



BRILL

The Meaning of the Umayyad Dome of the Rock

Author(s): Nasser Rabbat

Source: *Muqarnas*, Vol. 6 (1989), pp. 12-21

Published by: [BRILL](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1602276>

Accessed: 15/11/2014 14:45

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



BRILL is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Muqarnas*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE MEANING OF THE Umayyad DOME OF THE ROCK

The genesis of Islamic architecture in the few decades following the death of the Prophet Muhammad in 632 is still obscure. We know from textual and some archaeological evidence that, during the reigns of the four Orthodox Caliphs and the early Umayyads, a few communal buildings were constructed in the capital Medina and later Damascus, and in the new settlements or garrison towns (*amṣār*) in Syria, Iraq, and Egypt, but we know very little about their plans, structures, and construction materials. We do know that they were all constructed to fulfill the immediate needs of the Muslim communities or the Islamic governments in these towns, and that meant they invariably belonged to one of two types, either congregational mosques, such as those at Kufa (638-39), Basra (638-39), and Fustat (642), or government houses (*dār imāra*, pl. of *dar al-imāra*), like the ones in Kufa (638-39) and Damascus (after 644).¹ These first buildings were all of a straightforward utilitarian character lacking any architectural pretence, but the sources tell us that the second generation of Muslim governors paid more attention to appearance. Muʿawiya ordered his *dār al-imāra* in Damascus torn down and rebuilt with more durable materials after he heard the comment of a Byzantine envoy that “the upper part will do for birds and the lower for rats.”² In 665 Ziad ibn Abihi, Muʿawiya’s governor in Basra, ordered the congregational mosque and *dār al-imāra* in that town rebuilt in baked brick with stone columns taken from ancient sites. Although these new buildings represented a step up from the earlier ones, and may have shown a nascent Islamic style, they were still functional in nature and simple in form and meaning.

Yet, only a few decades after these modest buildings were built, we find Caliph ʿAbd al-Malik ibn Marwan (683-703) ordering the construction of a sumptuous building — the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem — that had no precedent in the short history of Islamic architecture. In fact, not only did the Dome of the Rock, dated by an inscription to the year 72 (692), sur-

pass all previous Islamic buildings, it even manifested a full-fledged stylistic, structural, and ornamental program which put it in a class apart as a meaningful architectural monument.

The Dome of the Rock has no immediately discernible purpose or function other than the commemorative one, and even that is riddled with uncertainties. Muslims around the world believe it was built to commemorate a decisive event in the Prophet Muhammad’s mission, namely his Night Journey (*isrāʾ*) from Mecca to Jerusalem, and his subsequent Ascension (*miʿrāj*) from the Rock to Heaven, where he received from God the doctrinal principles of the new religion.³ This belief dates from the beginning of the eighth century, when the earliest Arabic source, as far as can be ascertained, which connected the two events was codified by Ibn Ishaq (d. 761) under the title *Sirat al-Nabī*.⁴ However, neither the fact that there is a small dome next to the Dome of the Rock known as the Dome of the Ascension (*qubbat al-miʿrāj*), nor the Dome of the Rock’s inscriptions,⁵ nor early Islamic sources corroborate the ascription of this belief to the eighth century when the Dome was built.⁶ ʿAbd al-Malik must have chosen this venerated site in the Holy City of the three monotheistic religions to build the first truly monumental Islamic building for a purpose, or purposes, other than just to celebrate the Prophet’s Ascension to Heaven, since such an association appears not to have been fully formulated by his time. Thus, modern scholarship is presented with the problem of explaining why this puzzling monument was built. Many attempts have been made to do so; all of them adduced religious reasons for the Dome’s building.⁷

Art historians have used various approaches in trying to determine the meaning of the Dome of the Rock. Among them, the writings of Oleg Grabar form the most complete corpus on its Umayyad phase.⁸ Basing his reading on the available contemporary evidence — the location, the inscriptions, and the interior mosaics — Grabar sees the Dome as a monument which used

Biblical connotations and Christian-Byzantine forms to impose Islam's presence in the Holy City. The combination would imply that the new faith considered itself the continuation and the seal of the two preceding ones: Judaism and Christianity. He also found political undertones; the Umayyads, viewing themselves as the new masters of the region, used old, established Mediterranean and to a lesser degree Iranian motifs, but structured and displayed them through the new Islamic vision.⁹

In another interpretive effort, Priscilla Soucek discerned possible Solomonic references in the building's ornamentation. According to her theory, Solomon's Temple was praised in the Islamic sources for its opulent and symbolic decorations using jewels and fanciful trees; the same motifs are found in the mosaics of the outer octagon of the Dome of the Rock. She concluded, however, that the associations of holiness in the early Islamic period were attached to Mount Moriah and the Rock, rather than to the memory of the Temple of Solomon itself.¹⁰

Clearly, the question of the reasons behind the building of the Dome of the Rock remains unanswered. In particular, why was Mount Moriah in Jerusalem chosen as the site for this absolutely unprecedented Islamic monument? What were the circumstances that prompted 'Abd al-Malik, the fifth Umayyad caliph, to order its construction? What did he intend to accomplish by it? It is entirely possible that the building had mainly a political import, although it incorporated certain religious tenets as well.¹¹

Our comprehension of the Umayyad Dome of the Rock is hindered by the lack of contemporary Umayyad texts. The earliest Islamic historical sources we possess date to the time of the Abbasids, who sponsored a school of history writing that was openly anti-Umayyad.¹² Thus, most of the Umayyad caliphs, including 'Abd al-Malik, received a biased reporting of their deeds that focused mainly on their deviations from accepted practices and diminished the impact of whatever effective policies they might have pursued. The resulting distortion in our understanding is not easily overcome, and the best we can do is to attempt to reconstruct the historical circumstances of the Dome's construction by critically patching together the disparate pieces of information from the primary sources we have.¹³

Another problem facing us is that the religious and symbolic interpretations of the Rock, the monument, and even Jerusalem itself which are accepted today are

not necessarily the same associations made by early Muslims. They are instead the product of a process that started after the original building was constructed¹⁴ and assumed its definitive form after the Crusaders occupied Jerusalem in 1099. The Muslims' counter-crusade was slow to gather momentum. In the following century, members of the pietistic circles in Syria began to preach jihad to liberate the Holy Land from the yoke of the Crusaders, and to formulate the religious sanctions for this goal. Two great leaders adopted this ideology and translated it into a plan of action, Nur al-Din ibn Zengi (1146-74), and later his former general, the famous Salah al-Din al-Ayyubi (1174-93).¹⁵ They led the counteroffensive against the Shi'i movements and the Fatimid counter-caliphate in Egypt and Syria, unified the Islamic armies under the banners of a revived and militant Sunni Islam, and proceeded to reconquer the Holy Land from the Crusaders.¹⁶ During this troubled period, numerous books of religious merits (*faḍā'il*) were compiled, in which the Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock became the focus of the jihad pietistic propaganda. These books, containing traditions attributed to the Prophet in praise of Jerusalem, were used to stimulate the fervor of Muslim warriors, and were widely read in the circles of Salah al-Din's army.¹⁷ As a result of this intense movement of compilation, the religious and para-religious traditions attached to the Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock were fixed.¹⁸ But applying these post-Crusade traditions to the interpretation of Jerusalem's early Islamic significance is a questionable procedure.

