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The history of Tamīm in the times of the Jāhiliyya is of special importance. Information about Tamīm in Arabian sources point clearly to the close relations of the leaders of Tamīm with the kings of al-Ḥira. But there was another centre as well, with which Tamīm was closely connected: it was Mecca. It may be ventured to say that Tamīm played a considerable role in the history of Mecca in the times of the Jāhiliyya and were quite helpful in the establishment of the dominant position of this city in the tribal society of the Arabian peninsula.

The examination of the contacts between Mecca and Tamīm may shed some light on the origin of the “tribal commonwealth” under the leadership of Mecca and on the ways of Meccan diplomacy in its tribal environment. A scrutiny of these data may lead to a revision of some opinions about the relations between Mecca and the tribes and to an elucidation of some events during the period of the struggle between the Prophet and Mecca.

The discussion of the relations between Mecca and Tamīm may be preceded by some remarks about the relations between the Arab tribes and al-Ḥira at the end of the sixth century.

The second half of the 6th century was a period of fundamental changes in the relations between the tribes of North-East Arabia and al-Ḥira. The defeat of the forces of al-Ḥira, who took part in the raids against tribes and fought in the inter-tribal encounters—undermined the prestige of the rulers in the opinion of the tribes. Privileges of guarding of caravans granted to some chiefs caused jealousy and conflict between the tribes and led to clashes between them. Discontented tribes rose in rebellion against al-Ḥira. Raids on caravans of the rulers occurred frequently
and roads of commerce became unsafe; the rulers of al-Ḥira began to lose control of the commercial roads and their prestige dwindled. The weakness of the rulers of al-Ḥira and their Persian masters was apparent; troops of the Persian garrisons who took part in some battles on the side of the loyal tribes were defeated. A case of this kind is recorded by al-Baladhuri.

Wa-aghārat Bakrū bīn Wa‘īlīn 'alā Banū ‘Amr bni Tamīmin ya‘la l-Ṣalībi wa-μaʿabum nāsun min al-Asāwrati, fa-hażamathum Banū ‘Amrīn, wa-qatala Ṭarīfūn rasʾa ’l-Asāwrati, fa-qāla:

Wa-laulā ʾṭṭirādi bi-l-Ṣalībi lasawwiqat: nisāʾu unāsin bayna Durnā wa-Bārīgī

“And the Bakr b. Wā‘il attacked the Banū ‘Amr (of Tamīm) at the “Day of al-Ṣalīb”. With them were men from the Asāwrī. The Banū ‘Amr defeated them and Ṭarīf killed the chief of the Asāwrī and said:

Were it not my drive at al-Ṣalīb—there would have been driven women of men between Durnā and Bārīq” 1).

Equipment supplied by the Persians to loyal tribes was taken as booty by the victorious hostile tribes 2).

Meanwhile the disintegration of the Persian Empire at the end of the 6th century must have been felt at al-Ḥira. Al-Nu‘mān, the last ruler of al-Ḥira, seems to have sympathised with the Arabs and it is plausible that he might have come in touch with some leaders of tribes, attempting to make common cause with the strong tribes. In an apocryphal story the following saying is attributed to al-Nu‘mān: innamā anā rajumūn min-kum, wa-innamā malaktu wa-‘ażazı bu-makānikum wa-mā yutabawwafu min nāhiyatikum... li-ya‘lama anna ’l-‘Araba ‘alā ghayri mā ḥaḍatha nafasahu... 3). Nöldeke rightly stressed the fact that the dynasty of Lakhm

1) al-Baladhuri: Ansāb, ms. f. 105b.
2) See Naqd, p. 581: wa-kānāt Bakrūn tahta yadi Kisrā wa-Fārisa. Qāla: fa-kānū yuqawwimūnāhuwa yu-jabbiyūnāhuwa. Fa-aqbalū min ‘indī ‘āmilī ‘Aynī ’l-Tamri... etc. (“Bakr were under the control of Kisrā and the Perisans. They used to strengthen them and to equip them. They came from the governor (of Kisrā) of ‘Ayn al-Tamr...”).
seems to have become too independent in their attitude for Kisrā 1). Rothstein quotes a passage from al-Dinawarī in which Kisrā is said to have argued that he killed al-Nu‘mān because al-Nu‘mān and his family made common cause with the Arabs 2). According to a tradition, recorded by Abu ’l-Baqā’, Kisrā intended after the death of al-Mundhir to send a Persian governor with 12,000 Asāwira to al-Ḥira. He changed his mind and decided to appoint one of the children of al-Mundhir after a talk with ‘Adīyy b. Zayd 3). Poetry of the Jāhiliyya fairly reflects the resistance of the tribes to foreign rule; poets praise their clans that they fought the kings 4) and killed them 5). Al-Nu‘mān must have been aware of chaos in the Persian Empire and of the rise of the power of the Arab tribes and might have planned a new line in his policy which did not accord with Persian interests. There must be a grain of truth in the suspicions of Kisrā. It seems that the dynasty of Lakhm was abolished because it could not be trusted. The Lakhmids became unable to secure the ways of commerce. They failed to prevent the Arab tribes to raid the territories of the Persian Empire.

Nöldeke suggests that the abolition of the dynasty of Lakhm facilitated the raids of the territory of al-Ḥira by the Arab tribes 6). Brockelmann considers the defeat of the Persian forces at Dhū Qār as a consequence of the abolition of this dynasty 7). Levi della Vida assumes that “with the fall of this buffer state the door was opened to Arabians for invasion” 8). But the door was in fact opened to Arab invasion because of the decline of the Persian Empire and of the rise of power of the Arab

2) Rothstein: Die Dynastie der Lahmiden, pp. 116-117.
4) See Levi della Vida: Pre-Islamic Arabia (The Arab Heritage), p. 50.
5) See al-Zubayr b. Bakkār: Nasab Quraysh I, 26:
Al-qāṭilina min al-Manādhiri sab‘atan
fi ’l-kabh fansa wasa‘iddi l-rayhāni
(said in praise of the Banū Ḥarmala. The al-Manādhira are explained as “al-Nu‘mān b. al-Mundhir and his kin”).
6) T. Nöldeke, op. cit., ib.
tribes. Persian garrisons were not able to prevent the raids of the tribes and Persian troops were defeated by troops of Arab tribes.

The Arab tribes, disappointed by the policy of al-Ḥīra and Persia, and aware of the weakness of the client kingdom began to look for a body politic of their own with a competent leadership. This was created by the emergence of a new idea of an egalitarian association, based on common interest: “The Commonwealth of Mecca”.

The traditions about this period of the establishment of the power of Mecca, although scanty, give us a rough idea of the stages of this development.

A concise account of Muḥammad b. Sallām 1) furnishes an introduction the problem. The Quraysh were merchants. Their trade did not, however, exceed the boundaries of Mecca. The foreign merchants brought their merchandise and the merchants of Mecca sold the wares to the inhabitants of Mecca and the neighbouring tribes. Such was their trade till Hāshim b. ʿAbd Manāf went to Syria and alighted (in the territory) of the Emperor (Qayšar). He slaughtered every day a sheep and prepared a broth with crumbled bread for the neighbouring people. Thus he gained his nickname “Hāshim”, “the crumbler of the bread in the broth” 2). (His name was in fact ʿAmr.) He was invited by the Emperor and used to visit him. When he realised that he had gained his favour, he asked him to give the merchants of Mecca a letter of safe conduct for themselves and their merchandise. They would bring leathers and clothes from the Ḥijāz to Syria, which would be cheaper for the inhabitants of Syria. The Emperor granted him the requested letter of safe conduct for the merchants from Mecca, visiting Syria. On his way back he met the chiefs of the tribes he passed, and secured from them the īlāf, the pact of security in their tribal areas, yet without concluding an


2) For another explanation of this nickname see Caetani: Annali I, 109-110 (90).
alliance. The merchants of Quraysh would carry the goods to Syria, paying the Bedouins their capital and their profit (scil. for their goods) 1). Hāshim himself went out with the merchants of Mecca in order to carry out the provisions of the treaties concluded with the tribes. He led the Meccan merchants to Syria and settled them in Syrian towns. He died on this journey at Ghazza. Al-Muṭṭalib b. 'Abd Manāf went to al-Yaman and gained a similar charter for the merchants of Quraysh from the rulers of al-Yaman and ḫilāf from the chiefs. He died in Radmān. 'Abd Shams b. 'Abd Manāf went to Abyssinia and on his way gained the ḫilāf. Naufal, the youngest of the brothers, got the charter from the Persian Emperor (Kisrā) and ḫilāf from the tribal chiefs (on the way to Persia). He then went back to 'Irāq and died in Salmān. Quraysh afterwards developed their trade. Quraysh developed their trade in the period of the Jāhiliyya and their wealth increased. It was the Banū 'Abd Manāf to whom Quraysh in Jāhiliyya were mostly indebted (for their deed).

Ibn Sa'd records the story of Hāshim who got the ḫilāf and the charters of the rulers 2). The charters of the rulers are rendered by al-Qālī 'abd or amān. Ibn Sa'd uses the term ḥilf. Muḥ. b. Ḥabīb uses (in the chapter of the ḫilāf) the word ḫilāf for the charters and the agreements with the chiefs of the tribes 3).

Al-Balādthurī uses in his report about the ḫilāf the expression 'iṣam for

1) Muḥ. Hamidullah translates wa-'alā anna Qurayshān tahlīlu labhum (so in the text of al-Munammag; the text of al-Qālī has ilayhīm) baḍāʔi'ā fa-yakṣūnahuum ḥumlānahu wa-yu'addīna ilayhim ru'ūsa amwālihim wa-ribḥahum as follows:
   „ct leur remettaient la prix réalisée, sans pour autant les charger des pays ou déduire des commissions. . .‖; he renders the passage into English as follows:
   ”. . .promised. . .to carry their goods as agents without commission for commercial purposes or otherwise concluded treaties of friendship. . .‖
This translation seems to be inaccurate.

2) Ibn Sa'd: Ṭbaqāt I, 75-80 (ed. Beirut); a tradition told on the authority of 'Abdallah b. Naufal b. al-Ḥarīth (see Ibn Ḥajar: al-Isāba, No. 4994) states that Hāshim wrote to al-Naṣāsh (the king of Abyssinia) asking him to grant a charter for the merchants of Mecca. The economic base of the ḫilāf is here recorded as follows:
   . . .'alā an tahlmīla Qurayshāh baḍāʔi'ahum wa-lā kīrāʔa 'alā ahlī l-ṭarīqī (p. 78). This helps to understand the passage discussed in the preceding note.

the charters of the rulers. Naufal b. ‘Abd Manāf is said to have got the ‘iṣam from the kings of al-‘Irāq. 1)

Al-Ṭabarī uses the words ‘iṣam and ḥabl to denote the charter. Naufal got the ḥabl from the Chosroes (al-Akāsira) and they (i.e. the merchants of Quraysh) frequented al-‘Irāq and Persia 2).

Al-Ṭaḥālibī records that Hāshim took the ḥlaf from the enemies 3).

This phrase about the ḥlaf taken from the enemies is recorded by al-Ṭaḥālibī in another report, which essentially deviates from the narratives about the ḥlaf mentioned above 4). Quraysh—reports al-Ṭaḥālibī—used to trade only with merchants who frequented the markets of Dhū Majāz and ‘Ukāz during the sacred months and came to Mecca. The reason for this was, that Quraysh were devoted to their din and loved their haram and their bayt and used to serve the visitors of Mecca to their advantage. The first, who went out to Syria and visited kings and made far journeys and passed by enemies (i.e. hostile tribes) and took from them the ḥlaf mentioned by Allah (in the Qurʾān) was Hāshim. Al-Ṭaḥālibī mentions his two trips (to the ‘Abāhila in al-Yaman and al-Yaksūm in Abyssinia in winter; to Syria and Byzantium in summer) and says about the ḥlaf: he took the ḥlaf from the heads of the tribes and the chieftains for two reasons: because the people of the haram and others were not safe (of the attacks) of the “wolves of the Arabs” and the Bedouin brigands and men of raids and people involved

1) al-Balādhuri: Ansāb, I, 59; for the word ‘usum see al-Aʿshā: Dīwān, p. 29.
2) al-Ṭabarī: Taʾrīkh II, 12.
4) al-Ṭaḥālibī: Thimār al-qulūb, p. 89 seq. The exclusiveness of the ḥlaf for Quraysh is attested in the report by the verses of Musāwir b. Hind:

Zaʾamātum anna ikhwatakum Quraṣyshun
labum ilsun wa-laysa lakum ilāfū.
Ulāʾika uminū jūʾan wa-khanfan
wa-qad jāʾat Banū Asadīn wa-khāfū.


