SUQ AL-MA'RIFA: AN AYYUBID HANBALITE SHRINE IN AL-HARAM AL-SHARIF

Perhaps one of the most effective means of asserting Islamic hegemony over Jerusalem after the Crusades was to inundate the holy city with institutions promulgating Sunni Islam. They not only surrounded the Haram on its western and northern sides, the two sides coterminous with the city, but suffused public life with an intensity rivaled only by the capital Cairo itself. However, as the sites available precluded emulating the elaborate spatial schemes of the Cairene madrasa, narrow Haram frontages were transformed into panels of virtuosic decoration to compensate for the absence of volumetric expression.

Despite the confluence of Cairene and Syrian styles in Jerusalem, points of departure can also be clearly delineated, most notably in the reintroduction of the dome into the Islamic architectural repertoire of the Haram not only for the purpose of commemoration, but also as a symbol for the transmission of knowledge. Such domes surmount loggias built atop the western and southern porticoes of the Haram, a composition hitherto unknown in the architecture from the medieval period of the Muslim Middle East. These domed loggias represented not only a new architectural combination, but the adoption of the dome in a new context. Previously, the principal association of the dome, other than in mosque contexts, was commemorative or funerary.

In post-reconquest Jerusalem one can discern several stages of development. The dome first appeared over a a free-standing chamber with a commemorative function, an architectural type known, at least in the Haram context, as a qubba. The dome then continued in use as part of the qubba composition, but now strictly in buildings used for teaching. The dome's exclusive association with teaching was uncommon in the architecture of Syria and Egypt. Finally the dome is incorporated into complex architectural structures, of which the most novel are the madrasas with hanging domed loggias. In these instances the dome is associated with teaching structures, often covering an assembly hall. The dome thus lost its predominantly commemorative/funerary association in the setting of the Haram in Jerusalem.

The thrust of this paper is to bring to light, in view of the dome’s changing use and novel introduction into the loggias of the Haram, a long-vanished loggia-like Hanbalite shrine dubbed in the sources the Suq al-Ma’rifa, where transmission of knowledge, daily worship, and Haram rituals amalgamated to form an architectural composition quite singular in the visual milieu of the Haram. Although this research was largely instigated by my discovery of the Suq al-Ma’rifa in a number of nineteenth-century visual sources, it frames this shrine within the broader subject of the Ayyubid reconsecration of the Haram to Islam, a reconsecration that emphasized the continuity of Muslim life in the holy city by harking back to the practices of the Sunni revival in Jerusalem under the Seljuqs shortly before its fall to the Crusaders. This praxis and, above all, the holy sites and shrines it animated were preserved in the collective memory of the umma during the ninety years of Crusader rule despite the slaughter of almost all the Muslim and Jewish population.

It was preserved through the Padda’l Bayt al-Maqdis (Merits of Jerusalem), a genre of panegyrical treatises which proliferated during the suspension of Muslim life in the holy city. Though this proliferation may be seen as an expression of bereavement, it was largely promoted by the sojourns of numerous scholars in Jerusalem shortly after its return to the Sunni fold under the Seljuqs in the two decades immediately preceding its fall to the Crusaders.

The reconsecration campaign launched by Salah al-Din was continued by his nephew al-Mu’azzam 'Isa, during whose reign some major institutional transformations took place. Al-Mu’azzam’s architectural patronage in al-Haram prefigured the major developments undertaken by the Mamluks. However, his patronage remains a largely untapped source, mainly because it has been overshadowed by his disman-
ding of the walls of Jerusalem in 1219.¹ That such a thing should have been done by the ruler who is credited with building the walls of Damascus² as well as repairing the walls of Jerusalem a few years earlier³ is ironic, and it has to be viewed within the wider frame of Ayyubid-Crusader politics during this period.⁴

With the aid of travelers' accounts, Orientalist painting, early photography, and reports of engineering expeditions to Jerusalem. I will attempt to reconstruct the shrine and trace its architectural origins in the Haram, keeping in mind parallel developments in Damascus, the political mainstay of Jerusalem during most of the Ayyubid period. As the structure is a hybrid of two architectural types, I will first analyze the evolution and define the semiotics of each of the two types separately. Then, the meanings of the two types will be revisited as they coalesce to form an innovative ensemble.

**Jerusalem Reconsecrated to Islam**

Jerusalem's return to the Muslim fold after ninety years of Crusader rule ended the torpor with which Islamic life in the holy city had been afflicted. Salah al-Din, who reconquered Jerusalem on the anniversary of Muhammad's Night Journey, initiated the second period of Muslim sovereignty over the holy city by reconsecrating al-Haram al-Sharif to Islam. The Aqsa Mosque was believed by the Crusaders to have been the site of the royal palace of King Solomon (hence the Latin name Templum Salomonis). In 1119, the Crusader king of Jerusalem gave part of the Aqsa Mosque, where his palace was housed, to a group of aristocratic warriors trained in a semi-monastic discipline and dedicated to protecting the pilgrims in the Holy Land. These "monks of war," who, in western Europe, ranked among the leading defenders of Christendom, were known as the Knights Templars after the site of their headquarters. The Templars expanded their headquarters in 1131 to include the whole of the Aqsa Mosque, and the royal palace was moved to the Tower of David. By 1140, control of the Haram had largely passed from the hands of the Augustinian canons, the original custodians of the sacred site, to the Templars.

