SOME REPORTS CONCERNING MECCA
FROM JÄHILIYYA TO ISLAM

BY
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Information about the conditions in Mecca in the period preceding Islam is scarce, and there are few accounts about the relations of Mecca with tribes and vassal kingdoms. Some data from hitherto unpublished Mss., or those published only recently may elucidate certain aspects of the inner situation in Mecca, and shed some light on the relations of Mecca with the tribes and the vassal kingdoms.

I

A passage in the anonymous *Nibāyat al-irab fī akhbār al-furs wa-l-ʿarab*) gives some details about the activity of Hāshim b. ʿAbd Manāf and about the Expedition of the Elephant. It is noticeable that this report stresses especially the relations of Mecca with Abyssinia, not emphasized in other sources.

Hāshim, says the tradition, took from the kings of Abyssinia, al-Yaman, Persia and Syria charters permitting the merchants of Mecca to frequent these territories with their merchandise. It is emphasized that the first king who granted him the charter was al-Najāši and that “Abyssinia was the best land in which the Meccan merchants traded.” After receiving of the charter from the Najāši Hāshim went to Yemen. The report furnishes us with some information about the kings who ruled in that period: in Yemen ruled Abraha b. al-Ashram who bore the kunya Abū Yaksūm; he granted Hāshim the requested charter.

---

1) The reader’s attention is called to the Addenda at the end of this article. Places in the text and the notes referred to in the Addenda are marked by asterisks.
2) See about this Ms.: E. G. Browne, *Some Account of the Arabic Work entitled Nibāyat l-irab fī akhbār i Fursi wa-l-ʿArab*, JRAS, 1900, pp. 195-204.
4) Ibid.: ...wa-kānat arḍu l-ḥabashati min afḍali l-amākini llatī yatjaru fīhā qurayshun.
5) It may be noticed that the social conditions in the army of the Abyssinians and
From the Yemen Hāshim journeyed to Jabala b. Ayham, the king of Syria; from Syria he proceeded to 'Irāq, to Qubādh; from both of them he got the required charters. The final sentences of the report tell us about the results of the efforts of Hāshim and give a description of the changes which occurred in the relations of Mecca with the tribes and the neighbouring kingdoms as a result of the granted charters. “...Thus Quraysh traded in these territories and got profits and became rich; their wealth increased, their trade expanded; thus the Arabs overcame the ‘Ajam by the abundance of wealth, generosity and excellence; they (i.e. Quraysh) were men of mind, reason, dignity, generosity, excellence, staid behaviour and nobility; they are the chosen people of God’s servants, the best of His creature and the noblest of His peoples 1).”

the causes which brought about the fight between Aryt and Abraha are given in the Nihāyat al-irab in more detail than in other sources. Aryt, a nephew of the Najāshi, divided gifts and products after the conquest of the Yemen among the chiefs and nobles of the Abyssinians, treating scornfully the weak (i.e. the poor) and depriving them of his gifts (fol. 151a: ...wa-farraga l-sīlātī wa-l-hawā'ilā ‘alā ‘ugamū‘i l-habashati wa-asbrāfīhim wa-harama ḍu‘afā‘ahum wa-zdarāhun fa-gaḥḍībū min dhālikā ghaḍaban shadidān...). They appealed to Abraha, one of the officers of the army sent with Aryt, and swore their allegiance to him. The weak part of the army stood behind Abraha, the strong and the noble behind Aryt. In the well-known fight between them Abraha killed Aryt. The declaration issued by Abraha after the duel stresses again the social aspect of the rebellion: “O Abyssinian people, God is our Lord, Jesus is our Prophet, the Gospel is our Book, the Najāshi is our king. I rebelled against Aryt only because he abandoned equality amongst you. Therefore stand fast for equality amongst you, as God will not be pleased by preference in division (i.e. of spoils and grants—K) and by depriving the weak of their share of booty.” (fol. 151b: yā ma’shara l-habashati illū ṭabbūnā wa-qisā nabīyyuṁa wa-l-injīlu kitābunā wa-l-najāšiyyu营养价值, wa-innī innamā kharajtu ‘alā aryta li-tarkibi l-sawiyyata baynakum, fa-tbbūthū li-l-stiwā‘ī baynakum, fa-īnna illū bahā lā yardā bi-l-atharati fī l-ṣaqmi wa-lān yuhrama l-ḍu‘afā‘u l-maqbnama...) Abraha, stressing in his letter to the Najāshi his allegiance and loyalty, repeats his argument that Aryt treated the weak unjustly (fol. 152a: ...wa-innāmā qataltu aryta illā li-istārihi l-agwiyya‘a ‘alā l-ḍu‘afā‘ī min ḍanāqī, fa-lam yakum dhālika min siratika wa-lā ra‘yika...). The lowly origin of Abraha is indicated in the remark of the Najāshi: ...wa-innāma buwa qirdūn min al-gurūdī, laya lahu sharafun fī l-habashati wa-lā aṣlun. Cf. the account of Procopius in Sidney Smith’s Events in Arabia in the 6th Century AD, BSOAS XVI (1914), pp. 431-432; and see Mughultāy, al-Zahr al-bāsim, Ms. Leiden, Or. 370, fol. 32a (quoted from Wāqidi): ...fa-a‘ṭā (i.e. Aryt) ḍumūkā wa-stadhallas l-suqarā‘a.

1) Nihāyat al-irab, fol. 174a, inf.: fa-atjarat qurayshun fī ādibīhī l-amākīnī kullīhī fa-rabīḥī wa-atbrawa wa-kathurat amwālum wa-azymaṭtijārātum wa-sāda l-arabū
After the death of Hāshim his son ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib took over his duties and mission; he died during the reign of Anūshirwān b. Qubādhan)

In his time the well-known expedition of Abraha against Mecca took place.

According to Arab tradition Abraha built a temple (baykal, qullays) and tried to divert the pilgrimage to Mecca to his temple. The immediate cause for the expedition of Abraha was the desecration of this temple. We have conflicting traditions about the location of the temple (Ṣan‘ā’, Najrān, a place on the sea shore) and the persons who burnt it, robbed it or relieved their bowels in it. According to the traditions the desecration was committed by Nufayl b. Ḥābib al-Khath‘āmī, 2) by a man (or men) from Kināna 3), or more accurately by a man from the Nasa‘a 4) or by a group of Arabs.

The reports about the desecration (or the unintentional burning) of the temple point to Quraysh as the initiators of this action. The tradition that the deed was carried out by men from Kināna, or a group of nasa‘a or hums 5) deserves special attention; these groups were closely related to Quraysh. A tribal leader of al-Ḥārith b. ‘Abd

1) Ibid., fol. 174b, sup.
2) Al-Ṭabarī, Ta‘rikh, Cairo 1939, I, 556; Mughulṭāy, op. cit., fol. 32a; al-Zurqānī, Sharḥ al-mawāhib, Cairo 1325, I, 83; Nihāyat al-irāb, fol. 174a.
3) Muḥammad b. Ḥābib, al-Munammaq, ed. Khurshid Ahmad Fārīq, Hyderabad 1384/1964, p. 68; al-Ṭabarī, Ta‘rikh, I, 551; al-Zurqānī, op. cit., I, 83; al-Damīrī, Ḥayāt al-ḥayawān, Cairo 1383-1963, II, 230; and see al-Bayhaqī, Dalā‘īl al-nubuwwa, Ms. Br. Mus., Or. 3013, fol. 13a: ... anna rajulan min bani mlkān b. kināna, wa-huwa min al-hums ...
Manāt b. Kināna came to Mecca in order to conclude an alliance with a clan of Quraysh 1). Kināna were the allies of Quraysh in the wars of *al-Fijār* 2). The close co-operation of Kināna with Quraysh is reflected in a short passage recorded by al-Fākihī on the authority of al-Zuhrī where the crucial event of the boycott of the Banū Hāshim is recounted. When Quraysh decided to impose a boycott on the Banū Hāshim in connection with missionary activities of the Prophet, they allied with the Banū Kināna. The terms of the agreement between the two parties entailed that they should cease trading with the Banū Hāshim and desist from giving them shelter 3). This passage may help us to evaluate the story of the boycott 4) and the reports about the co-operation of Quraysh with the neighbouring tribes and clans. It is not surprising to find traditions according to which a leader of Kināna participated in the delegation to Abraha, when he came with his army to destroy the Kaʿba. Consequently the version that men from Kināna committed the desecration seems to be preferable.

