The mosque of al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh in Cairo is the product of a grammar of Fatimid mosque design that had developed in North Africa and Egypt over the previous century; it thereby represents the culmination of the early Fatimid congregational mosque in many of its features. Taking over twenty years to build and requiring vast sums of money for its construction and furnishing, it was the major architectural monument in a time already notable for its prosperity. The Ḥākim mosque, however, was not merely a larger and grander version of the then standard Fatimid mosque plan, for in it the mosque’s patrons made a statement about their goals for the contemporary world and about the history of Islam.

Thanks to K. A. C. Creswell’s monumental work, the history and structure of the building now pose few problems. As reconstructed by Creswell, the mosque measures 120 meters by 113 meters; it is more than twice as large as the original Azhar mosque built only twenty years earlier (figs. 1 and 2). The enclosure walls of rough-cut stone are built using a technique that Creswell calls talātār and are capped with brick cresting. Thirteen entrances originally led to the interior, but many are now walled up. The lesser entrances on the northwest, northeast, and southwest are all made of dressed stone; only the central entrances on these walls project from the walls, and only the central façade entrance, decorated in elegantly cut stone, is truly monumental, projecting more than six meters from the wall for a length of more than fifteen meters.

Of the towers at the corners of the façade wall, now enclosed in cubic salients, the one on the right side (called by Creswell “the western minaret”) is square and the one on the left side (“the northern minaret”) is round (fig. 3). Both are decorated with cut-stone bands of workmanship comparable to that of the portal; this led Creswell to conclude that the portal and the western minaret are the products of the same architect.

The interior of the mosque consists of a huge courtyard surrounded by arcades running parallel to the exterior walls. Each of the lateral arcades is three bays deep; the arcade behind the façade wall is two bays deep; and the prayer hall is five bays deep. The prayer hall, just as at al-Azhar and the now-destroyed Jāmiʿ al-Qarāfā, has a higher and wider axial aisle leading from the court to a dome in the bay before the mihrāb. The two lateral rear corners of the prayer hall are also domed. The interior construction is brick — brick piers supported a now-lost wooden roof — and the bricks are covered with stucco. A continuous band of Kufic inscription runs along all of the arcades immediately below the roof. Apart from a few window grilles, no other stucco decoration remains. The only other extant decoration is a beveled design on a wooden tie-beam.

Although this mosque has suffered from the vagaries of time, its original layout is not difficult to establish, especially since Creswell has already revealed the successive encasing of the minaret bases in square salients and the relationship of the mosque to the wall of Badr al-Jamālī, which runs along its northeast side. It is significantly larger than previous Fatimid congregational mosques, though its projecting portal, corner bastions, courtyard arcades, raised central aisle, and prayer hall marked by three domes show it to have evolved from their formal tradition. It differs, however, from al-Azhar in its rough stone exterior walls and dressed stone portals and minarets and the brick pier construction of its interior. The interior decoration is much more subdued than at al-Azhar, where the remaining stucco decoration points to a complete mural treatment. The Ḥākim mosque has only a plain, but elegant, inscription frieze under the roof, but it also claims the earliest Fatimid-period remnants of a program of exterior mosque decoration. At al-Mahdiyya, the first Fatimid capital in Tunisia, the façade shows a
Figure 1. Mosque of al-Ḥākim. Plan, after K. A. C. Creswell, The Muslim Architecture of Egypt (Oxford, 1952), fig. 32.

Figure 2. Mosque of al-Ḥākim. Reconstructed bird’s-eye view, after Creswell, MAE, fig. 44.
for the exterior decoration of the Ḥākim mosque is not to be found in the mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn. Despite its decorated windows and its cresting on the exterior wall to the ziyyātā, the mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn did not inspire the hierarchical decorative composition that is present in the façade of the Ḥākim mosque. At Ibn Ṭūlūn, the decoration was unrolled evenly over the wall surfaces; at al-Ḥākim it was concentrated on the minarets and portals.

Apart from the Kufic frieze, the interior decoration of the Ḥākim mosque was not made of long-lasting materials. In 403/1012–13, to complete the furnishing, al-Ḥākim ordered thirty-six thousand square cubits of matting, brocade curtains to be hung at all the doors, and four silver chandeliers, along with many silver lamps, to provide light.

Al-Ḥākim’s final furnishing was the culmination of some twenty years’ intermittent work under various patrons. According to the biography of Yaʿqūb b. Killis, part of which is preserved in the Khitat of Ahmad b. Ḥādī al-Maqritzī, the foundations of the new mosque were laid out on 10 Ramadan 379/989,12 a year earlier than the usually accepted date given by al-Musabbiḥ.13 Al-Musabbiḥ also states, under the events of 393/1002–03 that al-Ḥākim ordered “the completion of the building of the mosque which the vizier Yaʿqūb b. Killis had begun at the Bāb al-Futūḥ.”14 This is not even mentioned in the vizier’s biography,15 however, and, in any event, Ibn Killis died late in 380/990–91 before any significant work on the mosque could be done.16 In 393/1002–03 the estimate of the money needed to finish the mosque came to forty thousand dinars, indicating that quite a substantial amount of work remained upon the death of al-ʿAzīz. In 401/1010–11 bastions (arkān) were added to the corner towers, and in 403/1012–13 the cost of the final furnishings amounted to five thousand dinars.17

The sources refer to the mosque by various names. A text contemporary with the construction calls it jāmīʾ khārijī bāb al-futūḥ (“the mosque outside the Bāb al-Futūḥ”); by 415/1024–25, however, it had gained a new epithet, al-anwar (“the bright”),18 possibly inspired by the epithet al-azhar (“the splendid”) given to the mosque of al-Qāhirah. The common modern name, Jāmīʾ al-Ḥākim (“the mosque of al-Ḥākim”), does not appear in the sources until later.

Regardless of these minor confusions, the mosque is still one of the best-documented monuments of medieval Islamic architecture. It is therefore all the more surprising that the program of inscriptions, the meanings of the minarets and

Figure 3. Mosque of al-Ḥākim. Northern minaret, after Creswell, MAE, fig. 36.

tendency toward decorative composition in the arrangement of an elegant, two-storied portal flanked by bastions. Unfortunately, apart from hypothesizing similar projecting portals at al-Azhar and the Qarāfa mosque, it is impossible to imagine what the decorative treatment of the exteriors of these mosques might have been.

Creswell often cites the affinities between the mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn and the Ḥākim mosque,9 but these similarities prove on close examination to be much less important than they may seem at first sight. The remaining Fatimid monuments in Egypt indicate that, with the exception of the mosque of Sultan Baybars, the last of the great congregational mosques of medieval Cairo, pier construction was no longer used.10 It may well have been that the use of piers rather than columns was dictated solely by difficulties in procuring enough columns of sufficient size. The inspiration
portals, and the functional relationship of this mosque to other mosques in the Fatimid capital have not been thoroughly studied, for it is through these features that this extraordinary monument begins to reveal the secrets of why it was built and how it was viewed in its own time.

INSCRIPTIONS

Parts of inscriptions from both the interior and exterior programs remain. The interior inscriptions are found in a band of carved stucco, sixty centimeters wide, running immediately below the beams of the roof of the prayer hall. They have been examined carefully by Samuel Flury, who distinguished two styles of decoration, the first presumably belonging to the original period of construction, the second dating from a later restoration.20 While the two stages differ in style, the medieval restorers were generally faithful to the original subject.

The inscriptive program begins in the dome in front of the mihrab, with the opening four verses of Qur’an 48 the Sūrat al-Fatḥ (fig. 4 and inscription 14; for inscriptions, see appendix below). The next eleven verses are inscribed around the central aisle and into the first (i.e., qibla) bay of the left (i.e., northern) side of the prayer hall, ending with verse 22. The remaining four bays of the left side contain, respectively, the opening verses of suras 3, 7, 6, and 8.

On the right side the Qur’anic verses are somewhat less regular, especially in the qibla and third bays, where sections from the very long Sūrat al-Baqara (Qur’an 2) are used in both. The first, second, fourth, and fifth bays, respectively, contain the opening verses of suras 1, 36, 2, and 4 (inscriptions 21–25). The inscriptions in all bays but the fourth and fifth begin in the corner closest to the mihrab. It is possible that such anomalies were caused by the work of medieval or even modern restorers, but whatever the case the interior inscription program of this mosque does not indicate the same careful selection of verses as at the Azhar mosque.20 Instead of using selected verses of the Qur’an to support specific ideological points, the inscriptions in the interior of the Hākim mosque simply contain the opening verses of nine chapters of the Qur’an. Medieval sources assert that the interior inscriptions at the mosque of Ibn Tulun contained the whole text of the Qur’an.21 While demonstrably false, this image is remarkably similar to that conveyed by the remaining evidence from the Hākim mosque; there the use of the opening verses of a sura may have synecdochically suggested the presence of the whole.

