AN ASPECT OF ARAB SOCIETY OF THE EARLY SEVENTH CENTURY

— Non-related People in the Male Line Descendants' Groups —

AKIRA GOTO

Researcher, the Toyo Bunko (Oriental Library)

Introduction

It is generally recognized that in Arab society of the early seventh century, the male line descendants' groups were predominant as the social and political units. W. M. Watt says about these groups as follows:⁽¹⁾

“The social and political units among the Arabian nomads were groups of varying sizes. Western writers usually refer to these as ‘tribes’ or, in the case of the smaller groups and subdivisions, ‘sub-tribes’ and ‘clans’, but those terms do not correspond exactly to Arabic terms. There are a number of words in Arabic for such social and political units, but the commonest usage is to refer to a tribe or clan simply as *Banū Fulān* (‘the sons of so and so’).”

This short account is the most observant note on this subject. It is true that there were many fruitless efforts to discover the Arabic terms corresponding to ‘tribes’. Arab historians who left us so-called historical sources about the society, however, seldom discussed the general conception of the ‘tribe’ or any other social and political units, and they merely described each deed of a certain group, mentioning its proper name, mostly as *banū fulān*, with a few exceptions.⁽²⁾ It should be noted that this usage is valid not only for Arab nomads but also for settled Arabs such as the citizens of Mecca and Medina.

As expressed by the words, *banū fulān* (sons of so and so), the groups were formed mainly by kinship in the male line. W. M. Watt continues his account cited above as follows:

“The structure of these pre-Islamic tribes has not yet been adequately studied in the light of recent advances in social anthropology. They are presented in Arab tradition as being primarily constituted by kinship in

the male line, though there are certain exceptions to this. A person not related to a group by blood (not a *ṣaḥīḥ* or *ṣamīm*) could enjoy some of the privileges of membership, above all protection. He might do so as an 'ally' (*ḥalīf*), a 'protected neighbour' (*djār*) or a 'client' (*mawlā*)."

The aim of this article is to examine the social basis of such exceptions, especially of *ḥalīf* and *mawlā*. W. M. Watt is perhaps the first writer to have distinguished clearly *ḥalīf* from *mawlā*. W. R. Smith, a scholar of the beginning of this century, said the following about *mawlā* (pl. *mawālī*):⁽³⁾

"At the same time an Arabic group might and generally did contain in addition to pure-blooded tribesmen (*ṣarahā*, sing. *ṣarīḥ*) a certain number of slaves and clients. The clients again, *mawālī*, were of two kinds, freedmen and free Arabs of other kins living under the protection of the tribe or of its chief or some other influential men."

He includes both freedmen and free men of other kins under one term 'clients' (*mawālī*) and the usage of this word has been adopted by every Islamic historian without further consideration. Even after the appearance of the two volumes of Muḥammad's biography written by W. M. Watt, in which he distinguished 'free men' from '*mawālī*',⁽⁴⁾ the wrong usage has prevailed. It is clear from reliable sources that '*mawlā*' means only 'freedmen', and never 'free men of other kins'. W. M. Watt, however, has presented us with few grounds for distinguishing between '*mawlā*' and '*ḥalīf*'. This is just a note to present the grounds, which should throw light on a certain aspect of the social institutions of Arab society at the time.

Before making a detailed examination of '*mawlā*' and '*ḥalīf*', it seems desirable to pay some attention to other kinds of people not related to the groups. Slaves are one such kind of people. In the *Qur'ān*, various Arabic terms corresponding to the English term 'slaves' are found, such as '*abd*' (pl. '*ibād*', f. *ama*), *raqaba* (pl. *riqāb*), *mā malakat aymānu-kum*, *fata*' (pl. *fatayāt*), '*abd mamulūk*'. Though '*abd*' is used as a general term for 'slave', *raqaba* corresponds only to those slaves who are about to be freed⁽⁵⁾, and the term *mā malakat aymānu-kum* (one who is kept by your right hand) appears only in reference to a member of a family,⁽⁶⁾ (in particular to concubines). Such different usage of terms does not imply, however, that at that time there were several classes of slaves in Arab society. It is possible that one slave may have been called by various terms depending on differing circumstances.

