \chi^2 = 10.44, \text{df} = 2, p < .01 \).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Agricultural</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Equatorial Africa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In contrast to agricultural workers, slaves utilized in commercial work were more likely to be enslaved 20 years or less. In fact, commercial workers were 2.4 times more likely than agricultural workers to be enslaved for less than 20 years. Commercial and domestic slaves seemed almost equally likely to be enslaved 20 years or less. However, commercial workers were over-represented in this category (30 percent of the total sample but 44 percent of those enslaved 20 years or less), while the domestic slaves were slightly underrepresented (43 percent of total sample but only 39 percent of those enslaved 20 years or less).

Apparently, owners considered that buying a slave for agricultural work was a long-term investment. This deduction is reinforced by the chi-square test of the number of masters and occupations of slaves. Table 9 shows that agricultural slaves were more likely than domestic to have one master. Domestic slaves appear to have been bought and sold more often; they were 5.1 times more likely than agricultural slaves to have three or more masters. Slaves engaged in agricultural labor were only 21 percent of the sample but were 42 percent of those with one master. It appears that masters in Saudi Arabia more readily held agricultural slaves for long periods of time and were more hesitant to part with them.

Despite the fact that agricultural workers appear to be valuable property, Table 10 indicates that their value did not improve the treatment they received as slaves. The chi-square analysis for occupation and reason for running was highly significant. There was a close correspondence between agricultural workers and

---

**Table 8. Saudi Arabia: years enslaved and occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of labor</th>
<th>20 years or less</th>
<th>More than 20 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 9. Saudi Arabia: number of masters and occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of labor</th>
<th>One master</th>
<th>Two masters</th>
<th>Three or more masters</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51 \((n = 122, \chi^2 = 9.44, \text{df} = 4, \ p < .06)\).

52 \((n = 65, \chi^2 = 22.78, \text{df} = 6, \ p < .001)\).
ill treatment as a reason for running away. In fact, 93 percent of runaway slaves in agricultural work cited ill treatment as the reason they had fled. On a comparative basis, agricultural laborers were 3.7 times more likely than commercially utilized slaves to give ill treatment as a reason for running away.

Commercial workers were more likely than domestic or agricultural workers to leave their masters because of an impending sale. Abdul Kheyr, a 25-year-old camel driver, ran away from his master, Meccan slave dealer Abdulla Gari, in 1935. Abdul Kheyr had tried to run away three years before, but he had been apprehended by the Jeddah police and sent back to Mecca.\textsuperscript{53} His reason for running the first time is not recorded. However, on his second attempt, Abdul Kheyr cited his imminent sale to Amir Abdullah, the brother of King Ibn Saud and a man with a reputation for cruelty to his slaves.\textsuperscript{54} Abdul Kheyr’s story shows that sale was a gamble for commercial slaves; their circumstances and treatment would change with their new masters, perhaps for the worse, as in Abdul Kheyr’s case. Also, their commercial skills may have emboldened them; their actions may denote that commercial slaves knew they had skills that made their freedom viable.

**Conclusion**

The simple act of running away illustrates that some slaves in Saudi Arabia were not treated with the benevolence that the *shariah* encourages. The data from the documents of 90 runaways show that many masters ill-treated their slaves (*n* = 47, or 52.25 percent), usually starving or beating them. Another 12 former slaves (13.25 percent) had been freed but were re-enslaved or threatened with re-enslavement. Yet other masters threatened their slaves with actions not condemned by the *shariah*, such as sale (*n* = 17, or 19 percent). Some fugitive slaves (*n* = 14, or 15.5 percent) left for family reasons; they ran away to avoid

\textsuperscript{53} Petrushevsky, *Islam in Iran*, p. 157, notes that *shariah* provides a sort of fugitive slave law; fugitive slaves had to be arrested and returned to their owner. Muhyiddin al-Nawawi, *Gardens of the Righteous*, trans. Muhammad Zafrulla Khan (London: Curzon Press, 1975), p. 296, includes a *hadith* chronicled by Muslim and related by Jabir that prohibits a slave from running away from his master.

\textsuperscript{54} F.O. 905/28, 24 January 1935.
the break-up of their families or they wished to be reunited with their families. Again, breaking up slave families through sale or capture did not abridge Shariah notions of benevolence. It is important to note that an overwhelming majority of refugee slaves (n = 172) gave no reason for running away. They all may have been enslaved in circumstances deemed benevolent by Shariah standards, as was the situation of the Ethiopian slave, Salim, cited above. The British official who interviewed Salim noted that ‘his only reason for running away is his wish to return home and live with his parents and relations.’