The apparent absence of an ideological principle of selection in the Hākim mosque is important, for between the time al-Azhar was decorated and the time the Hākim inscriptions were chosen, a decision had clearly been made to avoid that kind of iconographically charged inscriptional program. For the moment one can only guess at the reason, but it seems likely that the complex references of the earlier inscriptions were either unappreciated or misunderstood.

The inscriptions of the exterior of the mosque are much more interesting.22 A now-lost marble inscription, first published in 1838, contains Qur’an 28:4, followed by the standard Fatimid foundation-inscription formula with standard titulature (inscription 1).23 Its interest lies in the verse chosen: “Yet We desired to be gracious to those that were abased in the land, and to make them leaders [a‘imma], and to make them the inheritors.” The choice is triply appropriate: the context of the verse is the story of Moses and Pharaoh, which takes place in Egypt. God speaks of his divine plan, and his words could be directed with

Figure 4. Mosque of al-Hākim. Schematic plan of the inscriptions.
equal applicability to Moses or to the Fatimid imam. Finally, the word 'imma — the plural of imām, the title assumed by the Fatimid rulers — would have ensured that this latter interpretation was made.

Although different in form, both minarets are decorated with horizontal inscription bands. Inscriptions in borders framing the windows are found only on the northern minaret. The middle band on the western minaret contains Qur’an 11:73 and an accompanying text, both parallel to inscription 1. The verse contains the key phrase ahl al-bayt (“people of the house”), which was always understood by the Fatimids to be a direct reference to themselves as descendants of ‘Ab. The lower inscription on this same minaret (inscription 3) follows the form of the previous two, but uses a verse (Qur’an 9:18) appropriate for any mosque anywhere. Its special Fatimid significance lies in the use of the word al-muhtadin (“the guided”), for, in inscription 2, al-Ḥākim’s ancestors are said to be al-muḥdīyyin (“rightly guided”). Both words come from the same root, h-d-y, from which also derives the regnal name of the first Fatimid imam, al-Mahdi.

The major inscription of the northern minaret is on the fourth band and follows the familiar form: a verse precedes a foundation text. The verse (Qur’an 9:128) is not common, as is the preceding one, although it is to be found in the façade of the mosque of al-Sāliḥ Talāʿī of 555/1160. It may have been chosen for its use of the word ‘azīz (“grievous”), a pun of sorts on the name of the later ruler. Around the four windows of the third band (inscriptions 5–8), we find the very famous and very common Qur’an 24:35–37(38?), a parable of the light of God in a lamp in a niche. While the major theme of these verses is this beautiful image of God, they have a very special meaning to the Shi’a, for they were taken to be evidence for the nasy, the divine portion of light transmitted to the successive ‘Alid imams. Ibn Shahrahshub, a [Twelver] Shi’i writer of the sixth/seventh century, gives al-Ḥusayn the following names: “the lamp of those who trust in God,” “the lamp of the lofty family ties,” “the shining full moon,” “the light of the Fatimid family,” and “a part of the light.” The choice of these verses on the Hākim mosque may be explained further if these associations can be taken back to the late fourth/eighth century.

A medallion on the northeast side of the second band (inscription 9) supports this ‘Alid interpretation, for it contains Qur’an 5: 55, “Your friend [wālī] is only God…” The term wālī was used in inscriptions 1, 2, and 4 as a qualificative for al-Ḥākim (“the slave and friend of God”) in the standard Fatimid titulature. The field of the medallion contains a verse that appears five times in the Qur’an: “from the shadows into the light.” The qur’ānic context, however, is irrelevant, as the verse continues the image of divine light established in the previous inscriptions.

This emphasis on the divine light of God suggests that the significance of the epithets the Fatimids attached to their mosque names may run deeper than was previously imagined. The epithet al-anwar, applied to this mosque in the fifth/eighth century resonates with this same concept of divine light.

Over the entrance to the northern minaret a short inscription (inscription 10) of almost anecdotal quality is perfectly appropriate: “And say, ‘My Lord, lead me in with a just ingoing, and lead me out with a just outgoing…” The fragment of the inscription on the main portal (inscription 12) is the end of Qur’an 3:198. It is impossible from the little that remains to tell whether the fragment was used as a pious filler phrase at the end of an inscription or whether it represents the tail end of the verse, which deals with paradise. Six blocks of limestone, now in the Islamic Museum in Cairo (inscription 11) may have come from this portal, but their context has yet to be established; in the meantime they are of no help whatsoever.

Arkān were added to the mosque in Safar 401/1010, and Creswell has demonstrated convincingly that these arkān can only be the great salients around the minarets. Their addition completely hid the minaret inscriptions, but a new inscription frieze of marble was inserted into the masonry of the salients. The frieze on the northern salient was removed and probably recarved when Badr al-Jamāli enclosed the salient in yet another sheath of masonry in 480/1087–88. The change in tone between the first inscriptions — which emphasize the role of the imam as builder and use verses with Isma’ili overtones — and the new inscriptions — a serious of purely qur’ānic admonitions to unbelievers, corrupt women and men, warning against undue familiarity and urging the proper observance of Friday prayer (inscription 14) — is startling. One can only assume that the patron had had a major change of heart, for these admonitions seem to have more to do with al-Ḥākim’s erratic prohibitions against women, certain foods, wine, Christians, and Jews than with the ideologically charged inscriptions characteristic of the minarets.

In their character these verses are similar to the interior inscriptions, for both groups are nothing more than series of statements. The rukn in-
scriptions are extracted from their contexts: they simply say, "Do this" or "Do not do that." The interior inscriptions string together one sura after another, unlike the inscriptions in the Azhar mosque, where the verses form a meaningful text. While Flury suggests that the first stage of the interior ornament was completed before 393/1003,28 the similarity of tone in the passages on the salients and the interior inscriptions suggests a date no earlier than 401/1011, when the salients were begun, and no later than 403/1013, when the mosque was considered finished.

The change in tone between the original and the new inscriptions suggests that the arkān — whose function has never been discussed — were built to cover the original minarets. Whatever excited the displeasure of the patron, it is unlikely to have been the inscriptions, because they could easily have been replaced.

MINARETS

The history and meaning of the minaret, the most visible symbol of the presence of Muslims in a place, is still poorly understood, even after some fifty years of intermittent study.29 In 1918 Max van Berchem characterized the problem of the minaret as philological, architectural, and functional (i.e., as religious custom).30 But this neat analysis in itself has hindered investigation. Students of architecture avoid the questions of placement and number in favor of investigating the varieties of minaret form (square, cylindrical, or octagonal). Students of its philological and functional aspects concentrate on the early Islamic minaret, ignoring the proliferation of minarets that appears to be characteristic only of later periods. The problem itself may also have been poorly formulated, for it reflects an "Orientalist" assumption that the minaret — like the mihrab — was given a basic shape (tower) and a basic purpose (the calling of the faithful to prayer) in the early Islamic period, which continued unchanged over the centuries. Far from suggesting one tripartite problem, the minaret poses a whole series of problems reflecting the diversity of medieval Islamic civilization.

It would not be fair, however, to say that everyone has ignored these questions, for individual studies have pointed out the practical impossibility of using certain minarets for the adhān ("call to prayer"), or that, of the three Arabic words for "minaret," mi'dhana ("place of adhān"), the one which best describes its supposed function, was the last to appear.31 Nevertheless, a coherent explanation for the philological, architectural, and functional variations of the minaret throughout the Islamic world is yet to be produced.

The only reference to minarets contemporary with the building of the Hākim mosque is by al-Musabbīḥī, quoted in the Khīṭāṭ. He says, "In Safar 401 the manāra of the Jāmiʿ Bāb al-Futuḥ was increased: arkān were made for it, each rukā was one hundred cubits long."32 The word manāra, from which our word minaret is derived, can originally have meant, according to J. H. Gottheil, "only 'an object that gives light.' As such, it is used in old Arabic poetry for the oil lamp or rush light used in the cell of the Christian monk. . . . It is then used for a 'light-tower' or 'light-house.' "33 Abū Ḥād Allāh Muḥammad al-Maqdīsī, describing the coastal defense system of Syria in the late fourth/tenth century, mentions ribats with manāras, which were lit up at night.34

Unfortunately, the foundation inscriptions on the minarets of the Hākim mosque (inscriptions 2–4) do not give a name for what al-Hākim ordered constructed in 393/1002–03, for they use only the relative pronoun mā ("what"). The inscriptions around the windows of the northern minaret (inscriptions 5–8), however, do develop an image of the divine light of God, which is reinforced by the medallion inscription (inscription 9) on the same minaret. An examination of qurʾānic inscriptions on minarets generally contemporary to those of the Hākim mosque produces no other instances of the use of these otherwise common verses. Their use therefore implies a conscious choice by the builder and offers a clue to the minarets’ purpose.