M. H. Lammens insists in his voluminous work⁽⁷⁾ that Abyssinian slaves composed a troop of the Meccan military forces. If he is correct, the slave class would have played an important role in the society. True, there was a troop called *aḥābīsh* (Abyssinian people in the general sense) in the Meccan army opposed to Muḥammad's power. This term, however, clearly refers to the name of a place where Arabs originating from various tribes were living together, and should not be identified with Abyssinian people.⁽⁸⁾ Besides this, there is no evidence to prove an important role of slaves in the society; there was no military troop composed of slaves; there were no plantations with slave workers; there were no factories with slave labourers. So, as people not related to the groups of that time, slaves were not so important.

The '*jār*', (which used to be translated 'protected neighbour'), were also people not related to the group.

"If one of the polytheists asks thy protection (*istajāra-ka*), grant his protection (*ajir-hu*) until he hear the word of Allāh, then see that he reaches a place of security."

This *āya* of the *Qur'ān*⁽⁹⁾ seems to indicate concisely the conception of the term. Besides this, the following articles of the 'Constitution of Medina'⁽¹⁰⁾ will give us a more detailed conception of it: "The 'protected neighbour' (*jār*) is as the man himself (protector) so long as he does no harm and does not act treacherously,"; "No woman is given 'neighbourly protection' (*tujār*) without the consent of her people,"; "No 'neighbourly protection' is given (*lā tujār*) to Quraysh and those who help them,"; finally, the 'Constitution' is concluded with the paragraph, "God is 'protecting neighbour' (*jār*) of him who acts honourably and fears God, and Muḥammad is the Messenger of God." Through these accounts, one may easily recognize that the '*jār*' was a protected person who could enjoy the same privileges as the protector.

Though Ibn Sa'd and other Arab writers left us biographies of many of Muḥammad's contemporaries whose social ranks were very varied, from the most influential men to slaves, including *mawālī* and *hulafā'*, one cannot, however, find any biography of the '*jār*'. This fact suggests that the '*jār*' was not a permanent member of the group, but only a temporary visitor to the group. Therefore, it seems unnecessary to pay more attention to the '*jār*'.

Mawlā (Pl. *Mawālī*)

The following are the brief records of the *mawālī* who emigrated from Mecca to Medina and participated in the Battle of Badr:⁽¹¹⁾

1) Anasa; *mawlā* attached to Muḥammad, born in slavery at al-Sara'a, his father was a Persian and his mother an Abyssinian.⁽¹²⁾

2) Abū Kabsha; *mawlā* attached to Muḥammad, born in slavery at Dūs, of the Sulaym tribe.⁽¹³⁾

3) Sālim; *mawlā* attached to Abū Ḥudhayfa: according to another version he was attached to a lady named Thubayta from Banū 'Ubayda of *anṣār* because he was freed by her.⁽¹⁴⁾

4) Sa'd; *mawlā* attached to Ḥāṭib b. Abī Balta'a from Banū Asad; Sa'd had been a member of the Kalb tribe, and was enslaved on capture and brought to Ḥāṭib.⁽¹⁵⁾

5) Khabbāb b. 'Uzwān; *mawlā* attached to 'Utba.⁽¹⁶⁾

6) 'Āmil b. Fuhayra; *mawlā* attached to Abū Bakr; had been a slave of al-Ṭufayl b. al-Ḥārith who was a child born of a previous marriage of Abū Bakr's second wife, and after 'Āmil's conversion to Islam, Abū Bakr bought him and freed him.⁽¹⁷⁾

7) Bilāl b. Rabāḥ; *mawlā* attached to Abū Bakr, born in slavery at al-Sara'a; Abū Bakr bought him and freed him.⁽¹⁸⁾

8) Mihja' b. Ṣāliḥ; *mawlā* attached to 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb; born in the Yemen; had been enslaved on capture; freed by 'Umar.⁽¹⁹⁾

9) 'Umayr b. 'Awf; *mawlā* attached to Suhayl b. 'Amr, born in slavery at Mecca.⁽²⁰⁾

Among the Meccan people there was another *mawlā* whose personal record survives:

10) Abū Rāfi'; had been a slave of al-'Abbās b. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, given to Muḥammad and then freed by him.⁽²¹⁾

Among these ten *mawālī*, there was no free Arab, but each of them, except Khabbāb of 5) whose record is rather obscure, had once been a slave and then been freed. This fact seems to imply that *mawālī* differed in social standing from free men. The 'Constitution of Medina' declares that a believer could not take a *mawlā* attached to another believer as a *ḥalīf* without the other believer's consent. This provision clearly shows the strong dependency of *mawālī* on their

masters. Returning from the Battle of Badr, Muḥammad praised a brave combatant named Abū Hind who was a *mawlā* attached to an *anṣār* at that time and said to his people;⁽²²⁾ "Well, Abū Hind should become a member of the *anṣār* and they should marry him to one of them." This speech of Muḥammad implies that Abū Hind as a *mawlā* had not yet been given full membership of the society.

