

founder, 'Abd al-Kādir al-Djilānī [q.v.], is said to have died at the place of the mosque dedicated in his name. His anniversary (*ziyārat al-Djilānī*) is celebrated by a pilgrimage and the accompanying ceremonies on 11 Rabi^c al-Awwal of each year.

Bibliography: R. Basset, *Histoire de la conquête de l'Abyssinie (XIVe siècle) par Chihab eddin Ahmed ben Abd el Qāder surnommé Arab-Faqih*. 2 vols. Paris 1897-1901; O. G. S. Crawford, *The Fung kingdom of Senar*, Gloucester 1951; C. Conti Rossini, *Il Gadla Filpos e il Gadla Yohannes di Dabra Bizan*, in *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, anno CCXVII (1900), Ser. V^a, classe di Sc. mor., vol. viii, Parta 1^a, Rome 1903; idem, *Storia d'Ethiopia*, Bergamo 1928; idem, *Comenti e notizie di geographi classici sovra il Sudan Egiziano e l'Ethiopia*, in *Aegyptus*, vi (1925); idem, *Documenti per lo studio della lingua tigre*, in *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana*, xvi (1903); F. M. Esteves Pereira, *Historia de Minás, Ademas Saged, rei de Ethiopia*, in *Boletim de Sociedade de Geographia de Lisboa*, 7^a ser. xii, (1887-8); J. W. McCrindle, *The Christian topography of Cosmas, an Egyptian monk*, London 1897; A. Kammerer, *Essais sur l'histoire antique d'Abyssinie*, Paris 1926; idem, *La Mer Rouge, l'Abyssinie et l'Arabie aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles et la cartographie des portolans du Monde oriental*, iii/3, Cairo 1952; *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, tr. W. Schoff, New York 1912; L. Caetani, *Annali*; J. W. Crowfoot, *Some Red Sea ports in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan*, in *GJ* (May 1911), 523-50; João de Barros, *Decadas da Asia*, Lisbon 1777; on the name Masawwa^c, see I. Guidi, *Le canzoni ge'ez-amariñña in onore di Re Abissini*, in *RRAL*, ser. ii, vol. v (1889), 57; S. Tedeschi, *La questione di Bādi^c*, in *RSO* lxiii (1984), 179-99; J. Peruchon, *Histoire d'Eskenzer, de 'Amda Seyon II et de Nā'od*, in *JA* (1894), 22; R. Basset, *Études sur l'histoire d'Ethiopia*, in *JA* (1881), 1, 24; idem, *Les inscriptions de l'île de Dahlak*, in *JA* (1893); F. M. Esteves Pereira, *Os Portugueses em Maçua*, in *Revista das sciencias militares* (1889); G. P. Badger, *The travels of Ludovico di Varthema*, London 1863; A. Corsali, *Historiale description de l'Ethiopia*, Antwerp 1558; M. L. Dames, *The Book of Duarte Barbosa*, 2 vols. London 1918-21; C. F. Beckingham-G. W. B. Huntingford, *The Prester John of the Indies, a true relation of the lands of the Prester John...*, 2 vols., Cambridge 1961; O. G. S. Crawford, *Ethiopian itineraries circa 1400-1524*, Cambridge 1958; H. Thomas, *The discovery of Abyssinia by the Portuguese in 1520*, London 1938; C. Orhonlu, *Osmanlı imparatorluğu'nun güney siyaseti: Habeş eyaleti*, Istanbul 1974; R. Pankhurst, *History of the Ethiopian towns from the Middle Ages to the early nineteenth century*, Athiopicistische Forschungen, 8, Wiesbaden 1982, index s.v.; C. Beccari, *Rerum Aethiopicarum scriptores occidentales inediti a saeculo XVI ad XIX*, 15 vols., Rome 1903-13; G. Arén, *Evangelical pioneers in Ethiopia*, Uppsala 1978; C. Conti Rossini, *La Guerra turco-abissina del 1578*, in *OM*, i (1921-2), 634-6, 684-91, ii (1923), 48-57; A. Bombaci, *Notizie sull'Abissinia in fonti turche*, in *Rassegna di Studi Etiopici*, iii, (1943), 79-86; idem, *Il viaggio in Abissina di Evliya Celebi*, in *AIUON*, n.s. ii (1943), 259-75; al-Haymī, *Sirat al-Ḥabasha*, ed. E. van Donzel, *A Yemenite embassy to Ethiopia 1647-1649*, Athiopische Forschungen, 21, Stuttgart 1986; idem, *Foreign relations of Ethiopia 1642-1700*, Leiden 1979; J. Bruce, *Travels to discover the Source of the Nile, in the years 1768-73*, 5 vols., Edinburgh 1790; W. Foster, *The Red Sea and adjacent countries at the close of the seventeenth century*, London 1949; G. Puglisi, *Alcuni vestigi dell'isola di Dahlac Chebir e la leggenda dei Furs*, in *Procs. of the Third International Conference of*

Ethiopian Studies, Addis Ababa 1966, i, 35-47; I. Guidi, *Annales Regum Iyastu II et Iyoas*, CSCO lxi (1910), lxvi (1912), repr. Louvain 1954; H. Salt, *A Voyage to Abyssinia, and Travels into the interior of that Country*, London 1814, repr. 1967; W. Münzinger, *Ostafrikanische Studien*, Schaffhausen 1864, 114 ff.; G. Rohlfs, *Meine Mission nach Abessinien*, Leipzig 1883; Zewde Gabre-Sellasié, *Yohannes IV of Ethiopia, a political biography*, Oxford 1975; C. Zaghi, *Crispi e Menelich nel Diario inedito del conte Augusto Salimbeni*, Turin 1956; H. G. Marcus, *The life and times of Menelik II, Ethiopia 1844-1913*, Oxford 1975. (E. VAN DONZEL)

MASCARA [see AL-MU^cASKAR].

MASCULINE [see MUDHAKKAR].

MASDJID (A.), mosque, the noun of place from *sadjada* "to prostrate oneself, hence "place where one prostrates oneself [in worship]". The modern Western European words (Eng. *mosque*, Fr. *mosquée*, Ger. *Moschee*, Ital. *moschea*) come ultimately from the Arabic via Spanish *mezquita*.

I. IN THE CENTRAL ISLAMIC LANDS

- A. The origins of the mosque up to the Prophet's death
- B. The origin of mosques after the time of the Prophet
- C. The mosque as the centre for divine worship
- D. The component parts and furnishings of the mosque
- E. The mosque as a state institution
- F. The administration of the mosques
- G. The personnel of the mosque
- H. The architecture of the mosque

II. IN MUSLIM INDIA

- A. Typology
- B. The actual monuments
- III. IN JAVA
- IV. IN THE REST OF SOUTH-EAST ASIA
- V. IN CHINA
- VI. IN EAST AFRICA
- VII. IN WEST AFRICA

I. IN THE CENTRAL ISLAMIC LANDS

- A. The origins of the mosque up to the Prophet's death.

The word *msgd²* is found in Aramaic as early as the Jewish Elephantine Papyri (5th century B.C.), and appears likewise in Nabataean inscriptions with the meaning "place of worship", but possibly, originally "stele, sacred pillar". The Syriac form *msgd²* and Amharic *masged* are late loans from Arabic, though Ge'ez *meshgād* "temple, church" may be a genuine formation from the verbal root *s - g - d* (itself certainly borrowed from Aramaic). The form *ms¹gd* "oratory, place of prayer" occurs also in Epigraphic South Arabian (A. F. L. Beeston *et alii*, *Sabaic dictionary*, Louvain-Beirut 1982, 125). The Arabic *masdjid* may thus have been taken over directly from Aramaic or formed from the borrowed verb (see A. Jeffery, *The foreign vocabulary of the Qur'an*, Baroda 1938, 263-4).

1. The Meccan period. The word is used in the Qur'an especially of the Meccan sanctuary (*al-Masdjid al-harām*, sūra II, 139, 144, 145, 187, 192, 214; V, 3; VIII, 34; IX, 7, 19, 28; XVII, 1; XXII, 25; XLVIII, 25, 27); according to later sources, this was already the usage in the Meccan period (*ca.* al-Ya^ckūbī, *Ta^crikh*. i. 285, 12). According to tradition, the term *al-Masdjid al-aḳṣā* (sūra XVII, 1) means the Jerusalem sanctuary (according to B. Schrieke, in *Isl.*, vi [1915-16], 1; cf. Horovitz, in *ibid.*, ix [1919], 159 ff., the reference is rather to a place of prayer in heaven); and in the legend of the Seven Sleepers,

masdjid means a tomb-sanctuary, probably Christian, certainly pre-Islamic (sūra XVIII, 20). The word is also applied to pre-Islamic sanctuaries, which belong to God and where God is invoked, although Muḥammad was not always able to recognise the particular cult associated with them. It is undoubtedly with this general meaning that the word is used in this verse of the Qurʾān: "If God had not taken men under his protection, then monasteries, churches and places of prayer (*ṣalawāt*) and *masādjid* would have been destroyed" (sūra XXII, 41). The word is also used in a *ḥadīth* of an Abyssinian church (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt, bāb* 48, 54; Muslim, *Masādjid*, tr. 3) and in another of Jewish and Christian tomb-sanctuaries (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt, bāb* 55; Muslim, *Masādjid*, tr. 3). Even Ibn Khaldūn can still use the word in the general meaning of a temple or place of worship of any religion (*Muqaddima, faṣl* 4, 6 at the end). There is therefore no question of a word of specifically Muslim creation. This is in entire agreement with Muḥammad's original attitude to earlier religions. Just as Abraham was a Muslim, so David had a *masdjid* (al-Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, i, 2408, 7 ff.).

To the Prophet, the Meccan sanctuary always remained the principal mosque, known as *Bayt Allāh* even before the time of the Prophet. It was a grave charge brought against the Quraysh in the Meccan period that they drove the believers out of *al-Masdjid al-harām* (sūra II, 214; V, 3; VIII, 34; XXII, 25; XLVIII, 25), which was considered all the more unjust as they worshipped the true lord of the sanctuary. To the true God belonged *al-masādjid* (sūra LXXII, 18, Meccan); it was therefore an absurdity for the godless to prevent the worship of God in "God's own mosques" (sūra II, 108). The result was that it was revealed in the year 9/630-1: "It is not right for polytheists to frequent the mosques of God" (sūra IX, 17 f.) and the opponents of the new religion were therefore excluded from the sanctuary. The *Sīra* agrees with the Qurʾān, that the sanctity of *al-Masdjid al-harām* to which Muḥammad had been used from childhood was always regarded by him as indisputable. Like other Meccans, he and his followers regularly made the *tawāf* around the Kaʿba and kissed the Black Stone (e.g. Ibn Hishām, 183, 12 ff.; 239, 8; 251, 15); it is frequently stated that he used to sit in the *masdjid* like his fellow-citizens, alone or with a follower or disputing with an opponent (Ibn Hishām, 233, 16; 251, 15; 252, 14; 259; 260; 294; 18 f.). It is related that he used to perform the *ṣalāt* between the Yaman corner and the Black Stone, apparently from the narrator's context, very frequently (Ibn Hishām, 190, 9 ff.). After his conversion, ʿUmar is said to have arranged that believers performed the *ṣalāt* unmolested beside the Kaʿba (Ibn Hishām, 224, 13 f., 17 f.). How strongly Muḥammad felt himself attached to the Arab sanctuary is evident from the fact that he took part in the traditional rites there before the *ḥijra* (sūra CVIII, 2); in the year 1/622-3, one of his followers, Saʿd b. Muʿādh, took part in the pilgrimage ceremonies, and in the year 2/623-4 he himself sacrificed on 10 Dhu 'l-Hijja on the *muṣallā* of the Banū Salima. He therefore, here as elsewhere, retained ancient customs where his new teaching did not directly exclude them. But when an independent religion developed out of his preaching, a new type of worship had to be evolved.

In Mecca, the original Muslim community had no special place of worship. The Prophet used to perform the *ṣalāt* in secret in the narrow alleys of Mecca with his first male follower ʿAlī and with the other earliest Companions also (Ibn Hishām, 159, 166, 13 ff.). The

references are usually to the solitary *ṣalāt* of the Prophet, sometimes beside the Kaʿba (Ibn Hishām, 190, 9 ff.), sometimes in his own house (Ibn Hishām, 203, 6 f.). That the believers often prayed together may be taken for granted; they would do so in a house (cf. Ibn Hishām, 202). Occasionally also ʿUmar is said to have conducted the ritual prayer with others beside the Kaʿba (Ibn Hishām, 224) because ʿUmar was able to defy the Quraysh. When the Prophet recited in the mosque the revelation, later abrogated, recognising Allāt, al-ʿUzzā and Manāt, according to the story, not only the believers but also the polytheists present took part in the *ṣudjūd* (al-Ṭabarī, i, 1192 f.). Abū Bakr is said to have had a private place of prayer (*masdjid*) in Mecca in his courtyard beside the gate; the Quraysh, we are told, objected to this because women and children could see it and might be led astray by the emotion aroused (Ibn Hishām, 246; al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt, bāb* 86; *Kafāla, bāb* 14 etc.; *Mazālim, bāb* 22).

In the dogma taught by Muḥammad, a sanctuary was not a fundamental necessity. Every place was the same to God, and humility in the presence of God, of which the ritual prayer was the expression, could be shown anywhere; hence the saying of the Prophet that he had been given the whole world as a *masdjid*, while earlier prophets could only pray in churches and synagogues (al-Wākidī, tr. Wellhausen, 403; *Corpus iuris di Zaid b. ʿAlī*, ed. Griffini, 50 and p. clxxx; al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt, bāb* 56; *Tayammum, bāb* 1; Muslim, *Masādjid*, tr. 1), and also the saying: "Wherever the hour of prayer overtakes thee, thou shalt perform the *ṣalāt* and that is a *masdjid*" (Muslim, *Masādjid*, tr. 1). That he nevertheless remained firmly attached to the traditional sanctuary of the Kaʿba, produced a confusion of thought which is very marked in sūra II, 136 ff. When in Medina he was able to do as he pleased, it must have been natural for him to create a place where he could be undisturbed with his followers and where they could perform the ritual *ṣalāt* together.

2. The foundation of the Mosque in Medina. According to one tradition, the Prophet came riding into Medina on his camel with Abū Bakr as *riḍf* surrounded by the Banū Naḍjdjār. The camel stopped on Abū Ayyūb's *fināʿ*. Here (according to Anas) the Prophet performed the *ṣalāt*, and immediately afterwards ordered the mosque to be built and purchased the piece of land from two orphans, Sahl and Suhayl, who were under the guardianship of Muʿādh b. ʿAfrāʿ, for 10 *dīnārs*, after declining to accept it as a gift; he lived with Abū Ayyūb until the mosque and his houses were completed. During this period he performed the *ṣalāt* in courtyards or other open spaces (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt, bāb* 48; Muslim, *Masādjid*, tr. 1; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, iii, 212 above; Ibn Hishām, 336; al-Ṭabarī, i, 1258 f.; al-Masʿūdī, *Murūdj*, iv, 140-1 = § 1469). According to this tradition, the building of the mosque was intended by the Prophet from the first and the choice of the site was left to the whim of his mount. According to another tradition, the Prophet took up his abode with Abū Ayyūb, but during the first period of his stay in Medina he conducted the *ṣalāt* in the house of Abū Umāma Asʿad, who had a private *masdjid*, in which he used to conduct *ṣalāts* with his neighbours. The Prophet later expressed the desire to purchase the adjoining piece of ground, and he bought it from the two orphans, who according to this tradition, were wards of Asʿad (al-Balādhurī, *Futūḥ al-buldān*, 6; cf. Wüstenfeld, *Gesch. d. Stadt Medina*, 60). The site was covered with graves, ruins (*khirab*); also

harth, al-Tabarī, i, 1259, 17; 1260, 1; cf. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, iii, 212, 7, perhaps due to an old misreading) and palm-trees and was used as a place for keeping camels (and smaller domestic animals, al-Bukhārī, *Wuḍūʿ*, *bāb* 66). The site was cleared, the palms cut down and the walls built. The building material was bricks baked in the sun (*labīn*) (Ibn Hishām, 337; al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bābs* 62, 65; according to one tradition they were baked at the well of Fāṭima, Wüstenfeld, *Stadt Medina*, 31); in plan it was a courtyard surrounded by a brick wall on a stone foundation with three entrances; the gateposts were of stone. On the *kibla* side (i.e. the north wall), at first left open, the stems of the palm trees which had been cut down were soon set up as columns and a roof was put over them of palm-leaves and clay. On the east side two huts of similar materials were built for the Prophet's wives Sawdā' and ʿĀ'isha; their entrances opened on to the court and were covered with carpets; they were later increased so that there were nine little houses for the Prophet's wives. When the *kibla* was moved to the south, the arbour at the north wall remained; under this arbour called *suffa* or *zulla* the homeless Companions (*Ahl al-Suffa* [q.v.]) found shelter (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bābs* 48, 62; Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 60 f., 66; al-Diyārbakrī, *Ta'rikh al-Khamīs*, Cairo 1302, i, 387 ff.; on the *suffa*, 387 in the middle; 391 after the middle; cf. L. Caetani, *Annali dell' Islām*, i, 377 f.). In seven months, the work was completed (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 59), according to others in the month of Ṣafar of the year 2 (Ibn Hishām, 339, 18 f.). The mosque was very simple. It was really only a courtyard with a wall round it; the *suffa* already mentioned supplied a shelter on the north side, while on the south side, later the *kibla* side, an arbour was probably built also, for the Prophet used to preach leaning against a palm-trunk and this must have been on the *kibla* side. How large the arbours were cannot be ascertained. The mosque was the courtyard of the Prophet's houses and at the same time the meeting-place for the believers and the place for common prayer.

According to the sources, it was the Prophet's intention from the very first to build a mosque at once in Medina; according to a later tradition, Gabriel commanded him in the name of God to build a house for God (al-Diyārbakrī, i, 387 below); but this story is coloured by later conditions. It has been made quite clear, notably by L. Caetani (*Annali dell' Islām*, i, 432, 437 ff.) and later by H. Lammens (*Mo'āwīya*, 8, 5, 62; idem, *Ziād*, 30 ff., 93 ff.) that the earliest *masjīd* had nothing of the character of a sacred edifice. Much can be quoted for this view from *Ḥadīth* and *Sīra* (cf. *Annali dell' Islām*, i, 440). The unconverted *Thaḳafīs* were received by the Prophet in the mosque to conduct negotiations and he even put up three tents for them in the courtyard (Ibn Hishām, 916; al-Wāḳidī-Wellhausen, 382); envoys from Tamīm also went freely about in the mosque and called for the Prophet, who dealt with them after he had finished prayers (Ibn Hishām, 933 f.; al-Wāḳidī-Wellhausen, 386). Ibn Unays brought to the *masjīd* the head of the Ḥudhālī Sufyān, threw it down before the Prophet and gave his report (Ibn Hishām, 981; al-Wāḳidī-Wellhausen, 225). After the battle of Uḥud, the Medina chiefs spent the night in the mosque (al-Wāḳidī-Wellhausen, 149). The Awsīs tended their wounded here (*ibid.*, 215 f.; al-Ṭabarī, i, 1491 f.); a prisoner of war was tied to one of the pillars of the mosque (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 76, 82; cf. 75). Many poor people used to live in the *suffa* (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 58); tents and huts were put up in the mosque, one for example by converted and liberated prisoners, another by the

Banū Ghifār, in whose tent Saʿd b. Muʿādh died of his wounds (*ibid.*, *bāb* 77; Ibn al-Athīr, *Usd al-ghāba*, ii, 297). People sat as they pleased in the mosque or took their ease lying on their backs (al-Bukhārī, *ʿIlm*, *bāb* 6; *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 85; Ibn Saʿd, i, 124, 14); even so late as the reign of ʿUmar, it is recorded that he found strangers sleeping in a corner of the mosque (al-Mubarrad, *Kāmil*, 118, 15 ff.); the Prophet received gifts and distributed them among the Companions (Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 42); disputes took place over business (*ibid.*, *bābs* 71, 83) and in general, people conducted themselves as they pleased. Indeed, on one occasion some Sudanese or Abyssinians with the approval of the Prophet gave a display with shield and lance on the occasion of a festival (*ibid.*, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 69; *ʿIdāyn*, *bāb* 2, 25; *Djihād*, *bāb* 81); and on another a stranger seeking the Prophet, rode into the mosque on his camel (*ibid.*, *ʿIlm*, *bāb* 6). So little "consecrated" was this, the oldest mosque, that one of the *Munāfikūn* or "Hypocrites", ejected for scoffing at the believers, could call to Abū Ayyūb "Are you throwing me out of the *Mirbad Banī Tha'aba*?" (Ibn Hishām, 362, 10 f.).

All this gives one the impression of the headquarters of an army, rather than of a sacred edifice. On the other hand, the mosque was used from the very first for the general divine worship and thus became something more than the Prophet's private courtyard. Whatever the Prophet's intentions had been from the first, the *masjīd*, with the increasing importance of Islam, was bound to become very soon the political and religious centre of the new community. The two points of view cannot be distinguished in Islam, especially in the earlier period. The mosque was the place where believers assembled for prayer around the Prophet, where he delivered his addresses, which contained not only appeals for obedience to God but regulations affecting the social life of the community (cf. al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bābs* 70, 71); from here he controlled the religious and political community of Islam. Even at the real old sanctuaries of Arabia, there were no restrictions on what one could do; what distinguished the mosque from the Christian church or the Meccan temple was that in it there was no specially dedicated ritual object. At the Ka'ba also, people used to gather to discuss every day affairs and also for important assemblies, if we may believe the *Sīra* (Ibn Hishām, 183 f., 185, 1, 229, 8, 248, 257, 19). Here also the Prophet used to sit; strangers came to visit him; he talked and they disputed with him; people even came to blows and fought there (Ibn Hishām, 183-4, 185-6, 187-8, 202, 19, 257, 259; *Chron. d. Stadt Mekka*, ed. Wüstenfeld, i, 223, 11). Beside the Ka'ba was the *Dār al-Nādwa*, where important matters were discussed and justice administered (*ibid.*, see index). From the Medina mosque was developed the general type of the Muslim mosque. It depended on circumstances whether the aspect of the mosque as a social centre or as a place of prayer was more or less emphasised.

3. Other mosques in the time of the Prophet. The mosque of the Prophet in Medina was not the only one founded by Muslims in his lifetime, and according to tradition not even the first, which is said to have been the mosque of Kubā'. In this village, which belonged to the territory of Medina (see Wüstenfeld, *Geschichte der Stadt Medina*, 126), the Prophet on his *hidjra* stopped with the family of ʿAmr b. ʿAwf; the length of his stay is variously given as 3, 5, 8, 14 or 22 days. According to one tradition, he found a mosque there on his arrival, which had been built by the first emigrants and the Anṣār, and he per-

formed the *ṣalāt* there with them (see Wüstenfeld, *op. cit.*, 56; al-Balādhūrī, *Futūḥ al-buldān*, 1; al-Diyārbakrī, i, 380-1). According to another tradition, the Prophet himself founded the mosque on a site, which belonged to his host Kulthūm and was used as a *mirbad* for drying dates or, according to others, to a woman named Labba, who tethered her ass there (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 131; Ibn Hishām, 335; al-Ṭabarī, i, 1260, 6; Ibn Saʿd, i/1, 6; Masʿūdī, *Murūdj*, iv, 139; al-Diyārbakrī, 1, 381; *al-Sīra al-Halabiyya*, Cairo 1320, ii, 58-9). Out of this tradition arose a legend based on the story of the foundation of the principal mosque in Medina. The Prophet makes (first Abū Bakr and ʿUmar without success, then) ʿAlī mount a camel, and at the place to which it goes builds the mosque with stone brought from the Ḥarra; he himself laid the first stone, and Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān the next ones (al-Diyārbakrī, i, 381). The Prophet is said to have henceforth visited the mosque of Ḳubāʿ every Saturday, either riding or walking, and the pillar is still shown beside which he conducted the service (al-Bukhārī, *Faḍl al-ṣalāt fī Masjdīd Makka wa ʿl-Madīna*, bāb 2, 4; Muslim, *Ḥaḍīḍī*, tr. 94; al-Diyārbakrī, i, 382; al-Balādhūrī, 5). We are occasionally told that he performed his *ṣalāt* on the Sabbath in the mosque at Ḳubāʿ when he went to the Banū ʿl-Naḍīr in Rabīʿ I of the year 4/625 (al-Wāḳidī-Wellhausen, 161).

It is obvious that the customs and ideas of the later community have shaped the legend of this mosque. The only question is whether the old tradition that the mosque was founded either by the Prophet himself or even before his arrival by his followers is also a later invention. We thus come to the question whether the Prophet founded or recognised any other mosques at all than that of Medina. Caetani, in keeping with his view of the origin of the mosque, was inclined to deny it, pointing to the fact that there was later an obvious tendency to connect mosques everywhere with the Prophet and that sūra IX, 108, strongly condemns the erection of an "opposition mosque" (*Masjdīd al-Dīrār*). The Ḳurʿān passage is as follows: "Those who have built themselves a *masjdīd* for opposition (*dīrār*) and unbelief and division among the believers and for a refuge for him who in the past fought against God and his Prophet; and they swear: We intended only good! God is witness that they are liars! Thou shalt not stand up in it, for verily a *masjdīd* which is founded on piety from the first day of its existence has more right that thou shouldst stand in it; in it are men who desire to purify themselves" (sūra IX, 108-9). According to tradition, this was revealed in the year 9/630-1; when the Prophet was on the march to Tabūk, the Banū Sālim said to him that they had built a mosque to make it easier for their feeble and elderly people, and they begged the Prophet to perform his *ṣalāt* in it and thus give it his approval. The Prophet postponed it till his return, but then his revelation was announced, because the mosque had been founded by *Munāfikūn* at the instigation of Abū ʿAmir al-Rāhib, who fought against the Prophet. According to one tradition (so Ibn ʿUmar, Zayd) the "mosque founded on piety" was that of Medina, from which the people wished to emancipate themselves; according to another (Ibn ʿAbbās), the reference was to that of Ḳubāʿ; Abū ʿAmir and his followers were not comfortable among the Banū ʿAmr b. ʿAwf and therefore built a new mosque. According to some traditions, it was in Dhū Awān. The Prophet however had it burned down (al-Ṭabarī, i, 1704-5; Ibn Hishām, 357-8, 906-7; Ibn Saʿd, i/1, 6; al-Wāḳidī-Wellhausen, 410-11; al-Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, xi, 17 ff.; Wüstenfeld,

Medina, 131; *al-Sīra al-Halabiyya*, ii, 60; al-Balādhūrī, 1-2; Muslim, *Ḥaḍīḍī*, bāb 93). If the connection with the Tabūk campaign is correct, the *Masjdīd al-Dīrār* is to be sought north of Medina; the "mosque founded on piety" would then be the mosque of Medina rather than that of Ḳubāʿ which lies to the south of it. There is in itself nothing impossible about the rejection in principle of any mosque other than that of Medina. We should then have to discard the whole tradition, for, according to it, the Prophet was at first not unfavourably disposed to the new mosque, and his wrath, according to the tradition, arose from the fact that it had been founded by a refractory party. But as a matter of fact, there are indications that a number of mosques already existed in the time of the Prophet; for example, the verse in the Ḳurʿān, "in houses, which God hath permitted to be built that His name might be praised in them, in them men praise Him morning and evening, whom neither business nor trade restrain from praising God and performing the *ṣalāt* and the giving of alms", etc. (sūra XXIV, 36-7). If this revelation, like the rest of the sūra, is of the Medinan period, it is difficult to refer it to Jews and Christians, and this utterance is quite clear: "Observe a complete fast until the night and touch thou them (i.e. women) not while ye are in the mosques" (sūra II, 183). This shows that there were already in the time of the Prophet several Muslim mosques which had a markedly religious character and were recognised by the Prophet.

That there were really public places of prayer of the separate tribes at a very early date is evident from the tradition that the Prophet in the year 2 offered his sacrifice on 10 Dhū ʿl-Hiǧǧa/3 June 624 on the *muṣallā* of the Banū Salima. In addition, there are constant references to private *masjdīd* where a few believers, like Abū Bakr in Mecca, made a place for prayer in their houses and where others sometimes assembled (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, bāb 46, 87; *Tahāǧǧūd*, bāb 30; cf. also *Adhān*, bāb 50).

B. The origin of mosques after the time of the Prophet.

1. Chief mosques. What importance the Medina mosque had attained as the centre of administration and worship of the Muslims is best seen from the fact that the first thought of the Muslim generals after their conquests was to found a mosque as a centre around which to gather.

Conditions differed somewhat according as it was a new foundation or an already existing town. Important examples of the first kind are al-Baṣra, al-Kūfa and al-Fuṣṭāt. Baṣra was founded by ʿUtba b. Ghazwān as winter-quarters for the army in the year 14/635 (or 16/637 or 638). The mosque was placed in the centre with the *Dār al-Imāra*, the dwelling of the commander-in-chief with a prison and *Dīwān* in front of it. Prayer was at first offered on the open space, which was fenced round; later, the whole was built of reeds and when the men went off to war the reeds were pulled up and laid away. Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī [q.v.], who later became ʿUmar's *wālī*, built the edifice of clay and bricks baked in the sun (*labīn*) and used grass for the roof (al-Balādhūrī, 346-7, 350; Ibn al-Faḳīh, 187-8; Yāḳūt, *Buldān*, i, 642, 6-9; cf. al-Ṭabarī, i, 2377, 14 ff.). It was similar in Kūfa, which was founded in 17/638 by Saʿd b. Abī Waḳḳās. In the centre was the mosque, and beside it the *Dār al-Imāra* was laid out. The mosque at first was simply an open quadrangle, *ṣaḥn*, marked off by a trench round it. The space was large enough for 40,000 persons. It seems that reeds were also used for building the walls here and later Saʿd used *labīn*. On the south side (and

only here) there was an harbour, *zulla*, built (cf. al-Balādhūrī, 348, i: *suffa*). The *Dār al-Imāra* beside the mosque was later by 'Umar's orders combined with the mosque (al-Tabarī, i, 2481, 12 ff., 2485, 16, 2487 ff., 2494, 14; Yākūt, *Mu'djam*, iv, 323, 10 ff.; al-Balādhūrī, 275 ff., cf. *Annali dell' Islām*, iii, 846 ff.). The plan was therefore an exact reproduction of that of the mosque in Medina (as is expressly emphasised in al-Tabarī, i, 2489, 4 ff.); the importance of the mosque was also expressed in its position, and the commander lived close beside it. There was no difference in al-Fuṣṭāṭ, which, although there was already an older town here, was laid out as an entirely new camp. In the year 21/642, after the conquest of Alexandria, the mosque was laid out in a garden where 'Amr had planted his standard. It was 50 *dhirā's* long and 30 broad. Eighty men fixed its *kibla*, which, however, was turned too far to the east, and was therefore altered later by Qurra b. Sharīk [q.v.]. The court was quite simple, surrounded by a wall and had trees growing on it; a simple roof is mentioned; it must be identical with the above-mentioned *zulla* or *suffa*. 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ lived just beside the mosque and around it the *Ahl al-Rāya*. Like the house of the Prophet, the general's house lay on the east side with only a road between them. There were two doors in each wall except the southern one (Yākūt, *Buldān*, iii, 898-9; al-Makrīzī, *Khīṭaṭ*, iv, 4 ff.; Ibn Duqmāk, *K. al-Intiṣār*, Cairo 1893, 59 ff.; al-Suyūṭī, *Huṣn al-muḥādara*, i, 63-4; ii, 135-6; cf. *Annali dell' Islām*, iv, 554, 557, 563 ff.). We find similar arrangements made in al-Mawṣil in 20/641 (al-Balādhūrī, 331-2).

In other cases, the Muslims established themselves in old towns either conquered or surrendered by treaty; by the treaty, they received a site for their mosque (e.g. al-Balādhūrī, 116, 14, 147, 2). But the distinction between towns which were conquered and those which were surrendered soon disappeared, and the position is as a rule not clear. Examples of old towns in which the Muslims established themselves are al-Madā'in, Damascus and Jerusalem.—In Madā'in, Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās after the conquest in 16/637 distributed the houses among the Muslims, and Kisrā's *Iwān* was made into a mosque, after Sa'd had conducted the *ṣalāt al-fath* in it (al-Tabarī, i, 2443, 15 f.; 2451, 7 ff.). In Damascus, which was occupied in 14/635 or 15/636 by capitulation, according to tradition, the Church of St. John was divided so that the eastern half became Muslim, from which Muslim tradition created the legend that the city was taken partly by conquest and partly by agreement (al-Balādhūrī, 125; Yākūt, *Buldān*, ii, 591; Ibn Djubayr, *Rihla*, 262; *JA*, ser. 9, vii, 376, 381, 404). As a matter of fact, however, the Muslims seem to have laid out their own mosque here just beside the church [see DIMASHQ]; and close beside it again was the *Khadrā'*, the commander-in-chief's palace, from which a direct entrance to the *maḥṣūra* was later made (al-Muḥaddasī, 159, 4). Conditions here were therefore once more the same as in Medina. But the possibility of an arrangement such as is recorded by tradition cannot be rejected, for there is good evidence of it elsewhere; in Hims, for example, the Muslims and Christians shared a building in common as a mosque and church, and it is evident from al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Hawḳal that this was still the case in the time of their common authority, al-Balkhī (309/921) (al-Iṣṭakhrī¹, 61, 7 f.; Ibn Hawḳal¹, 117, 5; al-Muḥaddasī, 156, 15), and a similar arrangement is recorded for Dabīl in Armenia (al-Iṣṭakhrī¹, 188, 3 f.; Ibn Hawḳal¹, 244, 21; cf. al-Muḥaddasī, 377, 3 f.).

There were special conditions in Jerusalem. The

Muslims recognised the sanctuary there, as is evident from the earlier *kibla* and from sūra XVII, 1 (in the traditional interpretation). It must therefore have been natural for the conquerors, when the town capitulated, to seek out the recognised holy place. Indeed, we are told that 'Umar in the year 17/638 built a mosque in Jerusalem on the site of the temple of Solomon (F. Baethgen, *Fragmente syr. u. arab. Hist.*, 17, 110, following Ḫshō'dēnah, metropolitan of Baṣra after 700 A.D.; cf. for the 2nd/8th century Theophanes, quoted by Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, London 1890, 91 n.). That the *Kubbat al-Ṣakhra* [q.v.], which the Mosque of 'Umar replaced, stands on the old site of the Temple is undoubted. How he found the site is variously recorded [see AL-KUDS]. The building was, like other mosques of the time of 'Umar, very simple. Arculf, who visited Jerusalem about 670, says "The Saracens attend a quadrangular house of prayer (*domus orationis*, i.e. *masjid*) which they have built with little art with boards and large beams on the remains of some ruins, on the famous site where the Temple was once built in all its splendour" (*Itinera Hierosolymitana*, ed. P. Geyer, 1898, 226-7, tr. P. Micklely, in *Das Land der Bibel*, ii/2, 1917, 19-20). It is of interest to note that this simple mosque, like the others, was in the form of a rectangle; in spite of its simple character it could hold 3,000 people, according to Arculf.

As late as the reign of Mu'āwiya, we find a new town, al-Ḳayrawān, being laid out on the old plan as a military camp with a mosque and *Dār al-Imāra* in the centre (Yākūt, *Mu'djam*, iv, 213, 10 ff.). As al-Balādhūrī, for example, shows, the Muslim conquerors even at a later date always built a mosque in the centre of a newly-conquered town, at first a simple one in each town, and it was a direct reproduction of the simple mosque of the Prophet in Medina. It was the exception to adapt already existing buildings in towns. But soon many additional mosques were added.

2. Tribal mosques and sectarian mosques. There were mosques not only in the towns. When the tribes pledged themselves to the Prophet to adopt Islam, they had also to perform the *ṣalāt*. It is not clear how far they took part in Muslim worship, but if they concerned themselves with Islam at all, they must have had a Muslim place of meeting. Probably even before Islam they had, like the Meccans, their *maḥlis* or *nādī* or *dār shūrā*, where they discussed matters of general importance (cf. Lammens, *Mo'āwia*, 205; *Ziād b. Abīhi*, 30 ff., 90-1; *Le Berceau de l'Islām*, 222 ff.). As the mosque was only distinguished from such places by the fact that it was also used for the common *ṣalāt*, it was natural for tribal mosques to come into existence. Thus we are told that as early as the year 5/626-7 the tribe of Sa'd b. Bakr founded mosques and used an *adhān* (Ibn Sa'd, i/2, 44, 7, not mentioned in Ibn Hishām, 943-4; al-Tabarī, i, 1722); it is also recorded of the Banū Djadhīma, who lived near Mecca, that they built mosques in the year 8/629-30 and introduced the *adhān* (al-Wākidi-Wellhausen, 351). How far one can rely on such stories in a particular case is however uncertain. A later writer like al-Diyārbakrī says of the Banu 'l-Muṣṭalik that they *aslamū wa-banaw masādjida* (*Ta'rikh al-Ḳhamis*, ii, 132, 20; cf. *Annali dell' Islām*, ii, 221); in the early sources, this is not found. Nor is the story told by Ibn Sa'd at all probable, that envoys from the Banū Ḥanifa received orders to destroy their churches, sprinkle the ground with water and build a mosque (Ibn Sa'd, i/2, 56, 11 ff., while Ibn Hishām, 945-6, al-Tabarī, i, 1737 ff., and al-Balādhūrī, 86-7, say nothing about

it). But that there were tribal mosques at a very early date is nevertheless quite certain. The mosque at *Ḳubāʿ* was the mosque of the tribe of ʿAmr b. ʿAwf (Ibn Saʿd, i/1, 6, 6 and cf. above) and according to one tradition, the Banū *Ḡhanm* b. ʿAwf were jealous of it and built an opposition mosque (al-Balādhūrī, 3; al-Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, i, 21). A Companion who had taken part in the battle of Badr, ʿItbān b. Malik, complained to the Prophet that he could not reach the *masjdīd* of his tribe in the rainy season and wanted to build a mosque for himself (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, bāb 46; Muslim, *Masāʾid*, bāb 47). The Prophet himself is said to have visited the *masjdīd* of the Banū *Zurayk* (al-Bukhārī, *Djihād*, bābs 56-8) and in the *masjdīd* of the Banū *Salima* during the prayer, there was revealed to him *sūra* II, 139, which ordered the new *ḳibla*, wherefore it was called *Masjdīd al-Ḳiblatayn* (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 62).

The tribal mosque was a sign that the independence of the tribe was still retained under Islam. Indeed, we hear everywhere of tribal mosques, for example, around Medina that of the Banū *Ḳurayza*, of the Banū *Hāritha*, of the Banū *Zafar*, of the Banū *Wāʿil*, of the Banū *Ḥarām*, of the Banū *Zurayk* (said to have been the first in which the *Ḳurʿān* was publicly read), that of the Banū *Salima*, etc. (see Wüstenfeld, *Gesch. d. Stadt Medina*, 29, 37 ff., 44, 50, 57, 136 ff.); the "mosque of the two *ḳiblas*" belonged to the Banū *Sawād* b. *Ḡhanm* b. *Kaʿb* b. *Salima* (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 41). This then was the position in Medina: the tribes usually had their own mosques, and one mosque was the chief mosque. This was probably the position within the Prophet's lifetime, for in the earliest campaigns of conquest, mosques were built on this principle. ʿUmar is said to have written to Abū *Mūsā* in *Baṣra* telling him to build a mosque *li ʿl-djamaʿa* and mosques for the tribes, and on Fridays the people were to come to the chief mosque. Similarly, he wrote to Saʿd b. Abī *Wakḳāš* in *Kūfa* and to ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀš in *Miṣr*. On the other hand in *Syria*, where they had settled in old towns, they were not to build tribal mosques (al-Maḳrīzī, *Ḳhiṭat*, iv, 4 below). It is actually recorded that the tribes in each *ḳhiṭta* had their own mosques around the mosque of ʿAmr in *Fuṣṭāt* (cf. Ibn *Duḳmāḳ*, 62 below -67), and even much later, a tribal mosque like that of the *Rāshida* was still in existence (al-Maḳrīzī, *Ḳhiṭat*, 64, 4 ff.). Even in the chief mosque, the tribes had their own places (*ibid.*, 9, 12-10). We have similar evidence from *ʿIrāk*. In *Baṣra*, for example, there was a *Masjdīd Banī ʿUbād* (al-Balādhūrī, 356, 2), one of the Banū *Rifāʿa* (Ibn *Rusta*, 201, 16), one of the Banū *ʿAdī* (Ibn al-*Faḳīh*, 191, 4) and one of the *Anṣār* (cf. *Goldziher*, *Muhammedanische Studien*, i, 77, n. 5); in *Kūfa* we find quite a number, such as that of the *Anṣār* (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 284, 13 f.), of the ʿAbd al-*Ḳays* (*ibid.*, ii, 657, 2, 9), of the Banū *Duhmān* (*ibid.*, 670, 4), of the Banū *Makhzūm* (*ibid.*, 734, 19), of the Banū *Hilāl* (*ibid.*, 1687, 8), of the Banū ʿAdī (*ibid.*, 1703, 4), of the Banū *Dhuhl* and Banū *Ḥudjr* (*ibid.*, 532, 8 f.), of the *Djuhayna* (*ibid.*, 533, 8), of the Banū *Ḥarām* (*ibid.*, iii, 2509, 10), and the ʿAbsīs even had several *masāʾid* (al-Balādhūrī, 278, 12 f., see also 285, and *Goldziher*, *loc. cit.*).

During the wars, these tribal mosques were the natural rallying points for the various tribes, the mosque was a *madjlis*, where councils were held (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 532, 6 ff.) and the people were taught from its *minbar* (*ibid.*, 284); battles often centred for this reason round these mosques (e.g. al-Ṭabarī, ii, 130, 148, 6, 960). "The people of your mosque" *ahl masjdīdikum* (*ibid.*, 532, 19) became identical with

"your party". Gradually, as new sects arose, they naturally had mosques of their own, just as *Musaylima* before them is said to have had his own mosque (al-Balādhūrī, 90, 4 from below; Ibn *Ḥanbal*, *Musnad*, i, 404 below). Thus we read later of the mosques of the *Ḥanbalīs* in *Baghdād*, in which there was continual riot and confusion (Hilāl al-*Ṣābī*, *Kitāb al-Wuzarāʿ*, ed. *Amedroz*, 335). It sometimes happened that different parties in a town shared the chief mosque (al-Muḳaddasī, 102, 5), but as a rule it was otherwise. In particular, the *Sunnīs* and *Shīʿīs* as a rule had separate mosques (cf. *Mez*, *Die Renaissance des Islāms*, 63). It sometimes even happened that *Hanafīs* and *Shāfiʿīs* had separate mosques (*Yākūt*, *Buldān*, iv, 509, 9; al-Muḳaddasī, 323, 11). These special mosques were a great source of disruption in Islam, and we can understand that a time came when the learned discussed whether such mosques should be permitted at all. But the question whether one might talk of the *Masjdīd Banī Fulān* was answered by saying that in the time of the Prophet, the *Masjdīd Banī Zurayk* was recognised (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, bāb 41; cf. *Djihād*, bābs 56-8, and al-Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, xi, 20, after the middle of the page).

3. Adaptation to Islam of older sanctuaries; memorial mosques. According to the early historians, the towns which made treaties with the Muslims received permission to retain their churches (al-Balādhūrī, 121, in the middle; al-Ṭabarī, i, 2405, 2407), while in the conquered towns the churches fell to the Muslims without any preamble (cf. al-Balādhūrī, 120 below). Sometimes also it is recorded that a certain number of churches were received from the Christians, e.g. fifteen in *Damascus* according to one tradition (*ibid.*, 124, 8, otherwise on 121; cf. *JA*, Ser. 9, vii, 403). It is rather doubtful whether the process was such a regular one; in any case, the Muslims in course of time appropriated many churches to themselves. With the mass conversions to Islam, this was a natural result. The churches taken over by the Muslims were occasionally used as dwellings (cf. al-Ṭabarī, i, 2405, 2407); at a later date, it also happened that they were used as government offices, as in *Egypt* in 146/763 (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 35; cf. for *Kūfa*, al-Balādhūrī, 286). The obvious thing, however, was to transform the churches taken into mosques. It is related of ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀš that he performed the *ṣalāt* in a church (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 6) and *Zayd* b. ʿAlī says regarding churches and synagogues, "Perform thy *ṣalāt* in them; it will not harm thee" (*Corpus iuris di Zaid* b. ʿAlī, ed. *Griffini*, no. 364). It is not clear whether the reference in these cases is to conquered sanctuaries; it is evident, in any case, that the saying is intended to remove any misgivings about the use of captured churches and synagogues as mosques. The most important example of this kind was in *Damascus*, where al-Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik in 86/705 took the church of *St. John* from the Christians and had it rebuilt; he is said to have offered the Christians another church in its stead (see the references above, in I. B. 1; and also *JA*, 9 Ser., vii, 369 ff.; *Quatremère*, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, ii/1, 262 ff. and art. *ḌIMASHḲ*). He is said to have transformed into mosques a total of ten churches in *Damascus*. It must have been particularly in the villages, with the gradual conversion of the people to Islam, that the churches were turned into mosques. In the Egyptian villages there were no mosques in the earlier generations of Islam (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 28-9, 30). But when al-Maʾmūn was fighting the *Copts*, many churches were turned into mosques in (*ibid.*, 30). It is also recorded of mosques in *Cairo* that they were converted churches. Accord-

ing to one tradition, the Rāshīda mosque was an unfinished Jacobite church, which was surrounded by Jewish and Christian graves (al-Maqrīzī, iv, 63, 64), and in the immediate vicinity al-Hākīm turned a Jacobite and a Nestorian Church into mosques (*ibid.*, 65). When Djawhar built a palace in al-Kāhira, a *dayr* or monastery was taken in and transformed into a mosque (*ibid.*, 269); similar changes took place at later dates (*ibid.*, 240) and synagogues also were transformed in this way (Masjdīd Ibn al-Bannā', *ibid.*, 265). The chief mosque in Palermo was previously a church (Yāqūt, *Buldān*, i, 719). After the Crusades, several churches were turned into mosques in Palestine (Sauvaire, *Hist. de Jérus. et d'Hébron*, 1876, 7; Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, i/2, 40).

Other sanctuaries than those of the "people of the scripture" were turned into mosques. For example a Masjdīd al-Shams between al-Hilla and Karbalā' was the successor of an old temple of Shamash (see Goldziher, *Muh. Stud.*, ii, 331). Not far from Ištakh̄r was a Masjdīd Sulaymān which was an old fire-temple, the pictures on the walls of which could still be seen in the time of al-Mas'ūdī and al-Muḥaddasī (4th/10th century) (al-Mas'ūdī, *Murūdj*, iv, 77 = § 1403; al-Muḥaddasī, 444). In Ištakh̄r itself there was a *djāmi'*, which was a converted fire temple (*ibid.*, 436). In Masšīša, the ancient Mopsuestia, al-Manšūr in 140/797-8 built a mosque on the site of an ancient temple (al-Balādhuri, 165-6) and the chief mosque in Dihlī was originally a temple (Ibn Baṭṭūta, iii, 151); as to Ṭā'if, cf. Abū Dāwūd, *Ṣalāt*, bāb 10. Thus in Islam also, the old rule holds that sacred places survive changes of religion. It was especially easy in cases where Christian sanctuaries were associated with Biblical personalities who were also recognised by Islam: e.g., the Church of St. John in Damascus and many holy places in Palestine. One example is the mosque of Job in Shaykh Sa'd, associated with sūra XXI, 83, XXXVIII, 40; here in Silvia's time (4th century) there was a church of Job (al-Mas'ūdī, i, 91 = § 84; Baedeker, *Paläst. u. Syrien'*, 1910, 147).

But Islam itself had created historical associations which were bound soon to lead to the building of new mosques. Even in the lifetime of the Prophet, the Banū Sālim are said to have asked him to perform the *ṣalāt* in their *masjdīd* to give it his authority (see above, in I. A. 3). At the request of 'Itbān b. Malik, the Prophet performed the *ṣalāt* along with Abū Bakr in his house and thereby consecrated it as a *muṣalla'*, because he could not reach the tribal mosque in the rainy season (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, bāb 47; *Tahadjudud*, bāb 36; Muslim, *Masājid*, tr. 46; a similar story in al-Bukhārī, *Adhān*, bāb 47, *Tahadjudud*, bāb 33, is perhaps identical in origin). After the death of the Prophet, his memory became so precious that the places where he had prayed obtained a special importance and his followers, who liked to imitate him in everything, preferred to perform their *ṣalāt* in such places. But this tendency was only an intensification of what had existed in his lifetime; and so it is not easy to decide how far the above stories reflect later conditions. Mosques very quickly arose on the road between Mecca and Medina at places where, according to the testimony of his Companions, the Prophet had prayed (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, bāb 89; al-Wākidī-Wellhausen, 421 ff.); the same was the case with the road which the Prophet had taken to Tabūk in the year 9/630-1 (Ibn Hishām, 907; al-Wākidī-Wellhausen, 394; there were 19 in all, which are listed in *Annali dell' Islām*, ii-246-7). Indeed, wherever he had taken the field, mosques were built; for example, on the road to Badr, where according to tradition Abū Bakr had built a mosque

(al-Wākidī-Wellhausen, 39, also Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 135). The mosque of al-Faḍīkh was built on the spot where the Prophet had prayed in a leather tent during the war with the Banu 'l-Naḍir in the year 4/625-6 (al-Wākidī-Wellhausen, 163; Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 132). He is said to have himself built a little mosque in Khaybar during the campaign of the year 7/628-9 (al-Diyārbakrī, ii, 49-50; cf. *Annali dell' Islām*, ii, 19). Outside Ṭā'if, a mosque was built on a hillock, because the Prophet had performed the *ṣalāt* there during the siege in the year 8/629-30, between the tents of his two wives, Umm Salama and Zaynab (Ibn Hishām, 872-3; al-Wākidī-Wellhausen, 369); in Liyya, the Prophet is said to have himself built a mosque while on the campaign against Ṭā'if (Ibn Hishām, 872; al-Wākidī-Wellhausen, 368-9). Mosques arose in and around Medina, "because Muhammad prayed here" (Wüstenfeld, *Gesch. d. Stadt Medina*, 31, 38, 132 ff.). It is obvious that in most of these cases, later conditions are put back to the time of the Prophet; in connection with the "Campaign of the Trench" we are told that "he prayed everywhere where mosques now stand" (al-Wākidī-Wellhausen, 208). Since, for example, the Masjdīd al-Faḍīkh is also called Masjdīd al-Shams (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 132), we have perhaps here actually an ancient sanctuary.

Mosques became associated with the Prophet in many ways. In Medina, for example, there was the Masjdīd al-Baghla where footprints of the Prophet's mule were shown in a stone, the Masjdīd al-Idjāba where the Prophet's appeal was answered, the Masjdīd al-Fath which recalls the victory over the Meccans, etc. (see Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 136 ff.). In Mecca, there was naturally a large number of places sacred through associations with the Prophet and therefore used as places of prayer. The most honoured site, next to the chief mosque, is said to have been the house of Khadīja, also called Mawlid al-Sayyida Fāṭima, because the daughter of the Prophet was born there. This house, in which the Prophet lived till the *hidjra*, was taken over by 'Aḳīl, 'Alī's brother, and bought by him through Mu'āwiya and turned into a mosque (*Chroniken d. Stadt Mekka*, ed. Wüstenfeld, i, 423; iii, 438, 440). Next comes the house in which the Prophet held his first secret meetings. This was bought by al-Khayzurān [q.v.], mother of Hārūn al-Rashīd, on her pilgrimage in 171/788 and turned into a mosque (*Chron. Mekka*, iii, 112, 440). She also purchased the Prophet's birthplace, *Mawlid al-Nabī*, and made it into a mosque (*ibid.*, i, 422; iii, 439). If Mu'āwiya really bought the Prophet's house from his cousin, it was probably the right one; but the demand for places associated with the Prophet became stronger and stronger, and we therefore find more and more places referred not only to the Prophet, but also to his Companions. Such are the birthplaces of Ḥamza, 'Umar and 'Alī (*Chron. Mekka*, iii, 445), and the house of Māriya, the mother of the Prophet's son, Ibrāhīm (*ibid.*, i, 447, 466), who also had a mosque at Medina (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 133). There were also a Masjdīd Khadīja (*ibid.*, i, 324) and a Masjdīd 'Ā'isha (*ibid.*, iii, 454), a Masjdīd of the "granted appeal" in a narrow valley near Mecca, where the Prophet performed the *ṣalāt* (*ibid.*, 453), a Masjdīd al-Djinn, where the Djinn overheard his preaching (*ibid.*, i, 424; iii, 453), a Masjdīd al-Ra'ya, where he planted his standard at the conquest (*ibid.*, ii, 68 below and 71 above; iii, 13, 453), a Masjdīd al-Bay'a where the first homage of the Medinans was received (*ibid.*, i, 428; iii, 441). In the Masjdīd al-Khayf in Minā is shown the mark of the

Prophet's head in a stone into which visitors also put their heads (*ibid.*, iii, 438). Persons in the Bible are also connected with mosques, Adam, Abraham and Ismā'īl with the Ka'ba, beside which the *Maḳām Ibrāhīm* is shown, and in 'Arafa there is still a *Masdjid Ibrāhīm* (*ibid.*, i, 415, 425) and another in al-Zāhir near Mecca (Ibn D̲jubayr, *Rihla*, Leiden-London 1907, 112). To these memorial mosques others were later added, e.g. the *Masdjid Abī Bakr*, *Masdjid Bilāl*, the Mosque of the Splitting of the Moon (by the Prophet), etc. (see Ibn D̲jubayr, *Rihla*, 114 ff.; al-Muḳaddasī, 102-3; Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka*, ii, 27; al-Batanūnī, *al-Rihla al-Hidjāziyya*², Cairo 1329/1911, 52 ff.).

In al-Hidjāz, the Muslims thus acquired a series of mosques which became important from their association with the Prophet, his family and his Companions, and made Muslim history live. On the other hand, in lands formerly Christian, they took over sanctuaries which were associated with the Biblical history which they had assimilated (see Le Strange, *Palestine*, passim). Other mosques soon became associated with Biblical and Muslim story. The mosque founded by 'Umar on the site of the Temple in Jerusalem was, as already pointed out, identified as *al-Masdjid al-Aḳṣā* mentioned in sūra XVII, 1, and therefore connected with the Prophet's night journey and the journey to Paradise. The rock is said to have greeted the Prophet on this occasion, and marks in a stone covering a hole are explained as Muḳammad's footprints (sometimes also as those of Idrīs; cf. Le Strange, *Palestine*, 136; al-Batanūnī, *Rihla*, 165; Baedeker, *Palästina*, 1910, 52-3; cf. al-Ya'ḳūbī, *Ta'rikh*, ii, 311). The name *al-Masdjid al-Aḳṣā* was used throughout the early period for the whole Ḥarām area in Jerusalem, later partly for it, and partly for the building in its southern part (Ibn al-Faḳīh, 100; Sauvage, *Hist. Jérus. et Hébron*, 95, 121; cf. Le Strange, *Palestine*, 96-7). Then there were the mosques which had specifically Muslim associations, like the *Masdjid* of 'Umar on the Mount of Olives where he encamped at the conquest (al-Muḳaddasī, 172).

In Egypt not only was an old Christian sanctuary called Ma'bad Mūsā (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 269), but we are also told, for example, that the Mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn was built where Mūsā talked with his Lord (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 36); according to al-Ḳurdā'ī, there were in Egypt four *Masjdjids* of Mūsā (Ibn Duḳmāḳ, ed. Vollers, 92); there was a *Masdjid Ya'ḳūb wa-Yūsuf* (al-Muḳaddasī, 200) and a Joseph's prison, certainly dating from the Christian period (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 315). There was also a Mosque of Abraham in Munyat Ibn al-Khaṣīb (Ibn D̲jubayr, 58). The chief mosque of Ṣan'ā' was built by Shem, son of Noah (Ibn Rusta, 110). The old temple near Iṣṭāḳh mentioned above was connected with Sulaymān (al-Mas'ūdī, *Murūdj*, iv, 76-7 = § 1403; Yāḳūt, i, 299). In the mosque of Kūfa, not only Ibrāhīm but one thousand other prophets and one thousand saints, described as *waṣī*, are said to have offered their prayers; here was the tree Yaḳṭīn (sūra XXXVII, 146); here died Yaghūth and Ya'ḳūb, etc. (Yāḳūt, iv, 325; also Ibn D̲jubayr, 211-12), and in this mosque there was a chapel of Abraham, Noah and Idrīs (Ibn D̲jubayr, 212); a large number of mosques were associated with Companions of the Prophet. What emphasis was laid on such an association is seen, for example, from the story according to which 'Umar declined to perform the *ṣalāt* in the Church of the Resurrection in Jerusalem, lest the Church should afterwards be claimed as a mosque.

4. Tomb-mosques. A special class of memorial

mosques consisted of those which were associated with a tomb. The graves of ancestors and of saints had been sanctuaries from ancient times and they were gradually adopted into Islam. In addition, there were the saints of Islam itself. The general tendency to distinguish places associated with the founders of Islam naturally concentrated itself round the graves in which they rested. In the Ḳur'ān, a tomb-*masdjid* is mentioned in connection with the Seven Sleepers (sūra XVIII, 20) but it is not clear if it was recognised. As early as the year 6/627-8 the companions of Abū Baṣīr are said to have built a mosque at the place where he died and was buried (al-Wāḳidī-Wellhausen, 262). The Prophet is also said to have visited regularly at al-Baḳī' in Medina the tombs of martyrs who fell at Uhūd and paid reverence to them (*ibid.*, 143). Whatever the exact amount of truth in the story, there is no doubt that the story of the tomb-mosque of Abū Baṣīr is antedated. The accounts of the death of the Prophet and of the period immediately following reveal no special interest in his tomb. But very soon the general trend of development stimulated an interest in graves, which led to the erection of sanctuaries at them. The progress of this tendency is more marked in al-Wāḳidī, who died in 207/823, than in Ibn Ishāḳ, who died in 151/768.

The collections of *Ḥadīth* made in the 3rd/9th century contain discussions on this fact which show that the problem was whether the tombs could be used as places of worship and in this connection whether mosques could be built over the tombs. The *ḥadīths* answer both questions in the negative, which certainly was in the spirit of the Prophet. It is said that "*Ṣalāt* at the graves (*fi 'l-maḳābir*) is *makrūh*" (al-Buḳhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 52); "*ṣit* not upon graves and perform not *ṣalāt* towards them" (Muslim, *Ḍjanā'iz*, tr. 33); "*ḥold* the *ṣalāt* in your houses, but do not use them as tombs" (Muslim, *Ṣalāt al-musāfirīn*, tr. 28). On the other hand, it is acknowledged that Anas performed the *ṣalāt* at the cemetery (al-Buḳhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 48). We are also told that tombs cannot be used as *masāḳjīd* (al-Buḳhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 48; *Ḍjanā'iz*, *bāb* 62). On his deathbed the Prophet is said to have cursed the Jews and the Christians because they used the tombs of their prophets as *masāḳjīd*. *Ḥadīth* explains this by saying that the tomb of the Prophet was not at first accessible (al-Buḳhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 48, 55; *Ḍjanā'iz*, *bāb* 62; *ʿAnbiyā'*, *bāb* 50; Muslim, *Masāḳjīd*, tr. 3); as a matter of fact, its precise location was not exactly known (*Ḍjanā'iz*, *bāb* 96). The attacks in *Ḥadīth* insist that tomb-mosques are a reprehensible Jewish practice: "When a pious man dies, they built a *masāḳjīd* on his tomb", etc. (al-Buḳhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 48, 54; Muslim, *Ḍjanā'iz*, *bāb* 71). Although this view of tomb-mosques is still held in certain limited circles (cf. Ibn Taymiyya and the Wahhābis), the old pre-Islamic custom soon also became a Muslim one. The expositors of *Ḥadīth* like al-Nawawī (on Muslim, *Masāḳjīd*, tr. 3, lith. Dihlī 1319, i, 201) and al-ʿAṣḳalānī, (Cairo 1329, i, 354) explain the above passages to mean that only an exaggerated *ta'zīm* of the dead is forbidden so that tombs should not be used as a *ḳibla*; otherwise, it is quite commendable to spend time in a mosque in proximity to a devout man.