ṣanna li-Fibrin sunnata ḥlafū
and see al-Hamdānī al-Iklīś I/II, ms. f. 26a:
Fa-lā tūṣū Maʿaddan, inna fihā
ḥlafū ḥlafū wa-l-amru ḥlafū.
in long-lasting actions of revenge and because there were tribes that like the tribes of Tayy, Khath'am and Quḍā‘a, did not respect the sanctity of the haram, and the sacred months whilst the other tribes performed the pilgrimage to the Ka‘ba and respected the House. The īlāf, records al-Tha‘ālibi, meant a sum that was granted by Hāshim to the heads of the tribes as profit while he undertook the transport of their wares together with his own and drove for them camels along with his camels, in order to relieve them of the hardships of the journey and to relieve Quraysh from the fear of the enemies. That was an advantage for both sides; the staying (scil. the Bedouins) were profiting, the journeying (Qurashites-scil.) were safe (guarded). Conditions of Quraysh improved.

Ibn Abī Ḥadīd records two accounts: 1) the account given by al-Qālī and an account of al-Jāḥīz recorded in his Faḍl Hāshim ‘alā ‘Abd Shams 2). This account of al-Jāḥīz is explicit about the shares of profit given the chiefs of the tribes by Hāshim. (. .wa-sharika fī tijāratīhi ru‘asā‘a īl-qabā‘īli min al-‘Arabi . . . wa-ja‘ala lahūm ma‘ahu ribhān . . . )

Al-Jāḥīz records another version about the īlāf: Hāshim imposed taxes on the heads of the chiefs of the tribes. These sums collected by Hāshim enabled him to organise the defence for the people of Mecca from brigands and tribes who did not respect the sanctity of Mecca 3).

The account of al-Ya‘qūbī 4) gives the already mentioned version about the four brothers who gained the īlāf. The account contains, however, a sentence, which gives a clue for the assessment of the validity of these agreements of the īlāf, concluded by Hāshim: After the death of Hāshim—says al-Ya‘qūbī—Quraysh were afraid that the Bedouin tribes might get the upper hand. This sentence indicates that the īlāf agreements had not been actually carried out. Quraysh feared that some tribes might refrain from carrying out the terms of the pacts. It was the energetic action of the sons of ‘Abd Manāf and the profits granted the chiefs which caused that the chiefs kept their obligations in connection with the īlāf.

---

3) ib.
Lexical explanations of the word *ālāf* examined by Birkeland render the word as "protection", "a pact providing security" etc. Birkeland states that the meaning of the word "protection" is not given in the commentaries of the Qur'ān, except Alūsī. This explanation is, however, given by Abū Ḥayyān 2). Abū Ḥayyān quotes the opinion of al-Najjāsh, that there were 4 journeys (i.e. they sent 4 caravans: to Syria, Abyssinia, al-Yaman and Persia). Abū Ḥayyān does not agree with the refutation of Ibn ‘Atiyya and quotes for his argument the story of the 4 sons of ‘Abd Manāf, who got the *ālāf*. Abū Ḥayyān quotes the explanation of al-Azhāri of the word *ālāf*, and the verses of Maṭrūd b. Ka‘b. (translated by Birkeland) 3). The explanation of al-Azhāri is given as well in the commentary of the *Maṭābid al-tanṣīs* to the verses of Musāwir b. Hind. 4): 

"a kind of protection by means of guarding (*Shibhu‘l-ijārati bi-l-khafāra*)".

It may be said that the accounts about the *ālāf* outlines the essential phenomena of the changes in Mecca. Mecca, a small centre for distribution of goods for the Bedouin tribes in the vicinity of the city, rose to the position of an important centre of transit trade. It was the merchants of Mecca, who carried the wares to Syria, Abyssinia, al-‘Iraq and al-Yaman. The family who laid the foundations for the revolutionary change was that of ‘Abd Manāf. The trade based on the pacts of *ālāf* was a joint enterprise of the clans of Quraysh headed by the family of ‘Abd Manāf. The pacts concluded with the tribes were based on a hitherto unknown principle of trade interest. It was not an alliance (*hilf*) with obligations of mutual help and protection. It was not an obligation of the tribes to guard the caravans of Quraysh against payment practised by the tribes in their relations with the caravans of al-Ḥira. The *ālāf* agreements were set up on a base of share in profit for the heads of the tribes and apparently employment of the men of the tribes as escort of the caravans.

---

2) Abū Ḥayyān: *al-Bahr al-muḥīf* VIII, 515 (Sūrat li-ālāf Qurayshin).
4) al-‘Abbāsī: *Maṭābid al-tanṣīs* I, 95 (Cairo 1316 AH).
One may assume that the *ilāf* must have contained a paragraph concerning the observation of the sacred months, namely the keeping of peace during these months and respecting the sanctity of Mecca (or rather the inviolability of Mecca). The *ilāf* meant in fact the acceptance of the “Pax Meccana” by the tribes, the acknowledgment of the position of the Meccans and the Meccan trade and the setting up of an economic co-operation based on common interest. That explains the peculiar passage in the account of al-Tha‘ālibī about the pacts with the (hitherto) hostile tribes.

Birkeland, discussing the historical background of the verses 1-2 of Sūra 106, stresses the importance of the *ilāf* pacts and states that “their (i.e. Quraysh) financial skill and their possession of the sacred territory had made them the economic masters of Western Arabia about a hundred years before the Prophet 1). But the statement of Birkeland may be extended to Eastern Arabia as well. The dimensions of the trade of Quraysh were very large 2).

It is conceivable, that the tribal chiefs might have preferred to collaborate with the merchants of Mecca. In their co-operation with Quraysh their profits were more stable, they could establish closer relations with them and actually did so. They were welcomed in Mecca and could enter it without fear. In al-Ḥira they were submissive and servile, in Mecca they could negotiate as equals.

The impression made by the enterprise of Mecca is vividly described in a story recorded by al-Ya‘qūbī 3): A Kalbī tribesman in the service of a Kalbī woman (a merchant) on the Syrian border witnessed the arrival of a Meccan caravan in Syria. He gives details about the personality of Ḥāshim and his dignity, about the respect shown to him by the chiefs of Mecca, about his generosity and remarks: “By God, that is the true splendour, not the splendour of the Banū Jafna”. It is a sentence which is remarkable: the glory of the Qurashi leader, his manners and

1) Birkeland, *op. cit.*, p. 122 seq.
behaviour were much more akin to the Kalbī Bedouin than the aloofness of the Jafnī ruler. It is a sentence forming a prelude for the future.

A peculiar tradition, which seems to throw some light on the situation in Mecca in the times of Hāshim deserves to be examined. This tradition, quoted by al-Suyūṭī from the Munwaffaqiyyāt of al-Zubayr b. Bakkār1) is told on the authority of ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. According to this tradition the nobles of Quraysh used to practice in the Jāhiliya the i’tifād.2) I’tifād—records al-Suyūṭī—meant that when they lost their property they used to leave for the deserts, where they pitched tents and patiently awaited death “one after another” (tanāwabū) till they died, before people might know about their plight. So things went on till Hāshim grew up and became a man of influence among his people. He summoned Quraysh and said: “O Quraysh, might goes with abundance, and you became the richest of the Arabs and the mightiest and the i’tifād ruined many of you”. He put forward his proposition which was accepted by Quraysh, to attach to every rich Qurashī a poor man. The poor would help the rich in his journeys with the caravans and “live in his shade by the redundance of his property”. That would be the means to stop the custom of i’tifād. They agreed and Hāshim brought the people together (i.e. the rich and the poor). When the event of Elephant occurred (that was the key of the Prophecy and the commencement of the splendour of Quraysh, so that all people respect them; in this year the Prophet was born) and when later revelations were revealed to the Prophet—God revealed to the Prophet ordering him to inform his people what he did for them and how He helped them against the people of the Elephant. “Hast thou not seen how thy Lord dealt with the owners of the Elephant?”3) Then He said: “And why did I do it, O Muḥammad, for your people, whilst they were at that time worshippers of idols? So He said to them: Li-ilāfi Qurayshīn4). It means: Because of their mutual feeling of mercy and

---

1) al-Suyūṭī: al-Durr al-manthūr VI, 397 (Sūra 106).
2) in text ihtifād, which must be a mistake.
3) Sūra CV.
4) Sūra CVI.
their mutual help. They were pagans. He freed them from the fear of the Elephant. “He fed them against hunger” means the hunger of *tīfād.*

The tendency of the tradition is to render the word *li-īlāfī Quraysh* as denoting *li-tarāhumi Qurayshin wa-tawāṣulibim.* But the story itself, rather loosely connected with the interpretation of the *āya,* seems in fact, to reflect the situation before the īlāf. Al-Zubayr b. Bakkār had an outstanding knowledge of the social and economic situation of Mecca in the times of Jāhiliyya and this story may contain a good deal of truth. The tradition points to the fact, that before the action of Hāshim the caravans were sent by individuals. Before the īlāf were concluded the sending of caravans seems to have been very risky and in case of an attack of brigands or of a hostile tribe the tradesman, who invested all his capital, lost everything. It was the īlāf which made the journeys secure.

The proposition of Hāshim to include the poor in the enterprise of the caravans was a bold one. It meant to give the poor some shares in the profits as payment for their work or, probably, against investment of small sums by poor relatives.

This trend seems to be echoed in one of the verses of Matrūd b. Ka‘b: 1)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Wa-l-khaliṭūna ḡaniyyahum bi-faqīrihibim} \\
\text{ḥattā yakūna faqīrūhum ka-l-kāfī}
\end{align*}
\]

“And who mix their rich with their poor till their poor becomes like an able (man to bestow his favour on needy).”

This idea of “mixing of the poor” (or inferior people) with rich and wealthy was an ideal of the Jāhili society and is attested by verses 2).

---

1) See above p. 120 n. 3; and see these verses as well: Ibn al-ʿArabī: *Muḥādarat al-abrār* II, 119; al-Ṭabarsi: *Majmaʿ al-bayān* (Sūra 106); al-Balādhuri: *Ansāb* I, 58; al-Yaʿqūbī: *Taʾrīkh* I, 202 (ed. Najaf); al-Diyārbakrī: *Taʾrīkh al-Kha-ṃīs* I, 156.

It is a significant tradition in which the ideal of the Jähiliyya is reflected in care for the needy of the clan, whereas the embracing of Islam is considered as deviation from this ideal.

Nu‘aym b. ‘Abdallah1) of the ‘Uwayj (of the ‘Adiyy Quraysh) embraced Islam. His father used to feed the poor of the ‘Adiyy. After Nu‘aym had embraced Islam he was met by al-Walid b. al-Mughira al-Makhzūmī who said to him: “O son of ‘Abdallah, you pulled down what your father built and you cut what he linked (by his favours), when you followed Muḥammad”2).

The account of al-Baladhurī about the Ḥilf al-Fuḍūl mentions a special obligation to help the needy arriving at Mecca with the surplus of the property of the people who entered the alliance (...Ta‘āqadū ‘alā...wa-muwāsāti abli ’l-fāqati mimman warada Makkata bi-fuḍūli amwālihim”)3).

An Anṣārī poet, al-Nu‘mān b. ‘Ajlān while boasting of the deeds of the Anṣār for the Muhājirūn, says:

\[
\text{Wa-qulnā li-qaumin hājarū: marḥaban bikum wa-aḥlan wa-saḥlan, qad amīntum min al-faqr}
\]

\[
\text{Wa-l-khāliṭina naḥītahum bi-nuḍārihim wa-dhawtī ʾl-gbinā minhum bi-dhī ʾl-faqr}
\]

and see Ibn al-Shajārī: al-Ḥamāsa, p. 56 (‘Amr b. Ḥtnāba):

\[
\text{Wa-l-khāliṭina ḥalifahum bi sarṭihim wa-l-bāḥbilina ʾaṭāʾahbum li-l-sāʾili}
\]

and see al-Khālidīyyānī: al-Asbāb I, 20; Ḥassān: Dīwān p. 308:

\[
\text{Wa-l-khāliṭina ghanīyabhum bi-faqrīrīhim wa-l-munʿīmīna ʾalā ʾl-faqrī l-murmili}
\]

and comp. al-Aʾshā: Dīwān III, 35:

\[
\text{Wa-abāna sāliha mālībi li-faqrīrhā wa-asā, wa-aṣlaḥa baynahā, wa-sāʾa labā}
\]


\[
\text{Fa-lā taḍudi ʾl-maula sharikaka fi ʾl-gbinā wa-lakinnāma ʾl-maulā sharikuka fi ʾl-sudmi.}
\]


2) al-Baladhurī: Ansāb, ms. f. 869a.

3) Idem: ap. cit., ms. f. 144a; another version is given in the Sīra of Ibn His-hām I, 141.
“And we said to the people who immigrated to us: Welcome and secured are you from poverty. We shall share with you our property and abode like the gamblers of maysir, who divide (in shares) the slaughtered camel.”

Traditions about Ḥakim b. Ḥizām record that he used to distribute the profits of his caravans among the poor and needy of his clan 2).

The traditions quoted above seem to reflect clearly the tendency of care for poor and needy in the clan. Ḥāshim, establishing the īlāf, could successfully expand the trade; rich and poor participated in the caravan. A caravan became a joint enterprise. Even if a merchant sent on his own risk a caravan—other merchants tried to join him and invest in his caravan 3). The following remark of al-Qummi about the social conceptions of the Meccans and their care for the poor is remarkable.