It should be noted that among the followers of the Prophet there were several persons who had been freed from slavery, but who had never been called *mawālī*. They were:

1) Zayd b. Hāritha; captured in his teens and sold at the market of 'Ukāz; an aunt of Khadija bought him and when Khadija married Muḥammad she presented Zayd to him; he then freed Zayd and adopted him.⁽²³⁾

2) Salmān; Persian origin; had been a slave of Banū Qurayza (a Jewish tribe in Medina); He received his freedom after an auction where Muḥammad bought him and then freed him; Salmān became a member of the Banū Hāshim.⁽²⁴⁾

3) Khabbāb b. al-Aratt; captured and bought by the mother of Sibā' who was a *ḥalīf* of Banū Zuhra; later became a member of Sibā's family.⁽²⁵⁾

4) Ṣuhayb b. Sinān; his father was an 'āmil of the Persian Emperor at al-Ubulla; Ṣuhayb was captured in the Roman territory in his childhood, then was bought by 'Abd Allāh b. Jud'ān at Mecca, who freed him and lived with him.⁽²⁶⁾

A feature common to these four freedmen is that each of them was accepted as a member of the family of the man who had freed him; Zayd was adopted by Muḥammad; Salmān belonged to Banū Hāshim (*huwa ilā banī Hāshim*) which, in this case, means the family of Muḥammad in a broad sense; Khabbāb was accepted by Sibā's family (*inḍamma ilā āli Sibā'*); Ṣuhayb lived with 'Abd Allāh (*aqāma ma'-hu*). It was also true that all four became brilliant members of early Muslim society. The freedmen with brilliant talents accepted by the leading families were never called *mawālī*. This fact suggests conversely that *mawālī* may have belonged to an inferior class.

The following table depicts the numbers of *mawālī* and *ḥulafā'* who participated in the Battle of Badr.⁽²⁷⁾

	total number	<i>ḥulafā'</i>	<i>mawālī</i>
Participants from <i>muhājirūn</i> (emigrants from Mecca to Medina)	88	32	9

Participants from <i>anṣār</i> (native people of Medina)	217	41	6
Quraysh opponents who died or were captured on the battle field	133	38	8

In Arab society of that time, it was not a privilege or an obligation of any one class or group to become combatants, but probably of every adult, excluding slaves. While *muhājirūn* who had converted to Islam at Mecca and emigrated to Medina were a special case, *anṣār* and Quraysh opponents were natives of Mecca and Medina. So, in the cases of *anṣār* and Quraysh opponents, the proportion of *ḥulafāʾ* and *mawālī* to the total numbers should reflect rather closely the social conditions of Mecca and Medina. Through these proportions, one may easily conjecture that *mawālī* did not play an important role in the societies of Mecca and Medina. We may, therefore, draw the conclusion that *mawālī* were those freed from slavery who closely depended on their masters, and their proportion to the total population was small. Their roles in the social and political spheres were perhaps not so important.

Ḥalīf (Pl. Ḥulafāʾ)

The above-mentioned table shows the rather large proportion of *ḥulafāʾ* in the populations of Mecca and Medina in contrast with *mawālī*. So we have to examine what *ḥulafāʾ* were. This question has not yet been investigated in the light of modern Islamic studies.

