New Research on Jaffa in the Islamic and Crusader Periods

by Katherine Strange Burke

Yaffa, ancient Jaffa (Gk. Joppa; Ar. يافا), sits south of the modern city of Tel Aviv on the coast of Israel between Caesarea and Gaza, about 60 km northwest of Jerusalem (fig. 1). The site consists of an ancient tell atop a kurkar sandstone ridge overlooking the Mediterranean Sea, and a sprawling lower city with port facilities (Peilstöcker 2000). As a major port, Jaffa was inhabited throughout nearly all periods from the Middle Bronze Age (ca. 1900 BC) to the present, and possessed connections not only with neighbors in its hinterland but also with distant maritime commercial centers throughout the Mediterranean world. A program of renewed exploration and systematic publication was initiated by the Jaffa Cultural Heritage Project in 2007. It aims to synthesize nearly sixty years of intermittent work by various institutions with recent rescue excavations by the Israel Antiquities Authority. These excavations have begun to reveal something of Jaffa in the Islamic and Crusader periods.

Preliminary work on a collection of whole and reconstructed ceramic vessels excavated in 1995 and 1996 at the Ganor site on Yefet Street in Jaffa (fig. 2), under the direction of Martin Peilstöcker of the Israel Antiquities Authority, permits a preliminary sketch of the history of the site from the early Islamic through the Ottoman period. This ceramic collection does not represent a coherent assemblage from a single context in the excavation, but is a group of sherds and vessels that were gathered together from disparate loci because they presented good prospects for reconstruction and conservation. A publication of these vessels with drawings and photographs is forthcoming in the first volume of the Jaffa Cultural Heritage Project series. Complete publication of Islamic and crusader ceramics with their stratigraphy and quantitative analysis will be included in future volumes in the same series.

As with many of the excavation sites in Jaffa, at the Ganor site the transition from the Late Antique to the early Islamic period is difficult to distinguish in the archaeological record; the town seems largely unchanged by the Islamic conquest.
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In the century following the conquest Jaffa became the port of Ramla, the new regional capital built by the Umayyad governor of Filastin Sulaymān ibn 'Abd al-Malik before he became caliph (Le Strange 1890: 303). The closeness of association between Jaffa and Ramla is remarked upon by Yaʿqūbī in the late ninth century CE: ‘[Yaʿfā] is much frequented by the people of ar-Ramlah’ (Le Strange 1890: 550), a phenomenon that should be manifest in the material culture of the two towns.

By the Abbasid period the ceramic assemblage at Jaffa not only shows close associations with its near neighbors, but also illustrates the city’s context in the greater Islamic world, containing many types that have wide distribution beyond the region. At this time the Ganor site can best be characterized as domestic, with many whole and completely reconstructable vessels being found in large refuse or sanitation pits beneath houses (Peilstöcker, pers. comm.). Some types that have wide distribution in this period are creamware juglets in several sizes and usually of cylindrical shape, often referred to as “eggshell ware” in the literature (fig. 3; cf. Arnon 1999: Fig. 3b). This ware is present at Ramla, Jaffa’s close neighbor, and as far away as Samarra in Iraq and Zabid in the Yemen (Kletter 2005: Fig. 16:1-2; Sarre 1925: Abb. 1-7; Ciuk and Keall 1996: Pl. 95/11). Very thick-walled and hard-fired spherical-conical vessels, sometimes erroneously referred to as “grenades,” are found all over the Muslim world and Jaffa is no exception (cf. Kletter 2005: Fig. 17:2; see Keall 1992). Types with more regional connections include a white-painted ware jar, identical to those found at Ramla, Pella, and several other sites in Jund Filastin and Jund al-Urdunn (Cytryn-Silverman forthcoming: Fig. 2:14; McNicol et al 1982: Pl. 144:4, 7). Several types of glazed bowls are known from the region, including “common glaze bowls” (fig. 4) as they are termed by Miriam Avissar, monochrome glazed, and “splashed and mottled” (cf. Avissar 1996: 78-79, Type 6).

By the eleventh century Jaffa appears as a node on a trade route between Egypt and Constantinople that is mentioned in the documents of the Cairo Geniza (Goitein 1967: 214). The documents also attest the export of Ramla’s olive oil through Jaffa to the ports of Egypt (Goldberg 2005: 336, n. 14). As with the preceding period, the shape and layout of the city are little known, and the Ganor site does not provide much clarity. In terms of ceramics, to date few types can be assigned to this period, but include types with regional distribution, such as glazed bowls continuing the previous traditions, and cooking pans believed to be imported from Lebanon (see below)

The shift in material culture in both ceramics and building traditions that was introduced by the arrival of the Crusaders in 1099 brought dramatic changes to Jaffa (Peilstöcker 2006). For the Franks of Jaffa was a county seat, home to the Count of Jaffa and Ascalon, who was vassal to the king of Jerusalem. Although Acre eventually usurped Jaffa’s importance, eventually becoming the de facto capital of the kingdom (1192-1291), Jaffa nevertheless sat at the head of a major route to Jerusalem and received numerous pilgrim and merchant ships (Richard 1979). Many of the major Crusader buildings at Jaffa are not preserved, yet significant traces of their occupation are to be found in nearly all excavation areas.

The crusader occupation at the Ganor site seems to consist of well-constructed courtyard buildings that may be domestic in nature. The ceramics well illustrate the active Mediterranean trade of the period, which brought North African and Italian wares as well as the products of Byzantium, to the Levantine and Egyptian coasts. Jaffa possesses a particularly rich assemblage of late twelfth and early thirteenth-century Black Sea amphorae and Aegean table wares. The latter types include coarse-incised, green-splashed, and a type combining the two decorative techniques (cf. Avissar and Stern 2005: Types I.5.2-I.5.4). This seeming predominance and variety of Aegean wares represents a departure from the proportion and diversity of types found at Acre and other sites in the Latin Kingdom (see Avissar and Stern 2005), and must be verified by quantitative analysis of the entire Crusader-period pottery assemblage from Jaffa. The thirteenth-century pottery assemblage at Jaffa is closer to that at Acre, however, with imports predominantly from Lebanon.
Figure 1. Jaffa.

Figure 2. Jaffa excavations map, Summer 2007.
Types II.2.1.1-4, II.2.3.1-2). This large increase in the supply of ceramics from Lebanon (possibly Beirut itself) is perhaps reflective of both areas being under Latin control. On the other hand, handmade geometric painted wares, a type with wide distribution in the Islamic world from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries, are also not rare in the assemblage and is one indication that commerce at Jaffa was not restricted to trade within the Latin states or with Byzantium (cf. Avissar and Stern 2005; Type II.4.4.1; Johns 1998; Whitcomb 1991; Irwin 1980).

In 1268 the Mamluk sultan Baybars occupied Jaffa and reportedly razed the town (Buhl and Bosworth 2002: 234). To date we have little archaeological evidence of occupation at Jaffa in the Mamluk period. The Ganor site was not occupied at this time, probably an indication that the city had shrunk in size and its remains must be sought nearer to the port facilities. It seems even in reduced circumstances Jaffa’s markets and ports were lively loci of commerce throughout the period. For example, Abu al-Fidāʾ (ca. 1321) remarks that the “markets are much frequented,” and the celebrated, large harbor is “frequented by all the ships coming to Filastin, and from it they set sail to all lands” (Le Strange 1890: 551). Two reported destructions for fear of new crusades in the mid-fourteenth century may have temporarily halted this activity (Buhl and Bosworth 2002: 234), but by the fifteenth century Venetian traders were exporting the cotton of the region from Jaffa (Ashor 1974: 30; 1976: 677-681).

