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The rivalry between the Persian and Byzantine Empires over the control of the regions of the Arab Peninsula at the end of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh century is reflected in a number of traditions attributed to the Prophet and recorded in some commentaries of the Qur'an. Qatada (died 117 AH) gives a description of the sad situation of the Arab population of the Peninsula before they embraced Islam, commenting on Qur'an, VIII, 26: "And remember when you were few and abased in the land and were fearful that the people (al-nas) would snatch you away". He describes their sorrowful economic situation, their going astray and their weakness, and states that they were "confined on a top of a rock between Fāris and Rūm" (maʿkūfina `alā raʾsi ḥağarin bayna Fārisa wa-l-Rūmi). The people (al-nas) mentioned in the verse of the Qur'an are said to refer to Persians and Byzantines. A hadīt reported on the authority of Ibn ʿAbbās (died 68 AH) states that the Prophet interpreted al-nas as...


3. AL-SUYŪṬĪ, al-Durr al-mašfūr, III, 177 (Cairo 1314 AH); TABARĪ's Tafsīr, XIII, 478 (ed. Maḥmūd Muḥ. ŚĀKIR and Aḥmad Muḥ. ŚĀKIR, Cairo 1958) contains the comment of Qatada, but the mentioned phrase is inserted by the Editors with variants: "between the two lions (asadayni) Fāris and Rūm" and "mahūmina" instead of "maʿkūfina"; AL-ṢAWKĀNĪ, Fāṭḥ al-Qādīr, II, 287 (Cairo 1932—but the phrase is omitted); IBN KĀṬĪR, Tafsīr, III, 303 (Beirut 1966—the phrase is omitted); AL-SAMARQĀNDĪ, Tafsīr, Ms. Chester Beatty, I, f. 252b (kānū bayna asadayni bayna Qaysāra wa-Kisrā).

4. AL-SUYŪṬĪ, op. cit., ib.; AL-ṬABARĪ, op. cit., ib.—but al-Ṭabarī prefers another interpretation, according to which "al-nās" refers to Qurayš, ib. p. 379; AL-FAYRŪZĀBĀDI, Tantwīr al-miqbās, p. 138 (Cairo 1290 AH) records that al-nās refers to Qurayš; AL-SAMARQĀNDĪ, op. cit., ib.: al-nās refers to Persians, Byzantines and "Arab" who dwelt around Mecca; AL-BAYḠĀWI, Tafsīr, I, 183 (Cairo 1355 AH) ... wa-qila li-l-ʿArabi kāfsatan fa-innahum kānū aqīllāʾa fi aydī Fārisa wa-l-Rūmi.
referring to Persians. Whatever the interpretation of the phrase in the verse discussed above, these early commentaries seem to mirror the apprehensions felt by the people of the Peninsula concerning the power of the two rival Empires and to bring out the impact of this rivalry on the life of the communities in the Peninsula.

The struggle between the two Empires, in which the two vassal-kings of al-Ḥira and Čassàn took active part, was closely watched by the unbelievers and Muslims in the different stages of their context. According to the commentaries on Qur'ān, XXX, 1-2, the sympathies of the unbelievers of Mecca were with Persia whereas the Muslim community inclined towards the Byzantines. The victories of the Byzantines, it is stressed, coincided with the victories of the Prophet.

The efforts of Persia to gain control over the region of al-Ḥiğāz were noticed by R. Růžička, who assumed that the waning of the influence of Tamīm and the rise of the influence of Gaṭafān were caused by the action of Persian policy performed through the medium of the Laḥmid kingdom in order to get a foothold in this region.

A tradition recorded by Ibn Saʿīd in his Naṣwat al-ṭarab reports

1. Al-Suyūṭī, op. cit., ib; but in Tabari’s Tafsīr, p. 478 the comment is attributed to Wahb b. Munabbih.


3. Al-Qurtubī, op. cit., XIV, 1-5; Al-Ṭabarī, op. cit., XXI, 16 seq.; Ibn Kaṭīr, op. cit., V, 348; of interest is a record reported by Al-Qurtubī: when the tidings of the victory of the Byzantines arrived many people embraced Islam, op. cit., XIV, 2; and see F. Altheim and R. Stiehl: Finanzgeschichte der Spätantike, pp. 158-60 (Frankfurt am Main 1957).

4. R. Růžička: Duraid b. aṣ-Ṣimma, I, 55 (Praga 1930): “Zda se, že v zaničení nadvlády Tamimovu a ve převládnutí vlivu Gaťafanovu třeba spatřovat i učinku politiky perské, jež se snažila postřednictvím politické vladnout...” [“Il semble qu’il faille voir dans la disparition de la prépondérance de Tamīm et la montée de celle de Gaṭafān les effets de la politique perse, qui s’efforçait d’assurer sa domination en mettant en œuvre de petits moyens” (N.D.L.R.)].

an interesting attempt of Persia to cast its power over Mecca. When Qubād embraced the faith of Mazdak and deposed the Banū Naṣr who refused to accept it, al-Ḥārīt al-Kindi followed suit. Qubād, the story relates, ordered al-Ḥārīt to impose this faith on the Arabs of Nağd and Tihāma. When these tidings reached Mecca some people embraced the faith of Mazdak (fa-minhum man tazandaqa) and when Islam appeared there was a group (scil. in Mecca-K.) of people who were indicated as former Mazdakites. There were however people who refrained from embracing this faith. Among them was 'Abd Manāf, who gathered his people and stated that he would not abandon the religion of Ismāʿīl and Abraham and follow a religion imposed by the sword. When al-Ḥārīt came to know about it he reported it to Qubād. Qubād ordered him to rush upon Mecca, to destroy the Ka'ba, to kill 'Abd Manāf and to abolish the leadership of the Banū Qusayy. Al-Ḥārīt was not willing to comply with the order; because of his partisanship of the Arabs he prevented Qubād from it and Qubād was busy with other people than Qurayṣ. The tendency of this tradition is obvious: it tries to lay a heavy stress on the behaviour of 'Abd Manāf who remained faithful to the religion of Qurayṣ, the ḏīn Ismāʿīl. The tradition may be spurious, but it points to the contacts which seem to have existed between al-Ḥira and Mecca.

Ibn Ḥurdāḏbeh in his Kitāb al-maṣālik wa-l-mamālik records a tradition according to which the marzubān al-bādiya appointed an ʿāmil on al-Madīna, who collected the taxes. The Qurayṣa and the Naḍīr—says the tradition—were kings who were appointed by them on al-Madīna, upon the Aws and the Ḥazraḡ. A verse to this effect by an Anṣārī poet is quoted. It says:

1. *fī zamani Qubāda sulṭāni l-Fursi llaḍī tazandaqa wa-ttabaʿa mağhaba Maṣdaqa.*
2. *wa-amara l-Ḥārīta an yaḥūda ahla Nağḍin wa-Tihāmata bi-dālika.*
3. *See GAWĀD ʿALĪ, Taʾrīḥ al-ʿArāb qabla l-Īslām, VI, 287-88 (Baghdād 1957); he assumes that these “zanādiqa” of Qurayṣ embraced the mağḥūsiyya; this passage of Naṣwat al-farab seems to give a new interpretation of the well known tradition about the “zandaqa” of some Qurayṣ. And see the list of these “zanādiqa” of Qurayṣ in IBN ḤABĪB’S al-Muḥabbar, p. 161 (ed. Ilse LICHTENSTÄDTER, Hyderabad 1942). 4. *"fa-amarahu an yanhada ilā Makkata wa-yahdima l-bayta wa-yanhara Abda Manāf in wa-yuṣila rīḍasata bani Qusayyin".*
5. *"fa-kariha jālika al-Ḥārītu wa-dāḥalahu ḥamīyyatun li-l-ʿArabi fa-dārātā ‘anhum wa-ṣuqila Qubādu bi-ğayrihim".*
"You pay the tax after the tax of Kisrā: and the tax of Qurayza and Naḍīr". Yāqūt quotes the tradition that the Qurayza and Naḍīr were kings driven out by the Aws and Ḥazraḡ; the Aws and Ḥazraḡ used formerly to pay tax to the Jews.

W. Caskel doubts whether Ibn Ḥurdāḏbeh had had another source than this verse of one of the Anṣār. Caskel's assumption can however hardly be accepted. The record given by Ibn Ḥurdāḏbeh and Yāqūt seems to be based on a separate tradition to which the verse was attached. This verse attributed here to an Anṣārī poet occurs in the well-known poem of Ibn Buqayla; in the poem this verse has quite a different connotation.