Wa-kānat Qurayshun yatafahhasūna ‘an ḥālati ‘l-fuqarāʾi wa-yasuddūna khallata ‘l-mahdwiyyi 4).

Ḥāshim seems to have expanded the tendency of care for the needy into a social principle. Al-Diyārbakrī records a tradition about Ḥāshim on the authority of Ibn ‘Abbās, reporting that the people of Mecca were in a state of neediness till they were rallied by Ḥāshim for sending of the caravans to Syria and al-Yaman. They used to divide their profits among the rich and poor, so that the poor became like the rich 5). Ibn Ḥabīb, reporting about the men of the īlāf says that through them Allah raised the Quraysh and turned rich their poor”. (Ashāбу

---

4) al-Qummi: Gharāʾib al-Qurʿān (on margin of Ṭabarī’s Tafsīr, Būlāq 1229 AH) XXX, 169.
5) al-Diyārbakrī: Taʿrīkh al-Khamīs I, 156.
l-illāfī min Qurayshin ’lladhīna rafa‘a ’llāhu bihim Qurayshan wa-na‘asha fuqarā‘abā . . . 1).

One is inclined to find some resemblance between the “mixing of the poor and the rich” (mukhālaṭa) and the mu‘ākhāt 2).

The conclusion of the ʿilāf agreements was accompanied by the improvement of the internal conditions in Mecca and the provision of amenities for the pilgrims. The first houses in Mecca were built by Quṣayy 3). It may be assumed that these houses were very modest. The cutting of the trees in Mecca formed a serious problem, because of the sanctity of Mecca. But Quṣayy ordered to cut the trees and to build the houses 4). The houses seem to have been circular in order to avoid the imitation of the shape of the Ka‘ba 5). Mu‘arrij al-Sadūṣī reports that Zubayr b. al-Ḥārith b. Asad was the first who covered a house (with a roof). Quraysh demolished the house out of reverence for the Ka‘ba 6). It was Ḥumayd b. Zubayr b. al-Ḥārith b. Asad b. ʿAbd al-ʿUzzā who built the first square house in Mecca 7). When he built his house Quraysh feared the punishment (of Allah). The rajaz poets composed verses:

Al-yaumā yubnā li-Ḥumaydin baytuh
Immā ḥayātubu wa-immā mautub.

“This today for Ḥumayd his house is built
(This means for him) either his life or his death” 8).

When he was not afflicted by punishment Quraysh started to build square houses.

---

1) Muḥ. b. Ḥabīb: al-Muḥabbār, p. 162.
2) Comp. al-Sulāmī: Ādāb al-suḥba p. 50: . . . wa-kāna (al-nabīyyuṣal‘ām) yanbasītu fī māli Abī Bakrīn kamā yanbasītu fī mālihi wa-yaḥkummu fī kamā yaḥkummu fī mālihi”.
3) See Abū ʿl-Baqā’: Manāqib, ms. f. 85a.
6) Mu‘arrij al-Sadūṣī: al-Ḥadīf min nasab Quraysb, p. 54.
8) These verses are attributed to Duwayd: see al-Zubayr b. Bakkār, op. cit., ib. n. 2.
If this tradition be true—the time of the changes in building of houses was the second half of the 6th century. The sister of this Ḥumayd was the mother of Ḥakim b. Ḥizām. The son of Ḥumayd, ‘Abdallāh b. Ḥumayd fought at Uhud 1). The time of the significant changes in the building of houses may thus be fixed in the last decades of the 6th century.

The nobles of Mecca vied in providing amenities for the pilgrims. Hāshim is said to have taken care to supply the pilgrims with food 2), ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib to have been the first who provided them with sweet water 3). He dug the well of Zamzam in the times of Kīsra b. Qubādh 4). The water of Zamzam, although having medicinal qualities 5) was not palatable and was mixed by ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib with raisins. He also gave the pilgrims milk with honey 6). ‘Abbās continued the tradition of ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib and supplied drinking water for the pilgrims. The Prophet drank from his sigāya and the drinking from the sigāya of the family of ‘Abbās is considered as sunna 7). There are traditions about digging of wells and rivalry between nobles of Mecca in providing drinks for pilgrims 8). Suwayd b. Harmī is said to have been the first who gave the pilgrims milk (to drink) 9). Abū Umayya b. al-Mughīra al-Makhzūmī (Zād al-rakb) and Abū Wadāʿa al-Sahmī gave the pilgrims honey 10)

The traditions about the īlāf, about the improvements in Mecca, about the provisions of food and drinks for the pilgrims—all this points to the efforts to increase the prestige of the city and to secure the
pilgrimage and trade. Special arrangements were made for individual merchants proceeding to Mecca for a pilgrimage ¹). Elaborate provisions were made for the caravans for which consent of the tribes was gained.

In this system Tamīm played a considerable role. This can be gauged from some passages of the report about the markets of the Jahiliyya, recorded by Muh. b. Ḥabīb ²).

Reporting about the market of Dūmat al-Jandal Ibn Ḥabīb states that “every merchant who set out from al-Yaman and the Ḥijāz asked for the escort of Quraysh as long as he travelled in the abode of Muḍar; for the Muḍar did not harass Muḍarī merchants, nor were they (i.e. the merchants) troubled by an ally of Muḍar. That was the accepted custom between them. So did Kalb not trouble them, because of their alliance with Tamīm ³). The Tayy also did not harass them because of their alliance with the Asad. Muḍar used to say: “Quraysh carried out for us the obligation of religious duties inherited to us by Ismā‘il” ⁴) (i.e. bequeathed to us).

This report is recorded in al-Marzūqi’s Amkina with important

---

³) Hamidullah in Muslim conduct of state p. 54 (101); “as they were allied (i.e. the Kalb) to the Banū Jusham” (evidently a misprint).
⁴) Hamidullah translates: Les Mudarites avaient l’habitude de dire (avec fierté) “Les Quraïchites ont payé la dette de honte que nous avions contractée au nom d’Ismaël (par les guerres fratricides et par le bellum omnium contra omnes)” — Le Prophète de l’Islam, II, 600—This translation seems however to be inaccurate. In order to translate “que nous avions contractée au nom d’Ismaël”—Hamidullah must have read mā aurathnā Ismā‘īla which is an error. The phrase has to be read: mā aurathanā Ismā‘īlu. The sentence is of the greatest importance for the understanding of the attitude of the tribes towards Quraysh. For the correct interpretation of the sentence a passage from al-Kalā’ī’s al-Iktīfā’ (I, 150) may be quoted. Al-Kalā’ī, discussing the qualities of Quraysh, records the following passage: ..wa-kānū ‘alā irtihān min dīnī Ibrāhīma wa-Ismā‘īla min girā’ l-dāyi’i wa-riḍī’ l-hājī wa-ta‘zīmī l-ḥarāmi wa-ma‘nīthī min al-baghyī fihi wa-l-ilhādī wa-qamī‘ l-zālimī wa-ma‘nī‘ l-ma‘zūmī. The passage commencing with min girā is an explanation of irtihān min dīnī Ibrāhīm wa-Ismā‘īl.—The passage in Marzūqi’s Amkina II, 162 does not leave any doubt about the meaning of the sentence: mā aurathānā abīnā Ismā‘īlu, “what our father (ancestor) Ismā‘il inherited us” (bequeathed to us). And comp. al-Majlisi: Biḥār al-anwār VI, 42.
variants 1). Quraysh used to set out (to Dūmat al-Jandal) from Mecca. If they took the way of al-Ḥazn 2) they did not require the protection of any of the tribes till they came back, and that was because Muḍar . . . etc. 3). And when they departed from al-Ḥazn or went to al-Ḥazn they reached the waters (i.e. the abode, the pasturing places) of Kalb. Kalb were allies of Tamīm and therefore they did not harass them. When they went on to the lowland they passed the Asad and arrived at the Ṭayy . . .”

The account of Marzūqi supplements the report of Ibn Ḥabīb. The vague expression of Ibn Ḥabīb fi bilād Muḍar is here more precise. The road leading from Mecca to al-Ḥazn 4), which was under the control of the tribes of Muḍar. The Ḥazn itself was the territory of Tamīm 5).

The two significant accounts, of Ibn Ḥabīb and al-Marzūqi give some idea how the system set up by Mecca worked in the area of Mecca-al-Ḥazn and its extension. Two tribal units of Muḍar, closely linked with Mecca by the Muḍar alliance, Tamīm and Asad—made it possible, due to the alliance of Tamīm with Kalb (Quḍā‘a) and the alliance of Asad with Ṭayy (Qaḥṭānī), to Quraysh to send in full security their caravans and to control the trade on these routes. It is these two tribes—Ṭayy and Kalb—who were especially dangerous for Mecca, as the majority of these two tribes did not respect the sanctity of Mecca and of the sacred months. It is significant that al-Marzūqi records about the Ṭayy: “ . . and (arriving in the territory of Ṭayy) they (i.e. the merchants) gave them some pay and they (i.e. Ṭayy) guided them (in the direction) wherever they wanted” 6).

---
1) al-Marzūqi: al-Amkina, II, 162.
2) Hamidullah translates fa-in akhadhat ‘alā l-ḥazni “et s’ils prenaient le chemin montagneux” (Le Prophète, II, 604). That seems, however, not to be accurate.
3) There is perhaps some misprint or error; perhaps one has to read “au ‘alau ‘l-Ḥazn”.
4) See Thilo: Die Ortsnamen p. 56; and see Yāqūt: Buldān and al-Bakrī — Mu‘jam ma’sta‘jam, s.v. “Ḥazn”.
6) al-Marzūqi: al-Amkina II, 162.
The attitude of the Tayy and Kalb towards Mecca will be touched upon later.

Merchants proceeding to the important trade-centre of al-Mushaqqar had also to require the escort of Quraysh, because the road led through the territory of Mudar. This harbour-city frequented by merchants from Persia, an important base of Persian rule—had a market governed by men from Tamim 1).

In examination of the accounts about Dūmat al-Jandal 2) one may assume that the Tamim played a most important role in the control of the roads to these two markets and in securing of the caravans of Mecca.

Some Tamīmis frequented Mecca for trade. An iniquity committed to a Tamīmi visiting Mecca caused a conflict between the leaders of Quraysh. The story is recorded by Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadid on the authority of al-Wāqidi 3). Abdallah b. Ja‘far contested in glory Yazid b. Mu‘āwiya in the presence of Mu‘āwiya 4). He asked him: “By which of your ancestors do you rival in pride? By Ḥarb, whom we sheltered or by Umayya...?” We are here concerned with the story of Ḥarb sheltered by ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, which is given as follows:

Quraysh had the privilege of priority in passing the ‘Aqaba, when travelling. Anybody had to wait till they passed. Ḥarb went out one night and when passing the ‘Aqaba he met a man from the family of Ḥājib b. Zurāra, proceeding to Mecca for business. Ḥarb leaned forward and announced his name and so did the Tamīmi. He stated to be the “son” of Ḥājib b. Zurāra. The Tamīmi passed the ‘Aqaba together with Ḥarb. Ḥarb was enraged and swore that he would never allow him to stay in Mecca as long as he lived. The Tamīmi spent some time outside Mecca. But—as his business was in Mecca (wa-kānā matjarubu bi-Makkata)—he decided to enter and enquired

2) See the article Dūmat al-Jandal of L. Veccia Vaglieri in EI2.
4) See the account of this event in Dahlān’s Sira I, 22 (on the margin of “Insān al-‘uyūn”): the talk was between Ibn ‘Abbās and Mu‘āwiya; and see Ibn al-‘Arabī: Muhādarat al-abrār I, 179.
about the man, who could give him protection against Ḥarb. The Tamīmī (the “son” of Zurārā) entered Mecca at night and went to the house of Ṭā’līb. He recited a poem in which the event was recorded and the protection of Zubayr b. Ṭalib1) was requested. He was granted the requested protection. In the morning Zubayr b. Ṭalib summoned his brother, Ghaydāq, and they went out girded with swords, escorting the Tamīmī. Ḥarb met them, assaulted the Tamīmī and slapped him on his face. A quarrel ensued between the sons of Ṭalib and Ḥarb. Ḥarb managed to escape and sought refuge in the house of Zubayr b. Ṭalib who granted him protection.

This narrative probably points to relations between the Banū Hāshim and the Dārīm. Tradition mentions the names of some people of Dārīm, who were in touch with the Banū Hāshim. One of them was the hirmiyy of the Prophet.

The prestige enjoyed by the Tamīm in Mecca was based mainly on their strength and their services for the external trade of Mecca. The Tamīm were strong and their leaders were highly respected. The prestige of the leaders of Tamīm (of the branch of the Dārīm) is reflected in a remarkable anecdote attributed to the Prophet: A man (a Muslim) married a woman from a lower social class and was reproached by his brother. The Prophet was told about it, he was told as well about the virtues of the woman whom he married. He said in a talk with the husband: “You are not to be blamed for not marrying a woman (so aristocratic) as the daughter of Ḥājib b. Zurārā. Allah brought Islam and made all men equal. A Muslim is not to be rebuked” (for such a marriage)2).