The reports usually describe the wrath of Abraha when he received the information about the desecration of his temple. The *Nihāyat al-irab* has a short but important passage about his reaction. Two men of Khathʿam, says the report, desecrated the temple of Abraha. Upon hearing about it he said: “This was committed by agents of Quraysh as they are angry for the sake of their House to which the Arabs resort for their pilgrimage.” He swore to destroy the Kaʿba so that pilgrimage should be to the temple of Ṣanʿāʾ exclusively. “In Ṣanʿāʾ there were (at that time—K) Qurashi merchants”, states the report. “Among them was Hishām b. al-Mughīra 5).” Abraha summoned

2) See e.g. *al-Munammaq*, p. 201 seq., al-Bakrī, *op. cit.*, s.v. ‘Ukāz.
the Qurashi merchants and asked them: “Have I not allowed you to trade freely in my country and ordered to protect you and to treat you honourably”? They said: “Yes, o king, so it was.” Abraha asked: “So why did you secretly send men to the church built for the king, al-Najashi, to defecate and to smear the walls with excrements?” They answered: “We do not know about it.” Abraha said: “I thought that you did it indeed out of anger for the sake of your House to which the Arabs go on pilgrimage, when I ordered to direct the pilgrims to this church.” Hisham b. al-Mughira then said: “Our House is (a place of) shelter and security; there gather there prey-beasts with wild animals, prey birds with innocuous ones and they do not attack each other. Pilgrimage to your temple should be performed by those who follow your faith, but adherents of the faith of the Arabs 1) will not choose or adopt anything (else) in preference to the House (i.e. the Ka’ba—K?)”. Abraha swore to demolish the Ka’ba. Hisham b. al-Mughira said that more then one king had intended to pull down the Ka’ba, but had failed to get there, as the House has a Lord who protects it. “Do what you like” (sha’naka wa-mâ aradta) he finally said.

This seems to be an early tradition, reflecting as it does the conditions at the period preceding the expedition of Abraha and

---
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corroborating the reports about commercial relations between Mecca and the Yemen in that period. There is little ground for suspicion that the story was fabricated: it contains no favourable features, heroic or Islamic, which would explain why it should have been invented; Makhźūm could have hardly any interest in forging it as one of the many “praises” of Hishām 1). It remained in fact peripheral, not included in any of the reports of the expedition of Abraha.

The answer of Hishām in his talk with Abraha contains an interesting definition of the position of Mecca and its role as conceived by a Meccan leader. Mecca, in this concept, was a neutral city, not involved in intertribal wars, a place of security and a sanctuary to which every Arab had the right to make pilgrimage. Only adherents of a state religion should be ordered to perform their pilgrimage to a temple established by the ruler. It is hardly necessary to observe that this neutral position enabled Mecca to expand its commercial relations with the tribes.

A similar opinion about Mecca was expressed by Qurra b. Hubayra, a tribal leader, in a decisive moment of the history of Mecca: in the first phase of the ridda. His view mirrors the attitude of the tribal groups, according to their established relations with Mecca. When ‘Amr b. al-‘Āš was on his way from ‘Uman to Medina, when the revolt of the ridda started, he came to Qurra b. Hubayra al-Qushayrī 2). Qurra received him hospitably and gave him escort to Medina. When ‘Amr b. al-‘Āš was about to leave, Qurra gave him his advice: “You people of Quraysh lived in your haram with security both for yourselves and for (other) people (i.e. the tribes—K) with regard to you. Then there appeared a man from amongst you and announced what you heard. When this (information) reached us we did not dislike it; we said: “A man from Muḍar is (going) to lead the people” (i.e. the tribes—K). This man has (now) died. People (i.e. the tribes—K) are hurrying to you not offering you anything. Therefore go back to your haram and live there in security. If you do not act (according to

my advice—K) I am ready to meet you (in fight—K) wherever you will fix the place 1)." The intent of Qurra was that Mecca should return to its former position as a place of security. Quraysh had to refrain from getting involved in a new political plan "to lead the people"; this plan had come to its end, in his opinion, with the death of the Prophet. Quraysh should revert to its previous relations with the tribes upon conditions of equality, with co-operation and confidence. Because of this saying Khālid b. al-Walīd demanded to execute Qurra when he was taken prisoner 2).

There are conflicting traditions about the troops which took part in the expedition of Abraha. Ibn Isḥāq mentions only the Abyssinians as the force of Abraha, reporting that the Arabs went out against him. The two leaders who fought Abraha, aided by their tribes and the Arabs who considered it their duty to fight him, were Dhū Nafar al-Ḥimyāri and Nufayl b. Ḥābib al-Khathāmī: they were defeated and captured. Abraha marched towards Mecca and passed by al-Ṭāʾīf where he was received with hospitality by Muʿattīb b. Mālik al-Thaqafī and directed towards Mecca. This story is followed by the report of the seizing of the herd of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, the talk of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib with Abraha and the miracle of the birds who destroyed the army of Abraha. Ibn Isḥāq mentions also another tradition according to which ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib went to Abraha in the company of the leaders of Kinānā and Hudhayl (Yaʿmar b. Nufātha al-Kinānī and Khwaylīd al-Hudhalī) and offered him a third part of the goods of the Tihāma 3).

Muqāṭīl (d. 150 H) reports (as quoted from his Tafsīr) about the following two expeditions of Abraha al-Ashram al-Yamanī against

1) Ibn Hubaysh, al-Maghāzī, Ms. Leiden, Or. 343, p. 24: ...wa-innakum, yā maʾshara qurayshin, kuntum fī ḥaramikum taʾmanūna fībi wa-yaʾmanukum l-nāsu; thumma khabrāja minkum rajulin yaqīlu mā samiʾta; fa-lammā balaghāna dhālika lam nakrabhu, wa-qulna: rajulin min muḍara yaṣiqū l-nāsa; wa-qad tuwuffiya wa-l-nāsu ilaykum sirāʿun, wa-innakum ghayra muʾṣikum shayʿan, fa-lḥaqī bi-ḥaramikum fāʾmanū fībi; wa-in kunta ghayra faʿilin faʿidnī ḥaythu shīta ātiaka ... *

2) Ibid., p. 24, ll. 4-5; p. 26, ll. 1-2.

3) Ibn Hishām, op. cit., I, 47, 63; al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 551-556 (from Ibn Isḥāq); Ibn Kathīr, al-Sīra, I, 30-41 (from Ibn Isḥāq); al-Azraqī, Akhbār Makka, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Leipzig 1858, pp. 87-92.
Mecca: the first one was headed by Abū Yaksūm b. (!) Abraha in order to destroy the Ka‘ba and establish the elephant as object of worship; this expedition failed. The second one occurred after some Qurashites came to a Christian church called al-Haykal (called by the Najāshī Māsirhasān), sat down to roast meat, forgot to extinguish the fire and as a result the church went up in flames. This happened a year or two after the first expedition and was the cause for the second expedition. When the Najāshī was informed about the burning of the church he became enraged and decided to go out against Mecca. Ḥujr b. Shurāhil al-Kindī, Abū Yaksūm al-Kindī (!) and Abraha b. al-Ṣabbāḥ promised him their help. It was the Najāshī who headed the expedition and who talked with ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib and returned him the seized herd. When ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib came back to Mecca, he was advised by Abū Mas‘ūd al-Thaqaṭī to leave the city and to stay in the surrounding mountains. “This House has a Lord Who protects it”—said Abū Mas‘ūd 1). Then the miracle of the birds appeared, Abraha’s army was destroyed and ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib and Abū Mas‘ūd both collected the discarded jewels and gold 2).

Ibn Ishāq gives a different version in his Mubtada’: the grandson of Abraha, the king of the Ḥabash (the son of his daughter), Aksūm b. al-Ṣabbāḥ came as pilgrim to Mecca. On his way back he stopped in a church in Najrān. There he was attacked by men from Mecca who robbed his luggage and looted the church. When the grandfather heard about it from his grandson, he sent against Mecca an army of twenty thousand men headed by Shamir b. Maqṣūd.

The short report contains the story of the seizing of the herd of ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib and the miracle of the birds 3). Two poems of ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib (14 verses ending in mū and 10 verses ending in mā) are also quoted from the Mubtada’ 4).

1) Comp. above, p. 65: the answer of Hishām b. al-Mughīra to Abraha.
2) Mughultāy, op. cit., fol. 25a-26b sup. (See a short passage of the version of Muqātīl in Majlisi’s Bihār, XV, 137; other fragments: al-‘Īsāmi, op. cit., I, 232-233; al-Tha‘labī, Qisas al-anbiya‘, Cairo n.d., pp. 602-603).*
3) Mughultāy, op. cit., fol. 26b.
4) Ibid., fol. 27a-b.
But Mughulțăy seems to have recorded only a part of the report of the *Mubtada*. The whole report is recorded by Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣfahānī in his *Dalā'il al-mubnawwa* ¹). The isnād of Abū Nu‘aym does not include the name of Ibn Ishāq; but the fragment of the *Mubtada* recorded by Mughulțăy is identical with the first part of Abū Nu‘aym’s report ²). According to this report the army of Shamir consisted of Khaulān and a group of Ashʿarīyyīn. The army was joined by al-Taqāl al-Khathāmī. The talk of ‘Abd al-Muţtalib with Abraha and the story of the miracle of the birds are given at length.

The combined report of al-Ṭabarī ³) is based on the account of al-Wāqīdī. It is recorded by Ibn Sa‘d ⁴), Abū Nu‘aym ⁵), Mughulțăy ⁶), and al-Tha‘labī ⁷). According to this tradition ‘Abd al-Muţtalib stayed at the mountain of Ḥirā’ with ‘Ā’idh al-Makhzūmī, Muţ‘īm b. ‘Adīyy and Abū Mas‘ūd al-Thaqāfī.

An anonymous report claims that the father of ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān, was close to ‘Abd al-Muţtalib on the mountain; the first who descended in order to collect the spoils of the army of Abraha were ‘Abd al-Muţtalib, ‘Affān and Abū Mas‘ūd al-Thaqāfī. The father of ‘Uthmān then became a rich man ⁸). According to the report of the *Nibāyat al-irab* ‘Abd al-Muţtalib descendend with Ḥākim b. Ḥizām ⁹).