Fortunately, the question of Jerusalem's holiness for the early Muslims can now be reexamined with the help of a book of *faḍā'il*, compiled before the First Crusade, and thus before the emphasis accorded the sacredness of the city in order to instigate the Muslims to fight for its liberation. This book, recently published under the title *Faḍā'il al-Bayt al-Muqaddas*, was recited by Abu Bakr al-Wasiti, a little-known preacher (*khaṭīb*), who lived sometime before 1019.¹⁹ It offers a record of the religious merits, and the eschatological and prophetic associations of the city, collected by a native scholar, and it gives a brief account of the construction of the Dome of the Rock by 'Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwan. For our purpose, this book provides the most complete pre-Crusade collection of accounts on Jerusalem's significance. These, in turn, can help us trace how the sanctity of the city was assimilated into the Islamic tradition, and on what belief this sanctity was based in

the days of the building of the Dome of the Rock.

The traditions collected by al-Wasiti concerning the hagiographical and eschatological associations of Mount Moriah, the site of the Dome, deal with few themes. The three that recur most often are the position of the site — often contrasted with the Kaʿba in Mecca — in the timetable of the Creation and of the Day of Judgment;²⁰ the miracles witnessed there by David and Solomon, and their consequent building of a Holy House (Bayt Muqaddas, i.e., the Temple);²¹ and finally, the Night Journey of the Prophet Muhammad from Mecca to the site, and the events connected with it.²² These accounts establish that Mount Moriah was recognized as a sacred spot which God designated for the building of His Holy House and entrusted the task to Solomon. The role of the Rock itself is given several versions: it was the second place on earth — after the site of the Kaʿba — created by God;²³ God ascended from it to Heaven after the Creation; the prophets David and Solomon saw miracles performed on the Rock;²⁴ and the Prophet Muhammad led the other prophets acknowledged by Islam in a prayer near or upon it, when he journeyed to Jerusalem.

Most of these traditions, with the obvious exception of those related to Muhammad's Night Journey, are influenced by the older Biblical and para-Biblical accounts on the same subjects. The holiness of Jerusalem was, after all, inherited by Islam from Judaism and Christianity. While this seems self-evident, it is an important point to bear in mind, especially when we are trying to trace the formation of Mount Moriah's sacredness to the Muslims at the time of ʿAbd al-Malik. Moreover, if we follow the chains of transmission (*isnād*) of these same traditions to their first transmitters, who were all either Companions (*sahāba*, pl. of *sahābī*), or companions of the Companions of the Prophet (*tābiʿīn*, pl. of *tābiʿī*), we find that most of them were known to have had a first-hand knowledge of the Jewish traditions pertaining to the Holy City. The major role in the transmission process was played by Kaʿb al-Ahbar, a Jewish convert to Islam and a *tābiʿī*, to whom most of the traditions concerning the eschatological attributes of Jerusalem were traced, perhaps because he was famous for his profound knowledge of the Jewish sacred books.²⁵ Two other leading transmitters, Ibn-ʿAbbas and ʿAbdallah ibn-ʿAmru ibn al-ʿAs, who were reputed to be among the most learned and respected of the Companions of the Prophet, were also familiar with Jewish sources. Ibn ʿAbbas, the Prophet's cousin, became the patron

(*mawla*) of Kaʿb al-Ahbar after his conversion, and he could have acquired his knowledge of the Jewish traditions concerning Jerusalem directly from his client.²⁶ ʿAbdallah ibn-ʿAmru was believed to have a deep knowledge of the prophecies of the People of the Book (*ahl al-kitāb*, i.e., Jews and Christians), for he was known to have read the Torah and other non-Islamic religious books.²⁷

In the beginning, then, Jerusalem and the Rock held primarily Judaic associations which the Muslims had adopted at the time as part of the religious heritage to which Islam laid claim.²⁸ However, these first transmitters played a decisive part not only in the recognition of the sanctity of Jerusalem and the eminence of the Rock's site, but also in the Islamization of these beliefs. Viewed as such, the *isrāʾ* of Muhammad easily fits into this scheme as the connection of the Prophet of Islam to a sacred spot and to the earlier religious traditions attached to it. The fact that al-Wasiti's accounts either lack or give little emphasis to the Ascension of the Prophet from the Rock²⁹ may be understood in light of the confusion that surrounded the dating and location of this event in the early days of Islamic hagiography. Some Islamic sources of the period placed the Ascension in locations other than Jerusalem,³⁰ and recent scholarship shows that the definite ascription of the event to Jerusalem occurred later.³¹

We can similarly explain the absence in al-Wasiti's text of any account connecting Abraham to the site of Jerusalem or to Mount Moriah.³² In the prophetic chronology established by Islam since the beginning, Abraham was very clearly assigned to Mecca as the builder of the Kaʿba, and the founder of the first true religion, considered the precursor of Islam. Assigning him to Jerusalem would have contradicted this belief. This leads us to establish a clear relationship between the three sacred cities and the associations of their mosques in early Islam.³³ The Kaʿba is the first House of God, and its building is attributed to Abraham. Medina is identified as the City of Muhammad, because he spent the later part of his life and laid down the principles of the new religion there. The names repeatedly and inextricably linked to Jerusalem, and its sacred spot, are those of David and Solomon, both of them recognized as God-sent messengers and God-supported kings.³⁴

These early associations of Jerusalem must have constituted the main reason the Umayyads as a dynasty took such an interest in the city and endowed it with a large building program in order to serve their political

ends, since it was neither their capital nor a major urban center in their realm. Mu'awiya was, a Syriac source reports, made "King of all the Arabs" in Jerusalem, and prayed on that occasion in many Christian sanctuaries.³⁵ Islamic sources record that he received the pledge of allegiance (*bay'at*) there in the year 660, but provide no details.³⁶

A little-known tale does, however, forge a close allegorical connection between Mu'awiya and the Holy City. Al-Tabari says that 'Amru ibn al-'As was sent by the Prophet to Oman in the year 629 and heard from a *hibr*³⁷ there a prophecy concerning the successors of the Prophet. The *hibr* correctly foretold the rule of the four Orthodox Caliphs after the death of Muhammad, and when he reached the slot corresponding to Mu'awiya's rule, he described him as Prince of the Holy Land (*amir al-ard al-muqaddasa*).³⁸ Al-Tabari used this story to explain the alliance between 'Amru and Mu'awiya, which was concluded in Jerusalem in the year 658, two years before Mu'awiya became caliph.³⁹ Whether this tale was invented by 'Amru, with the collaboration of Mu'awiya, by Mu'awiya himself, or by someone else, it was probably used to sustain Mu'awiya's caliphal claims (which is why it was probably devised in the first place). In any case, its importance for our purpose lies in the identification of Mu'awiya as Prince of the Holy Land, a term which carried a strong connection with the region at the time.⁴⁰ Furthermore, it must have meant a great deal for Mu'awiya's political ambitions. He is reported to have said: "I have hoped for this thing ever since the Prophet told me, O Mu'awiya when you rule, be fair."⁴¹ It also explains his choice of Jerusalem as the place in which to receive the *bay'at*, for what other city would be more appropriate to celebrate the fulfillment of such a prophecy?