In 1514 Jaffa like the rest of the Levant fell under Ottoman control until 1917 when western powers divided up Ottoman holdings. The latter part of this period, after Jaffa’s gradual revival from the second half of the seventeenth century (Buhl and Bosworth 2002: 234), is perhaps one of the most interesting phases of settlement in Jaffa, forming an essential link between the town’s past and its present form. Although the extensive material remains of this period are not legally recognized as archaeology by the Israeli government, several building foundations have been carefully excavated and recorded by the Israeli Antiquities authority in Jaffa. Together with standing architecture, monuments, maps, travel logs, and photographs they permit a detailed understanding of Jaffa’s features and its evolution during the Ottoman period, during which it was once again Palestine’s principal port. This is one of the avenues of research being pursued by the Jaffa Cultural Heritage Project.

Ottoman remains at the Ganor...
site include large buildings with vaulted substructures. Although many sherds of various types have been excavated, only one type of well-preserved ceramic of this period is found in the collection of whole and reconstructed vessels from the Ganor site. It is a distinctive, brightly glazed (yellow or green) redware bowl, an import to this region from northwestern Turkey and northern Greece in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, which Edna Stern has noted in great quantities in the ceramic assemblage of Acre (pers. comm. 10/27/07). Late Ottoman ceramics from Jaffa, which include copious amounts of stoneware and porcelain imports from Europe, are due to be published from the Qishle site at Jaffa (fig. 2) by Yoav Arbel. From the same site a local typology of tobacco pipes will soon be published by Lior Rauchberger.

Notes:
1. I am grateful to Martin Peilstöcker for allowing me to publish his finds.
2. I am grateful to Katia Cytryn-Silverman for allowing me to see her manuscript before publication.
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Relations Between Jews, Syriac Christians and Early Muslim Believers in Seventh-century Iraq

by Frank van der Velden

I. Syriac Christians and the New Conquerors

In his book *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, F. Donner proposed that in the period when Islam first coalesced, during the first century AH, there took place what we can call a kind of religious cohabitation: "As the Believers expanded their presence and hegemony outside Arabia ... they came into increasingly close contact with well-established monotheistic communities ... At first, there may have been a period of accommodation and symbiosis between the Believers and the Jews, Christians, and even, perhaps, Zoroastrians of the region, although this is just barely apparent according to our sources. Over time, however, this apparent symbiosis began to give way ... The result of these debates was that the broader identity as Believers gradually gave way to a more sharply defined identity as Muslims, that is, as confessionally separate from Christians, Jews, and other monotheists." This religious cohabitation of non-Muslims with early Islam in the Fertile Crescent followed different paths in two areas, due to the prevalence of different Christian sects in the two areas: the former Byzantine territories in Syria/Palestine and the former Sasanian territories in Iraq and Persia. In the case of Iraq, for example, the cities of al-Hira and Prat de Meishan (later Basra) were centres of Christian missionary activity from the 5th-century AD onward. This activity opened the way to the interior of the Arabian peninsula and down the coast of the Persian Gulf, where the Syriac Church of the East founded monasteries and bishoprics extending into Oman. Eventually the West-Syriac church maintained missions in the territories of both the Ghassanids and the Lakhmids. The Arabs, pillaging al-Hira in their early campaigns of expansion, nevertheless founded their new centre of military and political activity next to it in Kufa, later briefly the capital of the empire under 'Ali ibn Abi Talib (656 to 661 CE). Basra, on the other hand, developed into the starting-point of most military campaigns to the east, into Iran. Both Iraqi cities witnessed the political demise of the 'Alid family in the Arab civil wars of the first century AH and the subsequent development of the Shi'ite movement. It is therefore fair to assume that, if there were any region during the seventh century CE where the interaction between Syriac Christianity and Arabic-speaking culture might have occurred on a sophisticated level, it surely could have been there.

M. Cook, in discussing the ground-breaking studies of J. van Ess, therefore pondered over an early Christian influence upon the Qadarite sect. He further suggested an early inter-religious exchange between the Mu'ji'ite sect and the famous Syriac-Orthodox theologian Jacob of Edessa at the end of 7th century AD on the topic of human determination and free will. In my opinion, however, Jacob of Edessa's letter could also be an inner-Christian discussion of the monothelite cause, as the question of human determination relates to the question of the free will of Jesus Christ's human nature - the classic divergence of West-Syriac (Syriac-Orthodox) and East-Syriac theology. But this leads us to the question: What did Syriac Christians actually know about the confession of their new rulers as early as the seventh century CE? According to R. Hoyland, "The earliest clear Christian reference to the Prophet is to be found in the Syriac chronicle of Thomas the Presbyter, a resident of northern Mesopotamia ... we may assume that Thomas was writing ca. 640. In his chronicle he relates that: 'In the year 945, induction 7, on Friday 4 February (634) at the ninth hour, there was a battle between the Romans and the Arabs of Muhammad (rauyay y d-Mhmnt)' (Chronica minora II, 148)."

The East-Syriac Khuzistan-Chronicle (Chronicon Anonymum, ca. 660 CE) reports the destruction of the Sasanian empire by the "Ishmaelites ... whose chief was Muhammad" (Chr. Anon. 12, s. Sako 32). The most detailed analysis of the "Ishmaelite" creed prior to 692 AD we find in the writings of the Armenian chronicler Pseudo-Sebeos (wr. in the 660s). He knows about an "Ishmaelite" Muhammad, a trader who assumed a divine mission to profess the God of Abraham and to fight paganism. He eventually knew the history of Moses, and he brought his people back to the living God, the God of Abraham. Pseudo-Sebeos writes about ritual and moral prescriptions of the early Arab creed and about an Arab interpretation of their own victories as the restitution of the land, promised to their ancestor Abraham.

Discussions of the Christological creed between Christians and the Arab invaders are reported to have started after
the inscriptions on the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem in 692 AD. The Letter of Mar Yohannan, the (West-Syriac) Patriarch, to an unnamed Arab emir, according to Reinkinck (and others), may be an apologetic fiction from the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century CE.12 But it seems to me that there had been earlier attempts to evaluate the Christological convergences and divergences of the two confessions, and (as I will try to show subsequently) that in the Syriac Church of the East in Iraq, a deeper understanding of the Christological creed of the Arabs was attained. For the Christology of the Church of the East emphasized the human nature of Jesus and rejected the monothelite creed. Their polemic against all Byzantine confessions accused the Melkites in particular and in general all Christian churches accepting the Council of Ephesus (431 AD) of associating the Holy Virgin Mary with the Trinity by giving her the attribute theotokos, “the bearer of God.” We find the same polemic in the Qur’an (Surat al-Mā’ida 5:116f).13 Consequently, the East-Syriac catholicos Ishoyahb III, in a letter that reflects his troubles with monothelites (or, as we might more properly say, miaphysite) missionaries in the first decade of the Arab presence in Iraq and Persia (638 to 648 AD), saw a joint anti-theopleschis argument with his new Arab rulers: “The Arabs as Hagarites do not help those who say that the almighty God suffered and died.”14 This may have helped him to close ranks against missionaries of the Syriac-Orthodox sect and also against some of his own clergy challenging his jurisdiction,15 denouncing their credal and their activities to the Arab authorities.16 But it also gives evidence for his intimate knowledge of Christological aspects of the Arabs’ creed not many years after the invasion.