A significant report is recorded by al-Ṭabarī ¹⁰) and Majlisi ¹¹). The majority of the followers of Abraha in his army were from ‘Akk, Ashʿar and Khathāmī. When the troops of Abraha reached

---

¹) Hyderabad 1369/1950, pp. 101-105; see al-Suyūṭī, *al-Durr al-manthūr*, Cairo 1314, VI, 394 (quoted from the *Dalā‘il*).

²) Mughulțăy perused the text of Abū Nu‘aym and remarks (fol. 25b, l.7) that Abū Nu‘aym recorded the name of the commander Shamir b. Maṣfūd (see Abū Nu‘aym, *Dalā‘il*, p. 101, note 1).

³) *Ta‘rikh*, I, 556-557.


⁶) *Al-Zahr*, fol. 32a.

⁷) *Qīsāṣ al-anbiyā‘*, pp. 603-604.


⁹) Fol. 176b.


¹¹) *Bihār al-anwār*, Teheran 1379, XV, 134-137.
Mecca, the people left the city and sought shelter in the mountains. There were left in Mecca only 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib carrying out the duty of the *ṣiqāya* and Shayba b. 'Uthmān b. 'Abd al-Dār carrying out the duty of the *ḥijāba*. The story of the seizure of the herd of 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib is followed by the story of the meeting of 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib with Abū Yaksūm. The details about the events following the meeting are of special interest. The Ashʿariyyūn and the Khathʿam broke their swords and spears and declared themselves innocent before God of any intention to destroy the House. When the miracle of the birds occurred, the troops who marched against Mecca being killed by the stones thrown by the birds, the Kathʿam and Ashʿar were saved from being harmed by the stones.

This report, recorded by the Shīʿī Ṭabarsi and Majlisi, is recorded by the Sunnī al-Bayhaqī in his *Dala'il al-nubwā* ¹). It is evident that the tradition has a South-Arabian tendency. The South-Arabian tradition also adopts the version that Dhū Nafar and Naufal b. Ḥabīb were taken prisoners by Abraha and forced to follow him. Naufal (or Nufayl) was the man who desecrated the temple of Abraha in order to keep the pilgrimage to Mecca and Dhū Nafar was a friend of 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, who advised him when he came to meet Abraha ²). These are apparent attempts to clear the South-Arabian tribes from any accusation of aiding Abraha in his activities against the *haram* of Mecca.

The version recorded by Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb ³) differs from those mentioned above. Abraha built the church in Ṣanʿā‘ according to the plan of the Kaʿba. It was desecrated by a group of Kināna. Abraha decided to march against Mecca, to destroy the Kaʿba and afterwards to raid Najd. He gathered people of low extraction and brigands and listed them in his army. He was followed by the leader of Khathʿam, Nufayl, on the head of huge groups of his tribe and by the Munabbih b. Kaʿb of the Balḥārīth, who did not recognize the sanctity of the

---

¹) Fols. 13a-14a.
³) *Al-Munammagh*, pp. 68-80.
Ka‘ba and the haram. Ţarafa, who stayed at that time in Najrān, warned Qatāda b. Maslama al-Ḥanāfi 1) of the planned attack of Abraha against Najd. Verses of Kulthūm b. ‘Umays al-Ḵinānī, who was captured by the army of Abraha and put in chains, give a vivid description of the army of Abraha.

O, may God let hear a call:
and send between the mountains of Mecca (al-Askhabānī) a herald.
There came upon you the troops of al-Ashram, among them an elephant:
and black men riding (beasts like) ogers.
And infantry troops, stout ones, whose number cannot be counted:
by al-Lāt, they swing their javelins thirsty (of blood).
They came upon you, they came upon you! The earth is too narrow to bear them:
like a gush of water flowing overpowers the valley.

On their way the troops of Abraha were attacked by the Azd who defeated them. Abraha and his army were however received hospitably in al-Ṭā‘if by Mas‘ūd b. Mu‘attib, who explained to Abraha that the sanctuary of al-Ṭa‘if is small and that his goal is the Ka‘ba of Mecca, which should be destroyed in revenge for the desecration of his temple. When the army of Abraha approached Mecca, the people of city left, seeking refuge in the mountains; only ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib and ‘Amr b. ‘Ā’idh al-Makhzūmī remained in the city 2): they fed the people (scil. remaining in Mecca). Further the report gives the story of the meeting of Abraha with ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib and the miracle of the birds. The appended verses give the description of the disastrous end of Abraha’s army.

The quoted traditions are, in fact, contradictory and the picture they give is blurred. Miraculous and legendary elements 3) are evident and form a part of every report. There are however some details which deserve to be considered. Muqāṭil’s version, as recorded by Mughulṭāy, is the only one in which two expeditions are mentioned: a first one which failed to reach the precincts of Mecca, and a second one, which

---

1) See Divān de Ţarafa, ed. M. Seligsohn, Paris 1901, p. 146 (VII, appendix). And see ibid., p. 90; and see al-Munammas, p. 69, note 3.
3) See the legendary report of Abū l-Ḥasan al-Bakrī in Majlisi’s Bihār XV, 65-74.
occurred a year or two later. In this expedition the army was led by the Najāshi, some troops entered Mecca, but the expedition ended with the disastrous fate of the army. This tradition suits the assumption of W. Caskel, who considered the inscription Ry 506 referring to an expedition preceding the Expedition of the Elephant 1).

The troops in the army of Abraha seem to have been from both South and North Arabia. Khath'am, Balḥārith, 'Akk, Ash'ar, Khaulān are the names of South-Arabian troops, mentioned in the reports. The presence of Muḍārī troops is implied in the story of the meal of testicles prepared for Khath'am, which the Muḍārī (Northern) troops refused to eat 2). When the Muḍārīs refused to eat the testicles and to prostrate before the cross, Abraha ordered to summon them; they explained that they do not eat testicles, nor do they prostrate to the cross; they follow the tenets of their people (wa-naḥnu, abayta l-laʿna, fī dīnī qaumīna). Abraha freed them, stating: kullu qaumin wa-dīnahum 3). There was also a troop of Abyssinians. The verses of Qays b. Khuzāʿī (al-Sulamī) in praise of Abraha describe a selected unit of Abyssinians surrounding Abraha:

v. 3 The sons of Abyssinia around him:
wrapped in Abyssinian silk clothes
4. 4 With white faces and black faces:
their hair (curly) like long peppers 4).

The information that Abraha intended to raid Najd after he would destroy the Kaʿba is noteworthy. The attack on Najd, as attested by the verses of Ṭarafa, seems to have been planned on the background of the struggle between Persia and Byzantium and the raids of the tribes being under the sway of al-Ḥira on the territories of tribes in the region of Najrān being under the sway of Abraha 5). It is notice-

2) Al-Munammaq, p. 70: ayyubā l-māliku, inna man naʿaka min muḍāra abau an yaʿkulū min hādhihi l-khuṣā ṣay'an ... wa-arṣala, fa-ukhidha labū nāsun min muḍara ... 
3) Ibid., p. 71. The saying of Abraha reminds the idea advocated by Hishām b. al-Mughīra in his talk with Abraha.
4) Al-Munammaq, p. 70.
able that Abraha chose Najrân as halting place in his march, where, as Ṭarafa says, “the kings took their decisions.” (bi-najrāna mā qadā l-mulûk qaḍa‘ahum) ¹). The people of Najrân were devoted Christians and certainly sympathised with Abraha; ²) groups of Balḥarith in this region aided him.

The information about the leaders of Mecca who remained with ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib deserves to be examined. ‘Amr b. ‘Abbādīdh al-Makhzūmī was apparently in close contact with ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib; ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib married his daughter Fāṭima and she gave birth to his son ‘Abdallāh, the father of the Prophet ³). The Makhzūm, as mentioned in the Nihāyat al-īrab had trade relations with the Yemen. It is not surprising to find that Abyssinians dwelt in the Dār al-‘Ula‘, in the quarter of the Banū Makhzūm ⁴). The Makhzūm seem to have had financial relations with Najrân as well: when al-Walīd b. al-Mughīra died he mentioned to his sons that he owed the bishop of Najrân a hundred dinārs ⁵). It is thus plausible that Makhzūm had to be consulted

