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Introduction and the issue of sources

Writing about the history and the religious map of Arabia in the centuries preceding the birth of Islam is not a simple task. This is especially true for the Ḥijāz, the region of the western Arabian Peninsula that the career of the Prophet Muhammad (c. 570–632 CE) is connected with. The reason for this is the paucity of evidence and the fact that, in many cases, the sources are much later than the events they depict. However, scholarly studies of recent years have furthered the field considerably and the benefit of a holistic approach, which takes into account all source types, has been understood. We are starting to get a picture of Arabia that is full of life, religious ideas, and historical phenomena and that is not isolated from the world of late antiquity but is, instead, an intrinsic part of it (Robinson 2010: 7–11). The main powers in and around Arabia were the Byzantine Empire, Sasanian Persia, the kingdom of Axum in Ethiopia, and the kingdom of Ḥimyar in Yemen, all of which wielded influence at times on different parts of Arabia. The main religious currents in Arabia were forms of Christianity (Triningham 1979, Shahîd 1989: 148–229), Judaism (Newby 1988), polytheism (Fahd 1968; Peters 1999) and, to a much lesser degree, Mazdaism (Zoroastrianism). This chapter deals with Arabia of the fourth–sixth centuries especially (for the earlier history of Arabia and Arabians, see, e.g., Bulliet 1975; Bowersock 1983; Eph’al 1984; Shahîd 1984b; Ball 2000; Hoyland 2001; Young 2001; Retsö 2003).

The Arab identity forms a vexing issue that scholars continue to argue about; no consensus has emerged as of yet. In the primary sources, there are only very few instances of someone claiming to be an Arab in the pre-Islamic era: rather, it is a term utilized from the outside. After the Roman conquest of the Province of Arabia in 106 CE, it seems that the appellation “Arabs” was used for all inhabitants of the Province regardless of their ethnic identity, which further muddies the waters (Hoyland 2009: 392–393). As argued by Peter Webb in Chapter 8 of this book, the ethnogenesis of the Arabs should probably be placed in the Islamic period (see also Webb 2016, cf. Hoyland 2001: 229–247; Hoyland 2007; Macdonald 2009a and 2009b). Averil Cameron notes: “The difficulty remains of matching modern notions of ‘Arab’, ‘Syrian’, ‘Semitic’ and other such terms, which are still entangled in a mesh of confusion and even prejudice, with the actual situation in our period” (2012: 179). Because of this, this chapter refers
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to the inhabitants of Arabia as “Arabians,” sometimes with the qualifying attributes “North” or “South.” The word “Arab(s)” is only used when it appears in the sources.

Before proceeding any further, we have to deal with the issue of sources. The sources for pre-Islamic Arabia fall into three categories:

1 Archaeological remains: Excavations in Arabia have not been as numerous as one would hope but important archaeological work and field surveys have been carried out around the Peninsula and their results published (see, e.g., Potts 1990–1991; Hoyland 2001: 167–197; Finster 2009; Genequand 2015). However, there have been no archaeological excavations in or in the immediate vicinity of Mecca and Medina.

2 Documentary sources, in particular epigraphy: There are tens of thousands of published inscriptions written in Ancient North Arabian (ANA) and Ancient South Arabian (ASA) scripts and languages (Macdonald 2000). Nabataean Aramaic inscriptions are also very significant, especially the ones that are written in the late (transitional) variety of the script that was still used in the fifth century CE and from which the Arabic script is derived (Nehmé 2010). Old Arabic inscriptions, on the other hand, are fewer in number, if the ANA languages or dialects called Safaitic and Hismaic are not understood to be part of the Old Arabic continuum (Macdonald 2008; Al-Jallad 2014). ANA and ASA inscriptions are very interesting because of their references to pre-Islamic deities but the dating of the ANA inscriptions in particular is problematic. The received opinion is that the writing of ANA inscriptions dies out by the fourth century CE, but there is no definitive evidence to that effect (on the question of dating, see Al-Jallad, forthcoming). In any case, almost all of the ANA inscriptions are undated by their writers and there are currently no tools for the researcher to endeavor to put forth dates. Thus the usability of this corpus for understanding nascent Islam is diminished until further proof of their dating emerges. The ASA inscriptions are often dated or datable and continued to be written at least until the sixth century CE (Nebes and Stein 2008: 145), but they hail from Yemen, which is culturally different from the northern parts of Arabia where Islam began (Robin 2001). ASA survives not only as rock inscriptions but also on wooden sticks written in a minuscule script (Ryckmans, Müller, and Abdallah 1994). Many more, perhaps tens of thousands, Arabian inscriptions still remain undiscovered and unpublished.

3 Literary sources: The Arabic and non-Arabic (especially Greek and Syriac) literary corpus is one that is most often used by historians to trace the events and religious phenomena of pre-Islamic Arabia. Islamicists have in the past relied almost solely on the Islamic-era Arabic literary evidence when they explore the pre-Islamic background of the Hijāz and the Prophet Muḥammad (e.g., Lecker 2005). It is, however, often tendentious and centuries later than the events: the first surviving specimens of Arabic historiographic and other literary texts stem from around the year 800 CE (on the development of Arabic historiography, see Donner 1998). Material remains show that many pieces of information contained in Arabic literary evidence are inaccurate; on the other hand, they establish other details. Arabic texts such as Ibn al-Kalbī’s Kitāb al-Asnām clearly have some authentic material about the religious beliefs of pre-Islamic Arabia but separating the wheat from the chaff is difficult. To quote Robert Hoyland: “[I]t must be borne in mind that the Arabic reports are not plain historical narratives, but rather of an epic and legendary nature, full of seductions, ambushes, eloquent speeches and heroic battles” (2009: 389).