In a previous paper17 I tried to show a similarity between features of the Qur’ānic notion of the “genealogy of the Virgin Mary” (Sūrah 3:33-37) and of the “Adam-Christ typology” (Sūrah 3:33 and 3:59), on the one hand, and contemporary Syriac patristic writings, on the other. After all, the larger context of Sūrah 3:33-64 seems to be a convergent text of Syriac and early Arab Christological visions of Jesus within the framework of a Messianic salvation history.18 The classical Muslim exegetes link the text of Sūrah 3:33-60 to a delegation of East-Syriac Christians from the Najrān oasis, who came to Muhammad in 631 CE (see Tabari on the Mudābala of Sūrah 3:61).19 As usual, however, we lack contemporary sources on the delegation, making the whole issue of the treaty and its conditions unsure.20 In any case, it seems insufficient to relate this highly sophisticated discussion of Christological topics in Sūrah 3:33-64 to an uncertain Arab Christian delegation in the lifetime of the prophet (as the Muslim tradition does) or to an unspecified event in the “latter Medinan period” (Nöldeke / Schwally).21 The convergent formulation of early Arab and typical Syriac, if not specifically East-Syriac, Christological concepts in Sūrah 3:33-64 makes the regular cohabitation of Syriac Christians and Muslims in seventh century Iraq a much more intelligible scenario for the final redaction and canonization of these verses. Iraq also was the stronghold of the later Umayyad caliph ‘Abd al-Malik and his Iraqi governor al-Hajjāj. A decisive consequence of Syriac-Arab cooperation certainly happened at the time of the 2nd Arab Civil war (680 to 685 CE), as noted by M. Morony: “The involvement of the Nestorians in the closing phase of the second civil war in Iraq brought the first real intervention of the Muslim state into their internal affairs and effectively completed the process by which the Nestorians themselves forced the Muslim government to apply Sasanian methods towards the.”22 Catholicos Hananisho I (r. 686-693) was forced into exile after his interview with caliph ‘Abd al-Malik failed in 691 CE. In the years 692 and 693 CE, different parties opted for a schism that recognized the counter-patriarch John the Leprous. After the death of Hananisho I in 693 CE, the governor of Iraq, al-Hajjāj, blocked the election of a new catholicos for 14 years (700-714 CE).

‘Abd al-Malik and al-Hajjāj both played a still poorly-known role in the formation of early Muslim dogma and the canonization of the Qur’ān.23 ‘Abd al-Malik denied most of the Christological convergences with Syriac-Christian Churches, which we found had existed earlier in the seventh century CE, as he advanced his “Christological creed” in the inscription inside the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem (in 692 CE).24 This act might be understood as an imperial Ekthesis (explanation) similar to the one the Byzantine emperor Heraclius had pronounced in 638 CE. It therefore would be interesting to know if Christian theologians at the end of the seventh century CE, such as the East-Syriac catholicos Hananisho I and the Syriac-Orthodox Jacob of Edessa,25 are referring to an earlier knowledge of the Arab creed, or to the “new absurdity” (as Hananisho called it)26 of the inscriptions on the Dome of the Rock, where Jesus is entitled Messiah (masiḥ), Word of God (kalimatu), Spirit from Him (raḥminhu), and Prophet (nabi).27

To summarize: There are hints of an early (prior to 692 CE) East-Syriac perception of Qur’ānic topics if not of Qur’ānic texts dealing with the Christians’ Christological ideals. A friendly perception of what became the later Muslim creed by the Church of the East might have been motivated by the challenge of the West-Syriac (Syriac-Orthodox) missionarises and by the Byzantine Church’s rejection of the radical-dyophysite creed following the monothelete Ekthesis of the emperor Heraclius (638 CE), until the sixth Ecumenical council of Constantinople eventually condemned the monothelete creed and the Iconoclasts28 in 680 CE. We find a hint in the letters of catholicos Ishoyahb III that he had looked for a joint Christological argument with his new Arab rulers to fight the “theopleschis,” and that he had learned to be sceptical about the result of these convergences and o-operations before 660 CE. A critical analysis of the traditions and perceptions of the Qur’ānic text of Sūrah 3:33-64 suggests a shaping of those Qur’ānic texts dealing with Christian themes within the context of religious cohabitation of Syriac Christians and Arab believers in the later seventh century CE. This process definitely came to an end with the second Arab Civil War (680-685 CE) and with ‘Abd al-Malik’s explanation of his “Christological creed” in 692 CE.
II. Muslim Contact with Jewish or Jewish-Christian Sects in the Seventh Century CE

As in the first section, where we explored relations between Arabs and certain Christian communities during the first Islamic century, in considering relations between Arabs and Jews in the same period we are looking neither for a Jewish nor a Judeo-Christian influence on the historical person of Muhammad, nor are we considering the Jewish presence in the Hijaz and in the city of Medina before and during Muhammad’s time. Rather, our interest lies in exploring Jewish cohabitation with Christianity and also with the emerging Islam in the later seventh century CE in Syria, Palestine, and in Iraq.

What kind of Jews are we considering in our discussion of the seventh century CE? It is well-known that rabbinic communities flourished at this time in Palestine, Syria and Iraq. As noted by P. Crone, “Babylonia was in this period the unrivaled centre of rabbinic Judaism, and it is equally to this region that research from the Islamic side has traced the origins of Islamic law.” The well-known phrase regarding the absence of sources on Jewish sectarian life in the rabbinic chronicles may lead to a scrupulous interpretation, such as that of D. Wasserstrom: “No Jewish sects have been proven to exist during the long Talmudic period, roughly 200-600.” On the other hand, scholars such as E. de Gallez assert a continuity of Jewish sectarian life (messianic Jews, Judeo-Nazareans) in Western Syria and in Iraq until the sixth century CE.

To make the quest of existing and non-existing Jewish sects in the seventh century CE even more puzzling, S. Rosenkrantz reports inter-religious or even syncretistic movements on a popular level. Because of the Syriac mentality, which was familiar to the Jews, contacts between Jews and Christians became more contested about 700 CE. Church synods forbade their Christian subjects to participate in the Jewish feasts, but the frequent permutation of such laws suggests that they never took successfully. After the Arab conquest there seems to have been a reaction involving the re-Judaizing of proselytes to Christianity, and even the Judaizing of Christians. A seventh-century Syriac disputation between a stylistic and a Jew was authored, in the opinion of its editor, to combat real Judaizing. For example: “I am amazed how there are among you some Christians who associate with us in the synagogue and who bring offerings and at the time of the Passover send unleavened bread.” On the other hand, a considerable number of Jews seem to have converted to Christianity in the same period.

But who were those “Jews” whom the Christian fathers made efforts to fight? The “Who’s Who” of heresiography, apologetics, polemic is not easily deciphered. The Byzantine-Orthodox Anastasius of Sinai (640-700 CE), abbot of St. Catherine’s monastery, turns his polemics against a “synagogue of Jews and Arabs,” which he denounced for their efforts to fight against Christianity. Reading the contemporaneous Jewish apocalypse The Secrets of Rabbi Simeon ben Jochai one gets the impression that a certain Jewish milieu applauded this option and welcomed the invaders as their liberators, even though later Jewish sources show them as occupiers. Are these anti-Jewish polemics related to a conflict with rabbinic Jews or Jewish sects in Palestine, which might have Judaised parts of the Christian communities? Or should we see here the common “adversus Judaeos” tradition, which did not need any specific argument? May we eventually ponder the well-known inner-Christian polemic, which claimed that the East-Syriac Christians had “Judaized” the Christian Christological creed, and so were subsequently called “Jews” by their Byzantine and Syriac-Orthodox adversaries? Or did the church fathers make no distinction at all among the “Jewish” sects, using the epithet “Jewish” for all kind of “pagans” and “heretics,” whom they supposed to find in one corner of the field? Modern scholars perceive this point differently, as we shall now see.