---

²) See Ibn B. Abd al-Hakam, Futūḥ Misyr, ed. C. Torrey, New Haven 1922, p. 301, 15, the saying of the Prophet about his tiring discussions with the delegation of Najrān: . . . la-wadidtu anna baynī wa-bayna abli najrāna biḥāban (min shiddati mā kānū yuṭādilūnahu).*
⁴) Al-Fākihi, op. cit., fol. 458a; the Prophet was informed that these Abyssinians wanted to come to him in order to embrace Islam; they feared however that the Prophet might repel them. The Prophet said: “There is nothing good in Abyssinians: when they are hungry they steal, when they are sated they drink; they have two good qualities: they feed people and are courageous.” ‘Aṭā b. Abī Rabīḥ is said to have been born in this house. When ‘Umar came to Mecca he distributed money amongst Quraysh, Arabs, Mawāli, Persians and Abyssinians (al-Fākihi, op. cit., fol. 397a, inf.). When ‘Abdallāh b. al-Zubayr pulled down the Ka‘ba he used Abyssinian slaves for this task. He hoped that amongst them there would be the Abyssinian about whom the Prophet foretold that he would destroy the Ka‘ba (al-Azraqī, op. cit., p. 141 inf.; al-ʿĪsāmī, op. cit., I, 169 inf.) About the Abyssinian who will destroy the Ka‘ba see al-Azraqī, op. cit., p. 193; al-Fāsi, Shifā’ al-gharām, Cairo 1956, I, 127-128.*
⁵) Al-Zubayr b. Bakkār, op. cit., Ms. fol. 145b, 1.8.*
at the arrival of the army of Abraha and shared in the decisions. The Kinâna as mentioned above, had close relations with Mecca. It is thus probable that Muḥammad b. Khuzâ‘î (al-Sulamî) was sent by Abraha to the Banû Kinâna, that a Kinâni was captured and compiled the verses to warn Quraysh of the danger of the approaching army of Abraha and that a Kinâni, from the clan of Di‘l was said to have been a member of the delegation who negotiated with Abraha. The verse recited by a Di‘lî woman to Mu‘āwiya seems to refer to the role played by the Kinâna in the Expedition of the Elephant:

\\[\text{hum mana‘ū jaysa l-aḥābishi ‘anwatan:}\\ wa-hum nahnah wa-hum bakri\\
\\\text{They (i.e. the Di‘l) resisted the army of the Abyssinians forcibly:}\\ \text{and they repelled from us those who allure, the Banū Bakr} 1)\\
\\
\\]

It is plausible to find also a chief of the Hudhayl in the delegation. Hudhayl had good relations with Mecca and played a considerable role in stopping the expedition of Abraha against Mecca 2).

It is also quite likely that ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib consulted the leader of the Thaqīf in his decisions. Thaqīf had very close financial relations with Makhzūm and common financial enterprises 3). It is noteworthy too that ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib himself had property in al-Ṭā‘if 4). He had

1) Al-Balādhi, \textit{Ansāb al-asbrāf}, ed. M. Schloessinger, Jerusalem 1971, IV A, p. 18; Bakr apparently refers to Bakr b. ‘Abd Manāt (see Watt, Muḥammad at Medina, p. 83); and see the story of the alliance concluded between Quraysh and the Aḥābīsh by ‘Abd Muṭṭalib to face the Banū Bakr—al-Balādhi, \textit{Ansāb}, fol. 902a; but see the second hemistich in the poem of Ḥudhāfa b. Ghānim al-Jumahi, al-Azraqi, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 69:

\[\text{humū malakū l-baḥā‘a majdan wa-su’dadan:}\\ \text{wa-hum taradī ‘anbā‘ ghuwāta banī bakri}\\ \text{(malakū, perhaps preferable malā‘ī).}\\
\]

2) See EI², s.v. \textit{Hudhayl} (G. Rentz) and W. Caskel, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 31, ll.10-16.


\[\ldots\text{fa-lammū aẓhara ilāhu ʿazza wa-jalla l-nabiyya (s) ʿalā l-tā‘if ihtaratat thaqīfūn}\\ \text{anna kullah ribān labum ʿalā l-nāsi fa-huwa labhum wa-kullah ribā l-nāsi ʿalayhim fa-huwa}\\ \text{maḏi‘un ʿanhum} \ldots; \text{and see Mughulṭây, \textit{op. cit.}, fols., 1718-1728; and see al-Suyūṭi,}\\ \textit{al-Durr al-manṭubār}, I, 366-367.

also relations with the Yemen; this can be deduced from a tradition about a document of a debt owed to him by a man from Ṣan‘ā’. 1) ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib acted of course as a representative of the haram, as the dignitary of the Ka‘ba, in charge of the siqāya. This is especially emphasized in the tradition that he remained in Mecca with another dignitary Shayba b. ‘Uthmān, who held the office of the hijāba. They both fed the people; this reflects the concept of responsibility of the dignitaries of the Ka‘ba.*

It would be vain to try to establish who in fact led Mecca in the decisive moment of the raid of Abraha. What can be deduced from the traditions is only what were the tribal elements which influenced the policy of Mecca and who were the representatives of the clans of Mecca deciding at that time.

Details about the expedition are indeed meagre 2). But information about the results of the expedition is instructive. According to the report of the Nihāyat al-irab "Quraysh gained prestige in the eyes of the Arabs (i.e. the tribes) and they called them Ālu llāhi; they said: “God repelled from them the evil (of the enemy) who plotted against them 3).” ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib became wealthy, bought every year many camels and slaughtered them for the people of Mecca 4). He bought the wells called al-‘Ajbāb from the Banū Naṣr b. Mu‘āwiya 5), obviously in order to secure the water supply of Mecca in addition to the well of Zamzam which he dug.

Arabic tradition stresses that the institution of the hums was established after the Expedition of the Elephant 6). Some sources are doubtful about the date of the establishment of the hums 7). But it is

2) See Caskel, op. cit., p. 31 sup.: "Es geht daraus hervor, wie dürftig die einheimischen Quellen".
3) Nihāyat al-irab, fol. 177a; and see al-Azraqī, op. cit., p. 98.*
4) Nihāyat al-irab, fol. 177a.
5) Ibid., fol. 191b, inf.
7) Ibn Hīshām, op. cit., I, 211: qāla ibnu ʾishāqa: wa-qad kānat qurayshun—lā adri a-qabla l-fili am ba’dahu—btadaʾat raʿya l-humsi ...
evident that the failure of the expedition helped to expand the trade of Mecca, to set up close relations with the tribes, to establish its influence and to strengthen the institutions already built up by Quraysh. The market of ‘Ukāz was established fifteen years after the Expedition of the Elephant 1). ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib was one of the members of the delegation who came to Sayf b. dhī Yazan to congratulate him on his victory 2). According to a tradition recorded by al-Majlisi on the authority of al-Wāqidi, Sayf b. dhī Yazan sent his son to Mecca as a governor on his behalf 3). The report of Wāqidi is probably exaggerated; he may have been sent merely as a representative, not as governor. But both the reports indicate that the relations of Mecca with the Yemen were re-established and the commercial ties renewed.

II

Mecca owed its existence to trade. Pilgrimage rite and trade were indivisible in this city. It is thus plausible that in the young Muslim community one of the most vital questions which could be asked was the question whether trade could be conducted during the ḥajj. This question was positively answered in Sūra II, 198: “It is no fault in you, that you should seek bounty from your Lord . . .” 4) Trade in Mecca


3) Bihār al-anwār, XV, 146, no. 80: qāla l-wāqidiyyūn: kāna fī zamānī ‘abdi l-muṭṭalibī rajulun yuqālū lahu sayfu bnu dhī yazana wa-kāna min mulūkī l-yamānī wa-qad anfasīha bnahu illa makkata wāliyān min qibālīhi, wa-taḥaddama ilayhi bi-sti‘māli l-‘adli wa-l-insāfi . . .


. . . wa-kāna lā yashīri wa-lā yabī`i`u fī l-ḥajji.*
remained thus inseparably connected with religious rites, as it was in the times of the Jāhiliyya. Caravans with wares used to pour into Mecca, 1) protected by the established institutions of the Sacred Months, Hums and Dhāda and enjoying free access to the markets.* Caravans departed from Mecca loaded with wares for Syria, Persia or Yemen.

The following information about the import of wares from Egypt is of particular interest. In the lower part of Mecca there was the “Court of Egypt” (Dār Misr) 2) which belonged to Ṣafwān b. Umayya al-Jumāḥi 3). He used to deposit the wares which arrived from Egypt in this court. People would come to the lower part of Mecca and buy these wares. “His trade”, says the report, “was confined to Egypt;” therefore the court was named “Dār Misr”, referring to the wares which were sold in it 4).

In the quarter of the Banū Makhzūm was the court of al-Sāʾib b. Abī l-Sāʾib; in one of its departments the wares of the Prophet and of al-Sāʾib were stored 5). Al-Sāʾib was the Prophet’s partner before he received the revelation 6). According to al-Shaybānī they traded with skins 7). According to a tradition recorded by al-Balādhurī, the Prophet

---

2) See al-Azraqī, op. cit., p. 474 penult.
4) Al-Fākīḥi, op. cit., fol. 461b: . . . wa-labum darum bi-asfāli makkata yuqālu labā daru miṣra, fihā l-dabbāghīna, kānāt li-ṣafwāna bni umayyata; wa-innāmā summiyat dāra miṣra anna ṣafwāna bnsa umayyata kāna yaʿtihi min miṣra tijāratun wa-amtiʿatun, fa-kāna idīhī atathū unūkhat fi ḍārīhi ilīka, fa-yāṭihi l-nāsū ilā asfāli makkata fa-yashtarīʿa minhu l-matāʿa; wa-lā taqṣū tijāratuhū ilā ghayri miṣra, fa-nusibat al-dārū ilā mā kāna yubāṣu fihā min matāʿi miṣra.
7) Al-Ikṭīṣāb, p. 17 ult.—p. 18 sup.
invested in some wares carried by Abū Sufyān from Syria and got profit 1).

The intricate trade-transactions gave rise to various partnerships. Al-‘Abbās was a partner of Khālid b. al-Walīd; they both used to lend money for interest; when Islam appeared they had big sums lent for interest 2). According to another tradition al-‘Abbās was a partner of Abū Sufyān 3). Al-Dhahabī records a tradition stating that Naufal b. al-Ḥārith b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib was a partner of ‘Abbās 4). Al-Baladhurī reports about a partnership between two Sulāmī leaders and Ḥarb b. Umayya; Ḥarb invested the money necessary for the cultivation of the land owned by them 5).