Among the participants of the Battle of Badr, there were Saʿd b. Ḥawla from Yemen, a *ḥalīf* of one of the *muhājirūn*,⁽²⁸⁾ and Bujayl b. Abī Bujayl from the Balīy tribe, a *ḥalīf* of one of the *anṣār*.⁽²⁹⁾ In their biographies, Ibn Saʿd introduces some versions which say that they were not *ḥulafāʾ* but *mawālī*. This contradistinction between the *ḥalīf* and the *mawālī*, as well as the already referred to article of the 'Constitution of Medina' (that a believer could not take a *mawālī* attached to another believer as a *ḥalīf* without the other believer's consent), indicates that the conception of the *ḥalīf* clearly differed from that of the *mawālī*. Ibn Saʿd and other Arab writers were strongly interested in the genealogy of each *ḥalīf* as well as of each of the common people, while they were not so interested in that of each *mawālī*. This fact indicates again that the *ḥalīf* was different from the *mawālī* in his status.

Prophet Muḥammad appointed several *ḥulafā'* as military commanders; 'Abd Allāh b. Jahsh went on an expedition commanding a party of ten believers to attack a Quraysh caravan in the seventh month of the second year of Hijra;⁽³⁰⁾ 'Ukkāsha b. Miḥṣam led a party of forty believers in the fourth month of the sixth year;⁽³¹⁾ Shajā' b. Wahb was a leader of a party of twenty-four believers in the third month of the eighth year;⁽³²⁾ Muḥammad b. Maslama was twice in command of small parties, once in the first month of the sixth year and then in the fourth month of the same year.⁽³³⁾

It was not a special characteristic of the Islamic society that there were chances for the *ḥulafā'* to be appointed as military leaders. In the non-Islamic Meccan society, too, there was at least one example. Ibn Hishām introduces us to the following episode.⁽³⁴⁾ Just before the opening of the Battle of Badr, al-Akhnas b. Sharīq, a *ḥalīf* of Banū Zuhra of Quraysh, insisted to the people of the Banū Zuhra that they had to give up the fight with Muḥammad and to return to Mecca. They followed his advice as was their custom. Besides this episode, there was another example.⁽³⁵⁾ After Muḥammad's occupation of Mecca, which was followed by his great victory at the Battle of Ḥunayn, he distributed large booties to his followers. On this occasion, he gave special shares to the ones with military and political authority who had newly submitted to him. Among them, there was a *ḥalīf* of Banū Zuhra, named al-'Alā' b. Jāriya al-Thaqafī. The fact that the *ḥulafā'* had the chance to become military leaders clearly indicates that the *ḥulafā'* never belonged to an inferior class.

It is worthy of note that, at the Battle of Badr, two *ḥulafā'* of the *muhājirūn*, Marthad b. Abī Marthad and al-Miqdād b. 'Amr, rode their own horses. At that time in Arabia, horses were very expensive and precious,⁽³⁶⁾ and the Muslim party, which did not even have enough camels, possessed only two horses. This case may show that these two *ḥulafā'* were richer than common followers of Muḥammad. The members of the Banū Usayyid from the Tamīm tribe, who were living in Mecca as *ḥulafā'*, owned houses in the region near Ka'b and also possessed a hill in the suburbs of Mecca.⁽³⁷⁾ They may have belonged to the relatively upper class of Meccan society. The above-mentioned examples seem to confirm that some *ḥulafā'* could become leaders of the groups and belong to the higher levels of society.

There are several records of men whose process of becoming *ḥulafā'* is clear.

1) Mas'ūd, the father of 'Abd Allāh who was a *ḥalīf* of the Banū Zuhra

from the Hudhayl tribe, confederated with 'Abd b. al-Ḥārith b. al-Zuhra. The mother of the wife of Mas'ūd was a woman of Banū Zuhra.⁽³⁸⁾

2) Al-Miqdād b. 'Amr from the Quḍā'a tribe confederated with al-Sawas b. 'Abd Yaghūth of Banū Zuhra. Al-Aswad adopted al-Miqdād.⁽³⁹⁾

3) 'Abd 'Amr, the father of Dhū al-Yadayn 'Umayl who was a *ḥalīf* of Banū Zuhra, went to Mecca and a confederation was set up between him and 'Abd b. al-Ḥārith b. Zuhra. 'Abd made his daughter, Nu'n, marry 'Abd 'Amr and she bore 'Umayl by 'Abd 'Amr.⁽⁴⁰⁾

4) Yāsir, the father of 'Ummār who was a *ḥalīf* from the Madhḥij tribe, came to Mecca with his two brothers looking for another of their brothers. After his two brothers returned, Yāsir continued to live in Mecca and confederated with Abū Ḥudhayfa b. al-Mughīra of Banū Makhzūm. Abū Ḥudhayfa gave Sumayya, a slave girl, to Yāsir and she bore 'Ummār by Yāsir. Abū Ḥudhayfa freed 'Ummār.⁽⁴¹⁾

