

*The Institute of Asian and African Studies
The Max Schloessinger Memorial Foundation*

Offprint from

JERUSALEM STUDIES IN
ARABIC AND ISLAM

35(2008)

Amikam Elad

**ʿAbd al-Malik and the Dome of the Rock:
a further examination of the Muslim sources**

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM
THE FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

‘ABD AL-MALIK AND THE DOME OF THE ROCK: A FURTHER EXAMINATION OF THE MUSLIM SOURCES

Amikam Elad

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Introduction

One of the important issues in the discussion concerning Greater Syria (*al-Shām*) in general, and Palestine and Jerusalem in particular in the Umayyad period, relates to the reasons for the building of the Dome of the Rock. The 19th and early 20th century scholars¹ saw in ‘Abd al-Malik’s building of the Dome of the Rock a clear manifestation of the Umayyad desire to transfer the political centre of the caliphate to Jerusalem. Goldziher consolidated and developed the opinions and evaluations presented by earlier scholars, arguing that by erecting the Dome of the Rock, ‘Abd al-Malik intended to divert the pilgrimage from Mecca to Jerusalem because Mecca was at the time under the complete control of his rival caliph, ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr.²

When the Umayyad caliph ‘Abd al-Malik wished to stop the pilgrimage to Mecca because he was worried lest his rival ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr should force the Syrians journeying to the holy places in Ḥijāz to pay homage, he had recourse to the expedient of the doctrine of the vicarious *ḥajj* to the Qubbat al-Ṣakhra in Jerusalem. He decreed that the obligatory circumambulation (*tawāf*) could take place at the sacred place in Jerusalem with the same validity as that around the Ka‘ba ordained in Islamic law.³

Goldziher’s basic thesis was rejected by Goitein, who argued that the original incentive for the appreciation of the sanctity of Palestine in

¹Elad, *Jerusalem*, pp. 147–148.

²Goldziher, *Muslim studies*, vol. 2, pp. 44–46 (= *Muhammedanische Studies* [Halle, 1889–1890], vol. 2, pp. 35–36).

³Goldziher, *Muslim studies*, vol. 2, p. 44; see also *ibid.*, pp. 45–46.

early Islam should not be sought in the field of politics, but rather in the field of religion.⁴ Regarding the thesis proposed by Goldziher and his school, Goitein maintains that

there is no foundation to surmise that the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem was created in order to divert the Muslim pilgrimage from the holy sites of Islam to those of Judaism and Christianity... The erection of the Dome of the Rock was prompted by the cultural needs of the second generation of the Muslims. It was intended — as proven by its inscriptions — as a means of rivalry with the Christians and as an appeal to them to join the new religion, which, so to say, incorporated their own.⁵

Most contemporary scholars support Goitein's thesis. They do not think that the Dome of the Rock was intended to compete with the Ka'ba and certainly not to replace it.⁶ The controversy between Goitein and Goldziher is general and extensive, and concerns the reasons and background for the increased status of Syria, and more specifically Jerusalem, in the Umayyad period. The discussion regarding the Dome of the Rock is only one sub-topic in the context of this wider discussion, which is in itself subordinate to the overall polemics concerning the status and sanctity of Syria in the Umayyad period.

Regarding the sanctity of al-Shām, Goitein relies on several traditions, in which the Holy Land (termed by Goitein "Eretz Israel" in his Hebrew version of the article, and "Palestine" in the English version) is mentioned. In his opinion, these traditions attest to the unique religious status they wish to impart to the Holy Land.⁷

I wish to suggest that these traditions can be understood in a different way. They were created and developed by scholars in the Umayyad period, under the inspiration and direction of the Umayyads — on whom these scholars depended. These traditions reflect the Umayyad desire to exalt the political and religious importance of al-Shām (including Palestine), in opposition to the Ḥijāz, the old political and religious centre.⁸ The tradition in praise of Jerusalem certainly existed in the Jewish and Christian traditions before the emergence of Islam, but the

⁴Goitein, "The sanctity of the Holy Land," p. 26; *idem*, "The sanctity of Jerusalem," pp. 140, 148.

⁵Goitein, "The sanctity of Jerusalem," p. 147; see also *idem*, "The historical background," pp. 104–108, *idem*, "al-Ḳuds," *EI*², s.v.

⁶For a partial list of these scholars, see Elad, *Jerusalem*, p. 159, note 53.

⁷Goitein, "The sanctity of the Holy Land," pp. 26–28; *idem*, "The sanctity of Jerusalem," pp. 143–146.

⁸Elad, *Jerusalem*, pp. 149–153; *idem*, "Jerusalem during the Umayyad period," pp. 26–29.

Umayyads began to spread them and enriched them with new, Islamic elements.

In this article, I shall reexamine Goitein's thesis, while reviewing his argument and the textual evidence on which they are based.

A) Al-Yaʿqūbī's testimony: the problem of the textual evidence

I have extensively dealt with this subject elsewhere, but a summary of the arguments is in order.⁹

The essential evidence (or as Goitein calls it, the "Crown witness") on which Goldziher based his thesis is found in al-Yaʿqūbī. Goitein concentrates on refuting this historian's reliability: due to his Shīʿī bias, his testimony must be considered anti-Umayyad.¹⁰ This observation was accepted by the scholars.

Today, however, the opinion that al-Yaʿqūbī's moderate Shīʿī outlook completely distorted his historical writing is not accepted.¹¹ By examining the methodology of early Arabic historiography and its various aspects, it is possible to rebut this negative view of al-Yaʿqūbī's work.¹² Furthermore, I demonstrated that al-Yaʿqūbī's description is not the only one in the early Muslim sources (as Goitein thought). We now have a number of other early sources that confirm al-Yaʿqūbī's report. On the one hand, his report on the rituals and ceremonies on the Ḥaram and in the Dome of the Rock in the period of ʿAbd al-Malik is confirmed by the early traditions included in the Praises of Jerusalem (*faḍāʾil al-Quds*) literature. These traditions are much longer and more detailed than al-Yaʿqūbī's short report that Goitein used and attempted to refute.¹³

On the other hand, other sources confirm al-Yaʿqūbī's assertion that the central motive for building the Dome of the Rock was politico-religious: the struggle against the rival caliph, ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr.

⁹Elad, "ʿAbd al-Malik," pp. 41–44; *idem*, "Jerusalem during the Umayyad period," pp. 32–34.

¹⁰Goitein, "The sanctity of the Holy Land," p. 25; *idem*, "The sanctity of Jerusalem," pp. 136–137; *idem*, "The historical background," pp. 104–105.

¹¹Duri, "Historical writing," p. 66; Rosenthal, *Historiography*, pp. 64, 134; but esp. Marquet, "Yaʿqūbī."

¹²Following the observations of Khālīdī, *Arabic historical thought*, p. 226; see also Duri, *op. cit.*, pp. 66–67; Humphreys, *Islamic history*, pp. 72, 102–103; Rosenthal, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

¹³Elad, "ʿAbd al-Malik," pp. 39–40.

No less than four early important historians emphasize that this was ‘Abd al-Malik’s sole reason for building the Dome of the Rock.¹⁴ This tradition is found in late sources; however, they were not influenced by al-Ya‘qūbī — as Goitein thought¹⁵ — and they did not copy his tradition. On the contrary, they relied on other texts, in particular that of Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī.¹⁶

B) The imitation of the Meccan *ḥajj* ceremonies in
Jerusalem and in other cities in the early Islamic period:
the problem of *al-ta‘rīf*

In one place Goitein mentions that al-Ya‘qūbī reports on the performance of the *ṭawāf* in Jerusalem during the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik and other Umayyad caliphs.¹⁷

He further develops this point, referring to a single testimony (from 1047) of Nāṣir-i Khusraw, who described the performance of some major *ḥajj* rites in Jerusalem, such as the *wuqūf* (standing before mount ‘Arafa/‘Arafāt near Mecca during the *ḥajj*), and the sacrifice during the “Feast of Sacrifice” (*‘īd al-aḍḥā*) by those who cannot perform the *ḥajj* to Mecca.¹⁸ Nāṣir-i Khusraw’s testimony, continues Goitein, “has sometimes been quoted as a corroboration of Goldziher’s above mentioned thesis.”¹⁹ It is noteworthy, however, that al-Ya‘qūbī, does not mention the *wuqūf* ceremonies but only the *ṭawāf* — in this case the circumambulation of the Dome of the Rock instead of the Ka‘ba.

Neither does Sa‘īd b. al-Biṭrīq (Euty chius) mention the *ta‘rīf* (the verbal noun derived from *‘arrafa* — the performance of the *wuqūf* ceremonies in front of Mount ‘Arafa), but in general relates that ‘Abd al-Malik forced his subjects to perform the *ḥajj* rituals in Jerusalem.²⁰ But Goitein connected the descriptions of al-Ya‘qūbī and Euty chius that relate to the Umayyad period with the much later evidence of Nāṣir-i

¹⁴For a full discussion, see Elad, “‘Abd al-Malik,” pp. 38–40, 47–48, 50–51.

¹⁵Goitein, “The historical background,” pp. 104–105.

¹⁶See the full discussion in Elad, “‘Abd al-Malik”.

¹⁷Goitein, “The sanctity of the Holy Land,” p. 25.

¹⁸Nāṣir-i Khusraw, *Safar Nāme*, pp. 19–20 (Arabic translation); Le Strange, *Palestine*, p. 88 (English translation); Goitein, “al-Ḳuds”, p. 325; *idem*, “The historical background,” p. 105; *idem*, “The sanctity of Jerusalem”, p. 137; Nāṣir-i Khusraw records that in certain years more than 20,000 people came to these ceremonies. Goitein, “Jerusalem in the Arab period,” p. 189, argues that this is a standard number used by Nāṣir-i Khusraw in his descriptions.

¹⁹Goitein, “The historical background,” p. 105.

²⁰Ibn al-Biṭrīq, *Ta‘rīkh*, p. 39; see also Elad, “‘Abd al-Malik,” pp. 44–45.

Khusraw (from 1047), who specifically mentions the *wuqūf* ceremony in Jerusalem.

This connection was based on the well-known fact that *al-taʿrīf* ceremonies were also held in several important cities in the early period, and therefore, adds Goitein, one should not attribute a special importance to Jerusalem, or to attribute the reason for these ceremonies to the struggle between ʿAbd al-Malik and ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr.

According to Goitein, these ceremonies were held in the following cities:

1) Al-Baṣra, during ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib’s reign (r. 36/656–40/661); *al-taʿrīf* ceremony was introduced by the governor of the city, ʿAbd Allāh b. al-ʿAbbās (d. 68/687).²¹

2) Al-Fuṣṭāṭ, by ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Marwān b. al-Ḥakam (d. 85/704), the brother of ʿAbd al-Malik, who served as the governor of Egypt during the caliphate of his father, Marwān (r. 64/684–65/685) and his brother, ʿAbd al-Malik (r. 65/685–86/705).²²

Other testimonies bear witness to the performance of special ceremonies on “Arafa day” (*yawm ʿArafa*) in other Muslim cities: al-Kūfa in al-ʿIrāq and al-Madīna in al-Ḥijāz. This confirms Goitein’s argument that these ceremonies were a very early phenomenon.

Nevertheless, it seems that *al-taʿrīf* ceremonies in Jerusalem merit a different explanation and deserve a more comprehensive and detailed study.

B.1) The ʿArafa day (*yawm ʿArafa*) ceremonies in al-Kūfa, al-Baṣra, al-Madīna and al-Fuṣṭāṭ

1) **Al-Kūfa.** Special ceremonies were held in the city on *yawm ʿArafa* by ʿAmr b. Ḥurayth b. ʿAmr b. ʿUthmān al-Makhzūmī (d. 85/705).²³

²¹This is the accepted year of his death; there are also other dates ranging from 64 AH to 70 AH; on him, see Sezgin, *GAS*, I, pp. 25–28.

²²Goitein, “The historical background,” p. 105; *idem*, “al-Ḳuds,” p. 325; in both articles the reference is only to Egypt (according to Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm* [ed. Juynboll and Matthews], p. 207); the reference to al-Baṣra is missing.

²³Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaḡ*, vol. 3, p. 287: Sufyān [al-Thawrī? Ibn ʿUyayna?] < Mūsā b. Abī ʿĀʿisha: “I saw ʿAmr b. Ḥurayth delivering a sermon on “Arafa’s Day”, when people had already gathered to hear him” رأيت عمرو بن حريث يخطب يوم عرفة وقد اجتمع الناس إليه; see also al-Suyūṭī, *al-Durr al-manthūr*, vol. 1, p. 231: quoting from the works of Ibn Abī Shayba and al-Marwazī [unidentified] from Mūsā b. Abī ʿĀʿisha; al-Qurṭubī, *Tafsīr*, vol. 2, p. 419; on Mūsā b. Abī ʿĀʿisha al-Hamdānī al-Makhzūmī, *mawlā ʿAl Jaʿda b. Hubayra*, the direct transmitter and eye witness, see al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 6, pp. 150–151; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb* (Beirut, 1984), vol. 10, p. 314; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Maʿrūf), vol. 29, pp. 90–91.

‘Amr b. al-Ḥurayth was a distinguished *sharīf* in al-Kūfa. He served as the deputy governor of the city on behalf of its famous governors Ziyād b. Abī Sufyān (known as Ziyād b. Abīhi, governor of al-Kūfa and al-Baṣra 50/670–53/673) and the latter’s son, ‘Ubaydallāh b. Ziyād (governor from 55/675 until some time after the death of caliph Yazīd b. Mu‘āwiya in 64/683). He also served as the head of the *shurṭa* of al-Kūfa on behalf of ‘Ubaydallāh b. Ziyād²⁴ and as the governor of al-Kūfa on behalf of Bishr b. Marwān, ‘Abd al-Malik’s brother in 73/692–693 and 74/693–694.²⁵ Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal related that he was the first to introduce the *ta‘rīf* ceremony [in al-Kūfa],²⁶ but according to other sources it was Muṣ‘ab b. al-Zubayr (d. 72/691),²⁷ the governor of the city on behalf of his brother (from 67/686–72/691), who first introduced the *ta‘rīf* ceremony in al-Kūfa.²⁸

2) Al-Madīna. The Spanish scholar Ibn Waḍḍāḥ (Muḥammad b. Waḍḍāḥ b. Bazī‘, 199/815–286/899) records a tradition²⁹, according to which on the “Day of ‘Arafa,” Nāfi‘, the *mawlā* of ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar

²⁴See al-Ṭabarī, *Ta‘rīkh* (index); Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb* (Beirut, 1984), vol. 8, p. 16; Ibn Zabar, *Mawlid al-‘ulamā’*, vol. 1, p. 211; al-Shaybānī, *al-Āḥād wa-l-mathānī*, vol. 2, p. 36; al-Dhahabī, *al-Kāshif*, vol. 2, p. 74; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Ma‘rūf), vol. 21, pp. 580–582; the head of the *shurṭa*: Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 6, p. 74; Ibn Ḥanbal, *al-‘Ilal*, vol. 2, p. 210; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Ma‘rūf), vol. 6, p. 426.

²⁵Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta‘rīkh*, 2nd series, pp. 853, ll. 15–16; 857, ll. 12–13.

²⁶Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī, *al-Mughnī*, vol. 2, p. 129.

²⁷On the rebellion and its suppression by ‘Abd al-Malik, see H. Lammens-[Ch. Pellat], “Muṣ‘ab b. al-Zubayr,” *EI*², s.v.; Dixon, *The Umayyad caliphate*, index, esp. pp. 123–134; Hawting, *The first dynasty*, pp. 48–49.

²⁸Kister, “On concessions and conduct,” p. 104, note 140 on p. 229, quoting al-Mawṣilī, *Ghāyat al-waṣā’ il ilā ma‘rifat al-awā’il*, MS Cambridge Qq 33 (10), fol. 53a; see also Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaf*, vol. 7, p. 274: أول من عرف بالكوفة مصعب بن الزبير; the *isnād* is garbled (Yazīd Abū Shayba < al-Ḥakam); the correction of the *isnād* according to Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta‘rīkh* (Beirut ed.), vol. 58, p. 228: ...Abū ‘Alī al-Ṣawwāf < Muḥammad b. ‘Uthmān b. Abī Shayba [d. 297/900] < his father [d. 239/853] < **Yazīd b. Ḥārūn** [b. Zādhān d. 206/821] < **Abū Shayba** [Ibrāhīm b. ‘Uthmān al-‘Absī, the *Qaḍī* of Wāsiṭ, d. 169/785–86;] < **al-Ḥakam** [b. ‘Utayba b. Sinān, d. 113/731–32 or 114/732–33 or 115/733–34]; Abū Shāma, *al-Bā‘ith*, vol. 1, p. 33. On Abū Shayba, see Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ* (Beirut ed.), vol. 2, p. 115; al-Bukhārī, *al-Kabīr* (ed. al-Nadwī), vol. 1, p. 310; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Ma‘rūf), vol. 2, pp. 147–151; vol. 7, p. 114; al-Dhahabī, *Mizān* (Beirut, 1995), vol. 1, pp. 169–170. On al-Ḥakam b. ‘Utayba, see al-Bukhārī, *al-Kabīr* (ed. al-Nadwī), vol. 2, pp. 333–334; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ* (Beirut ed.), vol. 3, pp. 123–124; Ibn al-Qaysarānī, *Tadhkirā*, vol. 1, p. 117; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 5, pp. 208–213; see also, al-Suyūṭī, *al-Durr al-manthūr*, vol. 1, p. 231: al-Marwazī [in his work] from al-Ḥakam.

²⁹The *isnād* is: Muḥammad b. Waḍḍāḥ < Zayd b. al-Bishr < Ibn Wahb [d. 197/813] < al-Layth [b. Sa‘d, d. 94/713] < Abū Ḥafṣ al-Madanī [who was most probably ‘Umar b. ‘Abd Allāh *mawlā* Ghafira bint Rabāḥ the sister of Bilāl (the *mu’adhdhin* of the Prophet) d. 145/762–763]. See al-Bukhārī, *al-Kabīr* (ed. al-Nadwī), vol. 6, p. 169; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ* (Beirut ed.), vol. 6, p. 119; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb* (Beirut, 1984), vol. 7, p. 414; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Ma‘rūf), vol. 21, pp. 420–422.

b. al-Khaṭṭāb (d. between 116/734–35 and 120/737–38) went out to the people who gathered at the Prophet’s mosque after *al-‘asr* prayer offering prayers of request and supplications (*du‘ā*). He told them that what they were doing is considered a *bid‘a* and not *sunna*.³⁰

3) Al-Baṣra. There is substantial evidence that the *ta‘rīf* ceremonies in the city were first carried out by ‘Abd Allāh b. al-‘Abbās (d. 68/687) when he was governor during ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib’s reign (35/656–40/661). It is clear, therefore, that these ceremonies do not have any relation to the struggle between ‘Abd al-Malik and Ibn al-Zubayr, which took place more than twenty years later. Many of these testimonies are recorded from the great Baṣran scholar, al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110/728): “The first who carried out the *ta‘rīf* ceremonies in al-Baṣra was ‘Abd Allāh b. al-‘Abbās.”³¹

The well-known Egyptian scholar al-Quḍā‘ī (d. 454/1062)³² quotes al-Jāḥiẓ (d. 255/868–69) from the latter’s (lost) book *Nazm al-Qur‘ān*,³³ where he stated that ‘Abd Allāh b. al-‘Abbās was the first who established the practice of *al-ta‘rīf* in major city mosques.³⁴

4) Al-Fuṣṭāṭ. Arab historians of medieval Egypt, among whom the earliest is al-Kindī (d. 350/951), record that ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Marwān [‘Abd al-Malik’s brother] was the first who performed the *ta‘rīf* ceremonies in the city in 71 [691].³⁵ Noteworthy are Ibn Taghrībirdī’s

³⁰Ibn Waḍḍāḥ, *al-Bida‘*, pp. 62–63: إن الذي أُنتم فيه بدعة وليس بسنة; Abū Shāma, *al-Bā‘ith*, vol. 1, p. 3 copies Ibn Waḍḍāḥ omitting the *isnād*; al-Suyūṭī, *al-Amr bi-‘l-ittibā‘*, p. 182: the same tradition copying Abū Shāma; on Ibn Waḍḍāḥ, see al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 13, pp. 445–446; al-Ziriklī, *al-A‘lām*, vol. 7, p. 358; Kaḥḥāla, *Mu‘jam*, vol. 12, p. 94; Sezgin, *GAS*, vol. 1, pp. 474–475.

³¹أول من عرّف بالبصرة عبد الله بن العباس; see Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt* (Beirut ed.), vol. 2, p. 367; ‘Abd al-Razzāq, *al-Muṣannaf*, vol. 4, pp. 376–377; al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb* (ed. Dūrī), vol. 3, p. 34; Ibn Qutayba, *Gharīb al-ḥadīth*, vol. 2, p. 354; al-Jāḥiẓ, *al-Bayān wa-‘l-tabyīn*, vol. 1, pp. 83, 331; Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaf*, vol. 3, p. 287; vol. 7, pp. 257, 273; al-‘Askarī, *al-Awā‘il*, p. 209; al-Ṭabarānī, *al-Mu‘jam al-kabīr* (Mosul ed.), vol. 10, p. 265; Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī, *al-Mughnī*, vol. 2, p. 129; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya* (Beirut ed.), vol. 8, pp. 299–300, 302; Abū Shāma, *al-Bā‘ith*, vol. 1, p. 33; al-Dhahabī, *Ta‘rīkh* (ed. Tadmūrī: *ḥawādīth wa-wafayāt 61–80*), pp. 155, 159 (under year 68 AH); al-Qurṭubī, *Tafsīr*, vol. 2, p. 419; most of the *isnāds* of this tradition end with al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. From him the *isnāds* diverge to different transmitters.

³²See al-Quḍā‘ī, *al-Inbā‘*, pp. 6–19.

³³This source may be added to Pellat’s list of sources for this lost work; see Pellat, “Gāḥiẓiana III,” p. 172, no. 143 (*Kitāb fī ‘l-ihtijāj li-nazm al-Qur‘ān*).

³⁴Al-Quḍā‘ī, *al-Inbā‘*, p. 212: وذكر الجاحظ في كتاب نظم القرآن ان اول من سن التعريف في مساجد الامصار عبد الله بن العباس; Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, vol. 3, p. 72: copying the text of al-Quḍā‘ī verbatim, without mentioning his source; The first scholar to quote al-Quḍā‘ī’s book (still in MS form) was Kister; see *idem*, “Concessions and conduct,” pp. 104, 228 note 137 and the additional sources therein; al-Jāḥiẓ also mentioned this evidence twice in his *al-Bayān wa-‘l-tabyīn*, see note 31 above.

