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New Initiative: Medieval Islamic Economic Quantitative Data Collection in a Global Setting

Maya Shatzmiller
Western University
Ontario, Canada

The growing focus in recent years on comparative global economic history, which complements but does not supplement the traditional approach to national economic history, appears to have left Islamic economic historians uninvolved, unimpressed and disinterested. Why this has been so may have something to do with the narrow professional formation of the discipline, which excludes economic theory and mathematical applications including quantitative data collection, in favour of textual interpretation. This is not to say that quantitative data was not collected in the past, or that the analysis based on it was ignored. Since Ashtor’s death in 1984, the following come to mind (see below for bibliographic details): Bulliet on conversion and cotton, Shoshan on wages and prices, Mortel on grain prices, Sabra on wages, Borsch on GDP, Morony on plague victims, Shatzmiller on occupations, Idris on dowries and commodities, Chalmeta on the economy of al-Andalus and Söderberg on comparing prices. Furthermore, scholars of pre-modern Ottoman economic history have also enlarged the spectrum by including quantitative data from the late Middle Ages (1300 and post Black Death period) as Pamuk has done in several publications, to provide a more sophisticated study of long term trends. Medieval European economic historians, such as McCormick on the origins of European economy and Laiou on Byzantine economy, have equally attempted to expand the quantitative aspect of their respective subjects; work, which needless to say, provides a useful comparative tool for Medieval Islam.

In the meanwhile, while the debate over global economic growth is looming large on the scholarly research agenda, input from Islamic economic historians, and those of the medieval period in particular, is wanting. In their absence, unfortunately, the topic was left wide open to pronouncements by the uninformed. Proper investigation has been replaced by an assault on the “Islamic” nature of economic institutions, in particular on Islamic law, as blocking economic progress in the past and responsible for the poverty of Islamic societies in the present (see Greif; Kuran). Some, myself included, find the use of the trendy “historical cultural factor” as the source of all the ills of Islamic societies objectionable.

For all these reasons the new initiative to collect quantitative data from Medieval Islamic sources and place it in global economic datasets is an exciting prospect. The initiative was originated by a research project funded by the Netherlands’ Organisation for Scientific Research which proposed initially to look at comparative growth rates of Iraq, Italy and the Netherlands between 600-1800, directed by Professor Bas van Bavel of Utrecht University. The Islamic component of the project was planned for some time and finally was set up in an inaugural meeting at Utrecht University in December 2009. The participants discussed the benefits of collecting quantitative data for analysis of the pre-industrial Middle Eastern economy, the topics to be covered, the data needed, the methods to be employed, the wider framework to be used and the potential benefits. It was agreed that the scope of the project will be wide, so as to include individual separate research projects and joint studies for pooling quantitative data on a variety of topics. In the future, after publication of these studies, this research will be opened up for a wider audience. Both thematically and methodologically the Islamic datasets will be linked to a larger global project of economic data collection, the Clio-infra project. The Clio-infra project was developed by the International Economic History Association with the aim of analyzing patterns of long-term economic trends affecting economic growth and inequalities by using global datasets. To quote from its Internet posting, “The project—as developed—also aimed to change the ‘rules of the academic game’ in such a way that more efficient ways of cooperation are being made possible and so the exchange of data is facilitated by collaborative work by geographically dispersed groups of scholars using technology to enhance their access to colleagues and data.” The Islamic datasets will follow the main categories of Clio-infra thematic datasets: Its first category, Economic performance and living standards, includes data on Historical Prices and Wages, on Biological Standard of Living, and Quality of Life. The second category, Ultimate causes of development, will compile data on Institutions, Global Labour Relations, Gender, the family and demography, and Geography and the environment. In the third category, Causes of Development, the datasets include Human Capital Formation, Relative prices, and Inequality. The project will aim for a middle course between aims of ensuring intellectual property and opening up the data for research, which may later be
Quantitative data collection is the necessary next step and the topics on which we are seeking quantitative data include the following: Interest rates, demographic estimates, taxation rates, commodities market prices, supply and demand, regional variety, market efficiency, inter temporal storage, spatial market integration, diversification, technological innovations, dispersion of coins, pieces of agricultural projects, GDP, silver content of coins, basket of goods / per capita consumption, urban population, total population, government expenses and government income, area of agricultural land, agricultural output / industrial output, lease prices, human stature, structure of the population (occupational structure, share of the elite, poor surveys, etc.). Of course, not all data are available to all and what is most useful for individual projects may or may not benefit each other’s research, but a data set of “stray observations” will also be inserted in the website for future references. For instance, Ennahid collected terms of “Settlement terminology used in Arabic sources” in his work and putting those on the website will provide a useful tool for urbanization and demographic rates. For the most crucial subject—economic growth—though it may be difficult to calculate GDP for the periods separately, in combination arriving at estimates will be possible, as it will allow us to cross-check our research with similar data bases which have been collected and analyzed by other participants in other places. On the other hand some areas in the Islamic data appear unattainable. For instance, bone measurement through skeleton remains, used for getting at standards of living through measuring food consumption, ages at death, stature, etc., is currently unlikely. Yet, high frequency of animal hypoplasia was detected in the Late Roman period at Tell Masaikh, not far away from Dura Europos and has been tentatively interpreted as a sign of increased stress due to political instability in a region close to the frontier. In spite of the fact that most archaeologists are not interested in Islamic cemeteries in the Near East, the possibility of scholars using archaeological material / bones to get a better insight as to whether there was a change with the Muslim conquests is intriguing. Participants expressed interest in jointly writing a research application to get the funds for more archaeological research in this promising field. While procedures or research design, including methods, analyses, and criteria for evaluation of results will still be developed, data will be entered in categories already in existence to allow cross-reference with previous, contemporary and later periods in all possible ramifications. The chronological / geographical units proposed are the following: a.) Babylonia, ca. 400 BC - 0; b.) Egypt, 6th - 9th centuries; c.) Iraq, 6th - 12th centuries; d.) Egypt, 10th-19th centuries; e.) Iraq, 13th - 19th centuries.