Nevertheless, the Islamic-era Arabic texts can be studied from another point of view: namely, the narrative and Weltanschauung that they offer in which the pre-Islamic jāhilīyya, “Age of Ignorance,” is seen as a complete opposite to the time of Islam (Drory 1996; Rippin 2012: 7–17;
When studying empirical history, we must, however, give precedence to the material remains where they exist, and use literary sources with a critical eye. More research is needed on the question of transmission of pre-Islamic information to the later Arabic literary sources (for some notes, see Hoyland 2009: 390–391). Muslim authors who write on pre-Islamic Arabia sometimes refer to written sources that they had at their disposal. For example, al-Hamdânî (1963: I 118–119, 131), an expert on South Arabian matters, refers to some kind of written books and records that he used, but the existence or character of these is unclear. Furthermore, the Middle Persian historical literature, different specimens of which were translated into Arabic (Hämeen-Anttila 2013), might have included some information on North and South Arabia. However, it might be the case that the reports on Arabia were added during the translation process and thus postdate Islam.

In connection with the Arabic sources one must also mention the originally oral Arabic poetry that is attributed to the pre-Islamic era even if it was collected in the first centuries of Islam. Some earlier scholars (Margoliouth 1925; Ḥusayn 1926) dismissed the whole of this corpus of poetry as a forgery but a case can be made that the formal features of these poems (meter, rhyme) guaranteed that they were transmitted in a way that was more or less faithful to their original form(s) (see also Zwettler 1978). Most modern scholars are of the opinion that, if genuine, the pre-Islamic poetry stems from the fifth–sixth centuries CE, at the earliest. Study that compares this corpus to the epigraphic record, for example, is still in its infancy.

Languages of pre-Islamic Arabia

To show how at a loss the Islamic-era Arabic literary evidence can sometimes be, one needs only to consider the linguistic situation of pre-Islamic Arabia (on which see Macdonald 2000; Al-Jallad 2015: 1–25). The Muslim authors did not have an understanding of the variety of languages in the pre-Islamic era, claiming that most of the inhabitants of Arabia were Arabic-speaking (Rabin 1951), whereas in historical reality Arabia was home to speakers and writers of forms of North Arabian (including but not restricted to Arabic), South Arabian, Aramaic (Nabataean, Syriac) and, to a lesser extent, Hebrew, Ge’ez, Persian, Greek, and Latin. In the Islamic tradition, not only Arabians but also major characters of the monotheist tradition such as Ismail speak Arabic (al-Mas’ûdî 1979: II 162). Furthermore, later Arabic writers had little grasp of the fact that the South Arabs did not see themselves as and could not be called Arabs in the pre-Islamic era. The Muslim authors see Yemen as the original home of the Arabs and Arabic language – an idea for which we do not have much evidence and that is most likely incorrect.

To this is connected another myth, namely that the Arab tribes are divided into two sections: al-ʿarab al-ʿâribâ, “True Arabic-speaking Arabs,” and al-ʿarab al-mustaʿriba, “Arabized Arabs.” The ʿarab al-ʿâriba are deemed to be the Southern tribes and the ʿarab al-mustaʿriba Northern. But this is incorrect insofar as the Arabic language actually spread from the north to the south in the course of late antiquity, and not the other way around. The Islamic tradition pushes the importance of Yemen even further, for example claiming that the eponym of the Greeks, Yūnân, came from Yemen (al-Mas’ûdî 1979: II 5–6). All of this probably reflects the Islamic-era, post-conquest tendency of Yemenite Muslims to emphasize their significance, but further research is needed (Bashear 1989; Webb 2016: 177–239).

In the Muslim sources, the development and rise of the Arabic script is said to have happened in the Ḥijâz, al-ʿAnbâr, or al-Ḥâra (e.g., al-Hamdânî 1963: I 77–79). The suggestion of al-Ḥâra is interesting, since it was the capital of the Lakhmids (see below) and, indeed, the first text that is written completely in Arabic is the Namara inscription dated to 328 CE; it is a
funerary text for Marʾ al-Qays ibn ʿAmr, who is usually identified with a Lakhmid king of that name (Bellamy 1985; Macdonald 2015: 405–409). The script is a late variant of Nabataean, from which the Arabic script developed during the following centuries (Gruendler 1993). However, the Namara inscription is the only testimony for the Lakhmids’ ostensible written use of Arabic.

As for the Ḥijāz, there is actually more evidence that the Arabic script evolved there. Based on epigraphy, the rise of the Arabic script seems to be more directly related to the longevity of Nabataean Aramaic, which was, according to new finds (Nehmé 2010), used in the western parts of the peninsula until the fifth century. The script of these inscriptions is Nabataean and the language is often a mixture of Aramaic and Arabic. In 2014, a French-Saudi team found a new Nabataean Aramaic inscription dated 469–470 CE as far south as Najrān, which sparked scholarly and media interest.5 The Old Arabic inscriptions of the sixth century (Zebed, Jabal Usays, Harran; see Macdonald 2008) seem to be a continuation of this epigraphic habit of late Nabataean inscriptions, even if they have been found to the north of the Ḥijāz, in Syria. Writing on perishable material, if it existed, has not been preserved.

**Tribal groups**

There is a rather widespread misconception among the general audience that all or most of the inhabitants of Arabia, and especially the Ḥijāz, were nomadic (often called Bedouin) around the lifetime of the Prophet Muhammad, that is, the sixth and seventh centuries CE (on nomadism in Arabia, see, e.g., Bulliet 1980; Donner 1981: 16–20; Hoyland 2001: 89–102; Lancaster and Lancaster 2004). But this is incorrect. As Fred Donner reminds us about the inhabitants of Arabia: “it is unlikely that nomadic peoples have ever formed more than a small fraction of its population …. Most Arabians, then, are, and have been, settled people” (1981: 11). It has to be remembered that according to the traditional narrative, Muḥammad himself was a town-dweller, not a nomad of the desert.