³⁵Al-Kindī, *Wulāt*, p. 72: وعرف عبد العزيز بن مروان بمصر وهو أول من عرف بها في سنة [691]; Kister, “Concession and conduct,” pp. 104, 228, note 138: quoting

words: “the sixth year of the governorship of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Marwān on Egypt, e.g., the year 71. In this year ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr *Amīr al-Mu’minīn* [!] stood at the head of the pilgrims (in Mecca), while in Egypt [al-Fuṣṭāṭ?] ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Marwān, the subject of the biography, carried out the ceremonies that are held at ‘Arafa. He was the first who carried out the ‘Arafa ceremonies in that city. He governed on behalf of his brother, *Amīr al-Mu’minīn* ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān.”³⁶

The special ceremonies that were held on “Day of ‘Arafa” in al-Fuṣṭāṭ were practiced in later periods as well: this we learn from the objection of the well-known scholar and the *qāḍī* of Egypt, al-Layth b. Sa‘d (94/713–175/791) to give this day any special distinction.³⁷

We have seen so far that the custom of gathering in the great mosque on the “Day of ‘Arafa” after the afternoon prayer, and of performing ceremonies there took place in several cities, and can be dated to an early period.³⁸

B.2) The nature of the “Day of ‘Arafa” ceremonies in various cities

We have information about these ceremonies mainly with regard to ‘Abd

al-Kindī; both al-Qudā‘ī (*al-Inbā’*, p. 212) and Ibn Khallikān (*Wafayāt*, vol. 3, p. 72 who copied the former) quote al-Kindī’s tradition; al-Maqrīzī, *Khīṭaṭ* (ed. Sayyid), vol. 2, p. 48; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm* (ed. Matthews and Juynboll), vol. 1, p. 207. It seems that al-Qudā‘ī collected two pieces of evidence that appear one after the other in al-Kindī’s work when he relates (*ibid.*): “Abū ‘Umar al-Kindī mentioned that ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Marwān was the first who established the custom of *ta‘rīf* in al-Fuṣṭāṭ (Egypt? Arabic: Miṣr) in the great mosque after the evening prayer, and this in the year 71” ان عبد العزيز بن مروان أول من سنَّ التعريف بمصر في الجامع بعد العصر وذلك في سنة 71. al-Qudā‘ī added to this evidence about the *ta‘rīf* in Egypt, segments from another line of al-Kindī (*Wulāt*, p. 72): “The first to introduce the new improper custom on ‘Arafa’s Day of sitting [?] in the mosque after the evening prayer was ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Marwān” ان أول من أحدث القعود يوم عرفة في المسجد بعد العصر عبد العزيز بن مروان.

³⁶Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm* (ed. Matthews and Juynboll), vol. 1, p. 207: السنة السادسة من ولاية عبد العزيز مصر وهي سنة إحدى وسبعين فيها حج بالناس أمير المؤمنين عبد الله بن الزبير وعرف بمصر عبد العزيز بن مروان صاحب الترجمة وهو أول من عرف بها فقام من قبل أخيه أمير المؤمنين عبد العزيز بن مروان وعرف بمصر. This text may be an adaptation of a similar tradition recorded by al-Dhahabī, *Ta‘rīkh* (ed. Tadmurī: *ḥawādith wa-wafayāt 61–80*), p. 300 (under year 71 AH).

³⁷Abū Shāma, *al-Bā‘ith*, vol. 1, p. 32; on al-Layth b. Sa‘d, see A. Merad, “al-Layth b. Sa‘d,” *EI*², s.v.

³⁸Al-‘Iṣāmī (d. 1111/1699–1700) concludes the discussion on the custom of *al-ta‘rīf* by saying: “It was said that the first to carry out *al-ta‘rīf* in al-Baṣra was ‘Abd Allāh b. al-‘Abbās, may God be pleased with both of them, while being its governor on behalf of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, may God be pleased with both of them, and in Egypt [that is, al-Fuṣṭāṭ] ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Marwān, ‘Abd al-Malik’s brother, and in Jerusalem ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān.” (Al-‘Iṣāmī, *Simṭ al-nujūm*, vol. 3, p. 158).

Allāh b. al-‘Abbās in al-Baṣra. Most of the evidence is quoted directly from al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, who relates that the Muslims gathered in the mosque on the eve of the “Day of ‘Arafa.” Ibn al-‘Abbās ascended the *minbar*, recited *Sūrat al-Baqara* (according to several sources he also recited *Sūrat Āl ‘Imrān*) and explained each and every verse.³⁹ These traditions emphasize that the gatherings were not meant to imitate the *hajj* rituals at Mount ‘Arafa, but rather to encourage communal study.⁴⁰

However, other traditions relate that in the gatherings led by Ibn ‘Abbās supplications were uttered and sermons were delivered, as was the custom at ‘Arafa.⁴¹ Some traditions relate that the gathering in the mosque was similar to that which took place during the *wuqūf* in front of Mount ‘Arafa. The intention to emulate the *wuqūf* ceremonies was the reason for performing the *ta‘rīf* ceremonies by Ibn al-‘Abbās in al-Baṣra.⁴²

Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī may have used Ibn ‘Abbās’ *ta‘rīf* as a precedent: according to one witness, he used to sit in the mosque on the “Day of ‘Arafa” after the afternoon prayer, and uttered supplications and invoked God (فدعا وذكر الله).⁴³ It seems, however, that al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī was not entirely satisfied with this practice.⁴⁴

³⁹Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 2, p. 367; al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb* (ed. Dūrī), vol. 3, p. 34; al-Jāhīz, *al-Bayān wa-al-tabyīn*, vol. 1, p. 83; al-Dhahabī, *Ta‘rīkh* (ed. Tadmurī, *ḥawādīth wa-wafayāt*, 61–80), p. 159; *al-Baqara*; ‘Abd al-Razzāq, *al-Muṣannaḥ*, vol. 4, p. 377; al-Jāhīz, *op. cit.*, p. 331, Ibn Qutayba, *Gharīb al-ḥadīth*, vol. 2, p. 354 and al-Dhahabī, *op. cit.*, p. 155: the two chapters: *al-Baqara* and *Āl ‘Imrān*. Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya* (Beirut ed.), vol. 8, p. 302 (Dār al-Nīl ed., vol. 8, p. 324); Abū Shāma, *al-Bā‘ith*, vol. 1, p. 34: both quoting Ibn Qutayba.

⁴⁰Abū Shāma, *loc. cit.*

⁴¹Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya* (Beirut ed.), vol. 8, p. 299 (Dār al-Nīl ed., vol. 8, p. 322): The people of al-Baṣra gather in the mosque around Ibn ‘Abbās, who interprets for them Qur’ānic verses, preaching about the divine reward and punishment (*wa-yudhakkir al-nās*), from the end of the afternoon prayer until the evening prayer, which he led.

⁴²Abū Shāma, *al-Bā‘ith*, vol. 1, p. 34.

⁴³*Ibid.*, p. 33.

⁴⁴‘Abd al-Razzāq, *al-Muṣannaḥ*, vol. 4, p. 376: ‘Abd al-Razzāq < Ma‘mar [b. Rāshid, d. 153–154/770–771] < Qatāda [b. Di‘āma, d. 118/736] < ‘Adī b. Arṭāt [d. 102/720] who says to al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī: Would you go out with the people and perform the ceremony of the *ta‘rīf* for them? This was in al-Baṣra. Al-Ḥasan said: the location of the standing is ‘Arafa. He said: al-Ḥasan used to say: the first person who performed the *ta‘rīf* ceremonies in our land [that is, in al-‘Irāq] was Ibn ‘Abbās” ألا تخرج بالناس فتعرف بهم وذلك بالبصرة. قال: فقال الحسن: إنما المتعرف بعرفة. قال: وكان الحسن يقول أول من عرف بأرضنا ابن عباس. If the testimony is authentic, it bears witness to al-Ḥasan’s objection to performing the *ta‘rīf* ceremonies in any place other than Mecca. However, it is possible to understand al-Ḥasan’s words as expressing a weak reservation, while in reality he performed prayers and supplications on the “Day of ‘Arafa”, based on the precedent of Ibn ‘Abbās. From another source we learn that al-Ḥasan did not attend the mosque on the eve of the “Day of ‘Arafa” (Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaḥ*, vol. 3, p. 288). It is possible that al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī is used

From the seventh century onward, Muslim scholars differed as to the legitimacy of holding *taʿrīf* ceremonies in the various cities.⁴⁵ In this study, I shall briefly mention the opinions of several well-known scholars.

Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Athram (d. 260/873–74 or 261 AH or 273/886–87),⁴⁶ one of the well-known disciples of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 241/855) relates the following: “I asked Abū ʿAbd Allāh [the *kunya* of Ibn Ḥanbal] about *al-taʿrīf* in the cities, that is, [the custom of] gathering in the mosques on the “Day of ʿArafa”. He replied: “I hope that there is no harm in this; for some people had done it. Abū ʿAbd Allāh said: [those who did it were] al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Bakr (b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Muzanī, d. 106/724–25 or 108/726–727), Thābit (b. Aslam al-Bunānī (? d. 123/740–41 or 127/744–45) and Muḥammad b. Wāsiʿ (d. 120/738 or 123/740–41 or 127/744–45). They attended the mosque on the “Day of ʿArafa.”⁴⁷ Another source quotes this tradition verbatim, but adds at the end: “Aḥmad (b. Ḥanbal) said: “There is no harm in this, for it is to be considered only as a voluntary prayer, mentioning (the uniqueness and glory of) Allāh.” It was said to him: “Do you personally perform it?” He said: “I myself do not.”⁴⁸

ʿAbd al-Karīm b. al-Haytham b. Ziyād Abū Yaḥyā al-Qaṭṭān al-ʿĀqūlī (or al-Dayr al-ʿĀqūlī, d. 278/891)⁴⁹ relates: “I stayed with Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal ... and I asked him about *al-taʿrīf* in the towns [التعريف بالقرى].⁵⁰ He said: ʿAbd Allāh b. al-ʿAbbās had already performed it in al-Baṣra and ʿAmr b. Ḥurayth in al-Kūfa; it [the *taʿrīf*] is a voluntary prayer and a good thing (*duʿāʾ wa-khayr*); it had been performed in the past by Muḥammad b. Wāsiʿ, Ibn Sīrīn (d. 110/728) and al-Ḥasan [al-Baṣrī]; and he mentioned a group of the Baṣran (scholars).”⁵¹

Other scholars were opposed to performing the ʿArafa ceremonies in Muslim cities.⁵² Thus Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/795) who was asked by

here to convey the reservations or objections of those who opposed performing the ʿArafa ceremonies outside Arabia.

⁴⁵Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya* (Beirut ed.), vol. 8, p. 298; Kister, “Concessions and conduct,” pp. 104–105 and p. 229, note 141.

⁴⁶On him, see Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb* (Ḥaydarābād ed.), vol. 1, pp. 78–79; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Zakkār), vol. 1, pp. 257–259; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 12, p. 626.

⁴⁷Ibn Abī Yaʿlā, *Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 1, p. 67; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 12, p. 624; al-Qurṭubī, *Tafsīr*, vol. 2, p. 419 (parallel traditions to Ibn Abī Yaʿlā); al-Suyūṭī, *al-Amr bi-ʾl-ittibāʿ*, p. 185.

⁴⁸Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī, *al-Mughnī*, vol. 1, p. 129.

⁴⁹On him, see al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 11, pp. 78–79; al-Samʿānī, *al-Ansāb*, vol. 2, pp. 524–525: s.v. al-Dayr al-ʿĀqūlī, a town near Baghdād.

⁵⁰I translated here “*al-qurāʾ*” as towns and not villages. The accepted version in the traditions quoted is *التعريف بالمصار*; one of the well-known meanings of *qarya* is *miṣr*.

⁵¹Ibn Muffīh, *al-Maqṣad al-arshad*, vol. 2, pp. 194–195.

⁵²Many scholars of the 2nd/8th century are mentioned by Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-*

B.3) The ceremonies of the “Day of ‘Arafa”
in Jerusalem and Goitein’s thesis

At the beginning of this section, I argued that Goitein’s interpretation regarding the ceremonies of the “Day of ‘Arafa” in Jerusalem could be understood and interpreted differently.

As noted above, al-Ya‘qūbī relates that ‘Abd al-Malik compelled the people to circumambulate the Dome of the Rock (or: the Rock within it).⁵⁹ In this case it is the *ṭawāf* which is mentioned by al-Ya‘qūbī and not the special prayers held in the mosques of the different cities on the eve of the “Day of ‘Arafa” described by the sources; it is not similar to the *wuqūf* ceremonies mentioned by Nāṣir-i Khusraw in 1047. Al-Ya‘qūbī describes unique ceremonies. Additional early sources that were not available to Goitein give more credence to al-Ya‘qūbī’s description.

1) Hishām b. Muḥammad al-Kalbī (d. 204/819) reports that during ‘Abd al-Malik’s rule “the Muslims used to stand near the Rock [thus performing the *wuqūf*], circumambulate it as they used to circumambulate the Ka‘ba, and to slaughter [animals] on the Feast of Sacrifice [*‘īd al-adḥā*].”⁶⁰

2) According to another tradition, related by Hishām al-Kalbī from his father, Muḥammad b. al-Sā‘ib (d. 146/763), and also by Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqidi (d. 207/823) and other transmitters besides him who reported some choice parts of the tradition, ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, the rival caliph, accused ‘Abd al-Malik of transferring “the *ṭawāf* from the House of God to the *qibla* of the Children of Israel and (leveled against him other accusations) in the same manner.”⁶¹

3) In another early tradition from the end of the Umayyad period ‘Abd al-Malik is denounced and defamed by the Khārijī rebel Abū Ḥamza al-Mukhtār b. ‘Awf in al-Madīna (or Mecca). He accuses the caliph of destroying the Ka‘ba, reviving the way of the ignoble people, giving the Rock in Jerusalem a status like that of the Maqām [Ibrāhīm at the Ka‘ba]. “This is where the rough Arabs of Syria go on pilgrimage.” A version of this sermon was reported by al-Haytham b. ‘Adī (d. 206–207/821–823 or 209/824–825), who transmitted the first-hand testimony of Isā b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd.⁶²

⁵⁹Al-Ya‘qūbī, *Ta’rikh* (Leiden ed.), vol. 2, p. 311; the structure of the Arabic sentence does not allow unequivocal translation: فبنى على الصخرة قبة... واخذ الناس بأن يطوفوا حولها كما يطوفون حول الكعبة، وأقام بذلك أيام بني أمية.

⁶⁰Sibt b. al-Jawzī, *Mir’āt al-zamān*, Bodleian MS, fol. 153b (Elad, “‘Abd al-Malik,” pp. 34 (English translation), 53 (Arabic text)).

⁶¹Sibt b. al-Jawzī, *op. cit.*, fol. 154a; Elad, *op. cit.*, pp. 35 (English translation), 54 (Arabic text).

⁶²Al-Azkawī, *Kashf al-ghumma*, fol. 273b; Elad, *op. cit.*, pp. 50–51, and the detailed

In conclusion, the custom of *al-ta‘rīf* in Jerusalem (and most probably in al-Fuṣṭāṭ as well) was stimulated by the struggle between ‘Abd al-Malik and ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr. The ceremonies in Jerusalem were unique, and took place on a site which was built under unique historical circumstances. They are different from other *ta‘rīf* ceremonies held in other Muslim cities.

I tend to agree with al-Quḍā‘ī’s explanation (d. 454/1062) that the Dome of the Rock was built due to the struggle between ‘Abd al-Malik and ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr when the former “prevented the people from performing the pilgrimage to Mecca because Ibn al-Zubayr forced them to swear allegiance to him.” Therefore, continues al-Quḍā‘ī, ‘Abd al-Malik built the Dome of the Rock, “and the people used to come to it on the “Day of ‘Arafa,” standing beside it [i.e., performing the *wuqūf* ceremonies], and it was said that this was the reason for *al-ta‘rīf* in the mosque of Jerusalem and in the mosques of [other] major cities (*al-amṣār*).”⁶³

B.4) Worship and ceremonies in the Dome of the Rock during ‘Abd al-Malik’s reign

Goitein argued mainly against al-Ya‘qūbī’s description and to a lesser extent, against that of Eutychius. Today, we have at our disposal new texts, both published and unpublished. We are thus able to reconstruct a detailed and complex picture of the ceremonies and worship held on the Ḥaram, mainly within the Dome of the Rock, during ‘Abd al-Malik’s reign. This evidence is found in the following sources:

1) The Literature in Praise of Jerusalem (*faḍā’il Bayt al-Maqdis*). No less than eight extremely important traditions on the history of Jerusalem in the early Islamic period were transmitted by a family, whose forefather was a special slave of the Umayyad treasury (*al-akhmās*)⁶⁴ and served in the Dome of the Rock.⁶⁵ These traditions were then passed on through al-Walīd b. Ḥammād al-Ramī (fl. second half of the third/ninth

discussion there; I was unable to identify ‘Isā b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, who appears to have been an eyewitness to the entry of Abū Ḥamza with his men into al-Madīna; I am grateful to Prof. Michael Cook for this reference.

⁶³Al-Quḍā‘ī, *al-Inbā’*, p. 212; Kister, “Concessions and conduct,” p. 105.

⁶⁴The *akhmās* were slaves of the caliph who belonged to the state treasury as the fifth part (*khums*) of the booty, or who were acquired by the treasury from the *khums* money.

⁶⁵Elad, *Jerusalem*, pp. 17–18, 52.

century). Al-Walīd b. Ḥammād compiled these traditions into a book on the Merits of Jerusalem.⁶⁶

2) Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī's monumental work, *Mir'āt al-zamān*, most of which is still in manuscript form. This information was transmitted by some well-known and distinguished early historians: Muḥammad b. al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī (d. 146/763), his son Hishām (d. 204/819), al-Wāqidi (d. 207/823) and others whose names went unmentioned.

The descriptions of the construction of the Dome of the Rock and of the rituals held there, recorded by the early authors of the Praise of Jerusalem literature (mainly al-Wāsiṭī, Ibn al-Murajjā and their followers),⁶⁷ are almost identical to the description rendered by the early historians in Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī's book. It is plausible that they had a common source, perhaps one of the Jerusalemite scholars.⁶⁸

These testimonies contain detailed descriptions of the splendor of the Dome of the Rock: its Dome and gates were gilded; the Rock was encompassed with a balustrade made of ebony inlaid with jade; behind the balustrade were curtains of variegated and decorated silk embroidered with gold hung between the pillars. The Dome of the Rock was open to the public only on Mondays and Thursdays (the days in which Jews finish the reading of the Torah),⁶⁹ during the other days of the week only special attendants entered the building. The parallel traditions both in the *Faḍā'il* literature and in Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī's book record in minute detail the ceremonies of their purification in a bath house; the replacement of regular clothing with special silk garments; the preparation of special perfumes to be rubbed on the Rock and preparations of the perfumes for incense which is put in censers of gold and silver.⁷⁰ At each gate ten gate-keepers were posted;⁷¹ they were part of the 300 special attendants (the slaves of the caliph), who were purchased by Caliph 'Abd al-Malik

⁶⁶On al-Walīd b. Ḥammād, see Conrad, "al-Azdī," pp. 57–59; Jawda, *al-Ramla*, p. 312; Elad, "The history and topography," p. 49; *idem*, "'Abd al-Malik," p. 39; *idem*, *Jerusalem*, pp. 15–16; the author of a book on the Merits of Jerusalem: al-Dhahabī, *Sīyar*, vol. 14, p. 78.

⁶⁷The earliest compilations: al-Wāsiṭī, *Faḍā'il*; Ibn al-Murajjā, *Faḍā'il*; the later sources: al-Maqdisī, *Muthār al-gharām*; al-Suyūṭī, *Ithāf al-akhiṣṣā'*, pp. 241–245; Muḥīr al-Dīn, *al-Uns al-jalīl* (Būlāq ed.), pp. 240–243 (Beirut ed. pp. 272–273).

⁶⁸This problem will be dealt with in a forthcoming study.

⁶⁹Livne, *The sanctity of Jerusalem*, p. 327, note 154; Elad, *Jerusalem*, p. 51; Sharon, "The Merits of Jerusalem," p. 60.

⁷⁰Al-Wāsiṭī, *Faḍā'il*, pp. 81–83; Ibn al-Murajjā, *Faḍā'il*, pp. 58–62 and the parallel sources quoted by the editors; the text of Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī: Elad, "'Abd al-Malik," pp. 35–37 (English translation), 54–56 (Arabic text); Livne, *The sanctity of Jerusalem*, p. 327; Sharon, "The Merits of Jerusalem," pp. 58–63; Elad, *Jerusalem*, p. 51 ff.; Kaplony, *The Haram*, pp. 321–324.

⁷¹Al-Wāsiṭī, *Faḍā'il*, p. 83; Ibn al-Murajjā, *Faḍā'il*, p. 60.

from the *khums*⁷² money. They received a monthly allowance from the government and their sons inherited their positions.⁷³

It is possible that their offspring continued to carry out these duties on the Ḥaram still in the mid-tenth century, for al-Muqaddasī relates that in his days, the attendants of the Ḥaram are slaves (*mamālīk*), who were appointed by ‘Abd al-Malik from the *khums*; therefore they were given the epithet *al-ahkmās* and nobody except them serves in the Ḥaram.⁷⁴

In addition to these special servants, there were Jews and Christians who performed public service in the Ḥaram during ‘Abd al-Malik’s reign:

It [the Ḥaram?] had ten Jewish attendants on whom poll tax was not levied. Their number increased and they became twenty. They were engaged to clean the dirt (left by the) people during the pilgrimage seasons and in winter and summer, and to clean the places for ablution (*al-maṭāhir*) around al-Masjid al-Aqṣā [*al-Jāmi‘*]; It [i.e. the Ḥaram] had ten Christian attendants, of [one] family, among whom the role of servicing the building [*khidmat al-bayt*] was passed on by inheritance, that is, making the plaster, sweeping the mats of the mosque and the canals leading to the water reservoirs, as well as cleaning the water reservoirs. In addition to this, it had a group of Jewish attendants who used to make the glass for the lamps, the (big) bowls and the glass vessels (*al-bazzāqāt*),⁷⁵ and other things besides this. The poll tax was not taken from them, neither from those who were in charge of the preparation of the wicks (*al-surāqa*) of the lamps.