The name given to a tomb-mosque is often *ḳubba* [*q.v.*] a word which is used of a tent (al-Buḳhārī, *Ḍjanā'iz*, *bāb* 62; *Ḥadīth*, *bāb* 64; *Farḳ al-ḳhums*, *bāb* 19; *al-Ḍjīzīya*, *bāb* 15; Ṭarafa, *Dīwān*, vii, 1), but later came to mean the dome which usually covers tombs and thus became the general name for the sanctuary of a saint (cf. Ibn D̲jubayr, *Rihla*, 114, 115; cf. Dozy, *Supplément*, s.v.). *Maḳām* also means a little chapel and

a saint's tomb (van Berchem, *CIA*, i, no. 72, etc.; cf. index). The custom of making a *ḡubba* at the tomb of a saint was firmly rooted in Byzantine territory, where sepulchral churches always had a dome (Herzog-Hauch, *Realencyclopädie*³, x, 784). The usual name however for a tomb-sanctuary was *mashhad*; this is applied to places where saints are worshipped, among Muslim tombs particularly to those of the friends and relations of the Prophet (van Berchem, *CIA*, i, nos. 32, 63, 417, 544; al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 265, 309 ff.), but also to tombs of other recognised saints, e.g. *Mashhad Djirdjis* in Mawṣil (Ibn Djubayr, *Rihla*, 236), etc.

The transformation of the tombs of the Prophet and his near relatives into sanctuaries seems to have been a gradual process. Muḡammad, Abū Bakr and ʿUmar are said to have been buried in the house of ʿĀʾiṣḡha; Fāṡima and ʿAlī lived beside it. ʿĀʾiṣḡha had a wall built between her room and the tombs to prevent visitors carrying off earth from the tomb of the Prophet. The houses of the Prophet's wives remained as they were until al-Walid rebuilt them. He thought it scandalous that ḡasan b. ʿAlī should live in Fāṡima's house and ʿUmar's family close beside ʿĀʾiṣḡha's home in the house of ḡafṡa. He acquired the houses, had all the houses of the Prophet's wives torn down and erected new buildings. The tombs were enclosed by a pentagonal wall; the whole area was called *al-Rawḡa* "the garden"; it was not till later that a dome was built over it (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 66 ff., 72-3, 78 ff., 89). In the cemetery of Medina, al-Baḡīʿ [see BAKĪʿ AL-ḡHARKĀD], a whole series of *mashāhid* came to be built where tombs of the family and of the Companions of the Prophet were located (*ibid.*, 140 ff.; Ibn Djubayr, *Rihla*, 195 ff.). It is often disputed whether a tomb belonged to one or the other (e.g. al-ṡabarī, iii, 2436, 2). Such tomb-mosques were sacred (*mukaddas*; Ibn Djubayr, *Rihla*, 114, 13, 17), and they were visited *li' l-baraka*. The name *al-Rawḡa* of the Prophet's tomb became later applied to other sanctuaries (*ibid.*, 46, 16; 52, 11). Separate limbs were revered in some mosques, like the head of al-Husayn in Cairo, which was brought there in 491/1098 from ʿAsḡalān (ʿAlī Pāṡha Mubāarak, *al-Khiṡat al-ḡjadida*, iv, 91 ff.; cf. Sauvāire, *Hist. Jerus. et Hébr.*, 16); his head was also revered for some time in the *Mashhad al-Raʾs* in Damascus (according to Ibn Shāḡir, *JA*, ser. 9, vii, 385).

Gradually, a vast number of Muslim tombs of saints came into existence; and to these were added all the pre-Islamic sanctuaries which were adopted by Islam. No distinction can therefore be drawn between tomb-mosques and other memorial mosques. It was often impossible to prove that the tomb in question ever really existed. In the *Mashhad ʿAlī*, for example, ʿAlī's tomb is honoured, but Ibn Djubayr leaves it in doubt whether he is really buried there (*Rihla*, 212) and many located his grave in the mosque at Kūfa and elsewhere (al-Masʿūdī, *Murūḡi*, iv, 289, v, 68 = §§ 1612, 1825; Ibn ḡawḡal, 163). In ʿAyn al-Baḡar near ʿAkkā there was also a *Mashhad ʿAlī* (Yāḡūt, iii, 759) and also in the Mosque of the Umayyads (Ibn Djubayr, 267); on this question, cf. al-Muḡaddasī, 46. Names frequently become confused and transferred. In Mecca, between ṡafā and Marwa there was a *ḡubba*, which was associated with ʿUmar b. al-ḡhaṡṡāb; but Ibn Djubayr says that it should be connected with ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (*Rihla*, 115, 11 ff.). In Dḡīza there was a *Mashhad Abi Hurayra*, where the memory of this Companion of the Prophet was honoured; it is said to have been originally the grave of another Abū Hurayra (Maḡrīzī, i, 335, 19). Wherever Shīʿīs ruled, there arose numerous tomb-

mosques of the *Ahl al-Bayt*. In Egypt, Ibn Djubayr gives a list of 14 men and five women of the Prophet's family, who were honoured there (*Rihla*, 46-7). Islam was always creating new tombs of saints who had been distinguished for learning or asceticism or miracle-working, e.g. the tomb of al-Shāfiʿī in Cairo and Aḡmad al-Badaḡwī in ṡanṡa. There were mosques, chiefly old-established sanctuaries, of Biblical and semi-Biblical personages like Rūbīl (Reuben) and Āsiya the wife of Pharaoh (*ibid.*, 46). In and around Damascus were a number of mosques, which were built on the tombs of prophets and unnamed saints (Ibn Djubayr, *Rihla*, 273 ff.). In Palestine could be seen a vast number of tombs of Biblical personages (cf. Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, index, and Conder, in *Palestine Explor. Fund. Quarterly Statement*, 1871, 89 ff.), usually mosques with a *ḡubba*.

After the sanctuaries of persons mentioned in the Bible came those of people mentioned in the Qurʾān. For example, outside the *Dḡāmi*ʿ in ʿAkkā was shown the tomb-mosque of the prophet ṡāliḡ (Nāṡir-i ḡhusraw, *Safar-nāma*, ed. Schefer, 15, 1, tr. 49), and in Syria that of his son (Ibn Djubayr, 46); that of Hūd was also shown near ʿAkkā (Nāṡir-i ḡhusraw, 16, 5, tr. 52), farther east, that of Shuʿayb and of his daughter (*ibid.*, 16, 12, tr. 53); the tomb of Hūd was also pointed out in Damascus and in ḡadramawṡ (Yāḡūt ii, 596, 16); then we have peculiarly Muslim saints like Dhu ʾl-Kiṡl, the son of Job (Nāṡir-i ḡhusraw, 16, 4, tr. 52). Then there are the sanctuaries of saints who are only superficially Muslim but really have their origins in old popular superstitions, like al-ḡhaḡīr, who had a *mashhad* in Damascus (Yāḡūt, ii, 596, 9), or a saint like ʿAkk, founder of the town of ʿAkkā, whose tomb Nāṡir-i ḡhusraw visited outside the town (15, 6 from below, tr. 51). Such tombs were much visited by pious travellers and are therefore frequently mentioned in literature (on *mashāhid* of the kinds mentioned here in ʿIrāḡ, see al-Muḡaddasī, 130; for Mawṡil, etc., *ibid.*, 146). In this way, ancient sanctuaries were turned into mosques, and it is often quite a matter of chance under what names they are adopted by Islam (cf. Goldziher, *Muh. Studien*, ii, 325 ff.). It therefore sometimes happens that the same saint is honoured in several mosques. Abū Hurayra, who is buried in Medina, is honoured not only in the above-mentioned tomb-mosque in Dḡīza but also at various places in Palestine, in al-Ramla and in Yubnā south of ṡabariyya (ḡhalīl ed-Dāḡiry, *Zoubdat Kachf el-Mamālik* ed. P. Ravaisse, 42, 1 from below; Nāṡir-i ḡhusraw, 17, 1 from below, no. 59; Yāḡūt, iii, 512, 20; iv, 1007, 12; cf. *Symbolae Osloenses Fasc. Supplet.*, ii [1928], 31). The tomb of the Prophet Jonah is revered not only in the ancient Niniveh but also in Palestine.

Just as the *ḡubba* under which the saint lay and the mosque adjoining it were sanctified by him, so vice-versa a *ḡubba* and a mosque could cause a deceased person to become considered a saint. It was therefore the custom for the mighty not only to give this distinction to their fathers but also to prepare such buildings for themselves even in their own lifetime. This was particularly the custom of the Mamlūk sultans, perhaps stimulated by the fact that they did not found dynasties in which power passed from father to son. Such buildings are called *ḡubba* (van Berchem, *CIA*, i, nos. 82, 95, 96, 126, 138, etc.), exceptionally *zāwiya* (*ibid.*, no. 98), frequently *turba* (*ibid.*, no. 58, 66, 88, 106, 107, 116, etc.); the formula is also found: "this *ḡubba* is a *turba*" (no. 67); the latter word acquired the same meaning as *masḡjid*, *mashhad*, partly saint's grave

and partly sacred site (cf. Ibn D̲jubayr, *Rihla*, 114, 196); but this word does not seem to be used of ordinary tomb-mosques, although the distinction between these and mosques in honour of saints often disappeared. In these *kubbas*, the regular recitation of the Qurʾān was often arranged and the tomb was provided with a *kiswa*. The mausoleum might be built in connection with a great mosque and be separated from it by a grille (Yākūt, iv, 509, 6 ff.).

5. Mosques deliberately founded. In the early period, the building of mosques was a social obligation of the ruler as representative of the community and the tribes. Very soon a number of mosques came into existence, provided by individuals. In addition to tribal mosques, as already mentioned, there were also sectarian mosques, and prominent leaders built mosques which were the centres of their activity, for example the Masjid al-ʿAdī b. Hātim (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 130), the Masjid Simāk in Kūfa (*ibid.*, i, 2653), the Masjid al-Ashʿath, etc. As old sanctuaries became Islamised, the mosque received more of the character of a sanctuary and the building of a mosque became a pious work; there arose a *hadīth*, according to which the Prophet said: "for him who builds a mosque, God will build a home in Paradise"; some add "if he desire to see the face of God" (*Corpus iuris di Zaid b. ʿAlī*, ed. Griffini, no. 276; al-Bukhārī, *Salāt*, bāb 65; Muslim, *Masājid*, tr. 4; *Zuhd*, tr. 3; al-Makrīzī, iv, 36). Like other sanctuaries, mosques were sometimes built as a result of a revelation in a dream. A story of this kind of the year 557/1162 is given by al-Samhūdī for Medina (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 91); and a similar one of a mosque in Damascus (*JA*, ser. 9, vii, 384); a mosque was also built out of gratitude for seeing the Prophet (*al-Madrasa al-Sharīfiyya*, al-Makrīzī, iv, 209). It was of course particularly an obligation on the mighty to build mosques. Even in the earliest period, the governors took care that new mosques were built to keep pace with the spread of Islam (cf. al-Balādhurī, 178-9). About the year 390/1000 the governor of D̲jibāl, Badr b. Hasanawayh, is said to have built 3,000 mosques and hostels (Mez, *Die Renaissance des Islāms*, 24, Eng. tr. 27). The collections of inscriptions, as well as the geographical and topographical works, reveal how the number of mosques increased in this way.

In Egypt, al-Hākīm in the year 403/1012-13 had a census taken of the mosques of Cairo, and these were found to amount to 800 (al-Makrīzī, iv, 264); al-Ḳudāʿī (d. 454/1062) also counted the mosques, and his figure is put at 30,000 or 36,000 (Yākūt, iii, 901; Ibn Duqmāk, ed. Vollers, 92; al-Makrīzī, iv, 264), which seems a quite fantastic figure (there is probably a *wa*-lacking before *alf*, i.e. 1,036). Ibn al-Mutawwaḍḍī (d. 730/1330) according to al-Makrīzī counted 480, and Ibn Duqmāk (about 800/1398) gives in addition to the incomplete list of *ḍjāmi*ʿs a list of 472 mosques, not including *madāris*, *khānakāhs*, etc.; the figure given by al-Makrīzī is smaller. The fantastic figure of 30,000 for Baghdād is found as early as al-Yaʿqūbī (*Buldān*, 250). It is also an exaggeration when Ibn D̲jubayr was told in Alexandria that there were 12,000 or 8,000 mosques there (43). In Baṣra, where Ziyād built 7 mosques (Ibn al-Faḳīh, 191), the number also increased rapidly, but here again an exaggerated figure (7,000) is given (al-Yaʿqūbī, *op. cit.*, 361). In Damascus, Ibn ʿAsākir (d. 571/1176) counted 241 within and 148 outside the city (*JA*, ser. 9, vii, 383). In Palermo, Ibn Hawḳal counted over 300, and in a village above it 200 mosques. In some streets there were as many as 20 mosques within a

bowshot of one another; this multiplicity is condemned: everyone wanted to build a mosque for himself (Yākūt, i, 719; iii, 409, 410). As a matter of fact, one can almost say that things tended this way; al-Yaʿqūbī mentions in Baghdād a mosque for the Anbārī officials of the tax-office (*Buldān*, 245), and several distinguished scholars practically had their own mosques. It occasionally happened that devout private individuals founded mosques. In 672/1273-4 Tād̲j al-Dīn built a mosque and a separate chamber in which he performed the *ṣalāt* alone and meditated (al-Makrīzī, iv, 90). The mosques thus founded were very often called after their founders, and memorial and tomb-mosques after the person to be commemorated. Sometimes a mosque is called after some devout man who lived in it (al-Makrīzī, iv, 97, 265 ff.) and a *madrasa* might be called after its head or a teacher (*ibid.*, iv, 235; Yākūt, *Udabāʿ*, vii, 82). Lastly, a mosque might take its name from its situation or from some feature of the building.

6. Al-Muṣallā. In addition to the mosques proper, al-Makrīzī mentions for Cairo eight places for prayer (*muṣallā*) mainly at the cemetery (iv, 334-5). The word *muṣallā* may mean any place of prayer, therefore also mosque (cf. sūra II, 119; cf. al-Makrīzī *Khīṭāṭ*, iv, 25, 16; idem, *Itiʿāz*, ed. Bunz. 91, 17; Yākūt, *Buldān*, iv, 326, 3-5) or a particular place of prayer within a mosque (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2408, 16; al-Bukhārī, *Ḡhusl*, bāb 17; *Ṣalāt*, bāb 91). In Palestine, there were many open places of prayer, provided only with a *mihrāb* and marked off, but quite in the open (cf. for Tiberias, Nāṣir-i Khusrāw, ed. Schefer, 36). It is recorded of the Prophet that he used to go out at the two festivals (*al-Fitr* and *al-Adhā*) to the place of prayer (*al-muṣallā*) of the Banū Sālīma. A lance which the Negus of Ethiopia had presented to al-Zubayr was carried in front of him and planted before the Prophet as *sutra*. Standing in front of it, he conducted the *ṣalāt*, and then preached a *khutba* without a *minbar* to the rows in front of him (al-Ṭabarī, i, 1281, 14 ff.; al-Bukhārī, *Ḥayd*, bāb 6; *Ṣalāt*, bāb 90; *ʿIdayn*, bāb 6). He also went out to the *muṣallā* for the *ṣalāt al-istiṣkāʿ* (Muslim, *Istisḳāʿ*, tr. 1). This *muṣallā* was an open space, and Muhammad is even said to have forbidden a building on it (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 127 ff.). This custom of performing the *ṣalāt* on a *muṣallā* outside the town on the two festivals became *sunna*. There is evidence of the custom for several towns. In Medina, however, a mosque was later built on the *muṣallā* (*ibid.*, 128) which also happened in other places. An early innovation was the introduction of a *minbar* by Marwān (*ibid.*, 128; al-Bukhārī, *ʿIdayn*, bāb 6). When Saʿd b. Abī Waḳḳāṣ built a mosque in Kisrāʿs *ʿIwān* in al-Madāʿin, at the festival in the year 16/637, it was expressly stated that it was *sunna* to go out to it; Saʿd, however, thought it was a matter of indifference (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2451). Shortly after 300/912-13 a *muṣallā* outside of Hamadhān is mentioned (al-Masʿūdī, *Murūdj*, ix, 23 = § 3595). There was al-Muṣallā al-ʿAtīk in Baghdād; here a *dakka* was erected for the execution of the Ḳarmaṭian prisoners (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 2244-5; cf. 1659, 18); in Kūfa, several are mentioned (*ibid.*, ii, 628, 16; 1704, 8; iii, 367, 8-368) two in Marw (*ibid.*, ii, 1931, 2; 1964, 19; cf. Nāṣir-i Khusrāw, tr. 274), one in Farghāna (Ibn Hawḳal, 393, 11). In Tirmidh, the *muṣallā* was within the walls (Ibn Hawḳal, 349, 18) which also happened elsewhere (*ibid.*, 378, 6-377). In Cairo, the two festivals were celebrated on the Muṣallā Khawlān (a Yemeni tribe) with the *khātib* of the Mosque of ʿAmr as leader: according to al-Ḳudāʿī, the festivals were to be celebrated on a *muṣallā* opposite the hill Yaḥmūm,

then on al-Muṣallā al-Ḳadīm where Aḥmad b. Tūlūn erected a building in 256/870. The site was several times changed (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 334-5; cf. al-Muḳaddasī, 200, 14-20). In 302, 306 and 308 the *ṣalāt al-ʿīd* was performed for the first time in the Mosque of ʿAmr (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 20, 8 ff.; al-Suyūṭī, *Husn al-muḥādāra*, ii, 137 below; Ibn Taghribirdī, ii, 194, 9 ff.). Ibn Baṭṭūta notes the custom in Spain (i, 20) and Tunis (i, 22) and also in India (iii, 154). Ibn al-Ḥādīdj (d. 737/1336-7) says that in his time the ceremonies still took place on the *muṣallā* but condemns the *bidaʿ* associated with them (*K. al-Madkhal*, Cairo 1320, ii, 82). It is also laid down in Muslim law, although not always definitely (see Juynboll, *Handbuch d. Islām. Ges.*, 1910, 127; I. Guidi, *Il Muḥtaṣar*, i, 1919, 136). The custom seems in time to have become generally abandoned. In the 9th/15th century the Masdjīd Aḳsunḳur was expressly built for the *khutba* at the Friday services and at festivals (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 107, 17).

C. The mosque as the centre for divine worship.

1. Sanctity of the mosque. The history of the mosques in the early centuries of Islam shows an increase in its sanctity, which was intensified by the adoption of the traditions of the church and especially by the permeation of the cult of saints. The sanctity already associated with tombs taken over by Islam was naturally very soon transferred to the larger and more imposing mosques. The expression *Bayt Allāh* "house of God", which at first was only used of the Kaʿba came now be applied to any mosque (see *Corpus iuris di Zaid b. ʿAlī*, no. 48, cf. 156, 983; *Chron. Mekka*, ed. Wüstenfeld, iv, 164; van Berchem, *CI4*, i, no. 10, 1. 18; Ibn al-Ḥādīdj, *K. al-Madkhal*, i, 20, 23; ii, 64, 68; cf. *Bayt Rabbihi*, *ibid.*, i, 23, 73; ii, 56). The alteration in the original conception is illustrated by the fact that the Mamlūk al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars declined to build a mosque on a place for tethering camels because it was unseemly, while the mosque of the Prophet had actually been built on such a place (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 91; Abū Dāwūd, *Ṣalāt*, bāb 22).

In the house of God, the *miḥrāb* and the *minbar* enjoyed particular sanctity, as did the tomb, especially in Medina (al-Bukhārī, *Faḍl al-ṣalāt fī masdjīd Makka wa ʿl-Madīna*, bāb 5). The visitors sought *baraka*, partly by touching the tomb or the railing round it, partly by praying in its vicinity; at such places "prayer is heard" (*Chron. Mekka*, iii, 441, 442). In the Masdjīd al-Ḳhayf in Minā, the visitor laid his head on the print of the Prophet's head and thus obtained *baraka* (*ibid.*, iii, 438). A mosque could be built on a site, the sanctity of which had been shown by the finding of hidden treasure (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 75). There were often places of particular sanctity in mosques. In the mosques at Ḳubāʿ and Medina, the spots where the Prophet used to stand at prayer were held to be particularly blessed (al-Balādhurī, 5; al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, bāb 91; Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 65, cf. 82, 109). In other mosques, places where a saint had sat or where a divine phenomenon had taken place, e.g. in the Mosque of ʿAmr and in the Azhar Mosque (al-Maḳrīzī, iii, 19, 52) or the Mosque in Jerusalem (al-Muḳaddasī, 170), were specially visited. Pious visitors made *tawāf* [see ḤADJĪJ] between such places in the mosque (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 20). Just as in other religions, we find parents dedicating their children to the service of a sanctuary, so we find a Muslim woman vowing her child or child yet unborn to the mosque (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, bāb 74; al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 20). The fact that mosques, like other sanctuaries, were sometimes founded after a revelation received in a dream has already been mentioned (see 1. B. 5).

This increase in sanctity had as a natural result that one could no longer enter a mosque at random as had been the case in the time of the Prophet. In the early Umayyad period, Christians were still allowed to enter the mosque without molestation (cf. Lammens, *Moʿāwīya*, 13-14; Goldziher, in *WZKM*, vi [1892], 100-1). Muʿāwīya used to sit with his Christian physician, Ibn Uthāl, in the mosque of Damascus (Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, i, 117). According to Aḥmad b. Hanbal, the *Ahl al-Kitāb* (or *Ahl al-ʿAhd*) and their servants, but not polytheists, were allowed to enter the mosque of Medina (*Musnad*, iii, 339, 392). At a later date, entrance was forbidden to Christians and this regulation is credited to ʿUmar (Lammens, *op. cit.*, 13, n. 6). A strict teacher of morality like Ibn al-Ḥādīdj thought it unseemly that the monks who wove the mats for the mosques should be allowed to lay them in the mosque (*Madkhal*, ii, 57). Conditions were not always the same. In Hebron, Jews and Christians were admitted on payment to the sanctuary of Abraham until in 664/1265 Baybars forbade it (Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, i/2, 27).

According to some traditions, a person in a state of ritual impurity could not enter the mosque (Abū Dāwūd, *Ṭahāra*, bāb 92; Ibn Mādjā, *Ṭahāra*, bāb 123). In any case, only the pure could acquire merit by visiting the mosque (Muslim, *Masāʾid*, tr. 49; *Corpus iuris di Zaid b. ʿAlī*, no. 48), and in a later period it is specially mentioned that the *wudūʿ* cannot be undertaken in the mosque itself (*Madkhal*, ii, 47 below) nor could shaving (*ibid.*, 58-9).

It is always necessary to be careful not to spit in a mosque, although some traditions which are obviously closer to the old state of affairs say, "not in the direction of the *qibla*, only to the left!" (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, bābs 33-4). The custom of taking off one's sandals in the mosque is found as early as the time of Abū ʿUbayd (2nd/8th century) (Yāḳūt, *Udabāʿ*, v, 272, 13-237) and according to Ibn al-Ḥādīdj's *Madkhal* (see below) is also mentioned by Abū Dāwūd. Al-Ṭabarī puts the custom back to the time of ʿUmar (i, 2408). That it is based on an old custom observed in sanctuaries is obvious (cf. on the history of the custom, F. Cumont, *Fouilles de Doura-Europos*, 1926, 60-1). The custom, however, seems not to have been always observed. In the 2nd/8th century in the Mosque of the Umayyads, the shoes were taken off only in the *maḳṣūra*, because the floor was covered with mats; but in 212/827 an Egyptian superintendent ordered that the mosque should only be entered with bare feet (*JA*, ser. 9, vii, 211, 217). The visitor on entering should place his right foot first and utter certain prayers with blessings on the Prophet and his family (which Muḥammad is said to have done!) and when he is inside perform two *rakʿas* (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, bāb 47; *Tahādīdjīd*, bāb 25; Muslim, *Ṣalāt al-musāfirīn*, trs. 12-13; al-Ṭabarī, iii, 2464, 2532). Certain regulations for decent conduct came into being, the object of which was to preserve the dignity of the house of divine service. Public announcements about strayed animals were not to be made, as the Bedouins did in their houses of assembly, and one should not call out aloud and thereby disturb the meditations of the worshippers (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, bāb 83; Muslim, *Masāʾid*, tr. 18; more fully in *Madkhal*, i, 19 ff.). One should put on fine clothes for the Friday service, rub oneself with oil and perfume oneself (al-Bukhārī *Ḍjumʿa*, bābs 3, 6, 7, 19) as was also done with *ṭīb* for the *Ḥādījī* (al-Bukhārī, *Ḥādījī*, bāb 143).

A question which interested the teachers of morality was that of the admission of women to the mosques. That many did not desire their presence is evident from the *ḥadīth* that one cannot prevent them

as there is no *fitna* connected with it, but they must not be perfumed (Muslim, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 29; al-Bukhārī, *Djum'a*, *bāb* 13; cf. *Chron. Mekka*, iv, 168). Other *hadīths* say they should leave the mosques before the men (al-Nasā'ī, *Sahw*, *bāb* 77; cf. Abū Dāwūd, *Ṣalāt*, *bābs* 14, 48). Sometimes a special part of the mosque was railed off for them; for example, the governor of Mecca in 256/870 had ropes tied between the columns to make a separate place for women (*Chron. Mekka*, ii, 197 below). According to some, women must not enter the mosque during their menstruation (Abū Dāwūd, *Tahāra*, *bābs* 92, 103; Ibn Mādjā, *Tahāra*, *bābs* 117, 123). In Medina at the present day, a wooden grille shuts off a place for women (al-Batanūnī, *al-Rihla al-Hidjāziyya*, 240). At one time, the women stood at the back of the mosque here (Yāqūt, *Udabā'*, vi, 400). In Jerusalem there were special *maḥsūras* for them (Ibn al-Faḥīh, 100). Ibn al-Hādīdj would prefer to exclude them altogether and gives 'A'ishā as his authority for this.

Although the mosque became sacred, it could not quite cast off its old character as a place of public assembly, and in consequence, the mosque was visited for many other purposes than that of divine worship. Not only in the time of the Umayyads was considerable business done in the mosques (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1118; cf. Lammens, *Ziād*, 98) which is quite in keeping with the *hadīth* (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bābs* 70-1) which actually found it necessary to forbid the sale of wine in the mosque (*ibid.*, *bāb* 73), but Ibn al-Hādīdj records with disapproval that business was done in the mosques: women sit in the mosques and sell thread, in Mecca hawkers even call their wares in the mosques. The list given by this author gives one the impression of a regular market-place (*Madkhal*, ii, 54). Strangers could always sit down in a mosque and talk with one another (see al-Muḥaddasī, 205); they had the right to spend the night in the mosque; according to some, however, only if there was no other shelter available (*Madkhal*, ii, 43 below, 49 above; see below I.D.1b). It naturally came about that people also ate in the mosque; this was quite common, and regular banquets were even given in them (e.g. al-Maḥrīzī, iv, 67, 121-2; cf. in *Hadīth*: Ibn Mādjā, *Aṭ'ima*, *bābs* 24, 29; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, ii, 106, 10 from below). Ibn al-Hādīdj laments that in the Masjid al-Aḳṣā people even threw the remains of their repast down in the mosque; animals were brought in, and beggars and water-carriers called aloud in them, etc. (*Madkhal*, ii, 53 ff.). It is even mentioned as a sign of the special piety of al-Shūrāzī (d. 476/1083) that he often brought food into the mosque and consumed it there with his pupils (Wüstenfeld, *Der Imām Schāfi'*, iii, 298). Gradually, the mosques acquired greater numbers of residents (see below, I.D. 2b). In the Azhar Mosque, it was the custom with many to spend the summer nights there because it was cool and pleasant (al-Maḥrīzī, iv, 54). This was the state of affairs about 800/1398. Similar conditions still prevail in the mosques.

2. The mosque as a place of prayer. Friday mosques. As places for divine worship, the mosques are primarily "houses of which God has permitted that they be erected and that His name be mentioned in them" (sūra XXIV, 36), i.e. for His service demanded by the law, for ceremonies of worship (*manāsik*), for assemblies for prayer (*djāmā'at*) and other religious duties (cf. *Chron. Mekka*, iv, 164). The mosques were *ma'ābid* (al-Maḥrīzī, iv, 117, 140). In Medina after a journey, the Prophet went at once to the mosque and performed two *rak'as*, a custom which was imitated by others and became the rule (al-

Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bābs* 59-60; Muslim, *Ṣalāt al-musāfirīn*, tr. 11; al-Wākidī-Wellhausen, 412, 436). In this respect, the mosque played a part in public worship similar to that of the Ka'ba in Mecca at an earlier date and the Rabba sanctuary in Ṭā'if. The daily *ṣalāts*, which in themselves could be performed anywhere, became especially meritorious when they were performed in mosques, because they expressed adherence to the community. A *ṣalāt al-djāmā'a*, we are told, is twenty or twenty-five times as meritorious as the *ṣalāt* of an individual at home or in his shop (Muslim, *Masādjid*, tr. 42; Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 87; *Buyū'*, *bāb* 49). There are even *hadīths* which condemn private *ṣalāts*: "Those who perform the *ṣalāt* in their houses abandon the *sunna* of their Prophet" (Muslim, *Masādjid*, tr. 44; but cf. 48 and al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 52). If much rain falls, the believers may, however, worship in their houses (al-Bukhārī, *Djum'a*, *bāb* 14). In this connection, a blind man was given a special *rukhsa*; it is particularly bad to leave the mosque after the *adhān* (Muslim, *Masādjid*, tr. 45). It is therefore very meritorious to go to the mosque; for every step a man advances into the mosque, he receives forgiveness of sins, God protects him at the last judgment and the angels also assist him (Muslim, *Masādjid*, *bābs* 49-51; al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 87; *Adhān*, *bābs* 36, 37; *Djum'a*, *bābs* 4, 18, 31; *Corpus iuris di Zaid b. 'Alī*, nos. 48, 156, 983).

This holds especially of the Friday *ṣalāt* (*ṣalāt al-djum'a*), which can only be performed in the mosque and is obligatory upon every free male Muslim who has reached years of discretion (cf. Juynboll, *Handbuch*, 86; Guidi, *Sommario del diritto Malechita*, i, 125-6. According to Ibn Hishām (290), this *ṣalāt*, which is distinguished by the *khutba*, was observed in Medina even before the *hidjra*. This is hardly probable and besides is not in agreement with other *hadīths* (see al-Bukhārī, *Djum'a*, *bāb* 11) but the origin of this divine worship, referred to in sūra LXII, 9, is obscure. The assemblies of the Jews and Christians on a particular day must have formed the model (cf. al-Bukhārī, *Djum'a*, *bāb* 1). Its importance in the earlier period lay in the fact that all elements of the Muslim camp, who usually went to the tribal and particular mosques, assembled for it in the chief mosque under the leadership of the general. The chief mosque, which for this reason was particularly large, was given a significant name. They talk of *al-masdjid al-a'zam* (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2494; ii, 734, 1701, 1702, Kūfa; al-Balādhurī, 5; al-Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, xi, 21, centre; *ibid.* also *al-masdjid al-akbar*, Medina; cf. *al-masdjid al-kabīr*, al-Ya'qūbī, *Buldān*, 245) or *masdjid al-djāmā'a* (Yāqūt, iii, 896, Fustāt; also al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1119; Ibn Kutayba, *Ma'ārif*, ed. Wüstenfeld, 106). *masdjid li 'l-djumā'a* (al-Maḥrīzī, iv, 4); *masdjid djāmi'* (al-Balādhurī, 289, Madā' in; Yāqūt, i, 643, 647, Baṣra); then *masdjid al-djāmi'* (Yāqūt, iii, 899; iv, 885; Ibn Ḥawkal', 298, 315, 387; al-Ya'qūbī, 110, etc.). As an abbreviation we find also *al-djāmā'a* (Yāqūt, i, 400; Ibn Baṭṭūta, iv, 343; cf. *masdjid al-djāmā'a*, al-Balādhurī, 348) and especially *djāmi'*. As the *khutba* was the distinguishing feature, we also find *masdjid al-khutba* (al-Maḥrīzī, iv, 44, 64, 87), *djāmi' al-khutba* (*ibid.*, iv, 55) or *masdjid al-minbar*, al-Muḥaddasī, 316, for *djāmi'*, 1. 8).

Linguistic usage varied somewhat in course of time with conditions. In the time of 'Umar there was properly in every town only one *masdjid djāmi'* for the Friday service. But when the community became no longer a military camp and Islam replaced the previous religion of the people, a need for a number of mosques for the Friday service was bound to arise. This demanded mosques for the Friday service in the

country, in the villages on the one hand and several Friday mosques in the town on the other. This meant in both cases an innovation, compared with old conditions, and thus there arose some degree of uncertainty. The Friday service had to be conducted by the ruler of the community, but there was only one governor in each province; on the other hand, the demands of the time could hardly be resisted and, besides, the Christian converts to Islam had been used to a solemn weekly service.

As to the villages (*al-kurā*), 'Amr b. al-ʿĀṣ in Egypt forbade their inhabitants to celebrate the Friday service for the reason just mentioned (al-Makrīzī, iv, 7). At a later period, then, the *khutba* was delivered exceptionally, without *minbar* and only with staff, until Marwān b. Muḥammad in 132/749-50 introduced the *minbar* into the Egyptian *kurā* also (*ibid.*, 8). Of a mosque in which a *minbar* had been placed, we are told *ḍjuʿila masjidan li 'l-aʿyan* (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2451) and a village with a *minbar* is called *karya djāmiʿa* (al-Bukhārī, *Djumʿa*, bāb 15; cf. *madīna djāmiʿa*, Ibn Ḥawkal¹, 321), an idea which was regarded by al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870) as quite obvious. In introducing the *minbars* into the Egyptian villages, Marwān was apparently following the example of other regions. In the 4th/10th century, Ibn Ḥawkal mentions a number of *manābir* in the district of Iṣṭakhr (1st edn., 182 ff.) and a few in the vicinity of Marw (*ibid.*, 316) and in Transoxania (*ibid.*, 378; cf. 384), and al-Muḥaddasī does the same for other districts of Persia (309, 317) and he definitely says that the *kurā* of Palestine are *dhāt manābir* (*ibid.*, 176; cf. al-Iṣṭakhrī¹, 58); al-Balādhurī (331) also uses the name *minbar* for a village mosque built in 239/853-4; in general, when speaking of the *kurā*, one talks of *manābir* and not of *djawāmiʿ* (cf. al-Iṣṭakhrī¹, 63). Later, however, the term *masjid djāmiʿ* is used for a Friday mosque (Ibn Djubayr, 217). The conditions of primitive Islam are reflected in the teaching of the Ḥanafīs, who only permit the Friday service in large towns (cf. al-Māwardī, *al-Ahkām al-ṣultāniyya*, ed. Enger, 177).

As to the towns, the *Shāfiʿīs* on the other hand have retained the original conditions, since they permit the Friday service in only one mosque in each town (see *ḍjumʿa* and *op. cit.*, 178-8), but with the reservation that the mosque is able to hold the community. The distinction between the two rites was of importance in Egypt. When in 569/1173-4 Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn became supreme in Egypt, he appointed a *Shāfiʿī* chief *kādī* and the Friday service was therefore held only in the al-Ḥākīm mosque, as the largest; but in 665/1266, al-Malik al-Zāhir Baybars gave the Ḥanafīs preference, and many mosques were therefore used as Friday mosques (al-Makrīzī, iv, 52 ff.; al-Suyūṭī, *Ḥusn al-muḥādara*, ii, 140; Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.* i/2, 39 ff). During the Umayyad period, the number of *djawāmiʿ* in the towns were still very small. The geographers of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries in their descriptions of towns as a rule mention only "the *djāmiʿ*". Ibn al-Fakīh, ca. 290/903, sometimes says *masjid djāmiʿ wa-minbar* (304-6, also *minbar* simply, 305). In keeping with the oldest scheme of town planning, it was very often in the middle of the town surrounded by the business quarters (Ibn Ḥawkal¹, 298, 325; al-Muḥaddasī, 274-5, 278, 298, 314, 316, 375, 376, 413, 426, 427, etc.; Nāṣir-i Khusrāw, ed. Schefer, 35, 41, 56) and the *dār al-imāra* was still frequently in the immediate vicinity of the chief mosque (Ibn Ḥawkal¹, 298, 314; al-Muḥaddasī, 426).

Al-Iṣṭakhrī mentions an innovation in Islam that al-Ḥadīdjādī built a *djāmiʿ* in al-Wāsiṭ on the west

bank, although there was already one on the east bank (al-Iṣṭakhrī¹, 82-3; cf. al-Yaʿqūbī, *Buldān*, 322). Ibn Djubayr (*Rihla*, 211) mentions only one *djāmiʿ* in Kūfa, called *Masjid al-Kūfa* by Ibn al-Fakīh, although he also mentions other mosques (173; cf. 174, 183 and al-Muḥaddasī, 116). In Baṣra, where al-Yaʿqūbī (278/891) already mentions 7,000 mosques (*Buldān*, 361), al-Muḥaddasī (375/985) gives 3 *djawāmiʿ* (117). In Sāmarrāʾ, among many mosques, there was one *djāmiʿ* (al-Yaʿqūbī, *Buldān*, 258, 259), which was later replaced by another (*ibid.*, 260-1); al-Mutawakkil also built one outside the original town (*ibid.*, 265; see also P. Schwarz, *Die ʿAbbāsiden-Residenz Sāmarrāʾ*, 1909, 32). In Baghdād, al-Yaʿqūbī mentions only one *djāmiʿ* for the eastern town and for the western (*Buldān*, 240, 245, 251, 253; the almost contemporary Ibn Rusta just mentions the old western town and its *djāmiʿ*, 109) although he gives the fantastic figures of 15,000 mosques in the east town (*ibid.*, 254) and 30,000 in the west (or in the whole town?, *ibid.*, 250). After 280/893-4 there was added the *djāmiʿ* of the eastern palace of the caliph (Mez, *Renaissance*, 388, Eng. tr. 410, quoting al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Taʾriḫ Baghdād*; a private *djāmiʿ* of Ḥarūn al-Rashīd in the *Bustān Umm Mūsā* is mentioned by Ibn al-Kifī, *Taʾriḫ al-Ḥukamāʾ*, ed. Lippert, 433 below). These three *djawāmiʿ* are mentioned about 340/951 by al-Iṣṭakhrī (84), who also mentions one in the suburb of Kalwādhā. Ibn Ḥawkal in 367/977 mentions the latter and also the *Djāmiʿ al-Barāthā* (164-5, of 329/940-1; Mez, *loc. cit.*), a fifth was added in 379/989, a sixth in 383/993 (Mez, 389, Eng. tr. 410-11); thus al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī in 460 (1058) gives 4 for West Baghdād, 2 for the east town (cf. Le Strange, *Baghdad*, 324). Ibn Djubayr in 581/1185 gives in the east town 3, and 11 *djawāmiʿ* (*Rihla*, 228-9) for the whole of Baghdād. For Cairo, al-Iṣṭakhrī gives two *djāmiʿ*s: the 'Amr and Ṭulūn Mosques (49) besides that in al-Ḳarāfa, which was regarded as a separate town (cf. Ibn Rusta [ca. 290/903], 116-17). Al-Muḥaddasī, who wrote (375/985) shortly after the Fāṭimid conquest, mentions the 'Amr mosque (al-Azhar), also one in al-Djazīra, in *Djīza* and in al-Ḳarāfa (198-200, 209; the *djāmiʿ* in al-Djazīra, also *Djāmiʿ Miḳyās* [cf. al-Makrīzī, iv, 75] is mentioned in an inscription of the year 485/1092; see van Berchem, *CIA*, i, no. 39). As these places were all originally separate towns, the principle was not abandoned that each town had only one *djāmiʿ*. The Fāṭimids, however, extended the use of Friday mosques and, in addition to those already mentioned, used the *djāmiʿ* al-Ḥākīm, al-Maḳs and Rāshīda (al-Makrīzī, iv, 2-3). Nāṣir-i Khusrāw in 439/1047 mentions in one passage the *djawāmiʿ* of Cairo, in another seven for Miṣr and fifteen in all (ed. Schefer, 134-5, 147). This was altered in 569/1173-4 by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn (see above), but the quarters, being still regarded as separate towns, retained their own Friday mosques (cf. for the year 607/1210-11 in al-Ḳarāfa, al-Makrīzī, iv, 86).

After the Friday worship in Egypt and Syria was freed from restriction, the number of *djawāmiʿ* increased very much. Ibn Duḳmāk (ca. 800/1397-8) gives a list of only eight *djawāmiʿ* in Cairo (ed. Vollers, 59-78), but this list is apparently only a fragment (in all, he mentions something over twenty in the part of his book that has survived); al-Makrīzī (d. 845/1442) gives 130 *djawāmiʿ* (iv, 2 ff.). In Damascus, where Ibn Djubayr still spoke of "the *djāmiʿ*", al-Nuʿaymī (d. 927/1521) gives twenty *djawāmiʿ* (*JA*, ser. 9, vii, 231 ff.), and according to Ibn Baṭṭūta, there were in all the villages in the region of Damascus *masājid djāmiʿa* (i, 236). The word *djāmiʿ* in al-Makrīzī always

means a mosque in which the Friday worship was held (vi, 76, 115 ff.), but by his time this meant any mosque of some size. He himself criticises the fact that since 799/1396-7 the *ṣalāt al-djum'a* was performed in al-Aḳmar, although another *djāmi'* stood close beside it (iv, 76; cf. also 86).

The great spread of Friday mosques was reflected in the language. While inscriptions of the 8th/14th century still call quite large mosques *masdjid*, in the 9th/15th most of them are called *djāmi'* (cf. on the whole question, van Berchem, *CIA*, i, 173-4); and while now the *madrassa* [q.v.] begins to predominate and is occasionally also called *djāmi'*, the use of the word *masdjid* becomes limited. While, generally speaking, it can mean any mosque (e.g. al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 137, of the Mu'ayyad mosque), it is more especially used of the smaller unimportant mosques. While Ibn Duḳmāk gives 472 *masādjid* in addition to the *djawāmi'*, *madāris*, etc., al-Maḳrīzī only gives nineteen, not counting al-Ḳarāfa, which probably only means that they were of little interest to him. *Djāmi'* is now on the way to become the regular name for a mosque of any size, as is now the usage, in Egypt and Turkey at least. In Ibn al-Hādīdj (d. 737/1336-7), *al-djawāmi'* is occasionally used in this general meaning in place of *al-masādjid* (*Madkhal*, ii, 50). Among the many Friday mosques, one was usually distinguished as the chief mosque; we therefore find the expression *al-djāmi' al-a'zam* (Ibn Baṭṭūta, ii, 54, 94; cf. the older expression *al-masdjid al-a'zam*, in *ibid.*, ii, 53). The principal *djāmi'* decided on such questions as the beginning and ending of the fast of Ramaḍān (*Madkhal*, ii, 68).

3. Other religious activities in the mosque. "The mentioning of the name of God" in the mosques, was not confined only in the official ritual ceremonies. Even in the time of the Prophet, we are told that he lodged *Thaḳāfi* delegates in the mosque so that they could see the rows of worshippers and hear the nightly recitation (al-Wāḳidī-Wellhausen, 382). Although this story (which is not given in Ibn Hiṣhām, 916) may simply be a reflection of later conditions, the recitation of the Ḳur'ān must have come to be considered an edifying and pious work at quite an early date. In the time of al-Muḳaddasī, the *ḳurrā'* of Naysābūr used to assemble on Fridays in the *djāmi'* in the early morning and recite till the *duḥā*, (328), and the same author tells us that in the Mosque of 'Amr in Egypt the *a'immat al-ḳurrā'* sat in circles every evening and recited (205). In the time of Ibn Djubayr, there were recitations of the Ḳur'ān in the Umayyad mosque after the *ṣalāt al-ṣubḥ* and every afternoon after the *ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr* (*Rihla*, 271-2). Besides the recitation of the Ḳur'ān, there were praises of God, etc., all that which is classed as *dhikr*, and which was particularly cultivated by Ṣūfism. This form of worship also took place in the mosque. The *ahl al-tawḥīd wa'l-ma'rifa* formed *madjālīs al-dhikr*, and assembled in the mosques (al-Makkī, *Kūl al-kulūb*, i, 152). In the Mosque of the Umayyads and other mosques of Damascus, *dhikr* was held during the morning on Friday (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 49). In the *Masdjid al-Aḳṣā* the Ḥanafīs held *dhikr*, and recited at the same time from a book (al-Muḳaddasī, 182). In Egypt, Aḥmad b. Tūlūn and Ḳhumāwarayh allowed twelve men quarters in a chamber near the minaret in order to praise God, and during the night, four of them took turns to praise God with recitations of the Ḳur'ān and with pious *ḳaṣīdas*. From the time of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, an orthodox *ʿakīda* was recited by the *mu'adhdhīns* in the night (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 48). Ibn al-Hādīdj demands that the recitation of the Ḳur'ān

aloud should take place in a mosque for the special purpose (*masdjid madjhūr*), as otherwise pious visitors are disturbed (*Madkhal*, ii, 53, 67). Mosques and, in particular, mausoleums, had as a rule regularly-appointed reciters of the Ḳur'ān. In addition there was, e.g. in Hebron and in a mosque in Damascus, a *shaykh* who had to read al-Buḳḥārī (or also Muslim) for three months (Sauvaire, *Hist. Jérus. et Hébr.*, 17; *JA*, ser. 9, iii. 261). In Tunis, al-Buḳḥārī was read daily in a hospital (al-Zarkashī, tr. Fagnan, *Rec. Soc. Arch. Constantine* [1894], 188).

Sermons were not only delivered at the *ṣalāt al-djum'a*. In 'Irāk, even in al-Muḳaddasī's time, one was preached every morning, according to the *sunna* of Ibn 'Abbās (130), it was said. Ibn Djubayr, in the Nizāmiyya in Baghdād, heard the *Shāfi'ī ra'īs* preach from the *minbar* on Friday after the 'aṣr. His sermon was accompanied by the skilled recitations of the *ḳurrā'* who sat on chairs; these were over twenty in number (Ibn Djubayr, 219-22). In the same way, the calls of the *mu'adhdhīns* to prayer to the Friday *ḳhuṭba* were delivered to a musical accompaniment (see below, I. H. 4). The unofficial sermons, which moreover were not delivered in mosques alone, were usually delivered by a special class, the *ḳuṣṣās* (pl. of *ḳāṣṣ*) (on these, cf. Goldziher, *Muh. Stud.*, ii, 161 ff.; Mez, *Die Renaissance des Islāms*, 314 ff.; and ḳāṣṣ). The *ḳuṣṣās*, who delivered edifying addresses and told popular stories, were early admitted to the mosques.

Tamīm al-Dārī is said to have been the first of these; in Medina in the caliphate of 'Umar before the latter's decease, he used to deliver his orations at the Friday *ṣalāt*, and under 'Umar he was allowed to talk twice a week in the mosque; in the reign of 'Alī and of Mu'āwiya the *ḳuṣṣās* were employed to curse the other side (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 16-7). In the Mosque of 'Amr in Cairo, by the year 38/658-9 or 39/659-60 a *ḳāṣṣ* was appointed, named Sulaym b. 'Itr al-Tudjībī, who was also *ḳādī* (*ibid.*, iv, 17, wrongly: Sulaymān; al-Kindī, *Governors and judges*, ed. Guest, 303-4). There are other occurrences of the combination of the two offices (Ibn Ḥudjāyra [d. 83/702], al-Kindī, 317; Ḳhayr b. Nu'aym in the year 120/738, *ibid.*, 348; cf. al-Suyūṭī, *Husn al-muḥādara*, i, 131, *Djabr*, according to Thawba b. Nimr, *Husn*, i, 130 below; Ibrāhīm b. Ishāḳ al-Ḳārī [d. 204], Kindī, 427; see also al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 18), which shows that the office of *ḳāṣṣ* was quite an official one. There is also evidence of the employment of *ḳuṣṣās* in the mosques of 'Irāk in the 'Abbāsīd period (Yāḳūt, *Udabā'*, iv, 268, v, 446). The *ḳāṣṣ* read from the Ḳur'ān standing and then delivered an explanatory and edifying discourse, the object of which was to instil the fear of God into the people (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 18). Under the Fāṭimīds also, the *ḳuṣṣās* were appointed to the mosques; for example in 403/1012-13 the *imām* undertook the office in the Mosque of 'Amr (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 18, below) and the rulers had also a *ḳāṣṣ* in the palace. The *ḳuṣṣās* were called *aṣḥāb al-ḳarāsī*, because they delivered their discourses on the *kursī* (al-Makkī, *Kūl al-kulūb*, i, 152; Ibn al-Hādīdj, *Madkhal*, i, 159; cf. al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 121). Their discourse was called *dhikr* or *wa'z* or *maw'iza*, whence the *ḳāṣṣ* was also called *muḥakkir* (al-Muḳaddasī, 205) or *wā'iz*. Specimens of their discourses are given by Ibn 'Abd Rabbiḥī (*al-'Ikd al-farīd*, Cairo 1321/1903, i, 294 ff.). It was not only the appointed officials who delivered such discourses in the mosque. Ascetics made public appearances in various mosques and collected interested hearers around them (cf. e.g. al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 135). In the *Djāmi'* al-Ḳarāfa, a whole society, the Banū *Djawḥarī*, delivered *wa'z* discourses from a *kursī* for three

months on end; their servant collected money in a begging-bowl during the discourse, and the *shaykh* distributed some of it among the poor (*ibid.*, iv, 121).

The *kaṣaṣ* was completely taken over by popular Ṣūfism and later writers would hardly reckon, as al-Makkī does, the "story-tellers" among the *mutakallimūn* (*Kūṭ al-ḳulūb*, i, 152). The whole system degenerated to trickery and charlatany of all kinds, as may be seen in the *Makāma* [*q.v.*] literature (cf. thereon Yākūt, *Uḍabāʿ*, vi, 167-8, and see also Mez and Goldziher, *op. cit.*). Al-Makrīzī therefore distinguishes between *al-kaṣaṣ al-khāṣṣa*, the regular and seemly edifying discourse in the mosque, and *al-kaṣaṣ al-ʿāmma*, which consisted in the people gathering round all kinds of speakers, which is *makrūh* (iv, 17). Others also have recorded their objections to the *kuṣṣāṣ*. Ibn al-Hādīdj utters a warning against them and wants to forbid their activities in the mosque completely, because they deliver "weak" narratives (*Madkhal*, i, 158-9; ii, 13-14, 50). He says that Ibn ʿUmar, Mālik and Abū Dāwūd rejected them and ʿAlī ejected them from the *masjid* of Baṣra. It is of little significance that al-Muʿtaḍid in 284/897 forbade people to gather round them, for he issued a similar interdict against the *fukahāʿ* and the reasons were evidently political (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 2165); it was for political reasons also, but with a very different motive, that ʿAḍud al-Dawla forbade their appearing publicly in Baghdād because they increased the tension between Sunnis and Shīʿis (Mez, *op. cit.*, 319). As late as 580/1184, the *wuʿāz* still flourished in the mosques of Baghdād, as is evident from the *Rihla* of Ibn Dījūbayr (219 ff., 224), and in the 9th/15th century there was in the Azhar mosque a *maḍjlis al-waʿz* as well as a *ḥalaḳ al-dhikr* (al-Makrīzī, iv, 54).

When Ibn al-Hādīdj denounces speaking aloud in the mosque, it is in the interest of the pious visitors who are engaged in religious works and meditation. *Iʿtikāf* [*q.v.*], retirement to a mosque for a period, was adopted into Islām from the older religions.

The word *akf* means in the Qurʾān the ceremonial worship of the object of the cult (sūra VII, 134; XX, 93, 97; XXI, 53; XXVI, 71; cf. al-Kumayt, *Hāshimīyyāt*, ed. Horovitz, 86, 15) and also the ritual stay in the sanctuary, which was done for example in the Meccan temple (sūra II, 119; XXII, 25). In this connection, it is laid down in the Qurʾān that in the month of Ramaḍān believers must not touch their wives "while ye pass the time in the mosques" (*ʿakifūn fi ʿl-masājid*, sūra II, 183), an expression which shows, firstly, that there were already a number of mosques in the lifetime of the Prophet, and secondly, that these had already to some extent taken over the character of the temple. The connection with the early period is evident from a *hadīth*, according to which the Prophet decides that ʿUmar must carry out a vow of *iʿtikāf* for one night in the Masjid al-Harām made in the Dījhīliyya (al-Bukhārī, *Iʿtikāf*, bāb 5, 15-16; *Farḍ al-khums*, bāb 19; *Maghāzī*, bāb 54; *Aymān wa ʿl-nuḍhūr*, bāb 29). It is completely in keeping with this that the Prophet, according to the *hadīth*, used to spend ten days of the month of Ramaḍān in *iʿtikāf* in the mosque of Medina (al-Bukhārī, *Iʿtikāf*, bāb 6; *Faḍl Laylat al-kadar*, bāb 3), and in the year in which he died, as many as twenty days (*ibid.*, *Iʿtikāf*, bāb 17). During this period, the mosque was full of booths of palm branches and leaves in which the *ʿakifūn* lived (*ibid.*, bāb 13; cf. 6, 7). The Prophet only went to his house for some very special reason (*ibid.*, bāb 3). This custom was associated with the ascetism of the monks. The faithful were vexed, when on one occasion he received

Ṣafīyya in his booth and chatted for an hour with her (al-Bukhārī, *Farḍ al-khums*, bāb 4; *Iʿtikāf*, bāb 8, 11, 12). According to another tradition, his *iʿtikāf* was broken on another occasion by his wives putting up their tents beside him, and he postponed his *iʿtikāf* till Shawwāl (al-Bukhārī, *Iʿtikāf*, bābs 6, 7, 14, 18). According to Zayd b. ʿAlī, the *iʿtikāf* can only be observed in a chief mosque (*djāmiʿ*) (*Corpus iuris di Zaid b. ʿAlī*, no. 447). During the early period, it was one of the initiatory rites for new converts. In the year 14/1635 ʿUmar ordered the retreat (*al-ḳiyām*) in the mosques during the month of Ramaḍān for the people of Medina and the provinces (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2377). The custom persisted and has always been an important one among ascetics. "The man who retires for a time to the mosque devotes himself in turn to *ṣalāt*, recitation of the Qurʾān, meditation, *dhikr*, etc." says Ibn al-Hādīdj (*Madkhal*, ii, 50). There were pious people who spent their whole time in a mosque (*akāmū fīhi*; al-Makrīzī, iv, 87, 97); of one we were told that he spent his time in the *manāra* of the Mosque of ʿAmr (*iʿtakafa*, *ibid.*, 44). Al-Samhūdī says that during the month of Ramaḍān, he spent day and night in the mosque (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 95). Saʿd al-Dīn (d. 644/1246-7) spent the month of Ramaḍān in the Mosque of the Umayyads without speaking (Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, ii, 192). Nocturnal vigils in the mosque very early became an established practice in Islam. According to *Hadīth*, the Prophet frequently held nocturnal *ṣalāts* in the mosque with the believers (al-Bukhārī, *Djumʿa*, bāb 29), and by his orders ʿAbd Allāh b. Unays al-Anṣārī came from the desert for twenty-three successive nights to pass the night in his mosque in rites of worship (Ibn Kūṭayba, *Maʿārif*, ed. Wüstenfeld, 142-3). Out of this developed the *tahādīdjūd* [*q.v.*] *ṣalāt*, particularly recommended in the law and notably the *tarāwīḥ ṣalāts* [*q.v.*]. In Dihlī on these occasions, women singers actually took part (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, iii, 155).

During the nights of the month of Ramaḍān, there were festivals in the mosques, and on other occasions also, such as the New Year, sometimes at the new moon, and in the middle of the month. The mosque on these occasions was illuminated: there was eating and drinking; incense was burned and *dhikr* and *ḳirāʿa* performed.

The Friday *ṣalāt* was particularly solemn in Ramaḍān, and in the Fātimid period, the caliph himself delivered the *ḳhuṭba* (see al-Makrīzī, ii, 345 ff.; Ibn Taghribirdī, ii/1, ed. Juynboll, 482-6, ii/2, ed. Popper, 331-3). The mosques associated with a saint had and still have their special festivals on his *mawlid* [*q.v.*]; they also are celebrated with *dhikr*, *ḳirāʿa*, etc. (cf. Lane, *Manners and customs*, chs. xxiv ff.). The saint's festivals are usually local and there are generally differences in the local customs. In the Maghrib, for example, in certain places the month of Ramaḍān is opened with a blast of trumpets from the *manābir* (*Madkhal*, ii, 69).

The mosque thus on the whole took over the role of the temple. The rulers from ʿUmar onwards dedicated gifts to the Kaʿba (Ibn al-Fakīh, 20-1, and BGA, iv, *Indices, glossarium*, s.v. *shamsa*), and, as in other sanctuaries, we find women vowing children to the service of the mosque (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, bāb 74; al-Makrīzī, iv, 20). *Tawāf* was performed, as at the Kaʿba, in mosques with saints' tombs as is still done, e.g. in Hebron; Muḍjīr al-Dīn sees a pre-Islamic custom in this (Sauvaire, *Hist. Jérus. et Hébron*, 5). Especially important business was done here. In times of trouble, the people go to the mosque to pray for help, for example during drought, for which there is

a special *ṣalāt* (which however usually takes place on the *muṣallā*) [see 1515KĀ²], in misfortunes of all kinds (e.g. Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 19-20; al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 57); in time of plague and pestilence, processions, weeping and praying with Ḳurʿāns uplifted, were held in the mosques or on the *muṣallā*, in which even Jews and Christians sometimes took part (Ibn Taghribirdī, ii/2, ed. Popper, 67; Ibn Baṭṭūta, i, 243-4, cf. Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, ii/1, 35, 40; ii/2, 199) or for a period a sacred book like al-Bukhārī's *Ṣaḥīḥ* was recited (Quatremère, *op. cit.* ii/2, 35; al-Djabartī, *Merveilles biographiques*, French tr., vi, 13). In the courtyards of the mosques in Jerusalem and Damascus in the time of Ibn Baṭṭūta, solemn penance was done on the day of ʿArafa (i, 243-4), an ancient custom which had already been introduced into Egypt in the year 27/647-8 by ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Marwān (*kuʿūd* after the ʿaṣr; cf. al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 50). Certain mosques were visited by barren women (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 133). An oath is particularly binding if it is taken in a mosque (cf. J. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten*, 144); this is particularly true of the Kaʿba, where written covenants were also drawn up to make them more binding (*ibid.*, 143-4, *Chron. Mekka*, i, 160-1). It is in keeping with this idea of an oath that Jews who had adopted Islam in Cairo had to take oaths in a synagogue which had become a mosque (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 265). The contract of matrimony (*ʿaḳd al-nikāḥ*) also is often concluded in a mosque (Santillana, *Il Muḥtaṣar*, ii, 548; *Madkhal*, ii, 72 below; Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka*, ii, 163-4), and the particular form of divorce which is completed by the *liʿān* [q.v.] takes place in the mosque (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, bāb 44; cf. Pedersen, *Der Eid*, 114).