The rationale for including earlier and later periods, beyond the Islamic spectrum of 800-1500, is that these data will help in placing the medieval findings into a long term perspective, with earlier and later data used for cross-checking, which in turn allows for comparison with the findings for Europe in the period, 1000-1800—currently in the most advanced stage. At the same time a cautious approach is in order since reconstructions of pre-industrial GDP and structural aspects of economies show that geographical differences are very sharp—and results therefore cannot be projected onto other geographical areas. Currently, two cases where possibilities for research seem to be best and where most of the effort exists so far are on Iraq and Egypt, and data collection will likely begin there. With the Islamic site linked to Clio-infra, the option of creating and working with a few websites of the same format and simultaneously with different groups offers great flexibility.

The only question which has not been discussed in detail is that of the Arabic sources and which of the currently available source categories may be used for the project. The usual complaint among Islamic economic historians is that there are no sources with series of numerical data, including prices, and arranged in a chronological order similar to the waqf and kitchen accounts of the Ottoman period, as used by Pamuk. The studies by Ashtor and Idris show that many sources are likely to yield numerical data including the literary sources, geographical works, chronicles both Arab and non-Arab. Then there are legal sources, such as fiqh manuals and particularly fatwa collections; archival and court documents. Papyri and the Geniza documents may also be used. Claude Cahen once very effectively used a mathematical treatise for calculating tax rates in 9th century Iraq, and one of the first tools to be added to the website devoted to exchange rates for medieval Europe, posted on the Clio-infra should be Walther Hinz’s work: Islamische Masse und Gewichte umgerechnet ins metrische System. The possibilities opened by this initiative may yield great rewards for medieval Islamic history.

Anyone who is interested in participating in this project by identifying the titles of Arabic texts or sharing data sets is encouraged to contact Professor Maya Shatzmiller (maya@uwo.ca).
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MEM congratulates the 2011 Winner of the Graduate Student Paper Prize: Mushegh Asatryan, for his entry, “Bankers and Politics: 8th Century Kufan Moneychangers and Their Role in the Shi’a Community.”

MEM also welcomes a new Graduate Student Representative, Christine Baker, GS, University of Texas, Austin.
A Thirteenth-Century Fadā'īl Treatise on Syria and Damascus

Zayde Antrim
Trinity College
Hartford, Connecticut

In the period of the Crusades, Arabic compilations of Qur'ānic quotes, Ḥadīth, legendary and historical anecdotes, poetic fragments, and prose commentary extolling the merits (fadā'īl) of Syria and Syrian cities flourished as a genre. The landmark work in this genre was the introductory tribute to Syria and Damascus from the voluminous biographical dictionary, the Ta'rikh maddīnāt Dimashq (History of the City of Damascus), written by Damascene notable Abū al-Qāsim Ḍalīl I, (d. 571/1176) under the patronage of the warrior-prince Nūr al-Dīn b. Zangī, “avenger of the vile, infidel enemies of Muslims.” In the decades after 583/1187 when Nūr al-Dīn’s successor Saḥāla al-Dīn b. Ayyūb (Saladin) re-conquered Jerusalem ending a century of Crusader rule, the holy city remained a cause célèbre among Muslim intellectuals, especially when Saladin’s Ayyūbīd descendants used the holy city as a bargaining piece in their intra-dynastic struggles for power. At the same time, perhaps not surprisingly, fadā'īl literature on Jerusalem proliferated. However, fadā'īl treatises were also being circulated in this period that reflected the vitality of the city of Damascus, second city after Cairo in the Ayyūbīd confederation, and the assertiveness of its scholarly milieu.

One of the most intriguing examples of Damascus-centric fadā‘īl literature, particularly as it relates to the politics of the Crusades, is the treatise written by noted preacher and Shāfi‘ī jurist, ‘Īzz al-Dīn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. ‘Abd al-Salām al-Sulamī (d. 660/1262), entitled Targītub ‘ahl al-Islām fi subnā al-Shām (Inciting Muslims to Settle in Syria). Al-Sulamī had a distinguished career in Damascus, occupying the post of khaṭīb, or preacher, of the ‘Umayyad Mosque under the city’s Ayyūbīd ruler, al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl (reigned 63/1229-635/1238, 637/1239-643/1245). Described as having attained the status of “independent thinker” (mujtahid) in juridical matters by his biographers, al-Sulamī’s career exemplifies the loosening of the relationship between local intellectuals and the ruling elite in the Ayyūbīd period. Few Ayyūbīd rulers in the first half of the thirteenth century were able to build or maintain a support system among Syrian religious scholars (‘ulamā’) of the kind that had strengthened Saladin, founder of the Ayyūbīd dynasty, and his predecessor Nūr al-Dīn. Intemecine rivalry between the sons of Saladin’s brother al-‘Ādil I, who had consolidated power over both Egypt and Syria from 596/1200 until his death in 615/1218, created an unstable situation in which the cities of Cairo, Damascus, and Aleppo were increasingly aligned against each other as Ayyūbīd claimants jockeyed for position. It was in an attempt to strengthen his hand against those of his brothers in Syria that the Ayyūbīd ruler in Cairo, al-Kāmil, signed a treaty with Frederick II of Hohenstaufen in 626/1229 that ceded Jerusalem back to the Crusaders. This gesture raised the ire of Syrian ‘ulamā’, particularly those in Damascus who had constituted the most vocal supporters of jihad against the Crusaders.