The Hākim mosque was located outside the northern walls of the city, in the direction from which any attack might come (and did, in the form of the Qarmatian siege of 361/971–72); the northern minaret overlooked the plain stretching to the north. It is not improbable, therefore, that this minaret was used as a watch tower or beacon tower. If so, the window inscriptions were intended to parallel the one over the door (inscription 10), both being anecdotally appropriate, although the beacon light would have been in a window, not in the niche of the qurʾānic verse.

As attractive as this interpretation may be, it does not explain the western minaret, whose inscription has none of this divine-light imagery. Al-Musabbīḥī’s text states that arkān were added to the manāra in 401/1011. Creswell’s interpretation of the arkān is correct as far as it goes, but it avoids an analysis of the textual problems. Although al-Musabbīḥī mentions only one
According to al-Maqrīzī, the Umayyad caliph Mu'āwiyah ordered Maslama, the governor of Egypt, to build ṣawāmi for the adhān on the mosque of 'Amr in Fustat; four sawāmi were placed at the four corners, or rukn, of the mosque.⁴⁰ Creswell argues that these sawāmi were likely to have been four square towers, since the order came from Damascus.⁴¹ Writing earlier than Creswell, however, Gottheil states that “what the sawma’a was, we do not know.”⁴² Joseph Schacht later suggests that the sawma’a was a “sentry-box minaret” — a butt with a pointed roof perched at the corner of the mosque and reached by ladders or stairs.⁴³ Schacht’s suggestion seems all the more likely, considering the lack of evidence of actual towers at the mosque of 'Amr.

Creswell’s hypothesis is based on his interpretation of the Damascus mosque, for he believes that the corner towers of the original temenos were used for the call to prayer. Lacking any monumental evidence of early Muslim additions to these towers, it is much more likely that sawāmi like those at Fustat were used. The earliest mention of a real tower is from 375/985 when al-Maqdisi refers to a single minaret of “modern construction” (manāra muhaddatha) over the Bāb al-Farādisi, opposite the mihrāb.⁴⁴ Thus, though Mu'āwiyah had introduced four sawāmi, there was, three centuries later, only a single minaret opposite the mihrāb. When was this minaret built?

Creswell believes that al-Maqdisi’s phrase, “of modern construction,” implies a date at the beginning of the fourth/tenth century. If Umayyad architecture in Syria was a model for developments in North Africa and Spain, however, and if the placement of minarets in these regions was influenced by Syria, it seems likely that a tower manāra existed in Damascus before the ‘Abbasid revolution. Al-Maqdisi’s use of “modern” may mean no more than that it was constructed later than the other parts of the mosque.

Al-Maqdisi is also a crucial source for the history of the Haram al-Sharif in Jerusalem, for he was a native of that city and his detailed account is generally assumed to be very accurate. While Ibn 'Abd Rabbihî (c. 300/912) mentions four manāwir for the muezzins at Jerusalem,⁴⁵ al-Maqdisi does not mention them at all, nor does Ibn al-Faqih, who wrote some ten years earlier than Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihî.⁴⁶ In the early tenth/sixteenth century, Mujir al-Dīn traced the four minarets back to the time of ‘Abd al-Malik. Creswell finds that impossible,⁴⁷ and instead accepts Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihî’s statement, even though the latter may never have visited Jerusalem and has been shown to be mistaken in his enumeration of the minarets.

In each of these instances, the multiple towers were designed at the same time and consequently were of similar — if not identical — appearance. Thus, the appearance of two different minarets on the Hākim mosque is most unusual for its time and place.

Another group of monuments contained multiple structures for the call to prayer. They are all from the early Islamic period in Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and the Hijaz: specifically, the mosque of 'Amr in Fustat, the Umayyad Mosque of Damascus, the Haram al-Sharif in Jerusalem, the Mosque of the Prophet in Medina, and the Masjid al-Haram in Mecca. An understanding of these mosques is essential to any explanation of the minarets of the Hākim mosque.
MUQARNAS

at Medina. Inasmuch as al-Maqdisi is a most reliable source, it is likely that all four minarets were not in existence in 300/912, but were built some time afterward, certainly before the tenth/sixteenth century. If Ibn ‘Abd Rabbih’s account is accurate, however, it is possible that the Haram was given four minarets by al-Walid when four minarets were added to the other great Muslim sanctuaries in the Hijaz. Much more work is necessary to clarify the history of the Haram al-Sharif during the medieval period.

The earliest mention of minarets in Medina comes from the reign of al-Walid b. ‘Abd al-Malik (86–96/705–15). His successor, Sulayman, demolished the minaret at the southwest corner of the mosque; the ‘Abbasid caliph al-Mahdi (158–69/775–85) demolished the northeast and northwest minarets and rebuilt them when he extended the mosque one hundred cubits to the north in 162–65/778–82. Thus, the southeast minaret was the only Umayyad one to remain with the two ‘Abbasid minarets on the north. All three were seen by Ibn ‘Abd Rabbih, who mislocated them. Abu’l-Husayn Muhammad b. Jubayr (c. 580/1184) said that there were three šawāmī’, two small ones on the north that each had the shape of a burj (ka-annahum ‘alā ha’at burjayn), and one at the southeast corner that looked like a šawmā’ (‘alā ha’at al-šawmā’i). No doubt the one Umayyad “minaret” looked like a šawmā’, and the two ‘Abbasid ones looked like burjīs. Ibn Jubayr does not explain this distinction further; it is possible that the šawmā’ was not a tower-shaped minaret, but rather a “sentry-box minaret,” as Schacht suggested for Fustat. Ibn Jubayr describes three minarets, or šawāmī’, at Damascus: the ones at the southeast and southwest corners of the ancient temenos were like high burjīs (ka-’l-burj al-mushayyad); the third was located opposite the mihrab but was not described. Knowing the form of the two southern minarets at Damascus — rather square towers — we can conclude from his remark that the Umayyad minaret of Medina differed from them in shape.

The history of the minarets of the Masjid al-Ḥaram at Mecca is even more confusing than that of their counterparts at Medina, owing to the continuous restorations of the mosque under the caliphs and to the variety of terms used for the same parts of the building. A four-minaret plan was probably introduced during al-Walid’s caliphate when the mosque was restored in 91/709–10. Under ‘Abbasid rule, al-Manṣūr restored (ammara) one minaret; his son al-Mahdi restored three others. It is not clear whether three or all four minarets were placed at the corners of the mosque; the fourth is said, depending on the source, to have been either at the north corner or along the northeast wall.

Qūṭ al-Ḍin — a late source — states that a fifth minaret was probably added by al-Mu’taḍid (279–89/892–902) when he built the Dār al-Nadwa at the mosque. By 580/1184, however, when Ibn Jubayr visited Mecca, there were seven minarets (šawāmī’), four on the four sides (ja-wānīb, “corners”), one on the Dār al-Nadwa, a small one on the Bāb al-Ṣafā, and one at the Bāb Ibrahim. The annex of the Bāb Ibrahim was built under al-Muqtadir (295–320/908–32); the Bāb al-Ṣafā — the most magnificent portal of the mosque — was probably built or enlarged by al-Mahdī, although the date of the minaret is uncertain. Qūṭ al-Ḍin mentions that the latter two minarets were no longer standing in his time, but that the one on the Bāb al-Ṣafā was mentioned by Ibn Jubayr, who said it was “so small it could not be climbed.” He also noted that two of the minarets — Bāb al-Umrā and al-Hazwara — had been restored by Muḥammad al-Jawad b. ‘Alī b. Abī Manṣūr al-Īṣfahānī, vizier to the ruler (ṣāḥib) of Mosul, al-Ashraf Sha’bān b. Husayn, in 551/1156–57.

Thus at the time of the building of the Hākim mosque, only two, or perhaps three, mosques in the entire Muslim world are known to have had more than one minaret. In two cases — the Mosque of the Prophet in Medina and the Masjid al-Ḥaram in Mecca — four minarets were planned for the corners of a rectangular enceinte. Through time, however, Medina retained only three minarets and Mecca acquired five and eventually seven. The third mosque — Jerusalem — is a special case: if it had multiple minarets in the pre-Fatimid period, they were probably arranged in an L-shape rather than a square, for the Haram is set in a corner of the walled city. A minaret in the southeast corner of the Haram would have stood far away from the populated areas. The minarets of the Hākim mosque may have been unique in their arrangement, but their number seems to suggest some effort to establish a formal relationship of sorts to the holiest sanctuaries of Islam.