It is disputed whether a corpse may be brought into the mosque and the *ṣalāt al-djīnāza* performed there. According to one *ḥadīth*, the bier of Saʿd b. Abī Waḳḳāṣ was taken into the mosque at the request of the Prophet's widow and the *ṣalāt* held there. Many disapproved of this, but ʿĀʾiṣha pointed out that the Prophet had done this with the body of Suhayl b. Bayḍāʾ (Muslim, *Djānāʾiz*, tr. 34; cf. also Ibn Saʿd, i/1, 14-15). The discussion on this point is not unconnected with the discussions regarding the worship of tombs. In theory, this is permitted by al-Shāfiʿī, while the others forbid it (see Juynboll, *Handbuch*, 170; I. Guidi, *Il Muḥtaṣar*, i, 151). The matter does not seem to be quite clear, for Ḳuṭb al-Dīn says that only Abū Hanīfa forbids it, but he himself thought that it might be allowable on the authority of a statement by Abū Yūsuf (*Chron. Mekka*, iii, 208-10). In any case, it was a very general practice to allow it, as Ḳuṭb al-Dīn also points out. ʿUmar conducted the funeral *ṣalāt* for Abū Bakr in the Mosque of the Prophet and ʿUmar's own dead body was brought there; later it became a general custom to perform the ceremony in Medina close to the Prophet's tomb and in Mecca at the door of the Kaʿba; some even made a sevenfold *ṭawāf* with the corpse around the Kaʿba. This was for a time forbidden by Marwān b. al-Ḥakam and later by ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Azīz (Ḳuṭb al-Dīn, *loc. cit.*, Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 77). The custom was very early introduced into the Mosque of ʿAmr (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 7, 1 ff.). That later scholars often went wrong about the prohibition is not at all remarkable; for it is not at all in keeping with the ever-increasing tendency to found mosques at tombs. Even Ibn al-Ḥādīdj, who was anxious to maintain the prohibition, is not quite sure and really only forbids the loud calling of the *ḳurraʿ*, *dhākirūn*, *mukabbirūn* and *murīdūn* on such occasions (*Madkhal*, ii, 50-1, 64, 81). When a son of Sultan al-Muʿayyad died and was buried in the eastern *ḳubba* of

the Muʿayyad mosque, the *ḫaṭīb* delivered a *ḫuṭba* and conducted the *ṣalāt* thereafter and the *ḳurraʿ* recited for a week at the grave, while the *amīrs* paid their visits to the grave (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 240, 2 ff.). In Persia, it was the custom for the family of the deceased to sit in the mosque for three days after the death and receive visits of condolence (al-Muḳaddasī, 440 below).

4. Mosques as objects of pilgrimage. As soon as the mosque became a regular sanctuary, it became the object of pious visits. This holds especially true of the memorial mosques associated with the Prophet and other saints. Among them, three soon became special objects of pilgrimage. In a *ḥadīth* the Prophet says "One should only mount into the saddle to visit three mosques: al-Masdjid al-Ḥarām, the Mosque of the Prophet and al-Masdjid al-Aḳṣā" (al-Bukhārī, *Faḍl al-ṣalāt fī masdjid Makka wa 'l-Madīna*, bāb 16; *Djāzaʾ al-ṣayd*, bāb 26; *Ṣawm*, bāb 67; Muslim, *Ḥādīdj*, tr. 93; *Chron. Mekka*, i, 303). This *ḥadīth* reflects a practice which only became established at the end of the ʿUmayyad period. The pilgrimage to Mecca had been made a duty by the prescription of the *ḥādīdj* in the Ḳurʿān. The pilgrimage to Jerusalem was a Christian custom which could very easily be continued, on account of the significance of *al-Masdjid al-Aḳṣā* in the Ḳurʿān. This custom became particularly important when ʿAbd al-Malik made it a substitute for the pilgrimage to Mecca (al-Yaʿqūbī, *Taʾrīḫh*, ii, 311). Although this competition did not last long, the significance of Jerusalem was thereby greatly increased. Pilgrimage to Medina developed out of the increasing veneration for the Prophet. In the year 140/757-8, Abū Djaʿfar al-Manṣūr on his *ḥādīdj* visited the three sanctuaries (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 129) and this became a very usual custom. Mecca and Medina, however, still held the preference. Although those of Mecca and Jerusalem were recognised as the two oldest (the one is said to be 40 years older than the other; Muslim, *Masāʾid*, tr. 1; *Chron. Mekka*, i, 301), the Prophet is however reputed to have said "A *ṣalāt* in this mosque is more meritorious than 1,000 *ṣalāts* in others, even in *al-Masdjid al-Ḥarām*" (al-Bukhārī, *Faḍl al-ṣalāt fī masdjid Makka wa 'l-Madīna*, bāb 1; Muslim, *Ḥādīdj*, tr. 89; *Chron. Mekka*, i, 303). The *ḥadīth* is aimed directly against Jerusalem and therefore probably dates from the Umayyad period. According to some, it was pronounced because someone had commended performing the *ṣalāt* in Jerusalem, which the Prophet was against (Muslim, *loc. cit.*; al-Wāḳidī-Wellhausen, 349). The three mosques, however, retained their pride of place (Ibn Ḳhaldūn, *Muḳaddima*, faṣṡ 4, 6; Ibn al-Ḥādīdj, *Madkhal*, ii, 55), and as late as 662/1264 we find Baybars founding *awḳāf* for pilgrims who wished to go on foot to Jerusalem (Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, i/1, 248).

Although these three mosques officially hold a special position, others also are highly recommended, e.g. the mosque in Ḳubāʾ [see AL-MADĪNA]. A *ṣalāt* in this mosque is said to be as valuable as an *ʿumra* or two visits to the mosque in Jerusalem (al-Diyarbakrī, *Ḳhamīs*, i, 381-2). Attempts were also made to raise the mosque of Kūfa to the level of the three. ʿAlī is said to have told someone who wanted to make a pilgrimage from Kūfa to Jerusalem that he should stick by the mosque of his native town, it was "one of the four mosques" and two *rakʿas* in it were equal to ten in others (Ibn al-Faḳīh, 173-4; Yāḳūt, *Muʿdjam*, iv, 325); in another tradition, *ṣalāts* in the provincial mosques are said to be generally worth as much as the pilgrimage (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 4), and traditions arose about the special blessings associated at definite times

with different holy places of Islam (al-Muḳaddasī, 183) and especially about their superior merits (Ibn al-Faḳīh, 174). The Meccan sanctuary, however, always retained first place, which was marked by the *ḥaḍjī*. It was imitated by al-Mutawakkil in Sāmarrā': he built a Ka'ba as well as a Minā and an 'Arafa there and made his *amīrs* perform their *ḥaḍjī* there (al-Muḳaddasī, 122).

D. The component parts and furnishings of the mosque.

1. The development of the edifice. Except in the case of Mecca the earliest mosques as described above (B. 1) were at first simply open spaces marked off by a *zulla*. The space was sometimes, as in al-Fuṣṭāt, planted with trees and usually covered with pebbles, e.g. in Medina (Muslim, *Ḥaḍjī*, tr. 95; al-Balādhurī, 6) and Fuṣṭāt (al-Makrīzī, iv, 8; Ibn Duḳmāk, iv, 62; Ibn Taghribirdī, i, 77), which was later introduced in Baṣra and Kūfa, the courtyards of which were otherwise dusty (al-Balādhurī, 277, 348). These conditions could only last so long as the Arabs retained their ancient customs as a closed group in their simple camps. The utilisation of churches was the first sign of a change and was rapidly followed by a mingling with the rest of the population and the resulting assimilation with older cultures.

'Umar made alterations in the mosques in Medina and in Mecca also. He extended the Mosque of the Prophet by taking in the house of 'Abbās; but like the Prophet, he still built with *labin*, palm trunks and leaves and extended the booths (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 62; al-Balādhurī, 6). In Mecca also, his work was confined to extending the area occupied by the mosque. He bought the surrounding houses and took them down and then surrounded the area with a wall to the height of a man: the Ka'ba was thus given its *finā'* like the mosque in Medina (al-Balādhurī, 46; *Chron. Mekka*, i, 306; Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 68). 'Uthmān also extended these two mosques, but introduced an important innovation in using hewn stone and plaster (*ḍjās*) for the walls and pillars. For the roof he used teak (*sāḍī*). The booths, which had been extended by 'Umar, were replaced by him by pillared halls (*arwiḳa*, sing. *riwāk*) and the walls were covered with plaster (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 62; al-Balādhurī, 46; Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 70). Sa'd b. Abī Waḳḳāṣ is said to have already taken similar steps to relieve the old simplicity of the barely-equipped mosque in Kūfa. The *zulla* consisted of pillars of marble adorned in the style of Byzantine churches (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2489; Yāḳūt, iv, 324).

This was little in keeping with the simple architecture of the original town, for Baṣra and Kūfa had originally been built of reeds and only after several great fires were they built of *labin* (see above, I. B. 1; cf. Ibn Ḳutayba, *Ma'arīf*, ed. Wüstenfeld, 279). As to Kūfa, Sa'd by 'Umar's orders extended the mosque so that it became joined up with the *Dār al-Imāra*. A Persian named Rūzbih b. Buzurdjmīhr was the architect for this. He used fired bricks (*āḍjurr*) for the building, which he brought from Persian buildings, and in the mosque he used pillars which had been taken from churches in the region of Ḥīra belonging to the Persian kings; these columns were not erected at the sides but only against the *ḳibla* wall. The original plan of the mosque was therefore still retained, although the pillared hall, which is identical with the *zulla* already mentioned (200 *ḍhīrā'*s broad), replaced the simple booth, and the materials were better in every way (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2491-2, 2494). Already under the early caliphs we can therefore note the beginnings of the adoption of a more advanced architecture.

These tendencies were very much developed under the Umayyads. Even as early as the reign of Mu'āwiya, the mosque of Kūfa was rebuilt by his governor Ziyād. He commissioned a pagan architect, who had worked for Kisrā, to do the work. The latter had pillars brought from al-Ahwāz, bound them together with lead and iron clamps to a height of 30 *ḍhīrā'*s and put a roof on them. Similar halls, built of columns (here like the old booth in Medina called *suffa*: al-Ṭabarī, i, 2492, 14; but also *zulla*, plur. *zilāl*: al-Ṭabarī, ii, 259-60) were added by him on the north, east and western wall. Each pillar cost him 18,000 *dirhams*. The mosque could now hold 60,000 instead of 40,000 (idem, i, 2492, 6 ff., cf. 2494, 7; Yāḳūt, iv, 324, 1 ff.; al-Balādhurī, 276). Al-Ḥaḍjīdāḍj also added to the mosque (Yāḳūt, iv, 325-6). Ziyād did similar work in Baṣra. Here also he extended the mosque and built it of stone (or brick) and plaster and with pillars from al-Ahwāz, which were roofed with teak. We are told that he made *al-suffa al-muḳaddima*, i.e. the *ḳibla* hall, with 5 columns. This seems to show that the other sides also—as in Kūfa—had pillared halls. He erected the *Dār al-Imāra* close to the *ḳibla* side. This was taken down by al-Ḥaḍjīdāḍj, rebuilt by others, and finally taken into the mosque by Hārūn al-Rashīd (al-Balādhurī, 347, 348 above, 349; Yāḳūt, i, 642, 643). In Mecca also in the same period similar buildings were erected. Ibn al-Zubayr and al-Ḥaḍjīdāḍj both extended the mosque, and Ibn al-Zubayr was the first to put a roof on the walls; the columns were gilded by 'Abd al-Malik and he made a roof of teak (*Chron. Mekka*, i, 307, 309). The Mosque of 'Amr was extended in 53/673 with Mu'āwiya's permission by his governor Maslama b. Muḳhallad to the east and north; the walls were covered with plaster (*nūra*) and the roofs decorated; it is evident from this that here also the original booth of the south side was altered to a covered hall during the early Umayyad period. A further extension was made in 79/698 in the reign of 'Abd al-Malik (al-Makrīzī, iv, 7, 8; Ibn Duḳmāk, iv, 62). Thus we find that during the early Umayyad period, and in part even earlier, the original simple and primitive mosques were in some cases extended, in other cases altered. The alteration consisted in the old simple booth of the Mosque of the Prophet being gradually enlarged and transformed into a pillared hall with the assistance of the arts of countries possessing a higher degree of civilisation. In this way, what had originally been an open place of assembly developed imperceptibly into a court, surrounded by pillared halls. Very soon a fountain was put in the centre of the court, and we now have the usual type of mosque. The same plan is found in the peristyle of the houses and in the *aitrion* of a basilica like that of Tyre (Herzog-Hauch, *Realencyclopädie*³, x, 780).

The great builders of the Umayyads, 'Abd al-Malik and his son al-Walīd I, made even more radical progress. The former entirely removed the original mosque in Jerusalem, and his Byzantine architects erected the Dome of the Rock as a Byzantine building (cf. Sauvaire, *Jérus. et Hébron*, 48 ff.). Al-Walīd likewise paid equally little attention to the oldest form of mosque, when, in Damascus, he had the church of St. John transformed by Byzantine architects into the Mosque of the Umayyads. As al-Muḳaddasī distinctly states, they wanted to rival the splendours of the Christian churches (159). The new mosques, which were founded in this period, were therefore not only no longer simple, but they were built with the help of Christians and other trained craftsmen with the use of material already existing in older buildings. Al-Ḥaḍjīdāḍj, for example, used materials from the sur-

rounding towns when building his foundation of Wāsiṭ (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 321; al-Balādhurī, 290). Columns from churches were now used quite regularly (e.g. in Damascus: al-Mas'ūdī, *Murūdj*, iii, 408 = § 1292; Ramla: al-Muḳaddasī, 165; cf. al-Balādhurī, 143 ff.; for Egypt, see al-Makrīzī, iv, 36, 124-5). Sometimes, remains of the older style remained alongside the new. In Irānshahr, al-Muḳaddasī found in the chief mosque wooden columns of the time of Abū Muslim along with round columns of brick of the time of 'Amr b. al-Layṭh (316). The building activities of al-Walīd extended to Fuṣṭāṭ, Mecca and Medina (cf. Ibn al-Faḳīh, 106-7) where no fundamental alterations were made, but complete renovations were carried out. With these rulers, the building of mosques reaches the level of older architecture and gains a place in the history of art. There is also literary evidence for the transfer of a style from one region to another. In Iṣṭakhr, for example, there was a *djāmi'* in the style of the Syrian mosques with round columns, on which was a *baḳara* (al-Muḳaddasī, iii, 436-7; cf. for Shīrāz, 430). Al-Walīd also rebuilt the Mosque of the Prophet, in part in the Damascus style (*ibid.*, 80; al-Ḳazwīnī, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii, 71).

This revolution naturally did not take place without opposition, any more than the other innovations, which Islam adopted in the countries with a higher culture which it conquered. After the Mosque of the Prophet had been beautified by Christian architects with marble, mosaics, shells, gold, etc. and al-Walīd in 93/712 was inspecting the work, an old man said: "We used to build in the style of mosques; you build in the style of churches" (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 74). The discussions on this point are reflected in *ḥadīths*. When 'Umar enlarged the Mosque of the Prophet, he is reported to have said: "Give the people shelter from the rain, but take care not to make them red or yellow lest you lead the people astray", while Ibn 'Abbās said: "You shall adorn them with gold as the Jews and Christians do" (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 62). Ibn 'Abbās here takes up the Umayyad attitude and 'Umar that of old-fashioned people, according to whom any extension or improvement of the *zulla* was only permissible for strictly practical reasons. The conservative point of view is predominant in *Ḥadīth*. It is said that extravagant adornment of the mosques is a sign of the end of the world; the works of al-Walīd were only tolerated from fear of the *fitna* (Ibn Hanbal, *Musnad*, iii, 134, 145, 152, 230, 283; al-Nasā'ī, *Masāḍīd*, *bāb* 2; Ibn Mādja, *Masāḍīd*, *bāb* 2). The lack of confidence of pious conservatives in the great mosques finds expression in a *ḥadīth*, according to which the Prophet (according to Anas) said: "A time will come over my *umma* when they will vie with one another in the beauty of their mosques; then they will visit them but little" (al-'Askalānī, *Fath al-Bārī*, i, 362). In *fiqh*, we even find divergence from the oldest quadrangular form of the mosque condemned (Guidi, *Il Muḥṭasar*, i, 71). Among the types which arose later was the "suspended" (*mu'allak*), i.e. a mosque situated in an upper storey (e.g. in Damascus, *JA*, ser. 9, vol. v, 409, 415, 422, 424, 427, 430).

2. Details of the component parts and equipment of the mosque. — a. The Minaret [see on this, *MANĀRA*]. — b. The Chambers. The old mosque consisted of the courtyard and the open halls running along the walls: these were called *al-mughattā* (al-Muḳaddasī, 82, 158, 165, 182) because they were roofed over. When we are told that in Palestine, except in Jericho, towers were placed between the *mughattā* and the courtyard (*ibid.*,

182), this seems to suggest that the halls were closed, which would be quite in keeping with the winter climate of this region. The halls were particularly extensive on the *ḳibla* side, because assemblies were held here. The space between two rows of pillars was called *riwāk*, pl. *arwiḳa* or *riwākāt* (*ibid.*, 158, 159; al-Makrīzī, iv, 10, 11, 12, 49). Extension often took the form of increasing the number of the *arwiḳa*. In some districts, a sail-cloth was spread over the open space as a protection from the sun at the time of the worship (al-Muḳaddasī, 205, 430).

The courtyard was called *ṣahn*. The open space around the Ka'ba is called *Finā'* *al-Ka'ba* (*Chron. Mekka*, i, 307; Ibn Hishām, 822; cf. *Finā'* *Zamzam*: Yāḳūt, *Udabā'*, vi, 376). *Finā'* is also the name given to the open space around the mosque (al-Makrīzī, iv, 6). Trees were often planted in the courtyard: e.g. in the mosque of 'Amr (see above, I. B. 1; when we read in al-Makrīzī, iv, 6, that it had no *ṣahn*, this probably means that this space, planted with trees, between the covered halls was very narrow). In Medina, at the present day, there are still trees in the *Rawḍa* (al-Batanūnī, *Rihla*, 249); in Ibn Djubayr's time there were 15 palms there (*Rihla*, 194). Other mosques in Cairo had trees growing in them (al-Makrīzī, iv, 54, 64, 65, 120; in al-Masdjid al-Kāfurī, there were as many as 516 trees: *ibid.*, 266), as is still the case today. In other cases the court was covered with pebbles (see above, I. D. 1); but this was altered with a more refined style of architecture. Al-Muḳaddasī mentions that this was only found in Tiberias, out of all the mosques in Palestine (182). Frequently, as in Ramla, the halls were covered with marble and the courtyard with flat stone (*ibid.*, 165). In the halls also, the ground was originally bare or covered with little stones; for example in the mosques of 'Amr until Maslama b. Mukhallad covered it with mats (see below). The floor of the Mosque of 'Amr was entirely covered with marble in the Mamlūk period (al-Makrīzī, iv, 13-14, cf. in Shīrāz, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, ii, 53). But in the mosque of Mecca, the *ṣahn* is still covered with little stones (al-Batanūnī, *Rihla*, 99 below); 400 *dīnārs* used to be spent annually on this (*Chron. Mekka*, ii, 10-11). In Medina also, little pebbles were used (Ibn Djubayr, *Rihla*, 190; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, i, 263).

There were not at first enclosed chambers in the halls. A change in this respect came with the introduction of the *maḳṣūra* (on this word, cf. Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, i/1, 164, n. 46). This was a box or compartment for the ruler built near the *mihrāb*. Al-Samhūdī gives the history of the *maḳṣūra* in Medina (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 71-2, 89). The traditions all agree that the *maḳṣūra* was introduced to protect the ruler from hostile attacks. According to some authorities, 'Uṭmān built a *maḳṣūra* of *labin* with windows, so that the people could see the *imām* of the community (*ibid.*, and al-Makrīzī, iv, 7). According to another tradition, Marwān b. al-Ḥakam, governor of Medina after an attempt had been made on him by a Yamanī in the year 44/664, was the first to build a *maḳṣūra* of dressed stone with a window (al-Balādhurī, 6 below; al-Ṭabarī, ii, 70). Mu'āwiya is then said to have followed his example. Others, again, say that Mu'āwiya was the first to introduce this innovation. He is said to have introduced the *maḳṣūrāt* with the accompanying guard as early as the year 40/660-1 or not till 44/664-5 after the Khāridjī attempt (al-Ṭabarī, i, 3463, 9; Ibn al-Faḳīh, 109, 3; al-Makrīzī, iv, 12, 11 ff.); according to one story because he had seen a dog on the *minbar* (al-Bayhaḳī, ed. Schwally, 393 below; cf. on the whole question, H. Lammens, *Mo'āwiya*, 202 ff.). This much seems to be certain,

that the *maḡṣūra* was at any rate introduced at the beginning of the Umayyad period, and it was an arrangement so much in keeping with the increasing dignity of the ruler that, as Ibn *Khaldūn* says, it spread throughout all the lands of Islam (*Muḡaddima*, Cairo 1322/1904-5, 212-13, *faṣl* 37). The governors built themselves compartments in the principal mosques of the provinces, e.g. Ziyād in Kūfa and Baṣra (al-Balādhurī, 277, 348) and probably Qurra b. *Sharīk* in Fustāt (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 12). In Medina, we are told that ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz as governor (86-93/705-12) raised the *maḡṣūra* and built it of teak, but al-Mahdī had it taken down in 160/777 and a new one built on the level of the ground (*ibid.*, 7; Wüstenfeld, *op. cit.*; al-Balādhurī, 7 centre). We are further told that in 161/778, al-Mahdī prohibited the *maḡṣūr* of the provinces, and al-Maʿmūn even wanted to clear all the boxes out of the *masājjid ḡjamiʿa*, because their use was a *sunna* introduced by Muʿāwiya (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 12; al-Yaʿqūbī, *Taʿrīkh*, ii, 571). But this attempt did not succeed. On the contrary, their numbers rapidly increased. In Cairo, for example, the *ḡjamiʿ* al-ʿAskar built in 169/785-6 had a *maḡṣūra* (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 33 ff.) and the mosque of Ibn Tūlūn had a *maḡṣūra* beside the *miḡrāb* which was accessible from the *Dār al-Imāra* (*ibid.*, 36, 37, 42; Ibn Taghrībirdī, ii, 8, 14). The *maḡṣūra* was found in the larger mosques. In the *ḡjamiʿ* al-Ḳalʿa, Muḡammad b. Ḳalāwūn in 718/1318 built a *maḡṣūra* of iron for the sultan's *ṣalāt* (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 132). According to Ibn *Khaldūn*, the *maḡṣūra* was an innovation peculiar to the Islamic world. The question must however be left open, whether in its introduction and development there may not be some connection with the boxes of the Byzantine court, at least, for example, when the Turks in the *Yeshil ḡjamiʿ* in Bursa put the sultan's box over the door (R. Hartmann, *Im neuen Anatolien*, 27).

Although the *maḡṣūra* was introduced with the object of segregating the ruler and was therefore condemned by the strict as contrary to the spirit of Islam (e.g. *Madkhal*, ii, 43-4), *maḡṣūr* were probably introduced for other purposes. Ibn *Djubayr* mentions three in the Mosque of the Umayyads: the old one built by Muʿāwiya in the eastern part of the mosque, one in the centre, which contained the *minbar*, and one in the west where the Ḥanafīs taught and performed the *ṣalāt*. There were also other small rooms shut off by wooden lattices, which could be sometimes called *maḡṣūra* and sometimes *zāwiya*. As a rule, there were quite a number of *zāwiyas* connected with the mosque which were used by students (*Riḡla*, 265-6). We find the same state of affairs in other mosques.

While the groups of the *ḡurrā*², the students, the lawyers, etc. had originally to sit together in a common room, gradually the attempt was made to introduce separate rooms for some of them. Small compartments were either cut off in the main chamber or new rooms were built in subsidiary buildings. In the former case, we get the already mentioned *maḡṣūr* or *zawāyā*. Ibn al-*Hādīdj* says that a *madrassa* was often made by the simple process of cutting off a part of the mosque by a balustrade (*darbazīn*) (*Madkhal*, ii, 44). Thus in the halls of the Mosque of ʿAmr there were several compartments for teaching, which were called *maḡṣūra* and *zāwiya*, in which studies were prosecuted (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 20, 16, 25). In the Azhar Mosque, a *maḡṣurat Faṡīma* was made in the time of the Faṡimids, where she had appeared, and the *amīrs* in the following period made a large number of such *maḡṣūr* (*ibid.*, 52, 53). In the Aḡṣā Mosque about 300/912-13, there were three *maḡṣūras* for women (Ibn al-Faḡīh, 100).

These divisions might be a nuisance at the great Friday assemblies, and this is why al-Mahdī wanted to remove them in 161/778 from the *masājjid al-ḡjamāʿat* (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 486), and Ibn al-*Hādīdj* condemned them as works of the *mulk* and numbers them like other embellishments with the *ashrāt al-sāʿa* (*Madkhal*, ii, 43-4).

The *muʿadhḡhins* not only lived in the minarets, where, at any rate in the Tūlūnid period, they held vigils (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 48). They had rooms (*ḡhuraf*, sing. *ḡhurfa*) on the roof and these rooms in time came to be numerous (*ibid.*, 13, 14). All kinds of rooms were put in subsidiary buildings, for the *ḡhaṡīb* (*ibid.*, 13), for judges, for studies, etc. In addition, there were dwelling-houses, not only for the staff but also for others. As already mentioned, devout men used to take up their residence in the mosque for a considerable period for *iʿtikāf* and any one at any time could take up his quarters in the mosque; he could sleep there and make himself at home. It therefore came quite natural to the devout to reside permanently in the mosque. Ascetics often lived in the minaret (see above), a *zāhid* lived on the roof of the Azhar mosque, others made themselves cells in the mosque, as a *shayḡh* in Naṣībīn did (Ibn *Djubayr*, *Riḡla*, 240; cf. in Ḥarrān, 245) and as happened in Ṣalāḡ al-Dīn's time in the Mosque of the Umayyads (Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, ii, 182). It was, however, very usual for them to live in the side rooms of the mosque, as was the case for example, in the Mosque of the Umayyads (Ibn *Djubayr*, 269; Ibn Baṡṡūta, i, 206). In particularly holy mosques like that in Hebron, houses for *al-muʿtakifūn* were built around the sacred place (Sauvaire, *Hist. Jérus. et Hébron*, 11-12) and also beside the *Masjjid Yūnis* at the ancient Niniveh (al-Muḡaddasī, 146). Kitchens were therefore erected with the necessary mills and ovens and cooked food (*ḡjashīsha*) and 14-15,000 loaves (*raḡḡif*) were daily distributed to those who stayed there and to visitors (Sauvaire, 20; cf. Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, i/1, 231). Bread was also baked in the mosque of Ibn Tūlūn (Quatremère, *op. cit.*, i/1, 233) and kitchens were often found in the mosques (for al-Azhar, see al-*Djabartī*, *Merveilles*, iii, 238-9; Sulaymān Raṣad, *Kanz al-ḡjawhar fī taʿrīkh al-Azhar*, 71 ff., 107 ff.). Those who lived in and beside the mosque were called *muḡḡawirūn* (cf. al-Muḡaddasī, 146; for Jerusalem, Nāṣir-i *Ḳhusraw*, 82, 91; for Mecca, Ibn *Djubayr*, 149; for Medina, Ibn Baṡṡūta, i, 279, where we learn that they were organised under a *ḡadīm*, like the North Africans under an *amīn* in Damascus; Ibn *Djubayr*, 277-8). They were pious ascetics, students and sometimes travellers. The students generally found accommodation in the *madāris*, but large mosques like that of the Umayyads or al-Azhar had always many students, who lived in them. The name of the halls, *riwāḡ*, was later used for these students' lodgings (cf. van Berchem, *CIA*, i, 43, n. 1; perhaps al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 54, 23). Strangers always found accommodation in the mosques (cf. above, I. C. 1). In smaller towns, it was the natural thing for the traveller to spend the night in the mosque and to get food there (Yāḡūt, iii, 385; al-Ḳifṡī, *Taʿrīkh al-Huḡamā*², ed. Lippert, 252). Travellers like Nāṣir-i *Ḳhusraw*, Ibn *Djubayr*, Ibn Baṡṡūta and al-ʿAbdarī (*JA*, ser. 5, iv [1854], 174) were able to travel throughout the whole Muslim world from one mosque (or *madrassa* or *ribāṡ*) to the other. The traveller could even leave his money for safe keeping in a mosque (*Safar-nāma*, 51). Large endowments were bequeathed for those who lived in the mosques (Ibn *Djubayr*, *op. cit.*; Ibn Taghrībirdī, ii/2, 105 f.).

In later times, the rulers often built a lodge or pavilion (*manzara*) in or near the mosque (al-Maḳrīzī, ii, 345; iv, 13; cf. on the word, Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, ii/2, 15).

There was often a special room with a clock in the mosques; this also is probably an inheritance from the church, for Ibn Rusta talks of similar arrangements in Constantinople (126 above). Ibn Ḍjubayr (270) describes very fully the clock in the Mosque of the Umayyads (cf. *JA*, ser. 9, vii, 205-6). It was made in the reign of Nūr al-Dīn by Faḫr al-Dīn b. al-Sāʿatī (Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, ii, 183-4; an expert was kept to look after it, *ibid.*, 191). There was a clock in the Mustansiriyya in Baghdād (Sarre and Herzfeld, *Arch. Reise*, ii, 170), and the Mosque of ʿAmr also a *ghurfat al-sāʿatī* (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 13, 15). In the Mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn is still kept a sundial of the year 696/1296-7; cf. van Berchem, *CIA*, i, no. 415), but the clocks were usually mechanical (see also Dozy, *Supplément*, s.v. *mindjāna*, and on the clock generally, E. Wiedemann, in *Nova Acta der K. Leop. Carol. Akad.*, c [Halle 1915]). In the Maghrib also we find mosqueclocks, e.g. in the Bū ʿInāniyya (*JA*, ser. 11, xii, 357 ff.).

The very varied uses to which the mosques were put resulted in their becoming storehouses for all sorts of things. In 668/1269-70, the Mosque of the Umayyads was cleared of all such things; in the courtyard there were, for example, stores for machines of war, and the *zāwiya* of Zayn al-ʿAbidīn was a regular *khān* (*JA*, ser. 9, vii, 225-6).

c. The prayer-niche or *Mihrāb* [see for this, MIHRĀB].

d. The pulpit or *Minbar* [see for this, MINBAR].

e. The platform or *Dakka*. In the larger mosques, there is usually found near the *minbar* a platform to which a staircase leads up. This platform (*dakka*, popularly often *dikka*) is used as a seat for the *muʿadhdhins* when pronouncing the call to prayer in the mosque at the Friday service. This part of the equipment of a mosque is connected with the development of the service (cf. below, under I. H. 4, and C. H. Becker, *Zur Geschichte des islamischen Kultus*, in *Isl.*, iii [1912], 374-99 = *Islamstudien*, i, 472-500; E. Mittwoch, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des islamischen Gebets und Kultus*, in *Abh. Pr. Ak. W.* [1913], Phil.-Hist. Cl., no. 2). The first *adhān* call is pronounced from the minaret, the second (when the *khātib* mounts the *minbar*) and the third (before the *ṣalāt*, *ikāma*) in the mosque itself. These calls were at first pronounced by the *muʿadhdhin* standing in the mosque. At a later date, raised seats were made for him.

Al-Halabī records that Maslama, Muʿāwiya's governor in Egypt, was the first to build platforms (here called *manābir*) for the calls to prayer in the mosques (*Sūra Halabiyya*, ii, 111 below). This story, however, given without any reference to older authorities, is not at all reliable. It seems that a uniform practice did not come into existence at once. In Mecca, the *muʿadhdhins* for a time uttered the second call (when the preacher mounted the *minbar*) from the roof. As the sun in summer was too strong for them, the *amīr* of Mecca, in the reign of Hārūn al-Raṣhīd, made a little hut (*zulla*) for them on the roof. This was enlarged and more strongly built by al-Mutawakkil in 240/854-5, as his contemporary al-Azrakī relates (*Chron. Mekka*, i, 332-3). The position in the mosque of ʿAmr in Cairo was similar. Here also the *adhān* was uttered in a chamber (*ghurfa*) on the roof, and in 336/947-8 there is a reference to its enlargement (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 11). As late as the time of Baybars, when the many chambers were removed from the roof of the Mosque of ʿAmr, the old *ghurfa*

of the *muʿadhdhin* was left intact (*ibid.*, 14; cf. al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, ed. Guest, 469, n. 2). In the Mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn, the *adhān* was pronounced from the cupola in the centre of the *ṣahn* (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 40). Al-Muḳaddasī records in the 4th/10th century as a notable thing about *Khurāsān* that the *muʿadhdhins* there pronounced the *adhān* on a *ṣarīr* placed in front of the *minbar* (327). The *dukkān* "platform" in front of the *minbar* in the mosques of *Shahraṣtān* must have had the same purpose (*ibid.*, 357).

In the 8th/14th century, Ibn al-Hādīdj mentions the *dakka* as a *bidʿa* in general use, which should be condemned as it unnecessarily prevents freedom of movement within the mosque (*Madkhal*, ii, 45 above). In the year 827/1424 a *dakka* in the mosque of al-Hākim is mentioned (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 61); the *dakkas* mentioned in inscriptions from Cairo all date from the period before and after 900/1495. Ibn al-Hādīdj mentions that, in addition to the large *dakka* used for the Friday worship, there was sometimes a lower one for ordinary *ṣalāts* (*Madkhal*, ii, 46-7) and says that in the larger mosques there were several *dakkas* on which *muʿadhdhins* pronounced the *adhān* in succession so that the whole community could hear it (*tabligh*; *ibid.*, 45-6). Lane also mentions several *muballighs* in the Azhar Mosque (*Manners and customs*, Everyman's Library edn., 87, 2).

f. The reading-stand or *Kursī*; *Ḳurʿān* and relics. In the mosques there is usually a *kursī* [*q.v.*], that is, a wooden stand with a seat and a desk. The desk is for the *Ḳurʿān*, the seat for the *kāṣṣ*, or reader, *kārī*?. Ibn Ḍjubayr attended the worship in Baghdād at which a celebrated preacher spoke from the *minbar*, but only after the *ḳurrāʿ*, sitting on *karāsī* had recited portions of the *Ḳurʿān* (*Rihla*, 219, 222). The *wāʿiz*, often identical with the *kāṣṣ*, sat on a *kursī* made of teak (Ibn Ḍjubayr, 200. Yāḳūt, *Udabāʿ*, ii, 319; al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 121); sometimes he spoke from the *minbar* to which the *wāʿiz* often had access (cf. Ibn Ḍjubayr; see Mez, *Renaissance des Islāms*, 320, Eng. tr. 332). The *ḳuṣṣās* are called by al-Maḳkī *aṣḥāb al-ḳarāsī*, which is in keeping with this (*Ḳūt al-ḳulūb*, i, 152, quoting *K. al-Madkhal*, i, 159). Several *karāsī* are often mentioned in one mosque (cf. for the Mosque of ʿAmr, al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 19). Whether the *karāsī* mentioned for the earlier period always had a desk cannot be definitely ascertained. The *karāsī* with dated inscriptions given by van Berchem in his *Corpus* all belong to the 9th/15th century (nos. 264, 302, 338, 359^{bis}, 491). According to Lane, at the Friday service, while the people are assembling, a *kārī* on the *kursī* recites *sūra XVIII* up to the *adhān* (*Manners and customs*, 86). The same custom is recorded by Ibn al-Hādīdj and condemned because it has a disturbing effect (*Madkhal*, ii, 44, middle).

The *Ḳurʿān* very soon received its definite place in the mosque, like the Bible in the church (cf. al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 91: they prayed at a pillar beside *al-muṣḥaf*). According to one tradition, ʿUṯmān had several copies of his *Ḳurʿān* sent to the provinces (e.g. Nöldeke-Schwally, *Gesch. d. Qur.*, ii, 112-13); al-Hādīdjādj, a little later, is said to have done the same thing (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 17). The mosques had many other copies beside the one kept on the *kursī*. Al-Hākim put 814 *maṣāḥif* in the Mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn, where the founder had already put boxes of *Ḳurʿān* (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 36, 40; cf. al-Suyūṭī, *Husn al-muḥādara*, ii, 138) and in 403/1012-13, he presented 1,289 copies to the Mosque of ʿAmr, some of which were written in letters of gold (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 12; al-Suyūṭī, ii, 136). Even earlier than this there were so many that the *kādī* al-Hārīṯ b. Miskīn (237-45/851-9)

appointed a special *amīn* to look after them (al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 469); there are still a very large number in the Mosque of the Prophet (see al-Batanūnī, *Rihla*, 241 above). Of particular value was the *muṣḥaf Asmā*², belonging to the Mosque of ‘Amr, prepared by ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Marwān, later bought by his son and afterwards by his daughter Asmā²; her brother left it in 128/746 to the mosque and it was used for public readings (see its whole history in al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 17-18). Besides it, another copy was for some time also used for reading, which was said to have lain beside ‘Uṭhmān, when he was killed and to have been stained with his blood, but this one was removed by the Fāṭimids (*ibid.*, 19). In the time of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, a Ḳurʿān for which the same claims were made was kept in Baṣra (ii, 10). On New Year’s Day, when the Fāṭimid caliphs used to go in procession through the town, the caliph at the entrance to the Mosque of ‘Amr took up in his hands a *muṣḥaf* said to have been written by ‘Alī and kissed it (Ibn Taghribirdī, ii/1, 472 middle); it was perhaps the *muṣḥaf Asmā*². In Syria, Egypt, and the Ḥijāz, in the 4th/10th century, there were Ḳurʿāns which were traced back to ‘Uṭhmān (al-Muḳaddasī, 143; cf. Ibn Ḥawḳal¹, 117). One of the Ḳurʿāns made for ‘Uṭhmān was shown in the Mosque of the Umayyads in Damascus in the time of Ibn Djubayr. It was produced after the daily *ṣalāts* and the people touched and kissed it (*Rihla*, 268). It was brought there in the year 507/1113-14 from Tiberias (al-Dhahabī, *Taʾrīkh*, Ḥaydarābād, 1337, ii, 25). Other Ḳurʿāns of ‘Uṭhmān were shown in Baghdād and Cordova (see Mez, *Renaissance des Islāms*, 327, Eng. tr., 338-9) and Ibn Djubayr saw another in the Mosque of the Prophet; it lay in a desk on a large stand, here called *miḥmal* (*Rihla*, 193; cf. thereon Dozy, *Supplément*, s.v.). The Fādiliyya *madrasa* also had a *muṣḥaf ‘Uṭhmān*, bought by the Ḳāḍī al-Fāḍil for 30,000 *dīnārs* (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 197) and there is one in Fās (*Archives Marocaines*, xviii [1922], 361). Valuable Ḳurʿāns like these had the character of relics and belonged to the *khizāna* of the mosque. They were often kept in a chest (*ṣandūq*) (Ibn Djubayr, *op. cit.*; for *al-muṣḥaf*, al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 95, Muslim has *al-ṣandūq*; see al-‘Aṣḳalānī, *Fath al-Bārī*, i, 385), also called *tābūt* (Ibn Djubayr, 104). In the Ka‘ba, Ibn Djubayr saw two chests with Ḳurʿāns (84, 3). Ibn al-Faḳīh mentions 16 chests with Ḳurʿāns in the Jerusalem mosque (100). In the mosques there were also *ṣanādīk* for other things, such as lamps (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 53; Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 82 = Ibn Djubayr, 194), a *tābūt* for alms *Madkhal*, ii, 44, below), for the *bayt al-māl* or the property of the mosque (see below). There were also chests for rose-wreaths (*Madkhal*, ii, 50) which were in charge of a special officer. In the Mosque of ‘Amr there was a whole series of *tawābūt* (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 9).

The Ḳurʿāns were not the only relics to be kept in the mosques. Bodies or parts of the bodies of saints (cf. above, B. 4, C. 1) and other *athār* were kept and revered in mosques: the rod of Moses (in Kūfa, Yāḳūt, iv, 325, previously in Mecca, see Goldziher, *Muh. Stud.*, ii, 361), the Prophet’s sandals (in Hebron, Ibn al-Faḳīh, 101, also in Damascus, where the *Madrasa Ashrafiyya* had his left and the *Dam-māghiyya* his right sandal; *JA*, ser. 9, iii, 271-2, 402), his cloak (in Adhruḥ, al-Muḳaddasī, 178), hair from his beard (in Jerusalem among other places, al-Batanūnī, *Rihla*, 165) and many other things (see Goldziher, *Muh. Stud.*, ii, 358 ff.; Mez, *Renaissance des Islāms*, 325-6, Eng. tr., 337-9). These relics were often kept in valuable reliquaries. The head of Ḥusayn was buried in a *tābūt* in his mosque in Cairo (Ibn Djubayr,

45). There was a black stone like that in the Ka‘ba in a mosque in *Shahraṣtān* (al-Muḳaddasī, 433).

On the other hand, pictures and images were excluded from the mosques, in deliberate contrast to the crucifixes and images of saints in churches, as is evident from *Ḥadīth* (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bābs* 48, 54; *Djānāʿiz*, *bāb* 71; Muslim, *Masāʾid*, tr. 3; cf. on the question, Becker, *Christliche Polemik und islamische Dogmenbildung*, in *ZA*, xxvi [1911] = *Islamstudien*, i, 445 ff.). It is of interest to note that in the earliest period, Sa‘d b. Abī Waḳḳāṣ had no scruples about leaving the wall-paintings in the *Ḥwān* of Kisrā at Madāʿin standing, when it was turned into a mosque (al-Tabarī, i, 2443, 2451). The case was somewhat different, when, before the chief mosque in Dihlī, which had been a Hindu temple, two old copper idols formed a kind of threshold (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, iii, 151), although even this is remarkable (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, *Verspreide Geschriften*, ii, 451 ff. = *ZDMG*, lxi [1907], 186 ff.). In some circles the opposition to pictures extended to other relics also. Ibn Taymiyya condemned the reverence paid to the Prophet’s footprint, which was shown, as in Jerusalem, in a Damascus mosque also (Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, ii/2, 246).

g. Carpets. Carpets [see on these, *BISĀṬ* in *Suppl.*] were used to improve the appearance of the mosques. The custom of performing the *ṣalāt* upon a carpet is ascribed by *Ḥadīth* to the Prophet himself. Anas b. Mālik performed the *ṣalāt* with him in his grandmother’s house and the Prophet used a cloth or mat (*ḥaṣīr*), which had become black through wear; as a rule, he used a mat woven of palm leaves, *khumra* (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bābs* 19, 20, 21; *Ḥayḍ*, *bāb* 30; Muslim, *Masāʾid*, tr. 47; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, iii, 145). In any case, it is clear from al-Balādhurī that the *ṣalāt* was at first performed in the mosque simply in the dust and then on pebbles (al-Balādhurī, 277, 348; cf. al-Zurkānī, *Sharḥ ‘alā ‘l-Muwattāʿ*, i, 283-4). Later, when the halls were extended, the ground, or the paving, was covered with matting.

The first to cover the ground in the Mosque of ‘Amr with *ḥuṣur* instead of *ḥaṣbā*² was Mu‘āwiya’s governor Maslama b. Mukhallad (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 8; al-Suyūṭī, ii, 136; Ibn Taghribirdī, i, 77). The different groups which frequented the mosque (cf. above) had their places on particular mats: when a *ḳāḍī* (middle of the 3rd/9th century) ejected the *Shāfi‘īs* and *Ḥanafīs* from the mosque, he had their *ḥuṣur* torn up (al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 469). Ibn Ṭulūn covered his mosque floor with ‘Abbādānī and Sāmānī mats (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 36, 38). For the mosque of al-Ḥākim in the year 403/1012-13, al-Ḥākim bought 1,036 *dhīrā‘*s of carpeting for 5,000 *dīnārs* (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 56; cf. for al-Azhar, *ibid.*, 50). In the year 439/1047-8 in the Mosque of ‘Amr, there were ten layers of coloured carpets one above the other (Nāṣir-i *Khushraw*, ed. Schefer, text, 31, tr. 149). In the Mosque at Jerusalem, 800,000 *dhīrā‘*s of carpets were used every year (Ibn al-Faḳīh, 100). In the Mosque in Mecca they were renewed every Ramaḍān (*loc. cit.*). On ceremonial occasions, the *minbar* was also draped with a carpet (*sadjjāda*); in Medina, the *minbar* and the sacred tomb was always covered like the Ka‘ba in Mecca (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 83; cf. Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, ii/1, 91) and some, especially the teachers, had their skins (*farwa*), in some cases, also a cushion to lean upon. The doors were also covered with some material (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 56). On feast-days, the mosques were adorned with carpets in a particularly luxurious fashion (see Ibn Taghribirdī, ii/1, 483). The puritanical rejected all this as *bid‘a* and

preferred the bare ground (*Madkhal*, ii, 46, 49, 72, 74, 76), as the Wahhābīs still do.

h. Lighting. Where evening meetings and vigils were of regular occurrence, artificial lighting became necessary. Al-Azrakī gives the history of the lighting of the Meccan Mosque. The first to illuminate the Ka'ba was 'Ukba b. al-Azrak, whose house was next to the Mosque, just on the *makām*; here he placed a large lamp (*miṣbāḥ*). 'Umar, however, is said previously to have placed lamps upon the wall, which was the height of a man, with which he surrounded the mosque (al-Balādhurī, 46). The first to use oil and lamps (*kanādīl*) in the mosque itself was Mu'āwiya (cf. Ibn al-Fakīh, 20). In the time of 'Abd al-Malik, Khālid b. 'Abd Allāh al-Qasrī placed a lamp on a pillar of the Zamzam beside the Black Stone, and the lamp of the Azrak family disappeared. In the reign of al-Ma'mūn in 216/831, a new lamp-post was put up on the other side of the Ka'ba, and a little later two new lanterns were put up around the Ka'ba. Hārūn al-Raṣhīd placed ten large lamps around the Ka'ba and hung two lanterns on each of the walls of the mosque (*thurayyāt*; cf. Ibn D̄jubayr, *Rihla*, 149, 150, 155, 271; van Berchem, *CIA*, i, no. 506). Khālid al-Qasrī had the *mas'ā* also illuminated during the pilgrimage, and in 119/737 the torches called *naḥāt* were placed here, and 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz ordered the people, who lived in the streets of Mecca, to put up lamps on 1 Muḥarram for the convenience of those visiting the Ka'ba (*Chron. Mekka*, i, 200-2, cf. 458-9). In 253/867 Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Manṣūrī erected a wooden pole in the centre of the *ṣaḥn* and *kanādīl* on ropes were hung from it. This was, however, very soon removed (*ibid.*, ii, 196-7). About 100 years later, al-Mukaddasī saw around the *tawāf* wooden poles on which hung lanterns (*kanādīl*), in which were placed candles for the kings of Egypt, Yemen, etc. (74). Ibn D̄jubayr describes the glass *kanādīl*, which hung from hooks in the Meccan Ḥaram (*Rihla*, 103) and lamps (*maṣhā'il*) which were lit in iron vessels (*ibid.*, 103, cf. 143). Similar silver and gold *kanādīl* were seen by him in Medina (*ibid.*, 192 at the top; see also Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 83 ff.). According to Ibn al-Fakīh (before 300/912), 1,600 lamps were lit every evening in Jerusalem (100), and in the next century al-Mukaddasī says that the people of Palestine always burn *kanādīl* in their mosques, which were hung from chains as in Mecca (182). The illumination was thus very greatly increased. In the year 60/679-80, when 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād was searching for his enemies in the mosque of Kūfa, the lamps were not sufficient, and large torches had to be used in searching the pillared halls (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 259-60). This, like what has already been said about Mecca, shows out of what modest beginnings this part of the mosque's equipment developed.

In the time of the 'Abbāsids, lamps and lanterns were part of the regular furniture of the mosque. Al-Ma'mūn is said to have taken a special interest in this. He ordered lamps to be put in all the mosques, partly to assist those who wanted to read and partly to prevent crime (al-Bayhaḳī, 473). For this purpose, the *kanādīl*, already mentioned, hung on chains were used, as at the building of the mosque of Ibn Tūlūn (al-Makrīzī, iv, 36, 38), in the Azhar Mosque and elsewhere; they were often of silver (*ibid.*, 56, 63). Golden *kanādīl* were also used and were of course condemned by Ibn al-Ḥādīdj (*Madkhal*, ii, 54) as ostentatious. At the same time, candles (*ṣham* or *shama*) were used in large numbers, the candle-sticks (*atwār*, sing. *taur*) often being of silver (Ibn D̄jubayr, *Rihla*, 45, 151, 194; cf. Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 95, 100). About

400/1009-10, large candelabra were made in Egypt, which from their shapes were called *tannūr*, stoves. Al-Ḥākim presented the Mosque of 'Amr with a *tannūr* made out of 100,000 *dirhams* of silver; the mosque doors had to be widened to admit it. He also gave it two other lamps (al-Suyūṭī, ii, 136 below; cf. Nāṣir-i Khusrāw, text 51, tr. 148; Ibn Taghribirdī, ed. Popper, ii/2, 105). In the Mosque of al-Ḥākim, in addition to lamps and candle lanterns, he also put 4 silver *tanānūr* and he made similar gifts to the Azhar and other mosques: the lamps were of gold or silver (al-Makrīzī, iv, 51, 56, 63; cf. Ibn Taghribirdī, ii/2, 105). The *tanānūr* and other lanterns could also be made of copper (see van Berchem, *CIA*, i, nos. 502, 503, 506, 507, 511), as, for example, the celebrated candelabrum of the Mosque of Mu'ayyad (al-Makrīzī, iv, 137) which was made for the mosque of Hasan but sold by it (*ibid.*, 118).

This great interest in the lighting of the mosque was not entirely based on practical considerations. Light had a significance in the worship and Islam here, as elsewhere, was taking over something from the Christian Church. When, in 227/842 the caliph was on his deathbed, he asked that the *ṣalāt* should be performed over him with candles and incense (*bi 'l-ṣham wa 'l-bukhūr*) exactly after the fashion of the Christians (Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, i, 165; cf. ii, 89). The dependence of Islam on Christianity is also seen in the story that 'Uḥmān, when he was going to the evening *ṣalāt* in Medina, had a candle carried in front of him, which his enemies condemned as *bid'a* (al-Ya'kūbī, *Tarīkh*, ii, 187). The Shī'ī bias does not affect the significance of this story. A light was used particularly in the *mihrāb*, because it represented the holy cell, to which light belongs (cf. sūra XXIV, 35). Then, in Mecca, lamps were placed before the *imams* in the *mihrābs* and there were considerable endowments for such *mihrāb* lamps (Ibn D̄jubayr, *Rihla*, 103, 144). Light, as was everywhere the custom in ancient times, was necessary in mausoleums, and the documents of endowment show that a large number of oil-lamps were used in this way (cf. e.g. the document for al-Malik al-Aṣḥraf's mausoleum, van Berchem, *CIA*, i, no. 252). But in the mosque generally the use of lights had a devotional significance and lamps might be endowed for particular individuals (cf. al-Mukaddasī, 74, quoted above). The lamps so given by al-Ḥākim were therefore placed in the mosques with great ceremony, with blasts of trumpets and beating of drums (Ibn Taghribirdī, ii/2, 105).

On ceremonial occasions a great illumination was therefore absolutely necessary. In the month of Ramaḍān, says Ibn D̄jubayr, the carpets were renewed and the candles and lamps increased in number, so that the whole mosque was a blaze of light (*Rihla*, 143); on certain evenings, trees of light were made with vast numbers of lamps and candles and the minarets were illuminated (*ibid.*, 149-51, 154, 155). In the Mosque of the Prophet in the time of al-Samhūdī, forty wax candles burned around the sacred tomb, and three to four hundred lights in the whole mosque (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 100). On the *maulid al-nabī*, says Kutb al-Dīn, a procession went from the Ka'ba in Mecca to the birthplace of the Prophet with candles, lanterns (*fawānīs*) and lamps (*maṣhā'il*) (see *Chron. Mekka*, iii, 439). In the ḥaram of Jerusalem, according to Mudjir al-Dīn, 750 lamps were lit by night and over 20,000 at festivals (Sauvaire, *Hist. Jérus. et Hébron*, 138). In the dome of the Qubbat al-Ṣakhra in 452/1060, a chandelier and 500 lamps fell down (*ibid.*, 69); at the taking of the town in 492/1099, the Franks carried off 42 silver lamps, each

of 3,600 *dirhams*, 23 lamps of gold and a *tannūr* of 40 *raṭls* of silver (*ibid.*, 71). It was similar, and still is, in Cairo and elsewhere in the Muslim world. For the *laylat al-wuḳūd* in the Mosque of 'Amr, 18,000 candles were made for the Mosque of 'Amr, and every night eleven-and-a-half *ḳinṭārs* of good oil were used (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 21 and more fully, ii, 345-6). The four 'nights of illumination' fell in the months of Rādjab and *Shā'bān*, especially *niṣf Shā'bān* (Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, ii/2, 131; cf. also Snouck-Hurgronje, *Mekka*, ii, 77). In 1908 electric light was introduced into the Mosque of the Prophet (al-Batanūnī, *Rihla*, 245-6).

(On the question in general of illumination, see Clermont-Ganneau, *La lampe et l'olivier dans le Coran*, in *Recueil d'Archéologie Orientale*, viii [1924], 183-228; on the copper candelabra, see A. Wingham, *Report on the analysis of various examples of oriental metal-work, etc. in the South Kensington Museum*, etc., London 1892; F. R. Martin, *Ältere Kupferarbeiten aus dem Orient*, Stockholm 1902; on glass lamps, see G. Schmoranz, *Allorientalische Glass-Gefäße*, Vienna 1898; van Berchem, *CIA*, i, 678 ff.; M. Herz Bey, *La Mosquée du Sultan Hasan (Comité de Conservation des Monuments de l'Art Arabe)*, 1899, 8 ff.; see also the Bibliography in *Isl.*, xvii [1928], 217 ff.).

i. Incense. According to some traditions, even the Prophet had incense burned in the mosque (al-Tirmidhī, i, 116; see Lammens, *Mo'āwīa*, 367, n. 8) and in the time of 'Umar, his client 'Abd Allāh is said to have perfumed the mosque by burning incense while he sat on the *minbar*. The same client is said to have carried the censer (*midjmar*: cf. Lammens, *loc. cit.*) brought by 'Umar from Syria before 'Umar when he went to the *ṣalāt* in the month of Ramaḳān (A. Fischer, *Biographie von Gewährsmännern*, etc., 55 n.). According to this tradition, the use of incense was adopted into Islam very early as a palpable imitation of the custom of the Church. In keeping with this is the tradition that, in Fuṣṭāṭ as early as the governorship of 'Amr, the *mu'adhḳin* used to burn incense in the mosque (Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, 132; cf. *Annali dell' Islām*, iv, 565). The *Ḳubbat al-Ṣaḳhra* Mosque had incense burned in it during the consecration ceremony (Sauvaire, *Hist. Jérus. et Hébron*, 53).

Under the Umayyads, incense was one of the regular requirements of the mosque (*ṭīb al-masḳīd*: al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1234, 10). Mu'āwiya is named as the first to perfume the Ka'ba with perfume (*ḳhalūk*) and censer (*ṭayyaba*: Ibn al-Faḳīh, 20, 12). It became the custom to anoint the sacred tombs with musk and *ṭīb* (*Chron. Mekka*, i, 150, 10; Ibn Djubayr, *Rihla*, 191, 9). Baybars washed the Ka'ba with rose-water (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 96, 14). Incense, as well as candles, was used at burials (cf. de Goeje, *ZDMG*, lix [1905], 403-4; Lammens, *Mo'āwīa*, 436, n. 9). Al-Mu'ṭaṣim's desire to be buried with candles and incense (*bukḳūr*) exactly like the Christians (Ibn Uṣaybi'a, i, 165, 12 f., cf. above) shows that they were aware that the custom bore much the same relation to the Christian usage as the mosque building did to the church. The consumption of incense in the mosques gradually became very large, especially at festivals (see for the Fāṭimids, Ibn Tagḳrībīrdī, ii/1, 484, 12; ii/2, ed. Popper, 106, 3; al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 51; on vessels for holding incense, see the Bibliography in *Isl.*, xvii [1928], 217-18, and MA'ḌIN. 4. In Islamic art).

j. Water-supply. Nothing is said of a water-supply in connection with the oldest mosques. The Mosque of Mecca occupied a special position on account of the Zamzam well. In the early days of Islam, two basins (*ḳawḳ*) are said to have been sup-

plied by it, one behind the well, i.e. just at the side of the mosque for *wuḳū'* and one between the well and the *ruḳn* for drinking purposes; the latter was moved nearer the well by Ibn al-Zubayr. In the time of Sulaymān b. 'Abd al-Malik, a grandson of 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās for the first time built a *ḳubba* in connection with Zamzam (*Chron. Mekka*, i, 299). At the same time, the governor *Ḳhalīd al-Ḳasrī* laid down lead piping to bring water from the well of al-Ṭḳabīr to the mosque, to a marble basin (*fiskīyya*) with a running fountain (*ṣawwāra*) between Zamzam and the *ruḳn*, probably on the site of the earlier *ḳawḳ*. It was intended to supply drinking-water in place of the brackish water of Zamzam, but a branch was led on to a *birka* at the Bāb al-Ṣafā, which was used for ritual ablutions. The people, however, would not give up the Zamzam water and immediately after the coming to power of the 'Abbāsids, the provision for drinking-water was cut off, only the pipe leading to the *birka* being retained (*ibid.*, i, 339-40). In Ibn Djubayr's time, there was, in addition to Zamzam, a supply of water in vessels and a bench for performing the *wuḳū'* (*Rihla*, 89). *Ḳhalīd's* plan, arrangements for ablutions at the entrance and a running fountain in the *ṣaḳn*, seems to have been a typically Umayyad one and to have been introduced from the north. Such fountains were usual in the north, not only in private houses, but also for example in the *aitḳrion* (atrium) surrounded by pillars, which, from Eusebius's description, formed part of the church of Tyre (see Hauch, in Herzog-Hauch, *Realencyclop. f. prot. Theol. u. Kirche*, x, 782).

The usual name for the basin, *fiskīyya* (in Egypt now *faskīyya*), comes from *piscina*, which in the Mishna and in Syriac takes the form *piskīn* (see Levy, *Neuhebr. u. chald. Wörterbuch*, iv, 81b; Fraenkel, *Fremdwörter*, 124; *fiskīna*, found in al-Azrakī, *Chron. Mekka*, i, 340 is probably due to a slip). At the same time, however, *birka* or *ṣikāya* or *ṣihriḳī*, which probably comes from the Persian (cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 287), or the old Arabic *ḳawḳ*, are also used. The arrangements for ablutions were called *maṭāḳīr* or *mayāḳī*, sing. *mi'ḳa'a* (now usually *mēḳā*), "place for *wuḳū'*". The accommodation in Mecca just mentioned was later extended. Ibn Djubayr mentions a building at al-Zāḳīr, 1 *mīl* north of Mecca which contained *maṭāḳīr* and *ṣikāya* for those performing the minor 'umra (*Rihla*, 111).

In Medina, Ibn Djubayr mentions rooms for *wuḳū'* at the western entrance to the mosque (*Rihla*, 197, 13 f.; cf. the plan in al-Batanūnī, *Rihla*, facing p. 244). At the same time, Ibn Zabāla mentions seventeen receptacles for water in the *ṣaḳn* in the year 199/814-15, probably for drinking-water; later (8th/14th century) a large basin surrounded by a railing is mentioned in the centre of the court. It was intended for drinking purposes, but became used for bathing and was therefore removed. Baths and latrines were built anew by al-Nāṣir's mother (Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 99 ff.).

In Damascus, where every house, as is still the case, was amply supplied with water, Yāḳūt (d. 626/1229) found no mosque, *madrasa* or *ḳḳānaḳāḳ* which did not have water flowing into a *birka* in the *ṣaḳn* (Yāḳūt, ii, 590). Ibn Djubayr describes the arrangements in the Mosque of the Umayyads. In the *ṣaḳn*, as is still the case, there were three *ḳubbas*. The centre one rested on four marble columns, and below it was a basin with a spring of drinking-water surrounded by an iron grille. This was called *ḳaṣaṣ al-mā'* "water-cage". North of the *ṣaḳn* was a *Masḳīd al-Kallāsa*, in the *ṣaḳn* of which there was again a *ṣihriḳī* of marble with a

spring (Ibn D̲jubayr, *Rihla*, 267). There was also running water in an adjoining *mashhad* (269), in the *khānakāh* and *madrāsa* (271), and in a hall beside the living apartments there was again a *ḡubba* with a basin (*hawḡ*) and spring water (269). There were also *sikāyāt* against the four outer walls of the mosque, whole houses fitted up with lavatories and closets (273); a century earlier, we are told that at each entrance to the mosque there was a *miḡdaʿa* (159). The whole arrangements correspond exactly to those made by K̲hālīd al-Kaṣrī in Mecca in the Umayyad period and must therefore date from the Umayyads.