In their ground-breaking study Hagarism (1977), P. Crone and M. Cook sketched the presence of Samaritan Jews in the seventh century CE and subsequently tried to show Samaritanism’s influence on Islam. Their ideas are related to the Iraqi theatre, where they pondered over a Samaritan hill-sanctuary, molded after the pattern of Mt. Gerazim, near the Iraqi town of Bakka (see Sūrah 3:90). The Shi’ite concepts of the (hidden) Imām and the return of the Mahdi - in their opinion - also repeat Samaritan messianic features. Leaving aside the Samaritan issue, which is denied by scholars today, the broader Jewish influence on Shi’ite sects later plays a role in the well-documented inner-Islamic polemic against the Rāfida (Shi’ites), comparing their creed to the Jewish religion by “equation lists.” As S. Wasserstrom notes, “In his ‘Ijd al-Farid, Ibn Abd Rabbihi (d. 328/939) relates the first list of parallels between the Rāfida and the Jews. The list is cited in a quotation attributed to the Kufan Amīr Ibn Sharabhu Ibn ‘Abd al-Sha’bi (d. 103/721-722).” Wasserstrom dates this early equation list to the later eighth century CE.

The same eighth century CE witnessed a new development of Jewish sectarianism with the emergence of the Qara’ite movement. Wasserstrom, who reviewed the Arab Muslim sources on Jewish sects, sees only one more discernable group for which we have sufficient sources to reconstruct its history and doctrine: the ‘Isawiyya. He reports tangible convergences to proto-Shi’ite movements from the early eighth century CE, especially for the provinces of Mesopotamia and Persia, “The Persian and eastern geographic sphere constituted a veritable crucible of Jewish heterodoxy in the early years of Islam.” It was only the rabbinic reform of Saadia Gaon in the tenth century CE that brought the Jews of Mesopotamia back to the path of orthodoxy.

To sum up our limited knowledge of Jewish-Christian cohabitation in the seventh century CE, there must have been a mingling of Christianizing Jews, re-Judaizing proselytes to Christianity, and Judaizing Christians, an emergence of new Jewish sects - possibly in addition to activities of Jewish Christians and Messianic Jews - in the process of another confession emerging: the later Islam, which at the same time split up into different move-
mements. All religious confessions at the time might have been influenced by one another, but our sources are lacking. Morony quotes the East-Syriac writer John Bar Penkaye (end of seventh century CE), who considers this religious hodgepodge in Iraq to be a miserable condition for all: “In the reign of Mu’awiyah (660–680) there was no difference between pagan and Christian; the faithful was not discerned from a Jew.”47

III. The new quest of diachronic studies on a Jewish-messianic or a Jewish-Christian proto-Islam

The classics of Western oriental studies discussed a Jewish, Christian or a Jewish-Christian48 influence on the historical person of Muhammad. Today western scholars look upon the religious cohabitation in Syria, Palestine or Iraq as influential to the creation of “Crossroads to Islam” (Nevo / Koren) and to the crystallization of “Early Islamic Dogma” (Cook) at the end of the seventh century CE. Thus the well-known argument of “borrowed” Jewish, Jewish-Christian or “heretic” Christian features (messianism, prophecy, eschatology, and Christology) may be said to belong to the “proto-historicist phase” (Donner) of emerging Islam—this is, to the times from the four “rightly-guided caliphs” (640–660 CE) to the historically more palpable period of ‘Abd al-Malik (d. 705 CE).

Starting in the 1980s, Y. Nevo and later J. Koren49 presented archaeological evidence for what they claimed were pagan cults in the Negev-area lasting as late as the eighth century CE, as they found seventh century inscriptions that describe Allâh as rabb Miṣṭâwa-Iṣâ, “Lord of Moses and Jesus.” Subsequently, in their study Crossroads to Islam (2003), both authors drew the conclusion that a development of primitive monotheism with a Judeo-Christian background was significant for the emergence of the early Arab creed. This conclusion has, however, been the subject of debate.50

In 2005, E. Gallez51 published a voluminous study that aimed to prove the existence of a messianic Jewish sect (“the Judeo-Nazarenes”) in Syria during the fifth and sixth centuries CE. Not only does he trace scriptures and ideology of this sect from the time of the Qumran community in the first century CE (what he calls the “Essenian dossier”), but also he depicts these Judeo-Nazarenes as direct antecedents of early Islam, and considers their scriptures to be proto-Qur’anic manuscripts.

Also in 2005, Chr. Luxenberg52 published a new translation of the Umayyad inscription inside the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem (692 CE), in a certain way the oldest archaeological evidence of a Qur’anic text. He denies that the inscription makes any reference to the historic person of Muhammad, deciphering instead the participal muhammad (meaning in Syriac “the praised”) as a messianic attribute of Christ. This dovetails with the assertions of a group of German investigators (K.-H. Ohlig, R. Puin and V. Popp),53 who consider the first Umayyad caliph, Mu’awiyah (r. 660–680 CE), to have been a Christian and a lieutenant of the Byzantines, whereas ‘Abd al-Malik (r. 685–705 CE) brought from Iraq a new confession, which eulogized Jesus as muhammad, subsequently promulgating this new “muhammadanism” inside the Dome of the Rock as the official Christological formula of his empire.54 K.-H. Ohlig and Chr. Luxenberg consider this proto-Qur’ân to be a Christian lectionary, based on a “pre-Nicaean” Syriac Christology that viewed Jesus as the “Elected of God” and as the Messiah, obedient to God’s will, but not as the Son of God “having the same substance with the Father” (homo-ousios), as the Nicene creed would have it.

Common to all such theories are the deconstruction of the historical Muhammad and of the “Uthmanic” final redaction of the Qur’ân, both of which are considered to be retrospective interpolations from early Abbasid times, when our literary sources about early Islam increase in number. However, the problem of feeble sources cannot be restricted to the lifetime of Muhammad or the caliph ‘Uthman, but continues as well into the later seventh and the first half of the eighth century CE. Due to the lack of Islamic source material, Josef van Ess decided to skip the whole early period in his voluminous monograph on Islamic theology and society in the second and third centuries AH. Other scholars are more optimistic. The tradition of hadith-literature and Muslim akhbâr has been re-evaluated by H. Motzk55 in a manner that yields a rather different view than the unanimous disdain for such sources expressed by early researchers such as Th. Nöldeke, F. Schwally, and I. Goldziher. Numismatic evidence and even contemporaneous architecture of the seventh century CE are strongly debated, Arab papyri and early inscriptions still are under research and waiting for publication. R. Hoyland concludes that this situation “makes it difficult to see how historical scenarios that require for their acceptance a total discontinuity in the historical memory of the Muslim community—such as that Muhammad did not exist, the Quran was not written in Arabic, Mecca was originally in a different place etc.—can really be justified. Many of these scenarios rely on absence of evidence, but it seems a shame to make such a recourse when there are so many vocal forms of material evidence still waiting to be studied.”56

On the other hand, most of the Christian and Jewish sources of the seventh century dealing with the Arab conquest that have been published in the last twenty years shed more light on Christian attitudes toward, and polemics against, the conquest of the Arab invaders, rather than providing a balanced source of reliable information on this topic. It is intriguing to see how P. Crone and M. Cook in 1977 and in 1981 constructed an alternative picture of the emergence of Islam through an analysis of these Christian sources, and how it has been repeated ever since by scholars such as Nevo, Koren, de Gallez, and Ohlig, leaving aside only the Samaritan issue. Due to the lack of documents and source material from the seventh century, however, we should recognize that there is still not enough information available to falsify or to justify such a reconstruction of history.