For the decoration of the Meccan minarets, we can return once again to Ibn Jubayr, who did not stop at enumerating the minarets, but went on to describe them in fascinating detail:

The minarets also have an admirable form. That is, up to half their height they are angular with four sides in stone, perfectly carved and marvelous of manner [ṣāḥib al-wid’]. Around them there is a wooden grille [ṣabbāk] of exquisite workmanship. Above the grille is a column
[*amād*] in the air, as if it were a faceted tower [*makhāṣṣatu mukhattām*]. All of it is in faceted brick, some bricks set more deeply than others [*kuṭluḥu bi-l-ajjurr takhtīman yatadākkhišu ba‘ḍīhi ‘alā ba‘ḍ‘], which offers a lovely sight. Above the column is a lantern [*fahl*] also surrounded by a grille in the same workmanship as below. All [the minarets] are different from one another, but all share a general relationship: the lower half is angular and the upper half is columnar, without angles [*rukān*].

Ibn Jubayr singled out the minaret at the Bāb Ibrāhīm for special description:

Near to this door, to the right upon entering, is a minaret [*sawma‘a*] different: in form from the others mentioned above. It has carvings [*takhrīm*] in the plaster [*jūṣ*] of elongated form as if they were mihrabs. It is surrounded by *qarnasa* of exquisite workmanship. . . . [A description of the portal follows.] The lantern [*fahl*] of the minaret is on plaster columns, which are separated from each other by open spaces.

According to the chronology established above, only two of the seven minarets seen by Ibn Jubayr date to the sixth-/twelfth-century restorations by the vizier of the ruler of Mosul. While these two minarets would very likely have been made of brick, like contemporary minarets in Jībāl and the Jazīra, Ibn Jubayr clearly states that all the minarets shared general similarities: angular stone bases and columnar brick shafts. The stone was carved, the bricks set in patterns. The five other minarets seen by Ibn Jubayr must therefore have been standing in the fourth/tenth and fifth/eleventh centuries and would have been built of stone, brick, and stucco.

Ibn Jubayr’s description of the minarets at Mecca suggests that they resembled brick minarets in Persia, whose earliest remaining examples date from the fifth/eleventh century. More important for our purposes, however, is a poorly understood group of five minarets in Upper Egypt, which have been assigned with the minaret of the Mashhad al-Juyūshi in Cairo to the middle Fatimid period.

Apart from the original helicoidal minaret of the mosque of Ibn Tūlūn and the two minarets of the Ḥākim mosque, these six minarets are the oldest remaining in Egypt. They vary in quality of construction and in size, but share some common features: square bases, often of stone; tapering cylindrical shafts of brick (except al-Juyūshi); and domed lanterns, often of three stories, that make them resemble the domed mausoleums of Aswan. The brickwork is uniformly plain, relieved only by varying arrangements of arched windows and, on the minarets of Aswan and al-Mashhad al-Bāhri near Shellāl, by two or three horizontal bands of cut-brick Kufic inscription — the only appearance of this technique in Egypt. The minaret of the Mashhad al-Juyūshi also introduces a new feature into the Egyptian architectural vocabulary: the use of two, and sometimes three, courses of brick and stucco stalactites as a cornice to separate the first and second stories of the shaft and sometimes to support a balcony. The Esna minaret is also a first, in that its foundation inscription, dated 474/1081–82, calls the structure a *mīdhana*, the first appearance of this word in the Arabic epigraphy of Egypt. A nearly contemporary minaret at Shellāl (Bilāl) is called a *mandāra* in an undated foundation inscription.

For stylistic as well as historical reasons, the Juyūshi minaret can be included with the Upper Egyptian minarets. Creswell saw the Upper Egyptian group as commemorations of Badr al-Jamālī’s victorious campaigns there. This may be the case, but the explanation does not explore the formal sources of this minaret type in Egypt. Horizontal cut-brick Kufic inscription bands, the stalactite cornice, and a new name for the form are introduced along with the square base and tapering cylindrical shaft.

The location of these monuments in Upper Egypt provides a clue to their inspiration. The region near Aswan was not only the *thagrī*, or frontier, between Islamic Egypt and Christian Nubia, but also a major way station on the pilgrimage route to the holy cities in Arabia. Nāṣir-i Khusraw, who lived at the time of the building of these minarets, described, among the various routes from Egypt to the Hijaz, one that led directly east from Cairo to the Red Sea, which it followed either on land or through water. Another, which he followed in late 441 and early 442/1050, went south from Cairo to Asyût, Qūs, and Askhām, where the route bifurcated. Pilgrims could either go east over the desert to the Red Sea or continue along the Nile to Aswan and from there via Dhiyāqah and Hawd to the town of ‘Aydhāb on the Red Sea. In Aswan, he had to wait for pilgrims to return from the hajj so that he could rent their camels.

The connection of these minarets to the Hijaz is supported by other evidence: the minaret of the Mashhad al-Qibli near Bilāl must date from before 534/1139–40, when pious pilgrims to the Hijaz wrote graffiti on its interior. Thus, the similarities between the Upper Egyptian minarets and those described over a century later in Mecca are more than fortuitous: the general form — square base, rounded shaft, and lantern — the materials of construction — usually stone below and brick above — and the decoration — cut-
brick Kufic inscriptions and stalactite cornices — are all clearly derived from Meccan prototypes.

This explanation of the eccentric group of Upper Egyptian minarets through models known at Mecca has a number of ramifications for the history of Islamic architecture. One of them is that the continuous tradition of brick minarets in Mecca and Medina during the ‘Abbasid period suggests a continuity between early Mesopotamian ‘Abbasid use of bricks set in patterns (such as in the Baghdad Gate at Raqqa or Ukhaydir) and the development of the brick minaret in Iran, for which the undated minaret at Nayin is the earliest extant example. Further research is needed on the development and meaning of this Iranian minaret tradition in light of this new evidence, for it would support the belief that the helicoidal minarets of Samarra and Cairo were exceptions to a tradition of cylindrical minarets during ‘Abbasid times. Since it is unlikely that the Hijaz was a center of artistic innovation, the Medinan and Meccan minarets were probably products of an as yet unidentified tradition in Iraq or Iran, of which the incompletely understood ruin near Ukhaydir, Manār Mujda, is an example.

This Hijaz tradition that inspired the Upper Egyptian series of minarets in the mid-fifth/eleventh century is also the formal antecedent for the minarets of the Hākim mosque. Their shape and decoration closely resemble the horizontal bands of geometric and epigraphic material on the circular and octagonal brick minarets of Iran. Formal and ideological references to Mecca and Medina are rife in the Hākim mosque, and the time was ripe for such references.

The use of the stalactite cornice on the minaret of the Mashhad al-Juyushī brings to mind Ibn Jubayr’s description of the garmasa he saw on the minaret at the Bāb Ibrāhīm in Mecca; the influence was either direct or, more likely, through now-lost intermediaries in Upper Egypt. Where the stalactite cornice and squinch originated is a problem not yet solved to universal satisfaction, but it now at least appears certain that the cornice made its way into Egypt through the pilgrimage route. This suggests a similar route for the muqarnas squinch, which also makes its first appearance in Upper, rather than Lower, Egypt. It is unclear when these forms first appeared in the Hijaz: according to the historical record, al-Muqtadir built the Bāb Ibrāhīm annex to the Masjid al-Haram, on which the minaret rested, in 306/918-19. This suggests an early, but by no means impossible, date for the first known use of muqarnas.

This Hijaz connection shows how important the pilgrimage was as a transmitter of ideas and forms throughout the medieval Muslim world. The simultaneous appearance of forms and ideas at opposite ends of the Islamic world is not surprising when one remembers that inhabitants of those regions met more or less annually in common, pious devotion. The central importance of the Haraman led their rulers and overlords to lavish upon them the finest and most magnificent products of their realms, but only the literary record remains to suggest how splendid a sight they must have been in the Middle Ages. In addition to serving as an entrepôt for the exchange of goods and ideas, the Haraman can be seen as the world’s fair exhibition of their time, with the same influence on taste in that time and place as the Chicago, Paris, or London expositions once had in the West. With the exhibition parallel in mind, questions about the simultaneous appearances of the muqarnas in the Maghrib and Mashriq, previously thought to be unrelated phenomena, might be more easily answered.

Finally, the conscious transferral of a minaret type to the farthest reaches of the Muslim world suggests that the minaret form had a symbolic meaning far beyond a mere locus for the call to prayer. Its height made it a landmark. The minarets along the pilgrimage route in Upper Egypt and at the terminus for the pilgrimage in Cairo probably marked the trail for pilgrims. Before this theory can be used to explain other minarets, however, we need to know more about where minarets were situated in other lands, most notably in Iran. Even if the hypothesis that they were pilgrim-route markers should prove to be wrong, their symbolic function, as opposed to their quotidian function, is confirmed.