The vaults beneath the mosque, which were originally built to support the southern section of the platform, were used by the knights as stables. Hence the name "Stables of Solomon." Direct access to this underground structure from outside the city was provided by a new gate, the so-called Single Gate, which pierced the southern wall of the platform. Parts to east and west of the nave of al-Aqsa Mosque, much of its eastern, western and northern façades, the first version of its porch in front of the main (northern) façade, the eastern vaulted annexes (cleared away during the repairs of 1938-42), and a great hall that extends westwards from the mosque (today the Women's Mosque and part of the Islamic Museum) are attributed to the Crusaders (1199-1187).⁵ Salah al-Din's conquest foiled a Templar plan to erect a new church next to the Aqsa Mosque, which was reported first by John of Würzburg and later by Theodorich (1172) to be underway.⁶

Salah al-Din ordered the whole qibla wall including the mihrab redecorated, and installed the minbar made in Aleppo in 1169 for the Aqsa Mosque at the order of Nur al-Din Zengi, the saint-king under whose tutelage Salah al-Din's military career began. The Qubbah al-Silsila (Dome of the Chain), which had been dedicated as a chapel to St. James, and the Dome of the Rock, consecrated by the Knights as the Temple Domini ca. 1142 and on the northern side of whose platform the Augustinian canons had built the Temple Convent, were stripped of any remaining crucifixes and icons. Beneath the marble covering the Rock, the Muslims found the marks of the chips the monks had carved and sold in Constantinople and Sicily as relics from the temple. The Rock was washed with rose water in a special ceremony by the Ayyubid prince Taqi al-Din 'Umar ibn Shahinshah.⁷ Al-'Imad al-Isfahani (d. 1201), who participated in the liberation ceremony, which took place in al-Aqsa Mosque on the first Friday after the conquest and over which Salah al-Din himself presided, recounts that Salah al-Din transferred many copies of the Qur'an to both the Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock.⁸ To complete the reassertion of the Islamic character of the sanctuary, an inscription was introduced above one of its entrances declaring the premises forbidden to Christians.⁹

A full reconsecration to Islam, however, necessitated grafting emblems of Muslim ideology in and around the Haram al-Sharif, involving measures whose execution was to take up the whole of Ayyubid and most of Mamluk rule. Salah al-Din endowed the Madrasa al-Salihiyun in the Church of the Monastery of St. Anne (Crusader, ca. 1140) in 1192 to impart Ash'arite doctrine and Shafi'i law, the two most important constituents of the Sunni creed officially
esposed by the Ayyubids. A number of other Ayyubid institutions of learning were endowed in newly built structures, partly, and often preponderantly, constructed from spolia from dismantled Crusader buildings. One documented foundation is the Madrasa al-Afdal, built by al-Malik al-Afdal Nur al-Din ‘Ali, son of Salah al-Din (r. Damascus 1189-96, d. 1225). Despite the Shafi’ite monopoly on jurisprudence during the Ayyubid period, it was dedicated to the Malikite rite, and was located in today’s Jewish quarter, the part of the city endowed by al-Afdal in 1194 for the many immigrants from North Africa who settled in Jerusalem shortly after the conquest and helped repopulate the city, hence the name “Harat al-Maghari-ba” (Maghribi quarter). It was probably around this time that the Jam‘ al-Maghariha (Maghribi Mosque) was founded in the Ayyubid neighborhood occupying the western side of the southwestern corner of the Haram. This mosque was identified by Mujir al-Din al-Hanbali (d. 1521), the author of our main historiographical source of the holy city from the post-Crusade period, as the official prayer place for the adherents of the Malikite rite, a most logical arrangement given the Malikite preponderance in the Maghrib.

The Shafi’ite monopoly on jurisprudence in Syria somewhat abated under the influence of al-Mu‘azzam ‘Isa, governor of Damascus and Jerusalem for his father al-Malik al-Adil I Sayf al-Din from 1200 until 1218, and sultan of the Syrian flank of the Ayyubid state from 1218 until 1227. A staunch adherent of the Hanafite rite, al-Mu‘azzam ‘Isa (d. 1227) was in fact the first in the Ayyubid house to abandon the Shafi’ite doctrine, a legacy which he bequeathed to his sons. A man of great erudition, he composed the work known as al-Sahm al-musib fi al-radd ‘alâ al-Khatib as a rebuttal of the vilification of Imam Abu Hanifa in Tarihik Baghdad by al-Khatib al-Baghdadi (d. 1072). He dismissed the Shafi‘ite khatib (orator) of the Aqsa Mosque and replaced him with a Hanafite jurist from Baghdad by the name of Shihab al-Din, a lecturer at the Hanafite madrasa known as al-Amjadiyya, at one of the gates of the Haram. Although the Shafi‘ites retained the imamate of the Dome of the Rock, al-Mu‘azzam issued an edict prohibiting the mu‘azzins of the Haram from performing their tafhîl (repeating aloud the takâbih and certain invocations to the imam, for all to hear) except for the prayers led by the Hanafite imam of the Aqsa Mosque. Al-Mu‘azzam built the Hanafite madrasa known as al-Mu‘azzamiyya in 1217-18 on Tariq al-Mujahidin (the easternmost section of the Via Dolorosa) north of al-Haram al-Sharif. One of his princes, the amir Badr al-Din Muhammad ibn Abi al-Qasim al-Hakari, endowed al-Madrasa al-Badriyya near the Damascus Gate in 1213-14 for the Shafi‘ites. Al-Mu‘azzam is also reported by Mujir al-Din to have given the Hanbalites permission to found in the southwestern corner of the Haram their prayer place known as the Suq al-Ma‘rifa (Market of Knowledge). No transmission of knowledge is reported by Mujir al-Din in connection with this place, which, by the time he was composing his compendium, had already been superseded, at least as a prayer place for the Hanbalites, by a prayer hall in one of the madrasas embedded in the western portico of the Haram. In fact, he does not rule out the possibility that a name like Suq al-Ma‘rifa, which connotes edification and learning, was spuriously contrived by the servants of the Haram in order to elevate the status of the building to that of a pilgrimage site.