This situation makes it attractive for scholars such as Nevo/Koren, de Gallez or Luxenberg/Ohlig57 to look for new evidence through source-historical and
source-critical analysis. They opt for a layer of "proto-Islamic" tradition in a rude Arab monotheism of the sixth to seventh centuries (Nevo/Koren), or in the Syrian messianic Judaism of the fifth to sixth centuries (de Gallez), or in fourth-century Syriac theology (Othlig). But such approaches face a three-fold problem: First the sheer existence of such a tradition remains, in each case, to be proven. Second: This presumed tradition has to be linked to a sect for which there exists some historical evidence such as formerly pagan Arab tribes of the Negev and the Transjordanian area (Nevo/Koren) or the "Judéo-Nazaréens" (de Gallez) or a "pre-Nicaean Syriac-Christian heresy" in the confines of the Iraqi deserts (Othlig).58 Reconstructing such assumed proto-Islamic traditions and identifying a group or a sect whose features eventually matched those practices or beliefs is a complicated and disputed business. The whole issue of a "Jewish-Christian or Messianic influence on early Islam," for example, clings to acceptance of a revisionist interpretation of earlier Christian heresiographic sources.59 But the third step necessary to establish such views is even more hazardous: Once the positive identification matches the tradition with a relevant sect of its time, the source-critical analysis has to prove its diachronic relevance, looking for the missing-link that relates a fourth, fifth, or sixth-century sect and its ideas or practices to the seventh century's phenomenon of an "original Islam," which itself has to be peeled out of various overlays from the early Abbasid period. Of course, we never find an allegiance to it, neither in Muslim or Jewish nor in Christian literature contemporary to the events, leaving us to the less trustworthy pieces of circumstantial evidence. "Peeling" this original form may easily result in re-shaping or wilfully constructing it.60 Here again we look into the kind of hermeneutical abyss that misled some Christian biblical exegetes of the "new form critical school" in the 1970s.

Therefore, the significance of religious cohabitation in the early years of Islam may be summarized best by the perceptive statement of U. Rubin: "The Qur'anic Impact on Islamic tradition is secondary to the Biblical one... Since the Qur'an could become a literary mode for historiography only when its availability increased considerably, it is feasible to assume that Jewish and Christian models of sacred history preceded the Qur'anic ones in Islamic tradition."61 But to what extent did this affect the shaping of the Surahs, its redactional and its canonical process?62 We may assume that Syriac-Christians were already informed about Christological differences and convergences with the Muslim point of view before 692 AD. In my opinion, the Qur'anic texts and the processes of their redaction certainly do reflect the cohabitation of the Arab believers with their Jewish and Christian contemporaries.63 Therefore the synchronic analysis of these Qur'anic texts within their Christian and Jewish sectarian milieu of the seventh century CE, i.e., the time of their redactional and canonical process is the first item we should address and still has to be completed, before we may trust ourselves to a diachronic reconstruction of how Islam came to be.
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Early Islamic Military Architecture:
The Birth of Ribats on the Palestinian Coast
by Yumna Masarwa

During the Islamic conquest of al-Shām and Egypt in the first half of the 7th century, the Muslims were inexperienced in naval battles compared with the Byzantines, and had difficulty conquering the coastal cities of these regions. The fortified coastal cities of Palestine, such as Gaza, Ascalon and Caesarea, were subjected to siege by the Muslims, and were the last places there to fall to them because of the Byzantine supplies that reached these cities by sea. Moreover, the Byzantines did not miss a chance to regain localities on the coasts of Egypt and al-Shām.

Al-Baladhwī records that 'Asqalān (Ascalon) was first conquered by 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ during the reign of 'Umar b. al-Khattāb (r. 634-644), but that its inhabitants rebelled and received reinforcement from the Byzantines. Mu‘āwiya b. Abi Sufyān, the governor of al-Shām, recaptured it, posted guards in it, and settled garrisons of cavalry guard (rawābit) in it.2 Al-Baladhwī also tells us that in 645, the Byzantine fleet recovered Alexandria; however, 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ succeeded in recapturing it and demolished its walls to the ground.3 It was at that time, when 'Uthmān wrote to his governor in Alexandria ordering him “to station cavalry guard (rābiṭa) in it, and to assign abundant subsistence allowances to the guard, and to change its personnel once every six months.”4 We also know from al-Baladhwī that the Byzantines raided the coasts of al-Shām twice during the Umayyad period (661-750); in 6695 and in 683 when they invaded and devastated 'Asqalān, Caesarea, Acre and Tyre.6

The repeated Byzantine attacks on the coastal region of Syria-Palestine led the Umayyad caliphs to undertake major efforts to defend this coastline, which was considered part of a strategically important border area with the Byzantines. Literary sources and archaeological evidence enable us to reconstruct the efforts initiated by the Muslim caliphs in the coastal cities of Palestine. Although the title of this essay speaks of “the Palestinian coast,” it is more precisely about the coastal cities of the Byzantine province Palaestina Prima, which became jund Filastin during the Islamic era. In modern terms, these cities are located on the Mediterranean shore of Israel and extend from Gaza in the south to Haifa in the north (fig. 1). The chronological scope of this essay is from the time of the second caliph 'Umar b. al-Khattāb until the end of the Umayyad period (750).

When the Muslims took possession of Palestine and Egypt from the Byzantines, they realized that maritime strength was necessary to keep and con-
tinue their conquests. As long as Constantinople could send out a fleet, the coastal cities of al-Shām could easily be attacked. Muʿāwiya, the governor of Syria-Palestine, had long felt himself handicapped by the lack of a fleet, and had asked permission from the caliph ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb in Madīna to send his soldiers to conquer by sea. ʿUmar determinedly refused to consider naval action. According to al-Balādhūrī, he preferred a policy of passive defense of the coastal cities of Syria-Palestine. During his reign, "whenever the Muslims conquered a coastal city, they would station the necessary number of Muslims in it, and if the enemy there should start a revolt, the Muslims would flock for reinforcement." This strategy demanded military structures to accommodate the Islamic troops, and enable them to defend the coastline. Therefore, ʿUmar ordered Muʿāwiya "to repair the fortifications of these cities (marammat ḥuṣūnīhā), to garrison them, to post guards on their watchtowers (maʿāṣir), and to establish an alarm system by means of flaming torches (mawāqid)." ʿUmar granted fiefs (qatāʾī) to the garrison he stationed in the coastal cities; al-Balādhūrī speaks of the existence of certain fiefs in 'Asqalānī from the time of ʿUmar. ʿUmar and ʿUthmān's major efforts to rebuild and settle the coastal cities of al-Shām were initiated, supervised and encouraged by the governor of al-Shām.

When ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān became caliph in 644, he ordered Muʿāwiya "to fortify the coastal cities (taḥṣīn al-sawāḥil), to settle them and to give fiefs to those who dwell in them." We learn from al-Balādhūrī that ʿAsqalān was also among the coastal cities in which ʿUthmān settled Muslims and granted them estates (qatāʾī). ʿUthmān also instructed Muʿāwiya to keep troops in readiness in the coastal cities in addition to those already there, to give the garrison lands, to distribute the abandoned houses among the garrison, to establish new mosques and to enlarge those that had been established during 'Umar's caliphate. After Muʿāwiya had done these things, and during the time that followed, people from all areas moved to the coastal cities of Syria-Palestine. In addition, we learn from al-Balādhūrī that new fortresses (ḥuṣūn) were established in the coastal region of al-Shām in the time of ʿUthmān, such as the fortress of Jabala (Gabala) founded by Muʿāwiya and the fortress of Sufyān (Ḥisn Sufyān) founded by Sufyān b. Mujīb al-Azdi a few miles from Tripoli.

In comparison with ʿUmar's policy of passive defense of the coastal cities, the real age of Muslim sea power began during the time of ʿUthmān. Moreover, we might say that the Islamic settlement of the coastal cities of al-Shām and the foundation of Islamic military architecture (ḥuṣūn) there began in the reign of ʿUthmān. ʿUmar only settled soldiers in these cities and ordered them to repair and reuse the Byzantine fortifications there (marammat ḥuṣūnīhā), while ʿUthmān increased the number of the Muslim soldiers in these cities, started a policy of settlement there, and ordered fortification of the coastal cities (taḥṣīn al-sawāḥil).