5) Al-Ḥārith b. Sakhbara from the Azd tribe came to Mecca from al-Sara'a with his wife and confederated with Abū Bakr. After the death of al-Ḥāritha, his wife Umm Rūmān remarried with Abū Bakr and bore 'Ā'isha and 'Abd al-Raḥmān by Abū Bakr.⁽⁴²⁾

6) Abū Mālik, the father of Tha'laba who was a *ḥalīf* of the Banū Qurayza, a Jewish tribe in Medina, was a Jew from the Kinda tribe. He married a woman of the Banū Qurayza and confederated with them.⁽⁴³⁾

7) Ḥujayl b. Abī Ahāb from the Tamīm tribe was a *ḥalīf* of 'Uqba b. al-Ḥārith of the Banū Nawfal. Abū Ahāb, the father of Ḥujayl, was a uterine brother of al-Ḥārith, the father of 'Uqba.⁽⁴⁴⁾

It should be noted that in all these cases except 3) and 7), Ibn Sa'd presents in his writings the new comers to Mecca or Medina as subjects making confederations (*ḥālafa*) with citizens. In other words, he describes *ḥulafā'* as those who belonged to non-related groups by their own will. It might well be that, attracted by the urban life of Mecca or Medina, the new comers wanted to become members of confederations in those societies. The following episode,⁽⁴⁵⁾ however, shows that there could be an opposite case.

8) When Abū Qāriḍ, an influential man of the Kināna tribe, went to Mecca, the people of Mecca asked him to settle there and marry a Meccan woman. Abū Qāriḍ wanted to postpone his decision for three days, and then decided to confederate with the first man of the Quraysh whom he should happen to meet. 'Abd 'Awf b. 'Abd was the first man he met, and a confederation

was set up between them. All the above-mentioned cases indicate that the confederations (becoming *ḥulafā'*) were set up on equal terms.

The case of 'Abd 'Amr of 3) is very significant in the consideration of the status of *ḥulafā'*. He married a daughter of 'Abd, the partner of his confederation. This means that 'Abd 'Amr belonged as a *ḥalīf* to the kinship group of his wife, and that his son, Dhū al-Yadayn 'Ummār, belonged as a *ḥalīf* not to his father's kinship group but to his mother's. The case of 6) implies the same conditions. In the case of 4), it was not the father of 'Ummār but al-Ḥudhayfa, the owner of the slave girl, who freed her son. So one may suppose that the relation between Yāsir and the slave girl was temporary, and when 'Ummār was born his father had already left the group. Anyway, 'Ummār belonged as a *ḥalīf* to the kinship group of his mother's side. Through the case of 1), a similar conjecture may be made. Mas'ūd may have married a woman who lived with her mother's kinsmen, and his son, 'Abd Allāh, may have belonged to the same group. Furthermore, in the case of 7), Abū Ahāb may have lived with the kinsmen of his mother and his stepfather.

It seems to be confirmed that some *ḥulafā'* who belonged to a group, but were not related by the male line, were, in fact, related to the group by marriage or by the maternal line. In Arab society of that time, it was not only women but also, in many cases, men who changed households through marriage. Those who joined their wives' kinship groups had to be accepted as *ḥulafā'*, and in these instances, their children may have grown up in their mothers' kinship groups. Arab historians and genealogists, however, were only interested in the genealogy of male lines. In records concerning those who grew up in their mothers' kinship group, no mention is made of the nature of their relationship to the groups. In such cases, records may say that they were *ḥulafā'* of the groups. It may easily be conjectured that many of the so-called *ḥulafā'* were those who kept a close relationship to the groups to which they belonged through marriage or maternal lines.

All the above examples of the *ḥulafā'* refer only to those of Mecca and Medina. Was the existence of the *ḥulafā'* one of the characteristics of urban societies such as Mecca and Medina? If the *ḥulafā'* consisted only of those who had been attracted by urban life, then the *ḥulafā'* should have existed only in the urban society. The fact that many *ḥulafā'*, however, were related members of the group through marriage or maternal lines suggests that *ḥulafā'* may also

have been found in nomadic society. In fact, in one record, there is the instance of a man living in al-Baḥrayn who became a *ḥalīf* probably through the maternal line. The record says that Miṭr,⁽⁴⁶⁾ a uterine brother of 'Uqba b. Jirwa, was a *ḥalīf* of the (latter's) group.