THE AYYUBID QUBBA IN JERUSALEM AS AN AUTONOMOUS INSTITUTION OF LEARNING

The early Islamic practice of constructing mihrabs, domed shrines, and edicules on the Haram platform to commemorate Qur‘anic events and prophets was resumed by the Ayyubids. Salah al-Din built the domed structure known as Qubbat Yusuf on the southern side of the platform of the Dome of the Rock. Two domed polygonal structures, the Qubbat al-Mi‘raj (Dome of the Ascension, 1200-1), and Qubbat Sulayman (ca. 1200), which resemble in their general composition the Umayyad Qubbat al-Silsila, were built from Crusader-building spolia. Some of these new, free-standing domed chambers were used for teaching. Amir Husam al-Din al-Mu‘azzami, the viceroy of al-Mu‘azzam ‘Isa in Jerusalem, built the domed chamber and its annex known as al-Qubba al-Nahawiyah (Dome of Grammar) at the southwestern corner of the platform of the Dome of the Rock (fig. 1) in 1207-8 at the behest of al-Mu‘azzam ‘Isa, then governor of Damascus. In his Tarihik al-Islam wa waqayît al-mashâhir wa al-‘âlam, a voluminous fourteenth-century tabaqat-style chronicle, Shams al-Din al-Dhahabi (d. 1348) describes al-Mu‘azzam as a litterateur and a Hanafite faqih, and a scholar who had a special relish for the sciences of the Arabic language, particularly grammar. He studied the work of the famous grammarian Sibawayh, a commentary on it by al-Sirafi, and Abu ‘Ali al-Farisi’s al-Mu‘azzam fi al-qur‘ah, the standard work on the variant...
readings of the Qur'an, with the renowned grammarian Taj al-Din al-Kindi (d. 1217), and memorized al-Farisi's al-Idāh fi al-nahw.25 He held a famous council outside the Dome of the Rock to discuss various philological and theological questions when he visited Jerusalem as sultan in 1226.26 The entrance to the Qubbah al-Nahawiyah boasts two white marble Crusader columns carved in a braided design, a feature to be seen on the double gate Bab al-Sakina/Bab al-Silsila in the western portico of the Haram al-Sharif. The gates were rebuilt between 1187 and 1199.27

In his Musarrīj al-kurāb fi akhkhār Bani Ayyūb, the standard chronicle for the Ayyubids, Ibn Wasil al-Hamawi (d. 1298) credits al-Mu'azzam 'Isa with constructing a qubbah in the Haram which was dedicated to the teaching of the variant readings of the Qur'an (al-qirā'at al-sab'), and for which al-Mu'azzam 'Isa established a generous waqf restricted to the Hanafites. In 1226-27 in this qubbah, Ibn Wasil was given a lesson in the art of reciting the Qur'an (tajwīd) from its first appointed instructor Shams al-Din Razin al-Ba'albaki, a student of al-Mu'azzam 'Isa's instructor of nahw and qirā'at Taj al-Din al-Kindi.28 Ibn Wasil's recitation of the treatise of Abi 'Ali al-Farisi al-Nahawī (d. 987-88), al-Idāh fi al-nahw, to al-Ba'albaki there suggests that the qubbah's curriculum included grammar, a critical pendant to the science of qirā'at.

Also dating from al-Mu'azzam's term as governor (1200-18), a period of relative calm and prosperity in Jerusalem, was the rebuilding of the Nasiriya Zawiyah atop the Bab al-Rahma (Golden Gate) in 1214.29 According to Mujir al-Din, the zawiya was named after Shaykh Nasr ibn Ibrahim al-Maqdisi al-Nabulsi (d. 1096), who wrote famous treatises on Shafi'i law and whom the Shaykh al-Hijaz50 'Aṣif al-Din al-Ya'fī (d. 1367) called "the Shaykh of the Shafi'iites in the whole of Syria."31 It was later known as al-Ghazaliyya, after Imam Abu Hamid al-Ghazali (d. 1111), who was said to have written his monumental book, Iḥyā' 'ulūm al-din, there.32 Al-Mu'azzam, according to Mujir al-Din, made it a zawiya for reciting the Qur'an and studying grammar and endowed it with books. When Mujir al-Din wrote, the zawiya was no longer in existence; he stumbled across its copy of Ya'qub ibn al-Sakit's Islāh
al-Mantis with the waqf date of 1214 inscribed on its back. Given this date and function, it is possible that this hanging zawiya was a third qubba. Sultan al-Salih Najm al-Din Ayyub, who put an end to the second Crusader occupation with the aid of the Khwarizmians in 1244, added another domed chamber, known as the Qubbat Musa, to the free-standing Ayyubid domed structures in the sanctuary in 1249 (fig. 1). Mujir al-Din mentions that this qubba was dedicated, at least during the Mamluk period, to teaching the hadith, and had, for that purpose, an appointed imam or muhaddith, such as Sharaf al-Din ibn Qasim al-Adrari al-Qudsi (d. 1354).34