Figure 2. Ground plan of the fortress at Ashdod-Yam.
Mu'āwiya b. Abī Sufyān. We have no further information about these cities during the time of the fourth caliph 'Abbās b. Abī Tālib (r. 656-661) because of the fighting between him and Mu'āwiya over the caliphate during these years. However, the region seems to have been peaceful since the struggle took place elsewhere, outside Palestine. In 661, Mu'āwiya became the first Umayyad caliph and a new Islamic era began, during which the Umayyads ruled the Islamic empire from their capital Damascus until 750. During the Umayyad period, the coastal cities of Palestine formed a maritime frontier zone between the Muslims and the Byzantines. They were called "al-thughur al-bahrīyya," and were considered as a frontal defense line since they faced the Byzantine lands from the seaside, and could be easily attacked by the Byzantines. Consequently, Mu'āwiya and his successors undertook major efforts to defend this coastline against Byzantine incursions by continuing the policy of settling Muslims in the coastal cities and even transferring non-Arab elements and settling them there.

According to al-Baladhuri, Mu'āwiya (r. 661-680) transferred a group of Persian soldiers from Baalbek, Hims, and Antioch to the coastal cities of Syria-Palestine, and transported two foreign military elements to these coastal cities, al-Zuţ (of Indian origin) and al-Sayābīja (of Persian origin). 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān (r. 685-705) settled Arab Muslims in 'Asqālān and granted them lands. Al-Walid b. ‘Abd al-Malik (r. 705-715) and Marwān b. Muhammad (r. 744-750) settled Zuţ as well as Persians in the coastal cities of al-Shām.

In addition to this settlement policy, we learn that some of the coastal cities of Palestine were rebuilt and fortified under the Umayyads. The civil war between the Umayyads and Ibn al-Zubayr started in 683, and caused an absence of a stable and orderly government in Syria-Palestine, which allowed the Byzantines to raid the coast of Palestine successfully. Al-Baladhuri informs us that during this war, the Byzantines destroyed 'Asqalān and expelled its inhabitants, they went out against Caesarea, devastated it and demolished its mosque, and they attacked Acre and Tyre. Nevertheless, once secure in power, after 685, 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān repaired, restored and settled these cities. Additionally, the archaeological excavations carried out at Arsūf reveal that the city was fortified during the time of 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān.

In addition to these efforts, a combination of al-Maqdisi's text with the archaeological evidence discovered in the coastal cities of Palestine shows that the Umayyads established a military defense system of ribāṭāt on the coast of Palestine. Al-Maqdisi writes:

This capital [al-Raml] has ribāţāt along the sea [coast] where the men under arms assemble. The warships and galleys of the Byzantines pull into them [the ribāţāt], bringing with them captives taken from the Muslims for sale ... Whenever their [the Byzantines'] ships are sighted, those prepared to fight the enemy are alerted. If it is at night, a beacon is lighted on the tower (manāra) of the ribāţ, and if it is by day, they make a smoke [signal]. From each ribāţ to the capital [al-Raml] is a series of high towers (manāyar shāhīqa), in each of which is stationed a company of men ... The ribāţāt of this district [Palestine] at which the ransoming occurs are: Ghazza,
are constructed of sandstone ashlars laid in courses in which headers and stretchers alternate, and bonded with mortar mixed with shell inclusions. Fifth, they were excavated and dated, based on their architectural remains and archaeological finds, to the Umayyad period. In what follows, the sites are geographically presented proceeding from south to north.

The fortress of Māḥūz Aṣzūd/Ashdod-Yam (figs. 1 & 2), situated on the sand dunes a few meters from the shore, has a rectangular plan measuring 60 x 40 m. The walls are strengthened by external buttresses constructed at fixed intervals of 3-4 m. Eight solid towers are incorporated into the walls; four are corner towers and four towers guard the two gates, which are located in the center of the eastern and western walls. The eastern gate opens towards the city of Ashdod, and the western one opens towards the sea. The interior of the fortress contains rooms along each of the four walls, a stable and a paved courtyard, which includes a mosque and two wells.

The archaeological finds such as coins, glass, but mainly ceramics revealed that the fortress was founded during the Umayyad period and abandoned in the 12th century. Moreover, it was built on some remains of the Byzantine city Azotus Paralivus (Ashdod on the Sea), which was founded as the port city of Azotus in the 4th century. Both Byzantine cities are represented in the Madaba Mosaic Map.

The watchtower at Aṣzūd/Ashdod (figs. 1 & 3) is about 1 km east of the fortress of Māḥūz Aṣzūd/Ashdod-Yam. It has a square plan, about 5.50 x 5.50 m. On the eastern side of the watchtower, a well was discovered, and at about 5.50 m distance from the tower itself, its collapsed walls were found in situ.

Figure 5. General plan of the city of Apollonia/Arṣūf.

Figure 6. The watchtower at Tel Mikhmoret.
corners of the tower were strengthened with pilasters bonded into the walls.\textsuperscript{37}

Kafir Lāb/Lām/ha-Bonim (figs. 1 & 7) is located 15 km north of Caesarea. The occupation strata found at the site are dated from the Persian to the Ottoman periods, while the most dominant building is an Umayyad fortress, which is built on a sandstone hill rising about 30 m above the sea level, 800 m from the Mediterranean coast.\textsuperscript{38} We are told by Yaqút al-Hamawi that Kafir Lāb was built by the Umayyad caliph Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik (r. 724-743).\textsuperscript{39}

The fortified enclosure is nearly rectangular in shape and its sides measure 46.60 m on the south, 62.80 m on the east, 51.40 m on the north, and 60 m on the west. It has four solid round towers at the corners, and two semicircular towers flanking the gate, which is located in the center of the southern wall. The walls are strengthened by external square buttresses. The interior of the fortress includes vaulted rooms (fig. 7: V10, V11, V20, V21, V22, V23) opening onto a paved central courtyard with cisterns (fig. 7: F10.3, F10.4), reservoir (fig. 7: F10.2), and a stable (fig. 7: Area 10).\textsuperscript{40}

These archaeological sites together with al-Maqdisi’s text reveal that it is impossible to present an unequivocal translation of the term ribāṭ while speaking of the coast of Palestine. However, this combination clearly indicates that the term ribāṭ denotes an edifice such as a coastal fortress, as in the case of Ashdod-Yam and ha-Bonim (figs. 2 & 7), or a fortified coastal city as in the case of Arṣīf (fig. 5).

The Umayyad ribāṭs of Palestine consisted of a chain of coastal fortresses and fortified cities, while a watchtower was located between one ribāṭ and another. They functioned as a defense system from which the alert was given in case of Byzantine threat. A signal system was put in place to warn of the approach of Byzantine ships; a beacon was lit on the ribāṭs’ towers if it were night, and a smoke signal was issued if it were day. Apart from the use of the ribāṭs as defense structures, inhabited by Muslim volunteers and soldiers, they were also places where war prisoners were exchanged. Both actions, defending dār al-islām (the abode of Islam) and ransoming Muslim captives, are considered religious acts, which suggests that these ribāṭs had both a military function and a religious one.

The Islamic conquest of the Levant itself during the 40’s of the 7th century was the foundation stone of the establishment of the Islamic frontier defense system. During this conquest, the experience of the Muslims in sea-faring made it necessary to develop a military defense system in the coastal cities of Palestine in order to protect the coastline against the Byzantines, who hoped to have a chance to regain it. Consequently, a new type of military architecture was introduced in this region, and that is the ribāṭ. The development of the Islamic military defense system in the coastal cities of Palestine went through several stages, which depended on the progress of the Islamic conquest of al-Shām (633-648), as well as on the Byzantine attacks on these cities. These stages can be summarized as follows:

The first stage took place in the time of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, during which the Muslims were introduced to the Byzantine military architecture in the Levant and reused it. After the fall of Caesarea in 640, the Muslims repaired the fortifications of the coastal cities of Palestine and reused their watchtowers (manāyir).