Some groups of Tamīm were even included in the body politic of Mecca. They were given a share in the Meccan dominance and contributed to increase the influence of Mecca in the tribal society

---

1) Al-Zubayr b. Ṭalib was the leader of the Banū Hāshim at the “Day of al-Fijār”; see Muḥ. b. Ḥabib: al-Muḥabbār, p. 169; Ibn Durayd: al-Iṣbiqāq, p. 47; al-Baladhi: Ansāb 1, 102.

and its prestige. The organization we refer to is the organization of the Ḥums.

Ibn Saʿd counts as Ḥums: Quraysh, Khuzāʿa and people of the Arabs “born by Quraysh”. (According to another version of Ibn Saʿd: “and the allies of Quraysh”) 1).

Ibn Ishāq records as Ḥums: Quraysh, Khuzāʿa and Kināna; Ibn Hishām adds (on the authority of Abū ‘Ubayda al-Naḥwī) the ‘Āmir b. Ṣaʿṣaʿa 2).

Ibn Qutayba mentions in his Maʿārif as Ḥums Quraysh and people from Kināna 3). But in his al-Maʿānī al-Kabīr he counts as Ḥums: Quraysh their descendants and their allies 4).


Al-Anbārī 6) and al-Marzūqī 7) count: Quraysh, Kināna, Khuzāʿa and ‘Āmir b. Ṣaʿṣaʿa.

Abū Ḥayyān in his commentary of the Qurʾān has the following list: Quraysh, Kināna, Khuzāʿa, Thaqīf, Khathʿam, ‘Āmir b. Ṣaʿṣaʿa and Naṣr b. Muʿāwiya 8). An almost identical list is given by al-Qurṭubi; instead of Khathʿam—he has Jusham 9).

The L. 'A. records as Ḥums: Quraysh and “whom Quraysh had born” (i.e. descendants of men or women from Quraysh), Kināna, Fahm, ‘Adwān, ‘Āmir b. Ṣaʿṣaʿa and Khuzāʿa 10).

The lists of the Ḥums quoted above are contradictory. The examination of these lists shows doubtless that Ḥums included the Quraysh, the inhabitants of Mecca, and people outside Mecca. According to

---

1) Ibn Saʿd: Ṭabāqāt, I, 72.
5) al-Jāḥiz: Mukhtārāt fuṣūl, ms. f. 208 b.
6) al-Maṣfūḍātīyyāt XXXIV, 14 (Lyall).
9) al-Qurṭubi: al-Jāmī li-akhkām al-Qurʾān, II, 345 (Sura II, 189); and see Blachère: Coran II, 782, n. 185.
10) L. 'A., s.v. “Ḥms”.
Arendonk: "The Hums is the name traditionally given to the inhabitants of Mecca at Muḥamad’s appearance in so far as they were distinguished by special customs during the Ḩārām from the other tribes, who were together known as al-Ḩilla". 1) — This definition has to be altered.

A detailed list of the tribes of the Hums is given by Muḥ. b. Ḥabīb. "Hums were — reports Ibn Ḥabīb — all Quraysh, Khuzā‘a (because they had dwelled in Mecca and were neighbours of Quraysh), people being descendents of Quraysh ("born by Quraysh"), clans dwelling in Mecca.

Descendants of Quraysh ("born by Quraysh") were: Kilāb, Ka’b, ‘Āmir and Kalb i.e. the Banū Rabī‘a b. ‘Āmir b. Ṣa‘ṣa‘a. Their mother was Majd bint Taym b. Ghālib b. Fīhr. To her referred Labīd saying:

_Sagā qaumī banī Majdin wa-asqā_

_Numayran wa-l-qabā‘ ila min Hilāli_ 2).

and al-Ḥārīth b. ‘Abd Manāt b. Kināna and Mudlij b. Murra b. ‘Abd Manāt b. Kināna due to their dwelling near Mecca. And ‘Āmir b. ‘Abd Manāt b. Kināna and Mālik and Milkān b. Kināna and Thaqīf and ‘Adwān. And Yarbū‘ b. Ḥanẓala and Māzin b. Mālik b. ‘Amr b. Tamīm, whose mother (of both of them) was Jandala bint Fīhr b. Mālik b. al-Naḍr 3). Some maintain that all the ‘Āmir (i.e. ‘Āmir b. Ṣa‘ṣa‘a) are Hums, because their brethren, the Rabī‘a b. ‘Āmir became Hums.

And ‘Ilāf i.e. Rabbān b. Hulwān b. ‘Imrān b. al-Ḥāf b. Quḍā‘a. And Janāb b. Hubal b. Abdallah 4), from Kalb. His mother was Āmina

1) EI, s.v. “Hums”.
bint Rabî‘a b. ʻĀmir b. ʻa‘ṣa‘a; her mother was Majd bint Taym al-Adram b. Ghâlib b. Fihr” 1).

The list of Ibn Ḥabib shows a peculiar fact: the tribes allied in the organization of the Ḥums are of different origin and belong to various tribal divisions. The ʻĀmir b. ʻa‘ṣa‘a are Muḍarites. Kalb belonged to Quḍâ‘a. The origin of Thaqîf is disputed. (According to some traditions they are considered as descendants of Qays ʻAylân). ʻAdwân belonged to Qays ʻAylân, Khuzâ‘a were of South-Arabian origin 2). The more important is the fact, that these tribes lived in different areas of the peninsula. The Thaqîf dwelt to the South-East of Mecca, the Kinâna to the South, controlling the route Mecca-al-Yaman, the ʻĀmir b. ʻa‘ṣa‘a to the North East of Mecca, the Quḍâ‘a (Kalb) in the North, controlling the trade-route to Syria; Yarbû‘ and Mâzin controlled the route to al-Ḥira and Persia.

Of special interest is the case of Zuhayr b. Janâb al-Kalbî. The Ghaṭafân decided—according to tradition—to establish a haram like that of Mecca. Zuhayr b. Janâb raided them and destroyed their haram 3). This tradition explains why the group of Janâb of Kalb were included in the organization of the Ḥums.

One may find some connection between the īlâf discussed above and the Ḥums. The expression of al-Tha‘âlibî that Hâshim “took the īlâf from the enemies” 4) means in fact, that the īlâf were a complementary system for the Ḥums. The īlâf were intended for tribes who did not respect the sacred months, or—although performing the pilgrimage—were in the sphere of influence of the client kingdoms. These clans and tribes—like Ṭâyy, Khath‘am, clans of Quḍâ‘a 5), Ghifâr from the Kinâna 6)—were given some shares of profit and gave

---

3) Aḥbânî XII, 121; XXI, 63.
4) Thimâr al-Qulûb, p. 89.
5) al-Balâdhuri: Ansâb, ms. f. 90ob; al-Jâhiz: al-Ḥayawân VII, 216; see al-Balâdhuri: Ansâb, ms. 366a: the talk between Mu‘âwiya and ‘Adiyy b. Ḥâtim in which Mu‘âwiya accused Ṭâyy of not respecting the sanctity of Mecca. Ṭâyy and Khath‘am did not perform the pilgrimage to Mecca and were called al-Asfarâni.
6) See al-Dhahabi: Siyar a‘lâm al-nubalâ’ II, 34 (wa-kânituyhillûna al-shabra l-ḥarâma); and see Usd al-ghâba I, 160.
security to the caravans. How much Mecca was dependent on these tribes and eager to carry out the terms of the ʿilāf can be gauged from some records preserved. Al-ʿAbbās was present when ʿAbd Dharr was beaten violently in Mecca after he had embraced Islam. He reproached his people saying: “Woe to you, you are about to kill a man from Ghifār whilst your business and your passing by is through the territory of Ghifār”. They let him go 1). Thumāma b. Uthāl of the Ḥanīfa could threaten Quraysh with cutting of supplies from the Yamāma and even realized his threat 2). Saʿd b. Muʿādh could threaten Abū Jahl, that if he prevents him to circumambulate the Kaʿba—he would cut his trade with Syria 3). One is even tempted to think that there is some connection between the term allafabum “he concluded pacts of ʿilāf with them”, and the term al-muʿallafa qulībuhum “people whose hearts were gained (for Islam) by some gifts”. But Ḥums denotes people strong in their conviction of the sanctity of Mecca, admitting the distinguished position of Quraysh, enjoying a special status in the rites of the ḥajj and ready to struggle for their ideas.

Some features of the Ḥums can be gauged from the chapters of al-Jāḥiz dealing with the virtues of Quraysh. Al-Jāḥiz records that never did a Qurashi allege his origin to another tribe, whilst till today “noble Arabs—like Banū Murra b. ‘Auf, some of the Banū Sulaym, Khuzāʿa and others—allege being of Qurashi origin. Quraysh did never bury their (female) babies alive. That was followed by the inhabitants of al-Ṭāʾif, because they were neighbours and related with them by marriage and because they were Ḥums, and it was Quraysh who made them Ḥums . . .” 4).

When Islam appeared—continues al-Jāḥiz—there was no Qurashi woman who had been taken captive by the Arab tribes, nor was there

---

1) al-Dhahabi: Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ II, 37 (taqtulūna rajulan min Ghifārin wa-matjarukum wa-mamarrukum ʿalā Ghifār?).
4) al-Jāḥiz: Mukhtiḥāt fuṣūl, ms. f. 202 seq.
any captive among them whose mother was a Qurashi woman. The Quraysh distinguished themselves from other tribes, that they did not give their daughters in marriage to the nobles of other tribes, unless they had got an assurance, that they would embrace the idea of the Hums. (They themselves—stresses al-Jāḥiz—married the daughters of other tribes without conditions to be imposed on them.) These tribes were: ‘Āmir b. Ṣa‘ṣa‘a, Thaqīf, Khuzā‘a and al-Ḥārith b. Ka‘b. They were people of devotion (wakānū dayyānīna) and therefore they renounced raiding. That was in order to avoid pillage, injustice, robbery and rape”.

In another passage al-Jāḥiz, discussing the qualities of Quraysh, remarks that Quraysh remained generous although their profits were not big since they refrained from raiding. Al-Jāḥiz emphasizes the hospitality of Quraysh, their care for the pilgrims and their care for kinsfolk. They allotted the men of the tribes to the different clans of Mecca—says al-Jāḥiz. Gaḥtafān were assigned to (the care of) al-Mughīra (i.e. al-Makhzūmī), Banū ‘Āmir went to someone else, the Ṭamīṃ to somebody else. They (i.e. the Quraysh) compelled them to perform the rites and cared for all their needs). Al-Jāḥiz stresses that Quraysh

1) al-Jāḥiz: Mukhtārāt fuṣūl, ms. f. 204a (. . . fa-yaqta’simūnabum, fa-takūnū Ghaṭafān li-l-Mughiratī wa-Banū ‘Āmirin li-kadhbā, wa-Tamīmun li-kadhbā . . ). In al-Zubayr b. Bakkār’s Nasab Quraysh, ms. f. 128 b. an interesting report is given about the allotment of the clans of Quraysh. They (i.e. the Quraysh) used to give them clothes in which they used to circumambulate the Ka‘ba; they (i.e. the Bedouins) used to throw away the clothes which they wore when they came to Mecca. The host (i.e. the clan who lodged the Bedouins frequenting Mecca) used to get (scil. a share of) the meat of the slaughtered camels. The Banū Fazāra alighted in the house of al-Mughīra b. ‘Abdallah b. ‘Amr b. Makhzūm. The first who prevented him (i.e. al-Mughīra) to get (his share of) the slaughtered camel was Khushayn b. La‘y al-Fazārī al-Shamkhi . . ; comp. Ibn Abī _IL-Ḥadīd: Sharīḥ nāḥj al-balāgha IV, 296; and see Ibn Durayd: al-Ishtīqāq p. 282 (Zuwaylim). The word ḥarīm not recorded in the vocabularies as “payment for Quraysh from the alighting Bedouins” is recorded in the story of Zuwaylim reported by al-Balādhūrī in his Ansāb, ms. f. 1101a. The quoted verse is of interest:

Wa-nāhnu mana’nā min Qurayshin ḥarīmahā
bi-Makkata, ayyūma ‘l-tabāluqī wa-l-nabī

Al-Balādhūrī records also the story of ‘Amr b. Jābir b. Khushayn who used to get from every captive of the Gaḥtafān 2 camels. That was stopped by Zuwaylim b. ‘Arīn (comp. the version of Ibn Durayd, ib.).
remained Laqāḥ, independent. They did not pay any tax and to them were entrusted the functions of rifāda, siqāya, etc.

In a third passage al-Jāḥiz repeats once more that all Quraysh were Ḫums, devoted to their din, a fact which prevented them from raiding, capture, intercourse with captive women and from burying alive their female babies. Once more al-Jāḥiz emphasizes that the Quraysh gave not their daughters in marriage unless on the condition that the children would become Ḫums. They were compelled—dwelling in a barren valley—to find means of livelihood and they got the ʿilāf and made journeys to kings . .” 1).