SELJUK JERUSALEM AND THE MISSING LINK

The detached domed chamber is a composition peculiar to the commemorative/funerary architecture ubiquitous in medieval Islam. Its utilization by al-Mu'azzam 'Isa for teaching purposes in place of the iwan — the more common form of teaching hall in the medieval Muslim east — is puzzling, particularly given the consistency of Muslim architecture in Egypt and Syria, the two cultural mainstays of Jerusalem. According to Creswell, Syrian madrasas from the middle of the twelfth century until the end of the thirteenth all had a collegiate masjid taking up the whole of the qibla side of a courtyard and almost always roofed by a central dome with tunnel vaulting to the right and left. However, the teaching took place in an iwan occupying most of one of the three remaining façades of the courtyard, and in those madrasas dedicated to more than one rite, a second iwan was introduced on one of the two remaining sides of the courtyard.35 Domes attached to the madrasas of Cairo during the Ayyubid and Mamluk periods were invariably funerary: the qibla side of the courtyard was always occupied by a large iwan which served, among other things, as a prayer hall.

One chapter, however, is missing from that story. Namely the Muslim architecture of the Syrian cities destroyed by the Crusaders in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries. Fortunately, the journey of the Andalusian Malikite qadi Abu Bakr Muhammad ibn al-'Arabi al-Ma'afiri (d. 1148) and his father 'Abdullah to the Muslim east from April 1092 until shortly after November 1099 provides a rare glimpse into the religious institutions of Jerusalem on the eve of its fall to the Crusaders on 15 July 1099.36 Ibn al-'Arabi's accounts of religious life in the holy city can be gleaned from his description of their journey in two of his books, Tarikh al-arabi li al-targhib fi al-millah (which, according to the author, was destroyed during the Crusader sack of Jerusalem), and Qasam al-ta'wil, which has survived.37 Sporadic accounts of his journey are also preserved in his monumental treatise on the juridical verses of the Qur'an entitled Akhám al-Qur'án, as well as smaller works. These accounts are of paramount importance since they are probably the only known Muslim eyewitness accounts of the holy city during the Seljuk period, and therefore help fill the gap between Nasir-i Khusraw's Safarnama composed ca. 1047 and the descriptive accounts of the conquest of 1187. They also form a critical Muslim counterpart to the Geniza letters from this period.

The Fatimids were defeated in Jerusalem and Ramla by the Turkmen under Asiz ibn Oq al-Khwarizmi (al-Aqsi), a commander of the Great Seljuk (Iraq and Persia) sultan Alp Arslan (r. 1063-72), in 1071.38 Asiz captured Damascus from the Fatimids and returned it to the Abbasid fold in 1076,39 only to be killed there by Alp Arslan's son Taj al-Din Tutush (r. 1078-95) in 1078.40 He bestowed Jerusalem on Artuq ibn Ekseh, the founder of the Artuqid dynasty in Diyarbakir.41 The Fatimid troops under al-Afdal ibn Badr al-Jamali wrested Jerusalem from Artuq's sons Sökmen and Il-Ghazi in 1098 after bombarding the walls for forty days.42 The Fatimid commander İthikhal al-Dawla lost it in turn to the Crusaders the following year.43 Despite the complete suspension of Muslim life in Jerusalem for ninety years, many aspects of its academic religious life under the Ayyubids were essentially reintroduced and revived; their foundations were laid with the official reinstatement of Sunni Islam under the Seljuqs. Though physically uprooted by the Franks and though one cannot speak of a Jerusalemite community in diaspora, because almost all its Muslim and Jewish population were put to the sword,44 these foundations were nonetheless preserved in the collective memory of the umma and its ulama.