This connection with the Holy Land was passed on in the title King of the Holy Land to Mu'awiya's son and successor Yazid I. In his fierce and clever plotting to create a dynasty and to appoint his son as his successor, Mu'awiya needed all the support he could get, especially from members of the influential group of the Prophet's companions. In the year 672, 'Abdallah ibn-'Amru ibn al-'As, the highly respected *shahabī* who had read the Jewish and Christian books, reportedly proclaimed, "Mu'awiya is the King of the Holy Land and so is his son."⁴² Coming from such a prominent authority, this remark must have strengthened Mu'awiya's cause, and extended the eminence of a link with the Holy Land to his dynasty.

Mu'awiya, who had built his power base in Syria and Palestine, must have benefited from the political prestige this symbolic association with the Holy Land had brought him. Recognizing its value, he might have planned to give it substance. One source states that "Mu'awiya, after 'Umar, built (*bana*) the Bayt al-Maqdis,"⁴³ a reference perhaps to the restoration and enlargement of the platform on Mount Moriah, and the rebuilding of the mosque attributed to 'Umar,⁴⁴ a site designated by early Muslims as Bayt al-Maqdis.⁴⁵ This undertaking would have required planning and several years of construction work to complete. The versatile and energetic Mu'awiya had the long, prosperous, and relatively calm reign needed for both,⁴⁶ whereas the short and troubled reigns of all the caliphs who succeeded him up until 'Abd al-Malik would not have allowed sufficient time to complete any such project.

'Abd al-Malik had strong connections with Jerusalem itself. He was the deputy of his father Marwan in Palestine during the latter's short caliphate (683-84), and presumably his seat of government was in Jerusalem.⁴⁷ Another account states that 'Abd al-Malik received his *bay'at* there in Ramadan of 65 (684),⁴⁸ which means that he was in Jerusalem when his father died. Furthermore, he had already been symbolically associated with the city. Al-Wasiti records a prophecy that links 'Abd al-Malik with a divine will to build the Dome of the Rock. Ka'b al-Ahbar had said, "I have read in the Torah that God addressed the Rock of Jerusalem: 'I shall send my servant 'Abd al-Malik to build you and adorn you.'"⁴⁹ This tradition is improbable: Ka'b died in Homs in 652, when 'Abd al-Malik was still a six-year-old boy, living in Medina with no apparent relationship to Jerusalem. But that does not mean it was not useful, especially because it was attributed to Ka'b himself, the same authority who introduced, or was made to introduce, to Islam many traditions related to Jerusalem. 'Abd al-Malik could use it just as Mu'awiya had used a similar prophecy, for it was probably the precedent set by Mu'awiya that made 'Abd al-Malik seek his own symbolic association with the Holy City. His, however, was more explicit than Mu'awiya's King of the Holy Land, for it tied him directly to the most sacred spot in the city and the recently appropriated Jewish traditions attached to it. 'Abd al-Malik wanted to be remembered in Jerusalem as the builder of the most impressive monument on Mount Moriah over the Sacred Rock, not merely as the repairer of the platform or the structure attributed to 'Umar. This desire may be clarified by the cir-

cumstances of the first half of 'Abd al-Malik's reign and the grave problems that faced him then, since the Dome's inscriptions⁵⁰ and most of the Islamic historical reports, including that of al-Wasiti,⁵¹ show clearly that the Dome was built during that period.

'Abd al-Malik came to power in 684, a time of civil strife⁵² and of a threatening Byzantine army at the borders. For the first time in the history of the rising and aggressive Islamic empire, the Byzantines were able to reoccupy part of northern Syria (Antioch in 688).⁵³ But the internal problems were even more severe. To attend to them, 'Abd al-Malik was forced to sign a truce with Justinian II in 689, the terms of which included the payment of a yearly tribute to both the Byzantines and their clients the Maradites.⁵⁴ In Jerusalem in particular, where Christians constituted the overwhelming majority,⁵⁵ the psychological warfare between Christianity and Islam must have been heightened by these political developments, and 'Abd al-Malik must have felt compelled to provide a very visible reminder of his hegemony over the city.

Islamic rule also reintroduced to the city a Jewish population, perhaps as early as the time of 'Umar ibn al-Khattab (634-43),⁵⁶ which in turn revived the religious disputes between Jews and Christians, in which the Muslims were by no means neutral bystanders. They preferred, and even adopted, the Jewish viewpoints.⁵⁷ Some Jewish converts to Islam (notably Ka'b al-Ahbar, who was instrumental in defining the sanctity of Jerusalem in Islam) were also spreading anti-Christian propaganda. Ka'b is reported to have told two of his relatives who were planning to visit Jerusalem to pray in its mosque (probably the platform on Mount Moriah): "Do not go to the Church of Mary or 'al-'Amudayn' [the Two Columns?] for these are seducers (*taghūt*). Whoever visits them loses the merits of his prayers unless he starts anew. May God fight the Christians, for they are impotent: they only built their Church in Wadi Jahannam."⁵⁸ The strength of these feelings, especially in such periods as 'Abd al-Malik's reign, helps explain why the Dome is located on a spot sanctified by Judaism and Islam but discarded by Christianity;⁵⁹ why its form is at the same time of Byzantine martyrdom and conspicuously different; and why the inscriptions circling the inner octagonal arcade of the Dome on both sides comprise the entire Christology of the Quran that argues against the deification of Christ.