Moreover, the following record will show us a typical case of nomadic *ḥulafā'*. "(Banū) Balmuṣṭaliq from the Mudlij tribe were *ḥulafā'* of the Khuzā'a tribe. Balmuṣṭaliq were at the al-Muraysī spring which belonged to the Khuzā'a tribe."⁽⁴⁷⁾ In the nomadic society of Arabia at that time, a social and political group had continued contact with other groups through the common use of springs and pasture lands. These contacts might cause, on the one hand, many tribal wars which were popularized by the poems of *Jāhiliya*, but on the other hand, friendly relations between the groups, which constantly produce *ḥulafā'*. Besides the above-mentioned examples, several records which describe various deeds of nomadic tribes mention the term *ḥulafā'*.⁽⁴⁸⁾ During the wars of Ridda, Mu'āwiya, a *ḥalīf* of the 'Āmil b. Ṣa'ṣa'a tribe, led a party of Banū 'Uqayl of the same tribe.⁽⁴⁹⁾ This fact indicates that there were also chances for *ḥulafā'* of nomadic societies to become military leaders. In other words, the status of *ḥulafā'* of nomadic societies was the same as that of urban society. And there is no reason to suppose that the proportion of *ḥulafā'* in the nomadic societies was smaller than that in the urban societies.

Conclusion

The basic unit of social and political life among Arab nomads as well as settled Arabs may have been small in size. Although I hope to examine this problem in detail in a future article, it seems desirable to present a few examples here.

In the fourth month of the sixth year, Prophet Muḥammad ordered Muḥammad b. Maslama to lead a party of sixteen believers in an attack on Banū 'Umār from the Tha'alaba tribe who were at Dhū Qassa, fourteen *mil*'s distance from Medina. The Muslim party, however, lost the battle. Abū 'Ubayda B. Jarrāḥ hurried there with reinforcements, but when he arrived at Dhū Qussa, the enemy had already gone, leaving their livestock and other property there.⁽⁵⁰⁾

There is the following record about these reinforcements:

The land of the Tha'alaba tribe, the Muḥārib tribe and the Anmāl tribe

suffered from a drought, so they moved to near Medina, and waited at Dhū Qassa for a chance to invade Median pasture land. Abū 'Ubayda b. al-Jarrāḥ led a party of forty believers to attack them, but the enemy had gone. The Muslim party obtained their livestock and other property.⁽⁵¹⁾

This latter account says that the group which had to move from their lands as a result of a drought consisted of three tribes, and from other sources⁽⁵²⁾ it is indeed clear that each was sufficiently numerous to be rightly termed a 'tribe'. The size of the group must, however, have been small enough to be attacked by a party of sixteen men or forty men. The group may have been only a small part of the three tribes. As the former record says that they were Banū 'Umār from the Tha'alaba tribe, it may be supposed that the group was composed mainly of men of the Tha'alaba tribe but included members of the other two tribes as *ḥulafā'*.

On many occasions, Prophet Muḥammad dispatched small parties in the above case to attack his opponents, and sometimes the latter lived quite far from Medina. This fact means that his opponents lived their everyday life in fairly small groups, and in normal circumstances there was no military force strong enough to intercept the coming and going of such small sized parties. In Muḥammad's political activities, he seldom dealt with groups big enough to be called 'tribes'. He gave his *kitāb* (diplomatic documents) to leaders of small groups or to the groups themselves, but never to 'tribes' or representatives of 'tribes'. Delegates who called on him were from small groups but seldom from 'tribes'. It seems, therefore, that the basic social and political unit was not a group big enough to be called 'tribes', but rather a small group. The small group may be translated 'clan', in contrast to 'tribe', in its widest but not strictest sense.