Inhabitants of Arabia were divided along tribal lines that, if need be, could be flexible and negotiable. There is a sizeable secondary literature on pre-Islamic Arabian tribal groups (e.g., Kister 1965 on Tamūm; Donner 1980 on Bakr ibn Wā’il; Shahīd 1984a: 366–483 on Tanūkh; Landau–Tasseron 1985 on Asad; Lecker 1989 on Sulaym; Lecker 1994 on Kinda; Rihan 2014 on ʿĀmilā). It can be assumed that the Arabic literary evidence did transmit some historically valid knowledge of the tribes on the eve of Islam. In a section below, the Banū Ghassān, Ṣāliḥ, and Lakhm will be discussed; on these, the Arabic literature has valuable material. But when it comes to earlier times, it probably does not have much authentic information, except perhaps genealogies, which have proven to be only somewhat accurate.

The following two are extreme examples of the unreliability of Arabic literature: the extinct tribes, Thamūd and ʿĀd. They are treated here to remind students of pre-Islamic Arabia that sacred history in particular is often of doubtful reliability. A critical examination of the Islamic sources (the Qurʾān and the later tradition) shows that Muslims did not have any information about the historical Thamūd (on which see Macdonald 1995). The Thamūd narrative in the Islamic source is, quite simply, a myth (Stetkevych 1996). It tells the story of the Thamūd that live in al-Ḥijr (ancient Egra/Hgr’, modern Madāʾin Sāliḥ), a city carved out of rock (Q 11:61–68, 15:80–84, 41:13–17; al-Ṭabarī 1879–1901: I 244–252). A prophet, called simply Sāliḥ, “Pious,” emerges from among them, but the Thamūd disbelieve and God’s punishment wipes them all out. But in historical reality, al-Ḥijr was a Nabataean city (see, e.g., Nehmé 2005). Writing of Nabataean Aramaic in al-Ḥijr survived the fall of the Nabataean state in 106 well into the fourth century CE. There is no evidence that Thamūd lived there before or after the Nabataeans. It should be pointed out, at this junction, that the varieties of Ancient North Arabian inscriptions
called “Thamudic” do not have anything at all to do with the tribe Thamūd; “Thamudic” is merely a modern and unfortunate misnomer. The Islamic sources are correct, though, in that the Thamūd seems to have been an extinct tribe before Islam. The last mention of them is in the fifth-century CE Byzantine military document Notitia Dignitatum (Shahîd 2000: 436a). Al-Hijr, a city that was probably more or less abandoned by the lifetime of Muhammad, became connected in the minds of the people with a lost tribe, the Thamūd. But for the study of the historical Thamūd, the Islamic sources are of little value.

Another extinct tribe, Ād, is mentioned in connection with the Thamūd in the Qurʾān (e.g., 7:73–4). In one passage the Qurʾān states: “Have you not seen how your Lord dealt with the Ād of Iram of the pillars (iram dhāt al-ʾimād)?” (Q 89:6–7). The Arabic exegetical tradition speculates extensively on what this “Iram of the pillars” might have been. Usually it is stated that it was either a city, identified with Damascus, the ancient Aram, or a (non-attested) place of that name in Yemen, or a tribe somehow connected with the Ād. But a case can be made that the Qurʾānic Iram is nothing but the ancient Nabataean town of Iram, nowadays known as Wādī Ram, in Jordan (Healey 2001: 56). Iram (ʾrm) as a toponym is securely attested in the inscriptions from the area (Savignac 1933). For example, one Bar ʿAlivyû, writing on Jabal Ram, says that he wrote the inscription with his own hand in ʾrm (Hoyland 2010a: 39). Indeed, Jabal Ram is still called Iram in Islamic times (Yāqūt 1977: I 154–155). But the epigraphic evidence can be pushed even further, since a Hismaic inscription found on a stone from the temple of Lāt in Iram/Wādī Ram is written “by ḡṭ son of Sh son of Tk – and he built the temple of Lāt (u-buy bt lt) – of the tribe ḏ” (Farès-Drappeau 1996: 276–277). The Hismaic ḏ could be interpreted as the Arabic ʿĀd (Hismaic does not write vowels, even long ones), which would then place the ʿĀd in the ancient Iram. The pillars (al-ʾimād) mentioned in the Qurʾān could then be understood as the buildings or, perhaps more plausibly, as the rock formations of Iram (see also Gürsey, forthcoming). (See Figure 9.1.)

Figure 9.1  A view of Wādī Ram. Photograph by Hannu Aukia
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The Ḥijāz and polytheism

In the Islamic-era Arabic narratives, the pre-Islamic history of Mecca is linked with the sacred history and, sometimes, the history of the Persian Empire. For example, Sāsān, the eponym of the Sasanids, is depicted as going to Ka′ba for a pilgrimage (al-Maṣūdī 1979: 1283). The building of the Ka′ba is credited to Abraham, as is well known. But all this is of course nothing but pious fiction. This section discusses political events and religious beliefs in the Ḥijāz before Muḥammad based on documentary evidence. Epigraphy receives much space here, because many of the inscriptions are rather new finds and somewhat unknown to students of pre- and early Islamic history.