In a fourth passage of al-Jāḥiz the report about the Ḫums is repeated. But there are some details which deserve attention. Mentioning the caravans—al-Jāḥiz reports that the merchants went to (the land of) Qayṣar in Byzantium, to al-Najāshi in Abyssinia, and to al-Muqauqis in Egypt. It is the only case in which Egypt is mentioned as destination of the merchants of Mecca. Al-Jāḥiz draws in this passage a line between the Ḫums of Quraysh and the converted Ḫums of the ‘Āmir b. Ṣaʿṣaʿa and al-Ḥārith b. Kaʿb. The Quraysh, being Ḫums, refrained from raiding, whereas the tribes who accepted the ideas of the Ḫums continued to raid, to have intercourse with captured women and to take spoils. But Quraysh remained courageous 2).

Ibn al-Faqīḥ’s account records that Khuzāʿa, ‘Āmir b. Ṣaʿṣaʿa, Thaqif and “men of tribes” embraced the creed of the Ḫums. He records the tradition about the condition imposed on the nobles of the tribes marrying the daughters of Quraysh and gives details about the restrictions imposed on the pilgrims, not belonging to the Ḫums. They had to leave their travelling provision when entering Mecca, to take off their clothes which they wore outside the area of Mecca and to wear clothes of the Ḥaram (buying the clothes or borrowing them or as gifts). If they did not find clothes of the Ḥaram they per-

1) al-Jāḥiz: Mukhtārāt fuṣūl, ms. f. 16b. seq.
2) al-Jāḥiz: Mukhtārāt fuṣūl, ms. f. 208b. seq.; comp. al-Ṭāʾalībī: Thimār al-qulūb, p. 8 seq. (Abū ʿIlāḥ); (significant is the expression wa-ṣārū bi-ajmāʿibim tujjāran khulaṣaʿa).
formed the circumambulation naked. They obliged the pilgrims to start the *ifāda* from al-Muzdalifa. They were *laqāh*, they did not pay any tax, nor did any king rule over them 1).

Yaqūt mentions the Ḥums. According to him Quraysh gained for the idea of the Ḥums: Kināna, Jadilat Qays, Fahm and ‘Adwān, Thaqīf and ‘Āmir b. Ṣa‘ṣa‘a. He records the hardship which they imposed on themselves, the restrictions imposed on the pilgrims, and emphasizes that the people of Mecca were *laqāh*. Kings of Ḥimyar, Kinda, Ghassān and Lakhm used to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca and obeyed the Ḥums of Quraysh, considering as obliging to respect them . . 2).

Mecca is mentioned as *Dār al-Ḥums* in the verses attributed to a Kāhin of the Lihb 3) in the record of al-Ḥalabī. Al-Ḥalabī mentions the conditions of marriage of the Quraysh and their renouncing of raiding, which is connected with pillaging and rape 4).

Sources give details about the rites of the Ḥums and of the imposed hardships 5). They performed the *wuqf* at al-Muzdalifa instead of at ‘Arafāt 6). They confined themselves during the Ḥajj to the boundaries of the Haram. During the Ḥajj they did not eat meat, nor did they prepare curd, they did not stay in the shade of a house, they did not enter their houses through their doors 7), etc. It is evident that by the hardship imposed on themselves they wanted to express their veneration for the Ka‘ba and the Ḥaram. Al-Zamakhshari connects the root *ḥms* with the root *ḥrm*. They acquired their distinct position

---

3) The Lihb were known as men of special knowledge in augury (from the flight of birds) see: Wellhausen: *Reste*, p. 134; Ibn Durayd: *al-Iṣḥiqāq*, p. 491; al-Suhayli: *al-Raud al-unuf* I, 118.
6) See Wellhausen: *Reste*, p. 77; Rathjens: *Die Pilgerfahrt*, pp. 72-73; but the Prophet did not follow the Ḥums in their *wuqf*—see: al-Dhahabī: *Ta‘rikh al-Īlām* I, 49.
7) But see the contradictory traditions in al-Tabari’s *Tafsīr* (Ṣūra II, 189) and al-Suyūṭī: *al-Durr al-manṭūr* I, 204 seq.
of sanctity because they dwelt in the Ḥaram. They called themselves *Ahlu ’llāh* 1). That the idea of Ḥums was in fact connected with the cult of the Kaʿba is plainly attested by the fact, that the Kaʿba was called al-Ḥamsa* 2). It is evident that this link between Quraysh and the tribes attached to the Ḥums influenced their relations. Caskel remarks that the ʿĀmir b. Ṣaʿṣaʿa, being Ḥums, were on good terms with the inhabitants of Mecca 3). An ʿĀmiri poet and chief, ʿAuf b. al-Ḥāwaś b. Jaʿfar b. Kilāb, swears on the sacred month 4) of the Banū Umayya, the sacred places of Quraysh, the sacrificed victims 5). Khālid b. Jaʿfar, the uncle of ʿAuf, is said to have been the first who covered the Kaʿba with brocade (dībāj) which he got from a caravan looted by him 6). The Kaʿb and Kilāb of the ʿĀmir were called *Kaʿb Quraysh* and *Kilāb Quraysh* 7). Mālik b. Nuwayra of the Yarbūʿ (of Tamīm), who belonged to the Ḥums, mentions a group of horsemen who informed Quraysh (as ʿUmmār) about some battle 8).

The Prophet himself belonged to the Ḥums 9). He was the *hirmi* of ʿĪyāḍ b. Ḥīmār al-Mujāshiʿī ʾl-Tamīmī. The Prophet lent him his clothes and ʿĪyāḍ used to perform the circumambulation of the Kaʿba in the clothes of the Prophet 10).

---

1) al-Zamakhshari: *al-Fāʿiq*, s.v. Ḥums.
2) al-Fayrizibädi: *al-Qāmūs*, s.v. Ḥms. A curious explanation is given for the Ḥums in al-Maghribiʿs *Īnās*, ms. f. 26b: “They were called Ḥums, because they refrained from the service of labour.”
3) EI², s.v. ʿĀmir b. Ṣaʿṣaʿa.
4) i.e. Dhū ʾl-Ḥijja.
5) al-Ḍabbi: *al-Muḥaddithyyāt* XXXV, 4-5 (ed. Lyall):

`wa-innī wa-ʾlladhi ḥajjat Qurayshun
mahārimabū wa-mā jamaʿat Ḥirāʾu
Wa-shabri Bant Umayyata wa-l-hadāyā
idhā hubisat mudarrijahā ʾl-dīmāʾu`

7) al-Ḍabbi: *al-Muḥaddithyyāt*, p. 239 (ed. Lyall).
8) *al-Asmaʿīyyāt* XXVI, 3 (ed. Ahlwardt); Ibn Abī Ḥadīd: *Sharh nahj al-Balāḡa* 4, 292.
From the traditions quoted above one can gain a rough idea about the Ḥums. The fundamental principles of the Ḥums were the inviolability of the area of the Ḥaram, the independence¹) and neutrality of Mecca.

The feeling of security in Mecca is described by one of the nobles of Mecca in the following verses:

\[ Fakharnā wa-l-umūru labā qarārun \]
\[ bi-Makkatinā wa-bi-l-baladi ’l-ḥarāmi. \]
\[ Wa-annā lā yurāmu lanāḥ harimun \]
\[ wa-annā lā nurawwa’u fi ’l-manāmi. \]
\[ Wa-annā lā tusāqu lanā keśubun \]
\[ khilāla ’l-naq’i bādiyatu l-khidāmi. \]
\[ Ma’ādhā ’lābi min bādhā wa-bādhā \]
\[ fa-inna ’llāha laysa lahī musāmī²). \]

A Bedouin could not accustom himself to the quiet life of Mecca; Qays b. Zuhayr al-‘Absi said:

\[ Tufākhirunī ma’āshiru min Qurayshin \]
\[ bi-Ka’batibīm wa-bi-l-bayti ’l-ḥarāmi \]
\[ Fa-akrim bi-’lladibī fākbarū wa-lākin \]
\[ maghāzi ’l-khayli dāmiyatu ’l-kilāmi. \]
\[ Wa-τa’nun fi ’l-ṣajāji nīl yama’in \]
\[ nubūra ’l-khayli bi ’l-asali l-dawāmī. \]
\[ Aḥabbu ilayya min ‘ayshin rakbiyyin \]


¹) The fierce reaction of the Meccans when their independence was threatened can be gauged from the story of ‘Uthmān b. Ḥuwayrith. See al-Zubayr b. Bakkār: Nasab Quraysh, ms. f. 76b; al Muṣ‘ab al-Zubayrī: Nasab Quraysh, p. 210; L.‘A., s.v. Ḥab: Abū ‘l-Baqā‘: Manāqib, ms. f. 10b; al-Balādhuri: Ansāb IV B, 126 (and see “Annotations”).

²) al-Balādhuri: Ansāb, ms. f. 1094a.
The observation of some rites and customs was in fact an expression of their veneration of the sanctuary of Mecca. This organization, including different tribal units—among them units of Tamim, who dwelled in different areas of the peninsula, had a militant character. They were ready to struggle for their ideas of the sanctity of Mecca. The \textit{ilāf} seem to have been built up on the base of Ḥums. The Ḥums were the élite group distinct by their close relations with the Meccans, by their rites and customs. Both the organizations, the Ḥums and \textit{ilāf} had economic significance. The religious “colouring” is not surprising ²).

People not belonging to the Ḥums were “Ḥilla”. The Ḥilla included—according to the report of Ibn Ḥabib—all the Tamim (except Yarbū‘, Māzin, Ḳāba, Ḥumays, Zā‘īna, al-Ghauth b. Murr), all the Qays ‘āylān (except Thaqīf, ‘Adwān and ‘Āmir b. Ṣa‘ṣa‘a), all Rabī‘a b. Nizār, all Quḍā‘a (except ‘Ilāf and Janāb), the Anṣār, Khath‘ām, Bajila, Bakr b. ‘Abd Manāt b. Ḳināna (other divisions of Ḳināna were Ḥums), Hudhayl, Asad, Ṭayy and Bāriq ³). These Ḥilla—when performing the \textit{hajj}—were quite different in their rites during the \textit{ihrām} and during the \textit{tawāf}. A third group mentioned by Ibn Ḥabib were the Ṭuls, including tribes from al-Yaman and Ḵaḍramaut, ‘Akk, Ujayb and Iyād ⁴).

The division into the three groups—Ḥums, Ḥilla, Ṭuls—is confronted

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ib.}
\item Comp. Rathjens: \textit{Die Pilgerfahrt}, p. 80 (. .“Teilweise religiös getarnt.”).
\item Muh. b. Ḥabib: \textit{al-Mubābbar}, p. 179.
\item \textit{ib.}; A special group, which deserves to be mentioned, were the \textit{Basl}. The word \textit{basl} denotes ideas similar to the ideas inherent in the word \textit{hums}: courage, bravery, intrepid fighting on one hand, and the \textit{haram} the forbidden on the other hand. The \textit{Basl} were the ‘Āmir b. Lu‘ayy (or ‘Aūt b. Lu‘ayy, or Murra b. ‘Aūf b. Lu‘ayy). They maintained, that the number of the sacred months is 8. The tribes granted them security during these months. See al-Kalā‘ī: \textit{al-Iktīfā}, I, 78; Ibn Kathir: \textit{al-Bidāya} II, 204; L.‘A., s.v. \textit{bsl}; Abū Dharr: \textit{Sharḥ al-sīra} (ed. Brönnle) p. 233 (the \textit{Basl} were Quraysh, because they were the people of Mecca and Mecca is \textit{haram}).
\end{enumerate}
by another division. This scheme divides the tribes according to their recognition of the sanctity of Mecca: (1) the muhrimūn and (2) the muhillūn. The muhrimūn included the Ḥums and these tribes of the Hilla who in fact performed the pilgrimage. The muhillūn did not recognize the sanctity of Mecca nor did they respect the sacred months. These muhillūn constituted a real danger for Mecca.

Al-Jahiz counts as muhillūn all the Tayy and Khatham (mimman kāna lā yarā li-l-ḥarami wa-lā li-l-shabri ʿl-ḥarāmi ḥurmatan). Muhillūn—says al-Jahiz—were as well many clans of Qudāʿa, Yashkur, and al-Hārith b. Kaʿb. They were enemies because of their (different) din and their (different) pedigree.

Against these muhillūn the intercalator uttered his famous declaration, making lawful the shedding of their blood. “I make lawful to shed the blood of the muhillūn, Tayy and Khatham. Kill them, wherever you meet them if they harass you.”

Al-Yaʿqūbī mentions as muhillūn, people who considered as lawful to commit iniquities in these markets. They were groups from Asad, Tayy, Bakr b. ʿAbd Manāt b. Kināna and of ʿAmr b. Ṣaʿṣaʿa.

It is evident, that it was necessary to take some steps to guard the free markets of Mecca from hostile tribes and unruly elements like brigands and robbers.