It was the same in other Syrian and Mesopotamian towns. In Sāmarrāʿ, al-Mutawakkil built in his new *d̲jāmiʿ* a *fawwāra* with constant running water (al-Yaʿkūbī, *Buldān*, 265). In Naṣībīn, the river was led through the *ṣaḡn* of the mosque into a *ṣihriḡḡ*; there was also a *ṣihriḡḡ* at the eastern entrance with two *sikāyāt* in front of the mosque (Ibn D̲jubayr, *Rihla*, 239). In Mawṣil in the mosque, which dated from the Umayyad period, there was a spring with a marble cupola over it (*ibid.*, 235). In Ḥarrān, there were in the *ṣaḡn* three marble *ḡubbas* with a *biḡr* and drinking-water (*ibid.*, 246), in Aleppo, two (*ibid.*, 253). In Kūfa, there were three *hawḡs* with Euphrates water in front of the *D̲jāmiʿ* (*ibid.*, 212), but in the mosque in a *zāwiya*, a domed building with running water (Yāḡūt, iv, 325, 326, here called *tannūr*; cf. Ibn al-Faḡīh, 173, Ibn D̲jubayr, 89, 267). It was the same in Amīd (Nāṣir-i K̲husraw, ed. Schefer, 28) and in Zarandj in Sīd̲jīstān (Ibn Ḥawḡal, 298-9). The principal mosques of ʿIrāk had *mayāḡḡ* at the entrances, for which, according to a remarkable note by al-Muḡaddasī, rents were paid (129, read *karāsīʿ*?; cf. *maṣṡaba*: Ibn D̲jubayr, 89). In Palestine also, in al-Muḡaddasī's time, there were conveniences for ablutions at the entrances to the *d̲jawāmiʿ* (*maṡāḡir*: 182; *mayāḡḡ*: al-Iṣṡāḡḡrī, and in Ṣanʿāʿ in the 4th/10th century, beside each mosque, there was water for drinking and for *wuḡḡ* (Ibn Rusta, 111). In Persia also, it was the custom to have a *hawḡ* in front of the mosque (al-Muḡaddasī, 318) and there was drinking-water in the mosque itself on a bench (*kursī*) in iron jars into which ice was put on Fridays (*ibid.*, 327). Not only at the Zamzam well but also in the mosques of ʿIrāk, men were appointed whose duty it was to distribute drinking-water (al-ṡabārī, iii, 2165). The regular custom, therefore, was to have at the entrance to, or in front of the mosque, conveniences for *wuḡḡ*, and in the court of the mosque itself a fountain as the traditional ornament and for drinking water. It was the exception for the *wuḡḡ* to take place in the mosque itself.

In Egypt, at first the Mosque of Ibn ṡulūn was arranged similarly to the Syrian mosques. In the centre of the *ṣaḡn* there was a gilt dome, supported by sixteen marble columns and surrounded by a railing. This upper storey was supported by nineteen marble columns and below was a marble basin (*kaṣʿa*) with a running fountain (*fawwāra*); the *adhān* was called from the dome (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 37; the description is not quite clear). People complained that there were no arrangements for washing (*miḡdaʿa*) there. Ibn ṡulūn replied that he had not made them because he had concluded the mosque would be polluted thereby. He therefore made a *miḡdaʿa* with an apothecary's shop behind the mosque (*ibid.*, 38, 39; al-Suyūṡī, ii, 139; Ibn Tag̲hrībirdī, ii/10). This suggests that previously in Egypt, the washing arrangements had been directly connected with the mosque. After the fire of the year 376/986-7, the *fawwāra* was renovated by al-ʿAzīz (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 40), and again in 696/1297 by Lād̲jīn,

whose inscription still exists (*CIA*, i, no. 16). A new *miḡdaʿa* was built in 792/1390 beside the old one on the north, outside the mosque (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 42).

The Mosque of ʿAmr first got a *fawwāra* in the time of al-ʿAzīz. In 378-9/998-9 his vizier Yaʿḡūb b. Killīs installed one in the cupola, already in existence for the *bayt al-māl*. Marble jars were put there for the water (probably drinking-water) (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 9, 11; cf. al-Suyūṡī, ii, 136; Yāḡūt, iii, 899). A new water basin was installed by Ṣalāḡ al-Dīn beside his *manzara* in the mosque. The water was led to the *fawwārat al-fisḡiyya* from the Nile. This was prohibited in the reign of Baybars al-Bunduḡdārī (658-76/1260-77) by the chief *kādī*, because the building was being affected by it (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 14; al-Suyūṡī, ii, 137). The *amīr*, who restored it, brought the water for the *fisḡiyya* from a well in the street (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 15).

Like Ibn ṡulūn, the Fāṡimids do not seem to have considered the *miḡdaʿa* indispensable. For the Azhar Mosque had originally no *miḡdaʿa*: as late as al-Ḥāḡim's *wakf* document for the provision of *miḡdaʿa*, money is given only with the provision that something of the kind should be made (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 51, 54). At a later date we hear of two *miḡdaʿa*'s, one at the adjoining Aḡḡughāwiyya (*ibid.*, 54). On the other hand, there was already a *fisḡiyya* in the centre of the court, but whether it had existed from the first is not known. It had disappeared, when traces of it were found in 827/1424 in laying-out a new *ṣihriḡḡ* (*ibid.*, 54). The *fisḡiyya* of the Mosque of al-Ḥāḡim was not erected by the founder. Like that of the Mosque of ʿAmr, it was removed in 660/1262 by the *kādī* ṡād̲j al-Dīn, but after the earthquake of 702/1302-3, it was again rebuilt and provided with drinking-water from the Nile (*ibid.*, 56, 57) and again renovated after 780/1378 (*ibid.*, 61). A small *miḡdaʿa*, later replaced by another, was in the vicinity of the entrance (*ibid.*, 61). Other Fāṡimid mosques had basins in the *ṣaḡn*, which were supplied from the Nile and from the K̲hālīḡḡ (*ibid.*, 76, 81, 120).

The traditional plan was retained in the period following also. For example, we know that the *amīr* ṡughān in 815/1412 placed a *birka* in the centre of the *D̲jāmiʿ* of Aḡṡunḡur which was covered by a roof supported by marble pillars and supplied by the same pipe as the already existing *miḡdaʿas* (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 107, cf. 124, 138, 139, etc.). At the ceremonial dedication of mosques, it was the custom for the patron to fill the *birka* in the *ṣaḡn* with sugar, lemonade or other sweet things (e.g. at the Muʿayyadī, in 822/1419, al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 139; at the Madrasa of D̲jāmāl al-Dīn in 811/1408-9, *ibid.*, 253; another in 757/1356, *ibid.*, 256).

The importance of the *birka* of the mosque, as a drinking-place, diminished as pious founders erected drinking fountains everywhere (cf. for Mecca, *Chron. Mekka*, ii, 116-18; also *BGA, Glossarium*, 211, s.v. *ḡubb*; 258, s.v. *sabīl*) and especially when it became the custom to build a *sabīl* with a boy's school in part of the mosque (see below, I. E. 4, end). A *hawḡ* for watering animals was also sometimes built in the vicinity of the mosque (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 76). Sometimes also the *birka* of the *ṣaḡn* was used for washing. In the year 799/1397 the *amīr* Yalbug̲hā made arrangements for this in the Aḡḡmar mosque so that one could get water for *wuḡḡ* from taps from a *birka* put up in the *ṣaḡn* (al-Maḡrīzī, iv, 76). Al-Maḡrīzī condemns this addition, but only because there was already a *miḡdaʿa* at the entrance and the *ṣaḡn* was too small for the new one (*ibid.*), and not on grounds of principle; and it was only because the wall was damaged that the *amīr*'s gift was removed in 815/1412 (*ibid.*, 77). The custom of

using the water supply of the *ṣahn* for *wuḍūʿ* survived in many places in Egypt. The arrangements were therefore usually called *miʿdaʿa* or rather *mēdā* (which is not found in the inscriptions). If they had taps, they were called *ḥanafīyya*; according to Lane's suggestion, because the Ḥanafīs only permitted ablutions with running water or from a cistern 10 ells broad and deep (*Lexicon*, s.v.; cf. *Manners and customs*. Everyman's Library, 69; cf. on the question M. Herz, *Observations critiques sur les bassins dans les ṣahns des mosquées*, in *BIE*, iii/7 [1896], 47-51; idem, *La mosquée du Sultan Ḥasan*, 2; Herz wrongly dates the modern usage from the Turkish conquest in 923/1517). In quite recent times, the *miʿdaʿas* have often been moved outside to special buildings. Ibn al-Ḥādīdj condemns bringing water into the mosque, because the only object is for ablutions and ablutions in the mosque are forbidden by "our learned men" (*Madkhal*, ii, 47-8, 49); like shaving, ablutions should be performed outside the mosque in keeping with the Prophet's saying *idjʿalū maṭāhirakum ʿalā abwābī masāʿididikum* (*ibid.*, ii, 58). It was in keeping with this principle that in earlier times the *miʿdaʿa* was usually put at the entrance and the barbers took up their places before the entrance (cf. the name *Bāb al-Muzayyinīn* "The Barbers' Gate" for the main entrance to the Azhar mosque). *Miʿdaʿas* were also to be found in hospitals; thus the "lower hospital" was given two in 246/957, one of which was for washing corpses (Ibn Duḡmāḡ, 99 below).

E. The mosque as a state institution.

1. The mosque as a political centre. Its relation to the ruler. It was inherent in the character of Islam that religion and politics could not be separated. The same individual was ruler and chief administrator in the two fields, and the same building, the mosque, was the centre of gravity for both politics and religion. This relationship found expression in the fact that the mosque was placed in the centre of the camp, while the ruler's abode was built immediately adjacent to it, as in Medina (and in Fuṣṭāṭ, Damascus, Baṣra, Kūfa). We can trace how this *dār al-imāra* or *qaṣr* (so for Kūfa: al-Ṭabarī, ii, 230-1; *qaṣr al-imāra*, *ibid.*, 234) with the growth of the mosque gradually became incorporated in it at Fuṣṭāṭ and Damascus and was replaced by a new building. The tradition remained so strong that, in Cairo, when the new chief mosque *Djāmiʿ al-ʿAskar* was being planned in 169/785-6, a *Dār Umarāʿ Miṣr* was built beside it with direct access to the mosque (al-Makrīzī, iv, 33-4), and when Ibn Tūlūn built his mosque, a building called the *Dār al-Imāra* was erected on its south side, where the ruler, who now lived in another new palace, had rooms for changing his robes, etc., from which he could go straight into the *maḡṣūra* (*ibid.*, 42).

The ʿAbbāsids at the foundation of Baghdād introduced a characteristic innovation, when they made the palace the centre of the city; the case was similar with Fāṭimid Cairo; but Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik in Ramla had already built the palace in front of the mosque (al-Balādhurī, 143). Later rulers, who no longer lived just beside the mosque, had special balconies or something similar built for themselves in or beside the mosque. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn built for himself a *manzara* under the great minaret of the mosque of ʿAmr (al-Makrīzī, iv, 13; al-Suyūṭī, ii, 137) and just to the south of the Azhar mosque, the Fāṭimids had a *manzara* from which they could overlook the mosque (al-Makrīzī, ii, 345).

The caliph was the appointed leader of the *ṣalāt* and the *khāṭīb* of the Muslim community. The significance of the mosque for the state is therefore embodied in

the *minbar*. The installation of the caliph consisted in his seating himself upon this, the seat of the Prophet in his sovereign capacity. When homage was first paid to Abū Bakr by those who had decided the choice of the Prophet's successor, he sat on the *minbar*. ʿUmar delivered an address, the people paid homage to him and he delivered a *khūṭba*, by which he assumed the leadership (Ibn Hishām, 1017; al-Ṭabarī, i, 1828-9; al-Diyārbakrī, ii, 75; al-Yaʿqūbī, *Taʿrīkh*, ii, 142); it was the same with ʿUmar and ʿUṭmān (*ibid.*, 157, 187).

The *khūṭba*, after the glorification of God and the Prophet, contained a reference to the caliph's predecessor and a kind of formal introduction of himself by the new caliph. It was the same in the period of the Umayyads and ʿAbbāsids (see for al-Walīd, al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1177 ff.; al-Amīn, *ibid.*, iii, 764; al-Mahdī, *ibid.*, iii, 398, 451, 457; cf. on this question also al-Bukhārī, *Aḥkām*, bāb 43). The *minbar* and the *khūṭba* associated with it was still more important than the imāmate at the *ṣalāt*, it was *minbar al-mulk* (*Ḥamāsa*, ed. Freytag, 656, v, 4). According to a *ḥadīth*, the Prophet carried the little Ḥasan up to the *minbar* and said, "This my son is a chieftain", etc. (al-Bukhārī, *Manāḡib*, bāb 25). This reflects the later custom by which the ruler saw that homage was paid to his successor-designate; this also was done from the *minbar* (cf. *khūṭba yawm al-djūmʿa li 'l-Muʿtadid bi-wilāyat al-ʿahd*, al-Ṭabarī, iii, 2131). The Fāṭimid caliph showed honour to a distinguished officer by allowing him to sit beside him on the *minbar* (al-Suyūṭī, ii, 91); in the same way, Muʿāwiya allowed Ibn ʿAbbās to sit beside him *ʿalā sarīrihi* (Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, i, 119), but whether the reference is to the *minbar* is perhaps doubtful. The *bayʿa* could also be received by another on behalf of the caliph, but it had to be accepted on the *minbar*. Thus the governor of Mecca in 196/811-12 accepted on the *minbar* homage to ʿAbd Allāh al-Maʿmūn and the deposition of Muḥammad al-Amīn (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 861-2; cf. for al-Mahdī: *ibid.*, 389). There are other cases in which the solemn deposition of a ruler took place on or beside the *minbar* (*Aḡḥānī*², i, 12; Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 15). Even at a much later date, when spontaneous acclamation by the populace was no longer of any importance, the ceremonial installation on the *minbar* was still of importance (al-Makrīzī, iv, 94). It had become only a formality but still an important one. Homage was paid to the ʿAbbāsīd caliphs in Egypt in the great *iwān* of the palace or in a tent in which a *minbar* had been put up, and similarly to the sultans whose investiture was read out from the *minbar* (cf. Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, i/1, 117, 149 ff., 183 ff.). If one dreamt that he was sitting on the *minbar*, it meant that he would become sultan (*ibid.*, ii/2, 103). The ʿAbbāsīd caliph had, however, long had his own throne after the old Persian fashion in his palace (Ps. -al-Djāhīz, *al-Tādjī fī aḡḡlāḡ al-mulūk*, ed. Aḡmad Zakī, Cairo 1914, 7 ff.; tr. Pellat, *Le livre de la couronne*, Paris 1954, 35 ff.) and so had the Fāṭimids (Ibn Taghribirdī, ii/1, 457) and the Mamlūks (Quatremère, *op. cit.*, i/1, 87; cf. 147). When later we find mention of the *kursī 'l-khilāfa* (van Berchem, *CIA*, i, no. 33), *sarīr al-mulk* (*Chron. Mekka*, iii, 113), *sarīr al-salṭana* (al-Makrīzī, ii, 157; cf. *al-sarīr*, royal throne: Ibn Ḥawḡal¹, 282, 285; *kursī* similarly: cf. Ibn ʿArabshāh, *Vita Timuri*, ed. Manger, ii, 186) or *martabat al-mulk* (Quatremère, *op. cit.*, i/2, 61), the reference is no longer to the *minbar*. This does not mean that the ruler could no longer make public appearances in the mosques: thus in 648/1250, al-Muʿizz Aybak regularly gave audiences in *al-madāris al-ṣāliḡiyya* (Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, 17) and

memorial services for Baybars were held a year after his death in several mosques, *madāris* and *khawānik* in Cairo (677/1278; *ibid.*, i/2, 164-5).

The caliph spoke chiefly from the *minbar* of the capital, but when he made the pilgrimage he also spoke from the *manābir* in Mecca and Medina (cf. e.g. al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1234; al-Yaʿqūbī, ii, 341, 501; *Chron. Mekka*, i, 160). Otherwise, in the provinces, the governor stood in the same relation to the mosques as the caliph in the capital. He was appointed “over *ṣalāt* and sword” or he administered “justice among the people” and the *ṣalāt* (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 860), he had “province and *minbar*” under him (*ibid.*, ii, 611), *al-wilāyāt wa ’l-khuṭba* (al-Muḥaddasī, 337). Speaking from the *minbar* was a right which the caliph had delegated to him and it was done in the name of the caliph. ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ therefore refused to allow people in the country to hold *ḍūma* except under the direction of the commander (al-Maḥrīzī, iv, 7). This point of view was never quite abandoned. The *khuṭba* was delivered “in the name of” the caliph (*ibid.*, 94) or “for” him (*lahu*, *ibid.*, 66, 74, 198; Ibn Taghribirdī, ii/1, 85 below; al-Muḥaddasī, 485 above), and in the same way an *amīr* delivered a *khuṭba* “for” a sultan (al-Maḥrīzī, iv, 213, 214). The sultan did not have the “secular” and the caliph the “spiritual” power, but the sultan exercised as a Muslim ruler the actual power which the caliph possessed as the legitimate sovereign and had formally entrusted to him. During the struggles between the different pretenders, there was thus a confession of one’s politics if one performed the *ṣalāt* with the one or the other governor (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 228, 234, 258; *Chron. Mekka*, ii, 168). The pretenders disputed as to whether the one or the other could put up his standard beside the *minbar* (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 2009).

Like the caliph, the governor also made his formal entry into office by ascending the *minbar* and delivering a *khuṭba*; this was the symbol of his authority (e.g. al-Ṭabarī, ii, 91, 238, 242; *Chron. Mekka*, ii, 173; cf. *Hamāsa*, 660, vv. 2-3; al-Djāhiz, *Bayān*, iii, 135). After glorifying God and the Prophet, he announced his appointment or read the letter from the caliph and the remainder of his address, if there was a war going on, was exclusively political and often consisted of crude threats. The *khuṭba* was not inseparably connected with the Friday service. The commander-in-chief could at any time issue a summons to the *ṣalāt* and deliver his *khuṭba* with admonitions and orders (see al-Ṭabarī, ii, as above and 260, 297-8, 300, 863, 1179) and it was the same when he left a province (*ibid.*, 241); a governor, who could not preserve his authority with the *khuṭba* was dismissed (*ibid.*, 592). Since war was inseparably associated with early Islam, and since the mosque was the public meeting-place of ruler and people, it often became the scene of warlike incidents. While the governor in his *khuṭba* was issuing orders and admonitions relating to the fighting, cheers and counter-cheers could be uttered (*ibid.*, 238) and councils of war were held in the mosque (al-Ṭabarī, i, 3415; ii, 284; al-Balādhurī, 267). Soon after his election ʿAbd al-Malik asked from the *minbar* who would take the field against Ibn al-Zubayr, and al-Ḥaǧǧīdǧǧī shouted that he was ready to go (*Chron. Mekka*, ii, 20). After the Battle of the Camel, ʿAlī sent the booty to the mosque of Baṣra and ʿAʿiṣha looked for another mosque (al-Ṭabarī, i, 3178, 3223). Rowdy scenes occasionally took place in the mosques (al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 18); Ziyād was stoned on the *minbar* (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 88); one could ride right into the mosque and shout to the governor sitting on the *minbar* (*ibid.*, 682); fighting often took place in and beside the mosque (*ibid.*, 960, 1701 ff.; Wüstenfeld,

Medina, 13-14). Sometimes for this reason, the governor was surrounded by his bodyguard during the *ṣalāt* or the *minbar* or even clothed in full armour (al-Walīd: al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1234; al-Yaʿqūbī, ii, 341; al-Ḥaǧǧīdǧǧī: al-Ṭabarī, ii, 254). *Ṣalāt* and sword were thus closely associated in reality.

It thus came to be the custom for the enemies of the ruler and his party to be cursed in the mosques. This custom continued the old Arab custom of regular campaigns of objurgation between two tribes, but can also be paralleled by the Byzantine ecclesiastical anathematisation of heretics (cf. Becker, *Islamstudien*, i, 485, *Zur Gesch. d. islamischen Kultus*).

The first to introduce the official cursing of the ʿAlids from the *minbar* of the Kaʿba is said to have been Khālid al-Ḳasrī (*Chron. Mekka*, ii, 36). The reciprocal cursing of Umayyads and ʿAlids became general (cf. al-Ṭabarī, ii, 12, 4; *Aghānī*, x, 102; Ibn Taghribirdī, i, 248; see also Lammens, *Moʿāwīa*, 180-1). Like the blessing upon the ruler, it was uttered by the *kuṣṣās* (al-Maḥrīzī, iv, 16); it was even recorded in inscriptions in the mosque (Ibn Taghribirdī, ed. Popper, ii/2, 63, 64; cf. also Mez, *Renaissance*, 61, Eng. tr., 64). As late as 284/897, al-Muʿtaǧǧīd wanted to restore the anathematisation of Muʿāwīya from the *minbar* but abandoned the idea (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 2164). Anathemas were also pronounced on other occasions, for example, Sulaymān had al-Ḥaǧǧīdǧǧī cursed (*Chron. Mekka*, ii, 37), and al-Muʿtamīd had Ibn Ṭūlūn solemnly cursed from the *manābir* (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 2048, 5 ff.); and other rulers had Muʿtazilī heretics cursed from the pulpits (see Mez, *op. cit.*, 198, Eng. tr. 206; cf. against Ibn Taymiyya, Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, ii/2, 256). Ibn Baṭṭūṭa describes the tumultuous scene with thousands of armed men uttering threats in a mosque in Baghdād when a *Shīʿī khaṭīb* was on the *minbar* (ii, 58).

It was very natural to mention with a blessing upon him the ruler in whose name the Friday *khuṭba* was delivered. Ibn ʿAbbās, when governor of Baṣra, is said to have been the first to pronounce such a *duʿāʿ* over ʿAlī (Ibn Khaldūn, *Muḥaddīma*, *faṣl* 37, end); it is not improbable that the custom arose out of the reciprocal objurgations of ʿAlids and Umayyads; the *kuṣṣās*, who had to curse the ʿAlids in the mosques, used to pray for the Umayyads (al-Maḥrīzī, iv, 17). Under the ʿAbbāsids, the custom became the usual form of expressing loyalty to the ruler (Ibn Taghribirdī, ii/1, 151). After the caliph, the name of the local ruler or governor was mentioned (*ibid.*, 156, 161); even in Baghdād in 369/979-80 by order of the caliph al-Ṭāʿī, the actual ruler ʿAḍud al-Dawla was mentioned in the *duʿāʿ* (Ibn Miskawayh, vi, 499; ed. Cairo 1915, 396) and the Būyids, according to al-Muḥaddasī, were generally mentioned in the *khuṭba* even in the remotest parts of the kingdom (this is evident from the above-mentioned expression *khuṭiba laḥū*, for which we also find *ʿalayhi*: see Ibn Ḥawḳal, 20; al-Muḥaddasī, 337, 338, 400, 472, 485; cf. *Glossarium*, s.v.). There is also evidence that prayers used to be uttered for the heir-apparent (al-Maḥrīzī, iv, 37; *Kitāb al-Wuzarāʿ*, ed. Amedroz, 420). Under the Mamlūks also, the sultan’s heir was mentioned (Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, ii/1, 101; ii/2, 3). Under the Fāṭimids, it was even the custom to call *salām* upon the ruler from the minaret after the *adhān al-faḍīr* (al-Maḥrīzī, iv, 45); this also took place under the Mamlūks, e.g. in 696/1297, when Lāǧǧīn was elected (Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, ii/2, 45). The prayer for the sovereign in the *khuṭba* did not find unanimous approval among the learned (see Snouck Hurgronje, *Verspreide Geschriften*, ii, 214-15).

In general, the mosque, and particularly the *minbar*,

was the place where official proclamations were made, of course as early as the time of the Prophet (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt, bābs* 70, 71), 'Uthmān's bloodstained shirt was hung upon the *minbar* (al-Ṭabarī, i, 3255); messages from the caliph were read from it (*ibid.*, iii, 2084). Al-Walid announced from the *minbar* the deaths of two distinguished governors (Ibn Taghribirdī, i, 242); the results of battles were announced in *khutbas* (Yāqūt, i, 647; *al-ʿIqd al-farīd*, Cairo 1321, ii, 149-50). In the Fāṭimid and 'Abbāsīd periods also, proclamations, orders, edicts about taxation, etc., by the ruler were announced in the principal mosque (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 40; iii, 2165; Ibn Taghribirdī, ii/2, 68; al-Makrīzī, *Itti'āz*, ed. Bunz, 87 above; Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, i/2, 89; ii/2, 44, 151); documents appointing the more important officers were also read upon the *minbar* (al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 589, 599, 603, 604, etc., *passim*; al-Makrīzī, ii, 246; iv, 43, 88); frequently the people trooped into the mosque to hear an official announcement (al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 14; cf. Dozy, *Gesch. d. Mauren in Spanien*, ii, 170).

After the position of the caliph had changed, tradition was so far retained that he still delivered the *khutba* in the principal mosque on special occasions, particularly at festivals. Thus the Fāṭimid al-'Azīz preached in the Mosque of al-Hākīm on its completion (al-Makrīzī, iv, 55) and in the month of Ramaḍān he preached in the three chief mosques of Cairo, one after the other (*ibid.*, 53, cf. 61-2; Ibn Taghribirdī, ii/1, 482 ff.; exceptionally also in al-Rāshīd: al-Makrīzī, iv, 63). The 'Abbāsīd caliph also used to preach at festivals (e.g. al-Rādī: Yāqūt, *Udabā'*, ii, 349-50); it was the exception when a zealot like al-Muhtadī in the year 255/869 followed the old custom and preached every Friday (al-Mas'ūdī, *Murūdj*, viii, 2 = § 3110). Even the *fainéant* caliph in Egypt preached occasionally (al-Makrīzī, iv, 94; Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, ii/1, 138-9). Although the mosque lost its old political importance in its later history, it has never quite lost its character as the place of assembly on occasions of public importance. This is evident from al-Djabartī's history, and even quite recently large meetings have been held in the mosques of Egypt on questions of nationalist politics.

2. The mosque and public administration. The actual work of government was very early transferred from the mosque into a special *dīwān* or *maḍīlis* (see al-Ṭabarī, *Glossarium*, s.v.) and negotiations were carried on and business frequently done in the *kaṣr al-imāra* (cf. al-Ṭabarī, ii, 230-1). But when financial business had to be transacted at public meetings, the mosque was used; of this there is particular evidence from Egypt. Here the director of finance used to sit in the Mosque of 'Amr and auction the farming out of the domains, with a crier and several financial officers to assist him. Later, the *Dīwān* was transferred to the *Djāmi'* of Aḥmad b. Ṭūlūn, but even after 300/912-13, we find Abū Bakr al-Mādhārāḍī sitting on such occasions in the Mosque of 'Amr. Under the Fāṭimids, the vizier Ya'qūb b. Killis used first the *dār al-imāra* of the Mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn (see above); later his own palace and afterwards the caliph's *kaṣr* was used (al-Makrīzī, i, 131-2). In the same way, in the reign of Mu'āwiya, the Coptic churches were used and the taxation commission took up their offices in them (*Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer, Führer durch die Ausstellung*, no. 577); and Ibn Rusta (ca. 290/903) says that the officials in charge of the measurement of the Nile, when they noticed the rising of the river, went at once to the chief mosque and announced it at one *halka* after another, at the same time scattering flowers on those seated there (116).

The connection with administration was also seen in the fact that the treasury-chest, the *bayt al-māl* (identical with the *tābūt*; al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 70, 117) was kept in the mosque. In Fuṣṭāṭ, Usāma b. Zayd, the director of finance, in 97/715-16 and 99/717-18 built in the Mosque of 'Amr a *ḡubba* on pillars in front of the *minbar* for the *bayt al-māl* of Egypt. A drawbridge was placed between it and the roof. In the time of Ibn Rusta, it was still possible to move about freely below the *ḡubba*, but in 378-9/988-9 al-'Azīz put up a running fountain below it (Ibn Rusta, 116; al-Makrīzī, iv, 9, 11, 13; al-Suyūṭī, ii, 136; Yāqūt, iii, 899). Al-Kindī records an attempt to steal the chest in 145/762 (*Wulāt*, 112-13). In the disturbed period around the year 300/912, the *wālī* al-Nūsharī closed the mosque between the times of *ṣalāt* for the safety of the chest, which was also done in Ibn Rusta's time (al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 266; Ibn Rusta, 116). New approaches to the *bayt al-māl* were made in 422/1031 from the *khizāna* of the mosque and from the *Dīwān* (al-Makrīzī, iv, 13).

In Kūfa, the *buyūt al-amwāl*, at least during the early period, were in the *Dār al-Imāra* (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2489, 2491-2); in the year 38/658-9, during the fighting, it was saved from Baṣra and taken with the *minbar* to the Mosque of al-Ḥuddān (*ibid.*, 3414-15). In Palestine, in the chief mosque of each town, there was a similar arrangement to that in the Mosque of 'Amr (al-Muḡaddasī, 182). In Damascus the *bayt al-māl* was in the most western of the three *ḡubbās* in the court of the Mosque of the Umayyads; it was of lead and rested on 8 columns (*ibid.*, 157; Ibn Djabayr, 264, 267; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, i, 200-1); it is still called *ḡubbat al-khazne* ("treasure-cupola", earlier *ḡubbat 'Aṣīsha* (cf. Baedeker, *Palästina und Syrien*). In the time of the two travellers mentioned, the *ḡubba* only contained property of the mosque. Ibn Djabayr saw a similar *ḡubba* in the chief mosque of Harrān and says that it came from the Byzantines (246). In *Ādh ar bāy dījān*, also by the time of al-Iṣṭakhrī, the Syrian custom had been everywhere introduced (184); in *Īrān shahr*, in the centre of the court, there was a building with marble columns and doors (al-Muḡaddasī, 316), which perhaps points to a similar state of affairs, and in Armenia, it is recorded that the *bayt al-māl* was kept in the *Djāmi'* in the time of the Umayyads as in Miṣr and elsewhere (Ibn Ḥawḡal, 241). The *ḡubba* was usually of lead and had an iron door. Ibn al-Ḥādīdj considers it highly illegal to shut off a *dīwān* in a mosque, since this is the same as forbidding entrance to it. This shows that the custom still survived in his time.

Ibn Djabayr's remark about Harrān suggests that here again we have an inheritance from Byzantium. It was probably the building belonging to the *piscina* (cf. above) that the Muslims put to a practical use in this way. For the Byzantines had the treasury (*sakellē*) in the palace, and it is doubtful if the treasure-chambers of the church (*skenophylakion*) were built in this way (cf. F. Dölger, in *Byzantinisches Archiv*, Heft 9 [1927], 26, 34).

3. The mosque as a court of justice. That the Prophet used to settle legal questions in his mosque was natural (see al-Bukhārī, *Aḥkām, bābs* 19, 29, etc.; cf. *Ṣalāt, bāb* 71; *Khuṣūmāt, bāb* 4), but he could also deliver judgments in other places (*ibid.*, *passim*). In *Ḥadīth*, it is recorded that some *kādīs* of the earlier period (Shurayḡ, al-Sha'bi, Yahyā b. Ya'mar, Marwān) sat in judgment beside the *minbar*, others (al-Hasan, Zurā'a b. Awfā) on the open square beside the mosque (al-Bukhārī, *Aḥkām, bāb* 18). The custom had all the better chance of survival, as churches were used in the same way (Joshua Stylites, ed. Wright, ch.

29; cf. Mez, *Renaissance*, 223, Eng. tr., 224). Sitting in judgment was primarily the business of the ruler, but he had to have assistants and Abū Bakr's *kādī* is mentioned as assisting 'Umar (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2135), and a number of judges appointed by 'Umar are mentioned (Ibn Rusta, 227). In the reign of 'Uthmān, 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd is said to have been judge and financial administrator of Kūfa (Ibn Ḳutayba, *Ma'ārif*, ed. Wüstenfeld, 128). On the other hand, we are told that 'Abd Allāh b. Nawfal, appointed by Marwān in 42/662, was the first *kādī* in Islam (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 2477); it is recalled that in the year 132/749-50 the *kādī* of Medina administered justice in the mosque (*ibid.*, 2505). In Baṣra, we are told that al-Aswad b. Sarīf al-Tamīmī immediately after the building of the mosque (i.e. in the year 14/635) worked in it as *kādī* (al-Balādhurī, 346). In the early period, 'Umar wanted to choose a *kādī*, who had been already acting as a judge before Islam (al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 301-2; al-Suyūṭī, ii, 86). Even the Christian poet al-Akḥḥal was allowed to act as arbiter in the mosque of Kūfa (see Lammens, *Mo'āwīa*, 435-6).

In Fuṣṭāt, as early as 23/643 or 24/644 by command of 'Umar, 'Amr b. al-ʿĀṣ appointed a *kādī* named Ḳays (al-Suyūṭī, ii, 86; al-Kindī, 300-1). The *kādī* held his sessions in the Mosque of 'Amr but not exclusively there. The *kādī* Ḳhayr b. Nu'aym (120-7/738-45) held his sessions sometimes before his house, sometimes in the mosque, and for Christians on the steps leading up to the mosque (al-Kindī, 351-2). A successor of his (177-84/793-800) invited Christians who had lawsuits into the mosque to be heard (*ibid.*, 391); of another judge (205-11/820-6), it is recorded that he was not allowed to sit in the mosque (*ibid.*, 428). It seems that the *kādī* could himself choose where he would sit. A judge, officiating in the year 217/832, sat in winter in the great pillared hall, turning his back towards the *qibla* wall, and in summer, in the *ṣahn* near the western wall (*ibid.*, 443-4). During the Fāṭimid period, the subsidiary building on the north-east of the Mosque of 'Amr was reserved for the judge. This judge, called from the year 376/986 onwards *kādī 'l-Ḳudāt* (cf. al-Suyūṭī, ii, 91; al-Kindī, 590), sat on Tuesday and Saturday in the mosque and laid down the law (al-Makrīzī, ii, 246; iv, 16, 22; cf. al-Kindī, 587, 589; cf. Nāṣir-i Ḳhusraw, tr. Schefer, 149).

In al-Ya'kūbī's time in Baghdād, the judge of the east city used to sit in its chief mosque (*Buldān*, 245), in Damascus the vice-*kādī* in the 4th/10th century had a special *riwāk* in the Mosque of the Umayyads (al-Muḳaddasī, 158), and the notaries (*al-shurūṭiyyūn*) also sat at the Mosque of the Umayyads at the Bāb al-Sā'āt (*ibid.*, 17). In Naysābūr, every Monday and Thursday, the *maḍlis al-ḥukm* was held in a special mosque (*ibid.*, 328). In course of time, the judge was given a *maḍlis al-ḥukm* of his own (cf. al-Suyūṭī, ii, 96), and in 279/892 al-Mu'taḍid wanted to forbid the *kādīs* to hold sessions in the mosques (Ibn Taghrībirdī, ii/1, 87 above; perhaps, however, we should read *ḳāṣṣ*: see Goldziher, *Muh. Stud.*, ii, 164, n. 4). Justice was also administered in the *dār al-ʿadl* (Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, ii/2, 79). But the administration of justice did not at once lose all connection with the mosque. Under the Fāṭimids, the custom had been introduced that the *kādī* should hold sittings in his house, but Ibn al-ʿAwwām, appointed just after 400/1009-10, held them either in the *Djāmi'* at the *Bayt al-Māl* or in a side-room (al-Kindī, 612; cf. Ibn Taghrībirdī, ed. Popper, ii/2, 69; al-Ḳalkāshandī, *Subḥ al-a'ṣḥā'*, iii, 487; for 439/1046, see Nāṣir-i Ḳhusraw, ed. Schefer, text, 51, tr. 149). In Mecca, the *dār al-kādī* was in

direct connection with the mosque (Ibn Ḍjubbayr, 104). In the 8th/14th century, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa attended a court presided over by an eminent jurist in a mosque (*madrasa*) in Shīrāz (ii, 55, 63; cf. also *Madḳhal*, ii, 54 below), and in Damascus the Shāfi'ī chief *kādī* held his sessions in the 'Adiliyya Madrasa (so Ibn Ḳhallikān, in Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, ii/1, 22; cf. also for Egypt: *ibid.*, 87, ii/2, 253), the vice-*kādīs* sat in the Zāhiriyya Madrasa (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, i, 218). The judgment might even be put into execution in the *madrasa* (*ibid.*, 220). During the Mamlūk period in Egypt, we occasionally find a small mosque being used as a *maḍlis* for judges (al-Makrīzī, iv, 270; Ibn Duḳmāk, 98 above); Ibn Ḳhaldūn held legal sittings in the Madrasa al-Ṣālihiyya (*Ibar*, vii, 453).

A *muftī*, especially in the large mosques, was also frequently appointed; he sat at definite times in a *ḥalqa li 'l-fatwā*, e.g. in Cairo (al-Ḳazwīnī, in al-Suyūṭī, i, 182; Ḍjalāl al-Dīn, *ibid.*, 187), in Tunis (al-Zarkaṣhī, *Chronicle*, tr. Fagnan, in *Rec. Mém. Soc. Arch. Constantine*, xxi [1895], 197, 202, 218, 248). In Baghdād, Abū Bakr al-Dīnawarī (d. 405/1014-15) was the last to give *fatwās* in the Mosque of al-Manṣūr according to the *madḥhab* of Sufyān al-Thawrī (Ibn Taghrībirdī, ed. Popper, ii/2, 120).

F. The administration of the mosque

1. Finances. The earliest mosques were built by the rulers of the various communities, and the members of the community did all the work necessary in connection with the primitive mosques. The later mosques as a rule were erected by rulers, *amīrs*, high officials or other rich men in their private capacity and maintained by them. The erection of the mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn cost its builder 120,000 *dīnārs*, the Mosque of Mu'ayyad 110,000 (al-Makrīzī, iv, 32, 137, 138). The upkeep of the mosque was provided for by estates made over as endowments (*wakf*, *ḥabs*) (cf. thereon besides the *fiqh* books, I. Krčsmárik, *Das Wakfrecht*, in *ZDMG*, xlv [1891], 511-76; E. Mercier, *Le code du hobous ou ouakf selon la législation musulmane*, 1899). In the 3rd/9th century we thus hear of houses which belonged to the mosque and were let by them (*Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer, Führer*, nos. 773, 837), and Ibn Ṭūlūn handed over a large number of houses as an endowment for his mosque and hospital (al-Makrīzī, iv, 83). This custom was taken over from the Christians by the Muslims (see Becker, in *Isl.*, ii [1911], 404). According to al-Makrīzī, estates were not given as *wakf* endowments until Muḥammad Abū Bakr al-Māḍḥarā'ī (read thus) bequeathed Birkat al-Ḥabash and Suyūṭ as endowments (about 300/912-13; this was however cancelled by the Fāṭimids again (*ibid.*). Al-Ḥākim made large endowments not only for his own, but also for mosques previously in existence, such as the Azhar, al-Ḥākimī, Dār al-ʿIlm and Ḍjāmi' al-Maḳ and Ḍjāmi' Rāshīda; the endowments consisted of dwelling-houses, shops, mills, a *ḳaysāriyya* and *ḥawānūt*, and the document (*ibid.*, 50-1) specifies how and for what purposes the revenues are to be distributed. Baths were also given as endowments for mosques (*ibid.*, 76, for 529/1135; cf. 81 for the year 543/1148-9). Ṣalāh al-Dīn granted lands to his *madāris*: in 566/1170-1, for example, a *ḳaysāriyya* to the Ḳamhiyya and a *ḍay'a* in al-Fayyūm, and the teachers received wheat from al-Fayyūm; in the same year he endowed the Nāṣiriyya with goldsmiths' shops and a village (*ibid.*, 193-4; cf. another document, 196-7). During the Mamlūk period also, estates were given as endowments (for documents of this period, see van Berchem, *CIA*, i, nos. 247, 252, 528; Moberg, in *MO*, xii [1918], 1 ff.; *JA*, ser. 9, iii, 264-6; ser. 11, x, 158 ff., 222 f.; xii, 195 ff., 256 ff., 363 ff.). They

were often a considerable distance apart: the mosques in Egypt often had estates in Syria (van Berchem, *CIA*, i, no. 247; al-Maḳrīzī, vi, 107, 137). Not only were mosques built and endowed, but already existing ones were given new rooms for teachers, *minbars*, stipends for Qurʾān reciters, teachers, etc. There were often special endowments for the salaries of the *imām* and the *muʿadhdhins*, for the support of visitors, for blankets, food, etc. (see Ibn D̲jubayr, 277 with reference to the Mosque of the Umayyads). The endowments, and the purpose for which they might be used, were precisely laid down in the grant and the document attested in the court of justice by the *kādī* and the witnesses (cf. al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 50, 196 below). The text was also often inscribed on the wall of the mosque (cf. *ibid.*, 76; the above-mentioned inscriptions amongst others. For documents from Tashkent, see *RMM*, xiii [1911], 278 ff.). Certain conditions might be laid down, e.g. in a *madrasa* that no Persian should be appointed there (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 202 below), or that the teacher could not be dismissed or some such condition (van Berchem, *CIA*, i, no. 201); that no women could enter (*JA*, ser. 9, iii, 389); that no Christian, Jew or Ḥanbalī could enter the building (*ibid.*, 405); etc. Endowments were often made with stipulations for the family of the founder or other purposes. That mosques could also be burdened with expenses is evident from an inscription in Edfū of the year 797/1395 (van Berchem, *CIA*, i, no. 539). If a mosque was founded without sufficient endowment, it decayed (e.g. al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 115, 201, 203) or else the stipends were reduced (*ibid.*, 251), but in the larger mosques as a rule the rulers provided new endowments. According to al-Māwardī, there were also special "Sultan mosques" which were directly under the patronage of the caliph and their officials paid from the *bayt al-māl* (*al-Ahkām al-sultāniyya*, ed. Enger, 172 above, 176 above).

Just as the *bayt al-māl* of the state was kept in the mosque, so was the mosque's own property kept in it, e.g. the *kanz* or *khizānat al-Kaʿba*, which is mentioned in ʿUmar's time and may be presumed to have existed under his predecessors (al-Balādhurī, 43 above; *Chron. Mekka*, i, 307, ii, 14). The *Bayt Māl al-Djami* in Damascus was in a *kubba* in the *ṣaḥn* (al-Mukaddasi, 157; Ibn D̲jubayr, 267; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, i, 201. cf. for Medina, Wüstenfeld, *Medina*, 86). Rich men also had their private treasure-chambers in the mosque (see above, I. E. 2), as used to be the case with the Temple at Jerusalem (see E. Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*⁴, ii, 1907, 322-8; F. Cumont, *Fouilles de Doura-Europos*, 1926, 405-6).

2. Administration. As *Imām* of the Muslim community, the caliph had the mosques under his charge. This was also the case with the sultan, governor or other ruler who represented the caliph in every respect. The administration of the mosques could not however be directly controlled by the usual government offices. By its endowment, the mosque became an object *sui generis* and was withdrawn from the usual state or private purposes. Their particular association with religion gave the *kādīs* special influence, and, on the other hand, the will of the testator continued to prevail. These three factors decided the administration of the mosque, but the relation between them was not always clear.

a. Administration of the separate mosques. The mosque was usually in charge of a *nāzīr* or *walī* who looked after its affairs. The founder was often himself the *nāzīr* or he chose another and after his death, his descendants took charge or whoever was appointed by him in the foundation charter. In the

older period, the former was the rule and it is said to have applied especially in the case of chief mosques, if we may believe Nāṣir-i Khusrāw, according to whom al-Ḥākim paid the descendants of Ibn Ṭūlūn 30,000 *dīnārs* for the mosque and 5,000 for the minaret, and similarly to the descendants of ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ 100,000 *dīnārs* for the Mosque of ʿAmr (*Safar-nāma*, ed. Schefer, text 39-40, tr. 146, 148). In 378/988 we read of an administrator (*mutawallī*) of the mosque in Jerusalem (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 11). In the case of mosques and *madāris* founded during the Mamlūk period, it is often expressly mentioned that the administration is to remain in the hands of the descendants of the founder, e.g. in the case of a mosque founded by Baybars (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 89), in the D̲jami^c Maḳ when the vizier al-Maḳṣī renovated it (*ibid.*, 66), the Ṣāhibiyya (*ibid.*, 205), and the Ḳarāsunkuriyya (*ibid.*, 232), etc.; so also in the Badriyya in Jerusalem ("to the best of the descendants", cf. van Berchem, *CIA*, ii/1, 129). Other cases are also found. Sometimes an *amīr* or official was administrator, e.g. in the Muʿayyad (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 140), the Taybarsiyya (*ibid.*, 224), the Azhar (*ibid.*, 54-5) or the Mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn (al-Ḳalkashandī, *Ṣubḥ*, xi, 159-62). In D̲jamāl al-Dīn's *madrasa*, it was always the *kātib al-sirr* (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 256), in the *khānaḳāh* of Baybars the *khāzindār* and his successors (van Berchem, *CIA*, i, no. 252); but it was more frequently a *kādī*; for example, in the mosque of Baybars just mentioned, the Ḥanafi *kādī* was to take charge after the descendants (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 89); in the Aḳbughawīyya, the Ṣhāfi^c *kādī* was appointed but his descendants were expressly excluded (*ibid.*, 225). In the Mosque of the Umayyads, during the Mamlūk period the Ṣhāfi^c chief *kādī* was as a rule the *nāzīr* (al-Ḳalkashandī, iv, 191), and thus also in the Nāṣir mosque in Cairo (*ibid.*, xi, 262-4). In this city, we find during the Mamlūk period that *amīrs* and *kādīs* alternately acted as *nāzīrs* in the large mosques (e.g. the Mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn, al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 42). Cases are also found, however, in which descendants of the founder unsuccessfully claimed the office of *nāzīr* (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 218, 255). This was the result of the increasing power of the *kādīs* (see below). In the *madāris*, the *nāzīr* was often also the leading professor; the two offices were hereditary (*ibid.*, 204, the Ṣāhibiyya al-Bahāʿiyya; and 238 above, the D̲jamālīyya). In Tustar, a descendant of Sahl as *nāzīr* and teacher conducted a *madrasa* with the help of four slaves (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, ii, 25-6).

The *nāzīr* managed the finances and other business of the mosque. Sometimes he had a fixed salary (in Baybars' *khānaḳāh*, 500 *dirhams* a month, van Berchem, *CIA*, i, 252; in the Dulāmiyya in Damascus in 847/1443-4, only 60 *dirhams* a month, *JA*, ser. 9, iii, 261), but the revenues of the mosque were often applied to his personal use. His control of the funds of the mosque was however often limited by the central commission for endowments (see below). The *nāzīr* might also see to any necessary increase of the endowments. He appointed the staff and he fixed their pay (cf. e.g. al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 41). He could also interfere in questions not arising out of the business side of administration; for example, the *amīr* Sawdūb, the *nāzīr* of the Azhar in 818/1415-16, ejected about 750 poor people from the mosque. He was however thrown into prison for this by the sultan (*ibid.*, 54). Generally speaking, the *nāzīr*'s powers were considerable. In 784/1382 a *nāzīr* in the Azhar decided that the property of a *mudjāwir*, who had died without heirs, should be distributed among the other students (*ibid.*, 54). In Mecca, according to Ḳuṭb al-Dīn, the

Nāzīr al-Ḥarām was in charge of the great festival of the *mawlid* of the Prophet (12 Rabī^c I) and distributed robes of honour in the mosque on this occasion (*Chron. Mekka*, iii, 349). In the Azhar, no *nāzīr* was appointed after about 493/1100 but a learned man was appointed *Shaykh* al-Azhar, principal and administrator of the mosque (Sulaymān Raṣād al-Zayyātī, *Kanz al-djāwarh fi ta'rikh al-Azhar*, 123 ff.). Conditions were similar in Mecca in the late 19th century (Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka*, ii, 235-6, 252-3).

As we have seen, *kādīs* were often *nāzīrs* of mosques. This was especially the case in the *madāris*, where the *kādīs* were often teachers (cf. al-Makrīzī, iv, 209, 219, 222, 238, etc.); the *kādīs* were particularly anxious to get the principal offices in the large schools (cf. al-Kalkashandī, xi, 235). Their influence was however further increased by the fact that, if a *nāzīr* qualified by the terms of the founder's will no longer existed, the *kādī* of the *madhab* in question stepped into his place (cf. ZDMG, xlv [1897], 552). By this rule, which often gave rise to quarrels between the different *kādīs* (e.g. al-Makrīzī, iv, 218, the Zāhiriyya), a *kādī* could accumulate a larger number of offices and "milk the endowments" (*ibid.*, iii, 364). Sometimes their management was so ruthless that the schools soon declined (e.g. the Sāhibiyya and the Djamāliyya, al-Makrīzī, iv, 204-5, 238). They also exercised influence through the committee of management of the mosque.

b. Centralisation in the management of the mosques. The large mosques occupied a special position in the Muslim lands, because the caliph had to interest himself particularly in them, especially those of Mecca and Medina, where the rulers and their governors built extensions and executed renovations (cf. *Chron. Mekka*, i, 145; iii, 83 ff.). During the 'Abbāsid period, the *kādī* occasionally plays a certain part in this connection; for example al-Mahdī (158-69/775-85), presented the *kādī* with the necessary money to extend and repair the Meccan mosque (*ibid.*, i, 312; ii, 43). In 263/877, al-Muwaffaq ordered the governor of Mecca to undertake repairs at the Ka'ba (*ibid.*, ii, 200-1). In 271/1884-5, the governor and the *kādī* of Mecca co-operated to get money from al-Muwaffaq for repairs, and they saw the work through (*ibid.*, iii, 136-7). In 281/894, the *kādī* of Mecca wrote to the vizier of al-Mu'taḍid about the *Dār al-Nadwa* and backed up his request by sending a deputation of the staff there (*sadana*). The caliph then ordered the vizier to arrange the matter through the *kādī* of Baghdād and a man was sent to Mecca to take charge of the work (*ibid.*, iii, 144 ff.).

The importance of the *kādī* was based primarily on his special knowledge in the field of religion. A zealous *kādī* like al-Ḥārith b. Miskīn in Cairo (237-45/851-9) forbade the *kurā'* of a mosque to recite the Qur'ān melodiously; he also had the *maṣāhif* in the mosque of 'Amr inspected and appointed an *amīn* to take charge of them (al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 469). After the building of the Tūlūnid mosque, a commission was appointed under the *kādī* 'l-kuḍāt to settle the *kibla* of the mosque (al-Makrīzī, iv, 21-2). But at a quite early date they also obtained a say in the management of the funds. The first *kādī* to lay his hands on the *ahbās* was Tawba b. Namir al-Ḥaḍramī; while hitherto every endowment had been administered by itself by the children of the testator or someone appointed by him, in 118/736 Tawba brought about the centralisation of all endowments and a large *diwān* was created for the purpose (al-Kindī, 346). How this system of centralisation worked is not clear at first, but it was carried through under the Fātimids.

Al-Mu'izz created a special *diwān al-ahbās* and made the chief *kādī* head of it as well as of the *djāwāmi'* wa 'l-*mashāhid* (al-Makrīzī, iv, 83 and 75; cf. al-Kindī, 585, 587, 589, according to whom al-'Azīz specially appointed the chief *kādī* over the two *djāmi'*s), and a special *bayt al-māl* was instituted for it in 363/974; a yearly revenue of 150,00 *dirhams* was guaranteed; anything left over went to form a capital fund. All payments were made through his office after being certified by the administration of the mosque (al-Makrīzī, iv, 83-4). The mosques were thus administered by the *kādīs*, directly under the caliph. The *diwān al-birr wa 'l-ṣadaqa* in Baghdād (Mez, *Renaissance*, 72, Eng. tr., 80) perhaps served similar purposes.

Al-Ḥākim reformed the administration of the mosques. In 403/1012-13 he had an investigation made, and when it proved that 800 (or 830) had no income (*ghalla*), he made provision for them by a payment of 9,220 *dirhams* monthly from the *Bayt al-Māl*; he also made 405 new endowments (of estates) for the officials of the mosque (al-Makrīzī, iv, 84, 264). Under the Fātimids, the *kādīs* used to inspect all the mosques and *mashāhid* in and around Cairo at the end of Ramaḍān and compare them with their inventories (*ibid.*, 84). The viziers of the Fātimids, who also had the title *kādī*, did much for the mosques (Djāwarh, Ya'qūb b. Killis, Badr al-Djamālī, cf. van Berchem, *CIA*, i, nos. 11, 576, 631).

Under the Ayyūbids, conditions were the same as under the Fātimids. The *diwān al-ahbās* was under the *kādīs* (al-Makrīzī, iv, 84). Ṣalāh al-Dīn gave a great deal to the mosques, especially the *madāris*: 20,000 *dirhams* a day is a figure given (*ibid.*, 117). When Ibn Djubayr says that the sultan paid the salaries of the officials of the mosques and schools of Alexandria, Cairo and Damascus 43, 52, 275), he must really mean the *Diwān* already mentioned.

The same conditions continued for a time under the Mamlūks. In the time of Baybars, for example, the chief *kādī* Tādj al-Dīn was *nāzīr al-ahbās*. He caused the Mosque of 'Amr to be renovated, and when the funds from the endowments were exhausted, the sultan helped him from the *Bayt al-Māl* (al-Makrīzī, iv, 14); after conferring with experts, the chief *kādī* forbade a water-supply brought by Ṣalāh al-Dīn into the mosque (*ibid.*, 14; al-Suyūfī, ii, 137). In 687 the chief *kādī* Taqī al-Dīn complained to Kalāwūn that the 'Amr and Azhar mosques were falling into ruins, while the *ahbās* were much reduced. The sultan would not however permit their restoration but entrusted the repairs of the mosques to certain *amīrs*, one to each (al-Makrīzī, iv, 14, 15). This principle was several times applied in later times, and the *amīrs* frequently gained influence at the expense of the *kādīs*. Thus after the earthquake of 707/1303 (cf. thereon Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, ii/2, 214 ff.), the mosques were allotted to *amīrs*, who had to see that they were rebuilt (al-Makrīzī, iv, 15, 53). From the middle of the 7th/13th century, we often find *amīrs* as administrators of the chief mosques. The *kādī* had however obtained so much authority that he was conceded "a general supervision of all matters affecting the endowments of his *madhab*" (al-'Umarī, *al-Ta'rif bi 'l-muṣṭalah al-sharīf*, 117; cf. ZDMG, xlv [1891], 559); according to this theory the *kādī* could intervene to stop abuses. In Syria in 660/1262 Ibn Khallikān became *kādī* over the whole area between al-'Arīsh and the Euphrates and superintendent of *wakfs*, mosques, *madrasas*, etc. (Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, i/1, 170).

Sultan Baybars reformed these endowments and

restored the office of *nāzīr al-awḳāf* or *nāzīr al-ahbās al-mabrūra* or *n. ḍjihāt al-birr* (al-*Kalkashandī*, iv, 34, 38; v, 465; ix, 256; xi, 252, 257; cf. *Khalīl al-Zāhirī*, *Zubdat kashf al-mamālik*, ed. Ravaisse, 109). According to al-Makrīzī, the endowments were distributed among the Mamlūks in three departments (*ḍjihāt*): 1. *ḍjihāt al-ahbās*, managed by an *amīr*, the *Dawādār*: this looked after the lands of the mosques, in 740/1339-40, in all 130,000 *faddāns*; 2. *ḍjihāt al-awḳāf al-hukmiyya bi-Miṣr wa 'l-Kāhira*, which administered dwelling-houses; it was managed by the *Shāfi'ī kādī 'l-kuḏāt*, with the title *Nāzīr al-Awḳāf*. This department came to an end in the time of al-Malik al-Nāṣir Faraj because an *amīr*, supported by the opinion of the Ḥanafī chief *kādī*, spent a great deal and misused the funds; 3. *ḍjihāt al-awḳāf al-ahliyya*, comprised all the endowments which still had particular *nāzīrs*, either descendants of the testator or officials of the sultan and the *kādī*. The *amīrs* seized their lands and Barḳūk, before he became sultan, sought in vain to remedy the evil by appointing a commission. The endowments in general disappeared somewhat later because the ruling *amīrs* seized them (al-Makrīzī, iv, 83-6). In modern times, as a rule, endowments in Muslim lands have been combined under a special ministry, a *Wizārat al-Awḳāf*.

To be distinguished from the administrators of the mosque is the *nāzīr* who is only concerned with the supervision of the erection of mosques. Anyone could be entrusted with the building of a mosque (e.g. al-Makrīzī, iv, 92). Under the Mamlūks, there was also a clerk of works, *mutawallī ṣhadd al-ʿamāʾir* or *nāzīr al-ʿimāra*: he was the overseer of the builders (*ibid.*, 102; see *Zubdat kashf al-mamālik*, ed. Ravaisse, 115, cf. 109; van Berchem, *CIA*, i, 742, no. 751).

The caliph or the ruler of the country was in this, as in other matters, supreme. As we have seen, he intervened in the administration and directed it as he wished. He was also able to interfere in the internal affairs of the mosque, if necessary through his usual officers. In 253/867 after the rising in the Fayyūm, the chief of police issued strict orders by which it was forbidden to say the *basmala* aloud in the mosque; the number of prayers in the month of Ramaḏān was cut down, the *adhān* from the minaret forbidden, etc. (*Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer, Führer*, 788). In the year 294/908, the governor ʿIsā al-Nūsharī had the Mosque of ʿAmr closed except at the *ṣalāts*, because the *bayt al-māl* was kept in it, which however produced protests from the people (al-Makrīzī, iv, 11; al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 266; Ibn Rusta, 116). Many similar examples could be mentioned, especially during periods of unrest. In 205/821 the *nāʾib*, in conjunction with the *kādīs*, revised the budget of the Mosque of the Umayyads and made financial reforms (*JA*, ser. 9, vii, 220). The *adhān* formulae were laid down in edicts by the ruler (al-Makrīzī, iv, 44, 45). In the year 323/935 the vizier in Baghdād had a man whipped who had recited a variant text of the *Qurʾān* in the *mihṛāb*, after he had been heard in his defence in the presence of the *kādīs* and learned men (Yāḳūt, *Udabāʾ*, vi, 300). The importance of the sovereign in connection with the mosque depended on his personality. As a rule, he recognised the authority of the regular officials. When, for example, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī asked the caliph al-Kāʾim for authority to read *hadīth* in the mosque of al-Manṣūr, the latter referred the question to the *naḳīb al-nuḳabāʾ* (Yāḳūt, *Udabāʾ*, i, 246-7; cf. Wüstenfeld, *Schāfiʿi*, iii, 280).

The consecration of the mosque was attended by certain ceremonies. When, for example, the midday worship was conducted for the first time in the *Djāmiʿ al-Ṣāliḥ* in Cairo, a representative from Baghdād was

present (al-Makrīzī, iv, 81). At the consecration of the Mosque of Ibn Ṭulūn, the builder gave al-Rabīʿ b. Sulaymān, a pupil of al-Shāfiʿī, who lectured on *hadīth* there, a purse of 1,000 *dīnārs* (al-Suyūṭī, ii, 139). Al-Makrīzī describes the consecration ceremony at several mosques. In the Mosque of al-Muʿayyad the sultan was present seated on a throne surrounded by his officers; the basin of the *ṣahn* was filled with sugar and *ḥalwa*, the people ate and drank, lectures were given, then the *ṣalāt* was read and *khutba* delivered and the sultan distributed robes of honour among the officials of the mosques and *Ṣūfis* (al-Makrīzī, iv, 139); similarly at the *Zāhiriyya* in 662/1264 where poems were also recited: cf. Quatremère, *Hist. Sult. Maml.*, i/1, 228), *Madrasat Djāmāl al-Dīn*, in 811/1408-9; al-*Ṣarḥitmiṣhiyya*, 757 (al-Makrīzī, iv, 217-18, 253, 256).