The narrator [most probably in early ninth century] concludes by saying: “(This exemption from the poll tax) is carried out in regard to them and their children forever, as long as they live, from the time of ‘Abd al-Malik until today [*ilā ‘l-ān*].”⁷⁶

An inseparable part of the ceremonies established in the Umayyad period in the Dome of the Rock was the Black Paving Stone (*al-Balāṭa*

⁷²The fifth of the spoils to which the Caliph was entitled.

⁷³Ibn al-Murajjā, *Faḍā’il*, p. 61; Elad, “‘Abd al-Malik,” pp. 36–37 (English translation), 56 (Arabic text).

⁷⁴Al-Muqaddasī, *Aḥsan al-taqāsīm*, p. 171; Gil, “Jerusalem,” pp. 24–25, note 26; Elad, *Jerusalem*, p. 52, also quoting Ibn al-Faqīh, *Buldān*, p. 100 mentioning 140 attendants in the Ḥaram and Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi, *al-‘Iqd*, vol. 6, p. 246, mentioning 230 slaves (*mamālīk*); see also notes 64 and 65 above.

⁷⁵Apparently some kind of a glass vessel, see Dozy, *Dictionnaire*, b.z.q., s.v.: “*bazzāqa*... Doit désigner un objet fait de verre.”

⁷⁶Ibn al-Murajjā, *Faḍā’il*, pp. 61–62, no. 47 and the parallel sources mentioned by the editor; Gil, *Palestine*, vol. 1, p. 72, no. 86 (English transl. p. 72, no. 86); Livne, *The sanctity of Jerusalem*, p. 295; Kaplony, *The Ḥaram*, pp. 333–337.

al-Sawdāʿ), which was set in the floor adjacent to the north gate of the Dome of the Rock. This stone is linked to early traditions about Paradise and the Last Day, dating from the mid-Umayyad period. It is said to be located at one of the gates of Paradise and supplications made on it are granted.⁷⁷

I pointed out elsewhere that the builders of the Dome of the Rock were conscious of the parallel between this black paving stone and the Black Stone in the *Kaʿba*. The placing of the paving stone in the Dome of the Rock strengthens the theory put forward by Goldziher, Wellhausen, and others, who maintained that the Dome of the Rock was intended to compete with the *Kaʿba*.⁷⁸

Concerning traditions emphasizing the central role of Jerusalem on the Last Day,⁷⁹ noteworthy is the description of Ibn Kathīr, most probably copied from Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, about the pictures and signs painted on the Ḥaram relating to the Last Days which were executed during the caliphate of ʿAbd al-Malik: “They painted the picture of the *ṣirāt*, the Gate of Paradise, and the footprint of the Prophet, and the valley of Gehenna. And they also painted on its gates and in the [holy] places there.”⁸⁰

Before concluding this section, I would like to refer to an early tradition relating to a chain which hung from the center of the Dome in ʿAbd al-Malik’s day. Several items were hung on this chain: a precious stone, the horns of the ram sacrificed by Abraham (according to some traditions, these items originally hung in the *Kaʿba*)⁸¹, and the crown of Kistrā, king of Persia. When the ʿAbbāsīs assumed power, adds the transmitter, a member of the Jerusalemite family who lived at the beginning of the ʿAbbāsī rule “moved it [the chain] to the *Kaʿba*.” In spite of some scholars’ reservations regarding the historical value of the tradition, it seems to reflect ʿAbd al-Malik’s desire to give the Dome of the Rock a unique status.⁸²

⁷⁷Al-Wāsiṭī, *Faḍāʿil*, pp. 89–90, no. 146; Ibn al-Muraǧǧā, *Faḍāʿil*, p. 112, no. 128; Elad, *Jerusalem*, pp. 77ff; Kaplony, *The Ḥaram*, index.

⁷⁸Elad, *Jerusalem*, p. 80. Nevertheless, a thorough study of the parallels between the sites is necessary in order to reach binding conclusions.

⁷⁹Elad, *Jerusalem* (index: Last [Latter] Day[s]); Livne-Kafri, “Muslim apocalyptic tradition”; *idem*, “Jerusalem in early Islam”.

⁸⁰Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya* (Cairo, 1351–58 AH), vol. 8, p. 281 (Dār al-Nīl ed. vol. 8, p. 302); Elad, “The history and topography,” pp. 61–62; *idem*, “ʿAbd al-Malik,” pp. 51–52. Although Ibn Kathīr says that he copied this section from Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, I was not able to find this paragraph in the MSS of the latter which I consulted.

⁸¹Grabar, “The Dome of the Rock,” p. 50; Rubin, “The *Kaʿba*,” p. 118; Elad, *Jerusalem*, p. 52.

⁸²Al-Wāsiṭī, *Faḍāʿil*, pp. 75–76; Ibn al-Muraǧǧā, *Faḍāʿil*, p. 127, no. 156; Livne, *The sanctity of Jerusalem*, p. 296; Elad, *Jerusalem*, p. 52; Rabbat, “The Dome of the Rock re-visited,” p. 71; Kaplony, *The Ḥaram*, pp. 349–350; Ibrāhīm, *Faḍāʿil*, pp.

The bulk of evidence which was not at Goitein’s disposal testifies to an extensive and complex set of ceremonies held inside the Dome of the Rock and around it during ‘Abd al-Malik’s reign.

The “Day of ‘Arafa” ceremonies in Jerusalem in the post-Umayyad period

The *ta‘rīf* on the “Day of ‘Arafa” was performed in later periods as well. Abū Shāma (d. 665/1268) calls it *al-ta‘rīf al-muḥdath*, saying:

It is the gathering of the people on the eve of the Day of ‘Arafa in places other than ‘Arafa. This (also) means the supererogatory prayers, supplications and praises to God that the pilgrims perform on the Day of ‘Arafa. It was an unwarranted religious innovation from an early period and was widespread all over the world from east to west. The situation regarding this custom in Jerusalem became serious (*wa-’stafḥala amruhu bi-bayt al-maqdis*).⁸³

It is possible that Abū Shāma is referring here to ‘Abd al-Malik’s period, but he may also be describing ceremonies performed in his days. It is well-known that in later periods, Muslims used to sacrifice animals and perform the *wuqūf* ceremonies on the Ḥaram, in the Dome of the Rock and around it at the time of the *ḥajj*. This was noted by Nāṣir-i Khusraw in 1047.⁸⁴ Abū Bakr al-Ṭurṭūshī, the famous Spanish scholar (d. 520/1126 or 525/1131), who resided in Jerusalem around the end of the eleventh century, describes how on the “Day of ‘Arafa” Muslims from the city and from the surrounding villages prayed while facing Mecca, raising their voices in prayers of request as if they were standing in front of Mount ‘Arafa. “I used to hear there a widely circulated saying according to which four *wuqūfs* in Jerusalem equal one pilgrimage to Mecca.”⁸⁵ There is even later evidence of the ceremonies on the Ḥaram during the time of the *ḥajj*.⁸⁶

60–61, treats this tradition as a legend of a folklore nature.

⁸³Abū Shāma, *al-Bā‘ith*, vol. 1, p. 32.

⁸⁴See note 18 above.

⁸⁵Al-Ṭurṭūshī, *al-Ḥawādith*, pp. 116–117; on al-Ṭurṭūshī, see Drori, *Ibn al-‘Arabī*, pp. 59–60; A. Ben Abdeselem, “al-Ṭurṭūshī,” *EI*², s.v.; Elad, *Jerusalem*, pp. 61–62.

⁸⁶For evidence from the 12th and 14th centuries, see Elad, *Jerusalem*, p. 62.

C) The mosaic inscriptions inside the Dome of the Rock

Another of Goitein's central arguments is based on the content and nature of the original gilded mosaic inscriptions on the upper part of the octagonal arcade within the Dome of the Rock.

These inscriptions consist of Qur'ānic verses, cited in full, in part or paraphrased. This caused followers of the "revisionist school" to assume that in 'Abd al-Malik's period, the Qur'ān had not yet achieved its final form; I find this assumption to be far-fetched.⁸⁷ Goitein argued (an argument accepted by other scholars), that these verses clearly reflect the nature of Islam's dispute with Christianity: Jesus, who is mentioned in the verses, is a true prophet and servant of God, though he is not His son. In addition, they emphasize five times the expression related to God, "He has no partner" (لا شريك له). In summary, he says that "All this shows that rivalry with Christendom, together with the spirit of Islamic mission to the Christians, was at work at the creation of the famous dome."⁸⁸

Since the end of the 19th century, the inscriptions in the Dome of the Rock were copied and discussed by scholars, most noteworthy among them being Van Berchem.⁸⁹ A very small number of studies have been devoted to these inscriptions.⁹⁰ These inscriptions are not only important for the study of religious, political and cultural aspects of the Umayyad period; they also indicate the way in which the builders of the Dome of the Rock evaluated its importance and viewed the status of Jerusalem in Islam.

A profound philological-historical study of the inscriptions is called for, but in the present paper, I wish to make only the following comments.

1) It is now customary to consider the inscriptions as an integral text (further on this below). It seems to me that Grabar's argument that the two inscriptions that were apparently inscribed on the copper plates

⁸⁷See Crone and Cook, *Hagarism*, pp. 17–18; Cook, *Muhammad*, pp. 67–73; however, cf. the convincing discussion of Whelan, "Forgotten witness;" and especially Donner, *Narratives*, pp. 35–63.

⁸⁸Goitein, "The historical background," p. 106.

⁸⁹Van Berchem, *Haram*, pp. 228–230, no. 215; *Répertoire*, vol. 1, pp. 7–11.

⁹⁰The contribution of these inscriptions to early Arabic paleographic-epigraphic research is clear. One of the subjects worth clarifying in connection with these inscriptions is checking the citations from the Qur'ān, their precise comparison with the printed version of the Qur'ān and the *qirā'āt* literature. Among the partial studies of the inscriptions other than Van Berchem's, we will note the studies of Kessler, "Abd al-Malik"; Grabar, "The Dome of the Rock"; *idem*, *Jerusalem* (see following remarks); Rabbat, "The Dome of the Rock revisited," p. 70; see a recent and extremely important discussion of the subject in Whelan, "Forgotten witness."

in the period of ‘Abd al-Malik and were still in their original location above the eastern and northern gate of the Dome of the Rock at the end of the 19th century should also be considered part of this whole.⁹¹

2) The long inscriptions are on the inner and outer part of the octagonal arcade within the Dome of the Rock. The prevailing view is that they begin at the southeastern end of the arcade and they end in its inner side, in the south. Therefore, the Muslim visitor in ‘Abd al-Malik’s time presumably began the circuit at the southeastern exterior end of the arcade, and continued clockwise up to the dedicatory inscription of the building. The circuit in the inner side of the arcade was followed counter-clockwise.⁹² The prevailing opinion among researchers of Islamic art is that the entrance to the Dome of the Rock was from the southern gate.⁹³ Nevertheless, Grabar is not entirely satisfied with this view when he raises the question: “But from the point of view of the building, south was the *qibla*, the direction of prayer, and one may question whether a Muslim building with pious functions would have had its major entrance to the south.”⁹⁴

Shani uses the question of Grabar as a cornerstone supporting her central thesis that the main entrance to the Dome of the Rock was from the northern gate, “Hence, my reservations regarding the accepted notion that the original entrance for visitors must have been from the south, which would mean that Abd al-Malik was ignoring Mecca as the *qibla*.”⁹⁵ The builders of the Dome of the Rock wanted to emphasize (mainly by ornamental motifs) the north-South axis.⁹⁶ It should be remembered, however, that the Dome of the Rock was not built as a mosque, and did not serve as such, certainly not in the Umayyad period. It was a kind of temple which was open to the public twice a week. Ritual ceremonies were carried out in it by special officials. Shani, following Grabar, posits that the southern part of the Dome was particularly emphasized by its builders, and thus emphasis is put on the *qibla*. However, if the building is not a mosque, why should the *qibla* be emphasized? Grabar’s reasoning therefore cannot stand, whereas Shani’s arguments,⁹⁷ to the extent that they are correct, can only reinforce the idea that the entrance to the Dome was indeed in the south. Shani’s argument can be used to

⁹¹Grabar, *Jerusalem*, pp. 60–61, and the important discussion, *ibid.*, pp. 66–68; p. 186: the Arabic text; see Van Berchem, *Haram*, pp. 248–249, 250, no. 216 (the Arabic text), and the discussion on pp. 251–255; *Répertoire*, vol. 1, pp. 165–167, n. 209.

⁹²Blair, “The Dome of the Rock,” p. 76; Grabar, *Jerusalem*, pp. 65, 68, 106.

⁹³E.g., Blair, “The Dome of the Rock,” p. 76; Grabar, *Jerusalem*, p. 107.

⁹⁴*Ibid.*

⁹⁵Shani, “The Dome of the Rock,” p. 178.

⁹⁶*Ibid.*, mainly from pp. 178 to 182.

⁹⁷*Ibid.*, esp. pp. 178–182.

support the opposite conclusion: the builders of the structure wanted to emphasize the southern entrance, not as the *qibla*, but particularly as the south-north axis. This issue is important and requires further study which cannot be attempted here.

3) The inscription on the outer side is different from that on the inner side in both content and style. As far as the content is concerned, the two inscriptions on the two gates of the Dome of the Rock belong to the outer inscription.⁹⁸

The inscription on the outer side of the octagonal arcade is divided into six parts separated by a rose (rosetta) or a star within a square.⁹⁹

In the sixth and last part, historical information is given about the builder of the structure and the date it was built. Five parts begin with the *basmala*, stressing the absolute oneness of Allāh (لا إله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له); these parts cite or paraphrase Qur'ānic verses. In two of the five parts, there are also Qur'ānic verses emphasizing that Allāh has no progeny. In the first part, Qur'ān 112 is cited in full: 1) "Say: he is God one 2) the everlasting Refuge 3) who has not begotten, and has not been begotten 4) and equal to him is not any one." In the second part, Qur'ān 17:111 is fully cited (with the exception: "Say" (وقل) ("[Say], Praise belongs to God who has not taken to Him a son and who has not any associate in the kingdom, nor any protector out of humbleness. And magnify Him with repeated magnificats."¹⁰⁰

A trend to disputation with Christianity might be seen here, though, notably, Jesus is not mentioned (as opposed to the inner inscription). Moreover, immediately after this, in every one of the five parts, not only in the two mentioned above, the inscription reiterates that Muḥammad is the messenger of Allāh. Noteworthy is the citation from Qur'ān 33:56: "God and his angels bless the Prophet; O believers, send your blessing on him and grant him peace." The Prophet is the one who will intercede for his community on the Day of Judgment: وتقبل شفاعته يوم القيامة في أمته.

The outer inscription, then, emphasizes the absolute oneness of Allāh and Muḥammad's status as His messenger; Jesus is not mentioned. Even if it is possible to see in the two cases some relation to Christianity, this is not the main subject addressed by the inscriptions. In content, the two inscriptions on the doors of the Dome of the Rock¹⁰¹ fit the outer inscriptions discussed above. The inner inscription is one unit consisting

⁹⁸Kessler, "Abd al-Malik", p. 11, already discussed this, as did Hamilton in 1966. Kessler (*ibid.*, note 19) quotes from Hamilton's lecture in Cairo in 1966.

⁹⁹Kessler "Abd al-Malik", p. 11; Blair, "The Dome of the Rock," p. 76; Grabar, *Jerusalem*, p. 66.

¹⁰⁰Translation by Arberry, *The Qur'ān interpreted*.

¹⁰¹See footnotes 91, 98.

of several Qur’ānic verses.¹⁰² Although the inscription begins with the belief in the oneness of Allāh and in His Prophet Muḥammad, most of the inner inscription deals with Jesus, who is presented as a prophet, servant of God, and not the son of God; he was born, died, and will be resurrected. The inscription is aimed at emphasizing the main difference between Muslim and Christian beliefs. The inner inscription is easier to read, since this passage is more spacious and better lit than the outer roofed arcade.¹⁰³

Nevertheless, the lighting conditions in ‘Abd al-Malik’s time may possibly have been better in the outer arcade. Geographers and historians of the 9th and 10th centuries describe many large windows in the drum of the Dome of the Rock as well as the large lamps and candles that lit up the structure. Some of these reports are early,¹⁰⁴ and although the numbers they give are exaggerated¹⁰⁵, they themselves seem authentic.

Thus, Ibn al-Faḳīh writing in 289/902 or 290/903 and describing his times,¹⁰⁶ relates that there were five hundred copper chains on the Haram. Every night 1600 lamps (*qindīl*) were lit on it. The Dome of the Rock was lit up every night by 300 lamps. In its upper part there were 56 glass windows of different colours. The window dimensions were six cubits in length [between three and four meters] and six spans (*shibr*) [around 1.80 m] in width.¹⁰⁷

Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi (246/860–328/940) relates that on the entire Ḥaram there are 1500 lamps. In the Dome of the Rock there were 460 lamps.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰²Qur’ān 4:171–172; 19:33–36: with paraphrasing the canonical text. The text: Van Berchem, *ibid.*, pp. 230–231; Grabar, *Jerusalem*, p. 185; Blair, “The Dome of the Rock,” pp. 86–87 (English translation only).

¹⁰³Kessler, “‘Abd al-Malik”, pp. 11–12; Blair, *op. cit.*, p. 77; Grabar, *Jerusalem*, p. 67.

¹⁰⁴Such reports are found in sources such as Ibn al-Faḳīh (d. in the first half of the 10th c.), *Buldān*; Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi (d. 328/940), *al-‘Iqd*, al-Muqaddasī (d. ca. 1000), *Aḥsan al-taqāsīm* and Ibn al-Murajjā, *Faḍā’il*.

¹⁰⁵According to Ibn al-Faḳīh, *Buldān*, p. 100, every night 1600 lamps (*qindīl*) were lit on the site of the Ḥaram, and the Dome of the Rock was lit up by 300 lamps at night; Ibn al-Murajjā, *Faḍā’il*, p. 61, relates (from various sources) that on the entire Ḥaram there were 5000 lamps, and that on special occasions (such as Friday nights and the two ‘*īds*), 1000 (or 2000, according to another version) candles were also lit, and according to Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi, *al-‘Iqd* (Cairo ed.), vol. 6, p. 263, there were 460 lamps in the Dome. Similar large numbers are given concerning the windows; see for instance Ibn al-Faḳīh, *Ibid.*.

¹⁰⁶On him see H. Masse, “Ibn al-Faḳīh,” *EI*², s.v.

¹⁰⁷Ibn al-Faḳīh, *Buldān*, pp. 100–101: وفي أعلاها: يسرج فيها كل ليلة ثلاثمائة قنديل [...] ستة وخمسون بابا مزججة بأنواع الزجاج. والباب ستة أذرع في ستة أشبار. The dimensions of the *dhirā’* range between 50 and 70 cm, according to the different types. See W. Hinz, “Dhirā’”, *EI*², s.v. If I understood the text correctly, the expression أنواع الزجاج indicates glass of different colors.

¹⁰⁸Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi, *al-‘Iqd* (Cairo ed.), vol. 6, p. 263.

The author proceeds by giving a detailed description of the amounts and types of oils that were supplied every month to light the entire mosque as well as the budget for the glass and the workers who maintained the roofs of the mosque structures.¹⁰⁹ Ibn al-Faqīh testifies to the existence of upper windows, even if their dimensions and numbers were certainly exaggerated. Al-Muqaddasī (died ca. 1000) reports that in the cupola of the Dome of the Rock there are large windows [?].¹¹⁰ In the most important tradition about the the Dome of the Rock and the ritual ceremonies conducted in it during ‘Abd al-Malik’s reign — this tradition was transmitted by the Jerusalemite ‘Abd al-Raḥmān’s family, which can be traced back at least to the end of the Umayyad period — much data on the Ḥaram in the period of ‘Abd al-Malik is given.¹¹¹

Ibn al-Murajjā reports that on the Ḥaram there were 385 [!] chains, 280 of them on the Ḥaram and the rest, [105] in the Dome of the Rock. The lengths of the chains were 40,000 qubits.¹¹² . . . On the entire Ḥaram there are 5000 lamps. On Friday nights, middle of the months of Rajab, Sha‘bān, and Ramaḍān, and on the nights of the two Feasts¹¹³ 2000 [according to the “testimony of Ibn al-Murajjā, 1000] candles were also lit.¹¹⁴ Some of these data are identical to what was transmitted by Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī from early transmitters who take the tradition back to at least the middle of the 8th century. These transmitters are not from the Jerusalem family who are mentioned in al-Wāsiṭī’s and Ibn al-Murajjā’s *Faḍā’il*.¹¹⁵ Nevertheless, there are parallels between the two compositions.

On the entire Ḥaram, according to the early sources of Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī there were 5000 lamps, [an identical number to that noted by Ibn al-Murajjā. In the Dome of the Rock there were 400 chains. The chains were 40,000 qubits long. This is a number identical to that transmitted by Ibn al-Murajjā]. Each night 100 candles were lit in the Dome of the

¹⁰⁹*Ibid.*, p. 265. It appears that he had first-hand information.

¹¹⁰Al-Muqaddasī, *Aḥsan al-taqāsīm*, pp. 169–170: فوق هذا منطقة متعالية في الهواء فيها طيقان كبار. I translated the word طيقان as windows. This is the plural of طاق, which is customarily understood as a vaulted opening, a window, though every vaulted structure is also called طاق. See Lane’s *Lexicon*, t.w.q., s.v.; see also Le Strange, *Palestine*, p. 124, who translates the expression as windows. Yāqūt, *Mu‘jam*, vol. 5, p. 170, who copies al-Muqaddasī, uses the word طاقات instead of طيقان; طاقات is also a plural form of طاق.

¹¹¹Al-Wāsiṭī, *Faḍā’il*, pp. 81–84 (nos. 136–137); Ibn al-Murajjā, *Faḍā’il*, pp. 58–62 (no. 47); see also Elad, *Jerusalem*, pp. 17–18 (discussion of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān’s family).

¹¹²In *Ithāf al-akhṣṣā’* and Mujīr al-Dīn’s versions: 4000 [!].

¹¹³The feast of sacrifice (‘īd al-aḍḥā) and the feast at the end of Ramaḍān (‘īd al-fiṭr).

¹¹⁴Ibn al-Murajjā, *Faḍā’il*, p. 61, the text with variations of the versions with references to the literary parallels.

¹¹⁵See above, note 7 (Elad, “Abd al-Malik,” pp. 39–40).

Rock and an identical number was lit in al-Aqṣā mosque. In another version, the author of the tradition adds, it is said that their number was 1000. [This number is identical to the number given by Ibn al-Murajjā].¹¹⁶

For whom were these inscriptions intended? It seems that Grabar’s opinion — that they were meant for Muslims — is correct.¹¹⁷ Did the builders of the Dome of the Rock intend the Muslim visitor to circle the building, reading the inscriptions? The answer is not clear. In this period very few Muslims could read and write, and the placement of the inscriptions was such that they probably could not have been easily read in full. However, the verses were not chosen at random. It thus seems that the inscriptions were meant to play a part in the polemic debate with Christianity.