In cases of the *ḥulafā'* whose process of attaining this status is recorded, the confederations were set up between individuals. Records of most *ḥulafā'* are, however, rather obscure, and each of them is described only as *ḥalīf* of a certain clan or family. It may be conjectured that most such *ḥulafā'* or their ancestors confederated with a member of the clan and joined the clan for their daily life. It may perhaps seem strange that mention of *ḥulafā'* from other clans of the same tribe rarely appear in the sources. Where there no men who associated themselves with another clan of the same tribe? At that time in Arab society, there

was no control of marriage by two persons of the same 'tribe'. A clan must, therefore, have included many men originating from other clans of the same tribe who had married a woman of that clan. This means that in the clan there were also many people whose fathers had belonged to other clans. The sources mention the existence of *ḥulafā'* only where they joined a group action; they would hardly have taken part if they had belonged to their male line kinship group. In many instances of those belonging to their wives' or mother's clan of the same tribe as their father's clan, the latter may have lived near the former. In these cases, Arab historians, who were very much interested in the genealogy of each person, did not wish, however, to stress that such people came from a different kinship group. So, it may well be that a social and political unit included many persons from other clans of the same tribe as well as many *ḥulafā'* from other tribes. At the same time, a group may have excluded many of its male line kinsmen.

In the Arab society of the early seventh century, the social and political unit was a male line descendants' group of fairly small size which was called '*banū fulān*' (sons of so and so). The group did not, however, exclude people not related to it. On the contrary, it usually included many people not related to it through male lines. It willingly accepted strangers as *ḥulafā'* and sometimes made its women marry them. It also accepted the offspring of *ḥulafā'*, again as *ḥulafā'*. Furthermore, it included many people from other groups closely related to it. The group had an open door not only for new comers but also for men who wanted to leave it. If the group had not maintained such ease of access and egress, leaving a group to join another group would have created serious trouble. In the society of that time, it does not, however, seem to have been wrong for a man to leave a group to which he had belonged. This ease of access and egress made it possible, in later times, for many Arab warriors to migrate individually or in very small parties from their mother lands to newly conquered lands.

Notes

- (1) *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, n. e., "BADW".
- (2) There were a few examples of groups which were called 'people living in such a place', such the people of Rātij, people of Jahsh and others. I shall examine these cases in detail in a future article.
- (3) W. Robertson Smith: *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, Oosterhort N. B., 1966 (Re-

- print of the second edition of 1907), pp. 47–48.
- (4) W. Montgomery Watt: *Muhammad at Mecca*, London, 1953: *Muhammad at Medina*, London, 1956.
 - (5) 4–92; 5–89; 90–13; 2–177 (pl. *riqāb*); 9–60 (pl. *riqāb*). The numbers of the *āya* correspond to the Cairo edition.
 - (6) 4–3, 24, 25, 36; 16–71; 23–6; 24–31, 33, 58; 30–28; 33–50, 52, 55; 70–30.
 - (7) M. H. Lammens: “Les *ahabīs* et l’organisation militaire de la Mécque au siècle de l’hégire,” *Journal Asiatique*, II sér., 8 (1916), pp. 425–482. (Reprinted in *L’Arabie occidentale avant l’hégire*, Beirut, 1928, pp. 237–294.)
 - (8) cf. Watt: *Muhammad at Medina*, pp. 154–157. In addition to the sources to which Watt referred, Ibn Sa’d introduces another example which clearly shows that *ahābīsh* were not Abyssinian people. Ibn Sa’d: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, Bayrūt, 8 vols. 1377–1378 H., vol. 5, p. 58.
 - (9) 9–6. The translation follows Richard Bell: *The Qur’ān*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1937–1939.
 - (10) Ibn Hishām: *Kitāb Sira Rasūl Allāh*, Göttingen, 1853, pp. 341–344. Prof. J. Shimada of Chūō University in Tokyo is probably the first man to point out another version of the text of the ‘Constitution of Medina’ which is recorded in Abū ‘Ubayda al-Qāsim b. Sallām: *Kitāb al-Amwāl*, al-Qāhira, 1355 H., pp. 202–207. The latter text, however, excludes all articles concerning the ‘*jār*’. This fact, as well as other variants from the former text, is very important for considering the character of the ‘Constitution’, and will be examined in detail in a future article. Translations of the text follow Watt: *Muhammad at Medina*, pp. 221–225.
 - (11) cf. *ibid.*, p. 344. Here, Watt lists names of slaves and freedmen attached to *muhājirūn*, who participated in the Battle. This list omits 5) and 9) of the list presented in this article.
 - (12) Ibn Sa’d: vol. 3, p. 48. cf. al-Ṭabarī: *Tārīkh al-Rusūl wa al-Mulūk*, 15 vols., Leyden, 1847–1901, part I, p. 1780 & p. 1787; Ibn Hishām: p. 486.
 - (13) Ibn Sa’d: vol. 3, p. 49; Ibn Hishām: p. 486.
 - (14) Ibn Sa’d: vol. 3, pp. 85–88.
 - (15) *ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 115.
 - (16) *ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 100.
 - (17) *ibid.*, vol. 3, pp. 230–231.
 - (18) *ibid.*, vol. 3, pp. 232–239 & vol. 7, pp. 358–386.
 - (19) *ibid.*, vol. 3, pp. 391–392.
 - (20) *ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 407.
 - (21) *ibid.*, vol. 4, pp. 73–75.
 - (22) Ibn Hishām: pp. 458–459.
 - (23) Ibn Sa’d: vol. 3, pp. 40–47; Ibn Hishām: p. 485.
 - (24) Ibn Sa’d: vol. 6, p. 16 & vol. 7, pp. 318–319; Ibn Hishām: pp. 136–143.
 - (25) Ibn Sa’d: vol. 3, pp. 164–167; Ibn Hishām: p. 488.
 - (26) Ibn Sa’d: vol. 3, pp. 226–230; Ibn Hishām: pp. 488–489.
 - (27) Vol. 3 of Ibn Sa’d’s *Ṭabaqāt* is totally devoted to biographies of *muhājirūn* and *aṣṣār* who participated in the Battle. Ibn Hishām also lists the names of them in pp. 485–507. Between the two, names and numbers of the participants are a little different. The numbers presented in this article follow Ibn Sa’d. The numbers of Quraysh opponents follow Ibn Hishām: pp. 507–515.
 - (28) Ibn Sa’d: vol. 3, pp. 408–409.
 - (29) *ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 522.
 - (30) *ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 90. cf. Ibn Hishām: pp. 423–427; al-Wāqidī: *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*, 3 vols., London, 1966, pp. 13–19.
 - (31) Ibn Sa’d: vol. 3, p. 92. cf. Ibn Hishām: p. 975; al-Wāqidī: pp. 550–551.