A decade later, intra-dynastic power struggles again prompted an Ayyūbīd, this time the ruler of Damascus al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl, to sign a treaty with the Crusaders in 638/1240, which ceded some coastal territories and a number of nearby fortresses to the Franks of Acre and allowed them access to the weapons markets of Damascus. In response to this calculated act of realpolitik, many members of the Damascene ‘ulamā’ raised their voices in condemnation of al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl’s judgment. Front and center in this uproar was al-Sulamī, who issued a fatwa, or legal opinion, condemning the sale of arms to Crusaders and preached a fiery Friday sermon from the pulpit of the ‘Umayyad Mosque expressing outspoken rejection of al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl’s policies and, therefore, of his legitimacy as a ruler. Reprisal was swift on the part of the Ayyūbīd ruler, and al-Sulamī was briefly imprisoned and then forced to leave Damascus, from whence he fled to Egypt where he spent the rest of his life in self-imposed exile.

After fleeing to Egypt, al-Sulamī authored his fadā‘īl tribute to Syria and Damascus, presumably at least partly out of homesickness. In compiling this work, he borrowed material from the earlier Fadā‘īl al-Shām wa-Dimashq (Merits of Syria and Damascus) by one Abū al-Hasan ‘Ālī al-Rabā‘ī (d. 444/1052) and the introduction to Ibn ‘Asākir’s Ta’rikh maddīnāt Dimashq and reflected their emphases on the privileged status of the region of Syria and its central city, Damascus, in sacred history.

These similarities aside, al-Sulamī arranges and comments on this material in such a way as to communicate his particular understanding of his authority as a religious scholar as well as his
political agenda. Unlike his predecessors, he does not hesitate to wield his independent judgment as a mu'tahid, abbreviating or eliminating chains of transmission and proffering his own exegesis of the material from the Qur'an and Hadith that he presents as evidence for Syrian excellence.

He divides his faḍā'il treatise into two major parts, the first making a case for the virtues of the region of Syria and the second making a much briefer case for the virtues of the city of Damascus before concluding with a discussion of just leadership in Islam. While some ambiguity plagues the use of the toponym “al-Shām” in literature of this sort, the earlier exemplars by al-Raba'ī and Ibn Asākir both include traditions defining “al-Shām” as a regional entity, blessed by God in the Qur'an, stretching from the town of al-ʾArish on the border with Egypt in the south-west to the Euphrates in the north-east, an entity that might be termed today “Greater Syria” or “Bilād al-Shām.” Al-Sulamī also includes this tradition, and establishes a clear distinction between the region of “al-Shām” and the city of “Dimashq” in his opening remarks on the source and nature of their blessings: “God Almighty has made known those of us of the people of Syria who reside there to the worlds; He settled [Syria] with prophets and messengers, with saints and saviors, and with righteous worshippers; He surrounded [Syria] with His closest angels and placed it in the protection of the Lord of the Worlds; He made its people victorious in the name of truth, not impaired by those who forsake them, until Judgment Day; He made [Syria] a refuge for the faithful and a sanctuary for refugees. And, in particular, Damascus, the protected one (wa-lā sīyāmā Dimashq al-mabruṣa) is described in the glorious Qur'an as “high ground, affording rest and furnished with springs” (23:50). Also, as transmitted on the authority of the descendants of the prophets and the group of exegetes and commentators, it is where Jesus, peace be upon him, will descend to strengthen the religion and to help those who believe in the unity of God and to fight infidels and heretical practices. And its Gūṭa will be the fortress of the Muslims during the slaughters [of the apocalypse].”

This passage starts out by conferring God’s blessings upon “al-Shām,” referred to thereafter by the third person singular masculine pronoun, and then the phrase “and in particular Damascus, the protected one” switches the focus to Damascus, referred to in the rest of the passage by the third person singular feminine pronoun. There can be little doubt here that al-Sulamī is using “al-Shām” and “Dimashq” as distinct toponyms referring to plots of land at different scales, one nestled within the other, rather than as synonyms. Despite this distinction, al-Sulamī’s Syria and Damascus are also intimately related. In this passage, he represents Damascus, along with its adjacent fertile oasis the Gūṭa, as the epicenter of Syrian virtue, a predestined virtue derived from the privileged role in sacred history that Syrians in Syria – “those of us of the people of Syria who reside there” – have played and will play again at the end of time.

Al-Sulamī, however, is quick to acknowledge another kind of virtue bestowed upon Syria, “its worldly blessings” (baraḵāṭihi al-ʾājila), though no less evidence of God’s favor in their worldliness. Referring to two of the Qur’ānic verses in which God blesses a particular territory (17:1, 21:71), al-Sulamī notes that scholars disagree as to the nature of that blessing: “Some say that it is [by means of] prophets and messengers; others say that it is [by means of] what He bestows upon it in the way of fruits and water.” He continues by acknowledging that God clearly endowed Damascus with springs, rivers, fruits, and cereals. However, he also concludes that abundant “religious blessings” (al-barakāt al-dinīyya) reside in Syria and in Jerusalem. He never specifies the source of Jerusalem’s “religious blessings,” other than being part of Syria, and he seems much more preoccupied with the blessings bestowed upon Syria as a region – both worldly and religious – than to those accrued to any of its constituent parts other than Damascus. For instance, later in the faḍā'il treatise he presents an exegesis of the phrase from the first verse of the “Night Journey” in Sūra 17 in which God blesses the area around “al-Masjid al-Aqṣā”: “This does not apply specifically to one locality in [Syria] as opposed to other localities, but it applies to what is generally encompassed by the borders (hudul) of Syria.” Thus, al-Sulamī downplays Jerusalem’s particular claim to the baraka conferred by God in the “Night Journey” Sūra and assigns it to the region of Syria as a whole, echoing earlier interpretations of the “Holy Land” as comprising all of Syria.