G. The personnel of the mosque.

1. The *Imām*. From the earliest days of Islam, the ruler was the leader of the *ṣalāt*; he was *imām* as leader in war, head of the government and leader of the common *ṣalāt*. The governors of provinces thus became leaders of the *ṣalāt* and heads of the *kharāḏj*, and when a special financial official took over the fiscal side, the governor was appointed *ʿalā 'l-ṣalāt wa 'l-ḥarb*. He had to conduct ritual prayer, especially the Friday *ṣalāt*, on which occasion he also delivered the *khutba*. If he was prevented, the chief of police, *ṣāhib al-shurṭa*, was his *khalīfa* (cf. al-Makrīzī, iv, 83). ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ permitted the people of the villages to celebrate the two festivals, while the Friday divine service could only take place under those qualified to conduct it (who could punish and impose duties; *ibid.*, 7). This was altered under the ʿAbbāsids. The caliph no longer regularly conducted the *ṣalāts* (after the conquest of the Persians; al-Makrīzī, iv, 45), and ʿAnbasa b. Iṣḥāq, the last Arab governor of Egypt (238-42/852-6), was also the last *amīr* to conduct the *ṣalāt* in the *djāmiʿ*. An *imām*, paid out of the *bayt al-māl*, was now appointed (*ibid.*, 83), but the governor still continued to be formally appointed *ʿalā 'l-ṣalāt*. Henceforth, the ruler only exceptionally conducted the service, for example, the *Fāṭimids* on ceremonial occasions, especially in the month of Ramaḏān (Ibn Taghrībirdī, ed. Juynboll, ii, 482 ff.; al-*Kalkashandī*, iii, 509 ff.); in many individual mosques, probably the most prominent man conducted the service; according to the *hadīth*, the one with the best knowledge of the *Qurʾān* and, failing him, the eldest, should officiate (al-Bukhārī, *Adhān, bābs* 46, 49).

The *imām* appointed was chosen from among those learned in religious matters; he was often a *Hāshimite* (Mez, *Renaissance*, 147, Eng. tr., 150); he might at the same time be a *kādī* or his *nāʾib* (see al-Kindī, 575, 589; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, i, 276-7). During the *ṣalāt* he stood beside the *mihṛāb*; al-Muḳaddasī mentions the anomaly that in Syria one performed one's *ṣalāt* "in front of the *imām*" (202). He could also stand on an elevated position; on one occasion Abū Hurayra conducted the *ṣalāt* in the Meccan mosque from the roof (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt, bāb* 17). In Mecca, in Ibn *Djibayr's* time, each of the four recognised *madhāhib* (with the *Zaydis* in addition) had an *imām*; they conducted the *ṣalāt*, one after the other each in his place, in the following order: *Shāfiʿīs*, *Mālikīs*, *Ḥanafīs* and *Ḥanbalīs*; they only performed the *ṣalāt al-maghrib* together; in Ramaḏān, they held the *tarawīḥ* in different places in the mosque, which was also often conducted by the *kurraʾ* (*Rihla*, 101, 102, 143-4). This is still the case; very frequently one performs the *ṣalāt*, not after the *imām* of one's own *madhhab* (Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka*, ii, 79-80). In Jerusalem, according

to Muḍjir al-Dīn, the order was: Mālikīs, Shāfi'īs, Ḥanafīs and Ḥanbalīs, who prayed each in their own part of the Ḥaram; in Hebron the order was the same (Sauvaire, *Hist. Jér. et Hébron*, 136-7). In Ramaḍān, extraordinary *imāms* were appointed (*ibid.*, 138).

When the *imām* no longer represented a political office, each mosque regularly had one. He had to maintain order and was in general in charge of the divine services in the mosque. In al-Muḳaddasī's time the *imām* of the Mosque of 'Amr read a *ḍjuz* of the Qur'ān every morning after the *ṣalāt* (205). It was his duty to conduct every *ṣalāt*, which is only valid *fi ḍjamā'a*. He must conform to the standards laid down in the law; but it is disputed whether the *ṣalāt* is invalid in the opposite case. According to some, the leader of the Friday *ṣalāt* should be a different man from the leader of the five daily *ṣalāts* (al-Māwardī, *al-Ahkām al-sultāniyya*, ed. Enger, 171; Ibn al-Hāǧǧī, *Madkhal*, ii, 41, 43 ff., 50, 73 ff.; al-Subkī, *Mu'īd al-ni'am*, ed. Myhrman, 163-4; for *ḥadīths*, see Wensinck, *Handbook*, 109-10). Many misgivings against payment being made for religious services were held by certain authorities, who quoted in support of their view a saying of Abū Ḥanīfa (al-Muḳaddasī, 127).

2. The *Khaṭīb* or preacher [see KHATĪB].

3. The *Kāṣṣ* and *Kāri'*. On these, see above, I. C. 3. Sometimes, in later usage, *wā'iz* is used of the official speaker, very like the *khaṭīb* (cf. Ibn Baṭṭūta, iii, 9), while *al-kāṣṣ* is only applied to the street storyteller (al-Subkī, *Mu'īd al-ni'am*, 161-2). The *ḥurā'* were also frequently appointed to *madrasas* and particularly to mausoleums (al-Makrīzī, iv, 223; Yāqūt, iv, 509; al-Subkī, 162; van Berchem, *CIA*, i, no. 252).

4. The *Mu'adhḍhin*. According to most traditions, the office of *mu'adhḍhin* was instituted in the year 1, according to others only after the *isrā'*, in the year 2, according to some weak traditions, while Muḥammad was still in Mecca. At first, the people came to the *ṣalāt* without being summoned. Trumpets (*būq*) were blown and rattles (*nākūs*) used, or fires lit after the custom of Jews, Christians and Maǧjūs. 'Abd Allāh b. Zayd learned the *adhān* formula in a dream; it was approved by the Prophet and when Bilāl proclaimed it, it was found that 'Umar had also learned the same procedure in a dream (Ibn Hiṣhām, 357-8; al-Diyārbakrī, i, 404-5; al-Bukhārī, *Adhān*, bāb 1; al-Zurkānī, i, 121 ff.). There are also variants of the story, e.g. that the Prophet and 'Umar had the vision, or Abū Bakr or seven or fourteen of the Anṣār. According to some, the Prophet learned it at the *mi'rāǧ* from Gabriel, hence the introduction of the *adhān* is dated after the *isrā'*; among the suggestions made, the hoisting of a flag is mentioned (*Sīra Ḥalabiyya*, ii, 100 ff.). Noteworthy is a tradition which goes back to Ibn Sa'd, according to which at 'Umar's suggestion, at first a *munādī*, Bilāl, was sent out who called in the streets: *al-ṣalāta ḍjāmi'atān*. Only later were other possibilities discussed, but the method already in use was confirmed by the dream, only with another formula, the one later used al-Diyārbakrī, i, 404; *Sīra Ḥalabiyya*, ii, 100-1). According to this account, the consideration of other methods would be a secondary episode, and probably the tradition in general represents a later attitude to the practices of other religions. But in Islam, other methods were certainly used. In Fās, a flag was hung out in the minarets and a lamp at night (*JA*, ser. 11, xii, 341). The flag is also found in the legend of the origin of the practice.

The public crier was a well-known institution among the Arabs. Among the tribes and in the towns, important proclamations and invitations to general

assemblies were made by criers. This crier was called *munādī* or *mu'adhḍhin* (*Sīra Ḥalabiyya*, ii, 170; Lam-mens, *La Mecque*, 62 ff., 146; idem, *Berceau*, i, 229 n.; idem, *Mo'āwīa*, 150). *Adhān* therefore means proclamation, *sūra IX*, 3, and *adhḍhana*, *mu'adhḍhin*, *sūra VII*, 70, "to proclaim" and "crier". *Munādī* (al-Bukhārī, *Farḍ al-khums*, bāb 15) and *mu'adhḍhin* (*ibid.*, *Ṣawm*, bāb 69; *Ṣalāt*, bāb 10 = *Djizya*, bāb 16; *Sīra Ḥalabiyya*, ii, 270) are names given to a crier used by the Prophet or Abū Bakr for such purposes. Official proclamations were regularly made by criers (cf. al-Ṭabarī, iii, 2131, 3). Saǧǧāh and Musaylima used a *mu'adhḍhin* to summon the people to their prayers (al-Ṭabarī, i, 1919, 1932; cf. *Annali dell' Islām*, i, 410; 638-9). It was therefore a very natural thing for Muḥammad to assemble the believers to common prayer through a crier (*nādā li'l ilā 'l-ṣalāt*, *sūra V*, 63; lxii, 9); the summons is called *nidā'* and *adhḍhān*, the crier *munādī* (al-Bukhārī, *Wuḍū'*, bāb 5; *Adhān*, bāb 7) and *mu'adhḍhin*; the two names are used quite indiscriminately (e.g. *ibid.*, *Wuḍū'*, bāb 5; al-Ṭabarī, ii, 297 sq.). *Munādī 'l-ṣalāt*, al-Muḳaddasī, 182, 12, also *ṣā'ih* "crier" is used (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 861; *Chron. Mekka*, i, 340).

In these conditions, it was very natural for the crier in the earliest period to be regarded as the assistant and servant of the ruler; he is his *mu'adhḍhin* (Ibn Sa'd, i, 7; Muslim, *Ṣalāt*, tr. 4; al-Makrīzī, iv, 43, etc.; cf. al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1120). 'Umar sent to Kūfa 'Ammār b. Yāsir as *amīr* and 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd "as *mu'adhḍhin* and *wazīr*" (Ibn al-Fakīh, 165); he is thus the right hand of the ruler. Al-Ḥusayn had his *munādī* with him, and the latter summoned to the *ṣalāt* on al-Ḥusayn's instructions (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 297, 298; cf. Ibn Ziyād, *ibid.*, 260 and in the year 196/811-12, the *'amil* in Mecca, *ibid.*, iii, 861, 13; also *Chron. Mekka*, i, 340). During the earliest period, the *mu'adhḍhin* probably issued his summons in the streets and the call was very short: *al-ṣalāta ḍjāmi'atān* (Ibn Sa'd, 7, 7; *Chron. Mekka*, i, 340; al-Ṭabarī, iii, 861; cf. also in the year 196/811-12, *Sīra Ḥalabiyya*, ii, 101 al-Diyārbakrī, i, 404-5). This brief summons was, according to Ibn Sa'd, also used later on irregular occasions (i, 7 ff.; cf. the passage in al-Ṭabarī). Perhaps also the summons was issued from a particular place even at a quite early date (see I. D. 2a). After the public summons, the *mu'adhḍhin* went to the Prophet, greeted him and called him to prayer; the same procedure was later used with his successor; when he had come, the *mu'adhḍhin* announced the beginning of the *ṣalāt* (*akāma 'l-ṣalāt*: cf. al-Bukhārī, *Wuḍū'*, bāb 5; *Adhān*, bāb 48; *Sīra Ḥalabiyya*, ii, 104-5; al-Makrīzī, iv, 45; and *IKĀMA*). The activity of the *mu'adhḍhin* thus fell into three sections: the assembling of the community, the summoning of the *imām* and the announcement of the beginning of the *ṣalāt*. In the course of time, changes were made in all three stages.

The assembling of the community by crying aloud was not yet at all regular in the older period. During the civil strife in 'Irāq, 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād in the year 60/680 had his *munādī* summon people with threats to the evening *ṣalāt* in the mosque, and when after an hour the mosque was full, he had the *ikāma* announced (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 260). When a large number of mosques had come into existence, the public call to prayer had to be organised lest confusion result, and the custom of calling from a raised position became general after the introduction of the minaret. While previously the call to prayer had only been preparatory and the *ikāma* was the final summons, the public call (*adhān*) and the *ikāma* now formed two distinct phases of the call to prayer. Tradition has

retained a memory of the summoning in the streets, now completely fallen into disuse, when it tells us that 'Uthmān introduced a third *adhān*, a call in al-Zawrā', which was made before the call from the minaret: this call, however, was transferred by Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik to the minaret (al-Bukhārī, *Djum'a, bāb* 22, 25; *Sīra Halabiyya*, ii, 110; Ibn al-Hādīdj, *Madkhal*, ii, 45). This may be evidence of the gradual cessation of the custom of summoning the community by going through the streets. Ibn Baṭṭūta (but this is exceptional) tells us that the *mu'adhdhīn* in Khwārazm still fetched the people from their houses and those who did not come were whipped (iii, 4-5), which recalls Wahhābī measures. When exactly the Sunnī and, in distinction to it, the Shī'ī formula, finally developed can hardly be ascertained [see ADHĀN]. The call *ḥayya 'alā 'l-falāḥ* is known from the time of 'Abd al-Malik (65-85/685-705) (al-Akḥṭal, ed. Ṣāliḥānī, 254; see Horowitz, in *Isl.*, xvi [1927], 154; on *takbīr*, see *ibid.*; on *adhān* formulae, see further *Sīra Halabiyya*, ii, 105-6). At first, the call was only made at the chief mosque, as was the case in Medina and Miṣr (al-Makrīzī, iv, 43 below), but very quickly other mosques were also given *mu'adhdhīn*: their calls were sufficiently audible in the whole town. The chief mosque retained this privilege, that its *mu'adhdhīn* called first and the others followed together (al-Makrīzī, iv, 43 below, 44).

The summoning by the *imām* in Medina was therefore quite a natural thing. The custom, at first associated with the ruler's mosque, was not observed in Medina only (see for 'Uthmān and 'Alī, al-Ṭabarī, i, 3059-60), but was also usual under the Umayyads. The formula was *al-salām 'alayka ayyuhā 'l-amīr wa-rahmatu 'llāh wa-barakātuhu, ḥayya 'alā 'l-salāt, ḥayya 'alā 'l-falāḥ al-salāt, yarḥamuka 'llāh* (al-Makrīzī, iv, 45; *Sīra Halabiyya*, ii, 105). After the alteration in the *adhān* and the greater distance of the ruler from the mosque, to summon him was no longer the natural conclusion to the assembling of the community. In the 'Abbāsīd period and under the Fāṭimīds, there was a survival of the old custom, in as much as the *mu'adhdhīn* ended the *adhān* call before the *ṣalāt al-faḍr* on the minarets with a *salām* upon the caliph. This part of the *mu'adhdhīn*'s work was thus associated with the first *adhān* call. When Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn came to power, he did not wish to be mentioned in the call to prayer, but instead he ordered a blessing upon the Prophet to be uttered before the *adhān* to the *ṣalāt al-faḍr*, which after 761/1360 only took place before the Friday service. A *muḥtasīb* ordered that after 791/1389 in Egypt and Syria at each *adhān* a *salām* was to be uttered over the Prophet (al-Makrīzī, iv, 46; *Sīra Halabiyya*, ii, 110). Ibn Djubayr relates that in Mecca after each *ṣalāt al-maghrib*, the foremost *mu'adhdhīn* pronounced a *du'ā'* upon the 'Abbāsīd *Imām* and on Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn from the Zamzam roof, in which those present joined with enthusiasm (103), and according to al-Makrīzī, after each *ṣalāt* prayers for the sultan were uttered by the *mu'adhdhīn* (iv, 53-4). Another relic of the old custom was that the trumpet was sounded at the door of the ruler at times of prayer; this honour was also shown to 'Aḍud al-Dawla in 368/978-9 by order of the caliph (Miskawayh, vi, 499; ed. Cairo 1315, 396).

The *ikāma* always remained the real prelude to the service and is therefore regarded as the original *adhān* (al-Bukhārī, *Djum'a, bāb* 24). In the earliest period, it was fixed by the arrival of the ruler and it might happen that a considerable interval elapsed between the summoning of the people and the *ikāma* (cf. al-Ṭabarī, ii, 260, 297-8). The times were later more accurately defined; one should be able to perform one to three

ṣalāts between the two calls (al-Bukhārī, *Adhān, bāb* 14, 16). Some are said to have introduced the practice of the *mu'adhdhīn* calling *ḥayya 'alā 'l-salāt* at the door of the mosque between the two calls (*Sīra Halabiyya*, ii, 105). From the nature of the case, the *ikāma* was always called in the mosque; at the Friday service, it was done when the *imām* mounted the *minbar* (al-Bukhārī, *Djum'a, bāb* 22, 25; *Sīra Halabiyya*, ii, 110; al-Makrīzī, iv, 43) while the *mu'adhdhīn* stood in front of him. This *mu'adhdhīn*, according to some, ought to be the one who called the *adhān* upon the minaret (*Sīra Halabiyya*, ii, 109), while Ibn al-Hādīdj ignoring the historical facts only permits the call from the minaret (*Madkhal*, ii, 45). In Tunis, the *ikāma* was announced by ringing a bell as in the churches (al-Zarkashī, tr. Fagnan, in *Rec. Soc. Arch. Constantine* [1894], 111-12). A similarity to the responses in the Christian service is found in the fact that the call of the *mu'adhdhīn*, which contains a confession of faith, is to be repeated or at least answered by every one who hears it (al-Bukhārī, *Djum'a, bāb* 23); this is an action which confers religious merit (Ibn Kūṭlūbughā, *Ṭabaqāt al-Hanafiyya*, ed. Flügel, 30). It is possible that we should recognise in this as well as in the development of the formulae the influence of Christians converted to Islam (cf. Becker, *Zur Gesch. d. islam. Kultus*, in *Isl.*, iii [1912], 374 ff., and *Islamstudien*, i, 472 ff., who sees an imitation of the Christian custom in the *ikāma* in general; on the possibility of Jewish influence, see Mittwoch, in *Abh. Pr. A. W.* [1913], Phil.-Hist. Cl. 2).

The *mu'adhdhīn* thus obtained a new importance. His work was not only to summon the people to divine service, but was in itself a kind of religious service. His sphere of activity was further developed. In Egypt we are told that Maslama b. Muḥallad (47-62/667-82) introduced the *tasbīḥ*. This consisted in praises of God which were uttered by the *mu'adhdhīn* all through the night until *faḍr*. This is explained as a polemical imitation of the Christians, for the governor was troubled by the use of the *nawākīs* at night and forbade them during the *adhān* (al-Makrīzī, iv, 48). In the time of Aḥmad b. Ṭūlūn and Khumārawayh, the *mu'adhdhīn* recited religious texts throughout the night in a special room. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn ordered them to recite an *'akīda* in the night *adhān* and after 700/1300-1, *dhikr* was performed on Friday morning on the minarets (*ibid.*, 48-9, *Sīra Halabiyya*, ii, 111). In Mecca also, the *mu'adhdhīn* performed *dhikr* throughout the night of 1 Shawwāl on the roof of the *ḡubba* of the Zamzam well (Ibn Djubayr, 155, 156; cf. for Damascus, al-Makrīzī, iv, 49). Similar litanies are kept up in modern times, as well as a special call about an hour before dawn (*ebed, tarḥīm*: see Lane, *Manners and customs*, Everyman's Library, 75-6, cf. 86; Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka* ii, 84 ff.).

The original call of the *mu'adhdhīn* thus developed into a melodious chant like the recitation of the Qur'ān. Al-Muḥaddasī tells us that in the 4th/10th century in Egypt during the last third of the night, the *adhān* was recited like a dirge (205). The solemn effect was increased by the large number of voices. In large mosques, like that of Mecca, the chief *mu'adhdhīn* called first from a minaret, then the others came in turn (*Chron. Mekka*, iii, 242-5); Ibn Djubayr, 145 ff.; (cf. Ibn Rusta, 111, 1 ff. and above). But in the mosque itself, the *ikāma* was pronounced by the *mu'adhdhīn* in chorus on the *dakka* (see above, I. D. 2e) erected for this purpose, which is also traced to Maslama. In the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries we hear of these melodious recitations (*taṭrīb*) of the *mu'adhdhīn* on a raised podium in widely separated

parts of the Muslim world (Ṣan'ā', Egypt, Khurāsān, al-Muḳaddasī, 327; Ibn Rusta, 111; the expression *al-mutala'ibīn*, "the musicians", if correct, probably refers to the *mu'adhdhīns*, al-Muḳaddasī, 205; cf. also al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, 469; for Fārs we are expressly told that the *mu'adhdhīns* call without *taḥrīb*, al-Muḳaddasī, 439, 17). Sometimes in large mosques, they were stationed in different parts of the mosque to make the *imām*'s words clear to the community (*tabliḡh*). The singing, especially in chorus, like the *tabliḡh*, was regarded by many as *bid'ā* (al-Kindī, *op. cit.*; *Madkhal*, ii, 45-6, 61-2; *Sīra Ḥalabiyya*, ii, 111). In other ways also, the *mu'adhdhīns* could be compared to deacons at the service. The *khaṭīb* on his progress to the *minbar* in Mecca was accompanied by *mu'adhdhīns*, and the chief *mu'adhdhīn* girded him with a sword on the *minbar* (Ibn Djubayr, 96-7).

The new demands made on the *mu'adhdhīns* necessitated an increase in their number, especially in the large mosques. The Prophet in Medina had two *mu'adhdhīns*, Bilāl b. Ribāḥ, Abū Bakr's *mawlā*, and Ibn Umm Maktūm, who worked in rotation. 'Uthmān also is said occasionally to have called the *adhān* in front of the *minbar*, i.e. the *ikāma* (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 43). It is therefore regarded as commendable to have two *mu'adhdhīns* at a mosque (Muslim, *Ṣalāt*, tr. 4; cf. al-Subkī, *Mu'īd*, 165). Abū Maḥdhūra was also the Prophet's *mu'adhdhīn* in Mecca. Under 'Umar, Bilāl's successor as *mu'adhdhīn* was Sa'd al-Ḳaraz, who is said to have called to prayer for the Prophet in Ḳubā' (al-Maḳrīzī, *op. cit.*; cf. *Sīra Ḥalabiyya*, ii, 107 ff.). In Egypt under 'Amr, the first *mu'adhdhīn* in al-Fuṣṭāṭ was Abū Muslim; he was soon joined by nine others. The *mu'adhdhīns* of the different mosques formed an organisation, the head ('arīf) of which, after Abū Muslim, was his brother Shurahbīl b. 'Amir (d. 65/684-5); during his time, Maslama b. Mukhallad built minarets (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 44).

The office of *mu'adhdhīn* was sometimes hereditary. The descendants of Bilāl were for example *mu'adhdhīns* of the Medina Mosque in al-Rawḍa (Ibn Djubayr, 194). We also find in Medina the sons of Sa'd al-Ḳaraz officiating (Ibn Ḳutayba, *Ma'ārīf*, ed. Wüstenfeld, 132, 279), in Mecca, the sons of Abū Maḥdhūra (*ibid.*, 278; *Sīra Ḥalabiyya*, ii, 106), in Baṣra, the sons of al-Mundhir b. Hassān al-'Abdī, *mu'adhdhīns* of 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād (Ibn Ḳutayba, 279); it is, however, possible that this was really the result of a system of guilds of *mu'adhdhīns*. In the *djawāmi'* of the Maghrib in the 8th/14th century, each had regularly four *mu'adhdhīns* who were stationed in different parts of the mosque during the *ṣalāt* (*Madkhal*, ii, 47 above); but there were often quite a large number. In the Azhar mosque in the time of al-Ḥākim, there were fifteen, each of whom was paid two *dīnārs* a month (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 51). Ibn Baṭṭūṭa found seventy *mu'adhdhīns* in the Mosque of the Umayyads (i, 204). About 1900, in Medina there were in the Mosque of the Prophet fifty *mu'adhdhīns* and twenty-six assistants (al-Batanūnī, *Rihla*, 242). Blind men were often chosen for this office; Ibn Umm Maktūm, for example, was blind (al-Bukhārī, *Adhān*, *bāb* 11; *Sīra Ḥalabiyya*, ii, 104; cf. Lane, *op. cit.*, 75). The Prophet is said to have forbidden Thakīf to pay a *mu'adhdhīn* (al-Wāḳidī-Wellhausen, 383). 'Uthmān is said to have been the first to give payment to the *mu'adhdhīns* (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 44) and Aḥmad b. Ṭulūn gave them large sums (*ibid.*, 48). They regularly received their share in the endowments, often by special provisions in the documents establishing the foundations.

The *mu'adhdhīns* were organised under chiefs

(*ru'asā'*: al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 14). In Mecca, the *ra'īs al-mu'adhdhīnīn* was identical with the *mu'adhdhīn al-Zamzamī* who had charge of the singing in the upper story of the Zamzam building (*Chron. Mekka*, iii, 424-5; Ibn Djubayr, 145; cf. Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka*, ii, 322). The *ra'īs* was next to the *imām* but subordinate to him; in certain districts, it was the custom for him to mount the pulpit during the sermon with the *imām* (when the latter acted as *khaṭīb*) (*Madkhal*, ii, 74). The position which they originally occupied can still be seen from the part which they play in public processions of officials, e.g. of the *Ḳādī 'l-Ḳudāt*, when they walk in front and laud the ruler and his vizier (al-Maḳrīzī, ii, 246).

Closely associated with the *mu'adhdhīn* is the *muwaḳkīl*, the astronomer, whose task it was to ascertain the *kibla* and the times of prayer (al-Subkī, *Mu'īd*, 165-6 and see *mīḳāt*); sometimes the chief *mu'adhdhīn* did this (Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka*, ii, 322).

5. Servants. According to Abū Hurayra, the Mosque of the Prophet was swept by a negro (al-Bukhārī, *Ṣalāt*, *bāb* 72, cf. 74). The larger mosques gradually acquired a large staff of servants (*khuddām*), notably *bawwāb*, *farrāsh*, and water-carriers (cf. e.g. van Berchem, *CIA*, i, 252). In Mecca there have always been special appointments, such as supervisor of Zamzam and guardian of the Ka'ba (*sādīn*, pl. *sadana*, also used of the officials of the mosque: al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 76; cf. Ibn Djubayr, 278). In Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's time, the servants (*khuddām*) of the Mosque of the Prophet were eunuchs, particularly Abyssinian; their chief (*shaykh al-khuddām*) was like a great *amīr* and was paid by the Egyptian-Syrian government (i, 278, 348); cf. the title of an *amīr* of the year 798/1395-6, *shaykh mashā'ikh al-sāda al-khuddām bi 'l-haram al-sharīf al-nabawī* (van Berchem, *CIA*, i, no. 201). In the Mosque of Jerusalem in about 300/912-13, there were no less than 140 servants (*khādīm*; Ibn al-Faḳīh, 100); others give the figure 230 (Le Strange, *Palestine*, 163) and according to Muḍjir al-Dīn, 'Abd al-Malik appointed a guard of 300 black slaves here, while the actual menial work was done by certain Jewish and Christian families (Sauvaire, *Hist. Jér. et Hébr.*, 56-7).

In other mosques, superintendents (*ḳayyim*, pl. *ḳawama*) are mentioned, a vague title which covered a multitude of duties: thus the Madrasa al-Maḳdiyya had a *ḳayyim* who looked after the cleaning, the staff, the lighting and water-supply (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 251), the Azhar Mosque had one for the *mi'da'a*, who was paid twelve *dīnārs* (*ibid.*, 51) and also 4 *ḳawama*, who were paid like *mu'adhdhīns* (two *dīnārs* a month) and are mentioned between them and the *imāms*, probably supervisors of the staff (*ibid.*, 51). In other cases, a *ḳayyim al-djāmi'*, sometimes a *ḳādī*, is mentioned, who is apparently the same as the *imām*, the *khaṭīb* or some similar individual of standing (*ibid.*, 75, 121, cf. 122; cf. Ibn Djubayr, 51). A *mushrif*, inspector, is also mentioned, e.g. in the Azhar (al-Maḳrīzī, iv, 51).

Bibliography: given in the article.

(J. PEDERSEN)

H. The architecture of the mosque.

1. Introduction. Attempts to generalise about regional variations in mosque architecture are fraught with difficulty and have often miscarried. One solution, admittedly a compromise, is to select a few of the most celebrated mosques, to imply in more or less arbitrary fashion that they are typical, and to base the requisite generalisations on them. This approach has at least the merit of clarity, and it could indeed be argued that it is in the finest mosques of a given period and region that local peculiarities are apt to find their fullest expression. Nevertheless, such a broad-brush

approach, for all its superficial attractions, is simply not specific enough. Another approach, which might be termed typological, cuts across regional and temporal boundaries in order to isolate the significant variants of mosque design and trace their development. Yet, precisely because it ignores such boundaries, this approach tends to minimise the significance of regional schools and fashions. The categories and sub-species which it proposes tend to have a somewhat academic flavour; while technically defensible, they somehow miss the point. A third approach might be to rely on statistics and, by chronicling all known mosques of pre-modern date, to discover the types and distribution of the most popular varieties. The picture to emerge from such a study might indeed be literally accurate, but it would not distinguish between the *ḡāmi*^c and the *masḡid*, that is, between the major religious building of a town or city and the neighbourhood mosque (on the *ḡāmi*^c and its functions, see above, I. C. 2.). Since virtually all the mosques under discussion here fall into the category of *ḡāmi*^c, such a study would be of limited value in this context, and would assuredly blur the sharp outlines of regional peculiarities of mosque design. After all, the simplest types of mosques not only vastly outnumber the more complex ones but are also to be found throughout the Muslim world. It is such mosques, therefore, which make up the standard distribution of this building type. They dominate by sheer weight of numbers, but—by the same token—they distort the overall picture, suggesting a uniformity that actually exists only at the level of the most primitive buildings. Only when a statistical survey of this kind is relieved of the effectively dead weight of such buildings can regional and temporal distinctions stand out in their full clarity.

Such are the difficulties attendant on venturing a *tour d'horizon* of formal developments in the pre-modern mosque. What, then, is the best way of tackling this problem? The most promising line of approach is probably to identify those mosque types which are most distinctive of a given area and period, describing their constituent features but avoiding a detailed analysis of individual buildings. It should be emphasised that the over-riding aim of highlighting significant regional developments entails the suppression of much corroborative detail and, more importantly, of those periods when a given region was simply continuing to build mosques in a style already well established. Admittedly the lulls in innovation have their own part to play in the history of mosque architecture; but that part is too modest to rate any extended discussion here.

For that same reason, areas in which the pace of change was sluggish are allotted less attention in the following account than those which were consistently in the forefront of experiment. The Maghrib, for example, receives less space than Iran, while 'Irāk and the Levant take second place to Egypt and Anatolia. These emphases, moreover, reflect the basic truth that the design of a mosque was often less liable to take on a distinctively local colouring than were its decoration, its structural techniques or even specific components of that design, such as the minaret [see MANĀRA]. The time-span covered by this article is also limited. The mosque architecture of the last two centuries, which have seen the gradual invasion of a long-established Islamic idiom by European ideas and motifs, and in which a general decline is unmistakable, is omitted from this account. One final caveat should be sounded: the ensuing generalisations deliberately exclude the peripheral areas of the Islamic

world, notably Indonesia, Malaysia, China and sub-Saharan Africa, for which see sections III-VII below. Nearly all the mosques in these areas are of post-mediaeval date, and therefore lie in the shadow of developments in the Islamic heartlands. There is, moreover, a strong vernacular element in these regional traditions, for they draw very heavily on a reservoir of ideas, practices and forms which owe very little to Islam. Thus for reasons which are as much historical and cultural as geographical they do not belong in the mainstream of mosque architecture.

This survey, then, will cover the central Islamic lands from al-Andalus to Afghānistān. The very nature of the material, however, makes it undesirable to embark directly on a series of regional summaries: the sheer lack of surviving monuments would require each summary to start at a different date. In most areas of the Islamic world it is not until the 5th/11th century that mosques survive in sufficient quantities for the lineaments of a local style to emerge. To explain that style would in most cases entail reference to earlier mosques in other regions, with consequent repetition and overlap. The crucial decisions which dictated the subsequent formal development of the mosque were taken in the early centuries of Islam; and the buildings which embodied those decisions are themselves thinly scattered over the entire area bounded by al-Andalus and Afghānistān. Yet the interconnections between these buildings are such as to make light of their geographical remoteness from each other.

Accordingly, a pan-Islamic survey of the early architectural history of the mosque will preface the individual accounts of local developments. These accounts in turn will be of unequal length. Pride of place will go to the Arab mosque plan, which not only had the widest diffusion but also covers the longest chronological span. Next in length will be the survey of the Persian tradition, almost as ancient as that of the Arab plan but more restricted in geographical scope. Shortest of all will be the discussion of the Turkish mosque type, whose creative development is confined in time to the 8th-11th/14th-17th centuries and in space to Anatolia.

2. Early history of the mosque: 622-1000 A.D.

(a) The house of the Prophet. Beyond doubt, the genesis of the mosque is to be sought in a single seminal building: the house of the Prophet, erected to Muḡammad's own specifications in Medina in 1/622. It was a near-square enclosure of some 56 × 53 m. with a single entrance; a double range of palm-trunk columns thatched with palm leaves (a feature of many African mosques to this day) was added on the *kibla* side, with a lean-to for destitute Companions to the south-east and nine huts for Muḡammad and his wives along the western perimeter. By a curious paradox, it was not built even secondarily as a mosque. This fact cannot be over-emphasised, since to ignore it is to misinterpret the subsequent history of mosque architecture. The venerated model for all later mosques itself became a mosque only, as it were, by the way and in the course of time. How is this to be explained? The accumulated deposit of many centuries of reverence makes it difficult to disinter the full original context of the building. Yet this much is clear: it was first and foremost a house for Muḡammad and his family to live in. It was also conceived from the beginning as a gathering place for the growing band of Muslims: in fact a kind of community centre, complete with the attendant associations of welfare. At the same time it served political, military

and legal functions, while its high walls and single entrance allowed it at need to act as a place of refuge for the community. To be sure, by degrees people began to pray in it; but they prayed in many other places too and there is no evidence that it was used as the regular place of worship in the earliest years of the community. The mere fact that dogs and camels were allowed free access to it effectively disposes of such a notion. In short, Muḥammad had, it seems, no intention of creating a new type of building here. It is in no sense radical. In its extreme simplicity and austerity it well reflects his own life-style at that time. Its substantial scale may seem to contradict this, but is in fact somewhat deceptive, for some 80% of the interior consists of a vast empty courtyard. Yet it was this very emptiness that gave the mosque its innate flexibility, and in subsequent centuries a large open space became a standard feature of most large mosques. It is surely *à propos* to note that the earliest Christian places of worship, the so-called *tituli*, were also ordinary houses. (For a detailed discussion of the Prophet's *masjīd* and its various functions, see above, I. A. 1.)

(b) The so-called "Arab plan". Although there was thus a large measure of accident in the adoption of Muḥammad's house as the model *par excellence* of later mosques, that form could not have enjoyed the popularity it did unless it had answered to a nicety the needs of Muslim liturgy and prayer. Its components—an enclosed square or rectangular space with a courtyard and a covered area for prayer on the *qibla* side—could be varied at will so as to transform the aspect of the building. Thus there evolved the so-called "Arab" or "hypostyle" mosque plan. From the first it showed itself capable of quite radical modification according to circumstances. At Kūfa in 17/638 the location of the mosque within one of the garrison cities (*amṣār*) allowed the builders to dispense with the element of security, and the perimeter—its dimensions fixed, according to al-Balādhuri, by four bowshots—is marked by ditches; elsewhere, as at Baṣra in the year 14/635, a reed fence served the same purpose. At Fuṣṭāṭ in the rebuilt mosque of 'Amr (53/673), corner turrets served simultaneously to articulate the exterior, to single out the mosque from afar and to provide a place from which the call to prayer could be made: the germ of the future minaret. Multiple entrances became a feature as early as the first mosque of 'Amr at Fuṣṭāṭ (22/643), admitting light to the *muṣallā* [*q.v.*], and also above, I. B. 6] and allowing maximum ease of circulation.

The sunny climate of the southern Mediterranean and the Near East allowed the courtyard to accommodate the huge numbers of extra worshippers attending the Friday service. This was when its large expanse justified itself. For the rest of the week it was largely empty, and the heat and light emitted by this expanse could cause discomfort. This was especially likely if there were no provision for shade on three of the four sides, as in the early versions of the Great Mosques of Cordova (170/787), Ḳayrawān (221/836) and Tunis (250/864). Hence there arose the practice of adding arcades along the three subsidiary sides, so that people could walk around the mosque in cool shade. In time these arcades could be doubled, tripled or even quadrupled. A change in the alignment of their vaulting from one side of the mosque to another brought welcome visual relief and excluded the danger of monotony; so too did variations in the depth or number of the arcades (the second 'Amr mosque in Cairo). As the surface area of the covered sanctuary was increased so did new spatial refinements suggest

themselves, such as the progressive unfolding of seemingly endless vistas in all direction. Rows of supports (often spolia) with fixed intercolumniations created hundreds of repetitive modular units, perhaps deliberately mirroring the long files of worshippers at prayer.

Externally, the accent was on simplicity, with regular buttresses giving the structure a warlike air. At the Great Mosque of Sāmarrā (completed 238/852) there are a dozen of these on each long side, not counting the corners, with doorways after every second buttress. At Susa the exterior dispenses with buttresses in favour of rounded corner bastions, while in the mosque of al-Hākīm in Cairo (381/991 onwards) the minarets at the corner of the façade rise from two gigantic square salients. The emplacement of the *mīhrāb* [*q.v.*] was marked by a corresponding rectangular projection on the exterior wall. Entrances were commonly allotted a measure of extra decoration—as in the series of shallow porches along the flank of the Cordova mosque—but massive portals on the scale of those in Western cathedrals found no favour in the early mosques of Arab plan. The absolute scale of some mosques (the mosque of Sāmarrā, for instance, could have accommodated 100,000 people) encouraged the adoption of fixed proportional ratios such as 3:2, which contributed in large measure to the impression of satisfying harmony which these mosques produced. The Ḳarakhānid mosque of Samarkand (5th/11th century) illustrates the continuing use of such ratios. Sometimes the scale of the mosque was illusionistically increased by the addition of a broad open enclosure (*ziyāda*) on three of the four sides (Mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn, Cairo, finished 264/878, presumably copying the mosques of Sāmarrā). In comparison with later mosques of similar scale, which catered for multiple subsidiary functions by adding appropriate purpose-built structures to the central core, these early mosques maintain simple and symmetrical lines, especially for their outer walls.

The architectural vocabulary of these early mosques brought further scope for diversity. In the first half-century of Islamic architecture, the system of roofing was still primitive, and even when columns and roof-beams had replaced palm-trunks and thatching, the basic scheme remained trabeate (Baṣra; Kūfa; and Wāsiṭ, 83/702) whether the roof was flat or pitched. Thus the post-and-lintel system long familiar from Graeco-Roman buildings was perpetuated, and the pervasive classical flavour was strengthened by the lavish use of spolia. Sometimes, however, as in the bull-headed capitals of the Iṣṭakhḥr mosque, these were of Achaemenid origin.

By degrees, wooden roofs resting on arcades gained popularity, and this was the prelude to full-scale vaulting in durable materials (especially in Iran: Tārīkhāna mosque, Dāmghān, and Fahrādj *djāmi*^c, both perhaps 3rd/9th century; Nā'in *djāmi*^c, perhaps 4th/10th century). The earliest mosques all use columns, and were thereby restricted to relatively low roofs. By the 3rd/9th century the pier had ousted the column as the principal bearing member, though it occurs as early as the mosques of Damascus, Ba'labakk and Ḥarrān, and though the column was still used for some mosques (Ḳayrawān; al-Azhar, Cairo, 362/973). This change made it possible to raise the height of the roof, an important development given the oppressive sensation produced by a low roof extending over a large surface area. At the Cordova mosque the column shafts bore piers braced by strainer arches; but this device, for all its ingenuity,

could not rival the popularity of superposed arcades in the fashion of Roman aqueducts (Damascus mosque, finished 98/716).

The apparently minor detail of whether the arcades ran parallel to the *kibla* or at right angles to it was sufficient to transform the visual impact of the roof. In the latter case, it focused attention on the *kibla*, and this was the solution that recommended itself to Maghribī architects (mosques of Cordova, Tunis and Ḳayrawān). Syrian architects, on the other hand, with only one major exception (Aḳṣā mosque, Jerusalem), preferred arcades parallel to the *kibla* (Damascus; Ḳaṣr al-Ḥayr East, ca. 109/728; Ba'labakk, ca. 6th/12th century; Ḥarrān, ca. 133/750; and Raḳqa, ca. 3rd/9th century), possibly reflecting in this the influence of the Christian basilica ubiquitous in that region, and several Egyptian mosques followed suit, including those of Ibn Ṭūlūn, al-Azhar and al-Ḥākim. It was a natural development to build mosques with arcades running in both directions (Great Mosques of Sfax and Susa, both finished 236/850), but with these exceptions the early experiments with this idea are all on a relatively modest scale which betrays some uncertainty of purpose. They comprise a small group of 9-bayed mosques with a dome over each bay and no courtyard: a type represented in Toledo, Ḳayrawān, Cairo and Balkh and dating mainly from the 4th/10th century. These buildings inaugurate the much more ambitious use of vaults in later mosques. No such solutions are to be found in the larger mosques built before the 5th/11th century. This early Islamic vaulting drew its ideas impartially from the Romano-Byzantine tradition and from Sasanian Iran, and quickly developed its own distinctive styles, in which the pointed vault soon dominated.

(c) The secular element in early mosque architecture. In some mosques, the desire to emphasise the covered sanctuary (*muṣallā*) was achieved simply by adding extra bays and thus increasing its depth. In other mosques, especially those with royal associations, the requisite emphasis was achieved by some striking visual accentuation of the *muṣallā*: a more elaborate façade, a higher and wider central aisle, a gable or a dome. Once this idea of glorifying the *muṣallā* had taken root it was enthusiastically exploited, for example by furnishing this area with several carefully placed domes (Cordova, al-Azhar). On occasion, indeed, the *muṣallā*—complete with such distinguishing features as wider central aisle, dome in front of the *miḥrāb* and transversely vaulted bays adjoining the *kibla*—could itself become the mosque, with no attached courtyard (al-Aḳṣā).

The effect of singling out the *muṣallā* by these various means is to emphasise that this area is more important than any other in the mosque. Since this latter notion runs counter to the widely-expressed belief that all parts of the mosque are equally sacred, and that gradations of sanctity within it run counter to the spirit of Islam, its origins are worth investigating. It should be stressed at the outset that these various articulating devices cannot all be explained as attempts to draw attention to the *kibla*. Some measure of emphasis for this purpose was certainly required. Hence, no doubt, the greater depth of arcades on that side and the provision of an elaborate façade for the *muṣallā* alone. Similarly, the use of a different alignment or type of vaulting for the bays immediately in front of the *kibla* would make sense as a means of signposting this crucial area. Yet the addition of a dome or gable, or both, along the central aisle of the *muṣallā*, and the greater width and height of that aisle,

cannot be explained—as is so often the case—simply as a means of highlighting the *miḥrāb*. After all, the entire *kibla* wall served to mark the correct orientation for prayer, so that the *miḥrāb* was technically redundant. The relatively late appearance of the *miḥrāb* (no 1st/7th century mosque appears to have possessed one and it is described as an innovation introduced by al-Walīd I in his re-building of the Mosque of the Prophet in Medina in 84/703) further suggests that it was not devised to meet some liturgical imperative.

The evidence points rather to the desire to assert in as public a way as the dictates of religious architecture would permit, the importance of the ruler in religious ceremonies. It was the duty of the caliph or of his representative to lead his people in prayer and to pronounce the *ḵuṭba* [q. v.]. The political overtones of the latter ritual, which proclaimed allegiance to the ruler in much the same spirit as the diptychs in the contemporary Byzantine liturgy, in large part explain the physical form of the *minbar* [q. v.] from which the *ḵuṭba* was pronounced. Similarly, the *miḥrāb*, another latecomer to mosque architecture, can be interpreted in secular terms, most conveniently as a throne apse transposed into a religious setting. These royal connotations could only be intensified by the addition of a dome over the bay directly in front of the *miḥrāb*.

Underneath that same dome was the preferred location for the *maḳṣūra* (see for this, above, I. D. 2. b.), usually a square enclosure of wood or stone reserved for the ruler, and ensuring both his privacy and his physical safety. Each of these elements in the mosque—*miḥrāb*, *minbar*, *maḳṣūra*, dome—drew added power from the proximity of the others, and together they stamped a secular and princely significance on this particular area of the mosque. The earliest surviving mosque which illustrates this emphasis, the Great Mosque of Damascus, adds a further refinement: a high transverse gable with a pitched roof cuts across the lateral emphasis of the *muṣallā* and thus highlights not just the *miḥrāb* area but also the way to it. The extra height of the gable and the way it cleaves across the grain of the mosque underscore its proclamatory role. Sometimes, as in the *djāmi*'s of Tunis and Ḳayrawān, another dome over the central archway of the *muṣallā* façade sufficed to create an axis focused on the *miḥrāb*. As at Damascus, this axis asserted itself both inside the *muṣallā* and—by virtue of its greater width and the consequent break in the even tenor of the roofing—externally, at roof level. In later mosques, such as al-Azhar and al-Ḥākim (which possibly derive in this from al-Aḳṣā) the notion of the external gable is toned down to a broad flat strip projecting only modestly above roof level; but internally, the emphasis on the broader central nave terminating in the dome over the *miḥrāb* remains unchanged. It seems likely that these articulating devices were intended to mark out a processional way, presumably the formal route by which the ruler approached the *miḥrāb*.

So much, then, for the various elements in mosque design for which princely associations have been proposed. Yet their mere enumeration does not tell the full story. For it is above all the occurrence of these features in mosques located next to the residence of the ruler that places their political associations beyond doubt. This close juxtaposition of the secular and the religious may well have had its roots in the Prophet's house. Be that as it may, at Baṣra, Kūfa, Fuṣṭāṭ, Damascus, to name only a few very early examples, the principal mosque and the private residence of the ruler adjoined each other, and the viceroy Ziyād b. Abīhi [q. v.] said of this arrangement "it is not fitting

that the *Imām* should pass through the people"—a sentiment, incidentally, not shared by many later Islamic rulers. The analogy with the palatine chapel in Byzantium and mediaeval Europe—at Constantinople and Ravenna, Aachen and Palermo—is striking. Perhaps the most public expression of the idea in the mediaeval Islamic world was in the Round City of Baghdād, where the huge and largely empty space at the heart of the city held only two buildings: the palace and the mosque, next door to each other. It would be hard to find the concept of Caesaropapism expressed more explicitly, or on a more gargantuan scale, than this.

The local expression of the articulating features under discussion varied from one part of the Islamic world to another, but they had come to stay. Henceforth, the *djami*^c of Arab plan only rarely returned to the simplicity of the 1st/7th century. Such, however, was the strength of the traditions formed at that time that the basic nature of the earliest mosques remained substantially unchanged. They were proof, for example, against immense increases in size and against a growing interest in embellishment by means of structural innovations and applied ornament. Even the conversion into mosques of pre-Islamic places of worship, as at Damascus and Ḥamā, was powerless to affect their essential nature. The component parts of the Arab mosque could be redistributed and rearranged almost at will without impairing their functional effectiveness.

In much the same way, their idiosyncrasies of structure and decoration were purely cosmetic. The range of options in these areas was gratifyingly wide. Windows and lunettes bore *ajouré* grilles in stone or plaster with geometric and vegetal designs (Damascus mosque); wooden ceilings were painted or carved and coffered (Ṣan‘ā’ mosque, 1st/7th century onwards); a wide range of capitals, at first loosely based on classical models but in time featuring designs of Central Asian origin (Sāmarrā) was developed; and piers with engaged corner colonnettes (Ibn Ṭūlūn mosque, Cairo) rang the changes on the traditional classical column. Finally, the aspect of these early mosques could be varied still further by the type of flooring employed—stamped earth, brick, stone or even marble flags—and by applied decoration in carved stone or stucco, fresco, painted glass, embossed metalwork or mosaic.

3. Later history of the "Arab plan" mosque.

The essentially simple components of the Arab plan set a limit to the degree of diversity that could be achieved within these specifications. Most of the room for manoeuvre had been exhausted within the first four centuries of Islamic architecture. Thus the subsequent history of the Arab plan cannot match the early period for variety and boldness; the later mosques, moreover, lie very much in the shadow of their predecessors, to such an extent, indeed, that it is hard to single out significant new departures in these later buildings. It can scarcely be doubted that the presence of the great Umayyad and ‘Abbāsīd mosques, built at the period when the Islamic world was at the peak of its material prosperity, acted as a signal deterrent to later architects with substantially less money, men and materials at their disposal. In these early centuries the caliphal permission, not readily granted, had been required for the construction of a *djami*^c making it therefore a major undertaking, and correspondingly hard to emulate. By the 5th/11th century, moreover, most of the major Muslim cities had their own *djami*^c, so that the need for huge mosques had much declined.

Although mosques of Arab plan have continued to be built throughout the Islamic world until the present day, in the mediaeval period there were only two areas where they achieved dominance: in the Western Islamic lands before they fell under Ottoman rule, and in pre-Ottoman Anatolia. These areas will therefore provide the material for most of the discussion which follows. Nevertheless, sporadic references will be made to mosques elsewhere, for instance in Egypt and the Yemen.

(a) The Maghrib. The Maghrib rightfully takes pride of place in this account because for almost a millennium virtually no mosque that was not of Arab type was built there. Here, then, is to be found the most homogeneous and consistent development of that type. Its sources lie, like so much of Maghribī art, in Syria, and specifically in the Great Mosque of Damascus. Its transverse gable becomes a leitmotif in Maghribī mosques, and in some cases (such as the Ḳarawīyyīn Mosque [*q.v.*], Fez, founded 226/841 but largely of the 6th/12th century) is associated with the same proportions as the Syrian building, including the relatively shallow oblong courtyard imposed on the Damascus mosque by the classical *temenos* but copied thereafter in other mosques as a deliberate feature. In the Mosque of the Andalusians at Fez (600-4/1203-7) the Damascus schema is retained despite a jaggedly irregular perimeter and trapezoidal courtyard; and, as at the Ḳarawīyyīn mosque, the main entrance to the mosque is aligned to it, a refinement not found at Damascus. The length of the gable has also increased considerably, though its height is modest.

In later Maghribī mosques especially, the emphasis shifted from the exterior elevation of the gable to its impact from within the building. It attracts unusually intricate vaulting, often of *muḳarnas* [*q.v.*] type, or may be marked by domes ranging in number from two (Tlemcen, 531/1136) to six (second Kutubiyya, Marrakesh, mid-6th/mid-12th century). The latter mosque has a further five cupolas placed three bays apart along the transverse *ḳibla* aisle. Thus by means of vaulting alone is created a T-shape which combines the secular and religious emphases of the *djami*^c. Fewer vaults or domes, more strategically placed—for example at the *miḥrāb*, the *muṣallā* entrance and the corners of the *ḳibla* wall—could suffice to carry the T-shape into the elevation, but the form could be created at ground level alone by means of a wider central nave and by ensuring that the vaults stopped one bay short of the *ḳibla*, thus opening up dramatically the space immediately in front of it. The T-shape can indeed claim to be the principal Maghribī contribution to the development of mosque form, though horseshoe arches and square minarets were equally characteristic of the style.

Three other features distinguish Maghribī mosques from those found elsewhere in the Islamic world, though all have their origins in al-Andalus: the use of pierced ribbed or fluted domes, especially over the *miḥrāb*; the manipulation of arch forms to create hierarchical distinctions by means of gradual enrichment; and a readiness to alter the size, shape and location of the courtyard in response to the imperatives of a specific design. The ribbed domes (e.g. *djami*^cs of Taza, 537/1142 and 691/1292, and Algiers, ca. 490/1097) derive from those of the Cordova mosque, but elaborate on them by cramming them with vegetal designs in carved stucco or by increasing the number of ribs from the usual eight to twelve (Tlemcen *djami*^c) or even sixteen (Taza *djami*^c). This practice gives free rein to the characteristically Maghribī obsession with non-structural arched forms, here used as a lace-like

infill between the ribs; the overall effect is one of feathery lightness and grace. The light filtered through these domes suffuses the area of the *mihṛāb* with radiance, perhaps as a deliberate metaphor of spiritual illumination, an idea rendered still more potent when, as is often the case, that *mihṛāb* bears the popular text of sūra XXIV, 36-7, "God is the Light of the heavens and the earth; the likeness of His Light is as a niche wherein is a lamp..."

Long files of arched columns stretching in multiple directions and generating apparently endless vistas are a particular feature of Maghribī mosques. The distinctive "forest space" thereby created finds its fullest expression in the fourth major rebuilding of the Cordova mosque, the supreme generative masterpiece of Western Islamic architecture, and the major Almoravid and Almohad mosques are best interpreted as reflections of this great original. Where the Cordova mosque, however, employed systems of intersecting arches and carefully differentiated types of capital to establish hierarchical distinctions, later Maghribī *ḡāmi*'s typically use a wide range of arch profiles to the same end. These include, besides the ubiquitous horseshoe type already noted, lobed, multifoil, interlaced cusped, trefoil, lambrequin and other varieties. They spring from piers, not columns, and this, coupled with the low roof, dim lighting and the general absence of ornament unconnected with vaulting, lends these interiors a ponderous austerity. Against this general background of parsimonious simplicity, the sudden switch from plain arch profiles for most of the sanctuary to elaborate ones for the axial nave alone constitutes a dramatic enrichment of the interior. Sometimes the transverse aisle in front of the *kibla* wall attests a third type of arch profile, and thus a further gradation of importance is emphasised.

In most western Islamic mosques the courtyard is something of an appendage. It is almost always very much smaller than the covered space. Custom decreed that it was isolated at the opposite end of the mosque from the *mihṛāb*, and that it should either be contiguous to the outer wall or be separated from it by no more than a single aisle. By contrast, the sanctuary tended to be of disproportionate depth and extent. This meant that the courtyard was never able to function as the heart of the mosque. Only when the sanctuary was reduced, as in the *Ḳaṣba* mosque in Marrakesh (581-6/1185-90), with its pronounced cruciform emphasis, was the courtyard able, both literally and figuratively, to play a more central role. In narrow rectangular plans, it can be a diminutive square box hemmed in by deep lateral aisles (Mosque of al-Manṣūra, 704-45/1304-44) or an extended shallow oblong (Mosque of Seville, ca. 571/1175). In oblong plans, it faithfully mirrored that emphasis on a diminutive scale (Tinmal, 548/1153; first Kutubiyya, Marrakesh, ca. 555/1160). Exceptional on all counts is the gigantic but unfinished mosque of Ḥasan, Rabat (ca. 591/1195), whose scale of 180 × 139 m. makes it the second largest mosque in the world, after the Great Mosque of Sāmarrā. Here the typical shallow oblong courtyard is supplemented by two lesser and narrow courtyards perpendicular to the *kibla* and along the lateral walls. These were, it seems, intended for men and women respectively, but they would also have served for ventilation and lighting, besides offering visual relief to the endless march of columns.

(b) Anatolia. For all that pre-Ottoman Anatolia was a fertile field for innovation in later mediaeval experiment with the hypostyle mosque, its contribution cannot seriously match that of the Maghrib and

al-Andalus, not least because of the much shorter time span, a mere three centuries; discussion of it will accordingly be brief. The earliest surviving mosques well illustrate the dependence of local builders on more developed traditions of Arab and Persian origin. The Great Mosque of Diyārbakir (484/1091) follows the transept schema of Damascus, while those of Mayyāfāriḳīn (550/1155), Dunaysir (601/1204) and Mārdīn (largely 6th/12th century) follow Iranian precedent in their emphasis on a monumental dome rearing up out of the low roofing of the sanctuary and set squarely in front of the *mihṛāb* bay. Their foreshortened courtyards, however, owe nothing to Iranian precedent and instead presage later developments. So too did the increasing tendency to use domical forms rather than modular trabeate units as the principal means of defining space.

The buildings of the 6th/12th and 7th/13th centuries sufficiently demonstrate the embryonic state of mosque design in Anatolia, for the variety of plans is bewildering and defies easy categorisation. The absence of direct copies of the classical Arab type of plan is striking, though modifications of it were legion. A common solution was to do without the courtyard altogether—perhaps a response to the severe Anatolian winter—and reduce the mosque to a wooden-roofed hall resting on a multitude of columns or pillars ('Alā' al-Dīn mosque, Konya, 530/1135 to 617/1220; Sivas, ca. 494/1101; Afyon, 672/1273; Beyşehir, 696/1296). Usually the minaret was outside the mosque and therefore not integrated into the layout. Sometimes a similar design was executed in multiple small vaults (Divriği, castle mosque, 576/1180; Niksar, 540/1145; Urfa, 6th/12th century), and indeed the preference for vaulted as distinct from trabeated construction is well marked even at this experimental stage. Whatever the roofing system adopted in these enclosed mosques, the scope for development in either direction was small, while poor lighting, a sense of cramped space and inadequate ventilation were virtually inevitable. Huge piers and low vaults gave many of these mosques a crypt-like appearance ('Alā' al-Dīn mosque, Niğde, 620/1223; Sivas, Ulu Cami).

The obvious way forward was to allot a more significant role to the dome, a decision made at an early stage (Great Mosque of Erzurum, 530/1135; Kayseri, 535/1140; and Divriği, 626/1229) but by no means universally accepted. In such mosques the domed bay is invariably the largest of all and is placed along the axis of the *mihṛāb*. This emphasis on the totally enclosed covered mosque was to remain the principal feature of Turkish mosque architecture, and as a natural corollary fostered a compact and integrated style. Sometimes a small courtyard is integrated into this design (Malatya, 635/1237; Kayseri, Mosque of *Kh*^wānd *Kh*ātūn, 635/1237; Harput, 560/1165). By degrees, however, the courtyard was relegated to one of two functions: as a forecourt, akin to the atrium of Byzantine churches and thus heralding the mosque proper, instead of being co-equal to the sanctuary; and as a bay within the *muṣallā*, furnished with a skylight and a fountain as a symbolic reminder of the word outside. Sometimes these two uses coincided. The skylight bay (*shādirwān*) was normally placed along the axis of the *mihṛāb* and thus served as a secondary accent for it, in much the same manner as a central dome.

The 8th/14th century saw no major developments in hypostyle plans. Flat-roofed prayer halls, some with wooden-roofed porches (Merām mosque, Konya, 804-27/1402-24), others, especially in the *Ḳaramān*

region, without them, continued to be built. So too did hypostyle mosques with vaulted domical bays (Yivli Mınare mosque, Antalya, 775/1373; the type recurs both in eastern Anatolia and Ottoman territory in Bursa and Edirne). Variations in the Damascus schema, with the transept replaced by one or more domes, a raised and wider central aisle, a skylight bay, or any combination of these were frequent (‘Isā Bey mosque, Selcuk, 776/1374; Ulu Cami, Birgi, 712/1312; mosque of Akhī Elvān, Ankara, ca. 780/1378). Finally, mosques with an enlarged domed bay in front of the *mihrab* spread from their earlier base in south-eastern Anatolia, an area bounded to the east by the Ulu Cami in Van (791-803/1389-1400) and to the west by that of Manisa (778/1376). In the latter mosque the *kibla* side is dominated by the dome and takes up almost half the mosque; a large arcaded courtyard with a portico accounts for the rest. With such buildings the stage is set for Ottoman architecture and Arab prototypes are left far behind.

These Anatolian mosques depart still further from the norm of the hypostyle type in their predilection for elaborate integrated façades. While earlier mosques of Arab type frequently singled out the principal entrance by a monumental archway, often with a dome behind it, the tendency was to keep the façade relatively plain. Only in the highly built-up areas of the major cities of the Near East, such as Cairo, Jerusalem, Damascus and Aleppo, did the extreme shortage of space, and often the small scale of the mosques themselves, oblige architects to decorate mosque façades if they wished to draw attention to them, e.g. the Akmar mosque, Cairo, 519/1125. In Anatolia the tenacious Armenian tradition, which favoured extensive external sculpture and articulation, may well have predisposed Muslim architects in Anatolia to develop integrated decorative schemes for the main façades of their mosques. A monumental stone portal or *pīshṭāk* [q.v.], often an *iwān* [q.v.] was the standard centrepiece for such designs. It could be strongly salient and tower well above the roofline (Divriği Cami). Further articulation was provided by ranges of recessed arches with decorative surrounds (Dunaysir), open or blind arcades along the upper section of the façade (Mayyāfāriḳin and ‘Alā’ al-Din mosque, Konya), and windows with densely carved frames (‘Isā Bey mosque, Selcuk).

(c) Egypt and Syria. It seems possible that some of the more elaborate Mamlūk mosque façades in Cairo, such as those of Baybars (660/1262) and Sultān Ḥasan (757/1356) may derive, if at several removes, from Anatolian prototypes of the kind discussed above. It is noteworthy, however, that in general the mosques of the Ayyūbid and Mamlūk period offer little scope for large-scale reworking of the hypostyle plan, since they were too small. The mosque of Baybars and that of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Ḳalawūn in the Cairo citadel (718/1318), which is a free copy of it, provide exceptions to this rule; in both cases a monumental dome over the *mihrab* bay is the principal accent of an extensive covered space. The relative scarcity of major mosques in this period not only reflects the primacy of the great early *djāmi*’s which were still in use, and which made further such buildings redundant; it also marks a shift in patronage away from mosques towards mausolea, *madrasas*, *khānkāhs* and the like. In time, not surprisingly, joint foundations became the norm, in which the mosque was a mere oratory, a component in some larger complex. Eventually, too, the forms of mosques came to reflect those of contemporary *madrasas* more than the hypostyle plans of earlier periods. Hence the

dominance of small domed mosques such as the 7th/14th century Mamlūk *djāmi*’s of Tripoli. Such buildings have no bearing on the history of the Arab mosque plan.