D) The Syrian Umayyad delegation to the *hajj* in the year 68/688

Another argument raised by Goitein is based on a tradition recorded by al-Ṭabarī, according to which, in 68/688, “four camps — those of Abd al-Malik, Ibn Zubair, Najda (the Kharidjite) and Ibn al-Ḥanafīyya (Shī‘a) took part jointly in the Hajj.”¹¹⁸ The inevitable conclusion, according to Goitein, is “It takes for granted the fact that men from Syria performed the *hajj* at other times also during those crucial year [s]”.¹¹⁹

Al-Ṭabarī’s text indeed reports that there were four camps, each with its own banner. One of the camps is said to be the [camp at the head of which] the flag of Banū Umayya was carried (لواء بني أمية). Goitein considered this ‘Abd al-Malik’s camp.¹²⁰ Based on the same source, Goitein also stated: “On the contrary, we learn that ‘Abd al-Malik himself sent a group of celebrants [that is, pilgrims] to Mecca.”¹²¹

But this claim is not substantiated by this tradition of al-Ṭabarī. Moreover, nothing is said about the nature of this Umayyad camp. In this tradition, the leader of each camp is mentioned by name — except the Umayyad one. That the leader of the Umayyad camp was not

¹¹⁶Elad, “‘Abd al-Malik,” p. 56 (the Arabic text).

¹¹⁷Grabar, *Jerusalem*, p. 68.

¹¹⁸Goitein, “The historical background,” p. 104, according to al-Ṭabarī, 2nd series, pp. 781–782: al-Wāqidi < Shuraḥbīl b. Abī ‘Awn < his father.

¹¹⁹*Ibid.*

¹²⁰*Ibid.*

¹²¹Goitein, “Jerusalem in the Arab period,” p. 177 (according to al-Ṭabarī, 2nd series, pp. 781–782).

mentioned by name could possibly mean that he was not a well-known figure. Furthermore, we do not know if the pilgrims in this group came from Syria and if they were sent by ‘Abd al-Malik; they could have been Umayyad supporters from al-Ḥijāz. The parallel texts do not record the nature of the Umayyad camp or the name of its leader either, but they do report the names of the leaders of the three other camps. Al-Ya‘qūbī’s report may serve as an example when he says:

In this year [68 AH] four banners were posted [literally: “stood”] at ‘Arafāt: Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya at the head of his supporters, Ibn al-Zubayr at the head of his supporters, Najda b. ‘Āmir al-Ḥarūrī, and the banner of Banū Umayya. [The poet] al-Musāwir b. Hind b. Qays recited: they branched off, each group had an *Amīr al-Mu‘minīn*.¹²²

Goitein also concludes from al-Ṭabarī’s text that “men from Syria performed the Ḥajj at other times also during those crucial year [s].” This is not corroborated by al-Ṭabarī or by any other source. Al-Ṭabarī, his copyists and al-Ya‘qūbī, all give the year 68 AH as the year of the gathering of the four camps. Possibly another early source, Ibn Khayyāt (d. 240/854), describes this episode although he gives the year 66 AH instead of 68 AH and he reports of three camps only; the Umayyad camp is missing from his report.¹²³

Furthermore, it is clearly stated both by al-Ṭabarī and other sources that in each and every year, including 68 AH, Ibn al-Zubayr was the supreme leader of the *ḥajj*. He held a position higher than that of other leaders: “and the camp (literally: the banner) that sped out from ‘Arafa was that of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya [...] then the banner of Ibn al-Zubayr and the people followed him”: وكان أول من أفاض لواء محمد: “In this year [68 AH] Ibn al-Zubayr stood at the head of the pilgrims of the *ḥajj*”: وفي هذه السنة: حج ابن الزبير بالناس¹²⁴

¹²²Al-Ya‘qūbī, *Ta’rīkh* (Beirut ed.), vol. 2, p. 263:

وفي هذه السنة وقفت أربعة ألوية بعرفات محمد بن الحنفية في أصحابه وابن الزبير في أصحابه ونجدة بن عامر الحروري ولواء بني أمية وقال المساور بن هند بن قيس وتشعبوا شعبا فكل قبيلة فيها أمير المؤمنين.

On al-Musāwir b. Hind, see Elad, “The Golan,” pp. 59–63; for other parallel texts, see, for example, Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 6, pp. 70–71 (the text is garbled, though); Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya* (Cairo, 1351–1358 AH.), vol. 8, pp. 294–295 (a summary and adaptation of al-Ṭabarī’s text).

¹²³Ibn Khayyāt, *Ta’rīkh*, vol. 1, p. 333.

¹²⁴Al-Ṭabarī, 2nd series, p. 782; Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 6, p. 71; Ibn Khayyāt, *loc. cit.*: ووقف ابن الزبير بجماعة الناس.

This information is important since it corresponds to what we know of Ibn al-Zubayr’s complete control over Mecca and Medina. It is compatible with the evidence reported in the sources that from 64/684 until 71/691 (except perhaps 68/688), ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr stood alone at the head of the *hajj* pilgrimage.¹²⁵ There are also sources according to which Ibn Zubayr led the pilgrimage for nine successive years (64–72 AH).¹²⁶

¹²⁵Al-Ṭabarī, 2nd series, p. 537 (year 64 AH); p. 593 (year 65); p. 700 (year 66); p. 762 (year 67); p. 782 (year 68: four camps); p. 796 (year 69); p. 797 (year 70); p. 818 (year 71); Ibn Khayyāt, *Ta’rikh*, vol. 1, p. 334 (year 67); p. 337 (year 70); p. 339 (year 71); but see *ibid.*, p. 342; al-Ya’qūbī, *Ta’rikh* (Beirut ed.), vol. 2, p. 268: ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr stood at the head of the pilgrims in 63, 64 (it was said that in this year it was Yaḥyā b. Ṣafwān al-Jumaḥī who led the pilgrims), and in 65, 66, and 67; in 68 four banners were stationed in ‘Arafāt; and in the years 69, 70 and 71, ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr stood at the head of the pilgrimage; see also Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntazam*, vol. 6, pp. 31, 41, 61, 67, 71 (year 68 AH: four camps); pp. 93, 101, 113: years 64–71 AH accordingly; see also Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm* (ed. Juynboll and Matthews), vol. 1, pp. 197, 199, 200, 203, 204, 205: years 66–71 AH accordingly; the year 68 AH: four camps; year 69 AH: Muṣ‘ab b. al-Zubayr (on behalf of his brother).

¹²⁶Ibn Khayyāt, *Ta’rikh*, vol. 1, p. 343: “‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr stood at the head of the pilgrims from 64 until the arrival of the pilgrim’s season of 72, for [even] then ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr stood at the head of the pilgrims, but they did not perform the *wuqūf* where it was accustomed to do it [that is, in front of mount ‘Arafa that was under the control of al-Ḥajjāj’s army]; while al-Ḥajjāj, stood [in this year] at the head of the Syrian pilgrims, but they did not perform the *ṭawāf* around the *Ka’ba*.” Al-Qudā’ī, *al-Imbā’*, p. 212: [‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr] did not cease to stand at the head of the people during the *hajj* from the year 64 until 72” **ولم يزل يقيم للناس الحج** **ومن سنة أربع وستين إلى سنة أسنتين وسبعين**. Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, vol. 3, pp. 71–72: copying al-Qudā’ī without mentioning him; Rabbat, “The meaning of the Dome of the Rock,” p. 16 argues that “the *Ka’ba* appears to have remained the religious center for the Umayyads during the entire period of Ibn al-Zubayr’s insurrection (683–692);” but the two sources which he quotes (Ibn Sa’d, *al-Ṭabaqāt* [ed. Iḥsān ‘Abbās], vol. 5, pp. 228–229, and Ibn Khayyāt, *Ta’rikh*, vol. 1, p. 340) only relate to the end of the year 72/March–April 692, from the month of Dhū al-Qa’da, when the siege began; Ibn Sa’d also emphasizes that during the *hajj* of 72 AH al-Ḥajjāj and his second in command (Ṭāriq b. ‘Amr) did not perform the *hajj* ceremonies within Mecca (**ولم يطوفا بالبيت**); they performed it only after Ibn al-Zubayr’s death.

E) Some religio-social and cultural aspects
of the Umayyad caliphate

A) ‘Abd al-Malik and the *ḥajj*

One of the main arguments raised by Goitein, and accepted by other scholars¹²⁷ was that ‘Abd al-Malik would not have been able to establish Jerusalem as an alternative centre to Mecca, because by doing so he would have subverted one of the pillars of Islam, the pilgrimage to Mecca (*al-ḥajj*) and subsequently he would have been declared an unbeliever (*kāfir*). Rajā’ b. Ḥaywa, who was in charge of building the Dome of the Rock, and ‘Abd al-Malik himself, says Goitein, were pious Muslims and “it is inconceivable that, for political reasons, they would have been prepared to disavow the acknowledged sanctuary of Islam about which Muḥammad spoke at length in the Qur’ān.”¹²⁸

In order to examine this argument, several aspects pertaining to the Umayyad caliphate must be discussed.

1) Islam in the Umayyad caliphate: principles and institutions

In the Umayyad period, basic religious rituals, beliefs and institutions had not yet fully developed, and ignorance regarding such issues prevailed.¹²⁹ Muslims living in later periods — when the various institutions and law were better developed — misunderstood this state of affairs, and according to Goldziher “could only suppose that the godless Umayyads deliberately altered the times of the *ṣalāt*.”¹³⁰ Studies by Goldziher, Kister, Crone, Hinds, Hawting and Robinson clearly attest to this.¹³¹

¹²⁷For example, see Rabbat, “The meaning of the Dome of the Rock,” p. 17.

¹²⁸Goitein, “Jerusalem in the Arab period,” p.177; *idem*, “The historical background,” p. 105: “By such a step he would have marked himself as a *kāfir*, against whom *jihād* is obligatory. In addition, Rajā’ b. Ḥaywa [...] was an intimate friend of ‘Umar b. Abd al-Aziz, and a famous theologian, who could never have given his consent to such a pious fraud, and according to all we know, Abd al-Malik himself was an orthodox and observant Muslim.”

¹²⁹Goldziher, *Muslim studies*, vol. 2, pp. 38–39; Hawting, *The first dynasty*, p. 6; Robinson, ‘*Abd al-Malik*, pp. 93–100.

¹³⁰Goldziher, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

¹³¹*Ibid.*, pp. 38ff.; Crone and Hinds, *God’s Caliph*; Kister, “Concessions and conduct”; Hawting, *The first dynasty*, pp. 5–6 (Introduction) and p. 61; Robinson, ‘*Abd al-Malik*, esp. pp. 90–104. E.g., Goldziher, *op. cit.*, pp. 39–40. “[1] When Ibn ‘Abbās asked the people in Baṣra to fulfil the duty of the fast alms (*zakāt al-ḥiṭr*), they took counsel and sought to find Medinians who might inform them about this religious duty that was entirely unknown to them. [2] The same community in the first years of

Kister has shown that during the first century AH and the beginning of the second there were contradictory opinions among Muslim scholars regarding the basic principles of faith and ritual. He convincingly argued that the development and changes in modes and religious customs in the Umayyad period were inspired by the caliphs and their governors.¹³² One of the subjects expanded upon by Kister is that of the contradicting opinions concerning the rituals and customs during the *ḥajj*.¹³³

2) The politico-religious character of the Umayyad caliphate with emphasis on the nature and status of the caliph.

Another important part will deal with the status of the ‘*ulamā*’ in the Umayyad caliphate, stressing the relations between them and the government.

Goldziher showed that the Umayyads encouraged unconditional loyalty to their rule. In his discussion of the relations between the rulers and the scholars (a topic directly connected with the issue of ‘Abd al-Malik and the Dome of the Rock), he says:

Even pious doctors of the law belonged to the Murji’ite party — no doubt those theologians whom we have already met as willing tools and lenient judges of the Umayyad trend. They were expected by the authorities to declare the opponents of the dynasty and their abettors as ‘unbelievers’ and to spread this doctrine with the motivation that ‘those who split the staff,’ break the oath of allegiance, leave the community and thus threaten the security of the Muslims are worthy of the name *kāfir*.¹³⁴

its existence had no inkling of how to perform the *ṣalāt*.... [3] In Syria in olden times it was not generally known that there were only five obligatory *ṣalāts*, and in order to make certain of this fact it was necessary to find a Companion still alive who could be asked about it. [4]...p. 40: The people had so little accustomed themselves to the Islamic way of thought that at that time the Muslims had to be taught that one could not say *al-salām* ‘*alā Allāh*. [5] What must have been the state of knowledge of Muslims when it was possible for people to stand in the pulpit and recite Arabic verses, thinking them to be passages from the Koran [6] At the time of al-Ḥajjāj and ‘Umar II people had no idea of the proper times of prayer and the most pious Muslims were unsure of the quite elementary rules.”

¹³²Kister, “Concessions and conduct”, p. 97: “The great number of diverse traditions, merely hinted at above, clearly indicate that the formation of a normative code of ritual and usage began relatively late.”

¹³³*Ibid.*, pp. 97–105; Robinson, ‘*Abd al-Malik*, p. 96.

¹³⁴Goldziher, *Muslim studies*, vol. 2, p. 91; Goldziher’s argument that “the belief in unconditional blind loyalty to the government” was supported and nurtured by the political-religious movement/“party” al-Murji’a seems to be wrong, see W. Madelung, “Mur^ḍji’a,” *EI*², p. 606.

2.1) The ‘*ulamā*’ and the government

Goldziher’s keen observation seems to be correct. A thorough scrutiny of the sources reveals that a large number of important and famous scholars were involved in the daily life of the caliphate. On the one hand, many of them are described as pious and moral men; some of them even were said to be ascetics (*zuhhād*); on the other hand, many of them actively participated in politics and held public office. Moreover, men like Khālīd b. Ma‘dān (d. 103 or 104/721 or 722),¹³⁵ Maymūn b. Mihrān (d. 117/735–36),¹³⁶ ‘Ubāda b. Nusayy (d. 118/736–37) (on him see below), Ibrāhīm b. Abī ‘Abla (d. 152/769–70 or 153/770),¹³⁷ Shahr b. Ḥawshab (d. between 98/716 and 112/730–31),¹³⁸ and especially Rajā’ b. Ḥaywa (d. 112/730)¹³⁹ and Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124/742) held office under a number of caliphs. They were involved in governmental affairs, and were often the rulers’ partners in the formulation of the religio-political structure of the caliphate. They lived in a unique Arab-Islamic state, and worked within it and for it.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁵See Elad, “Community of believers,” p. 263.

¹³⁶See *ibid.*, pp. 260–261.

¹³⁷See Elad, *Jerusalem*, pp. 19–21; Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh* (Beirut ed.), vol. 6, pp. 428–440; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Ma‘rūf), vol. 2, pp. 140–145.

¹³⁸See Elad, “Community of believers,” p. 261.

¹³⁹Rajā’ (d. 112/730–731) is described as a *zāhid* and an ‘*ālim*, and was a *faqīh* and *muḥaddīth*. He was a member of one of the families of the southern tribe of Kinda, and held important offices under the Umayyads, from the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik until that of his son Hishām (r. 105/724–125/744). He was from Beth Shean in the province of al-Urdunn. At some stage Rajā’ moved to the province (*jund*) of Filastīn, possibly following his appointment by ‘Abd al-Malik as overseer of the construction of the Dome of the Rock. This move to *jund* Filastīn may be the source of his title *Sayyid ahl Filastīn*, the leader of the people of Filastīn. On Rajā’, see Bosworth, “Rajā’;” Gil, *Palestine*, vol. 1, pp. 100–101, no. 153; Rabbat, “The Dome of the Rock revisited,” pp. 70–71; Elad, “Beth Shean,” pp. 32–33 and the bibliography there; Elad, “Community of believers,” p. 260; *Sayyid ahl Filastīn*: Gil, *loc. cit.*; Abū Zur‘a, *Ta’rīkh*, vol. 1, pp. 249, 711; Ibn Ḥibbān, *al-Thiqāt*, vol. 4, p. 237; al-Ṭabarānī, *Mu‘jam al-Shāmiyyīn*, vol. 3, p. 266; Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh* (Beirut ed.), vol. 24, p. 215; vol. 44, p. 321; vol. 65, p. 57; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 5, p. 324; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Ma‘rūf), vol. 22, p. 198; vol. 32, p. 40.

¹⁴⁰The case of al-Zuhrī was exhaustively dealt with by Lecker, “al-Zuhrī,” pp. 23ff., 33, 37–40; See also the observations of ‘Athāmina, “The ‘Ulamā’,” pp. 159, 166 and Livne-Kafri, “Jerusalem in early Islam,” pp. 51–52 (both quoted by Lecker, *op. cit.*, p. 23, n. 11); see also Donner, “Historiography,” in which he discusses in great detail several important scholars in the Umayyad period and their relations with the regime; Elad, *Jerusalem*, pp. 19–21; for additional information concerning the relations between distinguished scholars and the Umayyad regime, see Abū Zur‘a, *Ta’rīkh*, vol. 1, pp. 351, 432–433, 370; vol. 2, pp. 700–701; al-Fasawī, *al-Ma‘rifa* (Beirut, 1981), vol. 2, p. 396; Goldziher, *Muslim studies*, vol. 2, p. 48; Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, pp. 80–81; and especially, Livne, *The sanctity of Jerusalem*, pp. 32–35 (a detailed discussion on the close relations between the early *zuhhād* and ‘*ulamā*’ and the government); Elad, “Community of believers,” pp. 256–267 for many more examples of scholars at the service of the Umayyad government.

This, therefore, is the context in which the building of the Dome of the Rock by Rajā’ b. Ḥaywa — at ‘Abd al-Malik’s command— should be viewed.¹⁴¹

‘Ubāda b. Nusayy (d. 118/736–737), a member of another family of Kinda, who lived in the province of al-Urdunn,¹⁴² should be regarded in the same way. He was a scholar, a specialist on law, and filled the post of *qāḍī* in the district of al-Urdunn.¹⁴³ At the same time [?] he was the governor of the province on behalf of ‘Abd al-Malik (r. 65/685–86/705) and ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (r. 99/717–101/720). He was called *Sayyid Ahl al-Urdunn* or *Sayyid al-Urdunn*.¹⁴⁴ ‘Ubāda is even said to have been the ‘*arīf*’ of Rajā’ b. Ḥaywa.¹⁴⁵

Scholars, such as Khālīd b. Ma‘dān, Rajā’ b. Ḥaywa, Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī and many others,¹⁴⁶ thought there was nothing wrong with serving the Umayyad government, and information which seems authentic indicates that such scholars were not above earthly matters. This is also true of their predecessors among the Companions.¹⁴⁷

Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124/742), perhaps the greatest scholar of the first and second centuries, arrived in Damascus penniless.¹⁴⁸ At the time

¹⁴¹Rabbat, “The Dome of the Rock revisited,” pp. 70–71 emphasises the crucial role of Rajā’ in the building of the Dome of the Rock being “the designer of the message that the Dome was meant to convey...”; my interpretation of the meaning of the Dome of the Rock and the intentions of the Caliph and Rajā’ b. Ḥaywa are different from Rabbat.

¹⁴²See Gil, *Palestine*, vol. 1, p. 101, no. 155; Donner, “Historiography,” pp. 9–12; Elad, “Beth Shean,” pp. 33, 35; Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh* (Beirut ed.), vol. 24, pp. 209–220.

¹⁴³Ibn ‘Asākir *Ta’rīkh* (Beirut ed.), vol. 26, pp. 214, 216; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ* (Beirut ed.), vol. 5, p. 113; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Ma‘rūf), vol. 14, p. 197; Donner, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

¹⁴⁴Elad, “Beth Shean,” p. 35, following Ibn ‘Asākir, *op. cit.*, pp. 210, 213–214, 216; p. 213: *al-Urdunnī, sayyiduhum*; and the sources in note 126 above) (Abū Zur‘a, *Ta’rīkh*; Ibn Ḥibbān, *al-Thiqāt*; al-Ṭabarānī, *Mu‘jam al-Shāmiyyīn*; Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh*; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*; and al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*).

¹⁴⁵Elad, *loc. cit.*, following Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh* (Beirut ed., vol. 26, p. 216); it means that ‘Ubāda was the ‘*arīf*’ of the tribal group to which Rajā’ belonged. This term denotes someone appointed by the government, with civil and military powers (taxation, pensions [*al-‘aṭā*]). Evidence from the beginning of the Muslim period indicates that this official was a commander of a military unit; see Ṣāliḥ A. el-‘Alī and Cl. Cahen, “Arīf,” *EI*², s.v.

¹⁴⁶See Elad, “Community of believers,” pp. 259–267, for more scholars; this topic merits a thorough study.

¹⁴⁷Much information on this issue has been compiled by al-Kattānī, *al-Tarātīb*, vol. 2, pp. 397–403: the great wealth of Ṭalḥa, al-Zubayr, al-Miqdād b. al-Aswad, Ḥakīm b. Ḥizām, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Awf, Zayd b. Thābit, Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqāṣ, ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, ‘Amr b. Ḥurayth al-Makhzūmī, Ḥurayth b. ‘Abd al-‘Uzzā and many others.