Central to al-Sulamī’s vision of Syrian virtue, reflecting again an emphasis in earlier faḍā’il literature, especially Ibn ʿAsākir’s introduction to the Tārīkh madīnat Dimashq, is his representation of the region of Syria as a site of struggle and triumph in the service of the one true faith, both past and future. However, unlike Ibn ʿAsākir, he makes an explicit connection between this representation and his own experience of life in Syria in the thirteenth century. In commenting on a Prophetic Hadith predicting that when Islam is threatened “Syria will be the center of the abode of the faithful,” al-
Sulamī explains that in this prediction the Prophet was urging the settlement of Syria because it is “a frontier fortress until Judgment Day, and we have witnessed this, for the edges of Syria have always been frontier fortresses.” In this commentary, al-Sulamī consciously represents Syria as the lodestone for faithful Muslims in the fight against disbelief, a fight that he has “witnessed” in his own time. Moreover, it is clear that he intends “al-Shām” in this statement to transcend the bounds of Damascus or of any single locality or district within the region of Syria, such as Jerusalem or Palestine, since, by evoking “frontier fortresses” (thughūr) along “edges” (aṭrāf) both historical and contemporary he conjures images of the northern border with Byzantium, the western Mediterranean coast, and, in this era of increasingly aggressive Mongol incursions, of which he was certainly aware, the north-eastern border along the Euphrates. Another of al-Sulamī’s commentaries calls attention to the weight he gives recent events in Syria and its people. He presents from the Great Mosque of Damascus, al-Sulamī quickly dispatches with the conventional Qur’ānic evidence for the city’s merits, its association with the “high ground” (al-rabwah) upon which Jesus and Mary took refuge (23:50), with the fig in God’s oath “by the fig and the olive” (95:1), and with the pre-Islamic city of Irām (89:7-8). He also presents further apocalyptic traditions locating Jesus’ second coming in Damascus and portraying the Ghūṭa as a refuge for the faithful at the end of time. Then, however, he enumerates the kinds of baraka accrued to Damascus by the current vitality and piety of the religious life of its notables and scholars, among whom he used to figure prominently: “Among the things that show its baraka and the merit of its people is the great number of its pious endowments for the purpose of different types of cisterns and public drainage channels as well as the fact that its Great Mosque is never empty, whether at midnight or noon, of followers of the Book of God Almighty, of people praying or reciting the Qur’ān, or of religious scholars and students.”

This tribute to the religious life of his hometown, a tribute to the life he lost in fleeing the city, acts as a prelude to the conclusion of the fudā’il treatise in which al-Sulamī reflects on the issue of the just ruler in Islam – a thinly veiled tirade against the injustice he so soundly condemned on the part of al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl and an expression of his bitterness as an émigré and political dissident. In this conclusion, al-Sulamī presents the same material Ibn ʿAsākīr uses as an apologia for the role Syrians played in the Battle of Ṣiffin (37/657). However, al-Sulamī’s presentation of these traditions is intended less to exonerate Syrians for their ancestors’ mistakes than to reflect on past instances of unjust rulers of Damascus betraying Syria and Syrians. Al-Sulamī invokes words attributed to ʿAṭī b. ʿAbī Ṭālib – “Don’t blame Syrians! Rather blame the oppression of Syrians!” – to condemn the unjust or illegitimate policies of Syrian rulers. He concludes his fudā’il treatise by asking God “to bring the governors of the affairs of the Muslims into line with your Book.” By representing Damascus via the exemplary religious life of its inhabitants just before this conclusion, al-Sulamī uses the fudā’il genre to condemn any betrayal of them on the part of their rulers. The crimes of al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl, this conclusion suggests, were all the more unforgivable since their victim was Damascus. In compiling a fudā’il treatise that drew both from earlier exemplars of the genre and from his own independent judgment and lived experience, al-Sulamī communicated his conviction that Syria’s divinely privileged destiny depended on the ‘ulama’ of Damascus and their willingness to speak truth to power.
Shuqayra al-Gharbiyya: An Early Islamic Elite Community on the Karak Plateau

Zakariya Ben Badhann
Mu’tah University, Jordan

The seventh and eighth centuries CE in Bilād al-Shām were a period of profound political change that resulted mainly from the rise and spread of Islam as a religion, political power, and social system, and the successive ruling of the two Arab Muslim dynasties, the Umayyads and the ‘Abbāsids. Social changes, in particular, are of special importance for archaeologists and historians who aim to reconstruct ancient cultural trajectories. This is largely because social changes leave their physical traces on the landscape in different ways thus enabling archaeologists to fill gaps in history that have always been influenced by political and military aspects of the early conquests.

The Umayyads established themselves as an elite oligarchy in a state that was a mixture of different tribes, ethnic groups, socio-cultural traditions and various competitive religious denominations. Meanwhile, a process of political Islamization during the Rāshīdūn era (632-661 CE) was followed by the administrative reorganization, cultural Islamization, and social consolidation that took place during the Umayyad period (661-750 CE). The Umayyads, whose interests in Bilād al-Shām predate their accession to power in 661 CE, were undaunted victors and dynamic builders. Archaeologically speaking, the Umayyad presence is best known through scores of imperial buildings such as palaces, baths, and villas dotting different areas of Greater Syria.

During the Early Islamic Period, according to the Ajnad military/administrative system, the Karak Plateau was part of the District of Mo‘āb which fell within the Province of Damascus. The district was thought to have been of little economic potential because of its geographic marginality. For example, sporadic references were made to this region in the Arabic geographical and historical chronicles from the third/ninth century onward. This has caused some
suffered to consider it a *terra neglecta* (Green 2004: 223). However, recent archaeological field projects have started to change this stereotype. For example, excavations sponsored by Mu’tah University have revealed an imposing Early Islamic building at Shuqayra al-Gharbiyya.

Shuqayra al-Gharbiyya rests on the southern edge of the Karak Plateau, overlooking the seasonal Wadi al-Hasa. The area is part of the Mo’ib plains which is in the domain of the semi-arid Mediterranean bioclimatic region (Al-Eisawi 1996: 36. The archaeological landscape here is characterized by the presence in Dhat Ras (ca. 3 km to the north) of three Nabataean/Roman temples (Eddinger 2004) (Fig. 1 & 2).