In fact al-Yaʿqūbī states: And among the tribes there were people, who condemned this and devoted themselves (nasabū anfusabūm) to the help of oppressed and to prevent bloodshed and committing of ini-

---

2) al-Baladhuri: Ansāb, ms. f. 900b (wa-innī qad ablaštu dimāʿa ʿl-muhillīna min Tayyin wa-Khathām fa-ʿqtulhūm ḥaythu wajadumūhūm idhā ʿaradū lakum); of interest is the following verse of al-Ḥuṭayʿa.

Alam akun muhriman fa-yakina baynī
wa-baynakumu ʿl-mawaddatu wa-l-ikbāʿu
(Dīwān (ed. Ṭahā) 40, 1.7.). The commentary says:

al-muhrīm al-musālimūn ʿl-adhibī yābramu damūbu ʿalayka wa-damuka ʿalaybi.

4) Comp. Muh. b. Ḥabib: al-Muhabbār p. 267 (wa-lam takun fihi (i.e. ʿUkāz) ʿusbūrun wa-lā ḥifṣāratun).
They were called *al-Dhāda al-Muḥrimūna* (The *Muḥrimūn*, “the Defenders”). They were from the ‘Amr b. Tamīm, the Banū Ḥanāzala b. Zayd Manāt (b. Tamīm), Hudhayl, Shaybān and Kalb b. Wabara. They used to carry weapons (in the sacred months). The tribes were divided into people who took off their weapons during the sacred months and (lacuna; apparently: people who carried arms during these months—K).

This report of al-Ya‘qūbī is of importance; it sheds some light on the role of some groups of Tamīm who served in an inter-tribal militia, set up to defend Mecca and the markets of Mecca.

One may recall the remarkable passage of al-Jāḥīz quoted above 1), in which *ilāf* was explained as a tax, imposed on the tribes in order to defend Mecca from the “wolves of the tribes”, brigands and hostile tribes. It cannot be ruled out that the *ilāf* might have included some point about a pay for the militia to guard the markets and to guard Mecca.

Additional details about this militia are given by al-Marzūqī 2): The tribes (al-‘Arab) were divided according to three different conceptions about the sacred months: (1) people who perpetrated unlawful deeds; these are the *muḥillūn*, who do not respect the sanctity of the *haram*, steal in the *haram* and kill. (2) people who refrain from it and respect the sacred months (*yuḥrimūna ‘l-ashbura ‘l-huruma*). (3) people sharing the principle set up 3) by Sulṣul b. Aus b. Mukhāshīn b. Muʿā-

---

1) See p. 119 n. 2 above; the passage in al-Jāḥīz’s *Rasa’il* runs as follows: 

2) al-Marzūqī: *al-Amkina* II, 166.

3) The translation of Hamidullah (Le Prophète, p. 605) is not accurate. He renders the text as follows:... mais les gens se partageaient en trois groupes à ce propos: ceux qui pratiquaient l’abomination... ceux qui s’en abstenaient... et enfin les fantaisistes (*ahl al-ahwā*), partisans du Tamīmite...” The text tells about three conceptions according to which people were divided. *Wa-kanāt al-‘Arabu fī ashburi*
wiya b. Shurayf of the 'Amr b. Tamîm; it is he who made lawful for them the fight of the muḥillîn.

This tradition transmitted by Ibn al-Kalbî (on the authority of his father) is refuted by Ibn al-Kalbî and Abû Khirâsh. They state: “That is the claim of the Banû Tamîm. Certain is in our opinion that it was the Qalâmmas and his ancestors. And it was he who intercalated the months”. The refutation of Ibn al-Kalbî and Abû Khirâsh does not refer to the whole tradition about Ṣulṣul. It refers only to the phrase fa-innahu ʾaḥalla qitâla ʾl-muḥillîn “and he made lawful to fight the muḥillîn.“Ibn al-Kalbî seems to refer to the declaration uttered by the intercalator. It was in fact the intercalator who uttered this declaration. But it was the group of Ṣulṣul, the muḥrimûn—dhâda who carried out the implication of this declaration.

A peculiar tradition recorded by al-Shâhrastânî (al-Milal, p. 443—ed. Cureton) claims that the Qalâmmas (in text al-Mutilammiss) b. ʿUmayya al-Kinānî was of the din of Tamîm (ʿalâ dînî baḥî Tamîm).

The tradition about the muḥrimûn—dhâda seems to be trustworthy. The Usayyid, the clan of Ṣulṣul, were in close connections with Mecca. Some of the Banû Usayyid came to Mecca, became allies of influential families, gained wealth, married daughters of aristocratic families, and became respected citizens of Mecca. Influential was the Usayyidî family of Nâbbâsh. Their houses were in the vicinity of the Kaʿba ¹). Al-ʿAʿshâ b. Zurâra b. al-Nâbbâsh mourned Nubayh and Munabbih, the two sons of al-Ḥajjâj b. ʿĀmir, killed at Badr ²). The mother of Baghîḏ b. ʿĀmir b. Hâshîm b. ʿAbd Manâf b. ʿAbd al-Dâr was the daughter of al-

¹) ʿl-ḥajjî ʿalâ thalâthati ahwâpîn: minhum...wa-minhum...wa-minhum aḥlî hawân sharâʿ abu laḥûm Ṣulṣul... The group set up by Ṣulṣul were not “fantaisistes”. The expression aḥlî hawân is not pejorative; it is equal in its denotation to the expression used for the preceding groups.

²) al-Zubayr b. Bakkâr: Nasab Quraysh, ms. f. 88b; al-Fâsî: Shifâʾ al-gharâm (Wüstenfeld, II, 140 seq.).
Nabbāsh b. Zurāra 1). One of the mountains of Mecca belonged to the Banū Nabbāsh 2). A spurious tradition—which may, however, contain some grain of truth—claims that Aktham b. Ṣayfī, the famous sage of the Usayyid, acquired his wisdom from Quṣayy, ‘Abd Manāf, Ḥāshim and Abū Ṭālib 3). Another spurious tradition claims that Aktham learned nasab from ‘Abd al Muṭṭalib 4). To the Usayyid belonged as well the first (or second) husband of Khadija, Abū Ḥāla.

The family of Aus b. Mukhāshin was a noble one. The descendants of Aus b. Mukhāshin were the guardians of the sanctuary of Shums, the idol worshipped by the Ḍaba, Tamīm, ‘Ukl, ‘Adiyy and Thaur 5). This idol was pulled down by Hind, the son of Khadija and by Ṣafwān b. Usayyid of the Mukhāshin 6). This Ṣafwān married Durra, the daughter of Abū Lahab, and she gave birth to two of his sons Auf and al-Qa‘qā‘ 7). Mukhāshin b. Mu‘awiya b. Jurwa b. Usayyid was called Dhī ‘l-a’wād 8). Ṣayfī b. Riyāḥ b. al-Hārith b. Mukhāshin b. Mu‘awiya b. Jurwa b. Usayyid, the father of Aktham was called Dhī ‘l-ḥilm or Dhī ‘l-aḥbār (because of the copious herds he possessed) 9). Rabī‘a b. Mukhāshin and his father Mukhāshin were respected “judges of the tribes” 10).

Ṣulṣul to whom the setting up of the muḥrimūn-dhāda is attributed was in very close relations with Mecca: he was in charge of the mausim and a judge at ‘Ukāz 11).

---

1) al-Zubayr b. Bakkār, op. cit., ms. f. 89b; al-Muṣ‘ab al-Zubayri: Nasab Quraysh p. 254; and see the discussion about the writer of the sabīfa in Suhayli’s al-Raud al-umūf I, 232.
2) al-Azraqī: Akhbār (Wüstenfeld I, 490); Yāqūt: Buldān, s.v. Shayba.
6) ib.; and see Ibn Ḥajar: al-Isāba, No. 4067, 4071.
7) Ibn Ḥazm: Jamharat ansāb al-‘Arab, p. 199, inf.
9) al-Hamdānī: ib. Ibn al-Athīr; al-Muṣafṣa‘ (ed. Seybold) p. 82 (also attributed to Aktham).
The duties entrusted to Tamīm in Mecca and in the markets of Mecca are a convincing evidence of the important role played by Tamīm in establishing of the economic power of Mecca. Tamīm were invested with the ifāda in Mecca itself and with the control of the market of 'Ukāz. 'Ukāz was one of the important markets because here the public opinion of the tribes could express itself in its literary, political and social aspects 1). It was the co-operation with Tamīm in the market of 'Ukāz which helped Quraysh to avoid competition and secured for the Quraysh the influence in these markets 2).


---

2) The opinion of Rathjens (Die Pilgerfahrt, p. 70), that there was competition between the market of Mecca and ‘Ukāz seems to be without basis.
3) Muḥ. b. Ḥabīb: al-Muḥabbār, p. 181 inf.; the Mālik b. Kināna were the clan of the intercalators.
The last man who performed the duty of “ijāza” when Islam appeared was Karib b. Ṣafwān.

The list of the Tamīmī judges given by al-Balādhurī on the authority of Ibn Kunāsa is almost identical with the list of al-Muḥabbār. Identical are as well the lists of the Naqāʿīd and al-Marzūqī’s Amkina. Ibn Ḥazm reports in a chapter omitted in the edition of Lévi Provençal, that the Tamīm got the duty of the judges at ‘Ukāz and the ifṣāda after it had been performed by ‘Adwān. The last of the ‘Adwān were ‘Āmir b. al-Zarīb and Abū Sayyāra. The last man who performed the ifṣāda at the appearance of Islam was Karib b. Ṣafwān; the last judge was al-Aqrā‘ b. Ḥābis. The Tamīm inherited the duties of the ramy, nafr and the ijāza from Sūfa—reports Ibn Ḥazm.

Tamīmī poets recall in their poems the duties performed by Tamīm. Al-Farazdaq boasts of the duty of the ḥakam performed by one of his ancestors:


3) al-Balādhurī: Ansāb, ms. f. 1044 b (but Māzin is followed by Mu‘āwiya b. Shurayf; Ṣuṣul is followed by ‘Allāq).

4) Naqāʿīd 438 (Tha‘lab b. Yarbū‘ is followed by Mu‘āwiya b. Shurayf; but Mu‘āwiya b. Shurayf is followed by Jurwa b. Usayyid. That is apparently an error; read for thuμma: bn).


7) al-Farazdaq: Diwān, p. 502 (ed. Ṣāwī).
The function of the judge boasts as well Jarīr:

\[\text{Wa-nahnu } 'l-bākimūna 'alā Qulāẖīn} \\
\text{kefaynā dhā 'l-jarīrati wa-l-muṣāba} \]^{1)}

(There is a variant: \(\text{Wa-nabhnu } 'l-.hJkimina } 'alā 'Ukdzin\) \]^{2}).

A significant verse of Ḥassān b. Thābit refers to the duties of Tamīm in the markets:

\[\text{Wa-afḏalu mā niltum min al-majdi wa-l-‘ulā} \\
\text{ridāfatunā 'inda 'htidāri 'l-mawásim} \]^{3)}

“And the best which you gained from glory and loftiness
Is (to be) our helpers at the attending of markets.”

This verse is the 14th of a poem of Ḥassān, which was an answer to the poem of the delegation of Tamīm, which came to Mecca to meet the prophet anno 9 H. Arafat analysed the poem \]^{4)} and came to the conclusion that though attributed to Ḥassān, it was actually composed by an Anṣārī in a later period. Unfortunately Arafat did not analyse this verse. The conclusion of Arafat is, however, not acceptable as far as this verse is concerned. Taking for granted that there was an Anṣārī poet interested to insult the Tamīm—he would not have recalled this relation of the Tamīm with Mecca. In later times when Quraysh were highly respected in the Islamic society—the \textbf{ridāfa} for Quraysh was not an insult.

Arafat remarks that the poem of Ḥassān “is clearly divided into two sections. The first eight lines are boasting in the first person plural in precisely the same manner which characterizes the poems of the later Anṣārīs some of which were attributed to Ḥassān. The remaining six lines are threats and insults addressed to the Banū Dārim” \]^{5}).

We are here not concerned with the eight verses of the poem containing

---

1) Jarīr: \(\text{Diwān}, \text{p. 67}; \text{Naqā'id}, \text{p. 457}.\)
2) See \(\text{Naqā'id}, \text{p. 438}; \text{Jarīr: Diwān}, \text{ib.}; \text{Yāqūt: Buldān}, \text{s.v. Qulāẖ}.\)
5) ib. p. 422.
praises of the Anṣār and stressing the aid of the Anṣār for the Prophet. Arafat may be right assuming that these verses were composed by an Anṣārī of a later generation. But why did an Anṣārī of a later generation slander the Tamīm in such a vehement manner.