¹⁴⁸Since al-Zuhrī’s father fought at the side of ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr against ‘Abd al-Malik (Lecker, “al-Zuhrī,” p. 47), this caliph ordered the removal from the *Dīwān* of the names of the members of this family (Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh* (Beirut ed.), vol.

of his death he was wealthy, thanks to money and lands he had received from the Umayyad rulers (despite apologetic attempts to present him as poverty-stricken and destitute).¹⁴⁹

Most of the scholars mentioned here were Arabs; many belonged to important tribes. This contradicts Donner's assertion that they were non-Arabs, of base origin, and that "their status within the community was established solely by their piety".¹⁵⁰ The studies by Monique Bernards and John Nawas also show that there were more Arabs than non-Arabs among the scholars of the first and second centuries.¹⁵¹

2.2) The character of the Umayyad caliph

a) The title *Khalīfat Allāh*

Crone and Hinds showed clearly that the Umayyad caliphs (including ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān) bore the official title *Khalīfat Allāh* (God's Deputy). Hakim has shown recently that this title was also borne by ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (d. 644).¹⁵² This honorific is of great significance and indicates that all religious and political authority was concentrated in the caliphate. In the words of Crone and Hinds:

It was the caliph who was charged with the definition of Islamic law, the very core of the religion, and without allegiance to a caliph no Muslim could achieve salvation.¹⁵³

ʿAbd al-Malik and all the Caliphs who succeeded him bore the title *Khalīfat Allāh*. The evidence is rendered by Crone and Hinds, from material (e.g., numismatic) as well as literary evidence.¹⁵⁴

b.) The Umayyad caliphs and the prophets

Moreover, Crone and Hinds convincingly show that the prevalent outlook in the Umayyad period, as learned from the official letters that survived in the Arabic chronicles and from diverse literary sources, was that the Umayyad caliphs claimed that their authority as rulers came

55, pp. 300, 302 [= *idem*, *al-Mukhtaṣar*, vol. 23, p. 227]; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 5, pp. 229, 230; Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntaẓam*, vol. 7, pp. 232–233; see also Abū Zurʿa, *Taʾrīkh*, vol. 1, p. 408) and other Arab tribes (al-Fasawī, *al-Maʿrifa*, vol. 1, p. 627; Ibn ʿAsākir, *Taʾrīkh* (Beirut ed.), vol. 55, p. 302 [= *idem*, *al-Mukhtaṣar*, vol. 23, p. 229]). ʿAbd al-Malik renewed and even increased the annual pension to al-Zuhrī, appointed him as one of the *Ṣahāba* of the Caliph, with the salary of that class (Ibn ʿAsākir, *op. cit.*, p. 324; Ibn al-Jawzī, *op. cit.*, p. 234; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 5, p. 331), and paid his debts (Ibn ʿAsākir, *op. cit.*, p. 298 [= *idem*, *al-Mukhtaṣar*, vol. 23, p. 241]; al-Dhahabī, *op. cit.*, p. 329).

¹⁴⁹See Lecker, "al-Zuhrī," pp. 36, 40 n. 83, but esp. pp. 50–55.

¹⁵⁰Donner, *Narratives*, p. 99.

¹⁵¹Bernards and Nawas, "The development of the Islamic religious sciences;" Bernards, "*Mawālī*"; Nawas, "*Mawālī* and Arab"; *idem.*, "*Mawālī ʿUlamāʾ*."

¹⁵²Hakim, "ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb," esp. pp. 207–217.

¹⁵³Crone and Hinds, *God's Caliph*, pp. 1, 5–6.

¹⁵⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 8ff; see also Robinson, *ʿAbd al-Malik*, pp. 82, 84, 87.

directly from God, and thus they are no lower in rank than the prophets, including Muḥammad.¹⁵⁵ Many traditions record that the Umayyad caliphs and their senior officials regarded *Khalīfat Allāh* as above the prophets and also above Muḥammad himself.

These traditions are found in the early *ḥadīth* literature, in the important historical chronicles, recorded through chains of transmitters that end with personal testimonies of different early historians (أخباريون) who lived in the period of ‘Abd al-Malik, sometimes essentially different from each other in regard to various circumstances, events and persons connected with these traditions.

Traditions attesting that *Khalīfat Allāh*
is above the prophets and even above Muḥammad¹⁵⁶

a) Letters from al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf to ‘Abd al-Malik

1) In a letter to ‘Abd al-Malik, al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf expressed the opinion that “God held His deputy on His earth in higher regard than His messenger to His living creatures.”¹⁵⁷

2) Al-Shaybānī from al-Haytham [b. ‘Adī, d. 206/821 or 207/822 or 209/824] from Ibn ‘Ayyāsh [al-Mantūf, d. 158/775]¹⁵⁸ who said: “We

¹⁵⁵Crone and Hinds, *God’s Caliph*, pp. 26–28: analyzing some official letters of caliphs al-Walīd II (d. 126/744), Yazīd III (d.126/744) and Marwān II (d. 132/750), which are quoted in al-Ṭabarī’s *Ta’rīkh*, in which the official Umayyad political theory is reflected; Robinson, *‘Abd al-Malik*, pp. 87, 90, 91.

¹⁵⁶The following traditions were quoted (in part) by Crone and Hinds.

¹⁵⁷Crone and Hinds, *op. cit.*, p. 28, quoting Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi, *al-‘Iqd*, vol. 5, pp. 52–53: *في كتابه إلى عبد الملك بن مروان: إن خليفة الله في أرضه أكرم عليه من رسوله إليهم.*

¹⁵⁸He is ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Ayyāsh al-Mantūf al-Hamdānī al-Kūfī, an early historian (*akhbārī*), who lived in Baghdād and was one of the *ṣaḥāba* of Caliph al-Manṣūr. He was a major transmitter of al-Haytham b. ‘Adī and other early *akhbārīyyūn*. See Leder, *Ḥaitam ibn ‘Adī* (index, esp. pp. 48–49 and the bibliography therein); Pellat in al-Mas‘ūdī’s *Murūj al-dhahab*, vol. 7, p. 477 (index); the main sources for his biography are al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta’rīkh*, vol. 10, pp. 15–16; al-Dhahabī, *Mizān* (Beirut, 1995), vol. 4, p. 158; *idem*, *Ta’rīkh (Ḥawādith wa-wafayāt 141–160 H.)*, p. 465; al-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfi*, vol. 17, pp. 393–394 and the bibliography therein; all the sources are mentioned by Leder, *op. cit.*, p. 48; see also Abū Nu‘aym, *Ḥilya*, vol. 5, p. 113 and al-Dhahabī, *Mizān*, *loc. cit.*, where he is called *ṣāhib al-Haytham b. ‘Adī*. The editor of *al-‘Iqd* rightly remarks that there is a missing link in the *isnād*, since Ibn ‘Ayyāsh al-Mantūf died in 158/775 [!], that is, more than 70 years after ‘Abd al-Malik’s death. He suggests that the missing link is Ibn ‘Ayyāsh’s father. This is a most plausible suggestion. Ibn ‘Ayyāsh indeed transmitted from his father; for example, see the long tradition that he related about ‘Umar II (Abū Nu‘aym, *Ḥilya*, vol. 5, p. 261); according to another piece of evidence he related to his son that he was sent by ‘Abd al-Malik in a delegation of ten men to Zufar b. al-Ḥārith. One of the members of this delegation was al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf, who was at that time one of

note the plural again).¹⁶² The full text runs as follows:

From Ibn ‘Ayyāsh al-Hamdānī [al-Mantūf]:¹⁶³ I was told by al-‘Umarī from al-Haytham b. ‘Adī who said: al-Ḥajjāj arrived to al-Kūfa and was assisted by the children of al-Mughīra [b. Shu‘ba [d. 50/670]]; he nominated ‘Urwa as the governor of al-Kūfa...and Ḥamza b. al-Mughīra as the governor of al-Madā’in.¹⁶⁴ He sent for Muṭarrif b. al-Mughīra who was a pious man (*wa-kāna yata’ allahu*)¹⁶⁵ and told him one day: “Indeed ‘Abd al-Malik is the deputy of God and he is more esteemed in the eyes of God than His messengers. These words affected Muṭarrif gravely. He used to believe firmly in disapproving what is disapproved by God, but he did not reach so far as to accept the dogma of the Khawārij. It happened that Shabīb b. Yazīd al-Khārijī passed through al-Madā’in while Muṭarrif was in the city, and he (Muṭarrif) discussed with him and disagreed with his (theological) view but he accepted his call to rebel.¹⁶⁶

Two additional alleged sayings in this vein from al-Ḥajjāj to Muṭarrif b. al-Mughīra are found in al-Balādhurī’s *Ansāb*; each is related by different transmitters).

4.1) “‘Abd Allāh b. Ṣāliḥ [b. Muslim al-‘Ijlī al-Kūfī, 143/760–761–211/826–827 or ca. 221/835–836] transmitted to me from Ḥamza [b. Ḥabīb b. ‘Umāra *al-Muqri’* al-Kūfī d. 156/772–773 or 158/774–775] *al-Zayyāt*. The former heard him saying, mentioning al-Ḥajjāj who sent for Muṭarrif b. al-Mughīra b. Shu‘ba who was a pious person and said to him: Oh Muṭarrif, who is more esteemed in your eyes, your messenger or your deputy of your family? He said: indeed my deputy is more dignified. Al-Ḥajjāj said: Indeed ‘Abd al-Malik is God’s deputy among his worshippers and he is held in higher regard by God than Muḥammad

¹⁶²Crone and Hinds, *God’s Caliph*, p. 28, note 16, quoting al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-ashraf*, MS Süleymaniye (Reisülküttap) no. 598, vol. 2, fol. 28b; see the text in al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb* (ed. al-‘Az̄m), vol. 6, p. 507.

¹⁶³See above, note 158.

¹⁶⁴Cf. al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb* (ed. al-‘Az̄m), vol. 6, p. 508: وقال هشام بن الكلبي: استعمل الحجاج حمزة بن المغيرة على همدان واستعمل مطرفا على المدائن ونواحيها...

¹⁶⁵He devoted himself to religious services or exercises; applied himself to acts of devotion (Lane’s *Lexicon*, s.v. *a-l-h*).

¹⁶⁶Al-Balādhurī, *op. cit.*, p. 507, ll. 10–16: وحدثني العمري عن الهيثم بن عدي عن ابن عباس الهمداني قال: قدم الحجاج الكوفة فاستعان بولد المغيرة [بن شعبة] فولى عروة الكوفة ... وولى حمزة بن المغيرة المدائن وأرسل إلى مطرف بن المغيرة وكان يتاله فقال له يوما: إن عبد الملك خليفة الله وهو أكرم على الله من رسله فوقرت في نفس مطرف وكان يعتقد إنكار النكير ولا يبلغ قول الخوارج، فمر شبيب بن يزيد الخارجي بالمدائن ومطرف بها فناظره تخالفه في رأيه ووافقته على الخروج.

and the other Messengers. These words affected Muṭarrif gravely, but he concealed it and said (in his heart): By God, *jihād* against you is preferable to *jihād* against the Byzantines, so he rebelled against him.”¹⁶⁷

According to this text, ‘Abd al-Malik’s position is higher than that of Muḥammad and of the other prophets. Muṭarrif b. al-Mughīra b. Shu‘ba was a senior member of al-Ḥajjāj’s court and the governor of al-Madā’in on the latter’s behalf. He rebelled against al-Ḥajjāj in 83/683.¹⁶⁸

4.2) “‘Alī b. al-Mughīra al-Athram [d. 230/844–845 or 232/846]¹⁶⁹ related to me [that is, al-Balādhurī] from Abū ‘Ubayda [Ma‘mar b. al-Muthannā, 110/728–209/824–25¹⁷⁰] who said: Muṭarrif heard al-Ḥajjāj saying: “Who is more esteemed in your eyes, your messenger or your deputy?” He kept silent and said: I swear by God: he is an unbeliever, killing him is lawful.”¹⁷¹

b.2) Al-Rabī‘ b. Khālīd al-Ḍabbī

5) The earliest text is Abū Dāwūd’s *Sunan* transmitted through the following *isnād*:

“Ishāq b. Ismā‘īl al-Ṭālaqānī and Zuhayr b. Ḥarb both transmitted from < Jarīr < al-Mughīra [b. Muqsim al-Kūfī, d. 133/750–751 or 134/751–752 or 136/753–54]¹⁷² < al-Rabī‘ b. Khālīd al-Ḍabbī [d. 83/683]¹⁷³ who said: I heard al-Ḥajjāj giving a sermon; he said in his

¹⁶⁷Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb* (ed. al-‘Azīm), vol. 12, p. 360, ll. 2–7:

حدثني عبد الله بن صالح عن حمزة الزيات أنه سمعه يقول وذكر الحجاج أنه أرسل إلى مطرف بن المغيرة بن شعبة وكان يتأله فقال له: يا مطرف أرسلوك أكرم عليك أم خليفتك في أهلك؟ فقال: بل خليفتي أكرم. قال الحجاج: فإن عبد الملك خليفة الله في عباده فهو أكرم عليه من محمد وغيره من الرسل. فوقرت في نفس مطرف واختباها وقال: جهادك والله أولى من جهاد الروم فخرج عليه. The transmitters: ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṣāliḥ b. Muslim al-‘Ijlī al-Kūfī *al-Muqribi al-Muḥaddith*; on him, see al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 10, pp. 403–405; on p. 404 al-Dhahabī argues against the year 211 AH as the year of his death and suggests ca. 221/835–836; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Ma‘rūf), vol. 15, pp. 109–115; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta’rīkh*, vol. 9, p. 477; on Ḥamza b. Ḥabīb b. ‘Umāra *al-Muqribi* al-Kūfī, see Ibn Hibbān, *al-Thiqāt* (Beirut, 1975), vol. 6, p. 228; Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (Beirut, 1978), vol. 1, p. 44, mentioning two books of his: *Kitāb qirā’at Ḥamza* and *Kitāb al-farā’id*; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Ma‘rūf), vol. 7, pp. 314–323.

¹⁶⁸See al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb* (ed. al-‘Azīm), vol. 6, pp. 507–516.

¹⁶⁹The famous grammarian, philologist and *ḥadīth* scholar; on him, see Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (Beirut, 1978), vol. 1, pp. 83–84 (d. 230 AH); Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh* (Beirut ed.), vol. 43, pp. 247–249 (d. 232 AH); al-Ziriklī, *al-A‘lām*, vol. 5, p. 23; Kahhāla, *Mu‘jam*, vol. 7, p. 244.

¹⁷⁰On this important philologist and historian, see H.A.R. Gibb, “Abū ‘Ubayda Ma‘mar b. al-Muthannā,” *EI*², s.v.; Madelung, “Abū ‘Ubayda”; Lecker, “Abū ‘Ubayda.”

¹⁷¹Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb* (ed. al-‘Azīm), vol. 6, p. 507, ll. 7–9:

حدثني علي بن المغيرة الأثرم عن أبي عبيدة قال: سمع مطرف الحجاج يقول: أرسل أحدكم أكرم عليه أم خليفته؟ فوجم وقال: كافر والله، والله إن قتله لخلال.

¹⁷²On him, see Ibn Zabir, *Mawliā al-‘ulamā’*, vol. 1, p. 316; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 6, pp. 10–13; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Ma‘rūf), vol. 28, pp. 397–403.

¹⁷³On him, see Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ* (Beirut ed.), vol. 8, p. 228; Ibn Ḥajar,

It is clear from these traditions that al-Ḥajjāj was much criticized by some scholars already during his life time; this is true also of later periods and modern times.¹⁷⁷ He was even regarded by some as a *kāfir*. It stands to reason that since he was a governor appointed by ‘Abd al-Malik, this attitude was also directed towards the caliph. Religio-political movements surely regarded al-Ḥajjāj as ‘Abd al-Malik’s instrument. One must remember that many socio-political changes made by ‘Abd al-Malik were immediately perceived by his opponents as an attack on the sacred principals of Islam. Be that as it may, the majority of scholars supported the caliph and the caliphate.

Three persons, a pious “noble” governor (Muṭarrif b. al-Mughīra), a *ḥadīth* scholar, al-Rabī‘ b. Khālīd (both also Qur’ān readers), and another pious Qur’ān reader, decided to rebel because of al-Ḥajjāj’s “blasphemous” speeches. Now the Arabic sources often have a tendency to explain historical events by focusing on specific persons. There are many examples of this phenomenon. One well known example is the way they depict the reasons for the rebellion of Ibn al-Ash‘ath himself against ‘Abd al-Malik.¹⁷⁸ These three scholars took part in Ibn al-Ash‘ath’s rebellion, and according to the sources quoted above, the reason for their antagonism towards the Umayyad regime and their rebellion was the specific sentence allegedly related by al-Ḥajjāj.

Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik is superior to the Prophet

Parallel versions of the above mentioned tradition are attributed to a different governor of al-‘Irāq and a different caliph, e.g., Khālīd b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Qasrī and Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik.

7) Al-Ṭabarī records (most probably from al-Haytham b. ‘Adī, d. 206–207/821–823 or 209/824–825) a tradition in which Khālīd b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Qasrī [d. 126/743] the famous governor of al-‘Irāq on behalf

خليفتك؟ يعرض بأن عبد الملك بن مروان بن الحكم أفضل من رسول الله صلعم: فلما سمعه جلبة بن زحر قال: لله علي ألا أصلي خلفه أبدا وإن رأيت من يجاهده لأجاهدنه معه. فخرج مع عبد الرحمن بن الأشعث وقتل معه.

¹⁷⁷This matter merits a separate study. Suffice to mention the attitude of the commentary and criticism of al-‘Azīmābādī, an Indian *ḥadīth* scholar who died at the beginning of the 20th century (see Kaḥḥāla, *Mu‘jam*, vol. 9, p. 63; al-Ziriklī, *al-A‘lām*, vol. 6, p. 39; Sarkīs, *Mu‘jam*, vol. 1, p. 310, vol. 2, p. 1344) on the tradition quoted above from Abū Dāwūd’s *Sunan*, al-‘Azīmābādī, *‘Awn al-ma‘būd*, vol. 12, pp. 256–257.

¹⁷⁸L. Veccia Vaglieri, “Ibn al-Ash‘ath”, *EI*², p. 718.

of Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik¹⁷⁹ writes to the caliph describing how Ibn Shufayy¹⁸⁰ stood in front of the caliph saying to him “Commander of the Faithful, who is more distinguished in your eyes: your deputy in your family or your Messenger; the Commander of the Faithful said [continues Ibn Shufayy]: But (of course) my deputy in my family; so Ibn Shufayy said: But surely, you are God’s deputy and Muḥammad is His messenger, peace be upon him...”¹⁸¹

8) This version was recorded by al-Ṭabarī without mentioning its source, i.e., al-Haytham b. ‘Adī. But in a parallel tradition (with some omissions — mainly the first sentence — and important additions) recorded by al-Balādhurī he is mentioned as the latter’s direct source: *amīr al-mu’minīn* is *khalīfat Allāh*, and he is more distinguished in God’s eyes than His Messenger; for you are a *khalīfa* and Muḥammad, peace be upon him, is a messenger.”¹⁸²

9) Another version is recorded by Abū ‘l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī¹⁸³ through the following *isnād*: ...‘Umar b. Shabba [172/789–262/876] < ‘Ubayd-

¹⁷⁹On him, see Crone, *Slaves*, p. 102.

¹⁸⁰Al-Ṭabarī and Ibn al-Athīr: Ibn Shaqī; al-Balādhurī and al-Maqrīzī: Ibn Shufayy; it seems that this is the correct reading of the name; perhaps he is Thumāma b. Shufayy b. Māti‘ al-Hamdānī al-Aṣbaḥī or according to some other sources al-Uhrūjī, who died during the Caliphate of Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik, before the year 120/737–738; See al-Bukhārī, *al-Kabīr* (Beirut ed.), vol. 2, p. 177; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ* (Beirut ed.), vol. 2, p. 25; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb* (Beirut, 1984), vol. 2, p. 25; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Ma‘rūf), vol. 4, pp. 404–405. Arab chieftains from Banū Aṣbaḥ are called: *Sayyid Ḥimyar bi-‘l-Shām wa-Miṣr* see Ibn al-Kalbī, *Nasab Ma‘add*, vol. 2, pp. 543: (said of Kurayb b. Abraha); p. 544: *Sayyid Ḥimyar bi-‘l-Shām* (said of al-Naḍr b. Yarīm).

¹⁸¹Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 2nd series, p. 1818; copied by Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil* (Beirut ed.), vol. 5, p. 272:

ولكن أعظم من ذلك قيام ابن شقي الحميري إلى أمير المؤمنين وقوله يا أمير المؤمنين خليفتك في
أهلك أكرم عليك أم رسولك فقال أمير المؤمنين بل خليفتي في أهلي فقال ابن شقي فأنت خليفة الله
ومحمد رسوله...

Crone and Hinds, *God’s Caliph*, p. 29, note 21; *ibid.*, quoting al-Dīnawarī, *al-Akḥbār*, p. 346, where Ibn Shufayy is ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṣayfī.

¹⁸²Al-Balādhurī, *al-Ansāb* (ed. al-‘Aẓm), vol. 7, p. 451:

قال الهيثم: فأقام خالد [بن عبد الله القسري] بدمشق... وقال الهيثم: أمر هشام الأبرش فكتب إلى
خالد... فكتب إليه خالد: ...ولكن أعظم من ذلك قيام ابن شقي الحميري وقوله: أمير المؤمنين خليفة
الله وهو أكرم على الله من رسوله فأنت خليفة ومحمد عليه السلام رسول...

Al-Balādhurī’s version was copied by al-Maqrīzī in his anti-‘Abbāsī polemical treatise (*al-Nizā‘ wa-‘l-takhāṣum*, p. 69).

¹⁸³Al-Iṣfahānī, *al-Aghānī* (Dār al-Kutub ed.), vol. 22, pp. 17–18 (Crone and Hinds, *op. cit.*, note 20):

أخبرني أبو عبيدة الصيرفي قال حدثنا الفضل بن الحسن المصري قال حدثني عمر بن شبة قال
حدثني عبيد الله بن حباب قال حدثني عطاء بن مسلم قال قال خالد بن عبد الله وذكر النبي فقال

allāh b. Ḥubāb [sic; read ‘Ubayd b. Jannād, d. 231/845–46¹⁸⁴] < ‘Aṭā’ b. Muslim [al-Khaffāf, d. 190/805–806¹⁸⁵].

10) Khālid al-Qasrī is also reported to have delivered a similar speech in Mecca in the year 79/698–699, when he was the governor of the city on behalf of al-Walīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik.¹⁸⁶

The traditions discussed above on Khālid b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Qasrī’s sermon in Mecca and his letter to Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik are to a large degree parallel to some of the traditions on al-Ḥajjāj and ‘Abd al-Malik; such traditions may have become a literary convention. On the other hand, the various versions of the traditions, their transmitters and the circumstances of their transmission show that the matter noted in them was mentioned and discussed before the Umayyad caliph and that they are not just literary anecdotes. Several other traditions are reported on the allegedly disrespectful (even contemptuous) attitude Khālid al-Qasrī demonstrated towards some of the most sacred places to Islam, e.g., the Ka‘ba and the Zamzam well.¹⁸⁷ These traditions are part of the extensive Arabic literature that developed in the early period (from the end of the 1st/7th century-beginning of the 2nd/8th century) on the Umayyads. A significant part of this literature was woven around the

أيما أكرم عندكم على الرجل رسوله في حاجته أو خليفته في أهله يعرض بأن هشاما خير من النبي.
 “Khālid b. ‘Abd Allāh mentioned [or praised] the Prophet and said: ‘Who is more distinguished and superior in your eyes: a man’s messenger sent on his behalf for any need or his deputy who is in charge of his family,’ hinting that Hishām is more distinguished than the Prophet.”