- (32) Ibn Sa'd: vol. 3, p. 94. cf. al-Wāqidī: p. 753.
- (33) Ibn Sa'd: vol. 3, pp. 443–444. cf. Ibn Hishām: p. 975; al-Wāqidī: pp. 534–535.
- (34) Ibn Hishām: p. 438. cf. Ibn Sa'd: vol. 2, p. 14.
- (35) Ibn Hishām: pp. 880–881; al-Ṭabarī: part I, pp. 1679–1680. al-Wāqidī and Ibn Sa'd introduce, however, other names of two *ḥulafā'* of Banū Zuhra.
- (36) Ibn Sa'd: vol. 3, p. 48 & p. 162.
- (37) cf. M.J. Kister: "Mecca and Tamīm — Aspects of their relations —", *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 8 (1965), pp. 144–145.
- (38) Ibn Sa'd: vol. 3, pp. 150–158.
- (39) *ibid.*, vol. 3, pp. 161–163.
- (40) *ibid.*, vol. 3, pp. 167–168.
- (41) *ibid.*, vol. 3, pp. 246–264.
- (42) *ibid.*, vol. 5, p. 251.
- (43) *ibid.*, vol. 5, p. 79.
- (44) Ibn Hishām: p. 640.
- (45) Ibn Sa'd: vol. 5, p. 58.
- (46) *ibid.*, vol. 5, p. 566.
- (47) *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 63.
- (48) *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 226 & p. 285, vol. 2, p. 10; Ibn Hishām: p. 421 & p. 906; al-Ṭabarī: part I, p. 1597 & pp. 2971–2973; al-Ya'qūbī: *Tārīkh*, 2 vols., Beirut, 1970, vol. 2, p. 68.
- (49) al-Ṭabarī: part I, p. 1993.
- (50) Ibn Sa'd: vol. 2, p. 86. cf. al-Wāqidī: pp. 551–552.
- (51) Ibn Sa'd: vol. 2, p. 86. cf. al-Wāqidī: pp. 552.
- (52) cf. Watt: *Muhammad at Medina*, pp. 91–95.