The second stage happened in the reign of ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān (644-656), during which the Islamic conquest of al-Shām was completed and the whole coastal cities of Syria-Palestine fell under Islamic rule. These years witnessed the initial phase of the formation of Islamic military architecture; we know from the sources about the construction of two Islamic fortresses, husūn, in the coastal area of al-Shām. Moreover, it was during this time when the Muslims began to create their own naval power, especially after the Byzantine attack on Alexandria in 645.

The third stage occurred in the Umayyad period (661-750), during which an organized Islamic frontier defense system was established in the eastern part of the Mediterranean, which was the birthplace of the phenomenon of the ribāṭ defense system. During this era, the Byzantines increased their attacks on the coastal cities of Palestine and destroyed some of them. These attacks created a pressing necessity to fortify these cities and protect them by an organized defense system, since they formed the maritime frontier between the Muslims and the Byzantines.

The need of the Muslims to defend the Mediterranean coast of Palestine against Byzantine attacks transformed the coastal cities of Palestine to ṭuḥārīr (border cities) protected by the ribāṭ defense system, which converted the Mediterranean Sea from a highway into a frontier.
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JEWISH, CHRISTIAN, AND EARLY MUSLIM RELIGIONS, FROM PAGE 33

58. Nevo and Koren are the only ones providing archaeological evidence; the others do reconstruction work of patristic sources, and there is no clear result, how those indicated groups ever existed as such.
60. For example de Gallez (on Sūrah 61,1-6) finds the “original form” by a section of verse “6c-f”: “Il apparait que, si l’on retrancha la partie litigieuse 6c-f, on obtient un texte beaucoup plus cohérent et qui s’intègre mieux au co-texte” (Gallez, E.-M., Le messie et son prophète, II, 135-137). A co-textual analysis of Sūrah 61.6 with Sūrah 5,110 (the text repeats the formulations of 61.6a6b; see also 3,50 to 61,6c) raises the question of whether both versions - the canonical one and the one of Ubayy - underwent such an interpolation.
63. A contrary position is represented by MacAuliffe: “The Qur’ānic view of praiseworthy Christians presents itself as a coherent theological construct. Qur’ānic Christians, those Christians whom the Qur’ān is understood to commend, are neither the historical nor the living community of people, who call themselves Christians. As a conceptual idealization, the notion of Qur’ānic Christians bears very little relation to present or past sociological configurations of the Christian community” (MacAuliffe, J.D., Qur’ānic Christians: an analysis of classical and modern exegesis (Cambridge and New York, 1991), 287).
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Has been neglected by scholars and many eminent Maghribi historical figures have yet to be studied. Unfortunately, al-Bikhtī’s bibliography contains few Western sources, and the few that he does include are mainly early 20th century texts in French and Spanish. Were he to have had access to recent sources written in both English and other European languages, he would have discovered a good number of newer studies on Maghribi Sufism, such as Vincent Cornell’s seminal Realm of the Saint: Power and Authority in Moroccan Sufism. While admittedly, North Africa is far less represented than the Muslim East, work has been undertaken as of late to rectify the situation. While he complains that there are many manuscripts left unstudied, the same rings true for manuscripts on Sufism all over the Muslim world, not just North Africa.

---


Although published in 1963,
Shalhat’s work is by no means outdated. Nor is it of interest only to students of al-Jāhiz (d. 255/869). But despite its significance, it is not often cited in later studies. It is hoped that this review will introduce Shalhat’s work to a wider audience.

Shalhat divides his work into two books. Book one focuses on the origin of al-Jāhiz’s unique style of prose literature (ādab) and is divided into three parts: 1) on al-Jāhiz’s style and the rhetorical arts (‘ilm al-balāghā); 2) on al-Jāhiz’s phraseology; and 3) on al-Jāhiz’s cognition. Book two focuses on the origins of the theological component in al-Jāhiz’s non-theological writings, and is divided into three parts: 1) on the different manifestations of al-Jāhiz’s theological inclinations; 2) on the oratorical and dialectical components of al-Jāhiz’s style; and 3) on al-Jāhiz’s inclination towards Mu’tazili theology. The author provides both an index of al-Jāhiz’s works used in the study, as well as a table of contents at the end of the book.

The work focuses on a single question: why do so many of al-Jāhiz’s non-theological works take the form of theological debates? Shalhat attempts to answer this question by tracing the origins of al-Jāhiz’s distinct style of disputational ādab. He concludes that this is due to his adherence to Mu’tazili theology. Shalhat notes that the techniques of persuasive speech were accepted and used extensively by theologians, but that the Mu’tazila are distinguished for the use of reason (‘aql) and logic (mantiq), in part, due to the influence of Greek philosophical texts that were being translated at this time, and that al-Jāhiz is exemplary of this.

Shalhat goes on to describe al-Jāhiz’s style as integrative (mutakāmul) and scientific (‘ilmī), explaining that through his style al-Jāhiz achieves harmony between methods of the theologians/philosophers and the littératoirs. The artistic aspects of prose are important to al-Jāhiz (e.g. rarity of words, aurality, and parallelism), but form never overrides meaning, and bay‘ān (clarity and appropriateness of content) and ifhām (comprehension) are the primary goals of communication.

What emerges from Shalhat’s analysis is that al-Jāhiz’s ultimate aim is to convey meaning to his audience, and that for al-Jāhiz, this is best achieved through a new and integrative style which seeks to balance the dialectical style of the Mu’tazili theologians combined with the artistic taste (al-dhawq al-fanni) of the littératoirs. Al-Jāhiz recognizes that the best way to persuade one’s audience is to appeal to all of their senses (al-hawaṣṣa), the rational and the aesthetic.

Al-‘Nāʿa’ al-kalāmiyya fi usūl ādab al-Jāhiz sheds light on ādab in general, and the “new” (badiʿ) rhetoric of the 3rd/9th century in particular, and their connection to early Islamic theology (kalām) and philosophy (falsafa), and is therefore indispensable for the student of Arabic literature, rhetoric, theology, and/or philosophy.

- Adrian James De Gifs


Dr. Ridwân al-Sayyid, professor of Islamic studies at the Lebanese University and a prolific author and active publicist, must surely be reckoned among the Arab world’s leading intellectuals at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Trained both at al-Azhār and at the University of Tübingen, he is one of a limited number of scholars (in the Islamic world or the West) who can address both Muslim and Western students of Islam on their own terms and with full understanding of, and even sympathy for, their very different scholarly traditions.

The short work under review constitutes an important addition to the now-vast literature on the question of “Orientalism.” As the author points out repeatedly, the German tradition of Orientalist scholarship has remained much less well-known to Arab readers, including most Arab intellectuals, than the French and British Orientalist traditions. The most obvious goal of this work, then, is to familiarize Arab readers with the range and depth of the German tradition, a goal that it must be said the author achieves brilliantly. He touches (often more than once) on the major scholars and makes clear their intellectual pedigrees (mainly: who trained whom) and their intellectual relationships to one another, and one comes away with a good sense of the approach and main contribution of each. He eschews, however, discussion of the personal rivalries or differences that sometimes divided them (or the affinities that made some of them close friends); thus one finds no mention of the intense hostility that (so I have been told) existed between H. H. Schaeder and Th. Nöldeke.