This interpretation is further supported by the explanation given by al-Muqaddasi for the building of

the Dome. He reported a conversation with his uncle, who explained to him al-Walid I's justification for building his magnificent mosque in Damascus. The uncle went on to say "and in like manner, is it not evident how Caliph 'Abd al-Malik, noting the greatness of the Dome of the Holy Sepulchre and its magnificence, was moved lest it should dazzle the minds of Muslims and so erected, above the Rock, the Dome which is now seen there."⁶⁰ The effect of the spectacular display of riches in Christian churches on the minds of Muslims must have been considerable in the early period of the Islamic presence in a formerly Christian land.⁶¹ It was no doubt reflected in the many traditions prohibiting the Muslims from visiting the churches of Jerusalem, as well as in the splendor and the intended dazzling aspect of the Dome of the Rock at a time when there was hardly anything comparable to it in the whole Islamic state.

On the domestic front, the revolt of Ibn al-Zubayr and his establishment of a rival caliphate in Mecca constituted the greatest menace that 'Abd al-Malik faced. When he became caliph in Damascus, his dominions were limited to Syria and Egypt, which had been secured by his father Marwan. The Syrians, who constituted 'Abd al-Malik's loyal army, succeeded in due course in crushing Ibn al-Zubayr's forces and in recapturing Iraq and Arabia. But Ibn al-Zubayr's revolt had nothing to do with the building of the Dome of the Rock, contrary to the opinion of some positivist historians. Basing their theories on al-Ya'qubi (d. 874) and the Melkite priest Eutychius (d. 940),⁶² they have interpreted the Dome of the Rock as providing an alternative to the Ka'ba in Mecca, which was controlled at the time by Ibn al-Zubayr. Other scholars have refuted this interpretation by demonstrating the discrepancies in al-Ya'qubi's reporting, and by showing that no other major Muslim source gave the same explanation.⁶³

The Ka'ba appears to have remained the religious center for the Umayyads during the entire period of Ibn al-Zubayr's insurrection (683-92).⁶⁴ 'Abd al-Malik himself led the Hajj in 694, two years after the completion of his Dome of the Rock.⁶⁵ The procession in Mecca, led by him, is described in a poem by al-Farazdaq (d. 732), who was one of the major Umayyad court poets. A distich from the same poem, in which the Bayt-Aelia (the sanctuary on Mount Moriah) and the Ka'ba are mentioned, had been used to show the almost equal status that the Dome and the Ka'ba were supposed to have had under the Umayyads.⁶⁶ The distich reads, "To us belong two houses, the House of

God (*bayt allah*), of which we are governors, and the revered house in upper [part of] Iliya' [Aelia, i.e., Jerusalem]."⁶⁷ It is clear from the words themselves that the House of Aelia is secondary and in no way equal in sanctity to the Ka'ba, the House of God, to which 'Abd al-Malik is leading the pilgrimage.

Another account is very indicative of how the Umayyads perceived their conflict with Ibn al-Zubayr. Khalid ibn Yazid, an Umayyad prince, went along with the army of al-Hajjaj sent to Mecca to confront Ibn al-Zubayr (73/692), so that he could perform the Hajj. While he was there, he proposed marriage to Ibn al-Zubayr's sister, which understandably angered al-Hajjaj. When the latter tried to dissuade him, Khalid replied, "As for your saying that these people [Ibn al-Zubayr and the Meccans] fought my father [Yazid I] over the caliphate, I should remind you that this matter concerns only the families of Quraysh [to which both Khalid and Ibn al-Zubayr belonged, but not al-Hajjaj] who are now quarreling. But when God settles the problem, Quraysh will regain its understanding (*ahlām*) and virtue."⁶⁸ It is clear that Khalid considered the Umayyads as a clan to be part of Quraysh, and that they undoubtedly were fighting Ibn al-Zubayr to decide who within the tribe was the leading family, and consequently the leader of the Muslim community. It follows that relinquishing Mecca and its Ka'ba to a rival Qurashi, such as Ibn al-Zubayr, would have been tantamount to admitting political defeat. But putting Jerusalem in its place would have been the equivalent of abolishing one of the fundamental tenets of Islam, thus creating serious problems for a Muslim caliph.

Certainly 'Abd al-Malik was not a man either to accept political defeat or to attempt such a grave departure from Islamic principles. From the scattered accounts describing his personality, it is clear that his knowledge of Islamic precepts and tenets was undisputed and his sense of sovereignty (*mulk*) uncompromising. 'Abd al-Malik belonged to the first Medinese generation brought up from birth in the Islamic faith.⁶⁹ He was considered among the most trustworthy scholars of Islamic law (*fuqahā'*) in Medina before he moved to Damascus (682).⁷⁰ The alleged rejection of his pious attributes after becoming caliph are inconsistent with the multitude of references in chronicles and biographies to his adherence to Islamic traditions throughout his rule. He once told the Medinese:

"You are the people most entitled to adhere to this original thing [*al-'amr al-'awwal*, i.e., original Islam].

Many traditions have come to us from the East which we cannot verify. We are only sure of the reading of the Quran. Be faithful to what is contained in your Quran: the one that the unjustly treated Imam [Uthman] gathered for you, and follow the obligations he specified for you, for in that he consulted Zayd ibn Thabit, who was a most respected scholar. Thus, accept what they have accepted, and reject what deviates from their interpretation."⁷¹

A person who shows such a strict interpretation of Islam, accepts only the dictates of the Quran, and rejects unverifiable traditions cannot easily be accused of reverting to disputed belief in order to justify decisions such as conferring a sanctity upon the Rock that was not already part of the Islamic faith. 'Abd al-Malik's motives for building the Dome must be viewed within the accepted Islamic framework of his time; he must have been celebrating a place that was already venerated by Muslims.

'Abd al-Malik was an energetic and determined caliph who firmly believed in his right to command.⁷² Many Muslim authorities of his time seem to have recognized his gift for rule.⁷³ Later accounts, however, though they vouch for his political acumen, condemn his deviations from the Islamic model of leadership. If from these commentaries prejudices against 'Abd al-Malik's brand of rule are eliminated, a more balanced picture emerges. In many instances, 'Abd al-Malik was aware that he had to govern according to the principles advanced by the Muslim religious authorities who were his counselors. He once asked Abu Zur'a, a theologian, how he is judged by God. The latter cited in response a Quranic passage (38:25) which describes David's duty as the Caliph of God on Earth, and then said, "If this is what God required from His chosen messenger, so you even more [abide by the same obligations]."⁷⁴

'Abd al-Malik's comprehension of sovereignty was apparently influenced and supported by the Quranic interpretation of the divinely ordained kingship of David. In this and other accounts, David and Solomon are often mentioned as ideal models for a Muslim ruler, perhaps because the Quran praises them, and popular traditions admire their wise rulership. Another report of a discussion that took place in the Caliph's court demonstrates how admired were the glorious reigns of David and Solomon, and one speaker attempted to link "the kingship of Banu-Isma'il [i.e., the Arabs, as represented by the Umayyads] to the kingship of their brothers Banu-Ishaq [i.e., the Jews], namely that of the prophet kings David and Solomon."⁷⁵

'Abd al-Malik's attempts to model his sovereignty

after the archetypes of David and Solomon as revealed in Quranic examples were thus in part manifested in the decision to build the Dome of the Rock on the sacred site in Jerusalem, since the Islamic tradition being formed at this time preserved the association of David and Solomon with Mount Moriah. In the first ten years of his rule, when ʿAbd al-Malik was faced with numerous challenges to his authority, one can see his actions as efforts to affirm his kingship. Building a highly visible dome on a site celebrated in the past by David and Solomon and sanctified in the present by Islam symbolized ʿAbd al-Malik's political aspirations, and balanced his monarchical inclinations and religious convictions. The precedence of David and Solomon building the Temple in the tradition that was appropriated by Islam, combined with the Umayyads' well known symbolic and real connections with Jerusalem, emphasizes the reading of the Dome as a monument to the Umayyad Islamic rule, built by the one caliph who is rightfully credited with its consolidation.