PORTALS

A characteristic feature of Fatimid mosque architecture is the projecting monumental portal on the façade opposite the mihrāb. It first appears on the mosque at al-Mahdiyya; it reappears at al-Azhar, on the Qarāfā mosque, and again three times on the Hākim mosque, whose portals project from the lateral façades as well as the main façade of the building. It is generally agreed that the projecting portals at the Hākim mosque are direct descendants of the Mahdiyya innovation, itself thought to be the result of a purely local transfer from the late-antique triumphal-arch form. The monumental portal has been considered a formal innovation of the Fatimids: “Down to the end of the 3rd/9th century,” Creswell writes, “no mosque had a monumental entrance. All mosques, large or
small, were entered by simple rectangular doorways in the enclosure walls.” More recent research at the Great Mosque of Cordova, however, shows that its major portal had been given a comparable, though not projecting, monumentalization nearly fifty years earlier than al-Mahdiyya. This early appearance in Andalusia and Ifriqiyya strongly suggests that the innovation was, like the square minaret, a Maghribi style.

Scholars have tried to explain why the portals at al-Mahdiyya and Cordova were monumentalized as they were, but their theories are irreconcilable. Klaus Brisch has suggested that the military character of the Bāb al-Wuzara betrayed Umayyad influence. He claims that the physical and ideological proximity of the mosque to the palace in Cordova accounts for the use of secular forms in this religious architecture. The proximity of these institutions dates from before the Muslim conquest, when the cathedral and the bishop’s residence were on this site. Fortification was also functional, for the builder had just cause to worry about security.

The explanation proposed by Alexandre Lézinè for the portal at al-Mahdiyya relies on a psychological assessment. He argues that the Mahdiyya portal was inspired by late-antique triumphal arches to provide an elaborate setting for Fatimid court ceremonial. Lézinè’s hypothesis was inspired by Marius Canard, who had recently translated Inostrantsev’s seminal study of Fatimid court ceremonial. Unfortunately, the ceremonies are from a much later period in Egypt, and there is no contemporary documentation that can vouch for elaborate ceremonial at al-Mahdi’s court. Lézinè’s hypothesis that the Fatimids responded to the ceremonial content of Roman triumphal arches assumes an art-historical sophistication otherwise unknown in the Middle Ages.

The similarities between these two early portals are great, but the disparities between the explanations for their presence make it difficult to claim that the two are in any way related, even though they are both chronologically and geographically close. The problems these monumental mosque portals pose are similar to those posed by the minarets. The similarity of the problems suggests that a similar approach to the solution might be fruitful.

Apart from the Dome of the Rock, which had four porches in front of its four doors, and the Umayyad Mosque of Damascus, which retains part of its ancient monumental entrances to the temenos, early Islamic religious buildings were not given monumental portals, though monumental portals were ubiquitous in Umayyad civil architec-

ture. 'Abbasid mosques did not have monumental portals either, except the Masjid al-Ḥaram at Mecca, which was rebuilt by the 'Abbasids with twenty-three portals. These portals ranged from a plain, single-arched opening to a many-arched portal, lavishly decorated in mosaic, teak, and other precious materials. Over the centuries, these portals were changed: for example, Qūṭb al-Dīn could count only nineteen gates with thirty-nine arches; Muḥammad al-Azraqī counted twenty-three gates with forty-three arches. Since the entire Ḥaram has since been rebuilt, only textual descriptions of these gates remain to give information about their actual appearance.

The simplest of the gates was described by al-Azraqī as a single, plain, arched doorway, like the Bāb Bānū Saḥm. Its arch was ten cubits in arc and seven cubits wide and was approached by ten steps. There were some eight of these portals and eight others that had two arches resting on a single column. With one exception — the Bāb Bānū Jumāḥ on the southwest — al-Azraqī does not mention any decoration these gates may have had. He reserved his energies for the five major gates, which had three or more arches:

[Bāb Bānū Shayba] has two columns [ustuwanatān], on which rest three arches, ten cubits in arc. The face of the portal is decorated [manqash] in mosaic [fusayfīd]; over the portal is a balcony [rūshān] of carved teak [ṣād manqash] ornamented with gold [muzakhrīf bi-l-dhāhāb]. The embellishment runs the length of the balcony, twenty-seven cubits, and is three and a half cubits wide. From the balcony to the ground is seventeen cubits, and between the two walls of the portal is twenty-four cubits. The two walls of the portal are revetted in marble, both white and red. There are four steps leading down into the masjid.

The other four major gates were similar, with decoration in mosaic, multicolored marble, imitation marble (riḥām mamāwwah), gold writing, and carved teak. The largest, the Bāb Ṣafā, had four columns and five arches: the rest only two columns and three arches.

According to al-Azraqī’s description (fig. 5), the width “between the two walls” is twenty-four cubits; therefore, the twenty-seven-cubit balcony above the portal probably projected one and a half cubits beyond each wall. Al-Azraqī notes this discrepancy between portal width and balcony length in other portals, such as Bāb al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib. The projection of these portals is slight, but sufficient to distinguish them from the flat expanse of wall surface and make them appear monumental.

The 'Abbasid Masjid al-Ḥaram at Mecca is, in
fact, the earliest known example of the projecting portal on religious architecture anywhere in Islam. The form this monumentalization took, however, was far more dependent on local vocabularies than it was on any central form: at al-Mahdiyya it resulted in the use of a late-antique triumphal arch; in Cordova it showed itself in an Andalusian interpretation of a once-Syrian Umayyad palace gateway. At the Ḥākim mosque, the third extant example, standard ideas and local forms were once again combined. The overall shape and general articulation of the façade portal can be imagined as the product of a Fatimid style going back to al-Mahdiyya, but the actual motifs of the richly carved stone of the portal decoration appear, in Creswell’s words, to be “arabesque worked, so to speak, into the skeleton of a classical entablature”; they are undoubtedly the products of a local main d’œuvre.  

The Persian traveler Nāṣir-i Khusraw offered a possible explanation for the significance of the monumentalized portal in Fatimid architecture when he called the triple portal, usually known in the sources as the Bāb Banū Ḥāshim, “Bāb ‘Allī,” because “this gate was used by the amīr al-mu’minīn, ‘Allī [b. Abī-Tālib], when he went to pray in the masjid.” The name must first have been applied to this gate during the fourth/tenth or early fifth/eleventh century, for it was known only as Bāb Banū Ḥāshim by al-Azraqī. Nevertheless, the name stuck, for in the tenth/sixteenth century QUṬB al-Dīn recorded both names. The significance of this name appears even greater when considered along with a hadith quoted by Nāṣir-i Khusraw’s contemporary, al-Mu‘ayyad Fīl-Dīn Shirāzī: “I [the Prophet] am the city of knowledge and ‘Allī is its gate; let those who want to acquire knowledge approach it by its proper gate.” The monumentalized portal, just like the minaret from which comes divine light, may have had a very specific Isma‘ili significance. Unfortunately, the fragments of inscription remaining on the portal of the Ḥākim mosque are not enough either to support or disprove this hypothesis. The use of the name ‘Allī in the central roundel of the portal hood of the Āqmar mosque of 519/1125, however, suggests that this identification was made in later Fatimid Egypt.  

This interpretation of the inclusion of the projecting monumental portal in the formative vocabulary of Fatimid mosque architecture gains further support from the allusions to Mecca in the early Fatimid panegyric description of al-Mahdiyya. The introduction of minarets in the Ḥākim mosque also had Meccan resonances, indicating that the symbolic importance of Mecca was as great after the founding of al-Mahdiyya as it had been before. While this could be explained easily as a natural reaction of pious Muslims, contemporary historical sources show that Fatimid interest in the holy cities was extraordinary. Throughout the third/ninth century, the ‘Abbasid caliphs expended vast sums of money in Mecca, ostensibly for pious purposes, but also with the idea of assur-
ing Meccan allegiance. In spite of their efforts, `Alid power grew so strong there that al-Ma'mūn appointed `Alids to be the governors of Mecca. In the fourth/tenth century, `Alid power continued to grow there, both officially and unofficially, for `Alids were often prominent among the bandits who ravaged the pilgrim caravans. In its early decades, Qarmatian power over Mecca was so great that they were able to steal the Black Stone from the Ka'ba in 317/929–30.