Excavations at Shuqayra al-Gharbiyya, which used to be known in the archaeological literature as Khirbat al-Qushtibah (Miller, 1991), started in 2002 as part of the archaeological field school of Mu’tah University’s Department of Archaeology. So far, ten seasons of excavations have been carried out here exposing parts of an impressive manor. These exposed parts along with the wall tops visible on the surface of the yet unexcavated areas of the site indicate that the remains here belong to a coherent building unit covering an area of nearly an acre (ca. 4000 m²). The complex at Shuqayra contains multiple-units. Excavations have mainly exposed the eastern half of the complex. The main gate is installed on the east side and gives access to a square entrance, with three niches (1.70 m. high) set up on its sides. Both the gate and entrance are flanked by hemispherical towers. After the ante-vestibule comes a rectangular benched vestibule (10 x 4.5 m.), which is surrounded on both sides by a system of square rooms. The vestibule opens onto a flagstone-paved courtyard, a fuller extension of which has not been established. Evidence for water management in the complex is evident by two channels unearthed in the courtyard area. Both channels start from an area at the center of the complex, which is still unexcavated. The channel in the northern part of the courtyard ends with a depression, probably a cistern. In the area to the south of the central courtyard are more rooms and a system of benches associated with pillared configuration (Fig. 3).

Evidently the most outstanding part of the complex at Shuqayra is a tessellated hall that occupies the southwestern part of the site. The hall measures 22 x 8 m. and is oriented east-west. It is divided longitudinally into three parts by means of two lines of columns. The northern aisle and central nave are in a good state of preservation, with only some areas in the western part of both have deteriorated (Fig. 6). Mosaics of the southern aisle have completely come off and only the bedding layer has remained. This position of the hall provides the sightseers a scenic view of Wadi al-Hasa. A flight of stairs descends toward the wadi. The spatial setting of this hall, its plan and supposed function indicate to a distinct feature in the early Islamic architecture. During this period artisans and architects excelled in creating a cognizant layout of the architectural elements particularly in this genre of imperial buildings “desert palaces.” A common feature of many of the known palaces in Bilād al-Shām is that they are judiciously positioned on prominent spots that enable a charming vision of the surrounding natural landscape. It is
Fig. 4, left: Umayyad-period vessels from Shuqayra al-

Fig. 5, right: 'Abbāsid-period jūṣg from Shuqayra

Fig. 6, below: Tessellated hall in Shuqayra al-Gharbiyya Area C.

Fig. 7, right: Comparison between Khirbat al-Mafjar and Shuqayra al-Gharbiyya mosaics (the former after Hamilton, 1959)
noted that many of these palaces were built close to wadis; Shuqayra al-Gharbiyya on wadi al-Hasa, Khirbat al-Mafjar in the Jordan valley with view of the River Jordan and the Jordanian plateau in the background, al-Tuba on wadi al-Ghidaf, the Amman Citadel overlooking the upper sources of wadi al-Zarqa. Others were built close to shores such as Khirbat al-Minya just north of Lake Tiberias and Sinnabba on the southern shores of the same lake. Also, Qusayr ‘Amra was built in an area rich with terebinth trees. Most of the majestic building in these sites had special compartments that archaeologists and art historians consider audience/reception halls. These architectural units occupy a prominent location within the whole complex. At Shuqayra, Khirbat al-Minya, and the Amman citadel these subspaces are arranged so that they provide a good view of the surroundings. The impression is that these architectural components were meant to be belvederes, probably an endeavour to create a visual merge between the building and surrounding environment. Thus the external landscape is rendered a source of enjoyment in these palaces that are thought to have been built to serve as retreats and places of pleasure.

Themes executed in the mosaics are exclusive to geometric and floral patterns. Patterns represented in the northern aisle are all geometric, including diamond-like features in overlapping squares, a square with denticulated diamonds-like feature and squares with overlapping octagons. The central nave has a main carpet of intertwined circles and it also has the central medallion which seems to represent the focal point of the mosaic pavement. The main subject depicted in the central medallion is a fenestrated-footed vase from which spring leafy shoots forming circles that hold dates bunches and grape clusters and end with etrog (or rather enlarged fig) fruits. The mosaics are skilfully constructed using several different colored cubes of limestone, sandstone and even basalt (Shdaifat and Ben Badhann 2008; Fig. 8). The dating of the building was established mainly based on the ceramic evidence which falls within the known pottery assemblage of the late seventh and early ninth century CE. The Shuqayra pottery repertoire consists of tableware, kitchenware and medium-sized storage jars. Palestinian fine ware bowls, a hallmark of the eighth century, is particularly common (Fig. 4). One of the interesting contributions of the settlement history of Shuqayra is that it has provided evidence for occupation during the ‘Abbāsid period (Late eighth and ninth centuries CE). The evidence consists of ceramic material associated with architectural modifications and expansions of some elements of the public building. We hope that the evidence will help in understanding the formation of the ‘Abbāsid cultural identity in this part of Jordan. Noteworthy is that Shuqayra is located within the area called al-Humayma, which witnessed the appearance of the ‘Abbāsids as opponents to the Umayyads in the Hisma area of southern Jordan, and at the same time the ‘Abbāsid ceramic material shows ties with other parts of the empire (Fig. 5).

The architectural technique employed at Shuqayra is well known in other Umayyad period complexes in the Levant. For the mosaic pavement, good parallel examples can be cited from Khirbat al-Mafjar in the Jordan valley. The numismatic evidence, although meager, does support this dating. It is noteworthy that the building continued to be used during the ‘Abbāsid Period (750-970 CE) as the ceramic evidence attests that the complex went through some expansion and modification during this period (Shdaifat, Tarawneh, and Ben Badhann 2006). The identity of the patron-owner-builder of the complex is hard to envisage in light of the meager textual evidence from and on the site. Yet, some remarks can be made. Among important finds in the site is a tile ostracon bearing a few Arabic letters, probably part of a corresponding letter written in cursive calligraphy and reads “…I acknowledge to you…” Also, the 2011 season of excavation at the site has discovered a lintel inscribed with an Arabic statement that is, unfortunately, in an eroded state. One word seems to read “in the name of …”. Both phrases are traditional Arabic/Islamic ones.