In the second part of his rule, after he had regained control of all the Islamic territories, ʿAbd al-Malik initiated the process of Arabizing the administration and Islamizing the coinage to create an imperial Islamic image of the state. Under his son al-Walid I, the process was carried further, and the imperial image was expressed in monumental mosques built in four major cities of the empire: Mecca, Medina, Damascus, and Jerusalem. The Dome of the Rock was then subjected to a shift in significance when the mihrab of the rebuilt Aqsa mosque was aligned with its north-south axis, thus incorporating it into a larger complex whose focal point it became.⁷⁶ The confusion that eventually arose over the building's original message was probably caused when the religious functions of the Dome of the Rock and the whole sanctuary supplanted the political ones, and the events that had led to the Dome's construction had lost their relevance.

*Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts*

NOTES

1. On the question of the genesis of Islamic architecture, see, for example, Ernst Herzfeld, "Die Genesis der islamischen Kunst," *Der Islam* 1 (1910): 27-63; also Oleg Grabar, *La formation de l'art islamique* (Paris, 1987), pp. 11-32, 139-92.
2. See Nikita Elisséeff, *La description de Damas d'Ibn ʿAskir* (Damascus, 1959), p. 228.

3. See, for example, *al-Mawsūʿa al-Filastīniyya* (The Palestinian Encyclopedia), (Damascus, 1984), vol. 3, art. "al-Quds," p. 511. For the elaborate interpretation of the two events, which is accepted by the Sunnis, see Sayyed Quṭub, *Fi Zīlāl al-Qurʾān* (Cairo, 1967), vol. 15, pp. 12 ff.
4. The book *Sirat al-Nabī* was collected by Ibn Hisham from the materials reported by Ibn Ishaq, who is considered the first chronicler of the life of the Prophet. See *Sirat al-Nabī*, ed. M. K. Harrās, (Cairo, n.d.), pp. 4-18.
5. The long original inscription band around the Dome, dated to the time of its building, is made up mainly of polemical Quranic quotations arguing against the deification of Christ and for the oneness of God. Nowhere in it are either of the two events, the Night Journey or the Ascension of Muhammad, mentioned. For a discussion of the meaning of these inscriptions, see, for example, Erica C. Dodd, "The Dome of the Rock," in Erica C. Dodd and Shereen Khairallah, *The Image of the Word* (Beirut, 1981), vol. 1, pp. 19-26.
6. For the evolution of the two concepts in Islamic tradition and the controversy on the location of the Aqsa mosque noted in early Islamic sources, see A. Guillaume, "Where Was al-Masjid al-Aqsa?," *al-Andalus*, 18 (1953).
7. As it was summarized in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2d ed., art. "al-Kuds," written by S. D. Goitein, p. 325.
8. A partial list of Oleg Grabar's contributions on the Umayyad Dome of the Rock are: "The Umayyad Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem" (hereafter cited as Grabar 1), *Ars Orientalis* 3 (1959): 33-62; the section on the Dome of the Rock in his *Formation of Islamic Art* (New Haven, 1973), pp. 48-67; his entry, "Ḳubbat al-Sakhrā," in *EP*, vol. 5, pp. 298-99; and his contribution to the article "al-Kuds," in *EP*, vol. 5, pp. 339-41. Other works of interest for the understanding of the Dome can be found in the bibliographies of the two *EP* entries.
9. In his latest contribution on the subject, which is an unpublished paper entitled, "The Meaning of the Dome of the Rock" (hereafter Grabar 2) delivered at Oxford University in 1985, Grabar restated his initial interpretation with two important modifications. I am grateful to Professor Grabar for making a copy of this paper available to me.
10. Priscilla Soucek, "The Temple of Solomon in Islamic Legend and Art," in J. Gutmann, ed. *The Temple of Solomon* (Missoula, Mont., 1976), pp. 73-123.
11. Goitein noted this message in the Dome, but considered it as second in importance to the major religious one. See S. D. Goitein, "The Sanctity of Jerusalem and Palestine in Early Islam," in *Studies in Islamic History and Institutions* (Leiden, 1966), pp. 135-48, esp. p. 147.
12. Most of the earliest Muslim historiographers and biographers are known to have been either sponsored by the Abbasids, or to have been their clients. Ibn Saʿd (784-844) the author of the seminal biographical *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, was a client of the Abbasids; the other two main figures of the "School of Medina" in the history of the Prophet (*sira*), Ibn Hishām (d. 833), the author of the important *Sirat al-Nabī*, and al-Waqīdī (d. 823), the first systematic collector of the materials for the early history of Islam according to H. A. R. Gibb, were both favorites of the Abbasid court. See the introduction to Ibn Saʿd, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* (hereafter cited as Ibn Saʿd) written by Ihsān ʿAbbas (Beirut 1960), vol. 1, pp. 5-17. In addition, some other chroniclers were partisans (*mutashayʿa*) of the descendants of the Prophet (*ahl al-bayt*), and thus they were more prejudiced