By the middle of the century, however, a new power began to emerge, encouraged by Fatimid support. In 348/959–60, the Fatimids supported the Banū Hasan over the Banū Ja'far to assure the eventual recognition of the Fatimids as suzerains; shortly after, the Ḥasanid sharifate emerged. In 358/969, months after the conquest of Egypt, the Fatimid caliph al-Mu'izz was recognized in the khutba in both Mecca and Medina, an act encouraged by the vast sums of money he had distributed there.

Some idea of the scale of expenditure can be imagined from the description of an object which al-Mu'izz had made for the Ka'ba:

On the day of 'Ara'a [9 Dhul-Hijja 362/973], al-Mu'izz had the shamsa which he had made for the Ka'ba set up in the iwan of his palace. It was twelve spans in each direction. The background was red brocade [āibā]. In each crescent was an openwork golden ball; inside each ball were fifty pearls the size of doves' eggs, as well as red, yellow, and blue precious stones. Around it, the verses of the Sūrat al-Ḥajj were written in emeralds, the spaces [between the letters] filled with pearls as big as could be. The shamsa was studded with powdered musk. Because of the height where it was set up, people could see it from outside the palace as well; the men who set it up had to drag it because of its great weight.

The shamsa was an ornament shaped like a sun (shams), designed to be attached to the covering (kiswa) of the Ka'ba. The first shamsa was sent by al-Mutawakkil (223–47/847–61); al-Mu'izz's commissioning of one was recognized by contemporaries as a conscious imitation of 'Abbasid practice. When it was displayed in al-Mu'izz's palace, the Egyptians, Syrians, Iraqis, and Khurasanis who had been on the pilgrimage said that there was none to equal it: although the 'Abbasid shamsa was more finely worked, it was only one-quarter the size.

The purpose of gifts to the Ka'ba has been explored by Grabar in a different context. They were sent to emphasize the holiness of the place and the piety of the donors; to acquire holiness and sacredness from the sanctuary's holiness; and, finally, to symbolize the submission of the ruler to Islam. The shamsa, however, seems to have had a slightly different function. Al-Mu'izz's shamsa was not, it seems, mentioned by Meccan sources, although (and Fatimid sources, too) duly noted the dispatch and receipt of the Fatimid kiswa. Its importance to contemporary people, however, depended not on its receipt in Mecca, but on its display in Egypt, the expressed intention of sending it, and most important, the political and financial resources needed to send it.

Nevertheless, al-Mu'izz and his successors had a tenuous hold on the allegiance of the Meccan sharifs. In 362/972–73, the year he ordered the shamsa, al-Mu'izz had not been mentioned in the khutba for two years; and, although he had been recognized in 363/973–74, his successor, al-ʿAzīz, still felt in 365/975–76 that the Meccans needed to be taught a lesson. He sent an army to besiege the city, which was forced to capitulate because of its dependence on Egypt for food and supplies. In 368/978–79, al-ʿAzīz sent a gold mihrab for the Ka'ba, in addition to grain and oil for the Meccans.

In the following year he sent the kiswa, as well as one hundred thousand dinars' worth of goods. In 380/990, al-ʿAzīz himself reviewed the caravan laden with the kiswa and goods. The herald of the successful completion of the pilgrimage was greeted on the first of Muḥarram with robes of honor and a parade throughout the Egyptian capital. The pilgrimage was not only a pious obligation, but also a major means of communication and a source of information: in 380/991, al-ʿAzīz learned through the returning pilgrims of the establishment in his name of a da'wa in Mosul and the Yemen.

Despite the lavish gifts to Mecca and its inhabitants and the warm welcome accorded the amir when he visited al-ʿAzīz, the sharifs wished to be independent of Fatimid interference. With increasing frequency the pilgrimage proved dangerous even for the Shiʿi Egyptians. In 394/1004, al-Ḥākim ordered the pilgrims to leave even earlier than usual, probably to allow them time to cope with problems in the Hijaz. In 401/1010, after the caravan was forced to return without even visiting Medina, another edict moved the departure date to the middle of Shawwal and ordered that Medina be visited first.

In the same year, the amir of Mecca called himself "amīr al-muʾminin," gave the khutba in his own name, took on the regnal name al-Rāshid, and claimed to possess Dhīl Faqār, the sword of the Prophet, as well as his rod (qaḍīb).

This use of the traditional caliphal symbols — sword and rod — was also a reaction to events of the previous year, when al-Ḥākim sent a func-
tionary to Medina to find the house in which Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, the sixth imam, had lived. The mission was accomplished when the functionary discovered Ja'far's Qur'an, some of his utensils, and his prayer mat, which the Fatimid imams were to use as their own. They already possessed Ja'far's sword.

Al-Rāshid's actions forced al-Ḥākim to prohibit people from going to Mecca so as to cut off the city's food and supplies. Challenged also by his own family, al-Rāshid's caliphate was short-lived and he was forced to come to an understanding with the Egyptians, on whom he depended for food. Yet the conflict between the Egyptians and the Meccans erupted once again in 414/1023–24, when, according to the Meccan sources, an Egyptian "heretic" struck the Black Stone with a mace (dabbūs) and broke off a piece of it. A mêlée broke out and a number of Egyptians were killed. According to the Egyptian sources, the guilty party was a Daylamite member of the Bāṭīniyya sect. In 415/1024–25, Egyptians, undoubtedly fearing for their lives, did not go on the pilgrimage.

Thus, Fatimid involvement in Meccan affairs appears to have had varying success. During the reigns of al-Mu'izz and al-'Azīz, it was generally on the upswing, despite the attempt at independence in 365/975–76, and it culminated in the cordial welcome given the amir of Mecca in 384/994–95. The importance of the pilgrimage to both Mecca and Medina is underscored by al-Ḥākim's order of 394/1003–04, despite the growing tension and attacks on the caravans. The construction of both the Ḥākim mosque and its second phase take place within this period of good relations. The visual references in the particular use of minarets and portals in this period may well, then, not have been merely fortuitous. The Ḥākim mosque stood to the north of the city on the route to the assembly grounds for the pilgrim caravan at Birkat al-Jabb. With its high minarets it may well have been conceived not only as a fitting terminus for the pilgrimage, but also as a sign that Cairo — the new capital of the Prophet's family — possessed some of the attributes of the holy cities of Islam.

At the turn of the century a decline in Egyptian-Meclean relations presumably led al-Ḥākim to terminate any association that had been established between the new mosque and Mecca or Medina. Rather than simply tearing the minarets down, he made the extraordinary decision to cover them up. That way he could remove their visual reference to Mecca and still retain their practical function as beacons or watchtowers. This seemingly irrational act is consistent with other of al-Ḥākim's orders at the time: covering up the minarets somehow has its equivalent in his 405/1014–15 edict prohibiting shoemakers from making sandals for women in an effort to discourage public immorality.

FUNCTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Its formal features shed some light on the meaning the Ḥākim mosque had for contemporaries, but the building can also be studied from a functional perspective — how and when it was used — by examining the contemporary accounts of Ibn Zūlāq and al-Musabbīḥ preserved in al-Maqrīzī's Khiyaṭ. These chronicles do not mention the daily and Friday prayers that were held in any of the Fatimid mosques; they do, however, describe the celebration of special holidays, and these provide another key to understanding the many facets of the Ḥākim mosque.

In Fatimid Egypt, three kinds of holiday celebrations involved the participation of the rulers: Muslim holidays, specifically Isma'īli holidays, and local Egyptian festivals of the agricultural calendar. Al-Maqrīzī provides a convenient list of these festivals. They include the Muslim holiday of 'Id al-Fitr and 'Id al-Nahr, which the Fatimids celebrated only at the musalla. The Christian population celebrated Epiphany and Christmas and other holy days without official patronage — and often at the ruler's sufferance — but the festival of Nawrūz, which marked the height of the Nile flood, and the Breaking of the Dike, which signaled the start of a new agricultural year, were celebrated with the approval and participation of the ruler himself.

The specifically Shi'ī-Ismā'īli holidays added quite a number to those celebrated by all Muslims alike. They included the birthdays of 'Ali, Fāṭima, Hasan, and the ruling imam; 'Id Ghadir Khumm, commemorating Muhammad's selection (nāsīh) of 'Ali as his successor, on 18 Dhul-Ḥijja; and the four Fridays of Ramadan, which were given special importance in the Fatimid period. The best descriptions of all these holiday celebrations are to be found in the Khiyaṭ, but since al-Maqrīzī's sources are from the sixth/twelfth century, they do not necessarily reflect the activities of the earlier period under consideration here. Rather than using these late compilations, it is better to rely on the yearly accounts of the Intīāz, supplemented by dated references in the Khiyaṭ. This evidence shows that the Ḥākim mosque was built in a period of great innovation and development in holiday celebration.
There is little, if any, evidence from the Iftiqiyyan Fatimid period for the celebration of holidays in any but a strictly religious manner. The description of the celebration of Ghadir Khumm in 362/973, the year when al-Mu'izz arrived in Egypt, is indicative:

Ibn Zālāq said, “A great number of Egyptians and Maghribis and others who followed them gathered for the sermon, because it was a festival, the Prophet having — on that day — designated 'Ali b. Abī-Tālib as Commander of the Believers and his lieutenant [khallifa]. This pleased al-Mu'izz, for it was the first time it was done in Egypt.”