(d) The Yemen. Apart from the Maghrib, it was principally in the Yemen that the large hypostyle mosque maintained its popularity throughout the mediaeval period. Inadequate publication has meant that these buildings are less well known than they deserve, and without excavation the dating of many of them will remain problematic. This is particularly regrettable because several of them were built on the site of pre-Islamic temples, churches or synagogues (e.g. al-Djilā’ mosque, Ṣan‘ā’), and spolia from these earlier buildings—such as columns, capitals, inscriptions and even sculptures of birds—are used very widely. Persistent local tradition attributes the *djāmi*’s of Ṣan‘ā’ and al-Djanad to the time of the Prophet; both were probably rebuilt by al-Walīd I. The former has preserved much more of its original appearance: perimeter walls of finely cut stone in stepped courses enclose a roughly square shape with a central courtyard with the *muṣallā* only slightly deeper than the other sides. Al-Djanad, on the other hand, has had its similar original layout transformed by a domed transept and numerous subsidiary buildings. This gradual transformation by the addition of prayer halls, mausolea, ablutions facilities and the like is a recurrent pattern in the Yemen (*djāmi*’s of Zabīd and Ibb).

Small hypostyle mosques of square form (al-‘Abbās, 7th/13th century), or of rectangular shape, whether broad and shallow oblongs (Tīḥid, 7th/13th century) or narrow and deep (Tamur, 5th/11th century or earlier), are common, and a few larger mosques of this kind, still without a courtyard, are known (Dhibin, after 648/1250). The commonest form, however, comprises a structure that is rectangular or trapezoidal (Masdjid al-Ṣawma‘a, Hūt, 7th/13th century) with a central courtyard and extensive covered *riwāks* on all sides (Rawḍa *djāmi*’, 7th/13th century). Often this formula is enriched by a lavishly carved or painted wooden ceiling over the sanctuary area alone (Shibām *djāmi*’, 4th/10th century) or by the incorporation of mausolea (Zafār Dhibin, 7th/13th century; funerary mosque of the *Imām* al-Hādī Yaḥyā, Sa‘da, 4th/10th century and later) or of minarets (Djibla, 480/1087; Dhū Ashrak, 410/1019). Influences from the central Islamic lands explain the use of wider central aisles in the *muṣallā* (Zafār Dhibin, Ibb, Djibla, Dhū Ashrak) and a concentration of domes along the *kibla* wall (enlargement of Ibb *djāmi*’; Djāmi’ al-Muṣaffar and Ashrafiyya mosque, both 7th/13th century, Ta‘izz). The glory of these Yemeni mosques as a group lies in their decoration: exceptionally long bands of stucco inscriptions (mosques of Dhamār and Rada, 7th/13th century and later), frescoes with epigraphic, floral and geometric designs (Rasūlid mosques of Ta‘izz) and a matchless series of carved and painted wooden ceilings (Zafār Dhibin, al-‘Abbās, Sirha, Dhibin, Shibām, Ṣan‘ā’ and others).

4. The Iranian tradition.

(a) The early period. Such was the prescriptive power of the “Arab plan” that its influence permeated mosque architecture in the non-Arab lands too. It would therefore be an artificial exercise to consider the development of the Iranian mosque in isolation, the more so as many early mosques in Iran (Bīshāpūr, Sīrāf, Susa, Yazd) were of Arab plan. Some also had the square minarets which were an early feature of that plan (Dāmghān; Sīrāf). Rather

did the Iranian mosque acquire its distinctive character by enriching the hypostyle form by two elements deeply rooted in pre-Islamic Iranian architecture: the domed chamber and the *iwān*, a vaulted open hall with a rectangular arched façade. The domed chamber derived from the mostly diminutive Sasanian fire temple with four axial arched openings, the so-called *čahār tāk*. Set in the midst of a large open space, it served to house the sacred fire. This layout obviously lent itself to Muslim prayer, and literary sources recount how such fire temples were taken over and converted into mosques (e.g. at Bukhārā) by the simple expedient of blocking up the arch nearest the *kibla* and replacing it with a *mihrāb*; but conclusive archaeological evidence of this practice is still lacking, though the mosques of Yazd-i Khāst and Kurwa may be examples of it. Such domed chambers, whether converted fire temples or purpose-built Muslim structures, may have served as self-contained mosques, with or without an attached courtyard; certainly the earliest part of many mediaeval Iranian mosques is precisely the domed chamber.

The associations of the *iwān*, by contrast, were markedly more secular than religious; its honorific and ceremonial purpose in Sasanian palaces is epitomised by the great vault at Ctesiphon, where it announced the audience chamber of the Emperor. The *iwān* form was therefore well fitted to serve as a monumental entrance to the mosque, to mark the central entrance to the *musallā* (Tārikhāna, Dāmghān; Nāʿīn) or, indeed, itself to serve as the sanctuary (as at Nīrīz perhaps 363/973 onwards?). Thus both the domed chamber and the *iwān* quickly found their way into the vocabulary of Iranian mosque architecture, and by their articulating power gave it a wider range of expression than the Arab mosque plan could command. It was in the interrelationships between the domed chamber, the *iwān* and the hypostyle hall that the future of the Iranian mosque was to lie.

(b) The Saldjūk period. The tentative experiments of early Iranian mosque architecture crystallised in the Saldjūk period, especially between ca. 473/1080 and ca. 555/1160. The major mosques built or enlarged at this time have as their major focus a monumental domed chamber enclosing the *mihrāb* and preceded by a lofty *iwān*. This double unit is commonly flanked by arcaded and vaulted prayer halls. This arrangement represents the final transformation of the *musallā* in Iranian mosques, using the vocabulary of Sasanian religious and palatial architecture for new ends. The sanctuary *iwān* opens onto a courtyard with an *iwān* at the centre of each axis punctuating the regular sequence of *riwāks*. These arcades attain a new importance as façade architecture by their arrangement in double tiers. Yet the focus of attention is undoubtedly the great domed chamber. The simplicity of the prototypical *čahār tāk* is scarcely to be recognised in these massive Saldjūk *maḳṣūra* domes with their multiple openings in the lower walls and their complex zones of transition. This concentration on the domed chamber was often achieved at the expense of the rest of the mosque (Gulpāyagān *ḡāmi*^c, ca. 510/1116). The new combination of old forms created the classical, definitive version of the already ancient 4-*iwān* courtyard plan that was to dominate Iranian architecture for centuries to come, infiltrating not only other building types such as *madrasas* and caravansarais, but also spreading as far west as Egypt and Anatolia and eastwards to Central Asia and India. The 4-*iwān* mosque thus became in time the dominant mosque type of the eastern Islamic world.

Up to the end of the Saldjūk period, however, the

way was still open for numerous other combinations of hypostyle hall, domed chamber and *iwān*. *Baḡḡan*, for example (4th/10th century) has a square layout with courtyard, hypostyle hall, domed sanctuary and sanctuary *iwān*, but lacks any further articulation of the courtyard façade by *iwāns*. The mosques of Dandānkān [*q.v.* in Suppl.] and Mashhad-i Mišriyān [*q.v.*] (both 5th/11th century) are typologically related. At Urmīya/Riḡāʿiyya (7th/13th century) the mosque is an extensive shallow oblong with the domed chamber at one end of a hypostyle hall, and no *iwān*. Sometimes the mosque is entirely covered by five (Masjdīd-i Diggaron, Hazāra, 5th/11th century) or nine domed bays (Čār Sutūn mosque, Tirmidh, 5th/11th century; Masjdīd-i Kūča Mīr, Nāanz, 6th/12th century). In its Saldjūk form the mosque at Ardabīl comprised a domed chamber with an *iwān* in front of it, while at Sīn (528/1136) the sanctuary, comprising a deep *iwān* with *muḳarnas* vaulting, engulfs one side of the diminutive courtyard. The huge courtyard of the Firdaws *ḡāmi*^c (597/1201) is dominated by its single *iwān* which heralds a low vaulted sanctuary. The *ḡāmi*^cs of Faryumad (7th/13th century?) and Gūnābād (606/1210) have only two *iwāns* facing each other across a narrow courtyard, and no domed chamber. Other mosques in Khurāsān are simpler still, comprising only the domed chamber itself (Sangān-i Pāʿīn, 535/1140; Birrābād and ʿAbdal-lāhābād, both possibly Saldjūk) or with insignificant bays adjoining it (Takhlātan Baba, 6th/12th century). Often too, the various elements were added in an unpredictable sequence, for instance at Simnān where a probably 5th/11th century columned hall had a complete mosque “unit” comprising a domed chamber, *iwān* and courtyard tacked on to its side. Even within the classical 4-*iwān* model, considerable diversity could be attained by varying the scale of the components: from long narrow courtyards (Simnān) or small square ones of domestic scale (Zawāra, 527/1133) to huge open expanses broken up by trees (Shīrāz *ḡāmi*^c, mainly 10th/16th century), pools or fountains.

The principal emphasis on the internal façade was, however, unchanging. The exterior, by contrast, was unadorned and unarticulated to the point of austerity. Variations in the height or breadth of *iwāns* reinforced axial or hierarchical distinctions. By common consent the sanctuary *iwān* was the largest and deepest; the opposite *iwān* was next in size, though often very shallow, while the two lateral *iwāns* were usually the smallest. Minarets at the corner of the sanctuary *iwān* underlined its importance, while the twin-minaret portal *iwān* first encountered in the Saldjūk period (Nakhčivān, ca. 582/1186; Ardīstān, Masjdīd-i Imām Ḥasan, 553/1158) became increasingly monumental and elaborate in later centuries (*ḡāmi*^cs of Ashtardjān, 715/1315, and Yazd, 846/1442). *Iwān* minarets of this kind gradually replaced the freestanding cylindrical minarets so popular in the Saldjūk period.

(c) The Ilkhānid period. As in Mamlūk Egypt, so too in Iran the later mediaeval history of the mosque is sometimes hard to disentangle from that of the *madrasa*, tomb- or shrine-complex. Prayer and communal worship were, after all, integral to the operation of such “little cities of God” as the shrines of Ardabīl, Nāanz, Turbat-i Djam, Bastām and Lindjān—all of them the scene of much building activity in the 8th/14th century—to say nothing of the great shrines of Kumm and Mashhad. Such new foundations as these were simply perpetuated Saldjūk models (Hafshūya, early 8th/14th century), though these were subtly altered by having their proportions

attenuated or otherwise modified. At *Aštardjān* everything is subordinated to the principal axis announced by the double minaret façade, an emphasis which is taken up and intensified by the single great *iwān* which takes up the full width of the courtyard and leads into the domed sanctuary. At *Warāmīn*, too (722/1322 onwards), which is of standard 4-*iwān* type, the sense of axial progression is strong, and is made rather more effective than at *Aštardjān* by the absolute length of the mosque and the extended vestibule. The *qjami*^c of ‘Alī *Shāh* in *Tabrīz*, by contrast (ca. 710-20/1310-20) deliberately returned, it seems, to much earlier models, for it comprised essentially a huge cliff-like *iwān* preceded by a courtyard with a central pool and clumps of trees in the corners—perhaps a deliberate reference to the *Ṭāk-i Kisrā* itself. For smaller mosques, *Saldjūk* models were again at hand; hence, for example, the trio of domed chamber mosques with *iwāns* at *Azīrān*, *Kadj* and *Dashū*, all datable ca. 725/1325. Yet another compliment to earlier masters was the *Īkhānid* tendency to add new structures to existing mosques: a *madrasa* to the *Iṣfahān qjami*^c (776-8/1374-7), an *iwān* to the mosque at *Gaz* (ca. 715/1315), and so on.

(d) The *Timūrid* period. The *Timūrid* period took up still further ideas which had been no more than latent in earlier centuries. While some mosques of traditional form were built such as the Mosque of *Gawhar Shād*, in *Mashhad*, of standard 4-*iwān* type (821/1418), attention focused particularly on the portal and *kibla iwāns*, which soared to new heights. Turrets at the corners magnified these proportions still further. This trend towards gigantism is exposed at its emptiest in the 4-*iwān qjami*^c of *Ziyāratgāh*, near *Harāt* (887/1482), where the absence of decoration accentuates the sheer mass of the sanctuary *iwān* looming over the courtyard. At its best, however, as in the mosque of *Bībī Khānum*, *Samarqand* (801/1399) where these exceptional proportions are consistently carried through to virtually every part of the mosque, the effect is overwhelming. Here the 4-*iwān* plan is transformed by the use of a domed chamber behind each lateral *iwān*; by the profusion of minarets—at the exterior corners and flanking both portal and sanctuary *iwāns*—and by the four hundred-odd domes which cover the individual bays.

As in the *Mongol* period, however, the fashion for building *khānkāhs*, *madrasas* and funerary monuments, all of them capable of serving as places of worship (shrine of *Aḥmad Yasawī*, *Turkestan*, begun 797/1394; the *Rīgīstān* complex, *Samarqand*, begun in its *Timūrid* form in 820/1417; *Gawhar Shād* complex, *Harāt*, 821/1418) excluded an equal emphasis on architecture. This may explain the continued popularity of so many standard mosque types—the domed hypostyle (*Ziyāratgāh*, *Masdjid-i Čihil Sutūn* ca. 890/1485) and the two-*iwān* type so long familiar in *Khurāsān* (*Badjīstān* and *Nīshāpūr qjami*^cs, both later 9th/15th century)—to say nothing of the emphasis on refurbishing earlier mosques (*qjami*^cs of *Iṣfahān*, 880/1475 and *Harāt*, 903-5/1497-9), which, in accordance with the *Timūrid* predilection for innovative vaulting, often took the form of transversely vaulted halls (*qjami*^cs of *Abarkūh*, 808/1415; *Yazd*, 819/1416; *Shīrāz*, ca. 820/1417; *Maribud*, 867/1462; and *Kāshān*, 867-8/1462-3; and the mosques of *Sar-i Rīg*, 828/1424 and *Mīr Čaķīnaķ*, 840-1/1436-7, at *Yazd*). There was also still ample room for surprises. The winter prayer hall added to the *Iṣfahān qjami*^c in 851/1447 has multiple aisles of huge pointed arches springing directly from the ground and

lit by ochre alabaster slabs let into the vaults and diffusing a golden radiance. The hoary 4-*iwān* formula was given a new twist by the addition of twin domed chambers flanking the sanctuary *iwān* (*Harāt qjami*^c, 9th/15th century), an idea which infiltrated other plan types too (*Rushkhar qjami*^c, 859/1454). At *Djādjarm* (late 9th/late 15th century?) the central axis marked by the domed chamber and the courtyard is flanked on each side by a trio of vaulted bays.

Yet perhaps the most original mosque designs of the period were those which focused on the single dome and thus echoed, if only distantly, the preoccupations of contemporary Ottoman architects. This concept manifested itself in several different ways. In the *Masdjid-i Gunbād*, *Ziyāratgāh* (ca. 887-912/1483-1506), a square exterior encloses small corner chambers and a cruciform domed central area, a layout more reminiscent of a palace pavilion than a mosque. The core of the *Masdjid-i Shāh*, *Mashhad* (855/1451), is again a large domed chamber, but this is enclosed by a vaulted ambulatory and preceded by a long façade with corner minarets and a portal *iwān*. Most ambitious of all, however, is the *Blue Mosque* in *Tabrīz* (870/1465) in which a similar idea is given much more integrated expression by virtue of the open-plan arrangement of the central space. The dome springs from eight massive piers, but this octagon has further piers in the corners, making it a square with twelve openings, and thus offering easy access to the multidomed ambulatory. A similar openness characterises the gallery area and ensures that this mosque, though entirely covered, was airy, spacious and flooded with light. The range and subtlety of its polychrome tilework makes this mosque an apt coda for a period which exploited to an unprecedented degree the role of colour in architecture.

(e) The *Ṣafavid* period. The restoration and enlargement of existing mosques, a trend already noted in *Timūrid* times, continued apace in the *Ṣafavid* period, and involved over a score of mosques in the 10th/16th century alone. Yet not one new mosque of the first importance survives from this century, though the *Masdjid-i ‘Alī* in *Iṣfahān* (929/1522), a classic 4-*iwān* structure, has a sanctuary whose open-plan dome on pendentives provides a bridge between the *Blue Mosque* in *Tibrīz* and the *Lufallāh* mosque in *Iṣfahān* (1011-28/1602-10). The latter, a private oratory for *Shāh ‘Abbās I*, makes a very public break with tradition, for it is simply a huge square chamber. Its lofty dome rests on eight arches via an intermediary zone of 32 niches. The whole interior is sheathed in glittering tilework whose smooth surfaces simplify all structural subtleties. Though the mosque is correctly oriented towards Mecca, it is set at an angle to the great square (*maydān*) from which it is entered, an angle dissimulated by the portal *iwān* which instead obeys the orientation of the *maydān* towards the cardinal points of the compass. A low vaulted passage linking *iwān* and dome chamber, but invisible from either, resolves these conflicting axes. It also draws attention to a discrepancy which could easily have been avoided and is therefore deliberate.

In the nearby *Masdjid-i Shāh* (1021-40/1612-30), which also fronts the *maydān*, the problem of discordant axes is solved with sovereign ease, for the portal leads into a diagonal vestibule which in turn opens into a 4-*iwān* courtyard now correctly orientated. Both portal and *kibla iwāns* have paired minarets to assert their importance. The scale is vast, but the entire mosque is conceived in due proportion to it. As at the comparably large mosque of *Bībī Khānum*, dome

chambers behind the lateral *iwāns* give extra space for prayer, while two *madrāsas* with courtyards flank the main courtyard to the south. Thus even at the height of its popularity, the 4-*iwān* mosque could accommodate quite major innovations without impairing its essential character. Later Šafavid mosques, such as the *djāmi*'s of Sarm and Čašum, the Masdjid-i Wazir in Kāshān and that of 'Alī Kulī Agha in Işfahān, serve by their very modesty, however, to highlight the altogether exceptional status of the two mosques on the Işfahān *maydān*. Even such a spacious and handsome version of the traditional 4-*iwān* schema as the Masdjid-i Hākim, Işfahān (1067/1656) could not fail to be an anticlimax in their wake.

5. The Turkish tradition.

(a) Early domed mosques. The earliest Anatolian mosques follow Arab prototypes, and by degrees some of them take on an Iranian colouring, especially in their free use of *iwāns* for portals and for sanctuary entrances. Already by the 7th/13th century, however, an emphasis on the isolated domed chamber as a mosque type began to make itself felt. This idea too might have had Iranian origins, but it soon developed in ways that owed nothing to Iran, since the contemporary preference for entirely covered mosques with no courtyard was itself enough to encourage experiments in the articulation of interior space. The dome quickly became the most favoured device to this end. In Iran, by and large, the domed chamber behind the *kibla iwān* remained spatially isolated from the rest of the mosque. In Anatolia, by contrast, architects were always seeking new ways of integrating the main domed space with the area around it. A consistent emphasis on domical forms created the necessary visual unity to achieve this. Already in the Saljūq period tentative experiments in this direction may be noted, for example the 'Alā' al-Dīn mosque, Niğde (620/1223), whose *kibla* is marked by three domed and cross-vaulted bays with further parallel aisles behind. In the Ulu Cami of Bitlis (555/1160), a single great dome replaces these smaller bays, while in the Gök mosque and *madrasa*, Amasya (665/1266), the *masdjid* comprises a series of triple-domed aisles. Experiment with domical forms was therefore deeply rooted in Anatolian architecture from the beginning. It is above all, however, the hallmark of mosques erected by the Ottomans, and can be traced to the very earliest years of that dynasty.

(b) Ottoman architecture before 857/1453. The sequence begins very modestly with a series of mosques comprising a simple domed cube with a lateral vestibule ('Alā' al-Dīn mosque, Bursa, 736/1335, a structure typical of well over a score of such Ottoman mosques built in the course of the 8th/14th century) and minor variants of this schema, such as the mosque of Orhan Gazi, Bilecik, and the Yeşil Cami, Iznik, 780/1378. Such structures have a natural affinity with larger mausolea throughout the Islamic world, and with the simplest forms of Iranian mosques. It is only with hindsight that their significance for later developments, in which the theme of the single, and (above all) central, dominant dome of ever-increasing size becomes steadily more important, can be appreciated. This, then, is the main line of evolution in Ottoman mosque architecture, and the discussion will return to it shortly.

Meanwhile, two other types of mosque, in which the dome also loomed large, deserve brief investigation, especially as they bade fair in the formative early years to oust the domed, centrally planned mosque as the favoured Ottoman type, and also because they had their own part to play in the final synthesis of the

10th/16th century. The presence of three major types of domed mosque in the same century is a reminder that the pace of change was uneven. Several mosques conceived on an altogether larger scale rejuvenated the hypostyle form by investigating the impact of multiple adjoining domes. In some cases, like the Ulu Cami, Bursa, of 797/1394, a simple square subdivided into 20 domed bays of equal width though of varying height—the choice of the dome as the agent of vaulting is a diagnostic Ottoman feature—the effect was distinctly old-fashioned. At ground level this is an Arab mosque, even if its elevation is Anatolian. Contemporary with this, but marking a very different attitude to interior space, are two mosques in Bursa, that of Yıldırım Bāyazid, 794/1390, and the Yeşil Cami of 816/1413, which use the dome motif on various scales and thus far more imaginatively. They represent a second preparatory stage on the way to the mature Ottoman mosque, and their large layout is by turn cruciform, stepped or of inverted T-type. Their distinguishing feature is the use of several domes of different sizes. In the two cases under discussion, the inverted T-plan highlights the *mihrāb* aisle by two adjoining domes along the central axis flanked by a trio of domed or vaulted bays on each side, the whole knit together laterally by a 5-domed portico. Sandwiched between these two buildings in date is the Ulu Cami of Edirne, 806/1403, where the square is subdivided into nine equal bays, eight of them domed, with a domed and vaulted portico tacked on. At the mosque of Çelebi Sulţān Mehemmed, Dimetoka, this arrangement is refined by an increased concentration on the central dome, which is enveloped by vaults on the main axes and diagonals, the whole preceded by a 3-domed portico. Such a combination cannot fail to recall the standard quincunx plan, complete with narthex, of mid-Byzantine churches, and it was of course these buildings which dominated the Anatolian countryside in the early centuries of Turkish occupation. Steady Byzantine influence can be seen to have affected the evolution of Ottoman architecture even before the capture of Istanbul brought Turkish architects face to face with Hagia Sophia. Yet it would be grossly mistaken to regard mature Ottoman mosques as mere derivatives of Hagia Sophia. The Uç Şerefli mosque, Edirne, of 851/1447, with its huge central dome on a hexagonal base flanked on either side by a pair of much smaller domes and preceded by a lateral courtyard enclosed by 22 domed bays, makes excellent sense within a purely Ottoman perspective as a key stage in the evolution which terminated in the great masterpieces of Sinān. The divergence between the great dome and the lesser ones flanking it has already become acute and was to end in their total suppression.

Yet one significant element, crucial to Hagia Sophia and a cliché of Ottoman architecture after 857/1453, had not yet entered the architectural vocabulary of the Turkish mosque before that date. This was the use of two full semi-domes along the *mihrāb* axis to buttress the main dome. The long-rooted Islamic custom of marking the *mihrāb* bay by a great dome rendered such a feature otiose. Once the decision had been taken to make the largest dome the central feature of a much larger square, the way was open for the adoption of this Byzantine feature, and with it the transformation and enrichment of interior space was a foregone conclusion. Otherwise, most of the architectural vocabulary used in mature Ottoman mosques was already to hand by 857/1453: flying buttresses, the undulating exterior profile created by multiple domes, tall pencil-shaped minarets and a cer-

tain parsimony of exterior ornament allied to exquisite stereotomy. It has to be admitted, however, that these features had yet to find their full potential, notably in the failure to develop a suitably imposing exterior to match the spatial splendours within. That potential could be realised only when these features were used in tandem with each other by masters seeking to express a newly-won confidence and bent on creating an integrated style for that purpose. The mosque was, moreover, their chosen instrument; indeed, Ottoman architecture is, first and foremost, an architecture of mosques.

(c) Ottoman architecture after 857/1453. The capture of Constantinople in 857/1453 provided both a terminus and an impetus to a radical rethinking of mosque design. Appropriately enough, the first building to express the new mood was a victory monument, as its name indicates: the Fātiḥ Mosque (867-75/1463-70). This has a single huge semi-dome butressing the main one but also displacing it off the main axis; clearly, the spatial, aesthetic and structural implications of such a semidome had not yet been fully grasped. Within a generation, this anomaly at least had been rectified; the mosque of Bāyazīd II (completed 913/1506) has two such semi-domes on the *mīhrāb* axis, with four lesser domes flanking this central corridor on each side. On the other hand, the projecting portico sandwiched between dome chamber and courtyard is a clumsy and lopsided expedient with little functional justification. Yet the resultant emphasis on the portico is wholly typical of a period in which this feature re-appeared under numerous guises, especially in the doubled form (Mihrimah mosque, completed ca. 973/1565). The Şehzade mosque (955/1548) presents a much more streamlined appearance, with dome chamber and courtyard of approximately equal proportions. Within the sanctuary, the great central dome opens into semi-domes on all four sides, with small diagonal semi-domes opening off the main ones and corner domes. It is instructive thus to see Ottoman architects developing the possibilities of the centralised plan like the builders of Christian churches and martyria a millennium before, and coming to very similar conclusions. Smaller mosques with domes on hexagonal (Ahmed Paşa, completed ca. 970/1562) or octagonal bases (Mihrimah mosque) were scarcely less popular than domed squares. A small number of wooden-roofed mosques perpetuating earlier modes, and with their roots in the Arab tradition, survive (e.g. Ramazan Efendi in Koçamustafapaşa, 994/1585, and Tekkeci İbrahim Ağa, 999/1590) as reminders of a very widespread type of Ottoman mosque now almost entirely eclipsed by more durable structures.

In the ferment of experiment which marks 10th/16th century Ottoman architecture, the key figure was undoubtedly Sinān, an Islamic equivalent to Sir Christopher Wren, who transformed the face of the capital city as of the provinces with some 334 buildings (mostly mosques) erected in his own lifetime, and whose pivotal role as chief court architect (effectively Master of Works) allowed him to stamp his ideas on public architecture from Algeria to 'Irāk and from Thrace to Arabia in the course of a phenomenally long career which spanned virtually the entire century. The Süleymaniye mosque in Istanbul (963/1556) is by common consent the masterpiece of his middle age. It takes up and refines the model of the Bāyazīd II mosque by adding ideas taken from the Şehzade mosque, like the succession of semi-domed spaces billowing out from the main dome, though only along the principal axis. Huge arches serve to compartmentalise the spatial volumes.

All these mosques are preceded by an open courtyard whose cloister is roofed by long files of adjoining domes. This standard feature typifies the new emphasis on subsidiary structures, mausolea, *imārets*, *madrasas* and the like, and the consistent attempt to integrate them visually with the sanctuary itself, for example by subordinating them to the principal axes of the design. All this implies a marked increase in scale and a new sensitivity to the landscaping of the ensemble. Hence the recurrent choice of dramatic sites for these mosques, especially in Istanbul with its built-in vistas along the Bosphorus. This awareness of topography as a feature of mosque design is evident as early as the Fātiḥ mosque; its three parallel axes are grouped around and within an enclosed open piazza measuring some 210 m. per side. The climax of mature Ottoman architecture is reached with Sinān's final masterpiece, the Selimiye at Edirne (982/1574), in which the largest of Ottoman central domes (31.28 m. in diameter, hedged externally by the loftiest quartet of Ottoman minarets (70.89 m. high) rests on eight piers pushed as close to the walls as safety will allow so as to create the largest possible open space.

While the increase in the absolute height and breadth of these great domed chambers is striking, the amount of articulation and detail crammed into these spaces is scarcely less impressive. All is subordinated to a formidable concentration of purpose—for example, the carefully considered fenestration, surely a legacy from Hagia Sophia, with its superposed groupings of eights and sixes or sevens, fives and threes. In the interests of creating the maximum untrammelled space, thrusts are concentrated onto a few huge piers with spherical pendentives between them, and thus the layout is a model of clarity and logic. Flooded with light, their volumetric subdivisions apparent at a glance, these interiors are at the opposite pole from the dim mysteries of Hagia Sophia. Frescoes reminiscent of manuscript illumination and of carpet designs vie with Iznik tiles to decorate the interior surfaces, and often (as in the case of fluted piers) to deny their sheer mass.

Externally, these mosques attest a well-nigh fugal complexity by virtue of their obsessive concentration on a very few articulating devices like windows, arches and domes. The repetition of the same forms on varying scales intensifies the sense of unity. Even the minarets which mark the outer limits of the mosque's surface area are brought into play; for example, those of the Sultan Ahmed Mosque (completed 1025/1616) have the bases of their balconies so calibrated as to coincide with the top of the main dome, its collar and the collar of the main subsidiary half-domes, while their location at the corners of the building binds it together and defines the sacred space from afar. Detailing is sparse and crisp, with a strong linear emphasis, a flawless sense of interval and a pronounced attenuation of features like wall niches and engaged columns (Süleymaniye mosque). Nothing is allowed to impair the primary aesthetic impact of cliff-like expanses of smooth grey stone. Most notable of all is a dramatic but ordered stacking of units culminating in the great dome which crowns and develops the entire ensemble. These individual units are each locked into place within a gently sloping pyramidal structure whose inevitable climax is the central dome. From this peak the subsidiary domes, semi-domes and domed buttresses cascade downwards to form a rippling but tightly interlocked silhouette. These highly articulated exteriors are a triumphant reversal of the standard Islamic preference in mosque architecture for stressing the interior at the expense of the exterior. As the viewpoint changes, so too does the profile of

these mosques, from a continuous smoothly undulating line to a series of sharp angular projections formed by stepped buttresses and roof-turrets. The preference for saucer domes rather than pointed domes with a high stilt fosters the sense of immovable, rock-like stability, with the topmost dome clamped like a lid onto the mobile, agitated roof-lines beneath it.

This, then, can justly claim to be architects' architecture. It merits that term by virtue of its unbroken concentration on the single germinal idea of the domed centralised mosque. It is against that consistent unity of vision that the role of the Hagia Sophia must be assessed. Of course, Turkish architects were not blind to its many subtleties, and they freely quarried it for ideas. But it was as much a challenge that inspired them to emulation as it was a source for technical expertise. Finally, it was the Ottomans who succeeded where the Byzantines had failed: in devising for these great domed places of worship an exterior profile worthy of the splendours within. The triumphant issue of their labours to that end can be read along the Istanbul skyline to this day.

Bibliography: C. Gurlitt, *Die Baukunst Konstantinopels*, 3 vols., Berlin 1907-12; F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld, *Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigrisgebiet*, 4 vols., Berlin 1911-20; M. S. Briggs, *Muhammadan architecture in Egypt and Palestine*, Oxford 1924; A. Gabriel, *Les mosquées de Constantinople*, in *Syria*, vii (1926), 353-419; E. Diez, *Masdjid. III. Architecture*, in *EP*, III, 378-89; E. Pauty, *L'évolution du dispositif en T dans les mosquées à portiques*, in *Ber.Or.*, ii, (1932), 91-124; L. Y. Hautecoeur and G. Wiet, *Les Mosquées du Caire*, 2 vols., Paris 1932-4; Gabriel, *Monuments turcs d'Anatolie*, 2 vols., Paris 1934; M. B. Smith, *Material for a corpus of early Iranian Islamic architecture. I-III.*, in *Arts Islamica*, ii (1935), 153-71, iv (1937), 1-40, vi (1939), 1-10; A. Godard, *Les anciennes mosquées de l'Irān*, in *Athār-é Irān*, i/2 (1936), 187-210, continued in *Arts Asiatiques*, iii (1956), 48-63, 83-8; *idem*, *Historique du Masdjid-é Djum'a d'Isfahān*, in *Athār-é Irān*, i/2 (1936), 213-82; B. Maslow, *Les mosquées de Fès*, Paris 1937; J. Sauvaget, *Observations sur quelques mosquées seldjoukides*, in *AIEO Alger*, iv (1938), 81-120; A. U. Pope and P. Ackerman (eds.), *A survey of Persian art from prehistoric times to the present*, 6 vols., Oxford 1938-9; K. A. C. Creswell, *Early Muslim architecture. II. Early Abbāsids, Umayyads of Cordova, Aghlabids, Tūlūnids and Samānids, A.D. 751-905*, Oxford 1940; Gabriel and Sauvaget, *Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie Orientale*, 2 vols., Paris 1940; M. Akkush, *Contribution à une étude des origines de l'architecture musulmane. La Grande Mosquée de Médine (al-Haram al-Madani)*, in *Mélanges Maspero*, iii (1940), 377-410; Sauvaget, *La mosquée omeyyade de Médina*, Paris 1947; G. Marçais, *L'église et la mosquée*, in *L'Islam et l'Occident. Cahiers du Sud*, Marseilles 1947, 174-84; E. Kühnel, *Die Moschee. Bedeutung, Einrichtung und kunsthistorische Entwicklung der islamischen Kultstätte*, Berlin 1949; E. Lambert, *La synagogue de Dura-Europos et les origines de la mosquée*, in *Semitica*, iii (1950), 67-72; H. Stern, *Les origines de l'architecture de la mosquée omeyyade*, in *Syria*, xxviii (1951), 269-79; L. Torres Balbás, *Origen de las disposiciones arquitectónicas de las mezquitas*, in *Al-Andalus*, xvii (1952), 388-99; Creswell, *The Muslim architecture of Egypt. I. Ikshīds and Fātimids, A.D. 937-1171. II. Ayyūbids and Early Bahrite Mamlūks, A.D. 1171-1326*. Oxford 1952-60; U. Vogt-Göknil, *Türkische Moscheen*, Zürich 1953; E. Egli, *Sinan, der Baumeister osmanischer Glanzzeit*,

Zürich 1954; Marçais, *L'architecture musulmane d'Occident: Tunisie, Algérie, Maroc, Espagne et Sicile*, Paris 1955; D. N. Wilber, *The architecture of Islamic Iran. The Il-Khānid Period*, Princeton 1955; Lambert, *Les origines de la mosquée et l'architecture religieuse des Omeyyades*, in *SI*, vi (1956), 5-18; Gabriel, *Une Capitale turque Brousse, Bursa*, 2 vols., Paris 1958; G. A. Pugačenkova, *Puti razvitiya arkhitekturi Yuzhnogo Turkmenistana pora rabovladieniya feodalizma*, in *Trudi Yuzhno-Turkmenistanskoi Arkheologičeskoj Ekspeditsii*, vi, Moscow 1958; L. Golvin, *La Mosquée. Ses origines. Sa morphologie. Ses diverses fonctions. Son rôle dans la vie musulmane, plus spécialement en Afrique du Nord*, Algiers 1960; M. Useinov, L. S. Bretanitski and A. Salamzade, *Istoriya arkhitekturi Azerbaidžhana*, Moscow 1963; A. Dietrich, *Die Moscheen von Gurgan zur Omajjadenzeit*, in *Isl.*, xl (1964), 1-17; Pugačenkova and L. I. Rempel', *Istoriya Iskusstva Uzbekistana*, Moscow 1965; A. Lézine, *Architecture de l'Ifriqiya*, Paris 1966; Bretanitski, *Zodčestvo Azerbaidžhana XII-XV v.v., i ego mesto v arkhitekture perednego vostoka*, Moscow 1966; A. Kuran, *The mosque in early Ottoman architecture*, Chicago and London 1968; O. Grabar, *La Grande Mosquée de Damas et les origines architecturales de la mosquée*, in *Synthronon. Art et Archéologie de la fin de l'Antiquité et du Moyen Âge. Recueil d'Études*, Paris 1968, 107-14; *idem*, *The architecture of the Middle Eastern city from past to present: the case of the mosque*, in *Middle Eastern cities*, ed. I. M. Lapidus, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1969, 26-46; Creswell, *Early Muslim architecture. Umayyads. A.D. 622-750*, 2 vols., Oxford 1969; J. Sourdel-Thomine, *La mosquée et la madrasa. Types monumentaux caractéristiques de l'art islamique médiéval*, in *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale X^e-XII^e siècles, Université de Poitiers, Centre d'Études Supérieures de Civilisation Médiévale*, xiii/2 (1970), 97-115; Golvin, *Essai sur l'architecture religieuse musulmane*, i-iv, Paris 1970-6; G. Goodwin, *A history of Ottoman architecture*, London 1971; O. Aslanapa, *Turkish art and architecture*, tr. A. Mill, London 1971; Kuran, *Thirteenth and fourteenth century mosques in Turkey*, in *Archaeology*, xxiv/3 (1971), 234-54; S. Ögel, *Der Kuppelraum in der türkischen Architektur*, Istanbul 1972; R. A. Jairazbhoy, *An outline of Islamic architecture*, Bombay 1972; R. Bourouiba, *L'art religieux musulman en Algérie*, Algiers 1973; Grabar, *The formation of Islamic art*, New Haven 1973; D. Kuban, *Muslim religious architecture*, 2 vols., Leiden 1974-85; R. Hillenbrand, *Saljūq dome chambers in North-west Iran*, in *Iran*, xiv (1976), 93-102; D. Hill, Golvin and Hillenbrand, *Islamic architecture in North Africa*, London 1976; J. D. Hoag, *Islamic architecture*, New York 1977; Vogt-Göknil, *Die Moschee. Grundformen sakraler Baukunst*, Zürich 1978; C. Ewert and J.-P. Wisshak, *Forschungen zur almohadischen Moschee. Lieferung 1: Vorstufen. Hierarchische Gliederungen westislamischer Betsäle des 8. bis 11. Jahrhunderts: Die Hauptmoscheen von Qairawan und Cordoba und ihr Bannkreis*, Mainz 1981; B. Finster, *Islamische Bau- und Kunstdenkmäler im Yemen*, in *Archäologische Berichte aus dem Yemen*, i (1982), 223-75; R. B. Serjeant and R. Lewcock (eds.), *San'ā'. An Arabian Islamic city*, London 1983; Hillenbrand, *The mosque in the medieval Islamic world*, in *Architecture in continuity. Building in the Islamic world today*, ed. S. Cantacuzino, New York 1985, 30-51. (R. HILLENBRAND)

II. IN MUSLIM INDIA

A. Typology.

The nature of the regional building styles and their characteristic decoration have been treated s.v. HIND.

vii. Architecture, in Vol. III above. This section deals with the essential typology of mosques in India, and excludes the simplest structures used only for occasional prayer such as the *kibla*-indications at some tombs and graveyards [see MAĀBARA. 5. India], and the special structures (*‘idgāh*) provided for the *‘ids*; for these see MUŞALLĀ. 2.

The continuous history of the mosque begins with the M. *Ḳuwwat al-Islām* in Dihlī, founded immediately after the Muslim conquest in 587/1191. There are however records of mosques founded earlier, e.g. under the *‘Abbāsīd* caliphate in Sind [q.v.], by small communities of Muslim traders, especially in Guḍjarāt and the Malabār coast, and by individual Ṣūfī *ḫīr*s who gathered a community around them. The remains of these are mostly too exiguous to be of value in a general statement. Recent explorations by M. Shokooḫy, not yet published, have revealed a few structures, of a century or two before the conquest, at Bhadrēshwar in Guḍjarāt. These, in common with the first structures of any fresh conquest of expansion, are constructed from the remains of Hindū buildings; in the case of mosques built after a conquest there has been a deliberate pillaging of Hindū or *Ḍjāy*n temples, as an assertion of superiority as well as for the expediency of making use of material already quarried and of local impressed labour before the arrival of Muslim artisans. Examples of this are cited for different regions of India s.v. HIND, vii. Architecture, in Vol. III, p. 441 above. (It should be pointed out that the practice of pillaging the buildings of the conquered is known in India in the case of rival Hindū kings also.)

Where a mosque is actually constructed on the plinth of a destroyed Hindū building (e.g. M. *Ḳuwwat al-Islām* at Dihlī; *Ātalā M.* at *Ḍjawnpur*) the *kibla* [q.v.] will probably not be accurately located and the original cardinal west made to serve the purpose; but in general an effort is made to observe the correct *kibla*, which varies between 20° north of west in the south of India to 25° south of west in the extreme north, with a conventional west used only rarely in original buildings.

Mosques which might be described as “public”—i.e. not only the *Masḡid-i ḏjāmi*^c of a particular locality (and of course in a conurbation there may be a separate *ḏjāmi*^c for each original *mahalla*) but also the individually-founded or endowed mosques within a town—are enclosed on all sides. This has not been required of mosques within a *sarā’ī* or a *dargāh*, or when the mosque is an adjunct of a tomb, and there are countless instances of small private mosques where there seems never to have been any enclosure. The enclosure for the public mosque is particularly necessary for Islam *in partibus infidelium*, and those courtyards which are not enclosed are protected from the infidel gaze in some other way, e.g. by the *ṣahn* standing on a high plinth (examples: the *Ḍjāmi*^c M. at *Shāhḏjahānābād*, Dihlī, *Ātalā M.* at *Ḍjawnpur*, where in both the courtyard is limited only by an open arcade or colonnade). The principal entrance is usually on the east, although any gate may be on occasion specified as a royal entrance; it is rare, though not unknown, for any entrance to be made in the western wall, and where this has happened it is not designed for access by the general public. The internal position of the principal *mihṛāb* [q.v.], sometimes of subsidiary *mihṛābs* also, is indicated on the outside of the west wall by one or more buttresses; a feature of mosques in India is the way the exterior elevation of the west wall is brought to life by decorative expedients.

The interior of the mosque admits of little variation outside two well-defined types. In one the western end (known in India as *liwān*) is a simple arrangement of columns supporting a roof, usually of at least three bays in depth but possibly of many more; the roof may be supported by beam-and-bracket or by the arch; the former arrangement being by no means confined to compilations of pillaged Hindū/*Ḍjāy*n material. The *liwān* openings may be connected directly with the arcades or colonnades of other sides of the *ṣahn*. Where Hindū material has been used it is usually necessary to superimpose one column upon another in order to gain sufficient height, for not infrequently a mezzanine gallery may be incorporated in the structure, in the *liwān* or in the side *riwāks*. These are frequently referred to as “women’s galleries”, but this is surely impossible unless they are placed to the rear of the structure so that women may not make their prayers in front of men; gallery structures in the *liwān* are more likely to be either reserved for royal (male) use or to be *ḥillas* for the use of a local *ḫīr*. In the other type, the *liwān* is physically separated from the *ṣahn* by a screen of arches (*maḡṣūra*), which may conceal a columnar structure to the west, as in the M. *Ḳuwwat al-Islām* where the *maḡṣūra* is a later addition to the original structure, or in the mosques of Guḍjarāt where the arch is not used with as much freedom as in other styles. More commonly, however, the arches of the *maḡṣūra* are part of a vaulting system whereby the *liwān* is composed into one or more halls; there is always an odd number of *maḡṣūra* arches, and it is common for the bay which stands in front of the principal *mihṛāb* to be singled out for special treatment, either by being made taller than the rest, or by being specially decorated (the latter treatment common in the mosques of *Bīḏjāpur* [q.v.]). (This is not invariably the central bay, as mosques are not necessarily symmetrical about the principal *mihṛāb* axis; cf. the “Stonecutters’ M.” in *Fathpur Sikrī*, where a *ḥilla* occupies two additional bays at the north end of the *liwān*, or the *Afhā’ī Kangūra M.* at *Kāshī Banāras*, where the side *riwāks* of the *liwān* are of unequal length.) In one mosque at *Bīḏjāpur* (*Makkā M.*), the *liwān* stands within and unattached to the surrounding courtyard. A staircase is commonly provided to give access to the *liwān* roof, either separately or incorporated within the walls or the base of a minaret, as this is a favourite place from which to call the *ḏḥān*; a staircase may be provided within a gateway for the same purpose. The *liwān* roof may be surmounted by one or more domes. Inside the *liwān*, the principal *mihṛāb* stands within the west wall opposite the main opening; if there are other *mihṛābs*, the central one is always the most sumptuously decorated and may be set deeper within the west wall than the other. The *minbar* is usually a permanent stone structure, with an odd number of steps, only occasionally made an object of decoration (splendid examples in the older Bengal mosques and in the *Mālwa* sultanate). A simple *minbar* is often provided when not liturgically necessary, as in the mosque attached to a tomb. There is an exceptional case at *Bīḏjāpur*, at the mosque building for the cenotaph of *Aḏḏal Khān*: the mosque is two-storeyed, the two halls being exactly similar except that a *minbar* is provided only in the lower one. (In another first-floor mosque at *Bīḏjāpur*, the *Andā M.*, there is no *minbar*; the ground floor is apparently a well-guarded *sarā’ī*, and the suggestion has been made that the whole structure was intended for *zanāna* use.) The floor of the *liwān* is often marked out into *muşallās* of *mihṛābī* shape for each individual worshipper. Lamps may be suspended from the *liwān* ceiling.

The *liwān* façade is open to the *ṣahn*; i.e. there is never any portion closed off like the *zimistān* of Persian mosques.

The *ṣahn* is usually an open courtyard, containing a *ḥawḍ* [q.v.] for the *wuḍūʿ*; this is usually placed centrally, except that in some *Shīʿī* mosques the *ḥawḍ* may be placed to one side of the central axis. There are rare cases where the *ṣahn* is completely or partially covered (e.g. the *Djāmiʿ* M. at Gulbargā [q.v.] is completely covered; in two mosques of the Tughlukid period at Dihlī, Khīrkī M. and Sandjar (Kālī) M., additional *riwāks* leave only four small open courtyards in the middle of the *ṣahn*). In such cases provision must be made for the *wuḍūʿ* outside the *ṣahn*; some major mosques may also make provision, outside the *ṣahn*, for the *ghuṣl*. In some Guḍjarāt mosques there is a water reservoir under the floor of the *ṣahn*, sometimes with chambers wherein to take refuge from the heat of the sun, with some sort of kiosk standing in the *ṣahn* from which water may be drawn; the idea is imitated on a small scale in the floor of the *Djāmiʿ* M. in Fatḥpur Sikrī. In one complex (Rāḍjōn kī bāʿin) south of the M. *Ḳuwwat al-Islām* the mosque and an associated tomb seem subordinate to an enormous step-well (*bāʿolī* [q.v.]).

One or more bays of the side or end *riwāks* may be closed off for a special purpose, e.g. to make a room for relics, or to serve as a room for the *kādī* or *mutawallī*; in *Shīʿī* mosques, sometimes to house the *ʿalams*, etc., but these are usually accommodated in the *Imāmbātā* or *ʿAshūrā-khāna* where there is one. The use of part of the mosque as a *madrasa* [q.v.] is commonplace, and many instances could be cited at the present day where there is no special provision for such a purpose; but there are instances of a special building forming an integral appendage of the mosque designated as a *madrasa*; e.g. M. *Khayr al-Manāzil*, near the *Purānā Ḳilʿa* in Dihlī, where the northern *riwāk*, of two storeys, forms the *madrasa* of the foundation.

The *ṣahn* may be used also for graves, from the simplest tombstone to elaborate mausoleums (see MAḲBARA. 5); e.g. the *Djāmiʿ* M. of Fatḥpur Sikrī, where most of the northern side of the *ṣahn* is occupied by the tomb of *Salīm ʿIshṭī*, the *Zanāna Rawḍa*, and the tomb of *Nawwāb Islām Khān* (not so designed originally, and possibly a *djāmaʿat-khāna* for the saint's disciples).

A *minār* is by no means an invariable appendage to the Indian mosque; apart from a few occasional early instances, only in the Guḍjarāt sultanate, and in *Burhānpur* in *Khāndēsh*, was a functional *minār* provided for the *adhān* before the *Mughal* period; after the 10th/16th century, the *minār* becomes common, but not invariable. See further MANĀRA. 2. India.

The administration of the mosque may be under the *kādī* [q.v.] or, in the case of larger foundations, a committee headed by a *mutawallī* [q.v.]. Where a mosque stands on a high plinth there may be openings in it sufficiently large to be rented off as storerooms or to traders, in which case the revenues accrued to the mosque; see also WAḲF.

Bibliography: There are no studies dealing with mosque typology alone; for works on all architectural aspects, see the Bibliographies to HIND. vii. Architecture, and Section B. below.

(J. BURTON-PAGE)

B. The monuments.

The development of the mosque in the subcontinent can be recognised as an adaptation of the Arab prototype, largely as already modified by Iranian builders, to local materials, climate, and the pro-

clivities of a long-established tradition of architecture and ornament. The Arab elements in this fusion were those basic to the expression of the *djāmaʿat*, the collective act of prayer and the simple, egalitarian liturgy: the courtyard and its protective enclosure, the *kibla* wall, here on the western side, the *zulla* or prayer hall, here known as *liwān*, along the western wall, and colonnades, *riwāk* or *dālān*, along the other sides, with an essential severity of outline and a spare orthogonal framework. The Iranian elements were rhythmic arcading, the prominent use of *pīshṭāk* [q.v.] or frontispiece alcoves, the voussoired dome, ultimately double, and a particular sense of proportion; minarets did not become general until relatively late, and then often as decorative rather than functional features. A gamut of Iranian decorative devices including ceramic tiles [see KĀSHĪ], cut plaster-work, *gaʿ-barī*, plaster relief work, *munabbat-kārī*, and *pietra dura* inlay, *parčīn-kārī*, besides the pseudostructural pendentive-work, *kalūb-kārī*, or squinch-netting. The Indian elements, within the context of an elaborated stone-cutting technique, were initially a certain heaviness due to the stone itself (especially in corbelled domes), complexity in individual forms, a vibration set up by the reiteration of forms at different scales, an interest in diagonal axes, and an overwhelming fertility of imagination in carved ornament. Indian traditions of massing only influenced mosque design in a limited way, and then largely through changes in dome form and grouping. The traditions of temple building were in strong contrast, creating massive, highly ornate enclosures within which progressively more intimate cells led to individual confrontation with a deity; the vertical extension was frequently emphasised as much as the horizontal. Despite this difference, a reconciliation of these traditions led to an enlivening of the mosque outline, especially on the skyline, with a frequent play of pinnacles and pavilions, much use of receding planes, and in some cases a culminating centrality comparable with the Ottoman achievement. The underlying Arab archetype retained its simplicity of arrangement in most regions, though periodically transformed in others. Evidence for the direct transfer of skills from temple-building to mosque building, which can be deduced from the earlier forms, is provided by a *Māru-Gurḍjara* architectural manual of the 15th century A.D., the *Vṛkṣārṇava*, in a chapter on the *Rehmāna-prāsāda*, or temple of *Rehmāna*, i.e. of Allāh, giving instructions for layout, orientation, superstructure and exclusively floral decoration, all within prescribed norms. The principal modifications attributable to the climate are a tendency to raise the courtyard level to catch wind currents and escape dust and noise, a tendency to pierce the courtyard walls to allow the currents through, and a preference for riverside sites. Specific architectural features are incorporated, notably the finely pierced *djālī* screen to reduce glare, and the *ḥaḍḍjā* or eaves pent to throw off monsoon water and increase shade. A general trend in the chronological development is the movement from trabeated construction towards arcuate or vaulted forms, though this is achieved with some hesitation. This is in parallel with a progression from a somewhat provincial emulation of Iranian or Central Asian types through local technique to a much more accomplished creation of local types in which influence from the *Vilāyat* can still be traced. Although the relative neglect of the *madrasa* [q.v.] as a building form may have been due in part to a practice of teaching within the mosque, this seems not to have produced any overall adaptation of layout, unless in the development of the undercroft.

The Arab conquest of Sind. It is recorded that the first mosque in Sind was built by Muḥammad b. Kāsim at Daybul [q.v.] after his capture of the city in 92/711, followed by another at Multān [q.v.], next year; he was urged to build mosques in every town, the resources seized having proved unexpectedly large. A third great mosque was built at Maṣūra [q.v.] either by his son ca. 120/738, or in the early years of Abū Djaʿfar al-Manṣūr, i.e. after 136/754, with teak columns. Little remains of these. If Daybul is correctly identified with Bhambōr, and the uncertain date of 109/727 is right, then the mosque there may be among the oldest in Islam. Its plan is certainly close to that of Kūfa [q.v.], as rebuilt in 50/670, with the same double rows of columns for the *riwāk*, but only three aisles (of twelve bays) parallel to the *kibla* wall in lieu of five for the prayer hall; no trace has been found of a *mihṛāb* recess, but neither has one been found at Wāsiṭ [see *MIḤRĀB*], as built under the same governor, al-Ḥadīdjādī b. Yūsuf. Outer bays of the *riwāk* were walled off to form cells, *ḥudjra*, and stone bases contain traces of timber pillars. Another inscription gives 239/853-4; one in flowered Kufic for 294/906-7 probably refers to rebuilding after the earthquake of 280/893. The building thus conforms to the early 'Irākī type, even to its strip foundations; though in yellow freestone, it lacks the stone columns. Pivots for gates in front of the *liwān* suggest some kind of *maḥsūra*. At Maṣūra, the Djāmi' Masdjid appears to have had a six-aisled prayer hall, built on an earlier Hindu site; three smaller mosques show careful alignment and external buttressing for a *mihṛāb*. In the absence of detail, the influence of these buildings is imponderable, but Daybul and Maṣūra survived until the 7th/13th century, and Maṣūra like Multān was taken by Maḥmūd of Ghazna; they can hardly have been ignored. A further early mosque in Kaḥ, at Bhadreśvar, has been identified by Shokoohy as a rebuilding with purposely-carved stone ca. 560/1165. This has a prayer hall of two aisles, a double *riwāk* colonnade at the sides, and a single one to the east. The prominent *mihṛāb* is echoed outside the east wall, which faces an open hypostyle hall, no doubt for an overflow congregation. The roof is trabeated throughout, mostly on the east-west axis.

In the period preceding the Dihlī Sultanate, the principal mosques must have been at Lāhawr [q.v.], the Ghaznawid centre (as Maḥmūdīpūr) from 412/1021, including the *Khishṭī* Masdjid., of which nothing remains, though brickwork is still typical of the area.

Sultanate. At Dihlī [q.v.] the victory of Kuṭb al-Dīn [q.v.] was proclaimed by the creation (587/1191) of the Masdjid Kuwwat al-Islām, "The Might of Islam", on a temple plinth, with stonework taken from 27 other temples by elephant-power. The plan, of the same 'Irākī type, is here elongated on the east-west axis, and includes formally symmetrical entrances to the east, north and south. The colonnades in the prayer hall are four aisles deep, those to the east three, and those down the long sides two. The hall is now modified to include a row of five corbelled domes, above five *mihṛābs*, by adjustment of the bay spacing to carry octagonal systems of lintels; this roof was set higher than the *riwāk* roofs, and mezzanines were built at the four angles of the court, possibly for women. Ingenious use of the strongly articulated temple pillars, with cruciform capitals and internally tiered domes, achieved a relatively light, harmonious building, whose Hindu character was scarcely disguised. In 595/1199, however, a great frontal screen of five pointed arches was added to the hall. Its

clearly-framed format, with the central arch much taller, is Iranian, and related to the Ghūrīd Shāh-i Mashhad in Ghardjstān (571/1175-6), or the Ribāt-i Sharaf [q.v.] (508/1114-15), but its construction is limited to Indian techniques, with corbelled arches. The marvellously vigorous combination of sinuous Hindu carving with *tughṛā* inscriptions makes fresh use of Indian skills for a Muslim purpose. The exaggerated height of this screen, with no direct relation to the hall behind, set a pattern for later buildings. In the same year Kuṭb al-Dīn began the immense Kuṭb Minār [q.v.] outside the southeast corner of the mosque, much like that at Khwādja Siyāh Pūsh in Sīstān, as a symbol of the centrality of faith; minarets, if used at all in Hindustān, are usually symbolic rather than functional until Mughal times. The exception is at Aḍjmer. There the equally symbolic re-use of temple components as "the annihilation of idolatry" achieved more orderly expression in the Afhā'ī-dīnkā Djhōnpfā (595/1199), under Abū Bakr al-Hirawī, with some evidence of specially-cut masonry in the lower column-shafts and tiered domes (see Meister, *op. cit.*), and a single, exquisite, cusped marble *mihṛāb*. The court is almost square, and probably had nine domes on all four sides, though there are five aisles in the prayer hall to three elsewhere; the effect is spacious, well-lit and calm. A reeded shaft graced each external angle, and the site on a mound allowed a grand approach stair to the east. Here too a great screen wall was added, with seven arches, under Iltutmish (607-33/1211-36), two lateral arches on each side reflecting the cusped form of the *mihṛāb*; the central arch is less dominant than at Dihlī, but is surmounted by two minaret shafts (now stumps), reeded and creased like the Kuṭb, so emulating a Salḍjūk [q.v.] *pīshṭāk*. Iltutmish was to extend the work at Dihlī. Accepting Aybek's plan, he enlarged the prayer hall by a further three domes to north and south, with corresponding *mihṛābs* and screen wall. Corbels on the latter suggest a double storey in each central bay, as in later work in Guḍjarāt. The *riwāk*, built as before, now enclosed the first mosque, including the Minār, to which he added three storeys [see DIHLĪ for plan and details] (completed 1229). The Shāhī Djāmi' Masdjid at Bari Khatu is of the same period and type, set on a high plinth; it introduces an ornate domed gallery over the east entrance. At Badā'ūn [q.v.] the great Djāmi' Masdjid built by Iltutmish in 620/1223-4 adheres to the same basic layout, but has been heavily rebuilt.

'Alā' al-Dīn Khaldjī's scheme to double the Kuwwat al-Islām again fell victim to its own ambition, for it was abandoned at his death. Remnants show that it respected the existing alignments in prayer hall, screen wall, and north gateway, and even in the immense 'Alā'ī Minār which was to rise from the centre of the new prayer court. The inherent symmetry cannot have mitigated the disruption of worship by three courts set within each other. The only complete element to survive is the southern gateway, or 'Alā'ī Darwāza (710/1311), set as a *čārjāk* on the palace approach: an elegant, accomplished building of a new order. Its vocabulary is recognisable in the Djāmā'at Khāna at the *dargāh* of Niẓām al-Dīn (dated for his death 725/1325), fully Muslim in style, and built with new stone. This has no courtyard, but only a prayer hall of three domed chambers, to each of which there is a broad archway in the eastern façade. The square central space, almost the same size as the Darwāza, has a similar system of concentric keel arches for its squinches, as in earlier Khurāsānian work (cf. Kīrk Kīz near Termez), here carved,

framed, and supporting an octagonal cornice; above, round the base of the smooth dome, are 32 arched niches, four of them pierced to admit light. The grace of the interior is achieved by a balance between the four main arches, the squinches, and at a reduced scale the *mihrab* and pairs of small arches at each corner, sustaining interest at each level. Each arch, inside or out, is contained by bands of inscriptions on the extrados (derived from *Čisht*?), set off by lotus buds lining the intrados, in recessed planes above the angle shafts first introduced in *Iltutmish*'s screen. The now-vousoired arch construction is masked by the carving. The lateral bays have two domes each on triangular pendentives, and may have been added rather later. Externally, the lateral bays are sunk, and the central one advanced and raised as a modest frontispiece; all are joined by a string course at mid-height and a lotus-bud parapet. Each archway is latticed. A provincial variant of the same style can be seen in the *Ūkha Masjid* at Bayāna, erected by *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn Mubārak* (716-20/1316-20). The mosques of the same period at *Djalōr*, *Dawlatābād*, *Pātan* and *Bharoĉ* are built from temple spoil, but that at *Dawlatābād* continues the use of tapering, fluted corner buttresses, and *Bharoĉ*, with its more conscious blending of Hindu with Muslim elements, provides a starting point for the *Gudjarātī* style, with latticed windows, coffered ceilings over carefully-grouped columns, and domes of two sizes over the *lūwān*. The *Djāmi*^c *Masjid* at *Khambāyat* (ca. 1325) owes a more direct debt to *Dihlī* in its arches and massing, but local features are evident in the merlon parapet, pinnacles on the frontispiece, latticework set in a grid-like frame, and pillars carrying a cusped arch just inside the main archway. These examples attest to the diffusion of the style in western *Hindūstān*.