¹⁸⁴He lived in Ḥalab, where he was nominated by caliph al-Ma‘mūn as the *qāḍī* of the town. See Ibn Ḥibbān, *al-Thiqāt* (Beirut, 1975), vol. 8, p. 432; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ* (Beirut ed.), vol. 5, p. 404; Ibn al-Najjār, *Dhayl ta’rīkh Baghdād*, vol. 2, p. 120 (nominated as a *qāḍī*); he learned (*ḥadīth*) from ‘Aṭā’ b. Muslim and transmitted to ‘Umar b. Shabba; see, for example, al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb* (ed. Madelung), vol. 2, p. 135; Ibn Shabba, *Ta’rīkh al-Madīna*, vol. 4, p. 1222; Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh* (Beirut ed.), vol. 14, p. 233; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (Ma‘rūf ed.), vol. 6, p. 441; al-Isfahānī, *al-Aghānī* (Dār al-Kutub ed.), vol. 11, p. 4.

¹⁸⁵On him, see Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntazam*, vol. 9, pp. 187–188; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Ma‘rūf), vol. 20, p. 106, and the bibliography therein.

¹⁸⁶Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, 2nd series, p. 1199 (Crone and Hinds, *God’s Caliph*, p. 29, note 19):

وفي هذه السنة ولي خالد بن عبدالله القسري مكة فيما زعم الواقدي وذكر أن عمر بن صالح حدثه عن نافع مولى بني مخزوم قال سمعت خالد بن عبد الله يقول على منبر مكة وهو يخاطب أيها الناس أيما أعظم أخليفة الرجل على أهله أم رسوله أليهم [...]

See also Kister, “Some reports,” p. 91 (quoting the MS of al-Fākihī, *Akhbār Makka* [= al-Fākihī, *Akhbār Makka*, vol. 3, p. 60]); (Crone and Hinds, *loc. cit.*, quoting Kister).

¹⁸⁷Al-Isfahānī, *al-Aghānī* (Dār al-Kutub ed.), vol. 22, p. 16 (Zamzam); p. 17 (Mecca); Kister, *loc. cit.* These are traditions in the spirit of Ḥajjāj’s words that reflect the frame of mind, the opinions and political-religious thinking prevalent in the Umayyad caliphate.

great caliphs of the Umayyad dynasty and their renowned governors, e.g., Ziyād b. Abihi, al-Mughīra b. Shu‘ba, al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf, Khālīd b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Qasrī, Yūsuf b. ‘Umar and Yazīd b. ‘Umar b. Hubayra.

The Prophet’s grave and the palace of *amīr al-mu‘minīn*

11) A different version of the “Deputy versus Messenger” motif is recorded by Ibn Abī ‘l-Ḥadīd: “Al-Ḥajjāj delivered a sermon in al-Kūfa in which he mentioned the Muslims who visit the grave of the Messenger of God *ṣal‘am* in al-Madīna. He said: May they perish, they merely circumambulate wood and decayed and rotten bones; is it not better for them to circumambulate the palace of *Amīr al-Mu‘minīn* ‘Abd al-Malik? Do they not know that the deputy of the man is better than his messenger?”¹⁸⁸ Ibn Abī ‘l-Ḥadīd records¹⁸⁹ that he copied from a book entitled:

كتاب افتراق هاشم وعبد شمس لأبي الحسين محمد بن علي بن نصر المعروف
 بابن أبي رؤية الدباس.

So far I was not able to find any information about the book. Very little is known of its author, Ibn Abī Ru‘ba who died in 320/932.¹⁹⁰ It is possible that the tradition about al-Ḥajjāj’s sermon in al-Kūfa is also taken from the same work, but it is not clearly attested to by Ibn Abī ‘l-Ḥadīd.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁸Ibn Abī ‘l-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ*, vol. 15, p. 242:

وخطب الحجاج بالكوفة فذكر الذين يزورون قبر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بالمدينة. فقال:
 تبأ لهم إنما يطوفون بأعواد ورمة بالية هلا طافوا بقصر أمير المؤمنين عبد الملك ألا يعلمون أن خليفة
 المرء خير من رسوله.

Crone and Hinds, *God’s Caliph*, pp. 28–29, note 17 paraphrasing: “He [= al-Ḥajjāj] was also of the opinion that those who circumambulated the tomb of Muḥammad in Medina should rather circumambulate the palace of ‘Abd al-Malik, since one’s deputy is [p. 29] better than one’s messenger.” They add that Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi (*Iqd*, vol. 5, p. 51) “has part of this story, not the scandalous suggestion regarding ‘Abd al-Malik’s palace”; see also Robinson, *‘Abd al-Malik*, p. 90.

¹⁸⁹Ibn Abī ‘l-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ*, vol. 15, p. 240.

¹⁹⁰Al-Khaṭīb al-Baḡhdādī, *Ta’rīkh*, vol. 3, p. 292: a short biography; his name: Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. Muḥammad b. Naṣr, instead of Muḥammad b. ‘Alī b. Naṣr rendered by Ibn Abī ‘l-Ḥadīd, who also quotes some additional segments from his book on pp. 232–233; he is mentioned a few times as a transmitter of traditions, e.g., al-Zayla‘ī, *Naṣb al-rāya*, vol. 3, p. 417; vol. 4, p. 280 (about the way the Prophet used to divide the spoils of war).

¹⁹¹Several of the paragraphs between pp. 240 and 242 opens with the word *qāla*, which may denote that Ibn Abī ‘l-Ḥadīd quotes the work of al-Dabbās.

In this tradition a new motif is added, namely, the strong reservation of circumambulation of the grave of the Prophet. It is recorded by other sources as well, e.g.:

12) Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi who records it in a special chapter entitled “Those who claimed that al-Ḥajjāj was an infidel” (من زعم أن الحجاج كان كافرًا). It runs as follows: “Among the things that caused the scholars to call al-Ḥajjāj an infidel was his words while seeing people circumambulating the Prophet’s *ṣal‘am* grave and his *minbar*: They circumambulate pieces of wood and decayed bones.”¹⁹²

As Crone and Hinds noticed, the end of the tradition about the preferred place of circumambulation is missing, but it is not because it is “scandalous” as they put it. The rest of the tradition in *al-‘Iqd* is no less “scandalous.”¹⁹³

Another parallel text (not mentioned by Crone and Hinds) is recorded by several sources, e.g.:

13) Al-Mubarrad (d. 286/900) explains the expression *كعظم الرمة* in Jarīr’s verses, incorporating the tradition about al-Ḥajjāj and the circumambulation of the Prophet’s grave.¹⁹⁴

13.1–13.2) The tradition is mentioned in other medieval works.¹⁹⁵ Noteworthy is the discussion of the well-known Egyptian Shāfi‘ī scholar, Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Damīrī (d. 808/1405), who quotes and severely criticizes the tradition recorded in al-Mubarrad’s work. His views and arguments undoubtedly reflect the attitude of many of the Muslim scholars to the Umayyads in general and to al-Ḥajjāj in particular.

It is related in *al-Kāmil* of al-Mubarrad, that one of the reasons of the jurisconsults considering al-Ḥajjāj an infidel is, that he once saw some people circumambulating the chamber of the Prophet, upon which he said: “You are circumam-

¹⁹²Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi, *al-‘Iqd*, vol. 5, p. 51 (mentioned by Crone and Hinds, *God’s Caliph*, p. 29, note 17):

ومما كفرت به العلماء الحجاج قوله. ورأى الناس يطوفون بقبر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ومنبره: إنما يطوفون بأعواد ورمة.

¹⁹³Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi, *al-‘Iqd*, vol. 5, p. 51, ll. 5–8 (see above, note 188).

¹⁹⁴Al-Mubarrad, *al-Kāmil* (ed. Wright), vol. 1, p. 127, ll. 3–8 (al-Dāli’s ed., vol. 1, p. 288): قال أبو العباس [المبرد]: وقوله: «كعظم الرمة» فهي البالية الذاهية والرميم: مشتق من الرمة: وإنما هو فعيل وفعلة وليس بجمع له واحد. ومما كفرت به الفقهاء الحجاج بن يوسف قوله: والناس يطوفون بقبر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ومنبره. In al-Mubarrad’s text the word *‘ulamā* is replaced with *fuqahā*.

¹⁹⁵E.g., al-Ābī, Manṣūr b. al-Ḥusayn al-Rāzī (d. 421/1030) in his work, *Nathr al-durr*, vol. 5, p. 38:

وما كفره به الفقهاء قوله: - والناس يطوفون بقبر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ومنبره - إنما يطوفون بأغوادٍ ورمة.

bulating timbers and decayed bones!” I say that they have considered him an infidel for this, because there is in these words what falsifies the statement of the Prophet; we seek refuge with God from believing that! It has been proved satisfactorily that the Prophet said: “Verily, God has caused it to be unlawful for earth (dust) to consume the bodies of the prophets.

Abū Dāwūd has extracted it, and Abū Ja‘far al-Dāwūdī has mentioned this tradition and extended it by giving the statements of several witnesses, learned men, and callers to prayer — quite a wonderful¹⁹⁶ extension. Al-Suhaylī states, that al-Dāwūdī was a jurisconsult and a learned man.

But it is related on the authority of, and regarding the Commander of the Faithful, ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, that he saw al-Ḥajjāj in a dream after his death in the condition of a stinking corpse and asked him, “What has God done to you?” and he replied, “God has killed me once for every person I have slain, except in the case of Sa‘īd b. Jubayr, for in his case He has killed me seventy times.” ‘Umar then asked him, “What did you expect?” and he replied, “What all believers in the unity of God expect.” This takes away from him the charge of infidelity and proves satisfactorily that he died a believer in the unity of God. But God knows what his belief was, and also knows best the truth of it.”¹⁹⁷

‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān and Jesus

Other traditions emphasize that ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān was equal to Jesus, who is mentioned in the Qur’ān; the parallel here is to the Umayyads in general and to ‘Abd al-Malik in particular.

14) Ibn Abī Shayba (d. 235/849–850) records the following tradition:

Mālik b. Ismā‘īl related to us saying: Ja‘far b. Ziyād [d. 165/781–782 or 167/783–84]¹⁹⁸ transmitted to me from ‘Aṭā’

¹⁹⁶It seems that the expression زيادة غريبة here means: and obscure, unfamiliar extension of the tradition; حديث غريب denotes a tradition that is related by one transmitter.

¹⁹⁷Al-Damīri, *al-Ḥayawān*, Jaykar’s translation, vol. 1, p. 370; the Arabic text in al-Damīri, *al-Ḥayawān*, vol. 1, p. 221.

¹⁹⁸A pro-Imāmī transmitter who was respected as a transmitter also by the Sunnīs (he is called *ṣadūq shī‘ī*, or *ṣāliḥ shī‘ī*). He was arrested in Khurāsān by order of

b. al-Sā'ib [d. 136/754]¹⁹⁹ who said: I was sitting with Abū al-Bukhturī al-Ṭā'ī²⁰⁰ while al-Ḥajjāj was delivering the Friday sermon saying: “The description and condition of ‘Uthmān in the eyes of God is similar to that of Jesus the son of Mary.” He raised his head then uttered a long moan and said: [(And remember) when Allah said: O Jesus! Lo!] “I am gathering thee and causing thee to ascend unto Me, and I am cleansing thee of those who disbelieve and I am setting those who follow thee above those who disbelieve until the Day of Resurrection.”²⁰¹ Abū al-Bukhturī said: I swear by the Lord of the Ka'ba, he became an unbeliever.²⁰²

14.1) A parallel tradition with the same *isnād* is recorded by Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi from ‘Aṭā’ b. al-Sā'ib < Abū 'l-Bukhturī.²⁰³

14.2) Abū Dāwūd records in his *Sunan* a similar tradition but from different transmitters and a different eye witness: “We were told by Abū Zafar ‘Abd al-Salām (d. 224/838–839) < Ja'far [b. Sulaymān al-Ḍaba'ī, d. 178/794–95] < ‘Awf [b. Abī Jamīla al-A'rābī, d. 147/764–65];²⁰⁴ the ending is different: the eye witness' report is related without expressing any moral judgment.²⁰⁵

Caliph al-Manṣūr with other Imāmīs, and was imprisoned in Iraq. See Ibn ‘Adī, *al-Du'afā'* (Beirut, 1409 AH), vol. 2, p. 143; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta'rīkh*, vol. 7, pp. 150–151; Ibn Ḥajar, *Taqrīb*, vol. 1, p. 140; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb* (Beirut, 1404 AH), vol. 2, pp. 79–80.

¹⁹⁹On him, see al-Bukhārī, *al-Kabīr* (ed. al-Nadwī), vol. 6, p. 465; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ* (Beirut ed.), vol. 6, pp. 332–333; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb* (Beirut, 1404 AH), vol. 7, pp. 183–185; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Ma'rūf), vol. 20, pp. 86–93.

²⁰⁰That is, Sa'īd b. Fayrūz, d. 83/703. See Abū Nu'aym, *Ḥilya*, vol. 4, p. 379; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar*, vol. 4, pp. 279–280; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb* (Beirut, 1404 AH), vol. 4, p. 65; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (ed. Ma'rūf), vol. 11, pp. 32–34; Ziriklī, *al-A'lām*, vol. 3, p. 99; he supported the rebellion of Ibn al-Ash'ath and died in the “Battle of al-Jamājim.”

²⁰¹Qur'an 3:55 (not completed; Pickthall's translation).

²⁰²Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaf* (al-Riyād ed.), vol. 6, p. 195:

حدثنا مالك بن إسماعيل قال أخبرنا جعفر بن زياد عن عطاء بن السائب قال كنت جالسا مع أبي البخترى الطائي والحجاج يخطب فقال مثل عثمان عند الله كمثل عيسى ابن مريم فرفع رأسه ثم تأوه ثم قال «[إذ قال الله يا عيسى] إني متوفيك ورافعك إلي ومطهرك من الذين كفروا وجاعل الذين اتبعوك فوق الذين كفروا إلى يوم القيامة» قال فقال أبو البخترى كفر ورب الكعبة.

²⁰³Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi, *al-Iqd*, vol. 5, pp. 50–51.

²⁰⁴A famous Baṣran scholar, who was accused of being both Qadarī and Shī'ī; see al-Dhahabī, *Mizān* (Beirut, 1995), vol. 5, p. 368; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb* (Beirut 1404 AH), vol. 8, p. 148; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* (Ma'rūf ed.), vol. 22, pp. 437–440.

²⁰⁵Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan* (Cairo, 1951), vol. 4, pp. 291–292, no. 4642 [= Dār al-Fikr ed., vol. 4, p. 209]:

حدثنا أبو ظفر عبد السلام ثنا جعفر عن عوف قال سمعت الحجاج يخطب وهو يقول إن مثل

These traditions are part of a vast corpus asserting that the Umayyads inherited their legitimacy to rule from ‘Uthmān.²⁰⁶

It is noteworthy that this specific Qur’ānic verse about Jesus was also used in the *ḥadīth* literature to denote Abū Bakr²⁰⁷ and ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib²⁰⁸.

The non-crystallized, primordial, and contradictory state of the Muslim prescriptive laws and rituals in the period in which the Dome of the Rock was built; the absolute rule of the caliph who wields complete political-religious authority and is the supreme decision-maker and the ultimate judge in every religious and political matter; the character of the Muslim scholars who frequented the caliph’s court and acted on behalf of the Umayyad government, all these enabled ‘Abd al-Malik to establish a uniquely sacred centre in Jerusalem.

Conclusions

An upsurge in research on the subject of Jerusalem after the end of the Six-Day War greatly advanced the research on “Erez Yisrael”/“Palestine” in the Muslim period in general and on Jerusalem in particular. In 1971, Sivan wrote his “The beginning of the Faḍā’il al-Quds literature”; Kister and his students Hasson and Livne initiated path-breaking research concerning “The Merits of Jerusalem” (*faḍā’il al-quḍs*) literature. Contrary to Sivan, Kister has shown that the sanctified status of Jerusalem in Islam was determined already in the first half of the 8th century. There is testimony from the first decade of the 2nd/8th century putting Mecca and Jerusalem on the same level of importance.²⁰⁹ The conclusions emerging from Kister’s studies accord with at least some of Goldziher’s conclusions. Continuing this line of work, I substantiate and develop Goldziher’s conclusions in this article. Examining both Goldziher’s and Goitein’s arguments, I was able to make use of many important sources that were not available to either scholar. These included mainly the “Literature in Praise of Jerusalem”, the monumental book of Ibn ‘Asākir, and many diverse Arab sources.

عثمان عند الله كمثل عيسى بن مريم ثم قرأ هذه الآية يقرؤها ويفسرها إذ قال الله «يا عيسى إني متوفيك ورافعك إلي ومطهرك من الذين كفروا» يشير إلينا بيده وإلى أهل الشام.

²⁰⁶See the exhaustive discussion of this topic by Crone and Hinds, *God’s Caliph*, pp. 31–32.

²⁰⁷Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaf*, vol. 7, p. 359; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, vol. 1, p. 383.

²⁰⁸Ibn Ḥibbān, *al-Majrūhīn*, vol. 2, p. 122; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Faḍā’il*, vol. 2, p. 600.

²⁰⁹Kister, “The three mosques”; *idem*, “Tradition in praise of Jerusalem.”

The huge construction projects in Jerusalem in the Umayyad period, inspired by, and with the initiative and the active encouragement of the Umayyad caliphs,²¹⁰ the testimonies on the ritual ceremonies in

²¹⁰The Umayyad building programme in Jerusalem included not only the Dome of the Rock and al-Aqṣā Mosque, but many other domed buildings on the Ḥaram including the four large buildings discovered during the excavations south and west of the Ḥaram. Nine of the Aphrodito Papyri clearly show that during the reign of al-Walīd b. ‘Abd al-Malik (86/705–96/715) (and perhaps even during his father’s reign), there was widespread construction in the Ḥaram and outside its walls. Jerusalem is mentioned in these papyri 30 times; the Mosque is mentioned 21 times (Küchler, “Moschee und Kalifenpaläste,” p. 125; Morelli, “Palazzi e moschee,” pp. 175–178: an annotated list of the relevant papyri). In one papyrus (London 1403, written between 709 and 714), “skilled workers and labourers for the mosque of Jerusalem and the palace <<Greek: *αὐλή* (*aulē*) >> [of the Caliph]”, are mentioned. The Greek transcription of *amīr al-mu’minīn* (*Αμυραλμουμιν*) is a completion of Bell and Küchler. It does not specifically tell that the palace is also in Jerusalem although the heading of the letter says “Concerning labourers and skilled workmen for Jerusalem” (Küchler, *op. cit.*: text and translation; Bell, “Translation,” *Der Islam* 2 (1911), p. 383; Morelli, “Palazzi e moschee,” p. 180 also believes that the palace mentioned is in Jerusalem). The Mosque of Jerusalem appears in Papyrus London 1414 several times. Küchler and Bell completed the missing words in the Greek text: “For the cost of oil and salt for the maintenance of labourers employed on the mosque of Jerusalem and the palace of the *Amīr al-Mu’minīn*.” Bell, “Translation,” *Der Islam* 3 (1912), p. 137 (without square brackets); Küchler, *op. cit.*, p. 132: Greek text, ll. 24; and 76; *ibid.*, p. 133: translation of line 24; p. 134: translation of line 76: “[Für: Kosten von Öl und Salz, Un terhaltskosten der Arbeiter, die sich abmühen an der Moschee von Jerusalem und dem Palast des *Αμυραλμου*]: Personen [...], Monate [...].” (*[α]υλή τ^{ου} Αμυραλμου*) [*[A]ulē tou Amīr al-mou*: the usual short form of the Arabic term, *amīr al-mu’minīn*, in the papyri]; Morelli, *op. cit.*, p. 180, also believes that the palace is in Jerusalem). Papyrus London 1433, ll. 30, 102, 154 and 202, mentions four times “The new building of Amīr al-Mu’minīn in Jerusalem” (Küchler, *op. cit.*, p. 135: Greek text; p. 136: translation, e.g., l. 30: “Für einen Arbeiter, 12 Monate, betrifft die neue Gründung des *Αμυραλμου* in Jerusalem...”; Bell, *op. cit.*, *Der Islam* 2 (1911), p. 370 (translated only line 30): “For I labourer for 12 months, for the new building of the *amīr al-mu’minīn* at Jerusalem...”). Now in the same papyrus (P. Lond. 1433), l. 286, another (different) building is mentioned “The [Pal]ace of *amīr al-mu’minīn* in Jerusalem.” (*[α]υλή τ^{ου} Αμυραλμου εΙ/Ιερ^{ου}*), see Küchler, *op. cit.*, p. 135: Greek text; p. 136, translation: “Für einen Arbeiter und die Unterhaltskosten desselben, 12 Monate, betrifft den [Pala]st des *Αμυραλμου* in Jerusalem...” This papyrus was dated by Küchler between 706 and 707, due to the Arabic section in which the governor of Egypt, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Malik who governed Egypt between 706 and 709 is mentioned and the date of the letter (88/706–707): *هذا مما: عبد الله الوليد أمير المؤمنين... هذا مما: عبد الله الوليد أمير المؤمنين في سنة ثمان وثمانين* (88/706–707); the term *αὐλή* (*aulē*), was translated by Bell as “palace” but see the comments of Abū Ṣafiyya, who argues that in several bilingual papyri where the address of the letter is written in Arabic the term *αὐλή* (*aulē*) of Amīr al-Mu’minīn is rendered in Arabic as *Dār Amīr al-Mu’minīn*, see Abū Ṣafiyya, *Bardiyyāt Qurra b. Sharīk*, p. 279: quoting papyri no. 1342 (see the discussion *ibid.*, p. 280), 1362 (discussed on pp. 280–282), 1378 (discussed on p. 282), 1378 (discussed on p. 282) and 1403 (discussed on p. 277); Küchler, “Moschee und Kalifenpaläste,” p. 125 also noticed the bilingual papyri (he mentions papyri no. 1342, 1362 and 1378 and concludes that the term *aulē* should be translated as palace (of the Caliph), and from the examples of the papyri that mention Damascus

the Dome of the Rock and on the Ḥaram, the abundant traditions on the Praises of Jerusalem and, among them, the specific Qurʾānic verses, the historical traditions on “Umar’s activities” in Jerusalem, and particularly on the conquest of the city and the peace treaty with it, all attest to an unusual status that the first Umayyads bestowed upon Jerusalem.

On the local level it appears that the city was the administrative political center of the Palestine district (*jund*) for a period of several decades. Although we have no specific written testimonies on Jerusalem being the capital city of the Palestine district, these tremendous efforts that the Umayyads made in the various realms in Jerusalem attest to this.