This tradition was discussed by H. Z. Hirschberg in his Yisrael be-'Arav. Hirschberg does not accept the tradition as valid, arguing that this report is not confirmed by another independent source. He maintains that the people of al-Madina were free (bnnei ḥorin) with regard to Persia and Byzantium. It is not plausible—argues Hirschberg—that the 'āmil of the marzubān of Ḥaḡar, whose power was so weak in Bahrayn, could have levied taxes in the North of Ḥiḡāz.

Altheim and Stiehl consider the tradition sound. The 'āmil of al-Madina represented the king of al-Ḥira, on his side stood the "kings" of Qurayza and Naḍīr. This state of affairs—according to Altheim-Stiehl—could endure as long as the Jewish tribes dominated the immigrant Aws and Ḥazraḡ, i.e. till the middle of the sixth century. How things went on later with the Sassanid 'āmil is unknown—state the authors.

---

1. "Tu'addī l-ḥarqa ba'da ḥarqī KISRĀ: wa-ḥarqīn min Qurayṣata wa-l-Naḍīr".

2. YĀQÛT, op. cit., ib.; and see ALTHEIM-STIEHL, op. cit., p. 150, l. 4-5.


4. See the poem AL-ṬABARI, Taʾriḥ, I, 2042; AL-MASʿŪDI, Murūḡ, I, 221-222 (ed. BARBIER DE MEYNAIRD, Paris 1861). A significant variant is given in ABū L-BAQĀʾ's al-Manāqib al-Mazyadiyya, f. 34b (Ms. Br. Mus.): "ka-ḥargī bani Qurayṣata". ABū L-Baqā' states that 'Abd al-Masīḥ composed this poem eulogising al-Nu'mān, his son and his grandfather and wailing them after Ḥālid b. al-Walīd "imposed (scil. upon his people—K.) the ǧizya" (lamma zahara l-Islāmu wa-daraba Ḥālidu bnu l-Walīdi l-ǧizyata).

5. p. 122, n. 99, Tel-Aviv 1946; in this note an additional reference is given: AL-SAMHŪDI, Wafāʾ al-wafāʾ, II, 269 (quoted from Ibn Ḥurdāḏbeh, but without the verse).

Altheim-Stiehl are probably right in their assumption. A significant record of Ibn Sa'id in his *Našwat al-ṭarab* gives important details about the continuity of the Sassanid control of al-Madīna after the Jewish domination had come to an end.

Ibn Sa'id reports that battles often took place between the two fighting groups (i.e. the Jews, Aws and Ḥaẓraḡ)¹ and no rule was imposed on them until ʿAmr b. al-Īṭnāba al-Ḥaẓraḡī entered the court of al-Neʾmān b. al-Mundir, the king of al-Ḥira and was appointed by him (as king) on al-Madīna ².

In another passage Ibn Sa'id furnishes us with further details about this event. The author records that ʿAmr b. al-Īṭnāba was appointed by al-Neʾmān b. al-Mundir as king of al-Madīna. The father of Ḥassān b. Ṭābit composed satirical verses about ʿAmr and said:

"Aliknī ilā l-Neʾmānī qawlan maḥaddituhu:
wa-fī l-nuṣḥi li-l-ʿalbābi yawman dalāʾīlu
Baʿṭṭa ilaynā baʿdanā wa-hwa ʾahmaqun:
fa-yā laytahū min ḡayrinā wa-hwa ʾāqilū"

"Convey from me to al-Neʾmān a word which
[I said truthfully
for in good advise minds will have some day
[indications
You sent to us one from us—but he is a fool;
Lo! Would that he were from an alien people
[and be a wise man" ³.

Our knowledge of the life of ʿAmr b. al-Īṭnāba is meagre. ʿAmr b. ʿĀmir b. Zayd Manāt b. Mālik b. Taʿlabā b. Kaʿb b. al-Ḥaẓraḡ is a well known poet often quoted in literary anthologies ⁴. He is

---

¹. See the interpretation of Hirschberg about the continuous penetration of the Bedouins and their raids against the Jewish population, *op. cit.*, 127 ult., 128 sup.
³. *ib.*, f. 57 v.: wa-min šīrī hi ʿAmrī bni l-Īṭnābātī l-Ḥaẓraḡīyyī lammā mallakahu l-Neʾmānī bnu l-Mundirī ʿalā l-Madīnati; aliknī—etc.
⁴. *IBN I;AM, Gamharat ansāb al-ʿArab*, p. 345, l. 17 (ed. LÉVı-Provençal, Cairo 1948); ʿṢADR AL-DĪN, *al-Ḥamāsa al-Baṣriyya*, I, 3 (see the references supplied by the editor, MUḤTAR AL-DĪN AHMAD, Hyderabad 1964); *AL-* ʿASKARI, *al-MAṣūn*, p. 136 (see the references given by the editor ʿAbd al-
described as "the most honoured of the Ḥaẓraḡ"¹, as the "best horseman of his people"², as a "king of al-Ḥiḡāz"³. The opinion of W. Caskel that the story of the meeting of ‘Amr b. al-Ītnābā with al-Ḥārīṭ b. Ẓālim is of legendary character⁴ seems to be sound. It is however noteworthy that Abū ‘Ubayda stresses in his record that ‘Amr b. al-Ītnābā was a friend of Ḥālid b. Ǧaʿfar, the leader of the Kilāb, who was in close contact with the ruler of al-Ḥira and who was murdered by al-Ḥārīṭ b. Ẓālim⁵ at the court of al-Ḥuʾmān. The names of the persons mentioned in the stories about ‘Amr b. al-Ītnābā⁶ like al-Ḥārīṭ b. Ẓālim, Zayd al-Ḥayl⁷, Ḥālid b. Ǧaʿfar, al-Ḥuʾmān b. al-Mundūr, help us to fix the time of his life as the second half of the sixth century.

The tradition about the appointment of ‘Amr as a "king", which meant in fact as a representative of al-Ḥira and a collector of the taxes on al-Madīna, by al-Ḥuʾmān seems authentic. Invention can hardly be suspected as there were no prominent men among the descendents of ‘Amr who would have been interested to boast of this appointment. The two verses of Ṭabīt, the father of Ḥassān, confirm the authenticity of the story, which is thus complementary

---

¹ Salām Hārūn, Kuweit 1960; Ibn al-Ṣaḡārī, al-Ḥamāsā, p. 112 (Hyderabad 1345 AH); Ibn Ḥabīb, Man nisībā ilā ummīhi min al-ṣūʿarāʾ (Nawādīr al-maḥfūẓāt, I, 95, 201—ed. ‘Abd al-Salām Hārūn, Cairo 1951); Al-Muṣarrād, al-Ǧāmil, I, 89, IV, 68 (ed. Muḥ. Abū l-Ǧafīl Ibrāhīm, Cairo 1956); L. ‘A., s.v. tnīb; S. M. Ḥūṣain, Early Arabic Odes, p. 42-44 (Ar. text; and see the references of the Editor; and see pp. 41-42 of the English text—Dacca 1938).

² One of the descendents of ‘Amr b. al-Ītnābā was Qaraqā b. Kaʿb b. ‘Amr, a Companion of the Prophet. See Ibn Ḥazm, op. cit., ib.; and see about Qaraqā Ibn Ḥaḍār: al-Ġūdā, V, 236, No. 7092; Ibn Saʿd, Ṭabqat, VI, 17 (Beirut 1957); Al-Minqārī, Waqʿāt Siffin, p. 17 (ed. ‘Abd al-Salām Hārūn, Cairo 1387 AH).

³ In the record of the battle of Fārī (Ibn al-Ǧāḥīr: al-Ǧāmil, I, 409-410) the leader of the Ḥaẓraḡ is "‘Āmīr b. al-Ītnābā", which seems to be an erroneous reading for "‘Āmīr b. al-Ītnābā. (The verses are by ‘Amr b. al-Ītnābā).


⁶ Al-Ǧānī, X, 28.


---

¹ Al-Marzubani, Muqam al-Suwarah, p. 203 (ed. F. Krenkow, Cairo 1354 AH).


³ Al-Ǧānī, X, 28.