- against the Umayyads than the pro-Abbasids. One of our major sources, al-Maqrizi (d. 1438), wrote a book on the dispute between the Umayyads and the Hashemites (including the Abbasids) in which he sided with the *ahl-al-bayt* and discredited both the Umayyads and the Abbasids, see al-Maqrizī, *Kitāb al-Nizā' wal-Takhāsum*, ed. G. Vas (Leiden, 1888), esp. pp. 30 ff. (henceforth cited as al-Maqrizī.) Moreover, al-Farazdaq (d. 732), who was the poet of the Umayyads par excellence, was also a partisan of the Descendants of 'Alī; see the introduction to *Diwan al-Farazdaq* (Beirut, 1960).
13. For a discussion of the early Islamic sources, see A. A. al-Duri, *The Rise of Historical Writing among the Arabs*, trans. L. Conrad (Princeton, 1983) (hereafter cited as Duri). F. M. Donner wrote an interesting review of modern attitudes toward early Islamic historiography in his introduction to Duri's book, pp. vii-xvii.
 14. This may explain why the Muslim chroniclers and biographers failed to note the importance of the Dome of the Rock in the career of 'Abd al-Malik. Had the prominent religious functions and associations now attached to the Dome been known to them, their omission of its construction from the list of 'Abd al-Malik's achievements, while they all listed the building activities of his son al-Walid I, for example, would be puzzling.
 15. See the biography of Salah al-Din in al-Sibkī, *Tabaqat al-Shāfi'iyya al-Kubrā* (Cairo, n.d.), vol. 7, pp. 339-69, where he is extolled as the Conqueror of Jerusalem (*fāih bayt al-maqdis*).
 16. An important discussion of jihad propaganda during the Crusades is in Emmanuel Sivan, *L'Islam et la Croisade: idéologie et propagande dans les réactions musulmans aux croisades* (Paris, 1968), esp. chap. 5, where Sivan discusses the propaganda policies of Salah al-Din.
 17. On the role of pietistic propaganda in the reconquest of Jerusalem, see F. E. Peters, *Jerusalem* (Princeton, 1985), pp. 333-48.
 18. See Emmanuel Sivan, "Le caractère de Jerusalem dans l'Islam aux XII^e-XIII^e siècles," in *Studia Islamica*, 27 (1967): 149-82. In this article, Sivan traces the origin of Muslim traditions concerning Jerusalem during the Crusades. For the traditions about the sanctity of Jerusalem since the time of Salah al-Din, see for example, Mujīr al-Dīn al-'Ulaimī (d. 1485), *al-Uns al-Jalīl bi Tarikh al-Quds wal-Khalīl*, ed. M. B. al-'Ulūm (Najaf, 1968). There is a section on Salah al-Din's conquest, pp. 317-40.
 19. Abū Bakr al-Wasīṭī, *Faḍā'il al-Bayt al-Muqaddas*, ed. Y. Hasson (Jerusalem, 1979) (hereafter cited as al-Wasīṭī). Hasson wrote a very interesting introduction to his text, esp. pp. 1-27. The importance of this book in modifying our understanding of Jerusalem's sanctity before the Crusades was noted by E. Sivan; see "The Faḍā'il al-Quds Literature," *Israel Oriental Studies*, 1 (1970): 263-71, esp. p. 266.
 20. Al-Wasīṭī, accounts 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 26, 27, 28, 35, 49, 85, 108, 134, 135, 142, 150, 153.
 21. *Ibid.*, 5, 6, 8, 10, 22, 46, 47.
 22. *Ibid.*, 73, 99, 117, 119, 147, 155-164.
 23. *Ibid.*, 18, 24, 25, 41, 55, 114, 115, 116, 118.
 24. *Ibid.*, 8, 36, 39, 44, 57, 58, 87, 88, 121, 149.
 25. Ka'b al-Ahbar is inextricably linked to Jerusalem in Islamic tradition. Al-Wasīṭī's book has twenty-seven reports recorded on his authority. See also the introduction to al-Wasīṭī, p. 15, *EP*, vol. 4, art. "Ka'b al-Ahbar"; M. J. Kister discussed the role of Ka'b in transmitting Jewish traditions to Islam in his "Ḥaddithū 'an Banī Isrā'īla wa-lā Ḥaraj," *Israel Oriental Studies*, 2 (1972): 215-39, pp. 229-32, 236. For a short bibliography of Ka'b, see Ibn Sa'd, 7: 445. The circumstances of his conversion established his acceptance as an authority in the question of Biblical prophecies. See al-Waqidī (748-823), *Futūḥ al-Shām*, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1946), pp. 153-54 (hereafter cited as al-Waqidī); also al-Azdi (d. 845) *Tarikh Futūḥ al-Shām*, ed. A. M. 'Amer (Cairo, 1970), pp. 259-62.
 26. See Ibn Sa'd, 7: 445.
 27. See *ibid.*, pp. 493-96, for a biography of 'Abdallah. He seems to have been able to read Syriac. Another source reported that the Prophet told 'Abdallah, "You will read the two books, the Torah and the Furqān [Quran];" see Kister, "Ḥaddithū 'an banī Isrā'īla wa-lā Ḥaraj," p. 231.
 28. See Y. W. Hirschberg, "The Sources of Moslem Tradition concerning Jerusalem," *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 17 (1951-52): 314-50; also H. Busse, "The Sanctity of Jerusalem in Islam," *Judaism* 17 (1968): 441-68. For an overview of the prophetic legends and their role in the formation of Islamic traditions, see R. G. Khoury, *Les légendes prophétiques dans l'Islam depuis le I^{er} jusqu'au II^e siècle de l'Hégire* (Wiesbaden, 1978).
 29. Although an unclear report on the *mi'rāj* is inserted at the end of al-Wasīṭī's traditions 117 and 162, account 117 was rejected in al-Nūwayrī, *Nihāyat al-'Arab*, ed. A. M. al-Bijawī (Cairo, 1976), vol. 1, p. 338, and 162 was doubted by al-Zarakshī, *A'lām al-Sajid bi Ahkām al-Masājid*, ed. A. W. al-Murāghī (Cairo, 1965), p. 298.
 30. Ibn Sa'd dated the *mi'rāj* to the 17th of Ramadan eighteen months before the hijra (immigration to Medina), and reported that it took place from the Ka'ba area in Mecca; the *isrā'* is dated to the 17th of Rabi' al-Awwal one year before the hijra, and started reportedly from the area around Abu-Taleb's house (Abu-Taleb was the Prophet's uncle and guardian), see Ibn Sa'd, 1: 213-14. As for the later adaptations, see Grabar 1, pp. 62-63.
 31. *Ibid.*, also A. Guillaume, "Where Was al-Masjid al-Aqsa?"
 32. See Grabar 1, pp. 42 ff. where an Abrahamic association with the Rock is emphasized. This, however, does not show in any of al-Wasīṭī's accounts. Furthermore, there is more confusion about the location of the Sacrifice of Abraham than about the *mi'rāj* in early Islamic sources; see, for example, al-Azraqī (d. 864), *Akhbār Makka*, ed. R. S. Mulhīs (Dar al-Andalus, n.d.), vol. 2, p. 175.
 33. See the introduction to al-Wasīṭī's book, pp. 10-19; also M. J. Kister, "You Shall Only Set Out for Three Mosques: A Study of an Early Tradition," *Le Museon* 82 (1969): 173-96.
 34. Quran, Surat Sad (38), also called Surat Banu-Isrā'il (the Jews). The two prophet-kings David and Solomon are extolled in many verses, esp. verses 16, 25, 34. Also, Quran, Surat al-Mā'ida (5: 20-21).
 35. See Grabar 2, pp. 11-12; also, *EP*, vol. 5, art. "al-Kuds," p. 324.
 36. See, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munnajid, *Mu'jam Banī Umayya* (Beirut, 1970), p. 173 (hereafter cited as al-Munnajid). Al-Munnajid extracted the biographies of all the Umayyads from the encyclopedic *Tarikh Dimashq* of Ibn 'Asakir; also al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tarikh Baghdad* (Beirut, n.d.), vol. 1, pp. 207-9. An earlier source reported a similar account; see Naṣr ibn Muzāhem al-Manqarī (737-827), *Waq'at Ṣiffīn*, ed. A. S. M. Haroun (Cairo, 1945) (hereafter cited as al-Manqarī), p. 244, where Naṣr is reporting the story of a Syrian who had heard the Prophet say that an "infidel" would be elected at the Lodd