To start with, one may observe that the six verses of Ḥassān (9-14) are an answer for the poem of al-Zibrijān b. Badr. In the four verses recorded al-Zibrijān praises his tribe and their deeds. The verses of Ḥassān form, in fact, an answer, a ṡaqqāl for the verses of al-Zibrijān. The verse of Ḥassān quoted above forms an answer for the first verse of al-Zibrijān:

\[
\text{Ataynāka kaymā yaʿlama } \text{ʕ-l-nāsu faḍlanā}
\]
\[
\text{idhā } \text{ḥtafalū } \text{ʿinda } \text{ḥtidārī } \text{ʕ-l-mawāsimi}
\]

“We came to you in order that people may know our excellence
When they rally attending the markets”.

The verse seems to point to the duty of the Tamīm performed in the markets. The answer of Ḥassān—on behalf of the Prophet—is explicit: you were merely our chamberlains, ardāf, at these markets. That is the utmost of excellence which you could attain. It would be, in fact, probably better to put this verse after verse 10 of the poem. That would give 3 verses in which Ḥassān refutes the claim of the excellence of the Tamīm. The three other verses (11-13) would form the unity of threat and urge to embrace Islam.

The violent insults in the verses of Ḥassān are not surprising. Ḥassān was known as the poet who mentioned in his verses in the defense of the Prophet the faults of his opponents, their lost battles and some flaws in their pedigree.

Arafat refuting the authenticity of the verses of Ḥassān remarks:
“However, it is doubtful whether it would be in keeping with the

---

1) Ibn Hishām: Sīra IV, 211; two verses are quoted in al-Marzubānī’s Muʿjam al-shuʿārā’, p. 299 and attributed to ‘Uṯārid b. Ḥājib (attributed as well to al-Aqrāʿ b. Ḥābīs).

character of the Prophet, always a great statesman, to allow such insults and threats to be used on such an occasion against the well known representatives of a great tribe” 1). The argument of Arafat is a sound one. But there is a report which may give a reasonable answer to the question put forward by Arafat. According to an account given in the Sira Halabiyya 2) there was a contest between al-Aqra' of the Tamim 3) and Hassān (mufākbara), which was attended by the Prophet. Al-Aqra' recited his poem and Hassān responded with his naqāda. The Prophet, hearing the verses of Hassān, said to al-Aqra': “You did not need (laqad kunta ghaniyyan) to be reminded of things which you understand that people already forgot”. This utterance of the Prophet—says al-Kalbī—was more grave for al-Aqra' than the verses of Hassān.

It is not surprising that this verse (14) of Hassān was omitted in later sources. The duty of Tamīm fell in oblivion and was mentioned only by early Islamic Tamīmī poets. The old markets had already ceased to exist. The verse could not serve as argument of boasting or of insult. The modern commentary of Barqūqī gives the following explanation: “It is better for you (says Hassān) because if you embrace Islam—you would gain the highest glory (sharaf), because you will attend with us all gatherings and that is the best thing you strive at” 4). This explanation is hardly acceptable. Wa-asfālu mā nīltum does not denote future, but past. The verse was, in fact, an insult in the time of Hassān, anno 9 H.: you were merely helpers of ours (of Quraysh) in the markets.

Verses 11-12 of the poem (verse 3 of the second division) describe a real situation. “If you have come to save your lives and your property lest you be divided among the booty, then admit no rival to God, and become Muslims and wear not a similar attire to that of foreigners” 5).

1) Arafat, op. cit., p. 423.
2) al-Ḥalabi: Insān al-‘uyūn, III, 228-29.
3) It is more plausible that the verses of the Tamīmī poet may be attributed to al-Aqra' or 'Uṯārid b. Ḥājib. It is hardly conceivable that the Sa‘di al-Zibriqān would have praised the Dārim: wa-an laysa fī ardi 'l-Hijāzi ka-Dārimi. The verses of Hassān are as well addressed to the Dārim: Banī Dārimin, lā tafṣīlādū.
4) Hassān: Dīwān, ib.
5) Arafat, op. cit., p. 423.
The situation referred to in these verses is plainly mentioned in the verses of al-Farazdaq. The threat of Ḥassān that the Tamīmi prisoners might have been sold in the markets—cannot be considered as a void threat. Al-Farazdaq boasts of the Dārim:

\[
\text{Wa-inda rasūli 'llābi idh shadda qabḍahu wa-mulli' a min āsrā Tamīmin adāhimuh}
\]

Farajnā 'ani 'l-āsrā 'l-adāhima ba' da mā takhammaṭa wa-shtaddat 'alayhim shakā' imuh

In another poem al-Farazdaq stresses that the freeing of the captives was due to the intercession of al-Aqra' with the Prophet for them.

\[
\text{Wa-inda rasūli 'llābi qa'ma 'bru Hābisin bi-khuṭṭati sawwārin ilā 'l-majdi, ḥāzimi.}
\]

\[\text{Labū aṭlaqa 'l-āsrā 'llatī fī ḥibālihi mughallaqatan a'nāqubā fī 'l-adābimi.}
\]

\[\text{Kafā ummahātī 'l-khā'ifīna 'alayhim 'alā' a l-mufḍādī au sibāma l-musābimi}\]

A tradition recorded on the authority of al-Kalbī (forming a commentary of these verses) states that al-Aqra' interceded for the captives of the 'Amr b. Jundab b. al-'Anbar b. 'Amr b. Tamīm and promised to pay the bloodwit. The Prophet freed the captives and al-Aqra' paid the bloodwit on behalf of his people. The verses of Ḥassān about Tamīm seem to be authentic.

One may agree with Arafat about the inferiority of these verses of Ḥassān—but that is not a sufficient proof that these verses were not composed by Ḥassān. Such verses are not surprising in political hijā'.

The problem of the delegation of Tamīm deserves to be treated separately.

The secular duties of Tamīm at the market, discussed above, were

---

1) al-Farazdaq: \textit{Diwān}, p. 767; \textit{Naqā'īd}, p. 748.
2) al-Farazdaq: \textit{Diwān}, p. 862; \textit{Naqā'īd}, p. 747 (mughallatān a'nāqubā).
3) \textit{Naqā'īd}, p. 747; it is significant that versions “L”, “O” of the \textit{Naqā'īd} have \textit{au sibāma l-muqāsimi} resembling closely the expression of the verse of Ḥassān.
complemented by remarkable duties performed by the relatives of Tamim during the festivities of the pilgrimage. The *Sira* of Ibn Hishām supplies the following account about the Tamīmī leaders at the pilgrimage festivities:

“Al-Ghauth b. Murr b. al-Ya’s b. Muṣṭar used to give permission to men on pilgrimage to leave ‘Arafa, and this function descended to his children after him. He and his sons used to be called Šūfa. Al-Ghauth used to exercise this function because his mother was a woman of Jurhum who had been barren and vowed to Allah that if she bore a son she would give him to the Ka‘ba as a slave to serve it and to look after it. In course of time she gave birth to al-Ghauth and he used to look after the Ka‘ba in early times with his Jurhum uncles and presided over the order of departure from ‘Arafa because of the office which he held in the Ka‘ba. His sons carried on the practice until they were cut off. Murr b. Udd, referring to the fulfilment of the mother’s oath, said:

O Lord, I have made one of my sons
A devotee in Mecca the exalted.
So bless me for the vow fulfilled,
And make him the best of creatures to my credit.

Al-Ghauth, so they allege, used to say when he sent the people away:

O God I am following the example of others.
If that is wrong the fault is Qudā‘a’s.

Yahyā b. ‘Abbād b. ‘Abdullah b. al-Zubayr from his father ‘Abbād said: Šūfa used to send the people away from ‘Arafa and give them permission to depart when they left Minā. When the day of departure arrived they used to come to throw pebbles, and a man of Šūfa used to throw for the men, none throwing until he had thrown. Those who had urgent business used to come and say to him: “Get up and throw so that we may throw with you”, and he would say, “No, by God, not until the sun goes down”; and those who wanted to leave quickly used to throw stones at him to hurry him, saying, “Confound you,
get up and throw”. But he refused until the sun went down and then he would get up and throw while the men threw stones with him.

When they had finished the stoning and wanted to leave Minā, Šūfa held both sides of the hill and kept the men back. They said: “Give the order to depart, Šūfa”. No one left until they had gone first. When Šūfa left and had passed on, men were left to go their own way and followed them. This was the practice until they were cut off. After them the next of kin inherited. They were of B. Sa’d in the family of Šafwān b. al-Ḥārith b. Shijna. It was Šafwān who gave permission to the pilgrims to depart from ‘Arafā, and this right was maintained by them up to Islam, the last being Karib b. Šafwān.

Aus b. Tamīm b. Maghrā’ al-Sa’di said:

The pilgrims do not quit their halting-place at ‘Arafā Until it is said, “Give permission O family of Šafwān”.

The verses of Abū Maghrā’ are often quoted and the importance of the duty of Karib b. Šafwān is stressed 2). It is a significant verse of Aus b. Maghrā’:

\[ Tarā thinānā, idhā mā jā’a, bad’ahumū \]
\[ wa-bad’uhum, in atānā, kāna thunyānā \]

The \[ ijāza \] of Šūfa is mentioned in the verses of Murra b. Khulayf:

\[ Idbā mā ajāzat Šafatu ’l-naqba min Minan \]
\[ wa-lāhā qutārun fauqābu safā’u ’l-damī \]
\[ Ra’aytu ’l-iyyāb ‘ājīlan wa-tabata’athat \]
\[ ‘alayni dawā’ in li-l-Rabābi wa-Kalthami \]

The two poets of Tamīm, al-Farazdaq and Jarīr mention boasting

---

1) Ibn Hīshām: \[ Sīra I, 125 seq.; \] the translation of the whole quoted passage is taken from Guillaume: \[ The Life of Muhammad, p. 49-50; \] comp. Ibn Kathīr: \[ al-Bidāya II, 206. \]


3) L. ‘A., s.v. \[ th. n. y. \]

4) al-Marzūbānī: \[ Muṣjam al-sbuṭarā’, p. 382. \]
the *ijāza* of their tribe 1) in Mecca. A verse of al-Farazdaq about the *ijāza* of Tamīm was considered as unsurpassed (*afkhar*) in boasting:

*Ibā habāta ʾl-nāsu ʾl-Muḥassaba min Minan
ʿashiyata yaumi ʾl-nābi min ḥaythu ʿarrāfū
Tarā ʾl-nāsā mā sīrān yasīrūna khalfānā
wa-in nahu aumaʾnā īlā ʾl-nāsi waqqafū 2)*

Jarīr says:

*Wa-jawwāzu ʾl-ḥajṭji lanāʿalaykum
wa-ʿādiyyu ʾl-makārimi wa-l-manāri 3)*

---

1) The tradition stating that Ṣūfā were the descendants of al-Ghauth b. Murr (called al-Rabīṭ, or Ṣūfā) is recorded by Ibn al-Kalbī: *Jambara*, ms. f. 60a (they perished; Muḥ. b. Ḥabīb: *Mukhtalif al-qabāʾil*; al-Balādhuri: *Anṣāb*, ms. f. 956b; Ibn Qutayba: *al-Maʾārif*, p. 34 (al-Ghauth b. Murr moved to al-Yaman and were called Ṣūfā); al-Kalāʾī: *al-Iktifāʾ*, I, 132 seq.; and see Wellhausen: *Reste*, p. 77; Caetani: *Annali* I, p. 105 (79).

There are however contradictory traditions about Ṣūfā. Al-Azraqī: *Akhbār* (Wüstenfeld, I, 128) reports that the men, who were entrusted with the duty of the *ifāda* were descendants of Ṣūfā, whose name was Akhzam; he was from the Māzin b. Asad. Al-Ghauth b. Ṣūfā, the son of Ṣūfā and a woman from Jurhum, was entrusted with the *ijāza* by Hubshiyya of the Khuzāʿa. His descendants performed the *ifāda* in the times of Jurhum and Khuzāʿa till they perished. In the times of Quraysh the *ifāda* passed to the ʿAdwān (of Qays ʿAylān), to Zayd b. ʿAdwān. The last man, who performed this duty when Islam appeared was Abū Sayyāra.

Al-Maqdisī (Kit. *al-Badʾ* IV, 127-ed. Huart) records that Ṣūfā were a group from Jurhum, given the privilege of the *ijāza*. They were defeated in the battle with Quṣayy.

Yāqūt reports that the *ijāza* was in the beginning entrusted to people from Khuzāʿa, passed to ʿAdwān and became the privilege of Abū Sayyāra; finally it became the privilege of al-Ghauth b. Murr b. Udd (al-Buldān, s.v. Thabīr).

In another passage Yāqūt reports that a group of Jurhum, called Ṣūfā, used to perform the *ijāza*. The poet said about them:

*Wa-lā yarīmūna fi ʾl-taʿrīf maqaʿīḥum
ḥattā yuqāla: “ajīrū ʿalā Ṣūfānā”* (Yāqūt: al-Buldān, s.v. Makka). The privilege passed to Khuzāʿa, who was later transferred to ʿAdwān (Abū Sayyāra). Quṣayy removed Abū Sayyāra and his people.

According to al-Sijistānī (*al-Muʿammārūn*, p. 51 ed. Goldziher) Ṣūfā performed the duty of the *ijāza* one day; on another day the duty was performed by ʿAdwān. (see n. 34 of Goldziher.)