⁶ In the record of the battle of Fārī (Ibn Al-Ǧāḥīr: Al-Ǧāmil, I, 409-410) the leader of the Ḥaẓraḡ is "‘Āmīr b. al-Ītnābā", which seems to be an erroneous reading for "‘Āmīr b. al-Ītnābā. (The verses are by ‘Amr b. al-Ītnābā).

⁷ Al-Ǧānī, XVI, 53.
to the tradition recorded by Ibn Ḥurdāḏbeh and attests the continuity of the Persian control over al-Madīna during the second part of the sixth century.

In order to secure the loyalty of the tribes was essential. Some formations of the tribes fought on the side of the military units of al-Ḥira, tribal chiefs had to guarantee the security of the caravans sent by the rulers of al-Ḥira which passed in their territory, rebellious chiefs had to be tamed and trade had to be made safe.

In order to secure the loyalty and co-operation of the chief of the tribe some prerogatives of the ruler were ceded to him. In this way the ṣiḏrāfī was created. The ṣidf sat—according to tradition—in the court of the king, on his right hand, rode with the king, got a fourth of the spoils and booty of the raids gained by the king and received some payment from the king's subjects. The ṣidfs are said to have had at the court the position of the ṣawīs in the Islamic period. At the court of al-Ḥira the clan of Yarbūʾ of Tamīm had the privilege of the ṣidf. Chamberlains, ṣarāf, of the kings, are mentioned as well in the tribe of Dabbā, in the clan of Taym, in the clan of Sadūs (of Ṣaybān) and in the tribe of Taḡlib. The institution of the ṣidf is often mentioned in ancient poetry. The Banū Yarbūʾ of Tamīm boasted that they were the ṣarāf of the kings of al-Ḥira.


2. L. 'A., s.v. "qsr"; Kuṭayyir ʿAzza, Dīwān, II, 49 (ed. Henri Père, Alger-Paris 1930); and see Rothstein, Die Dynastie der Ḵāṣibiden, p. 133.

3. Ibn al-Kalbī, Ğamhara, ms. f. 114 b; al-Balāḍurī, Ansāb, ms. f. 952 (Ḫulayla—or Ḡulayla—b. Ṭābit b. ʿAbd al-ʿUzza).

4. al-Balāḍurī, op. cit., f. 933 b (The Banū Ṣīḥāb).

5. Ibn Durayd, al-ʿIṣṭiqāq, p. 352. Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿārif, p. 45 (Cairo 1935); they were the ṣarāf of Kinda; and see Rothstein, op. cit., ib., n. 2; and see the verse of Labīd "wa-ṣarāfī l-mulākī ṣuḥūdū" in his Dīwān, p. 35 (ed. I. ʿAbbās, Kuwait 1962); L. 'A., s.v. "ṣidf"; al-Ṭaʿālībī, Timār al-ḡulūb, p. 144 (Cairo 1908); Yāqūt, al-Buldān, s.v. Uṣāqa; Naqā'id, p. 299; Abū ʿUbayda, Maqāṣ al-Qurṭān, I, 315 (ed. Fuʿād Sezgin, Cairo 1955); for the ṣidf of Mālik b. Nuwayrā, see Nöldeke, Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber, pp. 126-27 (Hanover 1864); and compare the saying of Wāʾil b. Ḥuḡr al-Ḥadramī to Muḥāwiya: "Mā aḏunnu ʿalayka bi-haqihi l-niqāṭi, wa-liikin lasta min arḍfī l-mulākī wa-ʿakkhu an wāyyata bika"—al-Ṭabarānī, al-Muʿjam al-ṣagīr, p. 242 (Delhi 1311 AH); Ibn Katīr, al-Sīra al-nabawīyya, IV, 154-55 (ed. Muṭṭafā ʿAbd al-ṣāḥib, Cairo 1966).

These socio-political conditions of the second part of the sixth century gave rise to another institution, that of the Dawū l-ākāl. Ibn Ḥabīb defines the Dawū l-ākāl as follows: “The Dawū l-ākāl are from Wāʾil; they are the noble among them. The king used to grant them fiefs” 1. A description of these Dawū l-ākāl, stressing their social position, is given by al-ʿAʿṣā:

“Around me are the men of the fiefs of Wāʾil like the night (i.e. numerous), nomads and sedentary. (Men) feeding on meat (i.e. the needy and the hungry—K.) in winter and obliging the gambler of maysir to care for food [(of the poor)]” 2.

Further the Dawū l-ākāl are mentioned in another verse of al-ʿAʿṣā in which the people of the ākāl are depicted as noble men serving the army of the king of al-Ḥira.

“You are the inherited one, the excellent of [the chiefs
The people of the leathern tents and the fiefs’” 3.

Ibn Ḥabīb shows a clear line between the tribes whose chiefs co-operated with Persia or with the rulers of al-Ḥira and were granted fiefs as a reward and the tribes who pursued a policy of independence towards al-Ḥira. As to Muḍar—states Ibn Ḥabīb—they were laqāḥ. They did not submit to the obedience of the kings (lā yadinūna li-l-mulūkī) except some clans of Tamīm, namely those whose abode was Yamāma and the adjacent regions” 4.

The case of fiefs granted by the rulers of al-Ḥira to the loyal chiefs is well illustrated by the story of Qays b. Masʿūd al-Šaybānī.

ka-l-layli min badīn wa-min ḥādirī
Al-muṣʿimū l-lahma ighā mā ʿatalaw
wa-l-ḥārīlī l-qāīla “alā l-yrāṣīrī”.
3. Al-ʿAʿṣā, op. cit., I, 56 (p. 11) “Gunduka l-tālīdu l-ʿatīqu min al-sādātī
ahlī l-qibābī wa-l-ākālī” ; and see commentary: “al-ṭairūfu l-tālīdu”. Al-Bakrī, Simf al-laʿālī, p. 269 (ed. Maymanī, Cairo 1936); but see al-Zawzānī, Nayl al-arab, p. 185 (Cairo 1328 AH): gunduka l-tālīdu l-ṭairūfu min al-gārātī ahlī l-ḥābātī wa-l-ışkālī. The expression “people of leathern tents” denotes their high position in the tribe.
Qays b. Mas‘ūd was granted the lands of Ta‘ff Ubulla by Khusrau II Parwez (after the death of al-Nu‘mān III) against a guaranteed that Bakr b. Wā’il would refrain from raiding the territory of the Sawād. Contrary to Saybān the Mu‘ḍar were independent. And it is noteworthy that one of the strongest tribes of the federation of Mu‘ḍar was Tamīm.

Traditions of some importance about the relations between al-Ḥira and the tribes are recorded by Abū l-Baqā. Discussing the position of the kings of al-Ḥira Abū l-Baqā remarks that the Bedouins (al-‘Arab), being used to blowing up things and to exaggerate, used to call the rulers of al-Ḥira “kings”. The Chosroes of Persia—states Abū l-Baqā—granted the rulers of al-Ḥira some territories as fiefs and as assistance for them in their governorship (scil. on behalf of the kings of Persia—K.). They collected the taxes of these territories and used them for their expenses. They bestowed from it presents on some of their own people and on people (of the Bedouins—K.) whom they blandished and tried to win over. Sometimes they granted them localities from the fiefs presented to them.

Abū l-Baqā points out that these fiefs granted by the Persian rulers were restricted to the border-lands in the vicinity of al-Ḥira. The rulers of al-Ḥira could not trespass these lands, because the territories (of Persia) belonged to the Dihqāns, who vied among themselves for their possession. Abū l-Baqā remarks that the fiefs granted by the kings of al-Ḥira were very meagre in comparison with the flourishing state of the country.

Of some interest is the passage in which Abū l-Baqā records:}


“Fa-inna bayta Tamīmin dū samī‘ta bihi:
fihi tanammal wa-arṣat ʿizzah Muḍaru

details about the amount of taxes collected by al-Nu‘mān from the fiefs granted to him by the Persian king\(^1\): “the sum of (the taxes collected from) the fiefs given by Kīsra to al-Nu‘mān was 100,000 dirham. In some of the books of al-Ḥīra it was mentioned, that the lands given by Kīsra as fief were the *rustaq* of Saylahēn, Qaṭā‘ī‘i‘ bani Ṭalḥa and Sanām Ṭībāq. This I have seen (i.e. read it) in a book”.