In the same month, al-Mu'izz rode to open the dīke. Ibn Zālāq described his route and mentioned that it was a big procession. The festival of Ghadir Khumm presents a strictly religious character, the Breaking of the Dike a strictly secular one, but neither festival was comparable in splendor to al-Mu'izz's audience (majlis) of three months earlier.

Eighteen years later, al-'Azīz celebrated the second Friday of Ramadan by riding to the Jāmi' al-Qāhira (al-Azhar) under a golden parasol (muzalla). Five thousand people accompanied him on foot. He held a scepter, wore a mantle (aylasan), and carried a sword. He gave the khutba, prayed, and then left, receiving petitions from the people on the way back to the palace. Al-Musabibī, describing the event, said that “it was a great day which the poets described.”

At the end of the month, al-'Azīz celebrated the 'Īd al-Fītr at the musalla outside the Bāb al-Naṣr. Between the palace and the musalla, mastabas were set up for the muezzins and reciters (fuqaha), “so that the takbīr would be simultaneous from the musalla to the palace.” Accompanied by troops in full regalia, horses with bejeweled golden saddles, an elephant, and a giraffe, the caliph paraded between the lines of people, who had been arranged according to their social station. When the caliph arrived at the musalla, he prayed and gave the khutba as usual.

In this same month — Ramadan 380/990 — the new mosque was probably begun, and on the seventeenth day al-'Azīz gave the khutba and prayed there. This is the first instance of the ruler going to a mosque other than Jāmi' al-Qāhira during Ramadan. The practice was to become standard for the Fatimids.

The description of al-Ḥākim praying in the Jāmi' al-Qāhira in Ramadan 388/998 marks another innovation in the Fatimid celebration of Ramadan:

He wore a cloak [riḍḍ], and carried a sword and a staff. When he gave the khutba, the curtains [hanging from] the qubba [on the minbar] were buttoned up. He gave a shortened khutba which could only be heard by those close by. This was the first Friday. He also prayed another Friday [at the mosque] and the 'Īd al-Fītr at the musalla, where he gave the normal khutba ['aḍ-l-rasīm al-mu'izz] and offered the meal breaking the fast.

This form of khutba, with its buttoning up of the imam in the minbar, also became standard Fatimid practice, for Ibn al-'Uwais described it in minute detail at a much later date.

In the years of al-Ḥākim’s reign that followed, the celebration of Ramadan became more and more formalized. In Ramadan 398/1008, he prayed one Friday in the new mosque he had had built in the Rāshida district. When the Ḥākim mosque was finished in 403/1012–13, al-Ḥākim went one step further and, in Ramadan, prayed once in the Jāmi' Rāshida, once in the mosque outside the Bāb al-Futūb (that is, the Ḥākim mosque), and once in the Jāmi' al-Āṭiq in Miṣr, “the first of the Fatimid caliphs to pray there.” The following year in Ramadan, the process was complete, for he prayed in all four congregational mosques. After that, the celebration of the four Fridays of Ramadan was institutionalized. The imam visited the four congregational mosques of the city in succession, a practice that became standard for the Fatimids forty years after their arrival, but is found nowhere else in contemporary practice.

The four mosques where the imam prayed were al-Azhar, al-Ḥākim, Rāshida, and 'Amr. The Qarāfa mosque was never used for these celebrations, because it had a special role as a funerary mosque for women. Ibn Ṭūlūn, the other great congregational mosque of the city, was not then used for the Ramadan prayers, although it was kept in repair and was used in Ramadan in later years.

The Jāmi' al-Qāhira — the Azhar mosque — had special prominence as the first mosque built by the Fatimids in Egypt. In 378/988–89, the role of this mosque was expanded when al-'Azīz, at the suggestion of his vizier Ya'qūb b. Killis, ordered a group of fuqaha to build a house for themselves next to the mosque. The establishment of resident legists marks the inauguration of the mosque's role as a teaching institution.

Construction of the mosque outside the Bāb al-Futūb was begun around 379 or 380 (988–90) by al-'Azīz, also at the suggestion of the vizier Ibn Killis. Work began anew on the mosque in 393/1002–03 and construction of another mosque, the Jāmi' al-Rāshida, which al-Ḥākim located on a site overlooking the Birkat al-Ḥabash, began in the same year. That mosque was finished by
Ramadan 398/1008, when al-Hākim prayed in it.\textsuperscript{133} It is possible that the mosques visited during Ramadan were those constructed with the rulers' patronage, for each of these three mosques was built — or at least started — by one of the three rulers. The Friday Ramadan prayer in the mosque of 'Amr in 403/1013 disproves the theory, however, for al-Hākim was the first of the Fatimid caliphs to use this mosque, and it is identified not with the rulers but with one of the Companions of the Prophet. Nevertheless, the Fatimids did not ignore this venerable mosque: in 378/988–89, under al-'Aziz's orders, Ibn Killis built a fountain in this mosque;\textsuperscript{134} in the following year the vizier removed the minbar of Qurra b. Sharik and substituted a gilded one;\textsuperscript{135} in 387/997, at the beginning of al-Hākim's reign, the mosque was whitewashed anew, some mosaics removed, and gilded, engraved plaques put in place.\textsuperscript{136} Fatimid patronage was thus not limited to the mosques which they had built. Patronage alone still does not explain the general increase in the ceremonial celebration of Ramadan and its localization in four congregational mosques of the city.

Another possible explanation for the elaboration of ceremony is the influence of local Egyptian customs. Nothing would have been more normal for the Fatimids, in their efforts to win popular support, than to take on the local holidays — such as the Breaking of the Dike or Nawrūz — or to make their own holidays more like Egyptian ones. Undoubtedly both processes were at work. The official celebration of secular Egyptian holidays at the expense of Christian ones can be discerned as early as 381/991, when al-'Aziz paraded to open the dikes\textsuperscript{137} but prohibited the festivities accompanying 'Īd al-Ṣaḥb, the Discovery of the Cross.\textsuperscript{138} The public spectacle associated with these new celebrations of Muslim and Shi'a holidays was accessible and visible to the entire Egyptian community.

Still, Egyptian practices do not fully explain the increasing ceremony and localization of festivals during this period. Nor do 'Abbasid ceremonial practices provide a source. Derived from a Persian tradition of the static ruler, 'Abbasid ceremony was localized in the palace and did not involve the processions characteristic of Fatimid celebrations.\textsuperscript{139}

Nearly thirty years ago, Marius Canard examined the relationship between Fatimid and Byzantine ceremonial by comparing texts preserved in al-Maqrīzī's Khīyat with Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos's Book of Ceremonies.\textsuperscript{140} This otherwise important study lacks chronological precision, however, since Canard's Byzantine source comes from the tenth century a.d. and his Muslim sources come from the twelfth, the very end of the Fatimid period. Now that some of the innovations in Fatimid ceremonial can be ascribed to a period only slightly later than Constantine's manual, Canard's discussion of Fatimid-Byzantine parallels gains credence.

Although the correspondence between Fatimid and Byzantine ceremonial is never exact, the parallels are striking: al-Azhār was certainly pre-eminent among the mosques the Fatimids built, but it never played the kind of role that Hagia Sophia did. The caliph's visiting four mosques during Ramadan has its parallel in the emperor's visiting churches during the Easter season: the Church of the Holy Apostles was visited on Easter Monday.\textsuperscript{141} Saint Sergios on Easter Tuesday.\textsuperscript{142} The Fatimid caliph paraded in state to the mosques and festival places much as the emperor paraded through the city on his way to these churches.\textsuperscript{143} The unusual form of Fatimid khutba, where the caliph gave the khutba from inside a curtained minbar, is similar to the Byzantine celebration of the mass at an altar enclosed in the bema by curtains.\textsuperscript{144}

In view of the number and quality of these parallels, Byzantine ceremonial, rather than 'Abbasid or Egyptian customs, offers the most convincing source for the development of Fatimid ceremonies and for some of the unusual features of Fatimid architecture as well — the domes in the rear corners of the prayer halls of early Fatimid congregational mosques, for example. These domes, which became standard features of the mosques, must have been places of some ceremonial significance. Textual evidence is still lacking for this early period, but established parallels allow us to imagine that these spaces — perhaps closed off by curtains — were set aside, just as the pastophoria of Byzantine churches were, for special functions associated with the service. If this hypothesis holds, these "rooms" would have served some of the functions which the dār al-imāra, formerly adjacent to the mosque, had served in Umayyad and 'Abbasid times. Nevertheless, until much more work is done on the chronology of ceremonial practices, these more general questions will have to remain unanswered.