An altogether different treatment of the mosque was to characterise *Tughluḳ* building. Most of the examples at *Dihlī* are undated, and have been ascribed to *Firūz Shāh*, but it has been suggested (*Burton-Page, op. cit. in Bibl.*, 1974, 15) that the large *Begampur Masjid* is better explained as built by *Muḥammad b. Tughluḳ* for his new city of *Djahānpanāh* (ca. 725/1325). Raised on a high plinth, it is important in introducing the Iranian four-*iwān* plan to India. North and south, the *iwāns* are advanced well into the court between heavy walls, boxing entrances at the centre of each side; to the east, the projection is outwards to a flight of steps, and to the west the tall arch rises to twice the roof height between tapering octagonal stair turrets, framing a triple entrance to the prayer hall. Here the main chamber is square, under a large pointed dome completely masked by this *pīshṭāk*. The hall on either side is three-aisled, with lesser domes, and 44 more domes cover the single *riwāk* all round the court, above arcades, and matching arched windows (for plan see *ASIAR*, iv [1871-2], pl. x). *Muḥammad*'s transfer of *Dihlī*'s population to *Dawlatābād* in 729/1329 appears to have depleted the skilled labour force and led to its dispersion elsewhere, notably in the *Bahmanī Sultanate*; southward expansion emptied the treasury. Nevertheless, the change of attitude introduced by *Firūz Shāh* (752-90/1351-88) was primarily an ethical one, in which his religious integrity required a return to prescribed simplicity and lack of ostentation. His building programme encompassed many mosques and 120 *khānakāhs* in *Dihlī* and *Firūzābād* alone, under the architect *Malik Ghāzī Shāhna*; given his stringent financial control, a modest but durable type of construction was inevitable. The fortified appearance of these mosques probably owes more to *Khurāsānīan* prototypes,

whose tapering round towers and massive walls had met the needs of mud construction, than to the need for defence (*Ghiyāth al-Dīn*, a *Kara'una Turk*, may have mediated this influence). The *Djāmi*^c *Masjid* at *Firūzshāh Kōtlā* (755/1354), now ruined, was built to incorporate a *tahkhāna* or undercroft, with arcaded vaults accessible from three sides, the east fronting the river. It once had three-aisled *riwāks* with multiple domes, and 216 stone pillars about 16 ft. (4.87 m.) high, around a central octagonal pool with its own dome. To the north, one of the *Ashoka*'s stone pillars was re-erected on a three-storey, arcaded pyramid as a marker. The materials for this and *Firūz Shāh*'s other mosques are rough rubble stonework faced with *čūnā* plaster, once whitewashed or painted, with a minimum of mouldings. The common repertoire included tall plain walls with merlons, plain lintels on plain, squared quartzite piers set in twos or fours, with elementary scrolled cross-brackets and capitals, still Hindu in type, and two-centred arches of variable width sunk in panels, sometimes concentric. Domes were of a similar, helmet-like profile, set on framed, recessed squinch arches. Externally, the mass is emphasised by long flights of steps, projecting porches, and battered towers at the angles. The device of the *tahkhāna*, which allowed the lease of shop spaces to sustain the mosque, is repeated at the *Kalān Masjid* (798/1387?) which exhibits these features, and an unusual corridor around the prayer hall, besides cannon-like *guldasta* pinnacles crowning the angle-towers of the porch. The *Khīfī Masjid*, also on a *tahkhāna*, repeats the three-aisled *riwāk*, but in combination with three-aisled passages which traverse the court on both axes, dividing it into four smaller square courts. This four-court plan is to be seen in a perhaps earlier form at the *Sandjar Masjid* (772/1370-1) at *Nizām al-Dīn*, though there the *riwāk* and the passages are only one aisle deep, and the courts are rectangular. This scheme, possibly derived from *Djāyn* temple plans, was presumably intended to provide shade; the courts themselves were probably covered by awnings, as in palaces at the time. It intruded on the essential unity of the *ṣahn* and its congregation, and the experiment was not repeated. The mosque of *Shāh 'Ālam* includes an early example of a mezzanine gallery in the northwest corner; the inaccessibility of such retreats leaves their purpose uncertain.

The *Djāmi*^c *Masjid* at *Iriĉ* (815/1412), some 40 miles north of *Jhansi*, demonstrates the transition from the *Tughluḳ* to the *Sayyid* manner. The plan, with single-aisled *riwāks*, is centred on a prayer chamber whose dome spans the full depth of the hall, with two aisles and six smaller domes on each side. The structure is wholly arcuate, on low piers carefully detailed to articulate both axes, with frequent use of recessed planes; the arches are now stilted, with marked corbelling at the impost giving a shouldered effect, and set in deep panels. The *riwāk* has groined vaulting. The dome is single, a little pointed inside, with ribs, and still set on concentric squinch arches. The generally ponderous effect is offset by the assured but simple proportions, and the skyline is relieved with merlons (see *Mem. ASI*, xix, *Calcutta* 1926, for drawings).

The *Lōdī* mosque (*Tughluḳid*) at *Khayrpur* (900/1494) incorporates similar features, while its massing shows the continuity of *Tughluḳid* tradition despite *Timūr*'s incursion. Attached by a walled court to the *Bafā Gumbad*, it is balanced by an arched structure opposite: a significant precedent for later tombs. An arcaded basement makes up the change in

level at the rear, with tapering round buttresses at each rear corner, and at each angle of the projecting bay of the central *mīhrāb*, whose tops are alternately reeded below *guldasta* pinnacles; a Hindu window is corbelled out from the middle, and from either end wall. The hall has five bays; the three in the middle are domed, but the ends have low, flat vaults. The elevation reiterates the pattern, with three broad shouldered arches, and narrow ones at the extremities. As at Irič, the central *pīshṭāk* is raised a little, but here it is set between narrow, niched piers, and the outer two bays are united by the line of a *chaḡḡījā*. Like its dome, the central arch, thrice recessed, is a little higher than the others, and a muscular tension results from the contrast of line. The surfaces, worked outside and in with deeply cut plaster, vibrate with countless arabesques; each extrados is inscribed, and inscribed rosettes fill the spandrels. Inside, they enhance pendentive systems of oversailing lintels carved with *mukarnas* [q.v.] niches. The vocabulary is further enlarged by blind merlon parapets, counterset trefoils around the octagonal dome bases (precursors of later foliation), and spreading lotus finials, *mahāpadma*. The development of this type is apparent in the Mōth kī Masdjid (ca. 911/1505), where the lateral domes are shifted to the end bays, in a much freer spacing. There they are supported on similar corbelled pendentives, as long used in Iran, while the central dome rests on squinch arches. The five façade arches are narrower, and a lancet window is added at each end. The *pīshṭāk* now encloses a lofty blind arch reacing the parapet, which frames the entrance arch below, and a window above, as anticipated in the *mīhrāb* at *Khayrpur*. The two corner buttresses give way to polygonal towers, arcaded in two storeys. White marble is used to set off the red sandstone, with coloured tilework, notably on *chaṭrīs* at the courtyard corners, and painted carved plaster.

Despite his dissatisfaction with this style, Bābur appears to have secured little improvement at his mosques (932/1526) at Kābulī Bāgh, Pānipat and Sambhal, beyond introducing Tīmūrid squinch netting. Humāyūn, however, developed it further in the *Djamālī Masdjid* (943/1536) at Dihlī, in the same five-bay format. This only has one dome. The *pīshṭāk* is contained between engaged reeded shafts that anticipate the Mughal use of minarets. The four-centred arches on either side are separated by large superimposed niches, which help to maintain the rhythm, and their haunches are slight. *Khaldjī* lotus buds are re-introduced on the central intrados. The *Masdjid-i Kuhna* at the Purānā Kīl'ā (ca. 1535-60?) shows further refinement. Each of its five arches is contained within a taller blind one, and that in a panel. The end bays, broken forward, resemble the *Djamālī pīshṭāk*, but the three middle ones are set deeper, with delicate angle shafts, and are proportionately taller. The fine ashlar incorporates the first geometric marble mosaic, after Tīmūrid models, and elaborate moulding profiles. Inside, the rippling recessed arches carry squinch arches below the prominent central dome, niched pendentives on either side, and arched cross ribs with vaulting at either end, again of a Tīmūrid type.

Regional developments. Bengal.

Remains from the early Muslim annexation are very limited. At Tribeni, an inscription framing the *mīhrāb* is dated 698/1298, but the mosque has been rebuilt, as has the Sālik mosque at Basirhāt (705/1305). At Čhōta Pānduā [see PĀNDUĀ, Čhōta] ruins of a large brick mosque include basalt Hindu columns supporting well-rounded, two-centred arches

of a type that remained typical of Bengal, and *mīhrābs* with carved trefoil heads above ringed shafts, plainly derived from Hindu niches, though within diapered Muslim frames, and a kiosk-like *minbar* [q.v.]. It may have been the model for the huge Adīna Masdjid at Ḥaḡrat Pānduā (776/1374-5)(154.70 x 87 m.), which has similar features. There the broad courtyard resembles that of the Great Mosque at Damascus in its proportions and the dominance of a *maḡsūra*-like bay at the centre of the prayer hall, once vaulted over. This runs through the hall, with five arches leading to five aisles of 18 bays on either side, but the presence of a royal mezzanine in the north wing leaves its purpose in doubt. Triple-aisled *riwāks* surround the court behind plain, stone-faced arcades, each arch recessed once within a panel. The simple pillars support brick cross arches between which spherical pendentives of corbelled brick carry 378 identical low domes, punctuated only by the *maḡsūra*. Outside, the ashlar wall is advanced and recessed in alternate vertical strips traversed by cornice and string course, each set off by an aedicule containing a cusped arch and lamp. Although never repeated at this scale (32 *mīhrābs*!) such treatment of detail was to inform most subsequent work. From the 9th/15th century onwards, mosques took a closed form in response to the wet climate, with the characteristically curved Bangālī eaves line, but still with the massive polygonal corner buttresses of the period. Thus the Čamkatta Masdjid at Gawf (ca. 880/1475?) has a single square chamber of brickwork surmounted by a single dome; it has single openings centred north and south, and three to the east giving on to a vaulted verandah running the full width, again with single doors to north and south, and three to the east. The piers between the arched openings carried aedicules set high, and glazed tilework. The Lattan Masdjid (880/1475-6) is similar, but with a more complete symmetry, having three openings to north and south, and three *mīhrābs* opposite the doors, three domes over the verandah, and intermediate "corner" buttresses; the central verandah dome has a roof with four curved eaves—a *čawčāla*. It was once tiled outside and in. The Gunmant Masdjid at Gawf (889/1484?) encloses four bays of three aisles, all domed, on either side of a central *maḡsūra*, the stonework of whose vault is carved in relief. A further variant is illustrated by three mosques at Gawf. The Thāntipāra Masdjid (885/1480) is rectangular, enclosing five bays of two aisles, with a single line of four stone pillars to carry its ten domes. Fine terracotta reliefs fill the spandrels and the two registers of aedicules on the piers outside. At the Čhōta Sōnā Masdjid, built between 899/1493 and 925/1519, the plan is comparable, but of three aisles; its central bay is wider, and has three *čawčāla* roofs in lieu of domes. Its ashlar front is finely carved, and the dome was once gilded. The Bafā Sōnā Masdjid (932/1526) combines eleven bays of three aisles with a verandah forming a further aisle down the front, facing an open quadrangle with arched gateways; the stone is remarkably plain. Such forms continued well into the Mughal period, as seen in the Kuṭb Shāhī mosque at Ḥaḡrat Pānduā (990/1582).

Djawnpur. A mosque begun in 778/1376 by Firūz Shāh Tughluḡ was completed under the independent Shārkī sultans (811/1408); its name, Aīāla Masdjid, apparently refers to the pylon-like *pīshṭāk* which was to become the dominant trait of subsequent buildings here (Sk. *attāla* = "watch tower", see Lehmann, *op. cit.*, 23), exaggerating the great screen-arch at Dihlī. The four-*iwān* plan is apparently derived from the Begampur Masdjid at

Dihlī, though the *iwān* walls are reduced to massive spurs outside the enclosure, and those to north and south have domes carried on clustered columns, leaving the three-aisled *riwāk* unimpeded. Only the western *iwān* still boxes in space in the prayer hall, accessible through triple doors as before, but with bi-axial symmetry, three arches on either side maintaining the continuity of the three prayer hall aisles; the frontal turrets are now resolved as square towers tapering five stories to accommodate the *pīshṭāk* arch, whose recessed tympanum is pierced in three registers to reveal the open air beyond. This pylon, used for giving the *adhān*, is echoed at 1/3 scale on either side in the *iwān* wings, and in the remaining *iwāns* outside the remarkable two-storey colonnade; it may have been suggested by the pierced archway of the *Shaykh Bārha* mosque at *Ẓafarābād* (711/1311), though its scale perhaps owes something to *Pānduā* [for further description, see *DAWNPUR*]. Tapering cylindrical turrets at the angles of the rear wall attest to *Tughluḳid* influence. At the *Lāl Darwāza Masjid* (ca. 852/1447), built on the same pattern, the structure behind the main *iwān* is still lighter, minimising obstruction of the prayer hall below the central dome, though mezzanines are set on either side; the absence of lateral domes, due to the smaller scale, leaves that at the centre uncluttered. The dome piers, with massive Hindu brackets, contrast oddly with the *Iranic* slenderness of the colonnades. In structural terms, the *Djāmi' Masjid* (842/1438, but finished under *Ḥusayn Sharḳī*) is a reversion to the *Begampur* type, with boxed-in, domed *iwāns* on all four sides, and the same high undercroft. In the prayer chamber the colonnades are eliminated except under the mezzanines either side of the central chamber, where the pillars are paired to match its piers, for the wings are again boxed in by heavy masonry supporting the roof of a single pointed barrel vault spanning east and west, on either side. The prayer hall is thus divided into three spaces free of supports, but separated by their cross walls and the two-storey mezzanines. The same triality is seen in the *façade*. The simply niched towers and arcaded tympana of the earlier *pīshṭāks* are transmuted into a rhythmic display of framed and fretted openings. The dichotomy between high frontal screen and the dome hidden behind is nowhere more pronounced than here. Related mosques are to be found at *Itāwā* (*Djāmi' Masjid*) and *Banāras* (*Arhā'ī Kanguar*).

Guḍjarāt. In a sandstone architecture, drawing more than that of any other region on the *Hindu* and *Jain* traditions, two tendencies in mosque design had already emerged in the *Khaldjī* phase already referred to: the screening of the prayer-hall front between a series of archways, as at *Khambāyat* (after *Nizām al-Dīn* at *Dihlī*), or the treatment of the hall as an open colonnade, given additional rhythm by the surge of domes above the *chaḳīja* line, as at *Bharoḥ*. In either case the domes were carried by the *Hindu* device of beams spanning between two columns grouped to convert each square bay to an octagon. Remaining square bays were panelled in intricately recessed layers of coffering, whose cellular carving matched that of the domes. Pillars with markedly stratified round shafts above squared, faceted pedestals, carry vigorously curved brackets never far from living movement. The proportions of the three-arched screen are carefully repeated at *Dhōlkā* in the mosque of *Hilāl Khān Kādī* (733/1333), but with bracketed, tiered pinnacles marking the *pīshṭāk* so prominently as to suggest the minarets which followed; the central dome, raised a storey above the roof, is surrounded by

pierced screens. The same scheme, with its lower wings on either side, recurs at *Aḥmadābād* in *Sayyid 'Ālam's* mosque (815/1412), with half-rounded, tiered and bracketed buttresses framing the central arch as bases for fully functional *minārs* in a comparable style. The larger domes are now true, hemispherical ones. The development reaches fruition in the *Djāmi' Masjid* at *Aḥmadābād* (826/1423) where the roof at the front of the three central bays is raised for a clerestory, with mezzanine galleries between, and the central dome is raised a further storey, so that light can enter indirectly at two levels, filtered by a pierced screen set in the usual *Guḍjarātī* gridframe of stone: the remaining domes, three deep and five in the length of the hall, surround these three at the lower level. The *minārs*, once four times this height, fell in 1819 (see *J. Forbes' drawing of 1781 in ASWI*, vii [1906], 30). The *Masjid* of *Malik 'Ālam* (1422?) combines a single arch with such minarets and an open front. Continuing interest in the open type of hall is seen, as at the mosque at *Sarkhēdj* (855/1451), where 140 pillars, grouped as usual to support two rows of five equal domes, are set throughout in pairs to achieve an elegantly simple unity below a continuous roof line; there is little carving but for the *mīhrābs*. The *Djāmi' Masjid* at *Āmpānēr* (*Mahmūdābād*) (924/1518-9) works variations on that at *Aḥmadābād*. The eleven main domes are staggered, the central one being set over a single central bay rising through three roof levels, behind a *pīshṭāk* which now overlaps the *minār* on either side, and incorporates three corbelled bay windows. The hall wings (*bāzūhā*) thus maintain a single roof line, with a plain walled front pierced by two arches each side, but there are now corner turrets to match the octagonal *minārs*. The main dome is ribbed inside, the side ones still corbelled, and the carved panels have filigree tendril-work. As at *Aḥmadābād*, the *riwāk* is one aisle deep; three entrance pavilions outside the wall carry prominent *chattris*, and the wall itself is strongly modelled. The mosque of *Rānī Rūpawātī* (ca. 916/1510) shows a hall of only three domes treated similarly, with bay windows playing a more conspicuous role in modulating the front and ends. The culmination of the open hall design at the mosque of *Rānī Siprī* (*Sabarī*), also at *Aḥmadābād* (920/1514), fronting her tomb, has two rows of three corbelled domes, with only one row of pillars down the centre, and another, paired, in front, enlivened by alternate spacing. The extreme delicacy of this small-scale scheme is most evident in the slender, but solid and purely decorative *minārs* now set at each end of the *façade*—a device already introduced at the mosque of *Muḥāfiẓ Khān* (897/1492) with full minarets. These two traditions were reconciled in the mosque of *Shaykh Ḥasan Muḥammad Āshṭī* (973/1565-6), a pillared hall of three *mīhrābs* in which the front is arcaded between terminal *minārs*, and the central five bays are raised in an upper storey of verandahs around a single dome. *Sīdī Sa'īd al-Ḥabshī's* mosque (980/1572-3), still at *Aḥmadābād*, has five bays of three aisles with intersecting arches, supporting shallow domes over squinches, lintels and corbels, but is remarkable for its ten large tracery lunettes, of which two are unrivalled in the sinuous naturalism they bring to the interior.

Māl wā. An initial phase of redeployed temple material is distinguished by a simple grace which remained typical of the kingdom. At the *Djāmi' Masjid* (or *Lāt Masjid*) at *Dhār* (807/1404-5) the proportions of a single smooth hemispherical dome impart a spaciousness to the centre of the prayer hall colonnades, complemented by a pattern of flagstones,

and a peaked, cusped *mīhrāb* arch; outside, its coronet of merlons enhances the traces of a tiled merlon parapet over the open front. One domed porch is surrounded by coved vaults, and in another false arch profiles are inserted between the pillars as in Guḍjarātī temples. The first mosque at Māndū, that of Dilāwar Khān (808/1405-6) is spartan, however, with its hall of elemental columns relieved only by seven *mīhrābs*. Its successor, that of Malik Mughūth (835/1432) presents a more Tughlukid exterior, with an arcaded undercroft in front between domed turrets, and the prominent stair often used here. The open, pillared prayer hall has three low, helmet-like domes. These, though still supported by an octagon of lintels, are partly enclosed by similar false arches below, with web spandrels, well integrated with the *mīhrābs* behind. The Djāmi' Masjdīd (858/1454) has the same undercroft and steps, and the three main domes again span three rear aisles of the hall, but there are now two aisles in front of them, which with the triple aisles of the side *riwāks* are covered with ranks of small domes, one to each bay, 158 in all. The building is mature, wholly Muslim, and of a sturdy dignity. The heaviness of strongly stilted domes is balanced by the grace of matching arcades round the court; the lofty hall is intersected by arches over plain, squared pillars, and articulated with blind wall arches and a characteristic flaring squinch. Each end dome covers a mezzanine set on nine bays of cross-vaulting. The pink stone is almost plain. The Djāmi' Masjdīd at Čandēri is comparable, though remarkable for serpentine brackets developed from those of the *minbar* at Māndū.

Khāndēsh. A similar restraint in the Djāmi' Masjdīd at Burhānpur is conspicuous in its open hall front of 15 uniform arches, relieved only by a dancing alternation of large and small trefoil merlons, and the reiteration of *chaḍḍijā* brackets, the arcaded court appearing larger thereby (997/1589). The interior of the hall is equally regular, with five aisles of cross vaulting sustained by plain squared pillars decorated only on their bases, and a crested *mīhrāb* to each bay, rising above the string course, with three recessed arches finely chiselled in the dark stone. A substantial octagonal *minār* rises from a faceted square base at each end of the hall front, topped by a square lantern and a dome. Similar tall but plain *minārs* appear elsewhere in the city, and most notably as a pair flanking the *pištāk* arch of the Bībī kī Masjdīd, with four *dīharōkhā* windows below their domes. Their tiered form otherwise resembles that at Čāmpānēr, there is even a *dīharōkhā* on either side fronting the three-domed hall, whose organisation is apparently based on Rānī Rūpawati's mosque at Aḥmadābād (see *ASI*, *NIS*, ix, 1873-5).

Bahmanī Sultanate. The interpretation of the *lūwān* as a simple repetition of arched bays is already present in the Shāh Bāzār Masjdīd at Gulbargā (ca. 761/1360?), in an open-fronted hall of 15 bays of crossed arches in six aisles, all of them domed. The arches, set on tall piers, are recessed once, shouldered at the impost and stilted; the domes are low. At the Djāmi' Masjdīd (769/1367, thus contemporary with the Khīrkī and Sandjar mosques at Dihlī) similar arches and squared piers are deployed quite differently to cover what would normally be the court with 63 domes on pendentives of corbelled work on angle. The *riwāks* are replaced by broader aisles roofed by rows of transverse pointed barrel vaults countering the thrust of these, with a large dome at each corner; these vaults rest on arches set on very low imposts, the contrasts in height adding interest to the

interior, while light floods in from arcades in the outer wall. A still larger dome is set in front of the *mīhrāb*, heavily stilted, over trilobed squinches echoing the *mīhrāb* itself, and set in a square clerestory (cf. that in the mosque of Karīm al-Dīn at Bīdjāpur, 720/1320). The ensemble recalls *bāzār* architecture in Iran; it was without sequel, like the experiments at Dihlī. A variant of the arcaded open *lūwān* at the Dargāh of Muḍjarrad Kamāl (ca. 802/1400) has carved stucco archivolts and rosettes, with an extraordinary "entablature" of depressed cusped arches on sinuous brackets. The Djāmi' Masjdīd (Solah Khamba) in the Fort at Bīdar [*q.v.*] is another version (827/1423-4), whose long front of 19 arched bays has square piers, and the five-aisle interior round pillars, carrying small domes on squinches. Heavy piers form a *makṣūra* enclosing the central three bays, from which squinches on sinuous brackets carry a tall 16-sided drum lit by fine *djālīs*, and a single large dome whose outer form is close to the domes at Mūltān [*q.v.*] while its supports recall the Tughlukid *lūwān* at Begampur. The small three-bayed Langar kī Masjdīd at Gulbargā (ca. 838/1435?) introduces a single pointed brick vault over two arched ribs.

Barīd Shāhī. At Bīdar, the use of tall arches on low imposts is resumed at the Djāmi' Masjdīd (ca. 926/1520?), recessed once, with angular matching squinches articulated with great clarity below plain domes (cf. those in southern Iran). A transition to the Bīdjāpur vocabulary can be seen in the Kālī Masjdīd (1106/1694-5), where the three front arches are framed by a pair of slender, formalised *minārs*, and the decagonal *mīhrāb* recess is housed in a square rear tower carrying a *čārṭāk* lantern, and a slightly bulbous dome as introduced at the Madrasa of Maḥmūd Gawan (877/1472); a domical vault roofs the central bay. A small mosque at the tomb of 'Alī Barīd (984/1576), handled similarly, has three domes on squinch-net pendentives, and a fretted cresting.

'Imād Shāhī. The Djāmi' Masjdīd at Gāwilgarh [*q.v.*], rebuilt in 893/1488, already combined a seven-arched hall façade on square piers with a square pylon at either end topped by a *čhatrī* with *djālī*-work in the sides, and *chaḍḍijās* on serpentine brackets, but otherwise follows the Bahmanī pattern of a dome over every bay, and a larger one raised on a tall drum at the centre; an arcaded screen wall surrounds its court. This is repeated at a smaller scale in the Djāmi' Masjdīd at Rohankhed (990/1582), where four pylons with *čhatrīs* now form the hall ends, with a single central dome: the imposing south gateway has extensive carving.

Nizām Shāhī. The Damrī Masjdīd at Aḥmadnagar, small and precise, has a three-arched façade flanked by ornate pylons, which carry four graceful *minārs* capped by bud-like domelets. Octagonal pillars form two arched aisles supporting a flat roof. At the centre of a decorative parapet two slim minarets frame an arch profile, as in the Bādal Maḥall Darwāza at Čandēri. No superstructure remains on the corner piers of the Dilāwar Khān mosque at Khed, but the exterior is enhanced by cusped arches, with two panelled bands running all round, and lotus medallions in relief. The central dome set on a square base imitates a tomb, complete with *chaḍḍijās* and corner *čhatrīs*. Inside, columns with volutes carry a coved ceiling.

'Ādil Shāhī. At Rāyčūr [*q.v.*] in the disputed Dōāb, a series of *lūwāns* were built with flat ceilings over black basalt Čālukyan pillars whose short, heavy profiles are compensated by a deep parapet; the Ek Mīnār kī Masjdīd has a tapering, free-standing *minār*

20 m. high (919/1513). In Bīdġāpūr [q.v.] the Bīdar vocabulary was elaborated in dark stone. Thus in the Dġāmi^c Masġid of Yūsuf (918/1512-3) the slightly bulbous dome, set on a tall cylindrical drum, is familiar but for the foliation around its base, as is the dominance of the central arch, its form, and the articulation of line and squinch within; what is new, and characteristic, is the prominence given the dome, and the domed *čartāk* lanterns at each corner, well above the roof line. The same three-bay format is used in the Dġāmi^c Masġid of Ibrāhīm (ca. 957/1550?), where a flat, domeless roof with sturdy domed *guldasta* pinnacles at each corner is relieved by a panelled *mīnār* set over each front pier. Cusped arches surround its *mihrāb*. The mosque of *kh*lāš *Kh*hān (ca. 968/1560?) is similar, with the addition of a lantern in two storeys above the *mihrāb*, and a cusped central arch. All three arches are cusped, and repeatedly recessed, in the mosque of ‘Alī *Shahīd Pīr* where a pointed vault (as at Gulbargā) runs parallel to the front, and a tall domed shaft rises over the *mihrāb*. In all of these carved stucco decoration, notably rosettes, is prominent. A mosque in the fort at Naldrug (968/1560) may have one of the first double domes in India. At the Dġāmi^c Masġid of Bīdġāpūr, the largest in the Deccan (985/1577-8?), these elements achieve mature expression. Its prayer hall, nine bays long and five aisles deep, is articulated with a calm strength, only an alternation of squinch detail varying a uniform structure with shallow domes; four piers at the centre are omitted, and intersecting pendentive arches are inserted in a miraculous change of scale to carry the dome (as already found in the tomb of Sulṭān Kalīm Allāh at Bīdar and based on Tīmūrid antecedents. Clerestory arches with fine *djālīs* light it through a square base rising above the roof, but the dome, still of the Mūltān shape above its foliation, remains dim, as usual here. Two features are innovations. At the east end of each seven-bayed *riwāk* is an octagonal base for an unbuilt *mīnār*; the entire external wall is modelled with two registers of arcading, the upper a corridor, and the lower blind. Both may be derived from the Muṣallā at Harāt (841/1437-8) [q.v.]. A central courtyard tank anticipates Mughal practice. Stucco is partly replaced by carved stone at Malika Dġāhān Bēgam’s mosque (ca. 995/1586-7), in which the dome now suggests a sphere in its collar of leaves, repeated at each stage of four corner minarets; *guldasta* lanterns, fretted cresting, and pendant stone chains compound a new elegance. The same character informs the Andā Masġid (1017/1608) in fine ashlar, set back above a *sarā’i*, with a gadrooned dome, and the mosque at the Mihtar-i Maḥall, domeless, with rod-like *mīnārs*, and four prolonged *čhadġġā* brackets engaged to the piers. Its acme is the mosque at the Ibrāhīm Rawḍa (1036/1626), facing the tomb across a plinth within a walled garden; brilliant use is made of elements repeated at a miniature scale to complement the whole. Afḍal *Kh*hān’s mosque (1064/1653) is on two floors, the upper probably for women, as at the Andā mosque. The style was taken as far south as Sante Bennur. Much of the extravagant ornament is discarded in the Makka Masġid, in the latter half of the century, free-standing within a *riwāk* continued to the west.

*Ku*ṭb *Sh*hāhī. At Golkondā [q.v.], the first capital, the ruins include a Dġāmi^c Masġid built by Sulṭān *Ku*ṭb al-Mulk in 924/1518 near the Bālā *Hiṣār* Darwāza. The regional achievement is best represented by the mosques at Ḥaydarābād [q.v.], which were given a new emphasis on height, accentuated by the concentration of external detail in the

fascia between the *čhadġġā* and the skyline, and complemented by arcaded galleries around powerfully contoured *mīnārs*. The multiple *guldastas* on fretted parapets, and foliated bulbous domes are, like the stucco, inherited from Bīdġāpūr. The Dġāmi^c Masġid (1006/1597-8) has a spacious arched hall behind a front of seven bays divided unusually into two registers, the upper one of cusped arches being carried on struts from the pier impost; the central arch, broader and taller than the others, is surmounted by a plain profile in the upper section. The Makka Masġid, begun ca. 1026/1617, and continued until finished by Awrangzīb in 1105/1693, is set behind a square courtyard reputed to hold 10,000 worshippers, with a hall two aisles deep and five tall bays wide. In the plain ashlar façade, the central arch is slightly larger, as the only variation below the strong horizontal of a *čhadġġā* on linked brackets, spanning between the broad galleries of the turrets at either end, each of which is crowned by a bulbous dome on a marked necking. The columns carry arched pendentives and domes, with a coved central bay. Verticality is particularly pronounced in the Tolī Masġid (1043/1633-4), where the five narrow arches of the front are stilted above impost blocks on the tall piers, and a tall parapet of arched screens joins the *mīnār* galleries for their full height; each shaft has two further galleries above roof level. Extensive use is made of cut plaster, syncretic in style. For other developments in the south, see MAHISUR. 2. Monuments.

*Ka*sh mīr [q.v.]. The combination of a mountain climate and plentiful timber have resulted in a tradition of mosque building in a blockhouse technique of laid *deudār* logs and pitched roofs with birchbark sarking topped by turf. In parallel with Dakhani mosques, the basic constructional unit had much in common with the local tomb type, a near-cubical volume set on a stone base, the corners emphasised by timber jointing, and roofed by a pyramid, sometimes tiered, with a slim spire at the centre. Frequent renewal after fires renders dating unreliable, though the type seems to have been used since the 8th/14th century. At *Sh*rinagar in the mosque of *Sh*hāh Hamadān, the volume is modulated by large roofed balconies on each outside face, and the roof by a square arcaded *mu’adhdhīn*’s gallery below the peaked spire. Four tapering octagonal columns support a painted ceiling, with small rooms ranged to north and south. Cusped round arches contrast with the rhythms of varying timber lattices and panelling. At the Dġāmi^c Masġid (last built 1085/1674), a variant of the four-*iwān* plan places four of these units symmetrically around a square court, joined by four-aisled *riwāks* full of timber columns. Three form arched gateways, while the larger one to the west rises between walls of arched panelling over paired columns at the *riwāk* ends in an expansion of light and space, focussed on the simple arches of a large *mihrāb* in a fenestrated wall. In this case the outer walls are of brick with a simple repeated window, contrasting with the four spired roofs. In Baltistān and Kuhistān simple open *liwāns* of one or two aisles are supported on wooden columns, often fluted above a waisted base, and with brackets carved in repeated waves supporting beams on the long axis; here the connection with Turkestan building is evident.

Mughal Empire. During Akbar’s minority, the Tīmūrid innovations introduced under Humāyūn remained in currency, associated with the harem faction, as in the mosque and *madrasa* of Māham Anaga (Angā), the *Kh*hayr al-Manāzil (969/1561-2) whose three bays to the court are close in format to the cen-

tral three at Purānā Kīl'a with a slightly raised *pīshṭāk* advanced between clustered shafts, and four-centred arches whose tympana are pierced with archways at a lower level; only the single dome has an awkward, old-fashioned stilt. The arch spandrels are inlaid. The screened upper storey of rooms enclosing the court on three sides appears to be unique for the period, while the portal is the first to use a semidomed *iwān*. At Faṭhpur Sikrī [q.v.] these forms are less in evidence. Although the front of the Stonecutters' Mosque (ca. 973/1565) is arched, originally in five bays, the arch profile is cut from thin slabs set between thicker posts, the *ḥadīdīā* is supported by long, sinuous brackets, and the internal row of pillars is Hindū. The organisation of the great Djāmi' Masdjid (979/1571-2) stems from Djawnpur via Bayānā, where the technique of assembling cut stone components was already well-developed a century earlier (fieldwork by Shokoohy 1981). Three domed spaces at the centre and amid either wing of the *liwān* are each contained within massive walls pierced by symmetric arches to communicate with the columned spaces between, where flat, beamed roofs are supported on Hindū brackets, all in red sandstone; the central dome set on squinch arches is painted with swirling floral patterns, and the lateral ones are ribbed, lit through the drum, and carried on corbelled pendentives. The front of the hall with its alternation of broad and narrow bays, thin spandrels, long *ḥadīdīās*, and the form of the pillars appears to be Gudjarātī in origin, as does the great tank under the courtyard. At the centre, however, is a great *pīshṭāk* of the Dihlī type, with a semi-dome, completely screening the stilted and lumpish dome behind. The wings are of half the height, and relieved by queues of little *ḥatris* along the skyline, like the *riwāks* with their central *iwāns*: these once served as lanterns. Although the awkward column-spacing under the lateral domes of the Atāla Masdjid has been resolved, and much is made of the three main spaces, their walls still interrupt the unity of the hall.

The Mosque of Maryam Zamānī (1023/1614) at Lāhawr [q.v.], known as the Bēgam Shāhī Masdjid, and built of brick following local practice, achieves an unencumbered prayer hall of five square, domed compartments in line, interconnected by single arches springing from heavy piers at front and rear. The central compartment is wider, with a larger dome than the others, still stilted, but housing an inner shell which, though only of plaster, was probably the first used in a mosque in the north. The new arch shape extends to the squinches, with *muḥarnas* semi-domes, and the domes are articulated with netting, the whole being elaborately painted with floral, geometric, and inscriptional designs. Outside, the *liwān* front follows the model of the Djāmālī Masdjid, with blind superimposed niches on the pier faces, but the arches are now simple in profile, the front is in one plane but for the vaulted *iwān*, and there are square, domed turrets at either end. The Masdjid-i Wazīr Khān (1044/1634-5) in the same city has a *liwān* of the same kind, both outside and in, as before punctuated by a *mihrāb* below a semidome in each bay, with pendentives rising to carry the inner dome shells in the wings, and squinches at the centre. The dome profile is lower, with minimal stilting, but still unlike the profile of the five arches. The turrets are here full-sized octagonal minars with *ḥatris* above the galleries, and are echoed by a second pair at the east of a long court. The brickwork forms shallow panels between orthogonal fillets, containing a sumptuous variety of tile mosaic; the interior is painted.

A series of court mosques faced entirely in white

marble—seen as “pure like the heart of the austere” (*Bādshāh-nāma*, ii/1, 155)—was probably initiated at Āgra [q.v.] with the tiny, perfectly simple Minā Masdjid and the larger, three-bayed Nagīna Masdjid within the Fort. The latter, in which the lower dome profile has been transformed by necking above a torus moulding into a smooth bulbous shape with a large pointed *mahāpadma* (Bīdjāpūrī influence is suggested by the crescent above), represents an attempt to eliminate the conflict between emphasis on the central bay, and that on the dome behind, by replacement of the *pīshṭāk* with an upward curve of the *ḥadīdīā* and parapet, in the new Bangālī fashion, at the middle. This accommodates the larger central arch; the arches are engrailed, probably to reduce glare when viewed from inside. In the mosque at the Tādī Mahall [q.v.], the same conflict is resolved by raising the level of the façade over the two lateral arches almost to *pīshṭāk* level, and including a blind arched panel above each. This scheme is repeated at Lāhawr in the mosque of Dā'ī Angā (1045/1635-6), the corner turrets containing the taller front as before; the side arches are surmounted by great cusped arch heads, and the Lāhawrī panelling is of tile mosaic inside and outside the three interpenetrating square compartments. The treatment of the Madrasa Masdjid at Patnā (ca. 1040/1630) is comparable. The Faṭhpurī Masdjid at Āgra, flanked by the same flaring turrets, has a fully bulbous dome, but a tall marble *pīshṭāk* in front over a deep *iwān*, and low wings; its red stone is finely worked in relief, notably in the pendentives and inner dome. Like it, the Mōtī Masdjid at Lāhawr (ca. 1055/1645) is fronted by cusped arches flanking a plain central one, but it offers a further solution to the problem with a barely raised *pīshṭāk* linked to the wings by a continuous parapet in *parcīn-kārī*. The three marble domes still have the cavetto and profile of Dā'ī Angā's mosque, now clearly visible. These smaller mosques owe much to the consonant detail of arcuate screens which separate their courts from the outside world, and a finesse that extends to *sadīdīāda* inlaid in the floor. On a larger scale, the Shāh Djāhānī Masdjid at Adīmēr (1048/1638-9), with a prayer hall two aisles deep with arched piers, presents a long, unbroken façade of eleven bays, accented only by a needle-like *guldasta* over each octagonal column, to a balustrated court adjoining the *dargāh* of Mu'īn al-Dīn Čishtī; the whole is in marble.

Some of these tendencies are resolved at the Djāmi' Masdjid at Āgra, completed in red stone in 1058/1648. Its plan is essentially that of the five-compartment prayer hall from Lāhawr, complete with its corner turrets and another pair at the east corners of the court. Its capacity is increased by the addition of a second row of compartments in front of the first, the central one forming a deep *iwān*, whose *pīshṭāk* is thus spaced well forward from the domes over the main row behind; the two lateral domes are placed over the ends, for better balance, and all three are double and distinctly bulbous, with a pointed profile accentuated by inlaid chevrons of white marble (structural inner domes were from henceforward the norm). The front is of the tall type, with panels above and between the well-spaced plain arches, and two prominent shafts frame the marble *pīshṭāk*. *Ḥatris* enliven the whole skyline. The interior is a smooth progression of netted pendentives and plain arches with a broad extrados, at a noble scale. Its equivalent at Dihlī (1066/1656), also raised on a high podium, and approached by three great pyramids of steps on the axes, is the largest enclosed mosque in northern India. Gateway *iwāns* on these axes regain their prominence,

and the *riwāks* are open to the external air on all three sides. A collision between these and the *lūwān*, a weakness at Āgra, is avoided by returning them along the west, and then advancing the hall forward between full-size minarets at the corners. The *lūwān* plan fuses those of Āgra and Faḥpur Sīkrī, with alternating main compartments, and slimmer piers at the front; cusped arches are used throughout. The domes, now on tall drums are, like the *minārs* and the *ūwān*, striped with marble inlay, and the entire front is panelled in marble, with plain merlons above. Such detail, and especially the marble calyces topping the angle shafts, introduce a mannered deviation from the former simplicity. The scale is such that the *ūwān* itself forms a *mīhrāb* to the courtyard.

The Mōṭī Masjdīd at Āgra Fort (1063/1653), the largest of the marble series, complete with *riwāk* and axial gateways, combines a restraint of outline and of plan with an extravagance in the intersecting, cusped arch profiles. Eighteen identical piers in three aisles carry plain coved ceilings alternating with three domes on smooth pendentives, that rise bulbous among the *ḥaṭrīs* outside. That in the Dihlī Fort (1074/1663-4) shows the full extent of the stylistic change at a small scale, with a Bangālī curve in the *ḥaḍḍiyyā* over the central bay, set off by Bangālī vaults within, reticulated coving, clustered *guldastas* with calyces, and floral relief playing on many surfaces; the domes, rebuilt after the Mutiny, were originally lower, and gilded.

The last of the great congregational mosques, the Bādshāhī Masjdīd at Lāhawr (1084/1673-4) derives its plan almost entirely from the great mosque at Dihlī, the principal differences being that the three-storey octagonal *minārs* are now set at the four corners of the court, and the *lūwān* itself reverts to the local scheme with a domed octagonal turret at each corner. The *riwāks*, too, are subdivided into an alternating series of *hujras* for teaching, accessible only through doorways, and though raised as before, the court is thus closed in. The *lūwān*, of brick faced with red stone, is rather taller than at Dihlī, and panelled in the local manner, but the surfaces swarm with relief carving; the marble domes formerly had dark drums to relate them to the wings. Internally the squinched dome chambers alternate with Bangālī vaults, and the walls, arch soffits and domes are panelled or worked in net-patterns, *islīm-i khaṭā'ī*, of plaster relief, or else painted. The mosque is claimed as the largest in the world. The gateways of such structures served to house the *imām* and other staff. The Sonahrī Masjdīd at Dihlī (1164/1751) repeats the Mōṭī Masjdīd at the Fort in fawn sandstone. In subsequent work in Awadh the curvilinear and vegetal elements were to become dominant [see LAKHNAW], and were still vigorous in the D̄jāmi' Masjdīd of ca. 1840 in the capital.

Provincial developments within the Mughal empire predictably show an adaptation of the court style to local practice. In Bengal, the mosque of the Lālbāgh Fort at Dhākā (1089/1678) has the closed appearance and panelled front typical of the area, but the height of the prayer hall, its three cusped and netted front *ūwāns*, its three low domes and the four octagonal turrets at its corners all refer to the experience of Lāhawr. The interior of the lateral bays is remarkable for semidomes set below the apical dome, with two sets of pendentives. Other mosques at Dhākā follow the same format, as in that of Khān Muḥammad Mirḍha (1118/1706), with tall minars at the *lūwān* corners, or the Sātgunbadh mosque with octagonal corner towers.

The brick architecture of Sind is extensively clad

in fine glazed tilework, owing much to Iranian influence, and apparently that of Harāt [*q.v.*] in particular. This is already apparent in the Dābgīr Masjdīd at Thattā (997/1588-9), of which the *lūwān* remains in a ruined state, containing a square central compartment flanked by a rectangular one at each side, with arches connecting them between massive piers, and three deep *ūwāns*, set in slightly raised *pīshṭāks*. The central dome, like the *ūwān* below it, is notably larger than those either side, but all three are set on double octagonal drums of an Iranian type. The walls of the central compartment each house one well-shaped arch within another; at the west the interval contains an arched window set on either side of the buff carved sandstone *mīhrāb*. The tilework, floral, geometric and calligraphic, in cobalt and azure on a white ground, filled arch spandrels and soffits. The D̄jāmi' Masjdīd of Shāhjahān (1057/1647) in the same city is unusual in plan, with repeated heavy piers forming the two aisles of the broad *riwāks*, and the three of the prayer hall, around a very deep court, focussed on a great *pīshṭāk*, with small subsidiary courts on each side of an east entry passing under two domes in series (cf. the Masjdīd-i D̄jāmi' at Kirmān). The multiple bays are roofed by 80 small domes, with larger single ones over the central *ūwāns*, backed to the west by a single shell dome replacing four bays in front of the *mīhrāb*; this rises from intersecting pendentive work over a zone of 16 arches, pierced for a clerestory at the angles, and tiled throughout in mosaic (more than 100 pieces per sq. ft.) in ranks of wheeling stars. The smallest sound at the *mīhrāb* can be heard throughout the mosque, perhaps by virtue of its domes. In both these mosques the red brick is defined by white pointing which accents the arches. Further excellent tilework at the D̄jāmi' Masjdīd of Khudābād has been badly damaged. The treatment of its façade shows stronger Lāhawrī influence in proportions and panelling; the external walls, however, are noteworthy for three superimposed registers of repeated blind arches, a few being pierced at the lower levels.

At Aḥmadābād, the mosque of Nawwāb Sardār Khān (ca. 1070/1660?) combines a relatively orthodox Gujjarātī treatment of a three-bayed *lūwān*, having three plain arches between narrow piers, a *dīharokhā* bay on each end wall, and balconied *minārs* framing the front, with features that seem to bridge the styles of Bīd̄jāpūr and Āgra. The three closely-spaced domes are bulbous, above torus mouldings, with steep *mahāpadmas* as in the Nagīna and Mōṭī Masjdīds. The *minārs*, however, carry long foliations, lotus buds and the elongated, bulbed finial of the later 'Adil Shāhī style, close to those at the similar and contemporary Mosque of Afḍal Khān in the Dargāh of Gīsū Darāz at Gulbargā. The mosque, unlike its counterparts, is of brick and stucco. The mosque of Nawwāb Shād̄jā'at Khān (1107/1695-6) has a five-arched front, with Gujjarātī merlons, and *minārs* placed to contain the central three bays, but the piers are panelled with rows of little niches, and a line of cartouches runs overhead, with three low domes of the Dā'ī Angā type; the *minārs* once more have foliations, but have lost their tops. In its ceiling, the domes alternate with coved bays, as in the Mōṭī Masjdīd at Āgra, and it is finished with marble and polished plaster.

In general, it may be seen that whereas the enclosure of the court only achieves full architectural expression in cathedral mosques, or the later court mosques, the prayer hall is the subject of consistent architectural development. The particular structural means adopted in each region for enclosing the space become the vocabulary for a series of variations which

in most cases go far beyond the immediate needs of the liturgy or of mere shelter, and can be recognised as successive resolutions of the need for balance, harmony, and unity at the chosen scale.

Bibliography: For general works, see HIND. vii. Architecture. To these may be added Z. Desai, *Indo-Islamic architecture*. N. Delhi 1970; J. D. Hoag, *Islamic architecture*, New York 1977, 280-307, 364-88; R. A. Jairazbhoy, *An outline of Islamic architecture*, Bombay etc. 1972; B. Gray, ed., *The arts of India*, Oxford 1981. Works on mosques in general include E. La Roche, *Indische Baukunst, II. Teil: Moscheen und Grabmäler*, Munich 1921; Z. Desai, *The mosques of India*, N. Delhi 1971; and Y. K. Bukhari, *The mosque architecture of the Mughals*, in *Indo-Iranica* ix/2 (1956), 67-75. For the early Arab mosques, see H. Cousens, *The antiquities of Sind*, Calcutta 1929, repr. Karachi 1975, 48 ff., and S. M. Ashfaque, *The grand mosque of Banbhore*, in *Pakistan Archaeology*, vi/1 (1969), 182-209. The *Ḳuwwat al-Islām* is still best described by J. A. Page in *A guide to the Qutb, Delhi*, Delhi 1938, but see also M. C. Joshi, *Some Nagari inscriptions on the Qutb Minar*, in *Medieval India—a miscellany*, ii, Aligarh Muslim University 1972, 3-7, and S. K. Bannerji, *The Qutb Minar: its architecture and history*, in *Jnal. of the United Provinces Historical Soc.*, x/1 (1937), 38-58. The *Afhāʿī-din-kā Djhōnpfā* is described by M. Meister, *The two-and-a-half-day mosque*, in *Oriental Art*, xviii (1972), 57-63, and plan in *ASIAR*, ii, 1864-5; and see R. Hillenbrand, *Political symbolism in early Indo-Islamic mosque architecture: the case of Ajmīr*, in *Iran, JBIPS*, xxvi (1988), 105-18. For the mosque at *Badāʿūn*, see J. F. Blakiston, *The Jami Masjid at Badaun and other buildings in the United Provinces*, *MASI*, xix, Calcutta 1926, and A. Cunningham, *ASI*, xi, 1880. The *Djamāʿat Khāna* is given a brief description by M. Zafar Hasan in *A guide to Nizāmu-d Dīn*, *MASI*, x, 1922, 14-6. The early mosques at *Pātan* are described by J. Burgess and H. Cousens in *Architectural antiquities of northern Gujarat*, *ASI*, NIS, xxxii, London 1903, and those of *Bharoç* and *Khambayāt* in Burgess's *On the Muhammadan architecture of Bharoç, Cambay, Dholka, Champanir and Mahmudabad in Gujarat*, *ASI*, NIS, xxiii, London 1896 (these two vols. being *ASWI*, ix and vi). The mosque at *Firūzshāh Kōtlā* is treated somewhat inadequately by Page in *A memoir on Kotla Firuz Shah, Delhi* (= *MASI*, lii) Delhi 1937; a few details and a plan of the *Sandjar Mosque* are in M. Zafar Hasan, *op. cit.*, 35-6. See J. Burton-Page, *Indo-Islamic architecture: a commentary on some false assumptions*, in *AARP*, vi (Dec. 1974), 15, for the *Begampur Masjid*. The mosque at *Iriç* is well illustrated in Blakiston, *op. cit.* pls. xxii-v, but without description. For the identification of the *Khayrpur mosque*, see S. Digby, *The tomb of Buhlul Lodi*, in *BSOAS*, xxxviii (1975), 550-61. Sultanate work in general is admirably illustrated with measured drawings in T. Yamamoto, M. Ara, and T. Tsukinowa, *Architectural remains of the Delhi Sultanate period* (text in Japanese), 3 vols. Tokyo 1967. For Bengal, refer to A. H. Dani, *Muslim architecture in Bengal*, Dacca 1961; S. M. Hasan, *Muslim monuments of Bangladesh*, Dacca 1980; idem, *Mosque architecture of pre-Mughal Bengal*, Dacca 1979, and his unpublished Ph.D. thesis *Development of mosque architecture with special reference to pre-Mughal Bengal*, 2 vols., University of London 1965; some useful photographs and plans in *Marg*, xxviii/2 (March 1972). *Djawnpur*: A. Führer and E. Smith's *The Sharqi architecture of Jaunpur*, *ASI* NIS, i,

Calcutta 1889, is still unsurpassed; also F. Lehmann, *The name and origin of the Ajāla Masjid*, Jaunpur, in *IC*, lii/1 (1978), 19-27; Cunningham, *ASI*, xi. *Gudjarāt*: besides the volumes by Burgess and Cousens given above, see Burgess, *The Muhammadan architecture of Ahmadabad*, 2 vols., *ASI*, NIS, xxiv, xxiii (= *ASWI*, viii and vii), London 1905, 1906, with excellent drawings and photographs. *Māl wā*: E. Barnes, *Mandu and Dhar*, *ARASI*, 1903-4, Calcutta 1906; G. Yazdani, *Mandū, the city of joy*, Oxford 1929; D. R. Patil, *Mandu*, N. Delhi (*ASI*) 1975, the current official guidebook; M. B. Garde, *Guide to Chanderi*, Gwalior 1928. *Khāndēsh*: no adequate sources other than general works, and Cunningham, *ASI*, ix, *Central Provinces*, 1873-5. *Dakhanī* architecture is reviewed by E. S. Merklinger, *Indian Islamic architecture, the Deccan, 1347-1686*, Warminster 1981, with a chronological catalogue and useful thematic treatment. For *Bahmanī* buildings, see G. Yazdani, *The Great Mosque of Gulbarga*, in *IC*, ii (1928), 14-21, and idem, *Bidar, its history and monuments*, Oxford 1948, with full descriptions and good plans. *Barīd Shāhī*: *ibid.* 'Imād Shāhī: see bibl. to *GAWILGARH*. *Nizām Shāhī*: see bibl. s.v. 'Ādil Shāhī: excellent coverage in Cousens, *Bijāpūr and its architectural remains*, *ASI*, NIS, xxxvii, Bombay 1916. *Ḳuṭb Shāhī*: for *Golkonda*, s.v.; for *Haydarābād*, see the *Annual reports of the Archaeological Department, Hyderabad* for 1916-17, 3 ff. and pls. ii-iii; for 1924-5, 2-4 and pls. iii-vi; for 1936-7, 2 ff. *Kashmir*: W. H. Nicholls, *Muhammadan architecture in Kashmir*, in *ARASI*, 1906-7, 164-70. *Mughal*: for the *Khayr al-Manāzil*, see *ASI*, NIS, xxii, 6 and pl. i, *ARASI*, 1903-4, 25-6 and pl. x-xi; for *Fathpur Sikri*, E. W. Smith's superb *Mughal architecture of Fathpur-Sikri*, *ASI*, NIS, xviii, Allāhābād 1894-7, now augmented by the intelligent discussion in S. A. Rizvi and V. J. A. Flynn, *Fathpur-Sikri*, Bombay 1975 (but beware error in description of domes, p. 74a). For *Lāhawr*, see Ahmad Nabi Khan, *Maryam Zamani Mosque*, Lahore-Karachi 1972, and M. A. Chaghatai, *The Wazir Khan Mosque, Lahore*, Lahore 1975, with good plans, sections, and photographs; also J. Burton-Page, *Wazir Khan's mosque*, in *Splendours of the East*, ed. Mortimer Wheeler, London etc. 1965, 94-101. For *Āgra*, see *Nūr Bakhsh*, *The Agra Fort and its buildings*, in *ARASI*, 1903-4, 185, and M. A. Husain, *Agra Fort*, N. Delhi 1956, 22 and 27; also R. Nath, *Agra and its monumental glory*, Bombay 1977, 35-8, and idem, *The immortal Taj Mahal*, Bombay 1972; The *Fathpurī Masjid* is illustrated in *ARASI*, 1902-3, pl. xii. For the *Dāʿī Angā mosque*, see W. H. Nicholls, in *ARASI*, 1904-5, 20-22 and pl. iv; and for the *Mōtī Masjid*, idem in *ARASI*, 1903-4, 26-7 and pl. xii-xiii, and M. Z. Hasan, *Moti Masjid or the Pearl Mosque in the Lahore Fort*, in *Proceedings of the Pakistan History Conference, 2nd session, Lahore 1952*, 8-16. For the *Mōtī Masjid* at *Āgra*, see *Nūr Bakhsh*, *op. cit.*, 181-4, and Nath, *op. cit.* (1977), 39-42; for that at *Dihlī*, see G. Sanderson, *A guide to the buildings, Delhi Fort*, Delhi 1937, 55-7, and idem in *ARASI*, 1911-12, 13. Chaghatai gives comprehensive treatment to *The Badshahi Masjid, history and architecture*, Lahore 1972, with useful comparative plans of the *djāmiʿ masjīds* at *Āgra* and *Dihlī*. The later mosques in *Sind* are reviewed in Cousens, *The antiquities of Sind*, ed. cit., though not in full detail, and by M. A. Ghafur in *Muslim architecture in Sind area*, Karachi 1961; for those in *Aḥmadābād*, see

Burgess, *op. cit.* (ASWI, viii, 1905). Epigraphy is mainly available in *EIM*; a useful index is provided by V. S. Bendrey, *A study of Muslim inscriptions*, Bombay 1942, for 1907-38, supplementing J. Horowitz, *A list of the published Mohammedan inscriptions of India in EIM*, 1909-10, 30-144. Much material relating to mosques in Pakistan is set out by S. Mahmood in *Islamic inscriptions in Pakistani architecture to 1707*, unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh University 1981. Some of the principal mosque inscriptions are also quoted at length by R. Nath in *Calligraphic art in Mughal architecture*, Calcutta 1979.

(P. A. ANDREWS)

III. IN JAVA.

In Java, the Arabic form *masjid* is practically limited to religious circles. The Indonesian languages have developed the derivatives *mesigit* (Javanese, in Central- and East Java), *masigit* (Sundanese, in West Java) and *masèghit* (Madurese, on the island of Madura and in part of East Java). In general, these terms are used only for the mosques in which on the Friday *ṣalāt al-djum'ā* is held. Smaller mosques serving for the daily cult and religious instruction alone, are called *langgar* (Javanese), *tadjug* (Sundanese) and *balé* (in Bantén).

Indonesian Islam has produced its own type of mosque, clearly to be distinguished from that of other Islamic countries. Since this type was probably first developed in Java, it can be termed the Javanese type of mosque. Its standard characteristics are the following: (1) The ground plan is a square one. (2) The massive foundations are raised. The Friday mosque is not built on piles, as is the case with the classical Indonesian houses and the smaller mosques mentioned above. (3) The roof is tapering, and consists of two to five storeys narrowing towards the top (4) An extension on the western or north-western side serves as *mihrāb* [q.v.]. (5) At the front—sometimes also at the two lateral sides—is an open or closed veranda. (6) The courtyard around the mosque is surrounded with a stone wall with one or more gates. Another characteristic is that in Java the mosque stands on the west side of the *alun-alun*, the grass-covered square which is found in virtually all chief towns of regencies and districts. In Tjeribon, Indramayn, Madjalèngka and Tjiamis—all regions in West Java—even each *désa* has an *alun-alun* with a mosque at its west side.

In Java, the direction of the *kibla* [q.v.], is, however, not west but north-west, and so, in order to indicate the exact *kibla*, the *mihrāb* or niche is sometimes built obliquely against the back wall. There are, however, also regions, like the Priangan, where the exact *kibla* is taken into consideration at the time of construction of the mosque.

The gate at the front which gives access to the courtyard surrounding the mosque is sometimes covered. The mosques of Central and East Java are characterised by their monumental entrance gates.

The veranda (Javanese: *surambi*, *sèrambi*, *srambi*; Sundanese: *tépas masjid*, *tépas masigit*) is not considered as belonging to the mosque itself, as is evident from the various purposes which it serves. It is the place where, at night, after the mosque has been closed, the *ṣalāt* is performed; where travellers and other people who have no home pass the night; where marriages are concluded; where in former times (see Raffles, *The history of Java*) religious courts were functioning; where sometimes religious instruction is given and where *riyalat* (Javanese; in Arabic *riyāda* = ascetic abstinence from sleep, food and sexual intercourse) is practised. It is also the place for religious meals (*walīma*) on feast days like *Mawlid al-nabī* and *Mi'radj* [q.vv.].

The walls of the mosque itself are rather low, but the roof tapers and ends in a sphere, on top of which is an ornament, called *mastaka* or *mustaka* in those regions where Javanese is spoken. In later times, this ornament was crowned by a crescent as the decisive symbol of Islam. This type of roof, in fact a piling-up of ever-smaller roofs, dates from pre-Islamic times and recalls the *mēru* on Bali. In the present century, the cupola-shaped roof (Ar. *kubba* [q.v.]), an imitation of the mosques in other Islamic countries, and in particular India, is competing with the traditional piled-up roof of ancient Indonesia. Already before its restoration in 1935, the *Masjid Kemayoran* in Surabaya diverged from the usual architectural pattern in that its base was not square but octagonal. In that year, two *kubbas* were constructed to the left and the right of the veranda. Another *kubba* was added to the monumental minaret, which is said to be an imitation of the *Ḳuṭb Minār* in Dihlī [q.v.]. At the same period, the *kubba* was also introduced into West Java. The use of the cupola-shaped roof became firmly established after Indonesia's independence in 1949. Impressive, huge mosques, all with *kubbas*, have been constructed since that time. The *Masjid al-Shuhadā'* in Yogyakarta and the *Masjid Istiqlāl* in Jakarta can be considered as examples of a new type of architecture applied to the mosque.

The interior of a mosque built in the ancient Indonesian style can be described as a closed hall, sometimes provided with pillars, of a sober character, reflecting the simplicity which is the characteristic of the *masjids* in Java. There are no pictures of man or animal on the walls, only sacred Arabic names and some religious texts like the *ṣhahāda* [q.v.] and the *ḥadīth* in which the builder of a mosque is praised: "Allāh has built a house in Paradise for whoever has built a mosque for Allāh". Since the floor of the mosque has to be clean, it consists of cement, tiles or marble. The grey colour of cement is occasionally alternated with rows of red tiles, indicating the rows (Arabic *ṣaff*) of the faithful when performing the *ṣalāt*. Mats are usually spread on the floor. In mosques which have not been constructed in the exact direction of the *kibla*, these mats are laid out in the right direction. Regular mosque-goers have their own small mat or rug (Ar. *ṣadḡāda*), preferably one brought back by pilgrims to Mecca.