3) Jarīr: *Diwān*, p. 298.
Al ‘Ajjāj says describing the multitude of the pilgrims:

\[ \text{Hattā idhā mā hāna fiṭru 'l-ṣuwwami} \\
\text{ajāza minnā jā'izun lam yūqami} 1) \]

These verses of the Tamīmī poets clearly point to the above co-operation between Quraysh and Tamīm. The fact that Quraysh invested Tamīm with the two most important duties in their religions and economic life: the ḥukūma and the ʾiǧāza 2) shows that the Tamīm were in fact strong and influential and rendered considerable services to Mecca.

The suggestion of Wellhausen, that the granting of the ʾiǧāza to Śuṭa (and later to Tamīm—K) shows, that Mecca was not the center of the ḥajj 3) seems not to be adequate. Quraysh ceded their authority or invested a clan with some duties in their territory or in the territory in which the exertion of influence was vital for Quraysh (the markets), because they could in this way efficiently control the activities of the tribes and gain the security of their territory. There were precedents of this kind and this principle was already applied by the rulers of the border kingdoms 4). About the investment of some duties in the market, we can gauge from a significant passage in al-Marzūqī’s Amkina 5):

\[ \text{Wa-kāna asbrāṣu 'l-ʿArabi yatawāṣama bi-tilka 'l-aswāqi maʿa 'l-tujjāri} \\
\text{min ajli anna 'l-mulūkā kānāt tardākhu li-l-asbrāṣi, li-kulli sharīfīn bi-sahmin} \]

1) al-ʿAjjāj: Dīwān, p. 60 (ed. Ahlwardt).
2) For the ʾiǧāza see: von Grunebaum: Muhammadan Festivals, p. 32-33: Wellhausen: Reste, pp. 57, 75-80; about asbrīq Thābir see Abū Mishal: Nawādir, p. 452; and see L. A., s.v. th b r and Sh r q.
3) Wellhausen: Reste, p. 77: “Das Recht, das Zeichen zum Beginne des Laufes zu geben, die sogenannte Iǧāza stand in alter Zeit den Ĩufa d. i. den Ĭl Čafwān zu, nicht den Quraisch (B. Hischām 77, 80, 82, vrgl. Agh. III, 412, seq.). Das ist bemerkenswert. Hätte Mekka im Mittelpunkt gestanden, so hätten es auch die Quraisch getan; statt dessen wird berichtet, dass sie in der heidnischen Zeit sich gar nicht an der Festversammlung zu Ṭarāfa beteiligten, sondern erst an einem späteren Punkte zu der Prozession stießen”.
5) al-Marzūqī: al-Amkina, II, 166.
min al-arbāḥi. Fa-kāna sharīfu kulli baladin yahduru sūqa baladihi, illā ‘Ukāz, fa-innahum kānū yatawāfauna bībā min kulli aubin.

“And the nobles (leaders of the tribes) used to frequent these markets with the merchants, because the kings used to allot to every leader (sharīf, noble), a share of the profits. The leader of every area used to attend the market of this district, except ‘Ukāz, as they flocked to ‘Ukāz from every side’.

This passage gives some idea about the relations between the rulers and the Bedouin chiefs. They were granted some share in the profits. Such apparently was the situation in Dūmat al-Jandal, at Hajar, at Ṣuḥār-at Dabā and in other markets, controlled by rulers of client kingdoms in which there were taxes levied. In the same way Quraysh invested the Tamīm with the privilege of the leadership of the market of ‘Ukāz. But this was not based on some paltry reward. ‘Ukāz was a free market where no taxes were paid. There is no indication what this reward was. The expression a’immat al-‘Arab points to some principle of mutual co-operation. As an ideological base served the principle of the respect for the sanctuary of Mecca and the sacred months. It is clear that the consent of the tribes was necessary for the performing of this duty.

The control of the markets and the ijjāza were of importance not only for the tribes. It was of the concern of some rulers as well. This can be gauged from a significant tradition reported by Suhayli: wa-qāla ba’du naqalati’l-akhbāri inna wilāyata ’l-Ghauthi kānāt min qibali mulūkī Kindata. “Some transmitters of historical records say that the appointment of al-Ghauth (b. Murr) was done by the kings of Kinda” 1). These Ghauth b. Murr are said to have left for al-Yaman 2). The traditions that al-Ghauth b. Murr emigrated to al-Yaman point clearly to their connections with South Arabia. According to tradition, after Ṣūfā were extinguished, the duty was inherited by the Ṣafwān b. al-Ḥārith b. Shijna of the Sa‘d, who were next in kin (fa warithahum dhālika min ba’dihim bi-l-qu’dudi). One may remember that this family had close connections

1) al-Suhayli: al-Raud al-umrūf I, 84 inf.
2) See above, p. 154, n. 1.
with the Kinda family. It was Uwayr b. Shijna who sheltered some members of the defeated family of Kinda and was praised by Imru ’l-Qays. It was Karib b. Ṣafwān who refused to join the other clans of Tamīm in their attack against the ‘Āmir b. Ṣa‘ṣa‘a, who belonged to the Ḥums, at the battle of Jabala. One may venture to suggest that there is a grain of truth in this tradition. The Kinda co-operated with Quraysh in the escort of caravans 1) and it is plausible that they influenced at least the appointment of the man and the clan who performed the ījāza.

A Saʿdī leader and poet, al-Zibrīqdn b. Badr, reproached a man who dared to slander Abū Jahl. He said:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Atadrī man hajauta Abā Ḥabībin} \\
\text{salīla khaḍārimin sakanū ’l-bitāba} \\
\text{A “Zāda ’l-Rakbi” tadbkuru am Hishāman} \\
\text{wa-bayta ’llāhi wa-l-balada} \\
\text{l-laqāha} 2) \\
\end{align*}
\]

The verses express loyalty and respect to the aristocratic Qurashite (Abū Jahl) and devotion for Mecca.

The branch of Tamīm to whom the function of the judge at Ḫaḍramaut: “...the Quraysh used to request the escort of Kinda...and the Banū Ākil al-Murār gained power, owing to Quraysh, over other people”. It is plausible that we find in Mecca men from Tamīm as *hulafā* and daughters of Tamīmī chiefs married by leaders of Meccan clans. This fact may deserve to be stressed. According to some traditions, Quraysh

1) Comp. Muh. b. Ḥabīb: *al-Mubabbār*, p. 267 (about the market of al-Rābiya in Ḫaḍramaut): “...the Quraysh used to request the escort of Kinda...and the Banū Ākil al-Murār gained power, owing to Quraysh, over other people”..
2) Yāqūt: *Buldān*, s.v. Makka.
3) See Oppenheim — Caskel: *Die Beduinen*, III, 166.
restrained from marrying daughters of some tribes. Tūmādir bint al-Asbagh of Kalb, the wife of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Auf was the first Kalbī woman married by a Qurashite. Quraysh did not enter into marriages with Kalb\(^1\)). About a family of the Tamīm tradition emphasizes that Quraysh entered into marriages with this family\(^2\).)


---

2) al-Balādhuri: *Ansāb*, ms. f. 989 b: .. kāna sharifan wa-qad nakahat ilayhi Qurayshun ..
9) al-Jumāhī: *Ṭabaqāt الفهūl al-shu‘arā‘*, p. 488 n. 3.


2) al-Balādhurī: Ansāb, ms. f. 154a, 155a.
3) al-Balādhurī: Ansāb, ms. f. 1044a; al-Muṣ‘ab al-Zubayrī, op. cit., p. 169.
5) al-Muṣ‘ab al-Zubayrī: op. cit., p. 198; al-Balādhurī: Ansāb, ms. f. 808a (Kuhayfa bint Jandal—not Fukayha); Ibn al-Kalbī: Jambara, ms. f. 21a.
10) al-Muṣ‘ab al-Zubayrī, op. cit., p. 204.

The granddaughter of Abū Lahab, Durra bint 'Utba b. Abī Lahab married a Tamīmī: Hind b. Hind b. Abī Ḥāla the grandson of Khadija from her first (or second) husband, the Tamīmī Abū Ḥāla 4). The daughter of Naufal b. al-Ḥārith b. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib 5) married the Tamīmī Hānẓala b. al-Rabī‘a, the secretary of the Prophet 6), the nephew of Aktham b. Ṣayfī 7).

The list of the Tamīmī women who married the men of the aristocratic families of Quraysh is not comprehensive at all. There seems to have been a considerable number of Tamīmī women who married the sons of distinguished families of Mecca. It points to the close relations between Quraysh and Tamīm. These marriages may have been intended to strengthen the ties with the chiefs of Tamīm, who contributed considerably to strengthen the position of Mecca in the tribal society.

2) Ibn al-Kalbi: Jamhara, ms. f. 116 b.
4) Ibn al-Kalbi: Jamhara, ms. f. 118b.
6) Ibn al-Kalbi: Jamhara, ms. f. 118a.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

al-'Abbāsī: Maṣābīḍ al-tansīṣ, Cairo 1316 A.H.
Abū Ḥayyān: Tafsir al-bahr al-muhīf, I-VIII, Cairo 1328 A.H.
MECCA AND TAMIN

Abū Ubayd: Kitāb al-amwāl, Cairo 1353 A.H.
al-ʿAlūsī: Bulūgh al-ʿArab, Cairo 1940.
al-ʿAskārī: Diwān al-maʿānī, I-II, Cairo 1352 A.H.
al-ʿAṣmaʿīyyāt, ed. W. Ahlwardt,
al-ʿAẓrāʾī: Akhbar Makka, ed. F. Wüstenfeld Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka),
Leipzig 1858.
al-Bakrī, Abū ʿUbayd ʿAbdallah b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz: Muʿjam maʿṣūmat, ed. M. al-
Saqqā, Cairo 1945-1951.
— —: Sīmīt al-lāʾālī, ed. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Maymānī, Cairo 1936.
al-Balāḏurī, ʿAbd al-Rahmān: Ansāb al-ashrāf, ms. Ashir Efendi, 597/8, Istanbul;
vol. I, ed. Muḥ. Ḥamidullāh, Cairo 1959; vol. IV/B, ed. M. Schloessinger,
al-Dabbī: Amīthāl al-ʿArab, Constantinople, 1300 A.H.
Dahlān: al-Sīra al-nabawiyya, on margin of al-Ḥalabī’s Insān al-ʿUyūn, I-III, Cairo
1952-1935.
al-Dhahabi: Siyar al-ṣālim al-nubalāʾ, I-II, ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjīd - I. al-ʿAbīrī,
Cairo 1956-1957.
— —: Taʾrīkh al-İslām, I-V, Cairo 1367-1369 A.H.
al-Diyārbakrī, Ḥusayn b. Muḥ.: Taʾrīkh al-Khamīs, I-II, Cairo 1283 A.H.
al-Farazdaq: Diwān, ed. al-Ṣāwī, Cairo 1936.
(Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka), Leipzig 1859.
M. Ḥamīdullāh: “al-Īlāf ou les rapports économiques-diplomatiques de la Mecque
pré-Islamique”, Mélanges Louis Massignon, II, p. 293 sep.
— —: Muslim Conduct of State, Lahore 1961.
Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr: al-Inbāb ʿalā qabāʾil al-rumāb, Cairo 1350 A.H.
— —: al-İstīʿāb fi maʿrifat al-ʾaṣḥāb, Hyderabad 1336 A.H.
Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihī: al-İqḍ al-Farīd, I-IV, Cairo 1933.
Ibn al-Jauzi: Şifat al-Safwa, Hyderabad 1355-57 A.H.
Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd: Sharḥ nabī al-balāgha, I-IV, Cairo 1329 A.H.

JESHO, VIII
Ibn Ḥajar: *al-Isbāʾa fī tamyiz al-qabābā*, I-VIII, Cairo 1323-1327 A.H.
Ibn al-Jārūd: *al-Muntaqqa*, Hyderabad 1309 A.H.
Ibn Kathir: *al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, I-XIV, Cairo 1351-1358 A.H.
—: *al-Maʿārif*, Cairo 1935.
Ibn al-Shajārī: *al-Ḥamāsa*, Hyderabad 1345 A.H.
Jarīr: *Diwān*, ed. al-Sāwī, Cairo 1353 A.H.
al-Majlisi: *Bihār al-anwār*, vol. VI, 1352 A.H.
—: *Sharḥ diwan al-hamāsa*, ed. A. Amin — A. S. Hārūn, Cairo 1953.
al-Qummi- Gharāʾib al-qur’ān, on margin of Ṭabarānī’s *Tafsīr*, Būlāq 1323-1329 A.H.
al-Ṭabarānī: *al-Muṯjam al-saḡbīr*, Delhi 1311 A.H.
J. Wellhausen: *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, Berlin 1887.
Zāfīr al-Qāsimī: *al-Īlaf wa-l-maʿnātī ghayrīn ’l-mashrūṭa*, *RAAD*, XXXIV.
al-Zurqānī: *Sharḥ al-mawābiḥ al-ladunniyya*, Cairo 1325-1328 A.H.