Ibn al-'Arabi's father was a high-ranking statesman under the Taifa king al-Mu'tamid ibn 'Abbad (r. 1069-91) in Seville. The capture of that city by the Almoravids in 1091 may have caused the father and the son to seek a less turbulent environment, although it is generally believed that pilgrimage to Mecca and the pursuit of the sciences of the Muslim east (al-Mashriq) were the main reason behind the journey. Ibn al-'Arabi was present when a book dealer offered his father and a group of jurists a set of books which had belonged to
al-Simmâni and al-Bâji, two scholars of the Ash’ârite school of rationalist theology. Having heard the crowd describe the books as great works brought to al-Andalus by al-Bâji from the Mashriq, but which represented branches of knowledge still unknown in al-Andalus, Ibn al-‘Arabi was profoundly intrigued and determined to go there. Their journey ultimately became a semi-official embassy to the Abbasid caliph al-Mustazhir (r. 1094-1118) in Baghdad in 1098 for the al-Moravid (Amir al-Muslinin wa Nâsir al-Din) Yusuf ibn Tashufin, ruler of North Africa (r. 1061-1106) and Muslim Spain (after 1086); Ibn al-‘Arabi’s return to Seville in 1099 shortly after his father’s death in Alexandria in Muharram (November) 1099 with the caliph’s diploma of investiture (taqlid) conferring rule of the Maghrâb and al-Andalus on Ibn Tashufin prompted Ibn Khalduhn (d. 1406) to present their embassy as the main reason behind the journey. Interestingly though, Imam Abu Hamid al-Ghazâlî reports that during the hajj (1099), Ibn al-‘Arabi and his father entreated the pilgrims in Mecca to pray to God to grant Yusuf ibn Tashufin and his prefect in Seville victory over the Christian armies in Spain. After his arrival in Jerusalem in 1098, Ibn al-‘Arabi was so entranced with the galaxy of scholars he met there that performing the hajj became ancillary to his quest for knowledge; he made his father postpone the journey for one year. In addition to the resident ulama of Jerusalem, one of the most notable of whom was ’Ata’ al-Maqdisi, Ibn al-‘Arabi met many accomplished Muslim scholars who had come to the Holy Land from many parts of the Muslim world during this post-Fatimid period, either as pilgrims such as al-Zawzani and al-Zinjâni from Khurasan to al-Masjid al-Aqsa and al-Khalil, or to partake of al-Masjid al-Aqsa’s scholarly activities as did Qadi al-Qudat Abu ’l-Ma’âlî Mujalli ibn Jumay’ al-Makhzumi (d. 1156), a leading authority on Shafî’ite jurisprudence in Egypt. The two Andalusians left Jerusalem in 1096 for Baghdad, to which they also returned after the hajj season of that year, propelled by Ibn al-‘Arabi’s yearning for further pursuit of knowledge in Baghdad. It was then that he finally met Imam Abu Hamid al-Ghazâlî, under whom he studied.

Ibn al-‘Arabi provides important accounts of the numerous scholarly meetings he attended in Jerusalem, where theological debates were held not only between orthodox Muslim theologians and schismatic groups like the Mu’tazîlis, Karamites, and al-Mushabbîhâ (anthropomorphists), but also between Muslims and Jews. Once a debate was opened by a rabbi named al-Tastari whose eloquence and sagacity impressed Ibn al-‘Arabi. The scholarly community was too engrossed in such debates to pay any attention, for example, to the major altercation that erupted one day at Mihrab Dawud, that involved an entire garrison and caused them to split into two groups cutting each other up. The disparity in intellectual life between Seljuk Jerusalem and contemporary Fatimid Cairo under al-Mustansir (r. 1036-94), where the two Andalusians stopped on their way from Barqa, was striking. In Cairo, Ibn al-‘Arabi found nothing of the perseverance that characterized the circles of learning in Jerusalem. The group of Cairene jurists he encountered were quite indifferent to intellectual developments elsewhere in the Muslim world.

A flourishing Karamite community in Jerusalem is also mentioned by the geographer al-Muqaddasi al-Bashshari (d. 985) in the tenth century, who reports they had khanqahs and held assemblies. With the year 985 as a terminus ante quem, his remark that the population of Tiberias and Qadas, the majority in Amman, and half the people of Nablus were Shi’ite suggests that he was writing in the first years of Fatimid rule over Palestine. Ibn al-‘Arabi’s accounts of scholarly diligence pervasive in the Masjid al-Aqsa contrast sharply with the grim picture painted by al-Muqaddasi who describes Jerusalem as a holy Muslim city with a smattering of scholars whose influence is diluted by a preponderance of Christians (qalalat al-ulama’ kathirat al-Nasîrâ); the masjid was bereft of congregations and councils; intellectual life was stagnant, there were no schools of law like the Malikite and the Dawudiyya, and the Mu’tazîlis were afraid to profess their views. But as the Fatimid dynasty approached a century of rule, a Shi’ite dar al-ilm in Jerusalem, a branch of the Dar al-Ilm al-Fatimiyah of Cairo, seems to have been propagating the Shi’ite creed, for Nasir-i Khusraw, who visited parts of Syria and Palestine, including Jerusalem, in 1047 describes the population of the major cities as Shi’ite. Ibn al-‘Arabi’s description of scholarly efflorescence in the holy city challenges Oleg Grabar’s conclusion that “the situation in Jerusalem had become unbearable long before the Crusaders temporarily suspended Muslim and Jewish life in the city altogether.” Grabar’s conclusion is premature because it is taken from the account of a leading scholar of Jerusalem, the Shafi’ite Nasr ibn Ibrahim (d. 1096), who had left the holy city for Tyre. A Geniza document’s record...
of the Jewish Gaon leaving Jerusalem ca. 1071 led Grabar to the same conclusion.64 Whereas the Gaon’s move from the city was probably precipitated by the Turkmen invasion in that year, neither al-Subki (d. 1370) in his biographical compendium dedicated to the Shafi’ites, Tabaqat al-Shafi’iyya al-kubra,65 nor any of the standard chronicles and biographical dictionaries from the medieval period give any reason for Nasr ibn Ibrahim’s move to Tyre after a long residency in Jerusalem other than the quest for knowledge, particularly the pursuit (sama) and narration (mawāya) of prophetic hadith and related sciences. This was the main reason for travel for Muslim scholars throughout the early and medieval periods. Nasr ibn Ibrahim left his hometown of Nablus and moved between Jerusalem, Tyre, Damascus, Gaza, Diyarbakir, and Amul (in Tabaristan).66 In Damascus Nasr Ibn Ibrahim met Abu Bakr ibn al-’Arabi and transmitted Sahih al-Bukhari to him when the latter made a stop there on his way to Baghdad.67 Ibn al-’Arabi’s list of the scholars he met in Jerusalem includes the renowned Maliki Abu Bakr al-Turtushi (Ibn Abi Randaqah) (d. 1126), who was in Seville a student of the renowned Andalusian scholar Ibn Hazm.68 Jerusalem was a very long way from his hometown of Turtusha (Tortosa), a Muslim frontier town on the northeastern coast of Spain. Having been a major stop for those traveling in pursuit of knowledge (al-rīḥa fi talab al-’ilm) as well as an important pilgrimage site, Jerusalem lived on in the chronicles of these migratory scholars whose claim to the occupied city found poignant expression in the budding Merits of Jerusalem (Fadā’il Bayt al-Maqdis) literature. While bemoaning the tragic loss of the holy city, the fada’il genre enabled the umma to roam the Haram and the valleys of Jerusalem vicariously through the umma and travelers whose descriptions of the holy city and accounts of its sanctity were assiduously compiled by the authors of the fada’il treatises.