The author identifies the names of the localities mentioned with names current in his time. They were located in the region of al-Naḡaf. The sum of the tax collected was a mere 100,000 dirhams, notwithstanding—as Abū l-Baqā‘ points out—the fertility of the lands, which yielded a yearly average of 30,000 *karr* in addition to fruits and other produce\(^2\).

Al-Nu‘mān granted some of these lands to some important persons. Sawādā b. ‘Adīyy (from Tamīm) was granted a place which was named after him “al-Sawādiyya”\(^3\). ‘Abd Hind b. Nūḡam al-Iyādí got al-Ḥusūš\(^4\).

When Khusrau II Parvez appointed Iyās b. Qabīṣa as ruler over al-Ḥīra he granted him ‘Ayn Tamr and eighty villages located on the border of the Sawād. Iyās b. Qabīṣa granted Aqsās as a fief to Mālik b. Qays and the place was later known as Aqsās Mālik\(^5\).

The interrelation between the rulers of al-Ḥīra and the friendly chiefs of the tribes is defined by Abū l-Baqā‘ as follows: “They

---


3. See **Yaḥūt**, *op. cit.*, s.v. al-Sawādiyya and al-Sawāriyya.

4. See **Yaḥūt**, *op. cit.*, s.v. al-Ḥusūs; this ‘Abd Hind b. Zayd has been a friend of ‘Adīyy b. Zayd. (**Abū l-Baqā‘**, *op. cit.*, f. 146 a; and see the *Diwān* of ‘Adīyy b. Zayd, p. 68 (ed. Muḥ. Gabbār Al-Mu‘ayhīd, Baḡdād 1965). From his descendants is said to have been the judge Abū Du‘ād al-Iyādí. (**Abū l-Baqā‘**, *op. cit.*, f. 146 a).

5. **Abū l-Baqā‘**, *op cit.*, 145 b; see **Yaḥūt**, *op. cit.*, s.v. Aqsās, where the pedigree of Mālik is given as follows: Mālik b. ‘Abd Hind b. Nūḡam b. Mana‘a (but the story of the grant is not mentioned).
had governors on the borders of the country from al-'Irāq till al-Baḥrāyin. Each of these governors ruled the Bedouins under his protection in the same way" 1.

But the kings of al-Ḥira themselves were in fact merely governors on behalf of the Akāsira. The Bedouins did not submit to their obedience. Only clans and tribes dwelling in territories under the control of the rulers of al-Ḥira were compelled to submit and to pay some taxes (iṭāwa) as they dwelt in their territory. These tribes virtually feared to be crushed by their military forces. When the tribe departed and left the territory, thus being beyond the reach of the rulers of al-Ḥira, it became unapproachable (imtānāṭ). “Obedience—maintains Abū l-Baqā’—did not mean for the tribes more than to refrain from raiding the Sawād and the border territories” 2.

Tribes could thus be divided—according to the classification of Abū l-Baqā’—into three groups: a) The independent tribes, laqāḥ 3, who raided the territory of the rulers of al-Ḥira and were raided by them, b) tribes who concluded pacts with the rulers of al-Ḥira on certain terms, and c) tribes who pastured in the vicinity of al-Ḥira and were obedient to the rulers of al-Ḥira. But even these tribes were blandished by the rulers of al-Ḥira, who tried to win their hearts. The nearest neighbours of al-Ḥira were Rabīʿa and Tamīm 4. For the expression laqāḥ Abū l-Baqā’ quotes the verses

---

1. Abū l-Baqā’, op. cit., f. 100: “wa-kāna lahum ʿummālun ʿalā ʿatīra fī bilādī min al-ʿIrāq ila l-Baḥrāyin ḥakama kullu wāḥidin minhum maʿa (sic!) man bi-izāʿihi min al-ʿArabi fī ḥīmāyatīhi mišā ḥādī ḥaḫmi”.
4. See L. ‘ A. s.v. ḥāq; and see al-Ḡāḥīz, Maqāmāt al-rasāʿīl, p. 59 (Fahr al-Sūdān ʿalā l-biḍān, Cairo 1324 AH): “fa-l-ṭaqāṭu l-baḥāḏu llaqū lā yuʿaddī lā l-mulūkī l-urbaʿa, wa-l-urbanu huwa l-ḥaragī wa-huwa l-īṭāwatu”; in the new edition of Abū al-Salām Hārūn, I, 187 (Rasāʾīl al-Ḡāḥīz, Cairo 1964) the word is read “aryān”;
of 'Amr b. Ḥawt al-Riyahi and the saying of Abū Zam'a al-Aswad b. al-Muṭṭalib b. Asad when he opposed the crowning of 'Uṭmān b. al-Ḥuwayriṭ as "king" of Mecca on behalf of the Byzantine ruler.

As Laqāh the author mentions Asad b. Ḥuzayma and Gaṭafān. They were independent in their relations with the kings of al-Ḥira. Only few of them visited the court of al-Ḥira as merchants, relatives or visitors.

To the second group of tribes belonged Sulaym and Hawāzin. "Sulaym and Hawāzin—reports Abū l-Baqā'—used to conclude pacts with the kings of al-Ḥira. They (nevertheless) were not submissive to them. They used to take their merchandise for them and to sell it at 'Ukāz and in other markets. Thus they got (in these relations) profits with them. Sometimes an individual or a group of them came to the king (of al-Ḥira), took parts in his raids and shared with him (i.e. with the king) some spoils. Then they (i.e. the people of the tribe) departed. The caravans of the kings with their goods could only enter Nağd and go beyond Nağd with the escort of men of the tribes.

This passage may shed some light on the battles of al-Fīgār caused by the murder of 'Urwā al-Raḥhāl (from 'Āmir) by al-Barrād (from Kinānā).

The changing relations between the kings of al-Ḥira and the chiefs of the tribes are reflected in the story of Hubayra b. 'Āmir b. Salama al-Quṣayrī of the 'Āmir b. Sa'ṣa'a and his son Qurra b.
Hubayra. Hubayra is said to have attacked the camp of al-Nu‘mān b. al-Mundīr, captured his wife al-Mutagharrida and taken booty and spoils. His son Qurra was entrusted by al-Nu‘mān to guard a caravan to ‘Ukāz against Bedouins who were not obedient to the king of al-Ḥira (yahfīrūhā ‘alā man layṣa fi dinīhi min al-‘Arabi). The events took place when al-Nu‘mān was compelled to flee before the Persian king. Qurra seized the caravan for himself. Then the Banū ‘Uqayl came to the Banū Ḥuṣayr asking for a share in the seized caravan, arguing that they were afraid of the possible consequences of the action of Qurra. When the Ḥuṣayr refused to grant them a share, a quarrel flared up. Hostilities between the two clans were avoided when Ḥuṣayr and ‘Uqayl agreed to take as arbiter the famous leader of ‘Āmir b. Sa‘ṣa‘a, Mu‘āwiya b. Mālik nicknamed “Mu‘awwīd al-Ḥukama”.

This passage is instructive: while the father of Qurra is recorded to have attacked the camp of al-Nu‘mān, al-Nu‘mān was compelled to entrust the escort of his caravan to his son. It is an evidence of the weakness of the last ruler of al-Ḥira and of fickle policy of al-Ḥira toward the chiefs of the independent tribes of ‘Āmir b. Sa‘ṣa‘a. It may be stressed that the ‘Āmir b. Sa‘ṣa‘a were in close relations with Mecca and the interests of Mecca might have some bearings upon the attitudes and the actions of ‘Āmir b. Sa‘ṣa‘a towards al-Ḥira.

The clever use of intertribal feuds and hostilities by the rulers of al-Ḥira to their own advantage is another aspect of the relations of al-Ḥira with the tribes, analysed with deep insight by Abū l-Baqā'. There was always some fight between tribes—says Abū l-Baqā'. The kings of al-Ḥira exploited it for their own ends; when they intended to raid a tribe they used to win the hearts of its enemies, to solicit the help of a group against another and “beat one by the
other’’. Considerable forces of a tribe used in fact to rally and join the troops of al-Ḥira in order to fight together against a hostile tribe or in the hope of getting spoils and booty. After the raid the forces of the tribe departed to their abode and the kings of al-Ḥira were left with their own forces only.