This meager textual evidence might indicate that the patron was an Arab or Muslim. This conjecture is supported by the fact that the mosaic pavement did not include representations of living beings, though this argument should not be considered a conclusive one. There is hard evidence that human being and animal motifs represented artistic subjects during the Umayyad period, for example at Qusayr ‘Amra and Khirbat al-Mafjar. Therefore another possible reason for the absence of human and animal motives in Shuqayra may be economic. If the mosaic comparison with Khirbat al-Mafjar proves that both sites (Shuqayra and Khirbat al-Mafjar) were the production of the same time and patron, one may infer that the elaborate execution in al-Mafjar of a lion and gazelles and the multitude of mosaic rugs there could have been produced at the expense of the other tessellation project of Shuqayra. Since the building could have been established at the request of a Muslim patron, it is noteworthy that the area was still, to a large extent, Christian. For instance, al-Rabbah, in the northern part of Mo‘āb, was an important bishopric within the patriarchate of Antioch (Schick 1995, 434). Established Christian communities during this time have also been documented along the south-eastern shore of the Dead Sea in Dayr ‘Ayn ‘Abata and Dayr al-Qattar (Politis 2001), an area that is part of the area of Mo‘āb. There is remarkable similarity, in terms of construction techniques and geometric patterns, between the mosaic pavements in Shuqayra al-Gharbiyya.
and Khirbat al-Mafjar in the Jordan Valley (Fig. 7). Future field research could bring more evidence to light thus clarifying the socio-economic relations between the sites.

Pottery evidence indicates that the two sites had a similar settlement history. The builder of Khirbat al-Mafjar is thought to have been al-Walid II (reigned 743-744 CE), who had already been active since before he became Caliph. Most likely, he undertook many of these building projects during the time of his predecessor, Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik (reigned 724-743 CE). Al-Walid II did not remain in power for very long and it is impossible that he would have built all these grand edifices including al-Mushatta, Bayer and al-Tuba, all in the steppe or desert areas of Jordan, and none of them would have served as a summer residence.

Shuqayra al-Gharbiyya and Khirbat al-Mafjar played an integral role. The natural setting of both sites differ dramatically. While Shuqayra is located up on the plateau and could have functioned as a summer residence, Khirbet al-Mafjar lies in the Jordan Valley, in an area that provides an ideal winter residence.

Bacharach (1996) argued for areas of patrimonial sovereignty during the first half of the eighth century. Then, each caliph (or sometimes caliph-to-be) had his own territory where he patronized the building of a palace or palaces. Accordingly, the central and southern part of the southern Levant where parts of al-Walid II’s areas of patronage. Arabic historical sources provide some hints about the seasonal itineration of some Umayyad caliphs and the phenomenon of different summer and winter residences (on itinerant kingship in early Islamic Syria see now Borut, 2011:383-466). For example, Mu‘awiya I had his winter residence at Sinnabra (al-Hamwi 1977: 425). The same site, which D. Whitcomb has identified to be current Khirbat al-Karak on the southern shore of the Tiberias lake, seems to have been associated with other caliphs. Marwān I is thought to have died there, and his heir, ‘Abd al-Malik, received allegiance there. ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān is reported to have resided seasonally at different localities. Sinnabra represented his winter residence, al-Jabiya in the Golan was his late winter place, Damascus was the spring residence and Baalbak was his preferred summer place (Bacharach 1996; Borut, 2011:397ff.). Al-Walid II went deep in the desert and built a palace for spring camping in Bayer in the Jordanian isolated area of Badya.

Other Umayyad caliphs and regents spent times of the year in isolated places (Atwan 1981). From these examples we can infer that constant itinerancy was a fixed tradition for some caliphs. The reasons behind this should not be thought of as only for pleasure and hunting. It was probably a policy to interact with local residents, particularly the tribes. Bacharach (1996: 37-38) made the point that Khirbat al-Mafjar is not an ideal residence during extremely hot summers, therefore al-Walid would have sought another place to stay in during the long summer. Bacharach suggested Amman as a potential place for summer residence as it was relatively isolated and had a palace that was built around 735 CE. It is likely that Shuqayra had also played an important role in the movement of the Umayyad caliphs during the first half of the eighth century. We hope that future research at Shuqayra will provide concrete evidence that will help us identify the owner of the magnificent building, consequently increasing our understanding of the social and political conditions under which such an elite group emerged. Also, al-Walid II is considered a controversial character among the Umayyad rulers (see lastly Judd, 2008), therefore research at Shuqayra can contribute more information about this disreputable caliph, either supporting the negative notion held about him or amending it.

The Umayyads represented an institutionalized elite, in a state where social inequality was determined by religious and tribal affiliations. In the case of Shuqayra, the community that flourished here also benefitted from agriculture and trade. Evidence for the first might be seen in the assiduous position of the site in the agriculturally productive area of Moib. Also, the central medallion in the mosaic pavement is exclusively dedicated to summer agricultural crops that might have been grown nearby by the inhabitants. Marine items found in the site such as shells and coral along with the decoration that represent fish could indicate that the inhabitants had trade relations with port cities such as Ayla (Aqaba). Shuqayra al-Gharbiyya is important for understanding the nature of the Umayyad presence in this part of southern Levant. As more field work is conducted in Shuqayra, it will uncover more about the Umayyad community in this part of the broader empire.
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This is obviously a doctoral dissertation but I have not discovered exactly where it was submitted. The author mentions two earlier dissertations on ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s travels, the last of which appears to have been to Mecca in 170/787. Unlike Motzki, she reports that ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s principal immediate sources were Ma’mar ibn Rāshid (7,807 ḥadīth reports), Ibn Jurayj (4,860), Sufyān al-Thawrī (4,05), and Sufyān ibn ‘Uyaynah (969). Apropos of suspicions that ‘Abd al-Razzāq was a Shi‘ī, she quotes various relevant ḥadīth reports in the Muṣannaf and quoted of him elsewhere, arguing plausibly that his Shi‘ism was fairly mild, extending to the occasional denigration of ‘Uthmān and possibly those who fought against ‘Ali but not to the wholesale rejection of the Companions.