It is evident that the trade of Mecca necessitated free traffic, free access to the markets of Mecca and free markets, without taxes. In fact, when the Prophet came to Medina he decided to turn Medina into a haram and to establish in Medina a free market, without taxes 6). The fundamental change occurred when Sūra IX, 28 was revealed: “O believers, the idolaters are indeed unclean; so let them not come near the Holy Mosque after this year of theirs. If you fear poverty, God shall surely enrich you of His bounty, if He will . . .” The verse

---

2) Al-Wāḥidī, op. cit., p. 59; Mughulṭāy, op. cit., fol. 170b, penult.
4) Siyar ašlām al-nubalā’, I, 144.
5) Al-Baladhuri, Ansāb IVa, p. 3.
was revealed in year 9 of the *bijra* ¹). The Muslims were afraid that the prohibition to approach the Ka'ba by the unbelievers may endanger their trade, as the unbelievers used to bring their merchandise to Mecca during their *hajj*. Allah promised the faithful to enrich them ²).

It is evident that this crucial verse was revealed after Mecca had been conquered, when the roads of trade were secured and controlled by chiefs and leaders who had sworn loyalty to the Prophet. They changed in fact their former loyalty to Quraysh into a new loyalty: to the Prophet and the Muslim community. Unbelievers who returned from this *hajj* could sadly remark: “What can you do, as Quraysh had already embraced Islām ³”.

Muqātil reports that the people of Judda, Ḥunayn and Ṣanʿā embraced Islām and brought food to Mecca: they had thus no need to trade with the unbelievers ⁴).

The *haram* became a Muslim sanctuary; its functionaries were appointed by the Prophet. It is the Muslim community and its representatives who decide who will bring merchandise to Mecca and its markets. The former institutions of *ilāf*, *hums*, *dhāda* were fundamentally transformed ⁵). Their functions and authority were transferred to the loyal tribes, who had to ensure the safety of the roads and of the trade traffic. They had to pay taxes and yield to the authority of the chiefs appointed by the Prophet. Profits could be kept, as before, for the tribes (or their chiefs respectively) and the established authorities of the two *harams*, Mecca and Medina.

It is significant that when the crisis of the establishment of Medina occurred after the death of the Prophet, when the chiefs of tribes

---


⁴) Al-Rāzī, *op. cit.*, XVI, 26 inf.*

⁵) Comp. al-Tahlīdī, *al-Ilmāt*, I, 85 about ‘Ukāz: ... *wa-man labn ḥukūmatun irtasa‘a ilā ḱallūbi yaqūnu bi-amri l-ḥukūmati min bani tamīmin, wa-kāna ākhirabum al-aqra‘u bnu ḥobisin. Al-Aqra‘ was in the new system appointed by the Prophet as muṣāddīq.
attempted to free themselves from their dependence on Medina, they tried to return to relations of a different kind than the ilāf-bums with Mecca. According to a tradition recorded by Ibn Ḥubaysh al-Aqraʿ b. Ḥābis and ‘Uyayna b. Ḥiṣn came at the outbreak of the ridda to Medina accompanied by chiefs of tribes, met some Muhājirūn and informed them about the ridda in their tribes; the tribes, they said, refuse to pay to the authority of Medina the payments which they paid to the Prophet. They suggested that they would assure that their tribes would not attack Medina if they were given a certain payment. The Muhājirūn came to Abū Bakr and advised him to accept the offer; Abū Bakr however refused 1).

Another tradition recorded by Ibn Ḥubaysh corroborates this report. When ‘Amr b. al-ʿAṣ was on his way to Medina he met people renouncing Islam (murtaddin). When he arrived at Dhū l-Qaṣṣa 2) he met ‘Uyayna b. Ḥiṣn, who returned from his visit to Medina. ‘Uyayna met Abū Bakr and told him: “If you pay us a (defined) sum, we shall keep you from (every attack occurring from) our territory.” ‘Amr b. al-ʿAṣ asked him about the events (which happened in his absence), and ‘Uyayna informed him that Abū Bakr headed the Muslim community. “Now we are equal, you and we,” added ‘Uyayna. ‘Amr said: “You are lying, O son of the mischievous of Muḍar 3).”

‘Uyayna b. Ḥiṣn, the chief of Fazāra, was aware of the weakness

1) Al-Maghāzī, p. 9: . . . wa-qadima ‘alā abī bakrin ‘uyaynata bnu ḥiṣnin wa-l-aqraʿu bnu ḥabisin fi rijālin min ashrāf l-ʿarabī, fa-dakhalū ‘alā rijālin min al-muhājirīna faqādū innabuh qad irdadda ʿammatu man warāʾanā ‘an al-islāmi wa-layya fi anfushīm an yuʿaddū ilaykum min amwālīhim mā kānuw yuʿaddīna ilā rasūlī lābi (s); fa-in taqʿalā lanā juʿlan narji; fa-nakṣīkum man warāʾanā; fa-dakhalā l-muhājirīna wa-l-anṣārīn ‘alā abī bakrin fa-ʿardū ʿalaybi l-lābi ʿarda ʿalayhim wa-qādū; narā an tuʾṣima l-aqraʿa wa-uyaynata tuʾmatan yardayāni bīhā wa-yakṣīnīka man warāʾabūmā hattā yarjiʿa ilayka usāmatu wa-jayshubu wa-yashadda amrūka, fa-ʿinnā l-yaumā qaṭālun fī kathīrin, wa-lā ṭaqata lanā bi-qṭālī l-ʿarabī . . .

2) See Yaqūt, Muṣjam al-baladān, s.v. Qaṣṣa.

of Medina. He suggested to Abū Bakr that Fazāra should protect Medina from attacks from their territory against an agreed payment. Abū Bakr could not accept the offer: acceptance of this offer might have meant giving up the idea of continuity of the work of the Prophet and yielding to the force of bedouin tribes, thus conceding to the disintegration of the Madinian commonwealth, which took up, in fact, the legacy of Mecca. Abū Bakr had to refuse the offer, which meant ridda. For the sake of Medina, he had to decide to crush the ridda.

III

The development of Mecca was accompanied by a continuous struggle between the factions of Quraysh, which brought about the formation of alliances of clans and sometimes led to clashes and bloodshed. The best known alliance is the one of the Muṭayyabūn and their adversaries, the Ablāf 1). The reports about the role of the Banū l-Ḥārith b. Fihr in this alliance may be of some interest.

The Härith b. Fihr belonged to Quraysh al-ẓawāhir. The Quraysh al-ẓawāhir, although closely co-operating with the Quraysh al-biṭāh, attended fights and raids in their own tribal units 2). Sometimes their actions seem to have collided with the policy of Mecca 3). They concluded alliances with tribes and carried out joint raids against tribes 4). Members of defeated groups of Quraysh al-ẓawāhir sought refuge in Mecca and dispersed amongst families of the Abtāhīyīn. It is of interest that persons of these Härith b. Fihr who already merged into clans of the Abtāhīs were “repatriated” by ‘Umar into their former tribal units 5). Ibn Ḥabīb mentions a group of the Härith b. Fihr (the clan

---

2) Cf. al-Balādhuri, Ansāb, Ms. fol. 882a: . . . wa-kāna dīrārū bnu l-khaṭṭābī raʾīsa muḫāribi bni fihrin wa-qāʾidahā fī l-fījārī.
4) Cf. al-Balādhusur, Ansāb, Ms. fol. 882a: . . . wa-ghazat bani fihrin wa-banū ʿabsin, wa-kāna baynabum yamuʿidhīn baʿdū 1-hilfī, ʿalā l-yamanī; fa-qāla dīrārū bnu l-khaṭṭābī . . .
5) Al-Zubayr b. Bakkār, op. cit., fol. 128b, inf.: . . . an ibnī shibābīn, sababu maqtalīn fahmin bani l-ḥārithi bni fihrin bi-farṭahab (?), fa-lam yabqa min bani l-ḥārithī illā l-shurādāt fa-taqqassamīthum Qurayshūn; fa-kāna ŵī bani ʿimrānā bni makhzūmīn iyāsun wa-huwa
of Abū ‘Ubayda) who came down to Mecca and joined the Muṭayyabūn 1); he counts them, in fact, in the list of the Muṭayyabūn 2) and records that they were put as adversaries of the ‘Adiyy b. Ka‘b during the mobilization of the rival forces 3). The ‘Adiyy b. Ka‘b were a weak tribal unit; they were the only group of Quraysh, who “had no sayyid who could cope with their problems and avenge their shed blood 4).” According to another tradition the Ḥārith b. Fihr were attached to ‘Abd Manāf and had jointly to face Sahm and Jumāḥ 5). It is evident that these Banū l-Ḥārith b. Fihr were not a strong group; they were accepted by the Muṭayyabūn into their alliance in order to strengthen the alliance. The attachment of the Ḥārith b. Fihr to the Abṭabīṣ was reinforced by mutual marriages: ‘Abd al-‘Uzzā b. Āmīr married Qilāba bint ‘Abd Manāf; the mother of Ḥarb b. Umayya was Umayma bint Abī Hamhama of al-Ḥārith b. Fihr 6). Abū Hamhama went out with Umayya when the latter contested Ḥāshim b. ‘Abd Manāf 7). Due to these marriages the Banū l-Ḥārith b. Fihr became a part of the Abṭabīṣ and consequently of the Muṭayyabūn 8). The case of the Banū l-Ḥārith is instructive and points to the policy followed by Quraysh of adopting clans and attaching families and individuals into their community 9).

lladhi qaṭa labu abū ṭalibin:
khālī l-walidū qad raʿaytum makānahū:
wa-khālū abī l-āṣi iyāsu bnu maʿbadi
wa-kāna maʿbadi bnu wabbi tābaannya, fa-kāna yuqālu iyāsu bnu maʿbadi; fa-lammā
kāna khilāfatu ʿumara bni l-khaṭṭābī (r) wajadahum fī buṭtimi qurayshīn, fa-jāmaʿabum
fa-hamalahum ilā gaumihim wa-ʿalā ʿarāfatihim.