The absence of learned Jewish men like the Gaon was short-lived. It can be easily deduced from Ibn al-’Arabi’s narrative that Seljuk Jerusalem was a place of tolerance rather than dogma. It attracted Jewish savants like the outspoken Rabbi al-Tastari, who found in its inter-religious debates an opportunity to outwit his Muslim counterparts. Citing Severus ibn al-Muqaffa, Grabar, in a recent study on pre-Crusade Jerusalem, relates that in 1092 or thereabouts Ghuzz tribesmen appointed a member of the minority Jacobite sect by the name of Mansur al-Balbavi as administrator of the city. However, Grabar does not see that as necessarily reflecting that Seljuk Jerusalem was free of prejudice; he alternatively suggests that chaos may have been so rampant that only a representative from a minority within a minority could be found to run the city.69

**IBN AL-’ARABI IN QUBBAT AL-SILSILA AND THE ORIGIN OF THE AYYUBID “DOME OF LEARNING”**

The institutions of learning that Ibn al-’Arabi encountered during his short but eventful stay in Jerusalem (1093-96) can be divided into two types. The first was the madrasa, of which there were two in Jerusalem: one dedicated to the Shafi’ites at Bab al-Asbat and operated by al-Qadi al-Rashid Yahya ibn ‘Ali (Ibn al-Sa’igh), who was entrusted with the institution by his predecessor Nasr ibn Ibrahim; and the other one, known as the madrasa of Abi ‘Uqba, dedicated to the Hanafites and run by Shaykh al-Qadi al-Rayhani. Such was the standard bifurcation of the functional program of the madrasa, an architectural type emblematic of the Sunni campaign launched by the Seljuqs. Less prevalent doctrines such as that of the Malikites do not seem to have been taught in the standard madrasa building, but in a second type comprising shrines and commemorative structures. Ibn al-’Arabi says that the Malikite scholar Abu Bakr al-Turtushi had a study corner (mawādi) known as al-Ghuwayr, located between Bab al-Asbat (Gate of the Tribes) and the Mihrab Zakariyya.70 Based on Nasir-i Khusraw’s sequential description, both places were on the northern border of the Haram not far from the cloisters of the Sufis, a place of prayer with fine mihrabs.71 Nasir-i Khusraw describes Mihrab Zakariyya as a large, beautiful domed structure on which is inscribed the structure’s identification as the mihrab of Zakariyya the prophet.72 Ibn al-’Arabi went to al-Ghuwayr to meet al-Turtushi but did not find him there. He tracked him down in a place called al-Sakina,73 which, according to Nasir-i Khusraw, is the name of one of the Haram gates; the Ark of the Covenant was once kept there, and in the adjacent vestibule is a mosque with many mihrabs.74 A scholar by the name of Ibn al-Kazaruni used to chant the Qur’an in Mahd “Isa, a small shrine in the southeastern corner of the subterranean part of the Haram known since the Crusader period as the Stables of Solomon. His penetrating voice gripped everyone in the Haram and reached as far as Mount Tur (Tūr Zīta) east of the city.75