To get at ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s method, ‘Ajin first looks at transmitters cited from five Followers: Ibrāhīm al-Nakha‘ī (967 ḥadīth reports), al-Hasan al-Baṣrī (588), Nāfī the client of Ibn ‘Umar (595), Makhūl al-Shāmī (84 or 87—I see different numbers on different pages), al-Zuhārī (1,782), and Yahyā ibn Abī Kathīr (2,40), chosen because they appear relatively many transmitters from them. Then she looks up how these transmitters from them were rated in riǰāl encyclopedias and finds that most of them were pronounced trustworthy except for those transmitting from al-Ḥasan, concerning whose reports ‘Abd al-Razzāq evidently maintained a lower standard. Looking over K. al-ṣalāḥ, she finds that ‘Abd al-Razzāq seldom uses alternative isnāds to strengthen otherwise weak reports. Like Motzki, she takes variation in the formulae of transmission (e.g. akhbārānī as opposed to akhbārānī, occasionally qāla to suggest indirect transmission) as evidence of his exacting accuracy. She also reviews ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s topic headings to bring out his attention to legal questions. She takes it from later authorities that mithlāh and naḥyāh indicate respectively exact transmission and paraphrase, which I would like to see demonstrated by comparisons with other ḥadīth collections.

The Muṣannaf of ‘Abd al-Razzāq is distinguished from the Six Books by its inclusion of so much opinion from early Muslim jurists. The most opinions are reported of ‘Aṭāʿ ibn Abī Rabīḥ (2,183), al-Zuhārī (1,005), Ibrāhīm al-Nakha‘ī (842), Ibn ‘Abbās (835), Ibn ‘Umar (821), and al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (759). It would be helpful to know how often Companion opinions are reported by later transmitters of each major center, but a certain Hijazī preponderance is evident. ‘Ajin reports that ‘Abd al-Razzāq himself seems to follow neither Mālik nor Abū Hanīfah but rather the majority view among the Companions and Followers, which he terms ra‘y al-nāṣ, “the opinion of the (respectable) people.” Altogether, this is no searching study of early Islamic jurisprudence—‘Ajin is not much troubled by the question of why things are one way and not another—but it does bring out a good deal of useful information.

Christopher Melchert
University of Oxford


This survey comprises five chapters: the beginning of the teaching of ḥadīth in Andalusia (Companions and Followers reported to have travelled there); the establishment of the school of ḥadīth in Andalusia (starting with Muḥammad ibn Waḍḍāḥ [d. 287/900?], who brought Saḥnūn’s Muḍawwanah); efforts of Andalusian traditionists in the field of transmission (mostly about collections assembled by Andalusians), efforts of Andalusian traditionists in commenting on the books of the sunnah (i.e. the Six Books); efforts of Andalusian traditionists in commenting on other books of the sunnah (including a survey of biographical dictionaries); and the method of criticizing ḥadīth as practiced by Andalusian ‘ulāma’. Ḥamīdātī, an Algerian academic, pays no attention to previous scholarship in European languages. He tends to minimize change over time and will not be distracted by issues such as what occupied pious Andalusian Muslims before the mid-ninth century. (He briefly identifies it as Mālik’s Muwaṭṭa’ [118], ignoring the teaching of Ibn al-Qāsim.) This is mostly a pile of information rearranged from standard sources. His purview goes up to about the ninth century A.H., but he is mainly concerned with the fifth/eleventh century and...
The bibliography is better than some but imperfect, usually naming editors and publishers and giving both Hijri and Christian dates (good) but not always (bad), usually citing original editions (good) but sometimes reprints with no notice of the original (bad). The most important study of this topic till now has been Isabel Fierro, “The Introduction of hadith in al-Andalus (2nd/8th-3rd/9th centuries),” *Der Islam* 66 (1985): 68-93. I suppose it continues to be.

Christopher Melchert
University of Oxford


These are two very similar books. Both begin with inadequate surveys of Ahmad’s life and works (although Kāfī’s discussion of works and editions is much more extensive, if incomplete). After that, however, they become very detailed surveys of early (9th century) hadith criticism, particularly that of Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal. Both reconstruct Ahmad’s method on the basis of quotations, especially in al-‘Ilal wa-mārīfāt al-rījāl in the recension of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ahmad.

Neither ʿUmar nor Kāfī is so fully free from the influence of later developments in hadith study as I should like. For example, ʿUmar is justified in investigating Ahmad’s attention to who had actually met whom, but he frames it in terms of whether Ahmad shared Bukhārī’s criterion or Muslim’s, as identified (dubiously, I would say) long after their deaths. (It appears that Ahmad was inconsistent about accepting or rejecting hadith by the criterion of whether some link in the isnād could or could not be shown to come of a face-to-face encounter.) Kāfī spends a great deal of time trying to figure out the precise definitions of various terms that Ahmad used to characterize hadith reports and their transmitters (e.g. muskar and ṭayyibah), obviously starting from the list of technical terms that is so prominent in later exposés of hadith criticism rather than from categories strongly suggested by quotations of Ahmad. (Both ʿUmar and Kāfī conclude, sensibly, that Ahmad’s terminology was loose with much overlapping.) Both ʿUmar and Kāfī repeat without providing examples (that is, fail to question) the traditional assertion that Ahmad judged legal hadith more strictly than pious.