1) Al-Munammaq, pp. 18, 84, 237.
2) Ibid., pp. 20 ult., 223; and see al-ʿIṣāmī, op. cit., I, 163.
3) Al-Munammaq, pp. 20, 44.
4) Ibid., p. 146.
5) Ibid., p. 334 ult.
8) Al-Zubayr b. Bakkār, op. cit., fol. 200b; wa-qadima (i.e. ʿabd al-ʿuzzā b. āmīr) makkata fa-zawwajahu ʿabdu manāfīn wa-aqāma maʿahu wa-ṣāda bani l-ṭarbī bni fīhrin maʿa bani ʿabdī manāfī bni quṣayyīn ilā l-yaumī, wa-bi-dhālika l-sababi ṣārū min abīl-ḥīfīdī, dinā bani muḥāribi bni fīhrin wa-bi-dhālika l-sababi ayīdan dokhalū fī l-muṭayyabīn.
9) See e.g. Ibn Ḥabīb, al-Munammaq, pp. 275-332.
The high position which a *halif* could achieve in Mecca can be deduced for instance from the fact that a man from Sulaym was appointed by Quraysh as "*muhtasib*" in Mecca 1).

The two groups of the *Muṭayyabūn* and the *Ablāf* could be mobilized with no difficulty. This can be gauged from the report about the murder of Abū Uzayhir; both groups stood ready to fight and the Prophet ordered Ḥassān to spur them to fight each other. Only due to the wise intervention of Abū Sufyān was bloodshed prevented. The date of the event is given with precision: after the battle of Badr 2).

The cohesive force of this alliance can be gauged from the report of al-Ḥakīhī, that there were two separate cemeteries in Mecca: one of the *Muṭayyabūn,* and another of the *Ablāf* 3). At the "Day of Uḥud" Quraysh fought under the banners of the *Muṭayyabūn* and *Ablāf* 4).

A story told on the authority of Ibn Abī Mulayka 5) records a talk between ‘Abdallah b. Safwān b. Umayya and Ibn ‘Abbās. The story exposes problems discussed in connection with the role of Mecca and its development and attests the persistence of the idea of division between the *Muṭayyabūn* and *Ablāf.* Ibn ‘Abbās attended the *ṣiqāya* 6); ‘Abdallah b. Šafwān passed by and said: "How pleasant is the rule (imāra) of the *Ablāf* with regard to you" ("What he in fact said was: How did you assess the imāra of the *Ablāf* with regard to you"). Ibn ‘Abbās answered: "The imāra of the *Muṭayyabūn* before that was better than that"; he referred to the caliphate of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. Ibn Šafwān said: "‘Umar ordered to close the well of Zamzam in the interval between the periods of the *hajj*" (i.e. to open the well only in the period of the *hajj*—K). Ibn ‘Abbās said: "Do you strive for the

---

6) About the privilege of the *ṣiqāya* granted by the Prophet to ‘Abbās see Muqātil, *op. cit.*, fol. 74a; al-Azraqī, *op. cit.*, pp. 337-338; al-‘Īṣāmī, *op. cit.*, I, 207.
sunna of 'Umar? 'Umar ordered to turn the upper and lower parts of the valley (i.e. the valley of Mecca) into a resting place for the pilgrims and to turn Ajyadayn and Qu'ayqi'an into a place for walking and resting for them. Then you and your "patron" (ṣāhibuka) started to build up the place with houses ("he perhaps said: 'you built it up with houses and palaces'"); within this is your house and property; after that (i.e. after all your actions contrary to the prescriptions and interdictions of 'Umar—K) you come and ask (for the application of—K) the sunna of 'Umar? How far is it! You left the sunna of 'Umar far behind 1)."

The quoted passage shows clearly how firm the consciousness of the division between the Muṭayyabīn and Aḥlāf was in the minds of the Qurashites in the times of 'Uthmān. The rule of Abū Bakr (muṭayyabīn) and 'Umar (aḥlāf) was assessed according to which faction they belonged to.

The questions discussed in this talk were connected with the conflicting views about the role of Mecca and whether it was legitimate to develop it. It was a fundamental question whether Mecca had to be kept as a center of pilgrimage, in which building new residential quarters was to be forbidden and the original character of the city preserved as it was in the times of the Prophet. As we can see from the quoted passage changes did take place early.

A considerable wave of building activity is attested in the times of Muʿāwiyah. The number of houses and courts bought by Muʿāwiyah at Mecca is surprising. He bought from the Banū Mulayl of Khuzāʿa the court called Dār Ibrāhīm or Dār Aus, located in the lane of the shoemakers, in the quarter of the allies of the Banū Ḥāshim 2). In the quarter of the Banū 'Abd Shams he acquired by exchange the Dār al-Ḥammām 3). In the same quarter he got hold of an unoccupied piece of land in the neighbourhood of the court of al-Ḥakam b.

2) Al-Fākīhī, op. cit., fol. 448b, ll. 11-12; in this court the shoe-makers and butchers had their shops (ib., fol. 451a, l. 16).
3) Ibid., fol. 449a, l. 4.
Abī l-ʿĀṣ and built there the court of Ziyād b. Abīhi 1). To Muʿāwiya belonged the Dār al-Raqṭāʾ (built with read bricks and gypsum-mortar), the White Court (al-Dār al-Baydāʾ—the plastered court), the Dār al-Marājil (bought by Muʿāwiya from the family of al-Muʿammal of the ‘Adiyy b. Kaʿb), 2) the Dār Babha (=ʿAbdallah b. al-Ḥārith b. Naufal b. al-Ḥārith b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib), the Dār Salm (a court located opposite the Dār al-Ḥammām), Dār al-Shībʾ, a court in the lane of the blacksmiths called Dār Māli Llāhi (in which the diseased were housed), the Dār Saʿd (built of carved stones, with figures carved in the stones). 3) In the quarter of the ʿAbd al-Dār Muʿāwiya bought the Dār al-Nadwa from Ibn al-Rahin 4) and paid for it 100,000 dirham 5). In this quarter he bought also the court of Saʿīd b. Abī Ṭalḥa 6). In the quarter of the Banū Zuhra he bought some courts from the ʿAbd ʿAuf 7). Muʿāwiya bought also the house of Khadija, in which the Prophet lived until the hijra, and turned it into a mosque 8). According to tradition, Muʿāwiya was the first who built in Mecca houses with baked bricks and gypsum mortar 9). The sums spent on buildings can be gauged from the report about the building of the court of al-Ḥajjāj. He bought the court of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib and deposited thirty thousand dinārs, as expenses of the building, with the pious ʿAtāʾ b. Abī Rabāḥ 10). For the court of Ḥuwaytib b. ʿAbd al-ʿUzza Muʿāwiya paid forty five thousand dinār 11). In some of the courts

---

1) Ibid., fol. 449a, l. 18-19; the spot between the court of Abū Sufyān and Ḥanzala b. Abī Sufyān, facing the court of Saʿīd b. al-ʿĀṣ and the court of al-Ḥakam was called Baynā l-Dārayni; it was a place where the caravans with wheat and corn used to make halt.

2) In this court there were pots of brass in which meals for the pilgrims and meals of Ramaḍān were prepared in the time of Muʿāwiya.

3) Al-Fākihi, op. cit., fols. 450b, inf.-451b, 460b, l. 5.

4) See on him ibid., fol. 424a.

5) Ibid., fol. 456b; and see other versions about this transactions: al-Zubayr b. Bakkār, op. cit., fol. 88b; Mughūlṭāy, op. cit., fol. 28b, ult.; Ibn al-Kalbi, op. cit., fol. 24a; al-Sīra al-balabiyya, I, 17 inf.; al-Balāḏūrī, Futūḥ, p. 70.

6) Al-Fākihi, op. cit., fols. 456a, l. 6; 496a.

7) Ibid., fol. 456b, l. 5.

8) Ibid., fol. 470b; cf. al-Azraqī, op. cit., p. 457 inf.

9) Al-Fākihi, op. cit., fol. 441a.

10) Ibid., fol. 447a.

11) Al-Balāḏūrī, Ansāb IVA, 47, l. 17 (and see the references of the editor).
acquired by Muṭawiya there seem to have been workshops of craftsmen, stores and magazines¹), which secured income and profit.