One might conclude that the majority, like Salim, simply preferred their own families and cultures to those of their masters, or that they desired the ultimate form of benevolence—freedom.
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# Questionnaire for Slaves

who take refuge in the British Legation, Jeddah.

*Signed copy to His Majesty's Minister at Addis Ababa*

1. Name of Slave
2. Sex
3. Apparent Age
4. Marks of Identification
5. Tribe
6. Village of Original Home
7. Country of Origin
8. Name of Owner
9. Residence in Hejaz
10. Craft or Trade of Slave
11. Names, Ages and Sex of any Children accompanying the slave
12. Short history of the circumstances of enslavement and escape

13. Names of any relations, chiefs or notables through whom the Slave could be identified

(Initialled) (Pro-Consul)

Having satisfied myself that the person named above is a proper person to be manumitted in accordance with the existing agreements, I hereby declare him to be free and order that he should receive from this Legation such assistance as is necessary to exercise the rights of a free person.

British Legation, Jeddah

(Signature) (Head of Mission)
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SLAVES
who take REFUGE in the BRITISH LEGATION, JEDDA.

SIGNED COPY TO: Commissioner, Port Sudan.

1. Name of Slave:  
   
2. Sex: Male
3. Apparent Age: 40 years

4. Marks of Identification: 

5. Tribe:  

6. Village of Original Home: 
   7. a village in the Nuba mountains

7. Country of Origin: Sudan

8. Name of Owner: Huraile ibn Hamis


10. Craft or Trade of Slave: Agriculturist

11. Names, Ages and Sex of any Children accompanying the slave: 

12. Short history of the circumstances of enslavement and escape. He states that he was born in Kordofan province and was kidnapped by Haggara tribesmen when he was about 10 years of age; he was taken to Hitan where he was sold to a native of Hitan with whom he stayed one year; his master then took him to the town where he sold him to a certain Umar ibn Al-Nahmani of Khums, who took him to Al-Hallab here he stayed about six months. His master then took him to Mecca overland and sold him to an Indian named Ahmad bin Ali, who was head of the Indian pilgrim guides. He stayed with his new master for 2 years and was then re-sold to Attiyah ibn Alik bin Abi Tuam of the Hane tribe who resided in Jeddah, with whom he stayed about 3 years. He was then sold to Idha ibn Hamis of Mecca with whom he stayed until the time of his escape.

13. Names of any relations, chieftains or notables through whom the Slave could be identified: 

(Initialled)

Having satisfied myself that the person named above is a proper person to be transmitted in accordance with the existing agreements, I hereby declare him to be free and order that he should receive from this Legation such assistance as is necessary to exercise the rights of a free person.

BRITISH LEGATION, JEDDA.

July 10, 1920.

(Signature)  

Khalil Minister.
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SLAVES

who take REFUGE in the BRITISH LEGATION, JEDDA.

SIGNED COPY TO H.E. Minister, Addis Ababa.

1. Name of Slave: Salim, originally Mageri Lajwannia.

2. Sex: Male.

3. Apparent Age: 25 years.


5. Tribe: 


10. Craft or Trade of Slave: Personal servant & bodyguard.

11. Names, Ages and Sex of any Children accompanying the slave: 

12. Short history of the circumstances of enslavement and escape: Salim states that he was kidnapped when a boy of 10 or 12 years by means of a trick in Addis Ababa, and was taken by train to Jibouti and sold there to a Bechem named Hama, who took him by dhow via Tejura to Hodeida and sold him to a Hodeid merchant named Muhammad. His master took him to Hodeid and sold him after 5 days to Abdullah El Sindi, of Mecca. He remained with Abdullah El Sindi for 18 months and was then sold to a Bechem named Sultan Ibn Bilal, with whom he remained for about 6 years. He was then sold to Amir Muhammad Abdurrahman, a brother of H.H. King Ibn Saud. He remained 6 years with his late master and escaped this year while the Amir was in Mecca performing the pilgrimage.

13. Names of any relations, chiefs or notables through whom the Slave could be identified: His father, Leil Jawwannia, who was a member of the bodyguard of the Emperor of Abyssinia. (2) Sheikh Nas Sada of Addis Ababa.

(Initialled) J.O.

Having satisfied myself that the person named above is a proper person to be manumitted in accordance with the existing agreements, I hereby declare him to be free and order that he should receive from this Legation such assistance as is necessary to exercise the rights of a free person.

BRITISH LEGATION,
JEDDA.

(Signature)

2nd May 1935.