The co-operation between the kings of al-Ḥira and the tribes in their military actions is well illustrated by the story of the raid of al-Qurnatayn. According to the report of al-Balāḍuṣi al-Nu‘mān equipped his brother (from his mother’s side), Wābara b. Rūmānīs with strong forces of the Ma‘add and others. He sent for Ḍirār b. ‘Āmir al-Ḍabbī who came with 9 sons, each of whom already experienced in warfare and leadership. Another leader of the Ḍabba, Ḥubayṣ b. Dulaf, came as well. Al-Nu‘mān sent with them to Mecca a caravan and instructed them to attack the Banū ‘Āmir b. Ṣa‘ṣa‘a after they had finished their trading transactions. The cause of this raid is given in the version of Ibn al-Atīr: the forces of al-Ḥira and their allies were sent against the ‘Āmir b. Ṣa‘ṣa‘a in retaliation for an attack of the Banū ‘Āmir on a caravan of al-Nu‘mān sent by him to Ḫūkāz.

When Qurayṣ returned from Ḫūkāz to Mecca, these forces of the king under the command of his brother attacked the Banū ‘Āmir. The Banū ‘Āmir, however, having been warned by ‘Abd Allāh b. Ǧudān, fought with great bravery and defeated the forces of the king of al-Ḥira. ḍirār b. ‘Āmir, the leader of the Ḍabba, was rescued by his sons when he was attacked by Abū Barā‘a ‘Āmir b. Mālik (the brother of Mu‘āwiya b. Mālik, the uncle of the poet ‘Āmir b. Ṭūfayl), one of the leaders of the ‘Āmir b. Ṣa‘ṣa‘a. Ḥubayṣ b. Dulaf was captured by a sign of ḍirār b. ‘Āmir. Wābara b.

1. Abū l-Baqā‘, op. cit., f. 100 a: “wa-kānati l-‘Arabu aydan là ṯablā fi ḍāti baynihā min al-dimā‘i wa-l-ḥurūbī wa-l-muḡawartī fīmā baynahum . . . wa-kāna l-maliku idā arāda ṭawāta ḥayyin min al-‘Arabī islamāla a’dārhum ‘alayhim . . . wa-istanāda bi-qawmin ‘alā qawmin wa-ḥarabā ba’dahum bi-ḥaḏīn’”.
2. Al-Balāḍuṣi, Ansāb, ms. f. 948 b.
7. According to the version of Ibn al-Kalbī, as recorded by al-Balāḍuṣi, Ansāb, ms. ff. 949 a and 956 b he was killed at the “Day of al-Qurnatayn”.

(wa-qala bnu l-Kalbī: qutila Ḥubayṣun fi yawmi l-Qurnatayn).
Rūmānis was captured by the warrior and poet Yazīd b. al-Ša‘iq. He freed him after he had paid a ransom of 1000 camels, 2 singing girls and an allotment of his possessions. The defeated forces were led back to al-Nu‘mān by Dirār b. ‘Amr. The victory of the Āmir was mentioned in the verses of Yazīd b. al-Ša‘iq:

“Tarakna aḥā l-Nu‘māni yarsufu ʿāniyan:
wa-gadda’na aḡnāda l-mulūki l-ṣanā‘iʾi‘ā”

“They left the brother of al-Nu‘mān walking in
[shackles as captive
and mutilated the troops of the kings, the ṣanā‘i’ī”

An interesting aspect of the battle is brought out in the version of Abū l-Baqā’ī: Yazīd b. al-Ša‘iq came to al-Nu‘mān with his brother, the captive, asking the promised ransom. Al-Nu‘mān asked him how it happened that a corpulent man like his brother was captured by a Yazīd b. al-Ša‘iq (a man of short stature). Yazīd answered: “His people were absent, my people attended (the battle)”. It is of course a hint, that his tribe, the attacked one (‘Āmir) were superior in battle to the mercenary troops of the ṣanā‘i’ī. The Kalb, the tribe of Wabara, did not take part in the battle; Wabara was a leader appointed by the ruler of al-Ḥīra.

For understanding of the policy of al-Ḥīra it may be mentioned that this very Dirār b. ‘Amr—according to a tradition recorded by Abū l-Baqā’ī in his Manāqib—attacked the camp of al-Mundīr, the father of al-Nu‘mān. It happened when al-Mundīr returned to al-Ḥīra from his visit to al-Ḥārīt b. ḫīṣn b. ḫādam al-Kalbī.
with the gift given to him by al-Ḥāṭir: the bondwoman Salmā, his later wife, the mother of his son al-Nuʿmān. Only by the intercession of al-Ḥāṭir b. Ḥiṣn—did Dirār agree to return the seized property of al-Mundir, inter alia the bondwoman Salmā.

Some time after the battle of al-Qurnatayn 1 Dirār attended the market of 'Ukāz 2. Dirār attended the battle as an aged man. He is said to have visited the court of al-Mundir b. Māʿ al-Samāʿ, had quarrelled with Abū Marḥab, Rabīʿa b. Ḥaṣaba b. Aznam of the Yarbuʿ 3 and had cut his forearm. He asked for the protection of the king failed to grant him protection. He was granted the protection of Ǧušayṣ (or Ḥušayṣ) b. Nimrān al-Ri’yāḥi 4.

Of interest are the relations of Dirār with Tamīm; he gave his daughter Muʿāda as wife to Maʿbad b. Zurārā 5. The version of Ibn al-ʿAṭīr states that al-Nuʿmān summoned with the Banī Dabba the Banī Ribāb and Tamīm; they responded and took part in the battle.

Some verses of Aws b. Ǧaḥar 6, Labīd 7 and Yazīd b. al-Šaʿiq 8 give the impression that the battle was a grave one.

It is noteworthy that Ibn al-ʿAṭīr stresses in his report (on the authority of Abū ʿUbayda), that the ‘Āmir b. Ṣaʿṣaʿa were Ǧums, kindred with the Qurayš and that they were Laqāḥ. (kāna Banū ʿĀmiri bni Ṣaʿṣaʿata ǧumṣan, wa-l-ǧumsu Qurayṣun wa-man laḥu fiḥim wiḥdātun). This points to the connections between Qurayš and the ‘Āmir and explains why ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥudʿān 9 sent to

---

1. See about the battle: Yaqūt, Buldān, s.v. Sullān; Ibn Ḥazm, Ḡamharat ansāb al-ʿArab, p. 194; about the location of the place: U. Thīlo, Die Ortsnamen in der altarabischen Poesie, s.v. Lūbān, ʿUyūn (Wiesbaden 1958).

2. Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd, Sarḥ Nahg al-Balāğa, IV, 308, 362 (Cairo 1329 AH).

3. About Abū Marḥab see: Ibn Ḥabīb, Asmāʾ al-muṭṭālīna (Nawādir al-maḥṭūtāt, VII, 139); about the quarrel between Dirār and Abū Marḥab see Al-Dabbī, Antūl al-ʿArab, p. 15; about Dirār at the court of al-Ḥira see Al-Maydānī, Maḥmaʾ al-amṭal, I, 44 (Cairo 1352 AH).


5. Al-Balāḏūrī, Ansāb, ms. f. 948 b, 954 a; Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd, op. cit., IV, 308; Al-Qahīz, al-Bayān, I, 168 (ed. Al-Sandūbī, Cairo 1932).


7. Sarḥ Diwān Labīd, p. 133 (ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās, Kuwait 1962); see note 2 of the editor, who did not identify the battle.


9. See about him: Ibn Ḥiṣām, al-Sira, I, 141 (ed. Al-Saqqa, al-ʿAbyarī, Šalabī, Cairo 1936); Al-Balāḏūrī, Ansāb, I, 74, 101 (ed. Muḥ. Ḥamīdullāh,
warn Banū ‘Āmir of the approaching forces of al-Ḥira, enabling
them to prepare themselves for battle. One may assume that there
was some co-operation between Qurayš and ‘Āmir, that Mecca had
some influence on the actions of ‘Āmir and that this had some
bearing on the attitude of ‘Āmir towards al-Ḥira.

It is plausible, that the booty of the raided caravan of the king
of al-Ḥira was sold at ‘Ukāz; a case of this kind is recorded in Ibn
Habib’s al-Munammaq 1.