The vigorous building activities of Muṭawiya were met with opposition by the orthodox circles, who looked with disapproval at the changes in the city. They wanted it to be a city for pilgrims, with wide, unbuilt spaces, preserved for pilgrims and their riding beasts. A comprehensive chapter in al-Fākhi’s Ta’rīkh, dealing with these problems, is entitled: “dhikru karāhiyati kirāʾi bayyīti makkata wa-ijāratihā wa-bayʿi ribāʾihā wa-mā jāʾa fi dhālika wa-tafsīrhu”²). The arguments of the scholars are based on the utterances of the Prophet. He is said to have stated, that Mecca had to be put freely at the disposal of the pilgrims: houses should not be rented nor sold (makkatu mubāḥun au munākbun³), lā tubāʾu ribāʾuhā wa-lā tuṭājaru bayyūthabā.⁴) ‘Ā’isha is said to have asked the Prophet to set up for him a building in Mecca in order to find shade from the sun; but the Prophet answered: “Mecca is an alighting place for these who come first” (innamā hiya munākhu man sabqa).⁵) “He who eats (the income) of the rent of houses in Mecca, eats fire” (i.e. he will enter Hell-K).⁶)

According to tradition, the houses of Mecca were during the time of the Prophet Abū Bakr and ‘Umar called “al-sawwāʾib”, free possessions, accessible to everyone: they were not sold nor bought; he who needed dwelt in them; he who did not, lodged others in them ⁷). People coming

¹) For the dimensions of a court (dār) see e.g. the report of al-Yaʿqūbī, Mushākalat al-nāṣ bi-ẓamānihim, ed. W. Millward, Beirut 1962, p. 13: fa-banā l-zubayru bnu l-ʿawwāmī dārāhu l-mashhūrata bi-l-baṣrati wa-fībā l-aswāq wa-l-tijārāt . . .
²) Fols. 443b-444b.
³) The difference of version مال مال may be regarded as variants in the written text, the two words looking alike in the Arabic script.
⁶) Al-Qurtubi, op. cit., XI, 33; Abū ʿUbayd, op. cit., p. 66, no. 163.
to Mecca used to pitch their tents everywhere, even in the open spaces of the courts 1).

The discussion of this problem centered around the interpretation of Sūra XXII, 25: “...and the Holy Mosque that We have appointed equal unto men, alike him who cleaves to it and the tent dweller” ... “Sawā'un al-'sākifū fībī wa-l-bādī” was interpreted by some of the scholars as equal rights of the residents of Mecca and the visitors in relation to the courts and houses. The residents have no more rights in relation to these places than the new-comers. “The visitor may alight at any place he finds; the householder has to shelter him, whether he wants to or not 2).” One of the interpretations has a cautious remark: ... “they are equal and they are entitled to alight wherever they want, without driving out anyone from the house 3).”

Another problem, a legal one, closely connected with the discussed question, was whether Mecca was conquered by force (‘anwatan) or by a peace-agreement. According to the former opinion (represented by Mālik, Abū Ḥanīfa, Auzā‘î) the houses should be considered as spoil; the Prophet did not distribute the houses and let the owners stay in their lodgings gratuitously, leaving these rights for their progeny too. Therefore, the courts of Mecca are at the disposal of residents and visitors alike. The contradictory opinion, represented by al-Shāfi‘ī, stated that Mecca was conquered by a treaty; the courts are thus in the ownership of householders 4).

The practical application of these views is mirrored in early traditions about ‘Umar. He is said to have forbidden to build doors for the courts of Mecca 5). The courts of Mecca had no doors; the first who installed a door in his court was Ayman b. Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta‘a (according to another tradition: Mu‘āwiya). 6) ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz in a letter

---

2) See al-Qurtubi, op. cit., XI, 32; Ibn al-‘Arabī, op. cit., III, 1263; and see al-Balādhurī, Futūḥ, p. 59.
3) Al-Balādhurī, op. cit., p. 59, ll. 4-5.
4) Al-Qurtubi, op. cit., XI, 33; Ibn al-‘Arabī, op. cit., III, 1263 inf.-1264 (see esp. ll. 4-7).
5) Al-Balādhurī, Futūḥ, p. 59; al-Fākhī, op. cit., fol. 444b, sup.
to the amīr of Mecca prohibited the renting of houses in the city 1). There are compromise utterances, in which the interdiction is restricted. Al-Ṭahāwī records the tradition about the proposal of ‘Ā’isha to set up a building for the Prophet in Minā; the refusal of the Prophet and the interdiction of building is thus limited to Minā 2). Further, according to al-Ṭahāwī, the idea of equal rights to residents and pilgrims is confined to public places; but places owned by people are not included in this category; 3) this is the concept of al—Layth b. Sa‘d: rents of houses are permitted, pilgrims may freely alight in open spaces of houses, ways, waste spaces and plains 4).

According to another compromise opinion, the renting of houses is unlawful during the hajj; but it is permissible if the rent is taken from a man who is resident of Mecca (mujāwir) and not in the period of the hajj 5). A special chapter in al-Fākihi’s Ta’rīkh deals with the permissibility of buying and renting houses (dhikru man rakbbhasa fī kirā‘i buyūti makkata wa-bay‘ī ribā‘ibā). 6) Houses were in fact bought and sold and the transactions were accurately registered 7).

The changes in Mecca and the reaction of the orthodox circles are mirrored in a talk between ‘Ā’isha and Mu‘āwiya. ‘Ā’isha reproved Mu‘āwiya that he built the city into townships and palaces, while the Prophet had made it free for all the Muslims. No one has more right in it (i.e. in the land and buildings—K) than the other. Mu‘āwiya answered: “O Mother of the Faithful, so indeed is Mecca and they do not find anything which would shelter them from sun and rain. I ask you to bear witness that it is a sadaga for them” (i.e. that my possession in Mecca be considered as a charitable endowment for the Muslim

---

1) Al-Balādhūrī, Futūḥ, p. 58 ult.-59sup.; al-Fākihi, op. cit., fol. 444b, l. 2.
2) Al-Ṭahāwī, op. cit., IV, 50-51; and see the discussion on this subject al-Fāsi, Shīrāz al-gharām, I, 320-321.
3) Ibid., IV, 50.
4) Al-Balādhūrī, Futūḥ, p. 60.
5) Ibid., p. 60.
6) Fols. 444b-445b.
community—K).

The growth of Mecca in the early period of Islam was impressive. Houses climbed up the mountains. They were built above the highly placed well of Jubayr b. Muṭʿim, an area where houses were never built before), and on the hill of Abū Qubays. The attitude of the pious men of Mecca is reflected in the saying of Ibn ʿUmar when he saw the houses built on Abū Qubays: “O Mujāhid, when you see houses appearing on its mountains and water flowing in its thoroughfares, then beware!” The intent of the warning is made clear in another saying of ʿAbdallah b. ʿAmr: “When you see rivers bursting in Mecca and buildings on the tops of the mountains, then know that you are already in the shade of the Day of Judgment.”

In fact Muʿāwiya’s activity of buying and building houses was accompanied by his energetic activity of digging wells, canals and planting gardens and orchards and cultivating the land in Mecca. Al-Azraqi mentions the wells dug by Muʿāwiya and the orchards in

1) Al-Fākihi, op. cit., fol. 451b: ... ʿan dhakwāna maulā ʿāʾishata qāla: inna muṣawiyata (r) dakhala ʿalā ʿāʾishata (r) manzilabā, fa-qālāt: anta lldābī ʿamdaṭa ilā makkata fa-banaytabā madāʾina wa-qusyrān, wa-qad abābhabā l-lābīn wa-l-muṣlimīn, wa-laysa aḥadun aḥaqqū biḥīn min aḥadīn; qāla: yā ʿumu ma l-muʿminīn, inna makkata kadhā wa-lā yajidīna mā yukīnunum min al-shamsi wa-l-majāri; wa-anā ʿashhīdūkā annabā ʿadaqatun ʿalayimīn.

2) Al-Fākihi, op. cit., fol. 472b, penult.: ... wa-samiʿtu baʿda abīi makkata min al-fugahāʾi yaqūlū: kānā l-nāṣū lā yuṣawīzīna ʿfi l-sakānī ʿfi qatīmī l-dabri ḥādbibi l-biʿara; innamā kānā l-nāṣū fīmā dīnābā ilā l-maṣjīdā, wa-mā faqūa ḫālīka ḫālīn min al-nāsī ...

3) Ibid., fol. 472a, l. 2: wa-lam yakun waumaʾidhīn ʿalā abī qubayṣiin buyyūtn, innamā ʾhadāthāt baʿdīn.


which palm-trees and plants were grown). Activities of this kind were never before carried out in the city. Sources stress that he was the first who dug wells in Mecca and planted orchards.

The aim and purpose of these investments can be deduced from a talk between 'Abdallah b. 'Abbās and Mu‘āwiya. Ibn 'Abbās said in his talk when he visited Mu‘āwiya: “I know a valley flowing with gold.” Mu‘āwiya remained silent and did not ask him (scil. about the valley). Afterwards he granted him the place which is called al-‘Abbāsīyya; Ibn 'Abbās turned it into an orchard and dug a well in it. Afterwards Mu‘āwiya set up the orchards (in Mecca).

The expression “a valley flowing with gold” points clearly to the aims of setting up the orchards; they were obviously profitable.