The *mihrāb* at the rear side of the mosque is usually rather narrow, consisting of a small gate with a round arch. Sometimes the niche, or rather the extension, is large enough to contain the *minbar* on the right side. There are, however, also mosques with two or even three niches next to each other, each provided with a small gate. Occasionally, the *mihrāb* is built out into a large pentagon with the *minbar* in the centre and the place of the *imām* to the left, the front side being fenced off by a wooden fencing with green and yellow sheets of glass and decorated with religious texts. Sometimes the *mihrāb* is built out into a large, square place with the *minbar* in the centre, the place of the *imām* for the daily *ṣalāt* to the left, and to the right a small movable construction with an open front, this being the place of the regent of the region. The *minbar* (Javanese and Sundanese: *mimbar*, Javanese and Sundanese of Bantén: *imbar*) is always found to the right of the *mihrāb*. Unlike other Islamic countries where the *minbar* is reached by a high flight of stairs, the *minbar* in Java is rather low. The height may vary from one to five steps, three steps being the average. Some *minbars* are very simple, but many others are conspicuous for their woodcarving. As Islam permits, decorations consist of plants and flowers which sometimes look like pictures of men and animals. On closer inspec-

tion, however, they prove to be representations of flowers and leaves of the lotus, arranged as wings and birds. Sometimes the *naga* (serpent) motive can be recognised on the arms of the *minbar*, as is the case in the holy mosque of Demak in Central Java and in the ancient, holy mosque of Kuṭa Deḡé in the same region.

Each mosque in Java possesses a drum, called *bēḡug*, stretched with buffalo-skin. Before the *adhān* [*q. v.*] (Javanese and Sundanese: *adan*) this drum is beaten vigorously at least five times a day. The *adhān* itself is made either from the minaret (Javanese: *mēnara*, Sundanese: *munara*) or, more often, in the mosque itself since not every mosque has its minaret. The *mu'adhḡhin*, called *modin* or *bilal*, stands at the entrance of the mosque or on its roof.

The highest official of the mosque is the *panghulu* (thus in Sundanese; Javanese: *pangulu*; Madurese: *pangōlō*, *pangōlōh*; Malay, *penghulu*), often a learned man (Ar. *ʿālim*) who has studied theology and is a pupil of the *pēsantren*, the Indonesian religious school, or of the more modern *madrassa*; he may even have studied in Mecca. Traditionally, the *panghulus* are highly-considered in Indonesian society. Sometimes the function is hereditary. One of his tasks is to supervise and coordinate the functions of the lower officials of the mosque: the *imām*, the *khaṡib*, the *mu'adhḡhin* [*q. v.*] and the *marbūṡ*, the official who is responsible for maintenance. According to the linguistic area, these officials are called *imām*, *kṡtib* or *ketip*, *modin* or *bilal*, and *mērbot*, *mērbōt* or occasionally *marbot*.

In Java the mosque is also used for *i'tikāf* [*q. v.*], especially during the last ten days of Ramaḡān.

Bibliography: H. Aboebakar, *Sedjarah Mysḡjid, dan amal ibadah dalamnja*, 1955 [in Indonesian]; P. A. Hoessein Djajadiningrat, *Islam in Indonesia*, in *Islam, the straight path, Islam interpreted by Muslims*, ed. W. Morgan, 1958; G. F. Pijper, *De Moskeeën van Java*, and *De Panghulu's van Java*, both in *Studiën over de geschiedenis van de Islam in Indonesia 1900-1950*, Leiden 1977; idem, *The minaret in Java*, in *India Antiqua, a volume of oriental studies presented to Jean Philippe Vogel*, Leiden 1947. (G. F. PIJPER)

IV. In the rest of South-East Asia.

That the traditional South-East Asian mosque originated in Indonesia and that it is formally *sui generis* cannot be disputed. Whether, as has been claimed, it developed in Java is less certain. Indeed, the history of Islam in Indonesia would suggest another possibility. The building in question was of wooden construction. It consisted of a simple structure on a square groundplan, erected on a substantial base. This distinguished it from the classic Indonesian house on stilts. The existence of internal pillars probably depended on its size. It had openings in the walls, probably closed with shutters, and an entrance in the east side, opposite the later *mihrāb*. It is not known how the *kibla* was originally indicated, but some mark on the west wall seems likely. Above this groundfloor hall, which had relatively low walls, there were a number of upper storeys of decreasing area, up to a total of four: each individual storey, including the main hall, had its own roof, usually in palm thatch, with widespreading eaves. The upper stories contained loft-like rooms which were functional. The whole building was topped by a finial which, in later times, seems to have been crowned by a crescent. The whole building was enclosed within a wall which had a more or less elaborate gateway in the east side. Occasionally there was more than one gate. There is some evidence to suggest that the main structure was surrounded by an irregular moat which may have

formed part of a stream which traversed the enclosure. There was no *manāra*; the *adhān* was given either from the doorway of the mosque or from its top storey. This was probably preceded by the vigorous beating of a large skincovered drum, as is generally the practice today. A more simple structure, essentially a traditional Indonesian dwelling on stilts, serves as the model for a prayer hall which does not have the status of the mosque. It is still to be found in communities which cannot muster the requisite forty souls to constitute a congregation or, on occasions, as a supplementary building in a compound where it serves as a meeting place, a rest-house for visitors, an administrative centre as well as for *ṡalāt* when the mosque proper is closed.

This Indonesian prototype did not have the verandah, Javanese *serambi*, which is such a distinctive feature of the Central Javanese mosque. There is no evidence that this formed an original part of the mosque, from which it is, in fact, separated, both architecturally and dogmatically: shoes may be worn there. It seems to have derived from a royal building in pre-Islamic Central Java. Neither it, nor the externalised *mihrāb*, belong to the original square mosque.

Various origins have been proposed for the basic Indonesian mosque. It has been derived from: (1) the *ṡāndi*, a temple of either Hindu or Buddhist intention, ultimately of Indian origin but modified by Indonesian religious concepts; (2) the traditional bamboo and thatch cockpit used in Bali for the quasi-ritual cockfighting; (3) the multi-tiered sacred mountain which is of widespread significance in Indonesian religions (the Balinese temple with multi-tiered thatched roofs known as a *meru*, after the Indian sacred mountain, is an architectural example of this). The objection to (1) is that, quite apart from its possible unacceptability to Muslim teachers, the *ṡāndi* does not occur in those parts of Indonesia where conversions to Islam first took place. The cockpit hypothesis appears to suffer from inherent implausibility. There is, however, good reason for holding the concept of the sacred mountain as one component in the undoubtedly complex origin of the Indonesian mosque. It differs so profoundly from mosques elsewhere in the Islamic world, not least in Cambay [see *KHAMBĀYAT*] and other parts of Guḡḡarāt [*q. v.*] from which the main impetus towards conversion seems to have come.

South-East Asia lies across the sea route from the Middle East and the Indian sub-continent to China and beyond. The Malay Peninsula and Sumatra mark the area where the monsoon system of the Indian Ocean meets that of the Pacific, and constitute a natural interchange point. For two millennia or more merchants have travelled and traded through this region. After the coming of Islam many of these travellers were Muslims, but, although there were without doubt Muslim communities in the ports and harbours of the region, some of whose members may have traded in the interior, there is no evidence at all for conversion to Islam among the local peoples. (Nor, incidentally, is there any evidence for mosques to serve the needs of such Muslim traders.) The first instances of such conversion comes at the end of the 7th/13th century. A hint in a Chinese source dated 683/1281 receives striking confirmation from Marco Polo who spent several months in Sumatra, on his way home from China ten years later. Of Ferlec (Perlak) he noted "the people were all idolaters, but, on account of the Saracen traders who frequent the kingdom with their ships, they have been converted to

the Law of Mahomet", adding that this was only the townspeople, those of the mountains being like wild beasts. The ruler of Samudra (Pasai), where Polo spent some months waiting for the wind to change, and who died in 699/1297, certainly died a Muslim for his tombstone, which was imported from Cambay, gives his name as Malik al-Šāliḥ. It was from this remote, in Javanese terms, area of Aceh that Islam spread to the Malay Peninsula, above all to Malacca, [q.v.], to the north coast of Java and thence to other parts of Sumatra, to the coasts of Borneo and to the sources for the much sought-after spices, by way of the ports of Sulawesi and Maluku. Over a period of some three centuries, Islam followed the trade routes and with it there went the Indonesian *masjid*, with its tiered, overhanging roofs. More than a dozen have been identified, notably by De Graaf. What is noticeable is that it was precisely in areas which had not been strongly influenced by Indo-Javanese architecture of Hindu or Buddhist tradition that the mosque of this type developed. Its origins have to be sought in the socio-religious structures of northern Sumatra in the communal house which, as elsewhere in Indonesia, once constituted the men's house. Now without windows or its original interior divisions, in Aceh it has become the *meunasah* which serves as a prayer house, a meeting place, and an administrative centre as well as a Ḥurʿānic school. It had the advantage that it had never housed idols, but this does not explain how the teachers from Guḍjarāt and elsewhere were persuaded to permit the adoption of such an aberrant form of mosque.

Bibliography: Illustrations of many of the mosques are in François Valentijn, *Oud en Nieuw Oost Indien*, 5 vols., Dordrecht-Amsterdam 1724-6. See also H. J. de Graaf, *De oorsprong der javaanse moskee*, in *Indonesie*, I, 289-305; B. Schrieke, *The shifts in political and economic power in the Indonesian Archipelago in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*, in *Indonesian Sociological Studies*, i. The Hague 1955, 1-82, W. F. Stutterheim, *De Islam en zijn komst in de Archipel*, Groningen 1952. (A. H. CHRISTIE)
V. IN CHINA.

The Chinese term is *Ch'ing-chen ssu*, lit. "Pure and True temple". *Ch'ing-chen chiao* ("Pure and True Religion") being a Chinese synonym for Islam. The first Muslim settlements in China, dating from the early centuries of Islam, were established either by the sea route along the southern and eastern coasts (Canton and Hainan Island in Kwantung Province; Chuan-chou in Fukien Province, Hang-chou in Chekiang Province, Yang-chou on the lower Yangtze in Kiangsu Province); or by the overland "Silk Road" route at the ancient city of Ch'ang-an (some miles south of present-day Sian, Shensi Province), T'ang dynastic capital between 618-906 (corresponding approximately to the first three centuries *Hijri*).

Chinese Muslim tradition holds that numbers of mosques were established in these and several other cities by Saʿd b. Abī Waḳḳāṣ and various Companions of the Prophet or itinerant holy men during the first century, quite probably during the Rāshidūn caliphs' period. Pending further archaeological excavation, however, most of these oral traditions must be treated with caution, and according to Leslie (*op. cit.*, in *Bibl.*, 40), but few sites "merit serious consideration", the most important of which are:

1. Canton (the *Huai-sheng* mosque and *Kuang-t'a* minaret). This mosque, claimed by Muslim tradition as the first and oldest in China, may well date back to T'ang times, but the earliest extant reference dates from ca. 603/1206, whilst the earliest mosque inscrip-

tion (in Chinese and Arabic) records the re-building of the *Huai-sheng ssu* in 751/1350 after its destruction by fire seven years before. The presence of a mosque in Canton in 755/1354 is attested by Ibn Baṭṭūta.

2. Chuan-chou (the *Sheng-yu* mosque), also sometimes claimed as the earliest mosque in China, though Leslie considers this to be "a priori, less convincing" than the claim of the *Huai-sheng ssu*. The mosque inscription of 710/1310-11 (in Arabic) dates the first building of the mosque to 400/1009-10, commemorating a restoration which took place over three centuries later. It claims that the *Sheng-yu ssu* was the first mosque "in this land", and calls it "The Mosque of the Companions" (*al-Aṣḥāb*).

3. Hang-chou (the *Chen-chiao* or *Feng-huang* mosque), ascribed by late Ming (11th/17th century) inscriptions to T'ang times, though Leslie rejects these unsubstantiated claims in favour of a Sung Dynasty establishment, Hang-chou being the capital of the Southern Sung (ca. 521-678/1127-1279), and by Yuan times "the greatest city in the world" (according to Marco Polo), with a substantial Muslim population living in its own ward (Ibn Baṭṭūta, Odoric).

4. Ch'ang-an (the *Ch'ing-chiao* or *Ch'ing-ching* mosque), which differs from those other mosques listed so far in that its foundation is ascribed to the arrival of Muslim soldiers travelling overland, rather than sailors coming by sea. Undated epigraphic evidence and long-established tradition date this mosque to the early T'ang (late Umayyad) period, but this remains inconclusive, and Leslie suggests that "until further evidence is forthcoming it is better to reject a T'ang date and query a Sung one, whilst taking for granted a Yuan [Mongol] presence".

Leslie continues by providing "Desultory Notes" for numerous other cities in Eastern, Central and Northern China (49-53), before concluding that many thousands (or even tens of thousands) of Muslims, mostly of Persian and Arab origin, were resident in China during T'ang Dynasty times, though little definitive evidence exists for the number of mosques which had been established during this early period of Chinese Islam. It is clear, however, that most of these *Hsi-yu jen* or "Westerners" were semi-permanent or permanent residents, many of whom would have intermarried freely with the indigenous Chinese population, thereby giving rise to a nascent Chinese-speaking, increasingly Sincised Muslim population which would, by Ming times, develop into the Hui Chinese Muslim community. Certainly by T'ang times, the distinction was already being made between "foreigners" and "native-born foreigners". *Shari'a* law requires the establishment of congregational mosques wherever communities of more than forty adult male Muslims are gathered together; the presence of many small mosques along the Chinese coast and (to a lesser extent) in the interior may, therefore, be taken for granted by late T'ang/Sung times. Doubtless, except in the more important coastal towns such as Canton (Khanfu) and Chuan-chou (Zaitun) these mosques would have been fairly insubstantial buildings, long since altered beyond recognition or destroyed; thus, definitive proof of the extent of mosque-building in China during this early period will depend upon future archaeological excavations.

The Yüan period (ca. 678-770/1279-1368) was characterised by a substantial expansion of Islam in the central and western parts of China, most particularly in Yunnan, where Sayyid Adjall Shams al-Dīn Bukhārī (who conquered and subsequently admin-

istered the former Nan-ch'ao area for the Mongols) is credited with establishing two mosques in the region. Sayyid Adjall and his family may be seen as the archetypal example of Muslims in service under the Mongols—by whom they were employed as soldiers, administrators and financial middlemen—and from Yüan times the central focus of Islam in China moved definitively away from the southern coastal ports towards the north and west. Certainly, the oldest mosques in Yunnan and the north-west are likely to have been established during this period, a trend which was continued under the Ming Dynasty (ca. 771-1054/1368-1644) which is also known as a period of Sinicisation for the Chinese Muslim community—indeed, it may be that the Chinese-speaking Hui Muslim community emerged as a separate and distinct entity (paralleling, for example, the Swahili [q.v.] in East Africa and the Mappila [q.v.] of southern India) during this period.

It is probable that the mosques of the Hui (Chinese-speaking) Muslims, which are scattered throughout China but are particularly numerous in the provinces of Kansu, Ningsia, Tsinghai and Yunnan, evolved in their characteristic form during this period. Certainly under the Ming, the nascent Hui community expanded greatly as a result of intermarriage, overt (and, perhaps more frequently, covert) missionary work, and their success in the fields of military and commercial venture. Wherever Hui settled in any numbers, *halāl* establishments (caravanserais, restaurants, inns), mosques and attendant *madrasas* soon followed. As Israeli notes (*op.cit.* in *Bibl.*, 29), many mosques constructed during the Ming period were built in a style reminiscent of indigenous Chinese temple architecture, either eliminating the minaret altogether, or eschewing the distinctive styles associated with the mosques of Central Asia, South Asia and the Middle East in favour of Chinese-style pagodas. As a result of this architectural development, the muezzin could no longer call the faithful to prayer in the usual way, but stood inside the mosque instead, calling the *adhān* behind the main mosque entrance. "And when one entered the mosque, one was struck by the traditional Muslim flavour; cleanliness and austerity. Except for the Emperor's tablets that were mandatory in any house of prayer, there was no sign of Chinese characters or Chinese characteristics. On the walls there were Arabic inscriptions of verses from the Qur'an and the west end (*qibla*) was adorned with arabesques. Once the believers were inside, they put on white caps, shoes were taken off, elaborate ablutions were ritually performed, and the prayers began in Arabic, with heart and mind centred on Mecca. When prostrating themselves before the Emperor's tablets, as required, the Muslims would avoid bringing their heads into contact with the floor... and thus did they satisfy their consciences in avoiding the true significance of the rite—this prohibited worship was invalid because it was imperfectly performed" (Israeli, *op.cit.*, 29).

Israeli defines this combination of external Sinicisation of mosque building and internal Islamic orthodoxy as a manifestation of the dichotomy of Chinese Islam. Certainly, the functions of the mosque remained immediately recognisable in their Islamic purpose. Thus, besides the area set aside for prayer, the interior of larger Chinese mosques is generally divided between lecture hall, dormitory, conference rooms, community leaders' offices, and the "dead man's room" for washing and otherwise preparing deceased Muslims for burial. Amongst the best-known and most beautifully decorated of these tradi-

tional Chinese mosques are the *Niu-chieh ssu* (Ox Street mosque) in Peking, and the *Hua-chueh ssu* in Sian.

By contrast with the Sinicised Hui Chinese mosques scattered throughout "China Proper", the mosques of the periphery are often very different. Thus the mosque architecture of Sinkiang conforms closely to that of neighbouring Western Turkestan, whilst in the far north-east (Heilungkiang Province), an area formerly much influenced by Russian culture, mosque may sometimes outwardly resemble Orthodox churches. In this context, an informative trilingual study illustrating many of the best-known mosques in China and clearly depicting the different architectural forms has recently been published by the China Islamic Association (*op.cit.* in *Bibl.*, 1981).

Bibliography: K. Himly, *Die Denkmäler der Kantoner Moschee*, in *ZDMG* xli (1887), 141-74; G. Phillips, *Two mediaeval Fuh-Kien trading ports: Chuan-Chow and Chang-Chow*, in *T'oung Pao*, vii (1896), 223-40; G. Arnaiz and M. van Berchem, *Mémoire sur les antiquités musulmanes de Ts'üan-tcheou*, in *TP*, xii (1901), 677-727; Cl. Huart, *Le texte turc-oriental de la stèle de la mosquée de Péking*, in *ZDMG*, lvi (1902), 210-22; W. Bang, *Über die Mandschu Version der Viersprachigen Inschrift in der Moschee zu Peking*, in *Keleti Szemle*, iii (1902), 94-103; H. Saladin, *Monuments musulmans de Chine et d'Extrême-Orient*, in *Manuel d'art musulman*, Paris 1907, 579-83; "N.", *Les Mosquées de Peking*, in *RMM*, ii (1907), 570-73; E. Blochet and A. Vissière, *Épigraphie musulmane chinoise*, in *ibid.*, v (1908), 289-93; R. Ristelhuber, L. Bouvat, F. Farjenel, *Études chinoises*, in *ibid.*, iv (1908), 512-30; anon., *Liste des mosquées de Pékin*, in *ibid.*, vi (1908), 699; M. Broomhall, *Islam in China: a neglected problem*, London 1910, 83-120, 183-90; Le Commandant D'Ollone, A. Vissière, E. Blochet, et alii, *Recherches sur les Musulmans chinois*, Paris 1911, *passim*; G. Cordier and Vissière, *Études sino-mahométanes: deuxième série. Renseignements envoyés par M. G. Cordier sur la chambre funéraire et le temple commémoratif du Seyyid Edjell à Yun-nan-fou*, in *RMM*, xv (1911), 60-9; eidem, (*Note on two photographs of the Mosque of Seyyid Edjell Omar*), in *ibid.*, xxv (1913), 306; Vissière, *Études sino-mahométanes: deuxième série. VII. L'islamisme à Hang-tcheou*, in *ibid.*, xxii (1913), 1-84; Cordier, *Études sino-mahométanes: troisième série. Les Mosquées de Yun-nan-fou*, in *ibid.*, xxvii (1914), 141-61; Vissière, *Inscriptions sino-mahométanes de Fou-tcheou*, in *ibid.*, xxvii (1914), 162-73; A. Von le Coq, *Buried treasures of Chinese Turkestan*, London 1928 (photographs); Ito Chuta, *Shina kenchiku soshoku* ("Chinese architectural decoration"), Tokyo 1941, i, 107-9; ii, plates 42-8; A. Hutt, *The Central Asian origin of the Eastern Minaret form*, in *Asian Affairs*, viii 3 (June 1977), 157-62 (with reference to Sinkiang); R. Israeli, *Muslims in China; a study in cultural confrontation*, London 1980; China Islamic Association, *The religious life of Chinese Muslims*, Peking 1981; D. D. Leslie, *Islam in traditional China*, Canberra 1986, esp. 40-68 (plus extensive Chinese language bibliography, glossary, etc.; a uniquely competent and useful reference work).

(A. D. W. FORBES)

VI. IN EAST AFRICA.

In East Africa the mosque is commonly spoken of in Swahili as *msikiti*, pl. *misikiti*, but *msihiri*, *msihire* in the Comoro Islands; and cf. Swahili *stijida*, the act of adoration, and verb *sujudu* "to prostrate oneself", from Ar. *sadjada*. Nineteenth-century traditional histories claim the setting up of Muslim cities on the eastern African coast in the 7th and 8th centuries

A.D. Of this there is no earlier literary evidence, but a mosque is mentioned in the Arabic *History of Kilwa* named *Kibala* (possibly a Bantu form from *kibla*) as existing on that island ca. 950 A.D. In spite of recent excavations at Kilwa [q.v.] by H. N. Chittick, there has so far been no positive identification of a mosque of this period. The first reliable evidence is from inscriptions. Cerulli reports one in the Friday Mosque at Barāwa, Somalia, dated 498/1104-5, while on Zanzibar Island there is the well-known Friday Mosque at Kizimkazi [q.v.] which has an inscription dating its foundation to 500/1107. The inscription is certainly of Sirāfi provenance, which does not argue that Zanzibar was much Islamicised at this period. The 4th/10th century *Kitāb 'Adjā'ib al-Hind* of Buzurg b. Šahriyār of Rāmhurmuz contains, however, the tale of the conversion of an eastern African king of a place of which no identification is given; he was followed by his people. In the same century al-Mas'ūdī, who visited eastern Africa, speaks of the people and their sovereigns as pagan. By the 6th/12th century al-Idrīsī says that "the people, although mixed, are actually mostly Muslims", which would accord with the epigraphical evidence.

Between 1962 and March 1964 the greater number of known mosques, from mediaeval times to the 18th century, both standing and ruined, were planned and photographed by P. S. Garlake. He omitted, however, an important series of foundation inscriptions of mosques at Lamu [q.v.], some twenty in all, and ranging from the 14th to the 19th century. He rightly says that "the most sensitive indicator of change and development in style and decoration is bound to be the mosque mihrāb": he distinguishes a clear and unbroken development of style and technique from the early classic *mihrāb* with a plain architrave of the 14th and 15th centuries; a developed classic *mihrāb* in which the plain surfaces of the architrave are broken by decoration; a neo-classic *mihrāb* of greater elaboration, both this and the foregoing in the 16th century; a simplified classic *mihrāb* restricted to northern Kenya, and a derived classic *mihrāb* on the Tanzanian coast in the 18th century, in which, however, there were new developments that led to multifoliate arches of an elaborate character. The dating of some of these *mihrābs* derives from inscriptions, but is based to a great extent upon the evidence of imported pottery and Chinese porcelain, the latter coming to be used as a decoration by inseting it into the architrave of the *mihrāb*.

All the 19th century Swahili settlements in eastern Africa are on the edge of the shore: Gedi, two miles from the Mida creek, is the sole exception. Some earlier mosques, however, are found on cliffs or headlands, where they may have been placed to serve as mariners' marks. Some of them are still of special veneration for seafarers. The population in these places was on the whole small, and only at Kilwa [q.v.] and at Mogadišū [see MAḌDISHŪ] was the need felt for mosques of more than modest size. Throughout the coast from Somalia to Mozambique, the only available building material of a permanent character was coralline limestone, obtained either from old raised beaches or directly from coral reefs. Mouldings, arches, and all features wherever precision was required, were of finely dressed coral blocks. A fine concrete, whose aggregate was coral rubble, was used for circular and barrel vaults. The method of burning it has survived to this day. From it also was made the plaster which in the 18th century was used to decorate not only the *mihrāb* but also elaborately decorated tombs. There was a limited repertoire of mouldings, used also on tombs, and—more sparingly—in

domestic architecture. The planning of all buildings, religious and domestic, was restricted by the span of the timber rafters, always of mangrove wood, which never exceeds 2,80 metres or approximately 9 feet. Even the vaulted buildings conform to this as to a fixed and unalterable convention. Thus even in the Great Mosque of Kilwa, with its five aisles and six bays, there is a sense of constriction rather than of spaciousness. Walls may be built of dressed coral limestone but quite commonly of coral rubble plastered over. Piers occur in mosques in Kenya and Pemba during the 14th to 16th centuries, but not in the south. After the 13th century in Tanzania, columns alone are found, some square and some octagonal. Generally, these were of dressed coral, but occasionally, as at Kaole (southern mosque) and in the northern *mušallā* of the Great Mosque of Kilwa, wooden columns fitted into coral sockets were used. Because of the difficulty imposed by the length of the rafters, the master-builders—for only rarely can architects have been employed, and perhaps only for the Fakhr al-Dīn Mosque at Mogadišū—in seeking to erect a building of a particular breadth, frequently encumbered the perspective of the *mihrāb* by constructing a central arcade of pillars. This clumsy feature (which occurs quite unconnectedly in certain mediaeval European churches) appears not only in two-aisled mosques such as those of Tongoni and Gedi but also in the four-aisled Friday Mosque of Gedi and the original North Mosque which forms part of the Great Mosque of Kilwa.

Minarets [see MANĀRA. 3. In East Africa] are very rare, and *minbars* [q.v.] have certain idiosyncratic features. In all, the mosques of the eastern African coast have a distinct regional character of their own, deriving in earlier times from the common use of ogival or returned-horseshoe arches, and in later times from the elaborate plaster decoration of the *mihrāb* and its architrave.

Bibliography: H. N. Chittick, *Kilwa*, 1975, describes the Kilwa mosques, bringing up to date P. S. Garlake, *The early Islamic architecture of the East African coast*, Nairobi 1966, with its numerous plates and plans and exhaustive bibliography up to that date; G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville, *Some preliminary observations of medieval mosques near Dar es Salaam*, in *Tanganyika Notes and Records*, no. 36 (1954), is wholly superseded by the finding of better evidence for date; see also J. S. Kirkman, *Men and monuments of the East African coast*, London 1964, and *Fort Jesus*, Oxford 1974; and, for inscriptions, G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville and B. G. Martin, *A preliminary handlist of the Arabic inscriptions of the eastern African coast*, in *JRAS* (1973).

(G. S. P. FREEMAN-GRENVILLE)

VII. IN WEST AFRICA.

In Muslim West Africa, the smallest hamlet has its mosque, and the quarters of an individual town compete with one another in the construction of cultic sites. In most villages, the mosque is situated in the middle of the public square, near the tree which is the traditional place for bargaining and discussion ("palaver"); it is generally constructed in the style of a large shed, roofed with zinc plates and bamboo partitions or with banco or with moulded clay, and has the appearance, in the majority of cases, of the most attractive building in the locality, often surrounded by bushy trees. The mosque is regarded with pious respect, and is kept clean. Volunteers, often women of a certain age, accept responsibility for maintenance, cleaning and the supply of drinkable water for the faithful.

In towns, the mosque is a more substantial building

and it dominates the neighbourhood with its minaret or minarets. Sometimes, as in the case of the Great Mosque of Dakar, it has only one, while that of Touba, the most important centre of the religious brotherhood of the Murids, has three, of which the tallest, known as the "Lamp" (*Fall*) measures 83 m. In fact, it is the modern mosques which possess minarets; the most ancient have none, but still dominate their surroundings with cubic pillars. In small villages, the floor of the mosque is covered with matting or with fine sand which is sifted every day. In the urban setting, oriental carpets cover the floor. A palisade of bamboo or zinc plates or even a cement wall forms an enclosure within which a spacious courtyard is set out, to enable those worshippers who cannot pray at the times when the mosque is crowded to perform their religious duties. On the left side of the larger mosques, the place reserved for women is separated from that where the men pray by a metal grill.

The *imām* leads the prayer standing in a niche (*min-bar*) in the *kibla wall*. The Great Mosque is furnished with a throne, a kind of raised dais where the *imām* takes his place to preach his sermon and to harangue the faithful, first in Arabic and then in the local language.

All the other facilities, including lavatories and taps for ablutions, are located on the exterior. In a corner of the courtyard there is a hut for the washing of corpses.

Each *imām* is served by a *nā'ib* or deputy who officiates in his absence. Two or more muezzins make the call to prayer from the tops of the minarets. In the larger mosques loud-speakers have been installed, to relay either the call to prayer or the sermon of the *imām*. The majority of *imāms* receive no monthly salary. The *imām* of the Great Mosque of the Senegalese capital is one of the few who receives regular payment and occupies an official residence; more often, the *imām* and his family are accommodated in the mosque.

The architectural style reproduces especially that of the Maghrib. It is thus that the Great Mosque of Dakar, inaugurated by King Ḥasan II, was built under the supervision of a Moroccan architect, as was the Islamic Institute which adjoins it. However the ancient mosques of northern Senegal, including those of Halwār, Ndïoum, Guédé and Dialmath, are in the Sudanese style of the mosque-institutes of the towns of Mali (Djenné, Mopti, Timbuktu, etc.) and of the land of the Sahel (cf. J. Boulègue, *Les Mosquées de style soudanais au Fuuta-Tooro (Sénégal)*, in *Notes africaines*, 136 (Oct. 1972), 117-19). This is a style characterised by its massive buttresses exceeding the height of the roof, in a rounded, conical form, with a small cubic minaret; the whole is constructed in brick made from dried earth and covered with a facing of the same material and ochre or beige in colour. The walls are very thick. An elaborate system of ventilation maintains a freshness similar to that provided by air-conditioning.

Religious function. In West Africa, the principal function of the mosque is still religious; each quarter possesses several, and in this context a genuine rivalry prevails between quarters or between members of different brotherhoods. It is thus that the mosque of the Tidjānis is found alongside those of the Murids [see MURĪD], of the Kādīrīs [see KĀDIRIYYA] or of the Hamallites [see ḤAMĀLIYYA]. The faithful fill the mosques without regard for their particular affiliation. The Tidjānis organise gatherings in the mosque after morning and evening prayers to recite, in chorus, the

litanies (*dhikr*) peculiar to their religious order. This ritual is performed around a carpet and in darkness. But on Fridays or at times of canonical festivals, great crowds of Muslims are seen streaming towards the mosques clad in their splendid boubous or flowing robes.

Special prayers for the dead are also offered in the mosque. In this case, the bier is placed before the faithful, who pray upright without bowing or sitting. After these funeral rites, the parents of the deceased arrange a ceremony of recitation of the Qurʾān "for the repose of his soul".

The veneration of which the mosque is the object inspired Cheikh El-Hadji Malik Sy (1853-1922), founder of the *zāwiyya tidjāniyya* of Tivaouane, to compose a poem in Arabic consisting of forty verses in *rajaz* style and revealing the details of a whole system of etiquette. Cheikh Aliou Faye, the chief marabout of the Gambia, revised and embellished his master's poem, entitling his version *Tabshīrat al-murīd* or "The way of success for the disciple". The following are a few of the verses:

Whosoever wishes to enter Paradise without punishment and without the need to give an exact account of his actions at the Resurrection, should build a mosque for God the Merciful, and he will be granted one hundred and thirty palaces in Paradise.

Every believer who enters this mosque to pray will obtain a pleasant dwelling in Paradise.

A mosque may be built in any place, even in the square of a church or a or a synagogue.

There it is forbidden to grow crops, to dig wells, to sew and to compose [profane] poetry.

There it is forbidden to eat garlic, leek, onion, to shave, to cause an injury to a human being, to cut the nails, to cast lice or fleas and to kill them.

To tie animals, confine the mentally ill, to allow a criminal to enter and be seated.

All mosques are of equal worth, with three exceptions: those of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem, which are the best mosques.

Social function. Besides this predominant religious role, the mosque also performs a very important social function. It is there, in fact, that, under the patronage of the *imām*, marriages are contracted between the parents of the betrothed parties. The father or guardian of the prospective bride gives her hand to the father or guardian of the suitor and receives the dowry. This function is so important that when information is sought regarding the marital status of a female person, the question is asked: "Have the men gone to the mosque for her?" (in Wolof: *Ndax dem-nānu jaka ja?*). As a form of pleasantry and to tell a girl that she is nubile, the remark is made: "I shall go to see the *imām* about it." Parents or guardians may be accompanied to the mosque by other parents and friends who act as witnesses. The relatives of the suitor bring the dowry which they entrust to the *imām*; the latter gives it to the father or guardian of the prospective bride and recites the sacramental formula. In the presence of all, the *imām* blesses the couple. Cola, non-alcoholic drinks or delicacies are distributed.

Even though, since the promulgation of a "Family Code" in Senegal, for example, some ten years ago, marriages must be contracted before the mayor or the representative of the public authorities, it is considered that, without the mosque playing a part, the matrimonial union is not valid. Thus the *imām* in fact represents the municipal magistrate.

Often the elders of the village hold meetings not under the traditional tree, but inside or in the courtyard of the mosque at any hour of day or night to

discuss public matters; finance for the sinking of wells, construction of a market, division of the produce of common land, preparations for the reception of distinguished guests, etc. In this case, the mosque represents a kind of national assembly where all the affairs of the village community are the object of wide and democratic debate.

Sometimes the mosque performs the role of a tribunal where disputes between members of the village are laid public and closely examined. Solutions are always formed on the basis of the *Shari'ca*, or of local custom, or of both. These may be disputes between spouses, between two dignitaries, between two families, between herdsmen and stock-breeders, between a representative of the state and local landowners, between traditional chiefs and religious leaders. Sometimes the division of bequests is performed in the mosque under the supervision of the *imām*.

Some mosques provide places of lodging for strangers. It is in this way that travelling Muslims are accommodated. Furthermore, any person who is regarded as having lived a pious life and who has contributed to the building of the mosque, is buried there after his death. Such is the case of Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba Mbacke, Cheikh El-Hadji Malik Sy, Cheikh Ibrahima Niassé, Cheikh Ahmadou Anta Samb, and Bouh Kounta respectively at Touba, Tivaouane, Kaolack, Kébémér and Ndiassance (Senegal).

Many other men renowned for their piety or for their work in the service of Islam are entombed within or in close proximity to the mosque.

Economic function. The economic function of the mosque is explained by the fact that the temporal is always closely linked with the spiritual. Thus, for example, the sums raised from legal alms (*zakāt*) are in most cases entrusted to the *imām* of the mosque who, as an expert in the matter, ensures that they are distributed to those entitled to them. Sometimes cattle are led to the mosque to be slaughtered by the *imām*, who distributes the meat to the needy. Every Friday, a whole army of beggars is seen flocking to the mosques, attracted by the prospect of receiving charity from the wealthier believers. The same spectacle is witnessed during the major Islamic feasts of *Tabaski* and *Korite*.

The *imām* received a gratuity for his services when marriage is celebrated. Even though the sum is by no means considerable, it is important for the *imām* who is not salaried. In the course of one Sunday afternoon he may preside over several marriage ceremonies. Furthermore, numerous mosques receive requests for readings of the *Qur'ān* in exchange for a certain sum, the amount being left to the discretion of the customer.

Mosques which incorporate tombs receive a profitable income as a result of daily, weekly, monthly and annual pilgrimages or on the occasion of major Islamic feasts. This applies in the case of the mosque of Touba during the well-known feast of *Magal*, which commemorates the departure into exile (in 1895) of Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba Mbacke, founder of the brotherhood of the *Murīds*, and that of Tivaouane at the time of the *Mawlūd* [see MAWLID].

Cultural function. Although the mosque in West Africa fulfils a considerable economic role, its function in the cultural sphere is more striking. In the majority of cases, the courtyard of the mosque is the setting for a *Qur'ānic* school. Sometimes dozens of young children, boys and girls, are seen squatting in a half-circle before their master, who sits either on the ground, on a sheepskin rug or reclining on a couch,

holding a cane. Each pupil places on his knees a tablet on which the lesson to be learned is inscribed in ink made from soot from cooking-pots. In the evening, after twilight and before the meal, a large fire is lit and the verses to be learned are read by the light of the flames. By this educational method, in the shadow of the mosque, many scholars arrive at the point where they can recite the entire Holy Book by heart.

The mosque also serves as a high school and university when, having memorised the *Qur'ān*, the pupils become students and learn the other Islamic sciences: exegesis, *hadīth*, theology, mysticism, Muslim law and even literature, history, logic, astronomy, rhetoric, etc.

It is also in the mosque that lectures are held on various subjects relating to religion, as well as educational lectures given by scholars or distinguished guests from other Muslim countries. In the mosque, throughout the month of *Ramaḍān*, marabout exegetes expound and comment on the *Qur'ān* before an audience, either to recall the teaching of the Holy Book or to instruct the faithful. On the "Night of Destiny" nobody sleeps, and reverent vigil is held in the mosque. Also in the mosque, particularly at Tivaouane, the sanctuary of *Tidjānism* in Senegal, the head *khalīfa* of the disciples of the brotherhood founded by Aḥmad al-Tidjānī (1737-1815 [q.v.]) expounds and comments on the *Burda* of al-Buṣīrī (608-ca.695/1212-ca.1295 [q.v. in Suppl.]).

Political function. Finally, the mosque performs in West Africa a political function which is far from insignificant, because the region contains a very substantial percentage of Muslims. This figure is increasing as a result of large-scale conversion to Islam of followers of other religions (Christianity and animism). Islam has enjoyed a revival of activity under pressure exerted both from the interior of this zone and, to a lesser extent, from the exterior. In Senegal, for example, the quite recent appointment of M. Abdou Diouf to the post of chief magistrate has had a considerable influence in this domain, to such an extent that, unlike his predecessor, the head of state, accompanied by the presidents of the National Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, participates behind the senior *imām* in the prayers conducted on the occasion of major festivals. In his *khutba*, the latter invariably affirms his loyalty to the authorities and invites the believers present to pray, with him, for the President of the Republic and the members of his government, whom he mentions by name, appealing to God to "perpetuate their rule and assist them, giving peace, health and long life to them, to their families and to Senegal".

This account of the activity of the present President of the Republic of Senegal applies to the other Muslim Heads of State of West Africa.

The *imām* often uses the occasion of the Friday Prayer to draw attention in his *khutba* to themes of concern to the government such as the misappropriation of public funds, corruption, juvenile delinquency, drugs, prostitution, the degradation of morals, the urgent need to combat bush-fires and desertification.

After this survey of the functions of the mosque in West Africa, it may be affirmed that it performs a multifarious role in this region by virtue of its status as the supreme place of prayer.

Bibliography: J. M. Cuoq, *Les Musulmans en Afrique*, Paris 1975, 103-271, gives information and bibliographies concerning religious life in West Africa; see also, in particular, J. Schacht, *Sur la diffusion des formes d'architecture religieuse musulmane à*

travers le Sahara, in *Travaux de l'Inst. de Rech. Sahariennes*, xi (1954), 11-27. (A. SAMB)

AL-MASDJID AL-AKṢĀ, literally, "the remotest sanctuary." There are three meanings to these words.

1. The words occur in Qurʾān, XVII,1: "Praise Him who made His servant journey in the night (*asrā*) from the sacred sanctuary (*al-masdjid al-harām*) to the remotest sanctuary (*al-masdjid al-akṣā*), which we have surrounded with blessings to show him of our signs." This verse, usually considered to have been revealed during the Prophet's last year in Mecca before the Hijra, is very difficult to explain within the context of the time. There is no doubt that *al-masdjid al-harām* is the then pagan sanctuary of Mecca. But whether the event itself was a physical one and then connected with a small locality near Mecca which had two mosques, a nearer one and a farther one (A. Guillaume, *Where was al-Masjid al-Aqṣā?*, in *Al-Andalus*, xviii [1953]), or a spiritual and mystical night-journey (*isrāʾ*) and ascension (*miʿrāj* [q.v.]) to a celestial sanctuary; a consensus was established very early (perhaps as early as the year 15 A.H., cf. J. Horowitz, *Koranische Untersuchungen*, Berlin 1926, 140) that *al-masdjid al-akṣā* meant Jerusalem. By the time of Ibn Hisham's *Sīra*, nearly all the elements of what was to grow into one of the richest mystical themes in Islam were in place. Their study and the diverse and at times contradictory interpretations found in early commentaries of the Qurʾān derive from a complex body of religious sources (references in R. Blachère, *Le Coran*, Paris 1949, ii, 374) which have not yet been completely unravelled.

2. The words were occasionally used in early Islamic times for Jerusalem, and, during many centuries, more specifically for the Ḥaram al-Sharīf [q.v.], the former Herodian Temple area transformed by early Islam into a restricted Muslim space.

3. The most common use of the words is for the large building located on the south side of the Ḥaram platform and, next to the Dome of the Rock (Kubbat al-Ṣakhra [q.v.]), the most celebrated Islamic building in Jerusalem. Its archaeological history has been superbly established by R. W. Hamilton, *The structural history of the Aqṣā Mosque*, and his conclusions were entirely accepted by K. A. C. Creswell and incorporated in his *Early Islamic architecture*, Oxford 1969, 373-80. Such points of debate as do exist (H. Stern, *Recherches sur la Mosquée al-Aqṣā et ses mosaïques*, in *Ars Orientalis*, v [1963]) deal only with the precise dating of the archaeologically-determined sequences of building, not with their character. From the 4th/10th century onward, precious descriptions by al-Mukaddasī, Nāṣir-i Khusraw and, much later, Muḍjir al-Dīn's chronicle of Jerusalem, provide a unique written documentation which has been made accessible in several books, of which the more important ones are G. Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, London 1890, and M. S. Marmardji, *Textes géographiques arabes sur la Palestine*, Paris 1951, 210-60. An easily accessible survey of drawings and plans is found in Eli Silad, *Mesgid el-Aksa*, Jerusalem 1978. For inscriptions, one should consult M. van Berchem, *CIA, Jérusalem*, Cairo 1927, ii/2, and S.A.S. Husseini, *Inscription of the Khalif El-Mustansir*, in *QDAP*, ix (1942); A. G. Walls and A. Abul-Hajj, *Arabic inscriptions in Jerusalem*, London 1980, 24-5, for a checklist. Finally, it is possible that a unique picture of Zion in the celebrated 9th century A.D. Byzantine manuscript known as the Chludoff Psalter is a representation of the Akṣā Mosque ca. 850 A.D.; cf. O. Grabar, *A note on the Chludoff Psalter*, in *Harvard Ukrai-*

nian Studies, vii (1983) (= a volume in honour of Professor Ihor Ševčenko). The recent excavations carried out south of the Ḥaram have brought a lot of contextual information pertinent to the uses of the Akṣā mosque, but, at least to the writer's knowledge, nothing immediately pertinent to its forms or history.

The latter can be summarised in the following manner: (a) There was an Umayyad hypostyle mosque consisting of several aisles (their exact number cannot be ascertained) perpendicular to the *qibla*, with a central, wider, aisle on the same axis as the Dome of the Rock. This mosque, like many Umayyad ones, reused a lot of materials of construction from earlier buildings and was either built from scratch or completed under the caliph al-Walīd I. The only item of contention is whether it already contained a large dome in front of the *mīhrāb* which would have been decorated with mosaics (Hamilton and Creswell argue that it did not, Stern that it did); the argument of the latter has historical logic on his side, as al-Walīd was lavish in his imperial buildings, but the archaeological arguments against it are weighty indeed. Many decorative remains of painted and carved woodwork (kept in various Jerusalem museums) which have been preserved probably date from the Umayyad period, but they, as well as numerous fragments of mosaics, marble, etc., whose records remain in the archives of the Palestine Archaeological Museum (the so-called Rockefeller Museum), still await a full investigation. This first Akṣā mosque was the congregational mosque of the city of Jerusalem, but it was also seen as the covered part (*mughattā*) of the whole Ḥaram conceived as the mosque of the city.

(b) A series of major reconstructions took place in early ʿAbbāsīd times, possibly because of a destructive earthquake in 746. But the extent of the reconstructions carried out under al-Manṣūr, al-Mahdī and ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭāhir between 771 and 844 suggests more than a simple restoration. It was certainly a major attempt to assert ʿAbbāsīd sponsorship of holy places. It is essentially this ʿAbbāsīd building which is described by al-Mukaddasī (ca. 985). It consisted of fifteen naves perpendicular to the *qibla*, of a fancy porch with gates inscribed with the names of caliphs, and of a high and brilliantly decorated dome. Its greatest peculiarity is that it was open to the north, towards the Dome of the Rock and the rest of the Ḥaram and to the east. The latter is unusual and is probably to be explained by the ways in which the Muslim population, mostly settled to the south of the Ḥaram, ascended the holy place. We know that the main accesses to the Ḥaram were through underground passages, and the eastern entrances of the Akṣā may indicate that the Triple Gate and the so-called Stables of Solomon in the southeastern corner of the Ḥaram played a much greater rôle in the life of the city than has been believed.

(c) The earthquake of 1033 was a devastating one, leading, among other causes, to a major reorganisation of the whole city [see AL-ḲUDS]. The Akṣā was rebuilt under al-Zāhir between 1034 and 1036 and the work completed under al-Mustansir in 1065. Except for the latter, it is the mosque described by Nāṣir-i Khusraw in 1047, and most of the central part of the present mosque dates from that time. Shrunken to seven aisles only, probably without side doors, it was a very classical mosque adapted to the peculiar circumstances of Jerusalem, whose major characteristic was the brilliance of its mosaic decoration. The triumphal arch with its huge vegetal designs surmounted by a royal inscription in gold mosaics, the gold pendentives with their huge shield of "peacock's eyes," and the

drum with its brilliant panels of an idealised garden with Umayyad and possibly Antique reminiscences, transformed the mosque into a true masterpiece of imperial art and exemplified the political ambitions of the Fāṭimids in Jerusalem.

(d) The Crusaders used the mosque as a palace and as living areas for the Knights Templar, and much of the present eastern and western façades date from this occupation. In 1187, when the mosque was reconsecrated to Islam, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn re-did the decoration of the whole *kibla* wall, including the beautiful *mihrāb* and the long inscription along the *kibla* wall. He also brought in the *minbar* made in 1169 by order of Nūr al-Dīn for the reconquered Holy City, but this great masterpiece of Syrian woodwork was destroyed by an arsonist in 1969 before it had been possible to study it fully. The northern porch was restored in 1217 and the eastern and western vaults re-done in 1345 and 1350. Under the later Ottomans, numerous repairs, often of dubious quality, and plasterings or repainting altered considerably the expressiveness of what was essentially a Fāṭimid building with major Crusader, Ayyūbid and Mamlūk details. It was only in the nineteen-twenties and especially between 1937 and 1942 that a major and carefully supervised programme of restoration took place.

In spite of scholarly debates which will continue to grow about this or that detail, and this or that date for some aspect of the building, the history of the monument is reasonably set. What is far more difficult to define and to explain is its function, and on that issue the debate has barely begun. As a work of art, should it be considered as a finite monument to be explained entirely in its own architectural terms? Or should it always be understood as physically and visually part of a broader vision, whether even completed or not, of the Haram as a unit? Socially and culturally, was it always, as it has become today, the city's mosque, different from its other sanctuaries, or was it, at times, simply the covered part of a single sanctuary? In all likelihood, the answers to these questions will differ according to the periods of the city's history. But beyond the fascinating vagaries of meaning of an extraordinary building in a unique setting, the problem is still unresolved of when it became known as the Masdjid al-Akṣā. The Qur'anic quotation XCII, 1, appears for the first time in the 5th/11th century official Fāṭimid inscription on the mosque's triumphal arch, and it is possibly at that time that it acquired its name. But in the early 10th/16th century, Muḍjir al-Dīn still calls it a *djāmi'*, while acknowledging that it is popularly known as the Akṣā.

These confusions are all part of the complexities of Jerusalem's meaning in the Muslim world. Yet it should be noted that the spiritual and onomastic impact of the mosque extended much beyond its location, since in the Javanese city of Ḳudus the main mosque is also called the Masdjid al-Akṣā.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(O. GRABAR)

AL-MASDJID AL-ḤARĀM, the name of the Mosque of Mecca. The name is already found in the pre-Islamic period (Horovitz, *Koranische Studien*, 140-1) in Ḳays b. al-Ḳhaṭīm, ed. Kowalski, v. 14: "By Allāh, the Lord of the Holy Masdjid and of that which is covered with Yemen stuffs, which are embroidered with hempen thread" (?). It would be very improbable if a Medinan poet meant by these references anything other than the Meccan sanctuary. The expression is also fairly frequent in the Qur'an after the second Meccan period (Horovitz, *op. cit.*) and in various connections; it is a grave sin on the part

of the polytheists that they prohibit access to the Masdjid Ḥarām to the "people" (sūra II, 217, cf. V, 2; VIII, 34; XXII, 25; XLVIII, 25); the Masdjid Ḥarām is the pole of the new *kibla* (sūra, II, 134, 149); contracts are sealed at it (sūra IX, 7).

In these passages, *masdjid ḥarām* does not as in later times mean a building, but simply Mecca as a holy place, just as in sūra XVII, 1, al-Masdjid al-Akṣā [*q.v.*] "the remotest sanctuary" does not mean a particular building.

According to tradition, a *ṣalāt* performed in the Masdjid al-Ḥarām is particularly meritorious (al-Bukhārī, *al-Ṣalāt fī masdjid Makka*, bāb 1). This *masdjid* is the oldest, being forty years older than that of Jerusalem (al-Bukhārī, *Anbiyā'*, bāb 10, 40).

This Meccan sanctuary included the Ka'ba [*q.v.*], the well of Zamzam [*q.v.*] and the Maḳām Ibrāhīm [*q.v.*], all three on a small open space. In the year 8, Muḥammad made this place a mosque for worship. Soon however it became too small, and under 'Umar and 'Uthmān, adjoining houses were taken down and a wall built. Under 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, the Umayyad and Abbāsīd caliphs, successive enlargements and embellishments were made. Ibn al-Zubayr put a simple roof above the wall. Al-Mahdī had colonnades built around, which were covered by a roof of teak. The number of minarets in time rose to seven. Little columns were put up around the Ka'ba for lighting purposes. The mosque was also given a feature which we only find paralleled in a few isolated instances: this was the putting up of small wooden buildings, or rather shelters for use during the *ṣalāt* by the *imām*, one for each of the four orthodox rites. The fact that one of these *maḳāms* might be more or less elaborate than another occasionally gave rise to jealousies between the Hanafis and the Shāfi'is. Ultimately, the ground under the colonnades, originally covered with gravel, was paved with marble slabs, also in the *maṭāf* around the Ka'ba as well as on the different paths approaching the *maṭāf*.

The mosque was given its final form in the years 1572-7, in the reign of the Sultan Selīm II, who, in addition to making a number of minor improvements in the building, had the flat roof replaced by a number of small, whitewashed, cone-shaped domes.

A person entering the mosque from the *mas'ā* or the eastern quarters of the town has to descend a few steps. The site of the mosque, as far as possible, was always left unaltered, while the level of the ground around—as usual in oriental towns and especially in Mecca on account of the dangers of sudden floods (*suyūl*)—gradually rose automatically in course of centuries (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka*, i, 18-20).

The dimensions of the Ḥarām (interior) are given as follows (al-Batanūnī, *Rihla*, 96): N.W. side 545, S.E. side 553 feet, N.E. side 360, S.W. side 364 feet; the corners are not right angles, so that the whole roughly represents a parallelogram.

Entering the *maṭāf* from the eastern side, one enters first the Bāb Banī Shayba, which marks an old boundary of the *masdjid*. Entering through the door, the Maḳām Ibrāhīm is on the right, which is also the Maḳām al-Shāfi'ī, and to the right of it is the *minbar*. On the left is the Zamzam building. As late as the beginning of the 19th century, there stood in front of the latter, in the direction of the north-east of the mosque, two domed buildings (*al-kubbatayn*) which were used as store-houses (*Chron. der Stadt Mekka*, ii, 337-8). These *kubbas* were cleared away (cf. already, Burckhardt, i, 265); they are not given in recent plans.

Around the Ka'ba are the *maḳāms* for the *imāms* of

the *madhhabs*, between the Ka'ba and the south-east of the mosque, the *maḳām* (or *muṣallā*) *al-Ḥanbalī*, to the south-west the *maḳām al-Mālikī* and to the north-west the *maḳām al-Ḥanafī*. The latter has two stories; the upper one was used by the *mu'adhḍhin* and the *muballigh*, the lower by the *imām* and his assistants. Since Wahhābī rule has been established, the *Ḥanbalī imām* has been given the place of honour; it is also reported that the *ṣalāt* is conducted by turns by the *imāms* of the four rites (*OM*, vii, 25). The *maḳām al-Ḥanafī* stands on the site of the old Meccan council-chamber (*dār al-nadwa*) which in the course of centuries was several times rebuilt and used for different purposes. The *maṭāf* is marked by a row of thin brass columns connected by a wire. The lamps for lighting are fixed to this wire and in the colonnades. In the 1930s, the mosque was provided with an installation for electric light (*OM*, xvi, 34; xviii, 39).

The mosque has for centuries been the centre of the intellectual life of the metropolis of Islām. This fact has resulted in the building of *madrasas* and *riwāks* for students in or near the mosque, for example, the *madrasa* of Kā'it Bey on the left as one enters through the Bāb al-Salām. Many of these *wakfs* have however in course of time become devoted to other purposes (Burckhardt, i, 282; Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka*, i, 17). For the staff of the mosque, cf. SHAYBA, BANŪ; Burckhardt, i, 287-91.

Bibliography: F. Wüstenfeld, *Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka*, ii, 10-11, 13-16, 337 ff.; i, 301-33, 339-45; iii, 73 ff.; iv, 121, 139, 159, 165, 190, 203, 205, 227-8, 268-9, 313-14; Ibn Djubayr, *Rihla*, in *GMS*, v, 81 ff.; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, ed. and tr. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, i, 305 ff.; Yākūt, *Mu'djam*, iv, 525-6; Iṣṭakhṛī, *BGA*, i, 15-16; Ibn al-Faḳīh, v, 18-21; index to vols. vii and viii, s.v.; Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi, tr. Muḥ. Shāfi', in *'Ajab-nāmah, a volume of oriental studies presented to E. G. Browne*, Cambridge 1922; 423 ff.; Muḥammad Labīb al-Batanūnī, *al-Rihla al-ḥidāziyya*, Cairo 1329, 94 ff.; *Travels of Ali Bey*, London 1816, ii, 74-93 and pls. liii, liv; J. L. Burckhardt, *Travels in Arabia*, London 1829, 243-95; R. F. Burton, *Personal narrative of a Pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina*, London 1855-6, iii, 1-37; C. Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka*, The Hague 1888-9, i, ch. i; ii, 230 ff.; *Bilderatlas*, nos. i, ii, iii; *ibid.*, *Bilder aus Mekka*, Leiden 1889, nos. 1 and 3; P. F. Keane, *Six months in Mecca*, London 1881, 24 ff.; Eldon Rutter, *The Holy Cities of Arabia*, London 1928; E. Esin, *Mecca the blessed, Madinah the radiant*, London 1963; G. Michell (ed.), *Architecture of the Islamic world, its history and social meaning*, London 1978, 17, 209-10. (A. J. WENSINCK)

MASDJIDĪ (A.), pl. *masdjidiyyūn*, an adjective formed from *masdjid*, but specifically concerning the Friday mosque of Baṣra and used to designate groups (see al-Djāḥiẓ, *Hayawān*, iii, 360) of adults or young people who were accustomed to meet together in that building, near the gate of the Banū Sulaym, as well as of poets, popular storytellers (*kuṣṣās* [see *KĀṢṢ*]), and transmitters of religious, historical and literary traditions, in particular, those regarding poetic verses. The information which we possess on the *masdjidiyyūn* in general comes from al-Djāḥiẓ, who seems clearly to have acquired from them, in his youth, part of his cultural formation and perhaps also some of the traits of his character. He was especially interested in a group which was probably composed of Baṣran bourgeois or, at all events, of idlers who exchanged ideas and held conversations on subjects which were probably more varied (see e.g. *Bayān*, i, 243) than those for which he

puts forward some examples in his *K. al-Bukhālā'* (ed. Ḥādīrī, 24-8; tr. Pellat, 41-8); the conversations thus reproduced are concerned essentially with how to spend as little money as possible, and allow us to classify the persons taking part in these conversations as part of the class of misers.

Nevertheless, al-Djāḥiẓ frequented other *masdjidiyyūn*: not only poets—al-Āmidī (*Muwāzana*, 116) could not appreciate their verses, and al-Marzubānī (*Mu'djam*, 379) states that Abū 'Imrān Mūsā b. Muḥammad, e.g., was a *masdjidi*—but also traditionists who themselves wrote books, since, in regard to two *hadīths*, he states that he did not gather them directly from the mouth of some scholar but that he had read them in some book of *masdjidiyyūn* (*Bayān*, iii, 57-8). He mentions however (*ibid.*, iii, 220) that one *shaykh* of the mosque only wanted to frequent persons amongst whom were included traditionists handing on *hadīths* on the authority of al-Ḥasan (sc. al-Baṣrī [*q.v.*]) and *ruwāt* [see *RĀWĪ*] who were reciting the verses of al-Farazdaq [*q.v.*]. It should be noted that it is concerning the transmitters of classical poetry installed at the Mirbad [*q.v.*], the *mirbadiyyūn*, or in the Friday mosque, that al-Djāḥiẓ observes the changes of taste among lovers of poetry which were discernable precisely in these *ruwāt*'s audience (*Bayān*, iv, 23).

Bibliography: Given in the article. See also Pellat, *Le milieu baṣrien et la formation de Ḡāḥiẓ*, 244-5. (CH. PELLAT)

AL-MASH 'ALĀ 'L-KHUFFAYN (A.), literally: "act of passing the hand over the boots", designates the right whereby Sunnī Muslims may, in certain circumstances, pass the hand over their shoes instead of washing their feet as a means of preparing themselves for the saying of the ritual prayer. Al-Djurdjānī (*Ta'rifāt*, ed. Tunis 1971, 112) proposes a definition of the *mash*: "passing the moistened hand without making (water) flow" (*imrār al-yad al-mubtalla bi-lā tasyīl*), which justifies the translation by "wetting of the shoes" which is adopted by L. Bercher and G. H. Bousquet (see below), but the term in question nevertheless remains ambiguous. In fact, if in the verses IV, 46/43, and V, 8-9/6, of the *Qur'ān*, the verb *masaha* refers to ablutions which necessarily entail the use of a certain quantity of water and consequently has the sense of "to wash", as is suggested by the *Lisān*, it is also employed in the same verses in reference to ritual purification with sand or soil (*tayammum* [*q.v.*]) and therefore no longer has the same meaning. In his translation of the *Qur'ān* (iii, 1115), R. Blachère points out moreover that it is quite inaccurate to render this verb by "to wipe" or "to rub", since it properly signifies, in these contexts, "to pass the hand over".

Unlike the *tayammum*, the *mash 'alā 'l-khuffayn* is not envisaged by the Holy Book, and it is probable that the practice in question, although ancient, was only tolerated at a relatively late date, to take into account difficulties which could face armies in the field, and after provoking debate in the very bosom of the Medinan school. Ultimately it constituted, along with, especially, *mut'ā* [*q.v.*], one of the most manifest signs of the rift between Sunnīs and Shī'īs, for the latter, like the *Khāridjīs*, do not recognise it. The different Sunnī schools now base their doctrine, in this context, on a half-dozen *hadīths* whose authenticity is accepted by al-Bukhārī and Muslim, and on a number of other more liberal, but nevertheless for that reason more suspect traditions.

From "authentic" *hadīths* it emerges that the Prophet was observed to practise the *mash 'alā 'l-*