Mecca, the town where Muḥammad is said to have been born, was not suited for agriculture (Donner 1981: 15): it seems to have been an insignificant town in pre-Islamic times and it is not referred to by any source before the coming of Islam (identifying Ptolemy’s Macoraba with Mecca is not credible). The first source to mention it is the Qurān (48:84; furthermore, in Q 3:96 a place called Bakka, often identified with Mecca, appears). It needs to be stressed that the trans-Arabian trade routes did not pass through it (Crone 1987; cf. Bukharin 2009). Mecca seems to have been a minor town with a temple, the Ka′ba, to which some Arabians made pilgrimage. Even though we do not have pre-Islamic references to Mecca or Ka′ba, we do have ample evidence of sacred enclaves (in Arabic, ḫanām, mahram, or himā), where violence was prohibited, in the Peninsula. These are attested in ASA and Nabataean Aramaic inscriptions as well as literary evidence (Nehmé 1998; Hoyland 2001: 157–162). The sanctuary usually employed a priest of some kind and pilgrimage to the site could be made. From Yemen, we have epigraphic records that describe annual pilgrimages to different sanctuaries; during the pilgrimage and festival time, shedding blood and sexual relations were often forbidden (Hoyland 2001: 161). In the Arabic literature, we also have references to other ka′bas (cubic religious buildings) of the Peninsula (Finster 2009: 75–76, 85–86).

More significant than Mecca in antiquity was the other town that Muḥammad’s life is linked with, Medina, known before Islam as Yathrib. Yathrib is widely attested in both pre-Islamic epigraphy and literature and was a stop along the trade route. What is more, monotheism (particularly Judaism) was rather strongly represented in Yathrib (Lecker 1995). Jews are also attested in epigraphy elsewhere in the Ḥijāz and Northern Arabia (Hoyland 2011). However, except the Qurān, we currently have very little tangible evidence for Christians in or around Mecca and Medina (Munt 2015: 252).

The religious environment of the Ḥijāz around the time of Muḥammad seems to be one where older polytheism was mixed with and perhaps supplanted by newer strands of monotheism (Christianity and Judaism): “The Qurān crystallized in an environment of monotheistic debate, not in a pagan environment” (Donner 2011: 29). In fact, scholars (Hawting 1999; Crone 2010) have claimed that the Qurānic mushrikūn, usually translated as “polytheists,” were actually some sort of monotheists (or quasi-monotheists). This is analogous to what the late antique scholars of the Graeco–Roman world have noticed, namely, that there was a general tendency toward “pagan monotheism” (Athanassiadi and Frede 1999). Q 29:65, for example, says, “When they go on board a ship, they call on God (al-lāh), in sincere devotion to Him alone, but once He has delivered them safely back to land, they ascribe partners.” This could indicate that even the polytheists viewed Allāh as some sort of High God (Watt 1971). But there is not much evidence outside the Qurān for this (Bowersock 2013: 120–133), so all views on the matter are somewhat tentative. It must be noted that the Qurān ascribes opinions and beliefs, often in a polemic vein, to the enemies of the Believers that they probably did not manifest: it not only describes religious groups and identities but also construes them. Discussing the characterization
of Christianity in the Qurʾān, Sidney Griffith remarks: “the Qurʾān does not simply report or repeat what Christians say; it reproves what they say, corrects it, or caricatures it” (2011: 311). This serves as “a polemically inspired caricature, the purpose of which is to highlight in Islamic terms the absurdity, and therefore the wrongness, of the Christian belief” (Griffith 2011: 311). In attributing the mushrikūn some monotheist tendencies, the Qurʾān is probably doing the same: it claims that even the polytheists acknowledge that Allāh is the only and real God when their lives are in peril but when the danger is over they resort to their false gods again. In fact, it is rather widely attested that polytheism was still practiced in parts of late antique Arabia, and we do not seem to have much reason to doubt that the Kaʿba of Mecca was a place where a pagan god, perhaps Hubal and possibly represented by the black stone, was worshipped (e.g., al-Azraqī 1858: 31; the deity ḥblw is attested in a Nabataean inscription from Madāʾin Śāliḥ, Healey 1993: 154).

The effect of the Mazdean (Zoroastrian) religion on the region before and during the life of Muḥammad was less significant than that of Christianity and Judaism, but scholars have suggested some influences. However, it is hard to say whether these influences are real or imagined: the evidence is slight. The Sasanian ruler Kavād I, who reigned in the late fifth and early sixth centuries, is said to have imposed Mazdaism upon the Arabians in Najd and the Hijāz (al-Masʿūdī 1979: I 75; Daryae 2009: 27) but whether this is a reliable report is hard to judge. In Q 2:102, angels called Hārūt and Mārūt appear; the names seem to be influenced by the Mazdean divine concepts Haurvatat (Middle Persian hordad, lit. “perfection”) and Ameretat (Middle Persian amurdat, lit. “immortality”) that were among the Amesha Špenta (Rose 2011: 171).

We have ample epigraphic evidence of Arabian polytheistic beliefs and rites in the ANA (especially Safaitic), ASA, and Nabataean inscriptions. The problem is that these are (often centuries) earlier than Muḥammad and the Qurʾān, making it unclear whether this corpus is always useful
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to study the context of early Islam. What is more, the epigraphic evidence stems mostly from the south and north of the Ḥijāz. However, it can be argued that the epigraphic record is nonetheless more valuable than the Islamic-era Arabic literary evidence, which is centuries later than Muhammad and composed after what was seen as a profound change in the world order: the coming of a new religion, Islam, and the conquest of almost all of the known world by its adherents.