Ibn al-’Arabi refers in his Akhām al-Qur’ān to some
of the Haram’s shrines and commemorative structures where he worshiped and studied. He talks about performing the maghreb prayer with a small congregation between Bab al-Akhdar and Bab Hitta, and performing Ramadan evening prayers known as tarawith with an imam in the Mihrab Zakariyya. According to Nāṣir-i Khusraw, the latter was probably a detached shrine covered by a single dome with an inscription. This commemorative structure may have copied the Umayyad Qubbat al-Silsila, the exemplar and earliest extant example of the commemorative gūbbat in the Haram, as its prototype. In addition to being a commemorative monument and a place of worship, the Qubbat al-Silsila served, at least during this period, as a place of learning, as revealed by Ibn al-'Arabī’s account of studying there for long hours, the place in the Haram where he reveled in watching the sun rise above Tur Zita (Mount Tur) to the east, and set behind Mihrib Dawud to the west. This use of a commemorative gūbbat for studying can conceivably be the origin of the Ayyubid non-commemorative/funerary gūbbat operating as an autonomous institution of learning. Interestingly, al-Muʿazzam’s reintroduction of this type is accompanied by his wish to be interred in a simple grave (labd) instead of a domed mausoleum, the standard burial place for a sultan or prince particularly in this period. It is unlikely that his decision was ideologically induced, since his attendance at the Friday prayer in the mausoleum of his uncle Salah al-Dīn proves that he did not completely shun funerary architecture. His ethos may help demystify the disparity between his approaches to the dome.

Ibn Wasil reports that al-Muʿazzam was a man of great modesty and humility, traits which did not detract from his formidability. He would not ride in the usual sultanic pomp (al-sanājīq al-sulṭāniyya), but instead traveled with a very small entourage. In deference to his brother al-Kamil, sultan of the Egyptian flank of the Ayyubid state (r. 1218-38), he ordered the Friday sermon delivered and coins minted with al-Kamil’s name instead of his own. Ibn Wasil also speaks of his great affability, for he saw al-Muʿazzam in Jerusalem beleaguered by throngs of men and women trying to talk to him, yet he did not have anyone pushed away. Ibn Wasil adds that the common term al-muʿazzamī, denoting lack of pretense and affectation, derives from the character of al-Muʿazzam. Al-Dhahabi tells how al-Muʿazzam would descend from the Citadel of Damascus to the house of his shaykh Taj al-Dīn al-Kindī in Darb al-ʿAjam with his book tucked under his armpit. Such humility may account for his reluctance to perpetuate his name via a dome, though he probably also realized that such a funerary dome would have blunted the novel symbolism of his domes in Jerusalem.

FROM DOMED CHAMBER TO DOMED LOGGIA

In 1814, Domingo Badia y Leblich, a Spaniard believed to have been a spy for Napoleon in the Middle East, published the earliest known measured drawings of the Haram al-Sharif in his Voyages en Afrique et en Asie, pendant les années 1803, 1804, 1805, 1806 et 1807. These drawings were the result of the five visits he made to the Haram in 1807, disguised as a "Ali Bey el Abasi." His plan of the Haram shows a sanctuary for each of the four rites of Islamic law: the Maghrībi Mosque in the southwestern corner for the Malikites, the Aqsa Mosque for the Shafiʿites, the Dome of the Rock for the Hanafites, and a hypostyle structure in the southeastern corner described as the "ancien lieu de prières pour le rit hānābi." (fig. 2). One of the madrasas embedded in the western portico is described as the "lieu actuel de prières pour le rit hānābi." These identifications correspond with those of Mujir al-Dīn. The sanctuaries have survived into modern times almost intact, except the hypostyle structure, of which nothing remains (fig. 3). Mujir al-Dīn dubs this curious structure the Suq al-Maʿrīfa (Market of Knowledge), an appellation also used by ʿAbd al-Ghānī al-Nabulsī (d. 1731), who visited the site in 1690.

Both the southeastern and southwestern corners of the Haram platform are fully exposed, unlike the northeastern corner, the eastern side of which is extended towards the north as part of the fortification system, or the northeastern corner, which, though marked by the Bab al-Ghawanimah minaret, is co-terminus with a dense urban fabric. The southwestern corner, however, is contained within the walls, whereas the southeastern one, where the Suq al-Maʿrīfa once stood, is itself one of the corners of the external fortification system (fig. 3). Its conspicuousness, reinforced by the dramatic proportions which the platform’s emergence from Mount Moriah reaches at this corner, explains why the Suq al-Maʿrīfa appears in a number of nineteenth-century depictions and early photographs of the holy city, all of which show two domes rearing up out of its roof. Among the earliest of these depictions is a drawing made in 1817-18 by Louis Comte de Forbin and labeled "Vue de Jérusalem"
Fig. 2. Part of 'Ali Bey's plan of the Haram showing Suq al-Ma'rifā in the southeastern corner. (Plan: from *Voyages en Afrique et en Asie*).

Fig. 3. The southeastern corner of the Haram al-Sharif. View from the Mount of Olives looking west.
prise de la Vallée de Josaphat,” a slightly inaccurate and romanticized view of the Haram platform and the city from the east.  

From 1819 comes a sketch of the Haram platform from the south by Sir Charles Barry (fig. 4), which was enhanced and romanticized by J. M. W. Turner in 1834. Both sketches show the two domes to be identical. Four fairly accurate lithographs of Jerusalem by David Roberts (1838–39) also depict the two domes as identical. One of them, a view of the Haram from the northern part of the city (fig. 5), shows the Suq al-Ma‘rifa’s front elevation (fig. 6). Roberts’s drawings epitomize the romanticizing propensity which permeated the depictions of Jerusalem by the many artists who flocked to the holy city in the nineteenth century. Such depictions usually present a sweeping panoramic view of the Haram al-Sharif and Jerusalem along with its environs from the Mount of Olives.