On the general Islamic level, it seems that the intention of the Umayyads was to develop a political-religious center in Jerusalem which, if not surpassing Mecca and nullifying its sanctity, would at least equal it.

Accepting this line of thought does not contradict two additional considerations that ʿAbd al-Malik was faced with while developing Jerusalem and the Muslim “Temple Mount”: one is the connection to the Last Day and the other is the connection of the Dome of the Rock to Solomon’s temple.

In summary, the immediate reason for building the Dome of the Rock was the struggle with ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr. Nevertheless, ʿAbd al-Malik wanted to emphasize the central place of Jerusalem within the religious-political landscape of early Islam. Polemics with Christians and Christianity is emphasized in the gilded mosaic inscriptions within the Dome of the Rock, though it seems that this matter should not be isolated and turned into a decisive factor for the building of the Dome of the Rock. The picture is broader and more complex. In my view, there is no contradiction between the argument that ʿAbd al-Malik built the Dome of the Rock on the location of Solomon’s temple as a symbol of the Last Day and of Paradise and the argument that the Dome of the Rock was built as a rival to Mecca, which at the time was under the exclusive control of the rival caliph, ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr.

and al-Fuṣṭāṭ, adds Kūchler, *Dār Amīr al-Muʾminīn is Dār al-Imāra*.) This is also accepted by Morelli, “Palazzi e moschee,” pp. 185–186. I wonder if this identification is correct. *Dār al-Imāra* is the governor’s abode.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ‘Abd al-Razzāq, *al-Muṣannaf* =
 ‘Abd al-Razzāq b. Hamām al-Ṣan‘ānī. *Al-Muṣannaf*². Ḥabīb al-Raḥ-
 mān al-A‘ẓamī, ed. Beirut: Maktabat al-Islām, 1403 AH.
- Al-Ābī, *Nathr al-durr* =
 Maṣṣūr b. al-Ḥusayn Abū Sa‘d al-Ābī. *Nathr al-durr fī ‘l-muḥāḍarāt*.
 Muḥammad Ibrāhīm ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, ed. Cairo: Al-Hay’a al-Miṣriyya
 al-‘Āmma li-‘l-Kitāb, 1981–1990.
- Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan* =
 Abū Dāwūd, Sulaymān b. al-Ash‘ath, al-Sijistānī. *Sunan*. Muḥammad
 Muḥīy al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, ed. Cairo, 1951. [= [Beirut?] Dār al-Fikr,
 n.d. Different pagination, but the same numbers of the traditions.
- Abū Nu‘aym, *Ḥilya* =
 Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣfahānī. *Ḥilyat al-awliyā’ wa-
 ṭabaqāt al-aṣfiyā’*. Cairo, 1351 AH.
- Abū Ṣafiyya, *Bardiyyāt Qurra b. Sharīk* =
 Jāsir b. Khalīl, Abū Ṣafiyya. *Bardiyyāt Qurra b. Sharīk al-‘Absī*. Al-
 Riyāḍ: Markaz al-Malik Fayṣal li-‘l-Buḥūth wa-‘l-Dirāsāt al-Islāmiyya,
 1425/2004.
- Abū Shāma, *al-Bā‘ith* =
 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ismā‘īl (known as Abū Shāma). *Al-Bā‘ith ‘alā inkār
 al-bida‘ wa-‘l-ḥawādith*. ‘Uthmān Aḥmad ‘Anbar, ed. Cairo: Dār al-
 Hudā, 1398/1978.
- Abū Zur‘a, *Ta’rīkh* =
 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Amr Abū Zur‘a al-Dimashqī. *Ta’rīkh Abī Zur‘a
 al-Dimashqī*. Shukr Allāh b. Ni‘mat Allāh al-Qūjānī, ed. Damascus:
 Maṭba‘at Majma‘at al-Lugha al-‘Arabiyya bi-Dimashq, 1980.
- Al-‘Askarī, *al-Awā’il* =
 Al-Ḥasan b. ‘Abd Allāh Abū Hilāl al-‘Askarī. *Al-Awā’il*. Beirut, 1417/
 1997.
- ‘Athāmina, “The ‘Ulamā’” =
 ‘Athāmina, Khalīl. “The ‘Ulamā’ in the opposition: the ‘stick and car-
 rot’ policy in early Islam.” *The Islamic Quarterly* 36 (1992): 153-78.
- Al-‘Azīmābādī, *‘Ayn al-ma‘būd* =
 Al-‘Azīmābādī, Muḥammad Ashraf Shams al-Ḥaqq Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥ-
 mān. *‘Ayn al-ma‘būd ‘alā Sunan Abī Dāwūd*². Beirut: Dār al-Kutub
 al-‘Ilmiyya, 1415 AH.
- Al-Azkawī, *Kashf al-ghumma* =
 Sirḥān b. ‘Umar b. Sa‘īd Al-Azkawī. *Kashf al-ghumma al-jāmi‘ li-akhbār
 al-umma*. London: British Library, MS Or. 8076.

- Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb* =
 Al-Balādhurī, Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā. *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*. 1) Maḥmūd al-Firdaws al-‘Aẓm, ed. Damascus: Dār al-Yaqza al-‘Arabiyya. Vols. 1–12, 1997–2000 (the text of *Ansāb al-ashrāf*). Vols. 13–20, 2001–2002 (The supplement to this work is *al-Mustadrak ‘alā al-Balādhurī, Ansāb al-ashrāf*). 2) Vol. 2. W. Madelung, ed. Beirut-Berlin, 2003. 3) Vol. 3. ‘A.‘A. al-Dūrī, ed. Beirut-Weisbaden, 1978.
- Bell, “Translation” =
 Bell, H.I. “Translations of the Greek Aphrodito papyri in the British Museum [6 parts]. *Der Islam* 2 (1911): 269–283, 372–384; 3 (1912): 132–140, 369–373; 4 (1913): 87–96; 17 (1926): 4–8.
- Van Berchem, *Ḥaram* =
 Van Berchem, M. *Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicorum*. 2nd Part. *Syrie du Sud*: vol. 2: *Jérusalem Ḥaram*. Cairo, 1922.
- Bernards, “*Mawālī*” =
 Bernards, M. “The contribution of *Mawālī* and the Arabic linguistic tradition.” In Bernards, M. and J.A. Nawas, eds. *Patronate and patronage in early and classical Islam*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2005, pp. 426–453.
- Bernards and Nawas, “A preliminary report” =
 Bernards, M. and J.A. Nawas. “A preliminary report of the Netherlands ‘*Ulama*’ Project (NUP): The Evolution of the Class of *Ulamā*’ in Islam with Special Emphasis on the non-Arab Converts (*Mawālī*) from the First through Fourth Century A.H”. In U. Vermeulen and J.M.F. van Reeth (eds). *Law, Christianity and Modernism in Islamic Society. Proceedings of the Eighteenth Congress of the Union Européenne des Arabisants et Islamisants* (The Katholieke Universiteit Leuven [September 3–September 9, 1996]. Leuven), 1998, pp. 97–107.
- Blair, “The Dome of the Rock” =
 Blair, S. “What is the date of the Dome of the Rock?” In J. Raby and J. Johns, eds. *Bayt al-Maqdis: ‘Abd al-Malik’s Jerusalem*. (*Oxford studies in Islamic art*, vol. 9). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992, pp. 59–87.
- Bosworth, “*Rajā*” =
 Bosworth, C.E. “*Rajā*’ b. Ḥaywa al-Kindī and the Umayyad Caliphs.” *Islamic Quarterly* 14 (1972): 36–80.
- Al-Bukhārī, *al-Kabīr* =
 Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl Al-Bukhārī. *Al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*. 1) Hāshim al-Nadwī, ed. [Beirut ?]: Dār al-Fikr, no date of publication. 2) Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1422/2001.
- Conrad, “al-Azdī” =
 Conrad, L.I. “Al-Azdī’s history of the Arab conquests in Bilād al-Shām: some historiographical observations.” In M.A. Bakhit, ed. *Proceedings of the Second Symposium on the History of Bilād al-Shām during the*

Early Islamic Period up to 40 A.H./640 A.D.: The Fourth International Conference on the History of Bilād al-Shām. Amman, 1987, pp. 28–62.

Cook, *Muḥammad* =

Cook, M. *Muḥammad.* Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Crone, *Slaves* =

Crone, P. *Slaves on horses: the evolution of the Islamic polity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Crone and Cook, *Hagarism* =

Crone, P. and M. Cook. *Hagarism: the making of the Islamic world.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Crone and Hinds, *God's Caliph* =

Crone, P. and M. Hinds. *God's Caliph: religious authority in the first centuries of Islam.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Al-Damīrī, *al-Ḥayawān* =

Al-Damīrī, Muḥammad b. Mūsā Kamāl al-Dīn. *Ḥayāt al-ḥayawān al-kubrā.* Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Fāḍilī, ed. Beirut-Sidon: Al-Maktaba al-ʿAṣriyya, 1423/2002 [English translation: Ad-Damīrī's *Ḥayāt al-Ḥayawān* (A zoological lexicon). Translated from the Arabic by A.S.G. Jaykar. London-Bombay: Luzac-D.B. Taraporevala Sons and Co., 1906.]

Al-Dhahabī, *Mizān* =

Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī. *Mizān al-iʿtidāl fī naqd al-rijāl.* ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwaḍ and ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawjūd, eds. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1416/1995.

Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar* =

Muḥammad b. Aḥmad Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī. *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ.* Beirut: Muʿassasat al-Risāla, 1982–1985.

Al-Dhahabī, *Taʾrīkh* =

Muḥammad b. Aḥmad Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī. *Taʾrīkh al-Islām wa-ṭabaqāt al-mashāḥīr wa-l-aʿlām.* ʿUmar ʿAbd al-Salām Tadmūrī, ed. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1408/1988–.

Al-Dīnawarī, *Akḥbār* =

Aḥmad b. Dāwūd Abū Ḥanīfa al-Dīnawarī. *Kitāb al-Akḥbār al-ṭiwāl.* ʿAbd al-Munʿim ʿĀmir, ed. Cairo: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Kutub al-ʿArabiyya, 1960.

Dixon, *The Umayyad Caliphate* =

Dixon, ʿAbd al-Ameer ʿAbd. *The Umayyad Caliphate 65–86/684–705 (A political study).* London: Luzac and Company, 1971.

Donner, “Historiography” =

Donner, F.M. “The problem of early Arabic historiography in Syria.” *The fourth international conference on the history of Bilād al-Shām.* M.A. Bakhit, ed. Vol. 1, Amman, 1987, pp. 1–27 (*Proceedings of the*

Second Symposium on the History of Bilād al-Shām during the Early Islamic Period up to 40 A.H./640 A.D.)

- Donner, *Narratives* =
 Donner, F.M. *Narratives of Islamic origins. The beginnings of Islamic historical writing*. Princeton, New Jersey: The Darwin Press, 1998.
- Drori, *Ibn al-‘Arabī* =
 Drori, J. *Ibn al-‘Arabī from Seville. Journey to Eretz Israel (1092–1095)*. Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1993 [In Hebrew].
- Duri, “Historical writing” =
 Duri, A.A. *The rise of historical writing among the Arabs*. L.I. Conrad, editor and translator. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Elad, “‘Abd al-Malik” =
 Elad, A. “Why did ‘Abd al-Malik build the Dome of the Rock? A re-examination of the Muslim sources.” In J. Raby and J. Johns, eds. *Bayt al-Maqdis: ‘Abd al-Malik’s Jerusalem*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992, pp. 241–308 (*Oxford Studies in Islamic Art No. IX*).
- Elad, “Beth Shean” =
 The Caliph Abū ‘l-‘Abbās al-Saffāh, the first ‘Abbāsīd *Mahdī*: following an unknown inscription from Beth-Shean”. *Mas’at Moshe: Studies in Jewish and Islamic culture presented to Moshe Gil*. The Bialik Institute, Jerusalem–Tel-Aviv University, 1998, pp. 9–55 [In Hebrew].
- Elad, “Community of believers” =
 “Community of believers of ‘Holy Men’ and ‘Saints’ or community of Muslims? The rise and development of early Muslim historiography.” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 47 (2002): 241–308.
- Elad, “The Golan” =
 Elad, A. “The southern Golan in the Muslim period: the significance of two newly discovered milestones of ‘Abd al-Malik.” *Der Islam* 76 (1999): 33–88.
- Elad, “The history and topography” =
 Elad, A. “The history and topography of Jerusalem during the early Islamic period: the historical value of *Fadā’il al-Quds* literature: a re-consideration.” *JSAI* 14 (1991): 41–70.
- Elad, *Jerusalem* =
 Elad, A. *Medieval Jerusalem and Islamic worship. Holy places, ceremonies, pilgrimage*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- Elad, “Jerusalem during the Umayyad period” =
 Elad, A. “The status of Jerusalem during the Umayyad period. *Hamiz-rah He-Ḥadash [The New East]* 44 (2004): 17–68 [*Islam, Society, and Space in Jerusalem Past and Present*. N. Luz, ed.] [in Hebrew].
- Al-Fākihī, *Akhbār Makka* =
 Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Ishāq Abū ‘Abdallāh al-Fākihī. *Akhbār Makka fī qadīm al-dahr wa-ḥadīthihi*.³ ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd Allāh

- Duhaysh, ed. Beirut: Dār Khidr li-'l-Ṭibā'a wa-'l-Nashr wa-'l-Tawzī', 1419/1998.
- Al-Fasawī, *al-Ma'rifā* =
 Ya'qūb b. Sufyān Abū Yūsuf al-Fasawī. *Kitāb al-ma'rifā wa-'l-ta'rīkh*. Akram Ḍiyā' al-'Umarī, ed. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1981.
- Gil, "Jerusalem" =
 Gil, M. "The Jewish quarters of Jerusalem during early Muslim rule." *Shalem (Studies in the History of the Jews in Eretz-Israel)* 2 (1976): 19–40 [in Hebrew].
- Gil, *Palestine* =
 Gil, M. *Palestine during the first Muslim period (634–1099)*. Tel-Aviv, 1983 (three volumes, in Hebrew). English translation of the first volume by Ethel Broido: *A history of Palestine, 634–1099*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Goitein, "The historical background" =
 Goitein, S.D. "The historical background of the erection of the Dome of the Rock." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 70 (1950): 104–108.
- Goitein, "Jerusalem in the Arab period" =
 Goitein, S.D. "Jerusalem in the Arab period (638–1099)." *The Jerusalem Cathedra* 2 (1982): 168–196.
- Goitein, "al-Ḳuds" =
 Goitein, S.D. "al-Ḳuds." *EI*², s.v.
- Goitein, "The sanctity of the Holy Land" =
 Goitein, S.D. "The sanctity of the Holy Land in Islamic piety." In Goitein, S.D. *Palestinian Jewry in early Islamic and Crusader times in the light of the Geniza documents*. J. Hacker, ed. Jerusalem: Yad ben Zvi, 1980, pp. 25–31 [in Hebrew].
- Goitein, "The sanctity of Jerusalem" =
 Goitein, S.D. "The sanctity of Jerusalem and Palestine in early Islam." In *idem, Studies in Islamic history and institutions*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966, pp. 135–148.
- Goldziher, *Muslim studies* =
 Goldziher, I. *Muslim studies*. Translated and edited by S.M. Stern. London, 1967–1971.
- Grabar, "The Dome of the Rock" =
 Grabar, O. "The Umayyad Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem." *Ars Orientalis* 3 (1959): 33–66.
- Grabar, *Jerusalem* =
 Grabar, O. *The Shape of the Holy. Early Islamic Jerusalem*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Ḥājji Khalifa, *Kashf* =
 Ḥājji Khalifa. *Kashf al-zunūn*. Beirut, 1413/1992.

- Hakim, “‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb” =
 Hakim, A. “‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb and the title *khalīfat Allāh*.” *JSAI* 30 (2005): 207–230.
- Hawting, *The First Dynasty* =
 Hawting, G.R. *The First Dynasty of Islam. The Umayyad Caliphate AD 661–750*. Croom Helm, 1986.
- Humphreys, *Islamic history* =
 Humphreys, R.S. *Islamic history. A framework for inquiry*. London-New-York: I.B. Tauris, 1991.
- Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi, *al-‘Iqd* =
 Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Abū ‘Umar (known as Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi). *Kitāb al-‘iqd al-farīd*. Aḥmad Amīn, Aḥmad al-Zayn, and Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī, eds. Cairo: Maṭba‘at Lajnat al-Ta’līf wa-’l-Tarjama wa-’l-Nashr, 1359/1940–1372/1953.
- Ibn Abī ’l-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ* =
 ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd b. Hibat Allāh b. Muḥammad Abū Ḥāmid (known as Ibn Abī ’l-Ḥadīd). *Sharḥ nahj al-balāgha*. Muḥammad Abū ’l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm, ed. Cairo: Dār Iḥyā’ al-Kutub al-‘Arabiyya, ‘Īsā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1959–1964.
- Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ* =
 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī. *Kitāb al-jarḥ wa-’l-ta’dīl*. Ḥaydarābād, 1952 [Reprint: Beirut: Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, 1371/1952–1373/1953: the same pagination with different numbers of volumes].
- Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaf* =
 ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm Abū Bakr (known as Ibn Abī Shayba). *Kitāb al-muṣannaf*. 1) Kamāl Yūsuf al-Ḥūt, ed. Al-Riyād: Maktabat al-Rushd, 1409 AH. 2) Saī‘id al-Laḥḥām, ed. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1989.
- Ibn Abī Ya‘lā, *Ṭabaqāt* =
 Muḥammad b. Abī Ya‘lā Abū ’l-Ḥusayn. *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila*. Ḥāmid al-Fiḳqī, ed. Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘rifa, n.d.
- Ibn ‘Adī, *al-Ḍu‘afā’* =
 ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Adī b. ‘Abd Allāh. *Al-Kāmil fī ḍu‘afā’ al-rijāl*. Yaḥyā Mukhtār Ghazzāwī, ed. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1409/1988.
- Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh* =
 Abū ’l-Qāsim ‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan...Ibn ‘Asākir. *Ta’rīkh madīnat Dimashq*. 1) ‘Umar b. Gharāma al-‘Amr (aw) ī, ed. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, li-l-Ṭibā‘a wa-’l-Nashr wa-’l-Tawzī‘, 1415/1995–2001. 2) Muḥammad b. Mukarram, al-Ma‘rūf bi-Ibn Manzūr. *Mukhtaṣar Ta’rīkh madīnat Dimashq*¹. Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, 1984–1988 [= *al-Mukhtaṣar*].
- Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil* =
 ‘Alī b. Muḥammad Abū ’l-Ḥasan ‘Izz al-Dīn (known as Ibn al-Athīr). *Al-Kāmil fī ’l-ta’rīkh*. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1402/1982.

- Ibn al-Biṭrīq, *Taʾrīkh* =
Saʿīd b. al-Biṭrīq. *Al-Taʾrīkh al-majmūʿ ʿalā ʾl-taḥqīq wa-ʾl-taṣdīq*. L. Cheikho, ed. Beirut, 1909.
- Ibn al-Faḳīh, *Buldān* =
Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Abū Bakr, Ibn al-Faḳīh al-Hamdānī. *Mukhtaṣar kitāb al-buldān*. M.J. de Goeje, ed. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1885 [*BGA*, 5].
- Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Iṣāba* =
Aḥmad b. ʿAlī Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī. *Al-Iṣāba fī tamyīz al-ṣaḥāba*. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī, ed. Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, 1412/1992.
- Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb* =
Aḥmad b. ʿAlī Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī. *Tahdhīb al-tahdhīb*. 1) Ḥaydar-ābād, 1325–1327 AH. 2) Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1404/1984.
- Ibn Ḥajar, *Taqrīb* =
Aḥmad b. ʿAlī Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī. *Taqrīb al-tahdhīb*. Muḥammad ʿAwāmma, ed. Damascus [?]: Dār al-Rashīd. 1406/1986.
- Ibn Ḥanbal, *Faḍāʾil* =
Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal. *Faḍāʾil al-ṣaḥāba*. Waṣī Allāh b. Muḥammad ʿAbbās, ed. Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1403/1983.
- Ibn Ḥanbal, *al-ʿIlal* =
Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal. *Al-ʿIlal wa-maʿrifat al-rijāl*. Waṣī Allāh b. Muḥammad ʿAbbās, ed. Beirut-al-Riyād: Al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1408/1988.
- Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad* =
Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal. *Musnad*. Cairo: Būlāq, 1313 AH.
- Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamhara* =
ʿAlī b. Aḥmad b. Saʿīd Abū Muḥammad, Ibn Ḥazm. *Jamharat ansāb al-ʿArab*. ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn, ed. Cairo, 1962.
- Ibn Ḥibbān, *al-Majrūḥīn* =
Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān b. Aḥmad Abū Ḥātim al-Bustī al-Tamīmī. *Kitāb al-majrūḥīn min al-muḥaddithīn al-duʿafāʾ wa-ʾl-matrūkīn*. Maḥmūd Ibrāhīm Zāyid, ed. Ḥalab: Dār al-Waʿy, 1395/1975–1412/1992.
- Ibn Ḥibbān, *al-Thiqāt* =
Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān b. Aḥmad Abū Ḥātim al-Bustī al-Tamīmī. *Kitāb al-Thiqāt*. Sharaf al-Dīn Aḥmad, ed. [Beirut?]: Dār al-Fikr, 1395/1975.
- Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntazam* =
Abū ʾl-Faraj ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. al-Jawzī. *Al-Muntazam fī taʾrīkh al-mulūk wa-ʾl-umam*.¹ Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1412/1992.
- Ibn al-Kalbī, *Nasab Maʿadd* =
Hishām b. Muḥammad al-Kalbī. *Nasab Maʿadd wa-ʾl-Yaman al-kabīr*. Nājī Ḥasan, ed. Beirut: 1408/1988.
- Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya* =
Ismāʿīl b. ʿUmar b. Kathīr. *Al-Bidāya wa-ʾl-nihāya fī ʾl-taʾrīkh*. 1)

Cairo: Maṭba‘at al-Sa‘āda, 1351–1358/1933–1939. 2) [Cairo?]: Dār al-Fikr al-‘Arabī-Dār Nahr al-Nīl li-l-Ṭibā‘a, n.d. [reprint with different pagination of the Cairo ed. of Maṭba‘at al-Sa‘āda, 1351–1358/1933–1939]. 3) Beirut: Maktabat al-Ma‘ārif, n.d.

Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt* =

Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr b. Khallikān. *Wafayāt al-a‘yān wa-anbā’ abnā’ al-zamān*. Iḥsān ‘Abbās, ed. Beirut, 1972–1978.