The Safaitic inscriptions are especially interesting because they are voluminous (over 50,000 are known so far), quite well understood, and paint a vibrant picture of the religious beliefs of their writers, the inhabitants of the Syro-Jordanian ḥāra, the basalt stone desert. Their dating, however, is uncertain. The inscriptions attest religious rituals, such as sacrificing animals (ḏbḥ) or dedicating (qṣy) an animal in a rock drawing to a deity; the writers also mention going on a pilgrimage (ḥg) (Al-Jallad 2015: 217). Quite a few deities feature, many of which are identifiable with the ones mentioned in the Qurʾān or later Arabic literature as being among the deities that the polytheists worshipped: for example, ʾlh, ʾlt, ḏṣʾr(ʾy)/ḏsʾr(ʾy), and ṭḏw/ḏy (Al-Jallad 2015: 210), corresponding in all likelihood to Allāh, Allāt, Dhū al-Sharā, and Ruḍā in Arabic. The inscriptions reveal that the writers sought refuge in the deities when times were tough:

By Sʿd son of Sʿwʿt son of Lmʿ and may ṭḏw help him through divine favor, as there is danger here, and may he bless him.

(AWS 218 in Al-Jallad 2015: 226)

By {ʿnʿm} and O {Gdʿwd}, O Merciful One (ʾḥ rm) and O One who causes death (ʾḥ ymyt), and O ṭḏw, may the people be established [in this place].

(C 4351 in Al-Jallad 2015: 241)

The deities (or attributes) ṭḥm and ymyt mentioned in C 4351 are especially interesting and should be compared with the divine attributes mentioned in the Qurʾān.

By Mlk son of ʾḥwʿd of the lineage of ʿmn and he halted on account of a monitor lizard the year Mk announced (declared war?) for Rome; and he mourned for Sʿyd, who was murdered, so, O Lt, may there be vengeance against his murderer; and he mourned for his paternal uncle’s captured son, whom Tayyiʿ have captured.

(CSNS 1004 in Al-Jallad 2015: 245)

By Nʿẓr son of Ḥfʿz son of Sʿwd and, O King of the sky (ʾḥ mlk h-sʿmy), let there be water.

(KRS 1944 in Al-Jallad 2015: 262)

Other Safaitic inscriptions speak of more worldly matters, such as:

By Bṭ and he copulated with Grmh, as he had celebrated the sending of the bride and had been pleased.

(C 285 in Al-Jallad 2015: 229)

By Whblh son of ʾḥrb son of Ykn of the lineage of Kkb and he rejoiced at Brkt because there was fresh herbage, and returned from a place of water the year the lineage of ṭwd pastured the livestock of the lineage of bd; and he served with his father in a cavalry unit.

(C 320 in Al-Jallad 2015: 229)
The inscriptions show that the inhabitants of the *ḥarra* were in the habit of naming years according to significant events, especially wars. This is analogous to what we read in Arabic sources, where years such as “the year of the elephant” (ʿām al-fīl) appear. To give a couple of examples from the Safaitic corpus:

By ʿnʿm son of Qḥṣ² and he raided in the year of the war of Nabataea.

(C 3690 in Al-Jallad 2015: 240)

By Ḥṣʾmn son of Gn¹ son of S²r son of Gn¹ of the lineage of Kn and adversity was widespread in the year of Caesar and the Persians so, O Lt and Gḍḍ, may he be secure; and may he who would efface this writing go blind.

(HAUI 72 in Al-Jallad 2015: 248)

By Ṣʿn son of Gṛm¹ son of Ṣʾn son of Bnt son of Ṣʾn son of Ḥṣʾt of the lineage of Kn and he found the writing of Gṛm¹, for those who remain despair; and he feared the Romans in the year of the Jews so, O Lt … protection against misfortune.

(HAUI 125 in Al-Jallad 2015: 249)

As is already clear from the above examples, the writers of the Safaitic inscriptions often mention the powers in the region: Nabataeans, Romans, and Persians. One could adduce one more inscriptions to this effect, in which erecting (*ṣb*) a sacred stone for a deity called ʿṯʿ is also mentioned. Sacred stones, representing deities, are widely attested in the archaeological, epigraphic, and literary evidence (Hoyland 2001: 183–187). (See Figure 9.3.)

By Ṭm¹ son of Qṭʿn son of Mʿmn son of Bs²mt son of Ṭwr son of Ṭylt son of Rʿd son of Hbn son of Qn¹ the Ḥwl-ite and he fled from Rome/Romans.

(LP 87 in Al-Jallad 2015: 265)

By Nʿmn son of Ḥbyt son of Nṣr son of Nʿmn son of Nṣr son of {Gṛm¹} son of Kn son of Nʿmn son of W¹ son of Rbn son of S²r son of Kn son of Ṭḥrt son of Hys¹r son of Bʿs² son of Df and he erected (*ṣb*) [a sacred stone of] ʿṯʿ the year Caesar sent reinforcements to the province and restored order to the province and the lineage of s¹hm was defeated, for the lineage of Mlk and ʿm the ‘bs²ite and s¹ of the lineage of Frṭ and he/those of the lineage of Yṭṭ had [all] made war upon them.

(MISSD 1 in Al-Jallad 2015: 273)

Polytheism also features in the late Nabataean Aramaic inscriptions, meaning Aramaic inscriptions written in transitional Nabataean script and often with heavy influence of Arabic (what follows is based on Nehmé 2013: 69–73). While we can often only guess the dates of the Safaitic corpus, these inscriptions are fairly securely dated to the first–fifth centuries CE on the basis of explicitly mentioned dates and paleography. What is more, the late Nabataean inscriptions derive from the Ḥijāz. Four deities, all recognizable from the Qurʾān or later Arabic tradition, occur in them: the Nabataean main god *duṣē* (Arabic Dhū al-Shārā, Ṭz (al-ʿUzzā), Ḥt (Allāt), and *mnṭw/mnwt/mnwtw* (Manāt). In addition to these, two inscribers ask to be remembered “in
front of all the gods” (mn qdm ʾlhy klhm). Highly interesting is the sole inscription that mentions Allāt, since it states dʾlt dy bnh ʿnmw, “this is [a stone representing] Allāt that ʿNmw built” (on Allāt, see Krone 1992). The inscribers mentioning the different deities ask to be remembered in front of one (dkyr PN mn qdm DN) or that the deity listen to or hear (the prayer of) PN (ʾsnʿ DN l- PN).