For understanding of the relations between al-Ḥira and the
tribes the reports about the taxes collected by the kings of al-Ḥira
and the position of the tax-collectors are of some importance.
Analyzing the sources of income of the rulers of al-Ḥira and the
position of al-Ḥira Abū l-Baqā’ mentions the income from the fiefs
of al-‘Irāq and states: ‘That was the amount of their income from
al-‘Irāq. But the bulk of their revenues for their livelihood and
their profits was gained from trade, from booty of their raids
against the Bedouins, against the border lands of Syria, against
every territory they could raid and from collection of taxes from
the obedient tribes; they collected in this way great quantities of
cattle’” 2.

The rulers of al-Ḥira appointed the leaders of friendly tribes as
collectors of taxes, as military leaders of divisions of their forces
and as officials in territories in which they exercised some control.
‘Amr b. Šārik, the father of al-Ḥawfazān, was in charge of the
police troops of al-Mundir and al-Nuʿmān (waliya šuraṭa l-Mundiri
wa-l-Nuʿmāni min baʿdihii), 3 Sinān b. Mālik of the Aws Manāt (of
the Namir b. Qāsiṭ) was appointed by al-Nuʿmān b. al-Mundir as
governor of Ubulla 4.

The rulers of al-Ḥira appointed the leaders of friendly tribes as
collectors of taxes, as military leaders of divisions of their forces
and as officials in territories in which they exercised some control.
‘Amr b. Šarīk, the father of al-Ḥawfazān, was in charge of the
police troops of al-Mundir and al-Nuʿmān (waliya šuraṭa l-Mundiri
wa-l-Nuʿmāni min baʿdihii), 3 Sinān b. Mālik of the Aws Manāt (of
the Namir b. Qāsiṭ) was appointed by al-Nuʿmān b. al-Mundir as
governor of Ubulla 4.

In the service of ‘Amr b. Hind there was the Tamīmī al-Ġallāq b.

2. ABU L-BAQA’, op. cit., f. 145 a: ‘fa-hādā kāna qadra nasibī l-qawmi min
al-‘Irāqi. Wa-innamā kāna ḍulla maʿāshihi wa-akṣara amwālihihi mā kānū
yuṣibūnahū min al-arbāḥi fl l-tīqārātī wa-yaqnimūnahu min al-magāzi wa-l-
tīqārātī alā l-‘Arabi wa-afrāfi l-Sāmi wa-kullī arḍīn yuṃkinuḥum ḍazwahā
wa-yuqtabūna l-itāwala minman dāna ḍawhū wa-ṣafīrū bihi min al-‘Arabi;
fa-yuṭāmi′u lāhūn min dālika l-kāfiρū min al-anʿāmī’.”
4. IBN AL-KALBĪ, op. cit., f. 232 a; W. CASKEL, op. cit., II, 513; these Aws
Manāt were exterminated by Ḥālid b. al-Walīd in the wars of the ridda.
(see IBN ḤAZM, Gamharat ansāb al-ʿArab, p. 284).
Qays b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr b. Hammām. He is mentioned in a verse of Diğāga as a leader of an attacking troop together with al-Ḥārīt b. Bayba and Ḥāġib. Gallāq was sent by ‘Amr b. Hind to submit the Tağlib; he raided them and killed many of them. This event is mentioned by al-Ḥārīt b. Ḩillīza in his Mu’allaqā. According to Aḏānī and the commentary of al-Tibrīzī al-Gallāq was in charge of the white camels (haǧā’in) of al-Nu’mān. According to Simt al-Laṭālī he was appointed by al-Nu’mān who put him in charge of the white camels of the tribes adjacent to his country (ista’malahu l-Nu’mānu bnu l-Munḏirī ‘alā haǧā’iṇī man yalī ardahu min al-‘Arab). The report of al-Bakrī indicates that al-Gallāq was entrusted with collecting taxes. ‘Uqfān b. ‘Aṣīm al-Yarbūḥ hid from al-Gallāq—

5. Ḥāḏib—obviously Ḥāḏib b. Zurārā.
7. And see Ibn al-Kalbī, op. cit., f. 72 a and al-Balāḏūrī, op. cit., f. 993 b.
11. al-Bakrī, Simt al-laṭālī, p. 746 (ed. al-Mayāmī, Cairo 1936); and see L. ‘A., s.v. alī; according to al-Balāḏūrī, op. cit., f. 798 b ‘Uqfān b. Qays b. ‘Aṣīm came to Arwā bint Kurayz (another version: the visitor was Muṭāmmīm b. Nuwayra). A verse of ‘Uqfān see Ibn Qutayba, al-Maṭānī al-kabīr p. 105; and see al-Balāḏūrī, Ansāb, V, 1 (ed. S. D. Goitein, Jerusalem 1936); he is said to have been a companion of the Prophet (see Ibn Ḥaḍār, al-Iṣāba, No. 5619).
according to this report—his white camels. When pursued by al-Gallāq he went to al-Nuʿmān with the herd and asked for his protection. He was in fact granted protection and al-Nuʿmān "did not take anything from his herd" (wa-lam yaḥud minhā—i.e. al-ibil—ṣayʿan).

The story of al-Gallāq illustrates the relations which existed between al-Ḥira and a chief of a tribal group. Al-Gallaq was entrusted by the king of al-Ḥira to subdue the Tağlib, he commanded a military unit and it is plausible that he had at his disposal some force for carrying out his task as tax collector. This may explain how the kings of al-Ḥira could impose their rule on tribal groups in cooperation with friendly chiefs and loyal tribal forces.

A clash between the tax-collector of al-Ḥira and a clan grew into a clash between tribal units. According to the tradition recorded in al-ʾIqd 1 on the authority of Abu ʿUbayda—the Banū Usayyid (a clan of the ‘Amr b. Tamīm) captured Wāʾil b. Șuraym al-Yaškūrī (from Bakr b. Wāʾil) and killed him. When they killed him they chanted: “Yā ayyuha l-māʾiḥu dalwi dānaka” 2. His brother Bāʾît, raided the Usayyid, killed a nobleman of this clan and upon his body he killed 100 men of the same clan. This version is also given by al-Bakrī in Muʿğam mā staʾğam 3.

According to another version given by al-Bakrī 4 Wāʾil b. Șuraym was sent by ‘Amr b. Hind as tax-collector (baʿatahu saʿiyan) of the Banū Tamīm. They threw him into a well and stoned him. He was killed by the clan of Usayyid.

A more detailed version is given by al-Riyāsī in his commentary of the Ḥamāṣa 5. All the clans of Tamīm paid the demanded tax (al-itawa) to Wāʾil b. Șuraym. When he came to the Usayyid they collected the cattle and sheep (scil. of the tax) and ordered them to be counted. When he was sitting on the side of a well there came an elder of the Usayyid and catching him unaware pushed

---

1. Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihī, al-ʾIqd al-farīd, III, 354.
3. Muʿğam mā staʾğam, s.v. Ḥāḡīr.
4. ib., s.v. Ṭuwaʿaylīs.
5. Al-Tibrīzī, Sīrḫ Diwān al-Ḥamāṣa, II, 112–13 (ed. Muḥ. Muḥyī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥāmid, Cairo 1938); and see Al-Bakrī, Simf, pp. 286, 476 (see the references given by Al-Maymānī in note 5).
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him into the well. The clan assembled and stoned him to death. His brother Bā'īt decided to avenge him, and together with his clan the Ğabar of Yaḵur, attacked the Banū Usayyid. His vow to fill the well with the blood of Usayyid was fulfilled; when some of them lowered the bucket into the well it came up full of blood.

Poets of Yaḵur mentioned the event in their verses. The event is recorded in al-Wazīr al-Maḏrībī’s Ḫnās 1 and Abū l-Baqā’s Maḏqīb 2. The clash lived long in the memory of the two clans, as is evident from the curses in these clans: “Taʿisat Ğabar, taʿisat Usayyid” 3.

W. Caskel denies the historical value of the story 4. This may be true. But the story faithfully reflects the attitude of the tribes towards the tax-collectors, their hatred towards them and the acts of violence committed against them.