- Gate. The Syrian continued, "When Mu'awiya was elected at the Lodd Gate, near Jerusalem, I left his group and joined 'Ali's." Nasr, a Kufan, was the first Shi'ī narrator (*akhbārī*). Thus, his inclinations are pro-'Ali, and his hatred of Mu'awiya is obvious. His story is definitely invented, given his capability as an *akhbārī*, but nonetheless it might be taken as a Shi'ī exaggeration of a real event, namely Mu'awiya taking the *bay'at* in Jerusalem. For Nasr's role in the development of the *akhbār* genre, and his bias, see Duri, pp. 47-48.
37. *Hibr*, from the Hebrew *haber*, is the scholarly title ranked immediately below *rabbi*; see *EP*, vol. 4, art. "Ka'b al-Aḥbār." Thus, this reported diviner was probably a Jewish theologian; if so, it reinforces the hypothesis of a Jewish influence on the Umayyad-Muslim view of Jerusalem.
 38. Al-Ṭabarī, *Tarikh al-rusul wal-mulūk*, ed. M. A. F. Ibrahim (Cairo, 1963), vol. 4, pp. 560-61. Al-Ṭabarī related this account on the authority of the controversial Sayf ibn 'Umar (d. 796) who basically presented the Iraqi viewpoint and benefited from the accounts (*akhbār*) of his own tribe Tamim, which opposed the Umayyads. Therefore, although this is an invented *khabar*, it is very difficult to consider 'Umar as the inventor of a story that could eventually be used for the glorification of Mu'awiya, unless we take into account that this story may show Mu'awiya as inclined toward non-Islamic traditions. For Sayf, see Duri, pp. 46, 140-42.
 39. See *EP*, vol. 5, art. "al-Ḳuds," p. 324; also, *EP*, vol. 1, art. "Amr b. al-ʿĀs," p. 451. On the details of the pact between 'Amrū and Mu'awiya, see al-Manqarī, pp. 39-50.
 40. It seems that the expression, the Holy Land, was not strictly applied to Jerusalem in the early Islamic period. Goitein has suggested that it might have been taken to mean all of Bilād al-Shām, probably under the influence of Christian as well as Jewish traditions. See S. D. Goitein, "The Sanctity of Jerusalem and Palestine in Early Islam," pp. 145-48. See also al-Waqidi, 1: 154, where Bilād al-Shām as a whole is identified as the Holy Land, the land of the Prophets, and the place to which people will be gathered on the Day of Resurrection.
 41. See al-Maqrizī, p. 37; also Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 1504-5), *Tarikh al-Khulafā'*, ed. M. M. D. 'Abd-al-Hamid (Cairo, 1964), p. 195. Even 'Ali ibn-Abī Ṭālib, Mu'awiya's rival, is said to have heard a prophetic saying to the same effect; see al-Munnajid, p. 172.
 42. See Khalifa ibn Khayyāt, *Tarikh*, ed. A. D. al-'Umarī (Najaf, 1967), vol. 1, p. 205. The event is reported in the year 52 (672), in which Mu'awiya designated Yazid as his successor.
 43. See the introduction to al-Wasiṭī, p. 20; also *EP*, vol. 5, art. "al-Ḳuds," pl. 324. They both reported the same source, al-Azdī, *al-Bid' wal-Tarikh*, vol. 4 (Paris, 1899), p. 87.
 44. Al-Waqidi reported an account from which we can understand that 'Umar established (*khaff*) a mihrab (sanctuary?) to the east of the city when he entered it. Al-Waqidi wrote that "it is in the place where the Mosque of 'Umar stands now [ca. 200 A.H.], with no reference to Mu'awiya; see, al-Waqidi, vol. 1, p. 152.
 45. See the discussion of the identification of al-Bayt al-Muqaddas in F. E. Peters, *Jerusalem*, pp. 187-91. He mentions many reports on 'Umar's search for the sanctuary.
 46. Sketched in Grabar 2, pp. 10-14.
 47. See al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashraf*, vol. 5, ed. S. D. Goitein (Jerusalem, 1938), pp. 158-80. This could have been the period in which 'Abd al-Malik established his connection with Jerusalem and started contemplating the building of the Dome.
 48. See, Khalifa ibn Khayyāt, *Tarikh*, 1: 257; this event may have strengthened 'Abd al-Malik's link to the city.
 49. Al-Wasiṭī, account 138, p. 86; another source, almost contemporary, added more details to this account, from which we can detect a stronger link to the Jewish tradition; see, *ibid.*, note 1. This other book of *fada'īl* written by Abu al-Ma'ali ibn al-Marja is being edited by E. Sivan; see, "Faḍā'il al-Ḳuds Literature," p. 264.
 50. The Dome's dating inscription reads, "The servant of God 'Abd [Allah the Imam al-Ma'mūn] has built this Dome in the year two and seventy, God accept [it] of him." Max van Berchem has shown that al-Ma'mūn substituted his name in the place of 'Abd al-Malik's, without changing the date. The original inscription read [al-Malik] instead. See Max van Berchem, *Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum*, II, *Jerusalem, Haram*, vol. 2 (Cairo, 1927), pp. 237-39.
 51. Al-Wasiti recorded an account of 'Abd al-Malik's coming to Jerusalem and ordering the building of the Dome, with an extensive description of the ritualistic treatments of the Dome and the Rock; see, al-Wasiṭī, account 136, pp. 81-82. The same account appears in later *fada'īl* texts as well, but it seems that this is its original form which later books copied, sometimes verbatim. See for example, al-'Ulammi, *al-Uns*, pp. 272-75; also al-Suyūṭī al-Minhājī (d. 1475) *Ithāf al-Ikḥṣā bi-Fada'īl al-Masjid al-Aqṣā*, ed. Paul Lemming (Copenhagen, 1817), pp. 13-14.
 52. See W. Ahlwardt, *Anonyme Arabische Chronik*, vol. 2 (hereafter Ahlwardt), (Greifswald, 1883), pp. 1-78, 266-356. This is the part of Baladhuri's *Ansāb* that chronicles the reign of 'Abd al-Malik. These sections of the *Ansāb* discuss the revolts of Mus'ab b. al-Zubayr, 'Abd-Allah b. al-Zubayr, the Kharejites (including the Azariqas), the Slaves and 'Abd al-Rahman b. al-Ash'ath. Al-Baladhuri (d. 892) is probably the most reliable source on the Umayyads, for he is known to have tried to give a balanced image to the accounts he chronicled, despite his connections with the Abbasids. His sources were mostly Medinese, and some of them were even close to the Umayyads. Moreover, he was among the first historians to have methodically organized the materials available to him; see Duri, pp. 61-64.
 53. For the major dates in the reign of 'Abd al-Malik see, *EP*, art. "'Abd al-Malik," vol. 1, pp. 76-77, written by H. A. R. Gibb.
 54. See, for example, I. A. al-'Adawi, *Al-Umayyūn wal Byzantiyyūn* (Cairo, 1964), pp. 205-8.
 55. This seems to have remained the case in Jerusalem until later times, for al-Muqqadisi (d. 895) in his *Aḥsan al-Taqāsīm fi-Ma'rifat al-Aqālīm* (Leiden, 1877-1906), vol. 4, p. 165, wrote, "Jerusalem is a town whose 'ulamā are few and whose Christians are many."
 56. See *EP*, art. "al-Ḳuds," vol. 5, pp. 323-25.
 57. See Hirschberg, p. 320; he reached a similar conclusion but stressed the Judaizing tendencies and underestimated the role of the Islamic context that used and transformed these tendencies.
 58. Al-Wasiṭī's account 24, pp. 21-22, Wadi Jahannam could be understood in two ways, but both have the same connotation. The first is literally "the Valley of Hell." The second is related to the prophecy that called the eastern side of the temple Wadi Jahannam, because it was believed to be the real gate to Hell, see, al-Wasiṭī, account 15, p. 14.
 59. See, Peters, *Jerusalem*, pp. 185-99.
 60. *Ibid.*, p. 198.
 61. See, Grabar 1, pp. 55-56.
 62. The text of al-Ya'qubi can be found in K. A. C. Creswell, *Early*