Polytheistic rites among North Arabians are also recounted in the pre-Islamic literary evidence, such as the Latin Itinerarium written by the anonymous “Piacenza Pilgrim” probably in the 550s. The author mentions a sacred stone on Mount Sinai:

And on this mountain, on a part of the mountain, the Saracens have set up their own idol, made of marble white as snow. Here also their priest resides, dressed in a dalmatic and a linen cloak. When the time of their festival arrives with the new moon, before the moon has risen on the day of their feast, the marble begins to change colour; as soon as the moon appears, when they begin to worship, the marble turns black as pitch. When the time of the festival is over, it returns to its original colour. We were totally amazed by this.

(Piacenza Pilgrim, Travelogue [Itinerarium]: 38, translation in Caner 2010: 258)

The point of this section was to show that polytheism of pre-Islamic North Arabia is widely attested in the epigraphic record and literature and there does not seem to be at the moment enough evidence to suggest, as Patricia Crone (2010, 2012) has done, that the mushrikān
mentioned in the Qurʾān were monotheist or believers in the same god, Allāh, as the Prophet, even though in some instances the Qurʾān does use the word for people who were not deemed monotheist enough, such as some Christians and Jews (e.g., Q 9:30–31). What is, in any case, true is that according to the pre-Islamic documentary record Allāh is very rarely attested. The polytheist pantheon and rites in South Arabia differed from those of North Arabia and will be discussed in the next section.

Yemen

Yemen is the only part of the Arabian Peninsula able to sustain dry-farming (Donner 1981: 11–12). Yemen was, before Islam, culturally very different from the more northern parts of the peninsula: the Yemenites spoke and wrote forms of South Arabian languages whereas the inhabitants of the north spoke forms of North Arabian languages. The Yemenites did not view themselves as Arabs before the coming of Islam and neither should the modern scholarship call them that. (To be sure, it was suggested in the introduction to this chapter that the term “Arab” could also be inapplicable to North Arabians in pre-Islamic times.) What is more, the Yemenites formed political units and states much earlier than they appear in the North. Their income was secured because Yemen produced frankincense and myrrh, valuable products in antiquity that were transported to, for instance, Rome (for the spice and incense trade in and from Arabia, see, e.g., Hourani 1979: 3–50; Crone 1987; Young 2001). The trans-Arabian trade is ultimately tied to the domestication and exploitation of the camel as a pack animal (Bulliet 1975).

The Yemenite kingdom of Himyar is characterized by its close, and sometimes hostile, relationship with the kingdom of Axum (Ethiopia) that had converted to Christianity by the 340s (Bowersock 2013: 67). Christianity had also spread to some parts of Yemen, especially Najrān, but, interestingly, and for reasons that we do not have a clear grasp of, towards the end of the fourth century, Yemen, or at least its ruling class, adopted Judaism with some peculiar characteristics (Robin 2003; Gajda 2010). Before this, the Yemenites were mainly polytheist, worshipping, among others, ʿAthtar, the sun goddess Shams, and the moon god Almaqah (Jamme 1947; Hoyland 2001: 140–141). (The importance of astral deities in North Arabia is a debated question; see Macdonald 2012; interestingly, however, Q 53:49 calls God “the Lord of Sirius.”) The South Arabian deity Wadd is mentioned in Q 71:23 along with other deities, so it is possible to suppose that traditional polytheism was practiced until the time of Muḥammad, even though it vanishes completely from the South Arabian inscriptions that are dated between 380 and 560. The new monotheist God is called ṭḥmn in Ancient South Arabian and often described as “Lord of Heaven and Earth” (Nebes 2009). The Qurʾānic name al-Raḥmān is probably related to that. One interesting inscription ends, after mentioning ṭḥmn, with the phrase ṭḥ hd b-ṯḥmn, which is translated as “by the Lord of the Jews, by the Highly Praised” (Ja 1028 in CSAI = Corpus of South Arabian Inscriptions, http://dasi.humnet.unipi.it/index.php?id=42&prjId=1&corId=0&collId=0), even though the similarity to the Prophet Muḥammad’s name is probably purely coincidental.

In 518 or thereabouts, the Ethiopian Negus (king) raided Yemen, which led to a short Christian occupation (Bowersock 2013: 87–93). But the staunchly Jewish Himyarite king Yūsuf, known in Arabic tradition as Dhū Nuwās, fought against the Christianizing trend and, in 523, went so far as to massacre Christians in Najrān and other places (see, e.g., al-Maṣʿūdi 1979: 1 74–75; Brock and Harvey 1987: 100–121; Beaucamp, Briquel-Chatonnet, and Robin 1999–2000 and 2010). This led to a new Ethiopian attack on Yemen, possibly at the instigation
of the Byzantines, in 525 (Bowersock 2013: 96–97). The Ethiopian and Christian presence in Yemen was strengthened and the Himyarite dynasty was supplanted. This led to a situation where other foreign powers also tried to exert influence in Southern Arabia. During the time of Khosrow I (r. 531–579), Sasanian Persia was able to conquer areas in Eastern Arabia, reaching regions in Yemen as well (Daryaei 2009: 31).