Refusal to pay taxes to the king of al-Ḥira was the cause of a raid made by the troops of al-Nuʿmān against Tamīm. The story recorded by al-Mubarrad 5 on the authority of Abū ʿUbayda says that Tamīm refused to pay the tax to al-Nuʿmān. He sent against them his brother al-Rayyān b. al-Mundūr at the head of troops which belonged mainly to Bakr b. Wā’il. They raided the Tamīm, captured children and took their cattle as spoils. Abū l-Muṣamrag al-Yaskuri (ʿAmr b. al-Muṣamrag) composed a poem in which he described the defeat of Tamīm:

“Lammā raʿaw raʿyata l-Nuʿmānī muqbilatan:
qālū allā layta adnā dārīnā ʿAdanū
Yā layta umma Tamīmin lam takun ʿarafat:
Murra n wa-kānāt ka-man awdā bihi l-zamanu
In taqṭulūnā 6 fa-aʿyārūn muqaddaʿatun:
aw tunʿimū fa-qadīman minkumu l-minanu
Minhum Zuhayrūn wa-ʿAttābun wa-Muḥtaḏarūn:
wa-bnā Laqīṭīn wa-awdā fī l-waqā Qaṭānū”

1. ff. 28 b-29 a.
2. f. 123.
“When they saw the banner of al-Nu‘mān advancing
they said: “would that our nearest abode be ‘Adan
May the mother of Tamīm not have known Murr
and been like one destroyed by the (changes of) time”.
If you kill them—they are (merely) asses with cut
noses,
and if you show grace—since ancient time you have
shown grace.
From among them are Zuhayr, ‘Attāb and Muhtaḍār
and two sons of Laqīṭ; Qāṭan perished in the battle”.

The leaders of Tamīm came to al-Nu‘mān asking him to release
the captives. Al-Nu‘mān agreed that every woman who
wished to return to her relatives should be returned. All the women
questioned expressed the wish to be returned to their tribe except
the daughter of Qays b. ʿĀṣim who preferred to remain with the
man who captured her, ʿAmr b. al-Muṣamraḡ. Qays then vowed
to bury every female child, that would be born to him.

The version of al-ʿAgānī Ḥ does not mention that the cause of the
raid was the refusal to pay taxes, does not contain the verses and
records the story as a raid of al-Muṣamraḡ. But in this version the
raid is restricted to the Banū Saḍ and the name of the captured
woman is given: Rumayma bint Aḥmar Ḥ b. Gandal; her mother
was the sister of Qays b. ʿĀṣim.

Al-Muṣamraḡ is mentioned in a short account of al-Balāḍurī ᶦ:
some clans of Bakr b. Wāʿil raided the ʿUkl. They were however
defeated by the ʿUkl under the command of al-Namir b. Tawlab.
In one of the verses quoted by al-Balāḍurī and attributed to al-
Namir b. Tawlab, al-Muṣamraḡ is mentioned as a captive of the ʿUkl.

For the assessment of the story of the raid the verse recited by

---

1. ʿAgānī, XII, 144.
2. In the text “ʿAḥmad”, which is a mistake, Aḥmar b. ʿGandal was the
brother of Salāma b. ʿGandal (See Salāma b. ʿGandal, Diwān, p. 21—ed.
Cheikhho; and see al-ʿGāhīz, al-Bayān, III, 318; al-ʿBagdādī: Ḥizāna ʿal-
adab, II, 86; ʿAmr b. Kulpūm, Diwān, p. 3—ed. Krenkow; al-Balāḍurī,
op. cit., f. 1040 a; W. Caskel, op. cit., II, 146).
3. al-Balāḍurī, op. cit., f. 928 a.
5. “Rāḥa l-Muṣamraḡ lī-l-rīkābī ʿanābaṭan:
fi l-qiddī māṣūr ʿalā aḍbārīḥā”
(in text: Muṣamraḡ, ʿanābaṭan).
al-Nu‘mān—quoted by al-Mubarrad—is of some importance: when al-Nu‘mān forgave the Tamīm he said:

"Mā kānā ḍarra Tamīman law taḏammadahā: min faḍlinā mā ‘alayhi Qaysu ‘Aylānī"

"What would harm the Banū Tamīm if they [would be filled with our favour like the Qays ‘Aylān’ 1.

Al-Nu‘mān reminds the Banū Tamīm that by paying the īlāwa, and by their loyalty they would enjoy the favour of the king. The expression seems to point to the benefits bestowed by the king on the chiefs of the tribe Qays ‘Aylān, appointment of their chiefs as tax collectors, granting them pastures, etc. It is noteworthy that al-Mubarrad renders īlāwa by adyān, pointing to obedience and submission 2. The verse attributed to al-Nu‘mān reflects the efforts of al-Ḥira to gain the allegiance of some divisions of Tamīm (evidently the Sa‘d), who tried to free themselves from the dependence of al-Ḥira. That was manifested by the refusal to pay taxes.

Some light on the relations between al-Ḥira and Asad and Ğaṭafān is shed by a story recorded by Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb 3. These tribes—says Ibn Ḥabīb—were allies, not submitting to the obedience of the kings 4. ‘Amr b. Mas‘ūd and Ḥālid b. Naḍla 5 of Asad used to visit every year the ruler of al-Ḥira, stay with him and drink with him. During one of these visits al-Mundir al-Akbar suggested that they should accept his obedience. He said: ‘What prevents you from yielding to my obedience and to defend me like the Tamīm and Rabī‘a?’ They refused his offer, remarking: ‘These territories are not suitable for our herds. Besides (in the present situation) we are near to you; we are here in these sandy lands and if you summon us we will respond’. Al-Mundir understood that they were not willing to accept his offer and ordered to poison them. Whether Ḥālid b. Naḍla was really poisoned is rather doubtful 6; the story itself may be spurious. But the tendency of

1. Al-Mubarrad, op. cit., II, 84.
2. ib., p. 83, l. 2; and see above note 4, p. [II]. (adyān is identical with urbān and arvān).
4. Comp. p. 12, l. 3 of this paper (note 3).
5. See W. Caskel, op. cit., II, 179, 342.
the rulers of al-Ḥira to widen their influence by gaining the obedience of independent tribes is evident from this story. The answer of the two leaders seems to indicate that the ruler of al-Ḥira proposed that they should enter territories under his control, but that they refused to do so.  

The rulers of al-Ḥira could impose their sway on the tribes either by granting the chiefs benefits—as mentioned in the stories quoted above—or by force. The rulers based their power on their troops. The troops were, however, not levied from a certain tribe: there was no tribe ruling in al-Ḥira; it was a family. The rulers of al-Ḥira had therefore to rely on foreign troops or on mercenary troops. Only occasionally could they use a tribal force against another tribal unit, hostile to the first—as already mentioned.

The problem of the formations of Dawsar, al-Ṣahbā', al-Wadā'ī', al-Ṣanā'i' and al-Rahā'in was discussed by Rothstein. Rothstein, quoting the sources and arguing with Caussin de Perceval arrives at the conclusion that the Ṣanā'i' seem to have been a Praetorian-schael. This is confirmed by the commentary of the Naqā'id: Aḥmad b. 'Ubayd states that the Ṣanā'i are people upon whom the king bestows his favours (yaṣṭani'uhumu l-maliku) and they remain in his service. Another version is also given there: the Ṣanā'i of the kings are the helpers of the king, who raid with him, by whom the king is aided. An additional information is given by al-Mubarrad: most of them are from Bakr b. Wā'il.

The Waḍā'ī are defined by Rothstein as Besatzungstruppen. Rothstein argues that Waḍā'ī cannot refer to certain troops (... "dass damit unmöglich eine bestimmte Truppe gemeint sein kann"). He assumes that the Waḍā'ī may probably denote the troops of the garrisons and especially the border garrisons. Dawsar and Ṣahbā' refer probably—according to Rothstein—to the garrison-troops of al-Ḥira.

---

1. GAWAD ALI, Ta'riż al·Arab qabla l·Islām, IV, 73; ABU MISHAL: Nawaṣīr, I, 122-3 (ed. 'IZZAT ḤASAN, Damascus 1961—see the notes of the editor).
3. AL·HAMASA, al·Ağānī, al·'Iqd al·farid, AL·GAWHARI, Ṣahāb.
4. ROTHSTEIN, op. cit., p. 137.
5. p. 884.
6. AL·Kāmil, II, 83.
The definition of the *Waqā'i* given by Aḥmad b. ‘Ubayd is different. *Waqā'i*—says Ibn ‘Ubayd—are the troops levied by the king, 100 from every tribal group (*qawm*), more or less according to their number. Another definition quoted in the same source claims that the *Waqā'i* are the forces of the subjects of the kingdom. According to this definition Bevan renders *Waqā'i* in his glossary “levies, troops, raised by the Lakhmite king”. Ibn al-Aṭīr, however, defines them as “semi-chiefs”.