Still, both are extraordinarily good, since they overwhelmingly reconstruct Ahmad’s method from 9th-century sources. That is, they do not rely on the manuals of al-Khaṭib al-Baghdādī and al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī to tell them all they need to know about earlier hadith criticism, as distressingly many modern Arabophone students of hadith have done. I slightly prefer Kāfī’s book, originally a doctoral dissertation at Jāmi’at al-Amīr ʿAbd al-Qādir, Constantine, Algeria. This is because of Kāfī’s willingness to make arguments, not just pile up facts. In particular, he rightly stresses isnād comparison as the fundamental technique of the early hadith critics. “Yes,” he says, “the ‘illah is a hidden matter but the way to realizing it is not to investigate the conditions of the narrators only, for the conditions of the narrators are in actuality (known) as a result of the investigation of what they relate. A narrator’s being a liar or suspect or left is realized only as a result of probing his narrations and comparing them with those of others” (155). As Kāfī unsurprisingly does not observe, this is to agree with Eerik Dickinson, *The Development of Early Sunnite Hadith Criticism* (Brill, 2001). As ʿUmar does observe, this is to disagree with later students of hadith, both in the High Middle Ages and the 20th century. These have tended to treat hadith criticism as a matter of looking up early evaluations of men in asānīd, glossing over the problem of usually-strong traditionists who occasionally made mistakes as well as usually-weak traditionists who sometimes transmitted accurately. Actually, isnād comparison was overwhelmingly the early (9th century) method of sorting hadith. What remains to be done concerning Ahmad is to relate ʿUmar’s and Kāfī’s results to what we actually find in the Musnad. As for other hadith critics, we probably have better evidence for Ahmad’s method than anyone else’s, but Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn, Bukhārī, and Ibn ʿAdī al-Qaṭṭān seem the most likely candidates for further detailed study.

Christopher Melchert
University of Oxford

Jūzîpi Skāfūlīn (Giuseppe Scattolin) and Ahmad Ḥasan Anwar. *Al-Abūd al-sūfiyyah ‘inda ʿAbd al-Malik al-Kharkūshī: dīrūsah wa-nuṣūṣ* (The Mystical dimensions according to ʿAbd al-Malik al-Kharkūshī: study
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Scattolin’s introduction (12-23) reviews the history of Orientalist studies of Sufism, culminating in Alexander Knysh, Islamic Mysticism (Leiden: Brill, 2000), noting the consensus that Sufism is endogenous. ʿAbd al-Hasan’s introduction (24-7) tells us that this is a version of his master’s thesis on Kharkūshī (University of Manṭūfīyah, 2007), supervised by Scattolin and ʿAffī. After a survey of Kharkūshī’s life and works comes a review of terms defined by Kharkūshī (56-87), a semantic analysis (after, above all, Toshihiko Izutsu) of Kharkūshī’s concept of love (mahabbah, 91-110), a comparison with al-Sarraj, al-Luma‘ (114-28), and a comparison with al-Qushayrī, al-Risālah (128-40). After a short conclusion, excerpts are presented from Kharkūshī, Sarraj, and Qushayrī (159-249), mostly defining terms.

The authors often suggest that Sufism has some essence that one approaches through the definitions of different authorities such as Ghazālī, Ḥujvīrī, and Qushayrī. In practice, fortunately, they also pursue a more historical track. They propose that Kharkūshī wrote the Tādhlib above all to defend Sufism as conforming to the outward meaning of the law, observing that, although he often quotes al-Shiblī and Abū Yazīd al-Baṣṭāmī, he avoids quoting them on the risky subject of shaṭḥ, ecstatic and apparently blasphemous outbursts (73, 87-8). Arberry observed that many of the same expressions appear in both the Tādhlib and the Luma‘. Scattolin and Hasan provide 24 examples of close verbal parallels in their respective discussions of terminology (121-4). Arberry assumed that Kharkūshī had taken material from Sarraj, whereas Scattolin and Hasan prefer to think that Sarraj took material from Kharkūshī. They observe that we know very little of Sarraj’s life beyond his date of death (Rajab 378/x-xi.988), so that we cannot rule out from it Sarraj’s coming across Kharkūshī’s book. They also observe that the Luma‘ is much more clearly organized than the Tādhlib. They find it easier to believe that Sarraj took Kharkūshī’s material and put some order into it than that Kharkūshī took material from Sarraj and carelessly shuffled it with material from elsewhere (126-7). I am not convinced. Although it admittedly cannot be proved that Sarraj was born any sooner than Kharkūshī, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī’s report that Kharkūshī returned from the pilgrimage only in 396/1005-6, together with Kharkūshī’s own statements in the Tādhlib that he gathered various sayings in Mecca, seem to indicate that he composed his book only well after Sarraj’s death. As for the relative disorder of the Tādhlib, that seems to agree with another difference Scattolin and Hasan point out, that Sarraj much more often expresses his own opinion (118). His was the more forceful personality. (I would also point to the influence on Kharkūshī of the adab tradition, which prized miscellany and therefore would have excused reshuffling.) It is easier for me to believe that numerous close verbal parallels between the Tādhlib and Qushayrī’s Risālah (lists at 131, 135-8) are evidence of Qushayrī’s dependence. Interestingly, Scattolin and Hasan find that Qushayrī lays much greater stress on the mutuality of love between God and man, without maintaining so much of a hierarchy among forms of love (139).

The excerpts at the end seem needless, especially since Scattolin and Hasan offer no textual comments, rather they apparently depend on the Abu Dhabi edition (based on one local manuscript, although Hasan thanks someone—a graduate student at Oxford, I am happy to observe—for providing them with a copy of the Berlin manuscript used by Arberry). Every library with Arabic editions of Sulamī and Qushayrī should now include a copy of Kharkūshī, as well. Libraries with significant holdings of secondary literature on early Sufism should probably also acquire Scattolin and Hasan.

Christopher Melchert
University of Oxford
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