Mu‘āwiya’s activity of digging up wells and canals met with opposition like the building of houses and palaces. 'Abdallah b. Ṣafwān rebuked Mu‘āwiya for his growing orchards in the “valley where there is no sown land” (i.e. Mecca), contrary to the words of Allah. Scholars of law discussed the problem whether the fruit of trees and vegetables grown in Mecca are permissible to be picked and eaten and whether it is permissible to cut in Mecca trees planted by men. It is evident that cutting trees not planted by men is forbidden in the haram area.

The governors and the officials of the Umayyads cared also for the supply of water for the city and for the pilgrims on their way. 'Abdallah b. 'Āmir b. Kurayz built cisterns for the pilgrims in 'Arafa. He dug

---

2) Al-Fākīhī, op. cit., fol. 441a-b.
3) Al-Fākīhī, op. cit., fol. 441b: wa-yuqālū: bal awwalu hū'ītūn njiyya bi-‘arūḍī makṣatu al-‘abbāsīyyaṭu; yuqālū inna bna ʿabbāsīn (r) qāla yunuqūn, wa-huwa ʿinda mu‘āwiyatu (r): inna la-‘a‘lamūn ṭādiyya yajūr bi-l-dhawḥabī jaryan; qāla, fa-sakata mu‘āwiyatu (r) wa-lam yuqālūn; fa-lammā kānū ba’dūn aqa‘ābū manṭiša al-‘abbāsīyyaṭi, fa-ajrūbū ‘aynūn; fa-lammā ‘amanībā akhḍabā mu‘āwiyatu (r) fī ‘amali l-ḥawā‘īṭi.
4) Qur‘ān, Sūra XIV, (Ibrāhīm) 37.
5) Al-Fākīhī, op. cit., fol. 490b; al-Balādhwī, Anṣāb, IV A, 16.
wells for pilgrims on their way from al-'Irāq to Mecca and said some day: “Had I been left (i.e. to do as I think fit—K) a woman would journey alighting every day at a well (literally a water—K) and a market until reaching Mecca”.¹ Later Khālid b. ‘Abdallāh al-Qasrī dug a well (between the passes of Dhū Ṭuwā and Ḥajūn) on the order of al-Walid b. ‘Abd al-Malik and drew the water from the well to the ʿaram. The water was sweet and Khālid urged the people to drink it. He spoke scornfully about Zamzam calling it “Mother of the black-beetles” (umm al-jīlān)² and stressed its preference over Zamzam ³. He was so proud of the deed of al-Walid that he tried to deduce from it the superiority of the Caliph of God (i.e. al-Walid) over the Messenger of God. “Abraham asked God rain water and He gave salty water (i.e. Zamzam); the Commander of the Faithful asked Him rain water and He gave him sweet water” (i.e. the well dug on the order of the Caliph).⁴ It was in fact a shameless saying. This covered pool located in the ʿaram, having its waters supplied from the well dug by Khālid al-Qasrī, was destroyed by Dāwūd b. ‘Ālī b. ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Abbās to the joy of the people; they preferred the water of Zamzam ⁵).

After the period of the first Umayyads the building activities came to what amounts to a standstill. Such activities were only resumed with the advent of the Abbasids ⁶).

¹) Ibid., fol. 799b.
²) There was however a well called “umm jiʿlān” belonging to the ‘Abd Shams (sec al-Azraqī, op. cit., p. 438; al-Fākihi, op. cit., fol. 487b, l.4).
³) Al-ʿIsāmī, op. cit., I, 228.
⁵) Al-Maūsīlī, Ghāyat al-wasāʾil, Ms. Cambridge Qq 33, fol. 14a: ṣawālu mā aḥdatha dāwūd b. ‘ālī b. ‘abdillāh... an badama l-birkata ṻalī ʿamilahā khālid b. ‘abdillāh al-qusbāyrī (read: al-qasrī) ... wa-kāna amaranu bi-ʿamali bāḥibī l-birkatī sulaymānu b. ʿabdi l-malikī wa-an yujiya minhā māʾ an ʿadhan fa-kharaja bayna zamzam wa-l-rūkn al-aswad yudāḥī bihā niʿama zamzam... wa-kānū fī shurbi niʾār zamzam arghaba minhum fihā ilā an qadima dāwūd b. ʿālī fa-badamahā wa-surra l-nāṣu bi-dhālika surūrah ʿaẓīman.
⁶) Cf. al-Fāsi, op. cit., I, 346: ... wa-qad kānat ʿyūnu muʾāwiyata tilka Ṽaqaṯat wa-dhababat fa-amara amīru l-muʿminīna l-rashīdū bi-tajdidihā.
ADDENDA

P. 67 note 1

P. 68 note 2
See al-Khāzin, _Lubāb al-ta‘wil_, Cairo 1381, VII, 244-245; al-Baghawi, _Ma‘ālim al-tanzil_ (on margin of _Lubāb al-ta‘wil_), ib.

P. 73 note 2
The forces which could be levied in the region of Najrān seem to have been considerable. This can be gauged from the report of Sālim b. 1-Ja’d (d. 98H at the age of 115; on him see _Tahdīb al-tahdīb_, III, 432, no. 799) as transmitted by al-A‘mash (on him see al-Dhahabī, _Tadhkirat al-huffāẓ_, I, 154, no. 149). When the (Christian) population of Najrān, says the report, increased in number so that the number of the men able to fight became forty thousand—the Muslims were afraid that they would turn against them. ‘Umar then decided to exile them. He deported a group of them to Syria, another one to ‘Irāq and another one to another region. (See Muqāṭil, _Tafsīr_, Ms. Ḥamidiyya 58, fol. 66b: ... _katburū ḥattā šāru arba‘īna alfa muqāṭilin, fa-khāfa al-muslimūna an yamilū ‘alayhim ... fa-akhiraja (i.e. ‘Umar) firqatun ilā l-shāmi, wa-firqatun ilā l-‘irāqi wa-firqatun ilā ardīn 1-ukhrā_. The number of the fighting men given in this account may be exaggerated; it points nevertheless to the strength of the forces which could be levied in Najrān. (Al-Balādhurī’s account of the event [_Futūb_, p. 89, ll.1-2] is very laconic: “... they [i.e. the people of Najrān] lent money at interest and increased in number; therefore ‘Umar feared them and expelled them”).

P. 73 note 4
About Persian craftsmen engaged in the building of the Ka‘ba during its restoration by ‘Abdallah b. al-Zubayr (or in the building of the houses for Mu‘āwiyah) see al-Mausili, _Ghayat al-wasdil_, Ms. Cambridge Qq 33, fol. 231b, inf. (wa-kdna marra bi-l-fursi wa-hum yabnafa l-masjida l-‘harāma fī fiinati bni l-zubayri, wa-qila yahnīna dūra ma‘āwiyata...).
The principle that the dignitaries of the _haram_ have to stay in Mecca, carrying out their duties in the Ka'ba, was followed by the Prophet. Al-'Abbās and Shayba were freed from the obligation of the _hijra_ and remained in Mecca. (See Ibn 'Asākir, _Ta'rīkh_, VI, 349: _kāna l-abbāsu wa-shaybatu umanā?a [perhaps min al-umanā?] wa-lam yuhājirā; fa-aqāma l-abbāsu 'alā siqāyatībi wa-shaybatu 'alā l-hijābati...). And see Ibn Ḥajar, _al-Isāba_, III, 218, II. 18-19, no. 3490.

P. 75 note 3
See al-Mauṣili, _op. cit._, fol. 156a: _awwalu mā 'azuma amru qurayshin fa-summiyat āla lāhi wa-qarābatabahu hīna bazama lāhi jaysha l-fīli._

P. 76 note 4
See al-Khāzin, _op. cit._, I, 154: _wa-qāla ba'du l-`ulamā'ī inna l-tijara in waqq'at naqṣan fī a'māli l-bajji lam ikum mubāhatain wa-in lam tuwaqqiqi naqṣan fihi kānat min al-mubāhātī llatī al-anlā tarkubā li-tajridī l-`ibādatī min ghayrihā li-anna l-hajja bi-dāni l-tijārati afṣalatu wa-akmalu._

P. 77 l. 4
About the encampment of the _Dḥdā_ at the well called _Bīr_ Sulṣul (in the neighbourhood of Minā) see al-`Īṣāmi, _op. cit._, I, 333. (About this well see al-Azraqī, _op. cit._, p. 442).

P. 77 note 1
The Companions of the Prophet used to trade with Syria by sea; among them were Ṭalḥa and Sa`īd b. Zayd. (See Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, _al-Šīla`, ed. T. Koçyiğit—I. Cerrahoğlu, Ankara 1963, I, 224, no. 1410: _kāna aśbhū rasūli lāhi [s] yatjarūna fa l-bahri ilā l-rūmī, minhum ṭalḥatu bnu `ubaydi lāhi wa-sa`īdū bnu zaydīn..._); and see al-Ṭabarānī, _al-Mu`jam al-ṣaghīr_, ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Muḥ. ʿUthmān, al-Madīna 1388/1968, I, 113,

P. 79 note 4
See al-Jawī, _Marāh labīd_, Cairo n.d., I, 336: _... wa-aslama ablu juddata wa-bunaynin wa-ṣan`ā`a wa-tabālata wa-jurasha fa-hamalī l-ṭa`āma ilā makkata..._; and see al-Khāzin, _op. cit._, III, 64.

P. 83, note 1