The opinion about the *Rahā'īn*, the hostages of the tribes is unanimous.

A detailed account about the troops of al-Ḥira is given by Abū l-Baqā’ī. Imru‘ l-Qays al-Badan—records Abū l-Baqā’ī—was the man who, imitating the division of the troops of Kisrā, divided his troops and gave them names, which remained till the end of the kingdom of al-Ḥira. People next in kinship to the king were called *Aḥlu l-rifā‘a*. There were leaders of the troops marching in front of the troops in battles and raids. The commanders of the divisions of the troops were the *Ardāf*.

A special division of the army of al-Ḥira was levied from among the Lahm. This troop was called *al-Ǧamarāt* or *al-Ǧimār*. As soldiers of this troop are mentioned the Urayš b. Irāš b. Ğazila of Lahm. Another version claims that this troop was formed from people levied from Lahm and other groups. Mentioned are Banū Silsila from Ğu‘ffī, Banū Māwīya from Kalb and groups from Banū Salamān b. Tu‘al of Tayy.

The *Ṣana‘ī* were a troop of outlaws from different tribes—records Abū l-Baqā’ī. Driven out from their tribes as murderers or culprits—they were protected by the king of al-Ḥira and gained
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4. See ĞAWĀD ‘ALI, op. cit., IV, 31; and see S. SMITH, *Events in Arabia*, in *BSOAS*, 1954, p. 430, Table A.
5. The word denoting the title of these leaders cannot be deciphered. It is written وَالْعَرَابَ.
7. See IBN ĞAZM, op. cit., p. 396.
safety. They attended his battles and raids. The other version about the Ṣana‘i‘ is given as well, they were men from Bakr b. Wā’il, from the Lahāzim, from Qays and ‘Abd al-Lāt and from Ṭa‘labā b. ‘Ukāba. Abū l-Baqā’ prefers the first version.

The Waḍā‘i‘—says Abū l-Baqā’—were a Persian unit, sent by Kisrā to the kings of al-Ḥira as reinforcements. They counted 1000 mounted soldiers (asāweira) and stayed a year at al-Ḥira. After a year’s service they used to return to Persia and were replaced by another troop sent from Persia. They formed in fact the strength of the ruler of al-Ḥira and through their force the ruler of al-Ḥira could compel the people of al-Ḥira as well as the Bedouin tribes to yield obedience to him. Without these forces the rulers were weakened, so that they had to fear the people of al-Ḥira.

The people of al-Ḥira consisted of three divisions Dawsar (or Dawsara), an elite troop of valiant and courageous warriors; al-Ṣahbā’, (but according to a contradictory tradition this was the troop of the Waḍā‘i‘); al-Malḥā’, so called because of the colour of the iron (i.e. their coat-of-mail).

The Rahā‘in were youths from Arab tribes taken by the kings of al-Ḥira as hostages guaranteeing that their tribes would not raid the territories of al-Ḥira and that they would fulfil the terms of their pacts and obligations between them and the kings of al-Ḥira. They counted—according to a tradition quoted by Abū l-Baqā’—500 youths and stayed 6 months at the court of al-Ḥira. After this period they were replaced by others.

These forces—of the people of al-Ḥira and the Persian troops—formed the strength, upon which the rulers of al-Ḥira relied. They fought with the rulers of al-Ḥira in obedience to Kisrā, in order to defend their abode, their families and possessions; they could not forsake them.

1. Two verses are quoted as evidence: the verse of Yazīd b. al-Ṣa‘i‘q (see above, n. 2, p. 15) and the verse of Ḥārīr:
   "Hamaynā yawma Dī Naṣābīn ḥīmānā: wa-aḥraznā l-ṣanā‘i‘a wa-l-nīḥābā"
   see his Dīwān (ed. al-Ṣāwī), p. 68, l. 1.
3. ib., f. 22 b; Abū l-Baqā‘ records the opinion of Ṭabari, that these two troops (Ṣahbā‘ and Dawsar) were Persian troops sent to al-Ḥira.
4. ib., f. 21 b; Gwād ‘Alī, op. cit., IV, 93.
5. Abū l-Baqā‘, op. cit., f. 99 b: “wa-kāna ḏundahum ilaḏīna bihimi muntā‘iḥum wa-izzuḥum aḥlu i-Hirāti l-musammauna bi-liḥa l-asmā‘i l-muqaddami ḥīrūhā; fa-kānū yuḥāribūna ma‘ahum ṯā‘atan li-Kisrā wa-
When the king of al-Ḥīra left with his troops for a military action, the people of al-Ḥīra afraid of an attack of the raiding Bedouins, used to stay in their fortified fortresses till the king returned with his troops. Sometimes the king concluded agreements with the neighbouring tribes—mainly from Bakr b. Wā’il and Tamīm—that they would not raid al-Ḥīra in his absence.

A peculiar aspect of the relations of the tribes with the rulers of al-Ḥīra is brought out by Abū l-Baqā’: tribes pasturing in regions adjacent to the kingdom of al-Ḥīra were compelled to get their provisions (al-mīra wa-l-kayl) from the kingdom of al-Ḥīra and therefore had to submit to the obedience of its rulers.

The rulers of al-Ḥīra were well acquainted with the situation in the tribe itself and used to intervene in the internal affairs of the tribes. A case of this kind is illustrated by the story of Laqīṭ b. Zurārā, who was convinced by al-Mundir b. Mā‘ al-Samā‘ to return the children of Ḍamra b. Gābir al-Nahṣali. His children were given as hostages to Laqīṭ for the children of Kubays and Rušayya and the Banū Nahṣal requested the king to intervene. Ḍamra himself was respected and liked by the king. His son, Ḍamra b. Ḍamra, was favoured by al-Mundir and al-Nu‘mān. He was one of his boon-companions and the king entrusted him with the care of his white camels.

Instructive is the case of Ḥāġīb b. Zurārā with the Banū ‘Adiyīy...
b. 'Abd Manāt 1. These 'Adiyy were in the service of Ḥāqīb and Ḥāqīb intended to turn them into his slaves by a writ of al-Mundīr 2.

Chiefs of tribal divisions co-operating with the rulers of al-Ḥira took part in their expeditions against Syria, visited their court and were favoured and respected. There was, however, no general line of continuous loyalty and allegiance to the rulers of al-Ḥira. Contending leaders of clans revolted against the agreements concluded by their chiefs with al-Ḥira from which they could not get the desired share of profit. There was continuous contention between chiefs on the favour of the ruler, which strengthened the feeling of lack of confidence. Sudden changes in the policy of Persia towards the rulers of al-Ḥira further enhanced the feeling of instability. The application of the method of "divide and impera" 3 as a means to control the tribes and the lack of sufficient and steady support for the loyal tribes—all this created a feeling of disappointment and bitterness.

The successful raids of small units of clans against al-Ḥira undermined the prestige of its rulers. 'Uṣayma b. Ḥālid b. Minqar 4 could oppose the orders of the king al-Nu'mān, when he demanded to extradite the man from 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'ā to whom 'Uṣayma gave shelter. When raided by the troops of al-Nu'mān 'Uṣayma summoned his people by the war-cry "Kawār" and defied the king. Directing the spear to the mane of his horse he said: "Go back, you wind-breaking king! Would I like to put the spear in another place—I would put it 5. The Banū 'Amr b. Tamim when attacked by the forces of the king al-Nu'mān succeeded in defeating his army and in plundering his camp 6. The cases of the victory of Bedouin tribes over the royal troops of al-Ḥira were sufficient proof of the weakness of the vassal kingdom of al-Ḥira, presaging its fall.

It was concurrent with the rise of Mecca to authority and power.

1. Probably the 'Adiy b. 'Abd Manāt b. Udd; see W. CASKEL, op. cit., II, 137.
2. IBN RAŠĪQ, al-'Umda, II, 174 (Cairo 1934).
4. Apparently Ḥisma b. Sinān b. Ḥālid b. Minqar as in IBN AL-KALBĪ's Ġamḥara, f. 78 b and in AL-BALĀDURI'S Ansāb, f. 1030 a; see ṢUFAYL AL-ĠANAWĪ, Diwān, p. 59 (No. 19), ed. F. KRENKOW; see W. CASKEL, Ḡamarat al-Nasab, II, 359 (Ḡisma b. Sinān).
5. MUḤ. IBN ḤABĪB, al-Muḥabbār, p. 354.