The Hākim mosque can, then, be explained functionally in ceremonial terms: the Fatimids created an imperial setting in the city and a stage for the performance of imperial pageants. This imperial policy can be traced in part to Ya'qūb b. Killis, the vizier who had ordered the construction of the Hākim mosque and was also the architect of the
Fatimid financial and administrative system, the most centralized and hierarchial administration ever known in Islam up to that point. In it, the imam, as God’s representative on earth, was the source of all power, ruling over administrative, judiciary, and missionary bureaucracies headed respectively by the vizier, the qadi, and the chief missionary. The Hākim mosque symbolizes this new Fatimid concept of the imam’s power in all its features. The inscriptions of the first stage constantly reiterate the role of the imam in Isma’il thought; the use of architectural features recognizably associated with those of the holiest shrine in Islam also contributes to the image of the imam as head of the faith. In its scale, it is an eloquent monument to Fatimid power at its apogee and marks the culmination of the first century of Fatimid rule, when Cairo was transformed from an accidental capita into a splendid imperial city.

A comparison of the Hākim mosque to the first mosque built by the Fatimids at al-Mahdiyya measures the distance traveled. Although the formal elements of its design can and should be traced to the tradition of Fatimid mosque architecture, the mosque displays an incredible wealth of new symbolic references — Isma’il, Meccan, and ceremonial — as well. This range of references, drawing upon Muslim, Fatimid, and contemporary Byzantine traditions, underscores the role of this congregational mosque at the seat of a Mediterranean empire.

Harvard University
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exterior Location</th>
<th>Reproduction and Reference</th>
<th>Translation and Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marble plaque: whereabouts unknown</td>
<td>J. von Hammer-Purgstall, &quot;Inscription confuse de la mosquée de Hakim bi-Emrillah,&quot; <em>Journal asiatique</em>, 3rd ser., vol. 5 (1838), p. 390; <em>RCEA</em>, 2089.</td>
<td>[Bismillah] &quot;Yet We desired to be gracious to those that were abased in the land, and to make them leaders, and to make them inheritors&quot; [Qur'an 28:4]. This is what the slave and friend of God, Abū 'Ali al-Manṣūr, the Imām al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh, Commander of the Believers — may the blessings of God be on him and on his pure ancestors — ordered to be done in the month of Rajab of the year 393.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. West minaret: middle band</td>
<td>Flury, <em>Ornamente</em>, pl. 33:1-3; <em>RCEA</em>, 2090.</td>
<td>&quot;The Mercy of God and His blessings be upon you. O people of the House! Surely He is All-Laudable, All-Glorious&quot; [fragment of Qur'an 11:73]. This is what the slave of God and His Friend, al-Manṣūr Abū 'Ali, the Imām al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh, Commander of the Believers — may the blessings of God be on him and on his rightly guided ancestors — ordered to be done in the month of Rajab of the year 393.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. West minaret: lower band</td>
<td>Flury, <em>Ornamente</em>, pl. 32:4; <em>RCEA</em>, 2091.</td>
<td>[Bismillah] &quot;Only he shall inhabit God's places of worship who believes in God and the Last Day, and performs the prayer, and pays the alms, and fears none but God alone; it may be that those will be among the guided&quot; [Qur'an 9:18]. This is what al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh, Commander of the Believers . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. North minaret: lower band</td>
<td>Flury, <em>Ornamente</em>, p. 18, fig. 4; <em>MAE</em>, 1, pl. 25d; <em>RCEA</em>, 2092.</td>
<td>&quot;Now there has come to you a Messenger from among yourselves; grievous to him is your suffering; anxious is he over you, gentle to the believers, compassionate&quot; [Qur'an 9:128]. This is what the slave of God and His Friend, al-Manṣūr Abū 'Ali, the Imām al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh, Commander of the Believers — may God's blessings be upon him and on his pure ancestors — ordered — Rajab of the year —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. North minaret: third band, west window</td>
<td><em>MAE</em>, 1, pl. 24b.</td>
<td>&quot;God is the Light of the heavens and the earth; the likeness of His Light is as a niche wherein is a lamp (the lamp in a glass, the glass as it were a glittering star) kindled from a Blessed Tree, an olive&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Location</td>
<td>Reproduction and Reference</td>
<td>Translation and Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. North minaret: third band, north window</td>
<td><em>MAE</em>, 1, pl. 24a.</td>
<td>&quot;that is neither of the East nor of the West whose oil well-nigh would shine, even if no fire touched it; Light upon Light (God guides to His Light whom He will). And God strikes similitudes for men, and God has knowledge of everything.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. North minaret: third band, east window</td>
<td><em>MAE</em>, 1, fig. 36.</td>
<td>&quot;in temples God has allowed to be raised up, and His Name to be commemorated therein; therein glorifying Him, in the mornings and the evenings, are men whom neither commerce nor trafficking diverts from the remembrance of God and to perform the prayer, and to pay the alms,&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. North minaret: third band, south window</td>
<td></td>
<td>[&quot;fearing a day when hearts and eyes shall be turned about, that God may recompense them for their fairest works and give them increase of His bounty; and God provides whomsoever He will, without reckoning&quot; (Qur'an 24:35–38)].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. North minaret: second band, northeast medallion</td>
<td><em>MAE</em>, 1, p. 24d.</td>
<td>&quot;Your friend is only God, and His Messenger, and the believers who perform the prayer and pay the alms, and bow them down&quot; [Qur'an 5:55].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;[In the field of the medallion:] From the shadows into the light&quot; [Qur'an 5:16; 14:1,5; 33:43; 57:9; or 65:11].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;And say: 'My Lord, lead me in with a just ingoing, and lead me out with a just outgoing'&quot; [Qur'an 17:80].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>——— [?] [End of eulogy or Qur'anic verse]. This is what al-Manṣūr the Imām al-Ḥākim bi-Amr Allāh, Commander of the Believers — may God's blessings be upon him and his pure ancestors — ordered . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. North minaret: entrance to stair</td>
<td><em>MAE</em>, 1, p. 23a and d; <em>MCIA Egypte</em>, 2, p. 127, no. 580.</td>
<td>&quot;[But those who fear their Lord — for them shall be gardens underneath which rivers flow, therein dwelling forever — a hospitality God himself offers; and that which is with] God is better for the pious . . .&quot; [fragment of Qur'an 3:198].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Six limestone blocks in Islamic Museum</td>
<td><em>MCIA Egypte</em>, 1, pl. 22; <em>MCIA Egypte</em>, 2, pl. 2; <em>RCEA</em>, 2093.</td>
<td>According to Creswell (p. 88) these verses appear on the salient frieze: &quot;God and His angels bless the Prophet. O Believers, do you also bless him, and pray him peace&quot; [Qur'an 33:56].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12. Main portal | *MAE*, 1, pl. 17. | "And those who have taken a mosque in opposition and unbelief, and
to divide the believers, and as a place of ambush for those who fought God and His Messenger aforetime — they will swear “We desired nothing but good”; and God testifies they are truly liars” [fragment of Qur’an 9:107].

“Corrupt women for corrupt men, and corrupt men for corrupt women; good women for good men, and good men for good women — these are declared quit of what they say; theirs shall be forgiveness and generous provision. O believers, do not enter houses other than your houses until you first ask leave and salute the people thereof; that is better for you; haply you will remember. And if you find not anyone therein, enter it not until leave is given to you. And if you are told, ‘Return,’ return; that is purer for you; and God knows the things you do” [Qur’an 24:26-28].

“O believers, when proclamation is made for prayer on the Day of Congregation, hasten to God’s remembrance and leave trafficking aside; that is better for you, did you but know” [Qur’an 62:9].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior Location</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Dome before mihrab</td>
<td>Qur’an 48:1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Central aisle</td>
<td>Qur’an 48:5-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Left side: qibla riwaq</td>
<td>Qur’an 48:11-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Left side: second riwaq</td>
<td>Qur’an 3:1-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Left side: fourth riwaq</td>
<td>Qur’an 6:1-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Right side: second riwaq</td>
<td>Qur’an 36:1-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Right side: third riwaq</td>
<td>Qur’an 2:255-86 (ff.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Right side: fourth riwaq</td>
<td>Qur’an 2:1-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Right side: fifth riwaq</td>
<td>Qur’an 4:1-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>