In the 540s–550s, Yemen was ruled by a king of Ethiopian origin called Abraha. He launched many campaigns into parts of Arabia, celebrating his deeds in inscriptions (Bowersock 2013: 111–118). One expedition, probably the one dated 552, was remembered later in Islamic tradition as “the year of the elephant” (‘ām al-fil), even if there is no evidence that Abraha raided Mecca, as the Arabic literature recounts. The Islamic tradition claims that Muḥammad was born in that year but this does not seem to be anything other than a confluence of two events that were later deemed highly significant (Conrad 1987). Ethiopians were not there to stay, however. By 575, the Persians had conquered the whole of Yemen and expelled the Ethiopian troops.

Ghassânids and Lakhmids

Two North Arabian tribes, the Banū Ghassān and Banū Lakhm, rise to important positions as allies of and sort of buffer states between the Byzantine Empire and the Sasanian Empire toward the end of the third century CE (Shahid 2002; Toral-Niehoff 2014; Genequand and Robin 2015). In the scholarly literature, they are sometimes called Jafnids and Naṣrids, respectively, according to their ruling houses. The reason for their being employed as vassals of the two great empires is given by Hoyland as follows: “Rome’s struggle with a re-energised Iranian Empire led by the Sasanian dynasty (inaugurated in 224 CE) meant that it had an increased need for military manpower and allies. Peripheral people were thus incorporated in the Empire in larger numbers, and consequently they could negotiate with Rome on better terms” (2009: 380).

The Ghassānids first appear in two Ancient South Arabian inscriptions dated to c. 260 and 360 CE (Robin 2015: 111–113). To these can be added a late Nabataean Aramaic inscription found at al-Qaṭ‘a in the Ḥijāz that Robin dates to the third–fourth centuries on the basis of paleography. It reads: bl ādyr nṣḥ hrtt br zydmnwtw nilk ‘śn, “Indeed be remembered the relative-in-law of Ḥārith that son of Zydmnwtw, King of Ghassān” (2015: 114; his reading and translation require modification as given here).9

Thereafter, the Ghassānids appear in the epigraphic record and literary evidence. The Jabal Usays inscription, dated 528–529, is written by a person that the Ghassānid king had sent for some sort of military activity: “I am Ruqaym son of Mu‘arrif al-Awsī; the king al-Ḥārith [ibn Jabala] sent me to Usays as a guard [? nṣlh/mṣlh, the interpretation is uncertain] in the year 4 × 100 + 20 + 3 [of the Province = 528–529 CE]” (Larcher 2010; Macdonald 2010). Al-Ḥārith’s son al-Mundhir (phylarch of Byzantium c. 568–581) is remembered in an inscription from Resāfā, reading, in Greek, “the fortune of al-Mundhir is victorious” (Cameron 2012: 174). It is important to note that while both the Ghassānids and Lakhmids were probably Arabic-speaking, they usually resorted to Greek or Syriac in writing.

By the fourth century, Christianity had spread to the Northern parts of Arabia (al-Mas‘ūdī 1979: I 76, 81; Hoyland 2001: 147–150) as well as some places in the South, such as Najrān. The spread of Christianity can be documented not only from the literary evidence but also from the emergence of crosses in rock graffiti, for example in Kilwa in the northwestern Peninsula (Finster 2009: 72). The Ghassānids had also converted and were staunch supporters of Christianity. For instance, the Ghassānid king al-Nu‘mān b. al-Mundhir (phylarch of the Byzantine Empire c. 581–602, not to be confused with the Lakhmid king of the same name
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who ruled around the same time) is characterized in the Greek and Syriac sources as “a zealous Christian man” (Hoyland 2010b: 48).

At times, the Byzantines employed tribes other than Ghassânids as their allies and clients. One must mention especially the Šāl̄ihids in this connection (Shâhid 1989: 233–324). One of their kings seem to be attested in a late Nabataean inscription found recently in the Hijāz that reads: “Indeed be remembered Pahmū son of ʿUbaydū for good and may he remain safe and sound; in the year 2 × 100 + 100 + 20 + 20 + 10 [of the Province = 455 CE] when they introduced ʿAmrū as king” (Nehmē 2009: 49–52). This is an important and rare document that appears to refer to the Šāl̄ihid king ʿAmr ibn Dujʿum/Zokomos who reigned in the fifth century and who is mentioned by Greek and Arabic authors (Shâhid 1989: 252–255).

The bilingual (Parthian–Middle Persian) Paikuli inscription, dated 293 CE, is the first record of the Lakhmids (Toral-Niehoff 2014: 30). There, the Lakhmid king ʿAmr (r. c. 270–300) is mentioned among the vassals of the Sasanians. For the son of ʿAmr we also have epigraphic evidence: in the Namara funerary inscription of 328 CE, Marʿ al-Qays b. ʿAmr claimed to have been the “King of all Arabs/Arabia” and that he subdued various Arabian tribes, raiding as far south as Najrān (Macdonald 2015). It cannot be assumed that the Lakhmids were the submissive clients of the Persians for three centuries, but rather they maintained some independence. The Lakhmids seem to have remained pagan until the late sixth century, when they converted to Christianity (Toral-Niehoff 2009).

The Sasanians found a reliable ally in the Lakhmids, who built their capital at al-Ḥīra, near Ctesiphon (on al-Ḥīra, see most recently Toral-Niehoff 2014). According to the Arabic sources, the relationship between the Sasanian ruling family and the Lakhmids was close and often amiable. It is, for instance, said that the Sasanian king Bahram V Gūr (r. 420–438) was brought up in the Lakhmid court of al-Ḥīra (al-Masʿūdī 1979: I 303; Daryaee 2009: 22–23), but this might be an unreliable report. According to Isabel Toral-Niehoff, “such legendary material should be read as symbolic cultural legends that personalize the Iranian–Arab cultural contact” (2013: 123). In the early sixth century, the Lakhmids played an important role in Persian military operations; this is also attested in the non–Arabic literature and is thus more strongly grounded in history (Hoyland 2007: 228–229).