- Muslim Architecture*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1932), p. 43. Creswell seems to have incorrectly accepted this explanation for the building of the Dome. As for Eutychius, see Eutychius ibn al-Baṭrīq, *Annales*, ed. L. Cheikho et al., in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* (Paris, 1909), ser. 3, vol. 7, pp. 39 ff.
63. Grabar 1, pp. 35-36, also *EP*, art. "al-Ḳuds," vol. 5, p. 325; also Peters, *Jerusalem*, pp. 190-91.
64. Al-Ḥajjaj is known to have led the hajj during and after the final attack against Ibn al-Zubair in Mecca (692). See Ibn Sa'd, 5: 228-29, also Khalīfa b. Khayyāt, *Tarikh*, 1: 257. Al-Husayn b. al-Numayr, the leader of Yazid I's army against Ibn al-Zubayr (683) did the same thing as al-Ḥajjaj, see, al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashraf* (hereafter *Ansab* 2), vol. 4, pt. 2, ed. M. Schloessinger (Jerusalem, 1938), pp. 52-53.
65. Ibn Sa'd, 5: 231-33; also Ahlwardt, p. 186.
66. See, M. J. Kister "You Shall Only Set Out for Three Mosques," p. 182. The dating of the poem to 694 stems from the fact that al-Farazdaq addresses 'Abd al-Malik in the opening few verses using the title Ibn Marwan, and later on he describes the caliph's leading the hajj procession as it comes down from Mīna, after the ritual throwing of stones, to the Ka'ba. 'Abd al-Malik is known to have performed the hajj only once after he became caliph, in 75 A.H.
67. Al-Farazdaq, *Dīwān al-Farazdaq* (Beirut, 1960), vol. 2, pp. 31-33.
68. See, al-Balādhurī, *Ansab* 2, p. 67. This account is recorded on the authority of 'Awana ibn al-Hakam (d. 764), who might have had inside knowledge of the Umayyads' affairs. Some of his reported accounts are suspected to reflect the Umayyad viewpoint, which in this case is what we are interested in (see Duri, pp. 141-43).
69. See *EP*, vol. 1, art., "'Abd al-Malik," pp. 76-77.
70. See al-Munnajid, p. 112. The report is on the authority of Ibn 'Umar, the famous scholar and son of the second caliph 'Umar, who described 'Abd al-Malik as a *faqīh* second in rank to the companions of the Prophet; see also, Ibn Sa'd, vol. 5, p. 234. Recorded in Ibn Sa'd, 5: 233; also, al-Munnajid, p. 115.
71. See esp. Ahlwardt, pp. 177-79, for Baladhuri's report of 'Abd al-Malik's speech to the people of Medina, in which he forcefully lays down the law, saying, "There are no games we will not tolerate except climbing the minbar [i.e., officially denouncing the caliph] and raising a flag [i.e., starting a revolt]."
72. Abu-Hurayra, the famous hadith transmitter, is reported to have said upon meeting the young 'Abd al-Malik, "This man will rule the Arabs." See al-Suyūṭī, *Tarikh al-Khulafā'*, p. 216. Umm al-Duradā', the pious wife of the first Muslim qadī of Bilad al-Sham, pointed out 'Abd al-Malik's qualifications for the caliphate (see al-Munnajid, p. 112). Mu'awiya himself and 'Amru ibn al-'As had reportedly noticed his natural abilities and skills (see Ibn Sa'd, 5:224).
73. See, Ahlwardt, pp. 258-59.
74. *Ibid.*, 254. Al-Baladhuri reported these two accounts on the authority of al-Mada'ini (752-839), who is known to have written narratives more balanced than those of previous narrators (*akhbāriyyun*). He also had direct access to Umayyad documents, see Duri, pp. 46-49, 145-48.
75. For the Aqsa Mosque, see, for example, Henri Stern, "Recherches sur la mosquée al-Aqsa," *Ars Orientalis* 5 (1963): 28-48. In addition to the possible work of Mu'awiya and the documented works of 'Abd al-Malik and al-Walid, we can see the construction of what appears to be an Umayyad palace complex outside the southern wall of the platform, and connected with the Aqsa Mosque as a later contribution to this progressive program of transformation. For the complex's excavation and plans and for a discussion of its connection with the mosque, see M. Ben Dov, "The Area South of the Temple Mount in the Islamic Period," *Jerusalem Revealed* (Jerusalem, 1975), pp. 97-101. A brief interpretation of this Umayyad program is given in Peters, *Jerusalem*, p. 201.