Ibn Khayyāt, *Ta’rīkh* =

Khalīfa b. Khayyāt al-‘Uṣfurī. *Ta’rīkh*. Suhayl Zakkār, ed. Damascus: Maṭābī’ Wizārat al-Thaqāfa wa-l-Siyāḥa wa-l-Irshād al-Qawmī, 1967–1968.

Ibn Mākūlā, *al-Ikmāl* =

‘Alī b. Hibat Allāh b. Abī Naṣr Ibn Mākūlā. *Al-Ikmāl fī raf‘ al-irtiyāb ‘an al-mu’talif wa-l-mukhtalif fī ’l-asmā’ wa-l-kunā wa-l-ansāb*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1411/1990.

Ibn Mufliḥ, *al-Maqṣad al-arshad* =

Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Mufliḥ Burhān al-Dīn. *Al-Maqṣad al-arshad fī dhikr aṣḥāb al-īmām Aḥmad*. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Sulaymān al-‘Uthaymīn, ed. Al-Riyād, 1990.

Ibn al-Murajjā, *Faḍā’il* =

Al-Musharraf b. al-Murajjā. *Faḍā’il Bayt al-Maqdis wa-al-Shām wa-l-Khalīl*. O. Livne-Kafri, ed. Shefar‘am: Al-Mashriq, 1995.

Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* =

Muḥammad b. Ishāq Abū ’l-Faraj Ibn al-Nadīm. *Al-Fihrist*. Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘rifa, 1398/1978.

Ibn al-Najjār, *Dhayl Ta’rīkh Baghdād* =

Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd b. al-Ḥasan, Muḥibb al-Dīn Abū ‘Abd Allāh (known as Ibn al-Najjār) al-Baghdādī. *Dhayl Ta’rīkh Baghdād*. Muṣṭafā ‘Abd al-Qādir ‘Aṭā, ed. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1417 AH.

Ibn al-Qaysarānī, *Tadhkira* =

Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir b. ‘Alī al-Maqdisī (known as Ibn al-Qaysarānī). *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz: Aṭraf aḥādīth kitāb al-majrūḥīn li-Ibn Ḥibbān*. Ḥamdī ‘Abd al-Majīd Ismā‘īl al-Salafī, ed. Al-Riyād: Dār al-Ṣamī‘ī li-l-Nashr wa-l-Tawzī‘, 1415/1994.

Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī, *al-Mughnī* =

‘Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Qudāma al-Maqdisī. *Al-Mughnī*. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1405 AH.

Ibn Qutayba, *Gharīb al-ḥadīth* =

‘Abdallāh b. Muslim b. Qutayba al-Dīnawarī. *Gharīb al-ḥadīth*. ‘Abd Allāh al-Jabbūrī, ed. Baghdād, 1397 AH.

Ibn Sa‘d, *al-Ṭabaqāt* =

Muḥammad b. Sa‘d Abū ‘Abd Allāh. *Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt al-kubrā*. Iḥsān ‘Abbās, ed. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir li-l-Ṭibā‘a wa-l-Nashr, 1958.

- Ibn Shabba, *Ta'riḫ al-Madīna* =
 ʿUmar b. Shabba. *Ta'riḫ al-Madīna*. Fahīm Muḥammad Shaltūt, ed.
 Qumm: Dār al-Fikr, 1410 AH.
- Ibn Taghrībirdī, *Nujūm* =
 Yūsuf b. Taghrībirdī, Abū 'l-Mahāsīn *Al-Nujūm al-zāhira fī mulūk Miṣr wa-'l-Qāhira*. T.G.J. Juynboll and B.F. Matthews, eds. Leiden, 1851 [1855?].
- Ibn Waḍḍāḥ, *al-Bida'* =
 Muḥammad b. Waḍḍāḥ b. Bazī' Abū 'Abd Allāh. *Al-Bida' wa-'l-nahy 'anhā*. Muḥammad Ḥasan Muḥammad Ḥasan Ismā'īl, ed. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1418/1997.
- Ibn Zabir, *Mawlid al-'ulamā'* =
 Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh Ibn Zabir al-Raba'ī. *Mawlid al-'ulamā' wa-wafayātuhum*. 'Abd Allāh Aḥmad Sulaymān al-Ḥamad, ed. Al-Riyāḍ: Dār al-'Āṣima, 1410 AH.
- Ibrāhīm, *Fādā'il* =
 Ibrāhīm, Maḥmūd. *Fādā'il Bayt al-Maqdis fī makhṭūṭāt 'arabiyya qadīma*. Al-Kuwayt, 1406/1985.
- Al-'Iṣāmī, *Simṭ al-nujūm* =
 'Abd al-Malik b. Ḥusayn b. 'Abd al-Malik al-'Iṣāmī. *Simṭ al-nujūm al-'awālī fī anbā' al-awā'il wa-'l-tawālī*. Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, ed. Cairo, 1380 AH.
- Al-'Iṣfahānī, *al-Aghānī* =
 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad Abū 'l-Faraj al-'Iṣfahānī. *Kitāb al-aghānī*. 1) Būlāq, 1284–1285 AH. 2) Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya, 1345/1927–1381/1961 (vols. 1–16); Cairo: Al-Hay'a al-Miṣriyya al-'Āmma li-'l-Ta'līf wa-'l-Kitāb, 1389/1970–1394/1974 (vols. 17–24). Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī, ed. Cairo: Dār al-Sha'b, 1394/1974–1399/1979 (vols. 25–30).
- Al-Jāḥiẓ, *al-Bayān wa-'l-tabayīn* =
 'Amrū b. Baḥr Abū 'Uthmān, al-Jāḥiẓ. *Al-Bayān wa-'l-tabayīn*. 'Abd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn, ed. Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, 1410/1990.
- Jawda, *al-Ramla* =
 Jawda, Ṣādiq Aḥmad Dāwūd. *Madīnat al-Ramla mundhu nashā'ihā ḥattā 'ām 492/1099*. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1406/1986.
- Jaykar, A.S.G. see al-Damīrī
- Juynboll, *Muslim tradition* =
 Juynboll, G.H.A. *Muslim tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Kaḥḥāla, *Mu'jam* =
 Kaḥḥāla, 'Umar Riḍā. *Mu'jam al-mu'allifīn*¹. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1414/1993.
- Kaplony, *The Haram* =
 Kaplony, A. *The Haram of Jerusalem 324–1099: temple, Friday mosque, area of spiritual power*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2002.

- Al-Kattānī, *al-Tarātīb* =
 ‘Abd al-Ḥayy al-Kattānī. *Niẓām al-ḥukūma al-nabawiyya (al-musammā al-Tarātīb al-idāriyya)*. Beirut, n.d.
- Kessler, “Abd al-Malik” =
 Kessler, C. “‘Abd al-Malik’s inscription in the Dome of the Rock, a reconsideration.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1970): 2–14.
- Khālidī, *Historical thought* =
 Khālidī, T. *Arabic historical thought in the classical period*. Cambridge, 1994.
- Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta’rīkh* =
 Aḥmad b. ‘Alī b. Thābit Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī. *Ta’rīkh Baghdād*. Cairo, 1349/1931.
- Al-Kindī, *Wulāt* =
 Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Kindī. *Wulāt Miṣr*. Ḥusayn Naṣṣār, ed. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, n.d.
- Kister, “‘Concessions’ and conduct” =
 Kister, M.J. “On ‘concessions’ and conduct: a study in early *Ḥadīth*.” In Juynboll, G.H.A. (ed). *Studies on the first century of Islamic society*. Pennsylvania: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982, pp. 89–107; 214–230.
- Kister, “Some reports” =
 Kister, M.J. “Some reports concerning Mecca from Jāhiliyya to Islam.” *Journal of the Economic and Social history of the Orient* 15 (1972): 61–91.
- Kister, “The three mosques” =
 Kister, M.J. “You shall only set out for three mosques.” *Le Muséon* 82 (1969): 173–196. Repr. *idem. Studies in Jāhiliyya and early Islam*. Variorum Reprints. London: 1988, no. XIII.
- Kister, “Traditions in praise of Jerusalem” =
 Kister, M.J. “A comment on the antiquity of traditions praising Jerusalem.” *The Jerusalem Cathedra* 1 (1981): 185–186.
- Küchler, “Moschee und Kalifenpaläste” =
 Küchler, M. “Moschee und Kalifenpaläste Jerusalems, nach den Aphrodito-Papyri. *Deutscher Palaestina-Verein Zeitschrift* 107 (1991): 120–143.
- Lecker, “Abū ‘Ubayda” =
 Lecker M. “Biographical notes on Abu ‘Ubayda Ma‘mar b. al-Muthannā.” *Studia Islamica* 81 (1995): 71–100.
- Lecker, “al-Zuhrī” =
 Lecker, M. “Biographical notes on Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī.” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 41 (1996): 21–36.
- Leder, *al-Haiṭam ibn ‘Adī* =
 Leder, S. *Das Korpus al-Haiṭam ibn ‘Adī. Herkunft, Überlieferung,*

- Gestalt früher Texte der aḥbār Literatur.* Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1991.
- Le Strange, *Palestine* =
Le Strange, G. *Palestine under the Moslems.* London, 1890.
- Livne, *The sanctity of Jerusalem* =
Livne, O. *The sanctity of Jerusalem in Islam.* Ph.D. thesis. The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1985 [In Hebrew].
- Livne-Kafri, “Muslim apocalyptic tradition” =
Livne-Kafri, O. “Some notes on the Muslim apocalyptic tradition.” *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 17 (1999): 71–94.
- Livne-Kafri, “Jerusalem in early Islam” =
Livne-Kafri, O. “Jerusalem in early Islam: the eschatological aspect.” *Arabica* 53 (2006): 382–403.
- Madelung, “Abū ‘Ubayda” =
Madelung, W. “Abū ‘Ubayda Ma‘mar b. al-Muthannā as a historian.” *Journal of Islamic Studies* 1 (1992): 47–56.
- Al-Maqrīzī, *Khīṭaṭ* =
Aḥmad b. ‘Alī Taqī al-Dīn Abū ‘l-‘Abbās, Al-Maqrīzī. *Al-Mawā‘iz wa-‘l-‘tibār fī dhikr al-khīṭaṭ wa-‘l-‘āthār.* Ayman Fu‘ād Sayyid, ed. London: Mu‘assasat al-Furqān li-‘l-Turāth al-Islāmī, 1423/2002.
- Al-Maqrīzī, *al-Nizā‘ wa-‘l-takhāṣum* =
Aḥmad b. ‘Alī Taqī al-Dīn Abū ‘l-‘Abbās, Al-Maqrīzī. *Kitāb al-nizā‘ wa-‘l-takhāṣum fīmā bayna Banī Umayya wa-Banī Hāshim.* Ḥusayn Mu‘nis, ed. Cairo: Dār al-Ma‘ārif, 1988.
- Marquet, “Ya‘qūbī” =
Marquet, Y. “Le Šī‘isme au IXe siècle a travers l’histoire de Ya‘qūbī.” *Arabica* 19 (1972): 1–45.
- Al-Mas‘ūdī, *Murūj* =
‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī, Abū ‘l-Ḥasan al-Mas‘ūdī. *Murūj al-dhahb wa-ma‘ādin al-jawhar.* Ch. Pellat, ed. Beirut, 1966–1979.
- Al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb* =
Jamāl al-Dīn, Abū ‘l-Ḥajjāj, Yūsuf al-Mizzī. *Tahdhīb al-kamāl fī asmā‘ al-rijāl.* 1) Bashīr ‘Awwād Ma‘rūf, ed. Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, 1985–1992. 2) Suhayl Zakkār, A.‘A. ‘Abīd and Ḥasan Aḥmad Āghā, eds. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr li-‘l-Ṭibā‘a wa-‘l-Nashr wa-‘l-Tawzī‘, 1414/1994.
- Al-Mubarrad, *al-Kāmil* =
Muḥammad b. Yazīd Abū al-‘Abbās al-Mubarrad. *Al-Kitāb al-kāmil.* 1) W. Wright, ed. Leipzig, 1864. 2) Muḥammad Aḥmad al-Dālī ed. Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, 1406/1986.
- Mujīr al-Dīn, *al-Uns al-jalīl* =
‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad, Mujīr al-Dīn al-Ḥanbalī al-‘Ulaymī. *Al-Uns al-jalīl bi-ta’rīkh al-Quds wa-‘l-Khalīl.* 1) Cairo: Būlāq, 1283 AH. 2) Beirut-Amman, 1973.

- Al-Muqaddasī, *Aḥsan al-taqāsīm* =
 Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Muqaddasī. *Aḥsan al-taqāsīm fī ma‘rifat al-aqālīm*. M.J. de Goeje, ed. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1906 [*Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum*, 3].
- Nāṣir-i Khusraw, *Safar Nāme* =
 Nāṣir-i Khusraw b. al-Ḥārith, Abū Mu‘īn. *Safar Nāme*. 1) Arabic translation by Yaḥyā al-Khashshāb, Cairo, 1364/1945. 2) English translation by G. Le Strange in *Palestine Pilgrims Text Society* 4 (1893).
- Nawas, “The development of the Islamic religious sciences” =
 Nawas, J.A. “The development of the Islamic religious sciences in early and classical Islam: a comparative approach.” *Al-Masāq* 11 (1999): 159–69.
- Nawas, “*Mawālī and Arab*.” =
 Nawas, J.A. “Birth of an elite: *Mawālī* and Arab ‘*ulamā*’.” *JSAI* 31 (2006): 74–91.
- Nawas, “*Mawālī ‘Ulamā’*” =
 Nawas, J.A. “A profile of *Mawālī ‘Ulamā’*.” In Bernardis, M. and J. Nawas, eds. *Patronate and patronage in early and classical Islam*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2005, pp. 454–480.
- Pellat, “Ġāḥiẓiana III” =
 Ch. Pellat. “Ġāḥiẓiana III. Essai d’inventaire de l’oeuvre Ġāḥiẓienne,” *Arabica* 3 (1956): 147–180.
- Al-Quḍā‘ī, *al-Inbā’* =
 Muḥammad b. Salāma al-Quḍā‘ī. *Kitāb al-Inbā’ bi-anbā’ al-anbiyā’ wa-tawārīkh al-khulafā’ wa-wilāyāt al-umarā’*. ‘Abd al-Salām Tadmurī, ed. Sidon, 1998.
- Al-Qurṭubī, *Tafsīr* =
 Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Abī Bakr b. Faraḥ al-Qurṭubī. *Al-Jāmi‘ li-ahkām al-Qur’ān*². Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-‘Alīm al-Baradūnī, ed. Cairo: Dār al-Sha‘b, 1372 AH [The work is known as *Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī*].
- Rabbat, “The Dome of the Rock revisited” =
 Rabbat, Nasser. “The Dome of the Rock revisited: some remarks on al-Wāsiṭī’s accounts.” *Muqarnas* 10 (1993): 67–75.
- Rabbat, “The meaning of the Dome of the Rock” =
 Rabbat, Nasser. “The meaning of the Umayyad Dome of the Rock.” *Muqarnas* 6 (1989): 12–21.
- Répertoire* =
 Comb, E., Sauvaget, J. and G. Wiet, eds. *Répertoire chronologique d’épigraphie arabe*. Le Caire, 1931–1943.
- Robinson, ‘*Abd al-Malik*’ =
 Robinson, C.F. ‘*Abd al-Malik*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2005.
- Rosenthal, *Historiography* =
 Rosenthal, F. *A history of Muslim historiography*.² Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968.

- Rubin, "The Ka'ba" =
 Rubin, U. "The Ka'ba: aspects of its ritual function and position in pre-Islamic times." *JSAI* 8 (1986): 97–131.
- Al-Şafadī, *al-Wāfi* =
 Khalīl b. Aybak Şalāh al-Dīn al-Şafadī. *Al-Wāfi bi-'l-wafāyāt*. Istanbul-Leipzig, vols. 1 (1931)–2 (1949). Vols. 3–24: Wiesbaden-Beirut, 1974–1993. Vols. 25–29: Beirut-Berlin, 1997–1999.
- Al-Sam'ānī, *al-Ansāb* =
 'Abd al-Karīm b. Muḥammad b. Maṣṣūr al-Tamīmī al-Sam'ānī. *Al-Ansāb*. 'Abd Allāh 'Umar al-Bārūdī, ed. Beirut, 1408/1988.
- Sarkīs, *Mu'jam* =
 Sarkīs, Yūsuf Ilyās. *Mu'jam al-maṭbū'āt al-'Arabīyya wa-'l-mu'arraba*. Cairo: Maṭba'at Sarkīs, 1346/1928.
- Sezgin =
 Sezgin, F. *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*. Vol. 1. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.
- Shani, "The Dome of the Rock" =
 Shani, R. "The iconography of the Dome of the Rock." *JSAI* 23 (1999): 158–207.
- Al-Sharbīnī, *Mughnī al-muḥtāj* =
 Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Khaṭīb Shams al-Dīn al-Sharbīnī. *Mughnī al-muḥtāj ilā ma'rifat ma'ānī alfāz al-Minhāj*. [A commentary on al-Nawawī's book, *Minhāj al-ṭālibīn*]. Beirut, n.d.
- Sharon, "The merits of Jerusalem" =
 Sharon, M. "The 'praises of Jerusalem' as a source for the early history of Islam." *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 44 (1992): 56–67.
- Al-Shaybānī, *al-Āḥād wa-'l-mathānī* =
 Aḥmad b. 'Amr b. al-Ḍaḥḥāk Abū Bakr al-Shaybānī. *Al-Āḥād wa-'l-mathānī*. Bāsim Fayṣal Aḥmad al-Jawābira, ed. Al-Riyāḍ: Dār al-Rāya, 1411/1991.
- Al-Shirwānī, *Hawāshī* =
 'Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Shirwānī. *Hawāshī al-Shirwānī* [= *Hāshīya 'alā Tuḥfat al-muḥtāj bi-Sharḥ al-Minhāj*, that is, the commentary work of Ibn Ḥajar al-Haythamī on *Minhāj al-Ṭālibīn of al-Nawawī*.] Printed together with the commentary by the same name by Aḥmad b. al-Qāsim al-'Ibādī [d. 994/1585]. Beirut, n.d.
- Sibt b. al-Jawzī, *Mir'āt al-zamān* =
 Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, Shams al-Dīn Abū 'l-Muẓaffar Yūsuf ibn Qizoghlu. *Mir'āt al-zamān*. Oxford: Bodleian Library, MS Marsh 289.
- Sivan, "*Fadā'il al-Quds*" =
 Sivan, E. "The beginning of the *Fadā'il al-Quds* literature." *Israel Oriental Studies* 1 (1971): 263–271.

- Al-Suhaylī, *al-Rawḍ al-unuf* =
 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad al-Khath‘amī al-Suhaylī. *Al-Rawḍ al-unuf fī sharḥ al-sīra al-nabawīyya li-Ibn Hishām*. Majdī Maṣṣūr al-Shūrā, ed. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1418/1997.
- Al-Suyūṭī, *al-Amr bi-’l-ittibā‘* =
 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr, Jalāl al-Dīn, al-Suyūṭī. *Al-Amr bi-’l-ittibā‘ wa-al-nahy ‘an al-ibtidā‘*. Mashhūr Ḥasan Salmān, ed. Al-Riyāḍ: Dār Ibn al-Qayyim li-l-Nashr wa-’l-Tawzī‘, 1410/1990.
- Al-Suyūṭī, *al-Durr al-manthūr* =
 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr, Jalāl al-Dīn, al-Suyūṭī. *Al-Durr al-manthūr fī al-tafsīr bi-’l-ma’thūr*. Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘rifa li-’l-Ṭibā‘a wa-’l-Nashr, n.d.
- Al-Suyūṭī, *Iḥāf al-akhiṣṣā‘* =
 Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. ‘Alī al-Minhājī, Shams al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī. *Iḥāf al-akhiṣṣā‘ bi-faḍā’il al-masjid al-aqṣā*. Aḥmad Ramaḍān Aḥmad, ed. Cairo: Al-Hay’a al-Miṣriyya al-‘Āmma li-’l-Kitāb, 1982–1984.
- Al-Ṭabarānī, *al-Mu‘jam al-kabīr* =
 Sulaymān b. Ayyūb Abū ’l-Qāsīm al-Ṭabarānī. *Al-Mu‘jam al-kabīr*². Ḥamdī b. ‘Abd al-Majīd al-Salafī, ed. Mosul: Maktabat al-‘Ulūm wa-’l-Ḥikam, 1404/1983.
- Al-Ṭabarānī, *Mu‘jam al-Shāmiyyīn* =
 Sulaymān b. Ayyūb Abū ’l-Qāsīm al-Ṭabarānī. *Mu‘jam al-Shāmiyyīn*. Ḥamdī ‘Abd al-Majīd al-Salafī, ed. Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla, 1417/1996.
- Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh* =
 Muḥammad b. Jarīr Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭabarī. *Ta’rīkh al-rusul wa-’l-mulūk*. M.J. de Goeje, ed. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1879–1901 [New Printing: Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964].
- Al-Ṭurṭūshī, *al-Ḥawādith* =
 Muḥammad b. al-Walīd, Abū Bakr al-Ṭurṭūshī. *Kitāb al-ḥawādith wa-’l-bida‘*. Muḥammad al-Ṭālibī, ed. Tūnis, 1959.
- Al-Wāsiṭī, *Faḍā’il* =
 Muḥammad b. Aḥmad Abū Bakr al-Wāsiṭī. *Faḍā’il al-bayt al-muqaddas*. I. Hasson, ed. Jerusalem: Magness Press, 1979.
- Whelan, “Forgotten witness” =
 Whelan, E. “Forgotten witness: evidence for the early codification of the Qur’ān.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118 (1998): 1–14.
- Al-Ya‘qūbī, *Ta’rīkh* =
 Aḥmad b. Abī Ya‘qūb b. Wāḍiḥ al-Ya‘qūbī. *Ta’rīkh*. 1) M.T. Houtsma, ed. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1883. 2) Beirut ed., 1960.
- Yāqūt, *Mu‘jam* =
 Yāqūt al-Rūmī, al-Ḥamawī. *Mu‘jam al-buldān*. Beirut, 1955–1957.

Al-Zaylaʿī, *Naṣb al-rāya* =

ʿAbd Allāh b. Yūsuf Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥanafī al-Zaylaʿī. *Naṣb al-rāya li-aḥādīth al-hidāya*. Muḥammad Yūsuf al-Banawī, ed. Cairo: Dār al-Ḥadīth, 1357 AH.

Al-Ziriklī, *al-Aʿlām* =

Al-Ziriklī Khayr al-Dīn. *Al-Aʿlām*⁵. Beirut: Dār al-ʿIlm li-l-Malāyīn, 1980.