According to the Arabic sources, the strong interaction of North Arabs with Sasanian Persia goes back to the early years of Shāpūr II’s reign (309–379 CE), when North Arabs raided some provinces of the empire. Later, the king retaliated and the Arabian tribes of Taghlib, ʿAbd al-Qays, Tamīm, Bakr ibn Wāʿil, and Ḥanāzila are said to have been forcibly removed and resettled inside Sasanian Persia (al-Masʿūdī 1979: I 295; Daryaee 2009: 16–17). The presence of North Arabs in Mesopotamia had, of course, a long history (Ephʿal 1984) but their number probably increased during the Sasanian period.

The last Lakhmid king, al-Nuʿmān III b. al-Mundhir, was killed by the Sasanians in 602 CE (Hoyland 2001: 30; Daryaee 2009: 33). The Lakhmids were replaced by another Arabian tribe, Ṭayyiʾ, which ruled in al-Ḥīra for nine years. After this, al-Ḥīra was directly ruled by the Persians.

The decades before the Islamic conquests were characterized by the renewal of hostilities between the Byzantine and Sasanian empires in various clashes and wars, the last war occurring in the years 603–630 (on these wars, see Howard-Johnston 1995; Greatrex and Lieu 2002: 182–228; Dignas and Winter 2007; Hoyland 2010b: 45–85; Fisher 2011; Sarris 2011; Cameron 2012: 191–198; Millar 2013). The inaptly named “Endless Peace” treaty of 561 between the empires came to an end when the Byzantine emperor Justin II opened hostilities in the year 572. He also planned a failed attempt on the life of the Ghassānid king al-Mundhir, which led to the severing of ties between the Ghassānids and Byzantines. However, al-Mundhir was soon
once again on the Byzantine side, fighting with the general Maurice against the Persians. The fighting between the Byzantine and Sasanian sides was indecisive, however, with truces being called and then broken. The Arabian clients of Persians and Byzantines also conducted proxy wars against each other (on the importance of the Arabian allies, see Hoyland 2010b: 47–48; Cameron 2012: 193).

However, in the 610s things started to change. During the reign of Khosrow II (590–628), the Persian armies advanced westward, conquering Syria, Egypt, and many cities of Asia Minor. Jerusalem was reduced in 614 and the True Cross taken, alongside the patriarch, to Ctesiphon, the Persian capital. The loss of land, goods, and prestige was a serious blow to the Byzantine Empire.

The Byzantine Empire started to recover and launch counterattacks in the 620s, during the reign of Heraclius (r. 610–641). This did not stop the Persians from threatening Constantinople, the Byzantine capital, in 626. But soon their fortunes turned. Forming an alliance with the Turks, Heraclius attacked Persian lands decisively, which made the Persian king sue for peace in 629. The True Cross was recovered and taken back to Jerusalem in the year 630. The Sasanian Empire fell into disarray, with different factions fighting each other and kings coming to the throne just to be unseated by the next (see al-Ṭabarî 1879–1901: I 1061–1067 for a possible list of kings). No wonder, then, that when the early Muslims started to raid the Near East in the 630s, the resistance from the Byzantines and Persians was not strong enough to stop them.

Conclusions

Today, we understand the religious phenomena of Arabia better than before. Epigraphy in particular has taken great strides, and we are no longer so dependent on the tendentious Arabic literary sources of the Islamic era. Arabia in general and the Hijāz in particular are regions where both polytheistic and monotheistic beliefs and practices are attested before Islam. Neither polytheism nor monotheism should be disregarded until we more fully understand the interaction or the power relations of the two and of nascent Islam.

Monotheism was quickly advancing in the region but traditional polytheism, with all its variety, apparently still had its supporters. But not for long. An Arabian Prophet called Muḥammad was about to start receiving a new revelation that continued the monotheistic tradition. Islam should be seen as part of the tendency towards monotheism in late antiquity. After a millennia-long history, polytheism in the Near East came to its end with the career of the Arabian Prophet who himself had grown up in the pagan environment, perhaps worshipping the local gods (Kister 1970), but who proved in the end to be their staunchest opponent.

Notes

1 I have greatly benefited from discussions with Suleyman Dost and Nathaniel Miller about pre-Islamic Arabia. I am grateful to them as well as to Yusuf Gürsey, Professor Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila, Jouni Harjumäki, and Kaj Öhrnberg, who read and commented on an earlier draft of this chapter.

2 There are a couple of indications that some ANA inscriptions could be contemporaneous with Islam. See, e.g., the Safaitic inscription CIS 4448 in Al-Jallad (2015: 242), which is dated according to s iht ḫrb ḫ-rndy ‘lm ḫ-bṣfy], “the year the Persians waged war against the people of Rome at Bostra.” The inscription could refer to the Sasanian–Byzantine wars of the early seventh century CE, but this is in no way certain.

3 North Arabian and South Arabian are not genetic groupings but regional ones and the research on them is still ongoing. Ancient North Arabian, for example, is usually said to include Taymatic and Dadanitic, as well, but these are not linguistically part of the North Arabian group.
4 Sometimes a third group, al-ʿarab al-bāʿida, “vanished Arabs,” is mentioned. Thamūd and ‘Ād (see the section “Tribal groups”) are among them.
6 I thank Yusuf Gürsey for this reference.
7 Animal sacrifices are attested in jāhiliyya poetry and the archaeological record, as well. One of the forms of animal sacrifice was that a camel was killed on the death of its owner (Stetkevych 1993: 40; Hoyland 2001: 163–166, 175).
8 The readings of the Saʿītic inscriptions are from Al-Jallad (2015). The translations have been modified if deemed necessary.
9 I thank Nathaniel Miller for this reference.
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