But the work is more than just a concise census of which German scholars wrote about what, and which research projects were achieved and by whom—although there is plenty of detail of this kind in its pages. Rather, al-Sayyid strives to understand the intellectual underpinnings of German Orientalism as it developed and evolved between the late eighteenth and mid-twentieth centuries CE. This effort often requires him to go well beyond the strict limits of German scholars and scholarship. Sometimes this is because German scholars were trained by or inspired by scholars from other countries (Freitag, Flügel, and Fleischer, for example, three of the founders of German Orientalism, all of whom studied in Paris with De Sacy). More often, it is because the intellectual trends that marked the evolving phases of German Orientalism affected most of European thought and were not phenomena restricted to German-speaking areas only. Thus he traces how the philologically and historicist-oriented German Orientalism of the nineteenth century moved in the twentieth to the study of history of culture. He also discusses the question of German Orientalism’s ambiguous relationship to state power (the role of Hartmann and Becker around the time of the First World War in particular), a theme of significance for all Orientalist studies; and considers the position of various German Orientalists toward intellectual trends such as Marx-
ism, the sociology of Max Weber, the Annales school, and the English anthropologists, as well as the old question of the Orientalists' stance vis-a-vis Christian polemic.

Given the topic of the book, al-Sayyid inevitably has things to say about Edward Said's book *Orientalism* (1978), which sparked—or perhaps more accurately, re-ignited—the debate over Orientalist scholarship and its limitations (a debate, as al-Sayyid notes, had been started by others before Said). While appreciative of Said's positive contributions, al-Sayyid cannot but reinforce the notion that Said was inexplicably (and, one might say, inexcusably) ignorant of the central importance of German scholarship in the rise of classical “Orientalism” of the philological-historicist variety, and hence that the depiction of the subject provided by Said in *Orientalism*, based as it was almost entirely on French and English-language works, seriously distorted the subject of his inquiry. This, however, is really but a small side issue in al-Sayyid's book, which focuses on much more important matters, particularly the intellectual evolution of classic German Orientalism and its gradual dissolution, in the second half of the twentieth century, into work defined as history, literary studies, religious studies, or the sociology/anthropology of Muslim societies.

Al-Sayyid also spends some time on the debate that emerged among Orientalists, and subsequently among Muslim thinkers, over the question of Islam's "authenticity" (asāla): was Islam basically just a warmed-over version of Hellenic culture (or of Jewish or Christian traditions), or was it something new and original? For some Orientalists, the study of Islam was important mainly because they thought they could recover from the works of medieval Muslim scholarship otherwise lost works of Greek science and philosophy. That view, however, created a strong reaction among some Muslims, who agonized over Islam's relations to the "West": in some cases emphasizing that the real core of the Islamic tradition was not the work of the *farāfī* like al-Kindi and al-Farābī, but rather the activities of the architects of Islamic law, theology, and mysticism, in other cases exhibiting a tendency (criticized by al-Sayyid) to reject everything "Western" as hostile to Islam.

That the author has packed so much in such a short book is evidence of his mastery of the general lines of development of his subject. There are a very few places where I found myself disagreeing with his judgments (anyway, he knows the subject far better than I): one was his comment (p. 52) that since World War II, Qur'ānic studies did not form a large part of German Oriental studies. This was true not only of German but of all Oriental studies until the revisionist wave of the 1970s, but since that time, particularly beginning in the 1990s and continuing today, innovative scholarship on the Qur'ān is being led, it seems to me, by contributions from Germany. It is also striking that al-Sayyid fails to mention in this context the controversial work of Günter Lüling on the Qur'ān, published in the 1970s, which was subjected to a virtual conspiracy of silence by mainstream German scholarship for decades; whether or not one agrees with it, Lüling's work raised serious questions worthy of discussion in an open forum, and al-Sayyid unfortunately missed a chance to restore some perspective on the issue. But in general, this is a work admirable for its range, balance, judgment, and accuracy. Other than references to "Max Turner," which should be Bryan Turner (pp. 75, 78), I noted virtually no factual slips or typos.

There are many passages in this rich little book that make one stop and think more deeply about the work we do as scholars concerned with the study of the Islamic world and Middle East. This alone makes it worth the attention not only of Arab scholars, but also of many of us in the West, established scholars and students alike, who want to know more about how "Orientalism" developed, and who are more at home reading modern Arabic than German. It is well worth one's time.

- Fred M. Donner
The Jordan National Bank Numismatic Museum

by Warren C. Schultz

The Jordan National Bank Numismatic Museum (mathaf al-bank al-ahli al-urduni li-al-nimiyat), located in the Shmeisani district of Amman, features a collection of more than 30,000 coins, weights and other items. The museum was established in 1999 for "educational benefit of residents, visitors and academics" in Jordan, according to its promotional brochure. The curator is Dr. Nayef Goussous, whose donated personal collection forms the core of the institution's holdings. His assistant is Hassan al-Zuod. Both men are welcoming and extremely helpful to visiting researchers.

While the museum contains material covering the spectrum of monetary history, ranging from specimens of primitive monies and early Lydian coins to the money of modern Jordan, the strength of the collection is in its coverage of the Nabateans, the coins of the Roman Decapolis, and of the early to Medieval coinage of Islamic Bilād al-Shām. This is particularly the case for Umayyad copper coinages. Dr. Goussous's dissertation, published by the museum in 1994 as Rare and Incised Umayyad Copper Coins draws attention to the depth of the collection’s Umayyad holdings. The museum also has an extensive range of weights, ranging from the Roman and Byzantine eras into the Islamic. The holdings in Islamic bronze weights, commonly attributed to the tenth to the twelfth centuries CE is one of the most extensive I have seen. The museum staff is in the early stages of preparation of a bi-lingual (Arabic and English) catalogue of these weights.

Approximately 3000 items are on display at any given time. These items are clearly identified and their types linked to the major publications in the pertinent field. The staff is pleased to provide researchers access to those items as well as any material not on display. Thus in my case, I was able to examine and glean information from the approximately 50 Mamluk coins from the cases, as well as more than four hundred from storage. This availability of multiple examples of many types of coins is a valuable boon for numismatic research.

The collection is also supported by a library of more than 1500 books devoted to numismatic topics and monetary history. In addition to catalogues and monographs, it includes major journals such as The American Journal of Numismatics and the latest series of Numismatic Chronicle.

The museum is located at the corner of Queen Noor and Abdallah bin Omar streets near the fourth circle in Amman. The museum has a separate entrance from the bank off of Abdallah bin Omar street, and is open to the public Sunday to Thursday, 8:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. (Hours may be restricted during Ramadan.) Scholars wishing to use the collection are encouraged to contact the curatorial staff to arrange for an appointment.

Mailing address: Jordan National Bank Numismatic Collection, P.O. Box 2102, Amman 11181, Jordan.
Telephone: 5687090 Fax: 5685848 e-mail: museum@ahlibank.com.jo.
The Working Files of Michael W. Dols

In August 2007 the scholarly working files of the late Prof. Michael Dols (1942-1989) were donated to Portland State University in Portland, Oregon.

Professor Dols, who took his PhD at Princeton and taught at California State University Hayward, was a well-known specialist in the history of medicine in the medieval Muslim world. His dissertation was published as the classic The Black Death in the Middle East (Princeton University Press, 1977), and he subsequently published Medieval Islamic Medicine: Ibn Ridwan’s Treatise "On the Prevention of Bodily Ills in Egypt", translated and with an introduction by Dols, with an edition of the Arabic text by Adil S. Gamal (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984). His final major work was Mājuūn: the madman in medieval Islamic society (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

Dols’s files, ten and a half linear feet, consist of scholarly notes, correspondence with various scholars and presses, and offprints or photocopies of the most important articles published on his field of study up to the time of his death. The files are arranged alphabetically by author.

For further information contact Kris Kern, Cataloging and Preservation Librarian, Millar Library, PSU, P.O.B. 1151, Portland, OR 97207-1151. Her phone number is (503) 725-5218 and e-mail is kernk@pdx.edu.

---
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Page 38, figure 3: Plan from Israel Antiquities Authority archives.


Page 40, figure 7: Plan after Barbé, Lehrer, and Avissar (2002), p. 34.
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