Two of the most romantic yet adequately accurate paintings of this genre, which were both produced by Englishmen, capture the two identical domes. The first is a painting dating from 1844 by William Bartlett, author of two classic guides to the city: *Walks about the City and Environs of Jerusalem* (1844) and *Jerusalem Revised* (1854). The second, a painting commissioned by Lady Waldgrave, was produced by the landscape painter Edward Lear in 1858–59.

The earliest photographs of Jerusalem, particularly those taken ca. 1857 by Francis Frith, the inventor of the postcard, ca. 1858 by M. J. Diness, Jerusalem’s first known resident photographer (fig. 7), and between 1867 and 1885 by Bonfils, all show the two identical domes rising in full above the Haram wall. A detailed and accurate large-scale model of Jerusalem from 1873 by Stephen Illes shows a rectangular building with two symmetrically placed, identical domes in the southeastern corner of the Haram. The building abuts the southern and eastern enclosure wall of the Haram, while its northern and western sides are each shown to have an arcade or multiple-arched entrance. An elevation of the south wall of the Haram platform published in 1890 in Guy Le Strange’s translation of the works of medieval Arab geographers, entitled *Palestine under the Moslems: A Description of Syria and the Holy Land from A.D. 650 to 1500*, shows the two identical domes still extant.

Al-Nabulsi describes the Suq al-Ma‘rifa as having a
domed construction and a mihrab (makānun ma‘qūdun bihi mihrāb). However, the earliest visual documentation of a domed construction in this corner of the Haram comes from a woodblock by Erhardum de Reuwich in the first travel book ever printed, Bernhard von Breydenbach’s Peregrinatio in Terram Sanctum, published in Mainz in 1486, three years after his visit to the Holy Land and thirty years before the eclipse of Mamluk rule (fig. 8). Produced only thirty-six years after Gutenberg’s invention of the printing press, the woodblocks in this book are believed to be the first travel pictures ever reproduced of a scene drawn realistically, and the first known foldout inserted in any publication. This first printed map and view of Jerusalem looks particularly realistic because of its partial subordination to the rules of perspective discovered only half a century earlier by Brunelleschi in Florence. The drawing, which inaugurates a tradition of capturing the city and its environs from the Mount of Olives looking west, shows only one dome in the southeastern corner of the Haram. The map of Jerusalem by Claudio Duchetti (Rome, 1570, presumably copied from that by Stefano du Perac) is based on that by Breydenbach, and the map by Jan Janssonius (Amsterdam, 1657) is derived from the account given by Matheus Merian, which in turn relies on the map by Breydenbach. It is of no surprise then that these printed maps also show a single dome in the southeastern corner of the Haram. The four almost identical maps produced by four Italian printers (Camocio, Ligorio, Bertelli, and Zaltieri) during the 1560s and early 1570s, which were based on an anonymous Italian map in turn derived from one made by a Dutch artist in 1538, also show a single dome. The maps of Von Breydenbach and the Dutch artist (1598) and their derivatives are printed, three-dimensional representations of the city as a contiguous group of pilgrimage sites and places of worship. Soon, however, they gave way to the printed realistic street map of Antonio De Angelis (Rome, 1578) (fig. 9), a Franciscan monk who served in Jerusalem for eight years. Three-dimensional and planometrically drawn, this map spawned similar printed maps, some of which were drawn by travelers and pilgrims based on their own direct observations in Jerusalem, like the Franciscans Bernardino Amico (Florence, 1620) and Francisco Quaresmius (Antwerp, 1639), while others were generated in Europe from maps that were produced by those who walked in the footsteps of Jesus in the holy city. Amico’s map, however, appears to be largely a copy of De Angelis’s.

Numbers keyed to the sites of worship on these maps refer to legends which provide accurate if sometimes anachronistic identifications. Their intended use as Christian pilgrimage maps accounts for their reliability,
but it also explains why Muslim sites in these maps are diminished, ignored, or drawn rather carelessly. The maps by De Angelis and Amico, along with the ones by H. J. Bräuning (Strassburg, 1612), O. Dapper (Amsterdam, 1677), and J. Komp [an?], all three of which also appear to have been influenced — directly or indirectly — by De Angelis’s map, show a rectangular building with three identical domes in the southeastern corner of the Haram as they depict Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives looking west. With the same orientation, Quaresmius’s map shows two domes instead. The master-etcher Joseph Eder produced an engraving which he called “a new and genuine sketch of Jerusalem” in Vienna ca. 1800. Apart from the artistic embellishments, it largely echoes the map by Quaresmius. However, it only shows one dome in the southeastern corner.

While it is impossible to reconstruct with consider-
able precision the Suq al-Ma‘rifa from this genre of maps due to the discrepancies in the number of domes shown, the maps associate a domed construction with the southeastern corner of the Haram since the fifteenth century. The visual representation of the holy city took a sharp turn shortly before the end of the seventeenth century when Cornelis de Bruyn, guarded by two Franciscan fathers, furtively sketched a panoramic view of the holy city from the Mount of Olives. Taken from the standard angle yet depicting a realistic perspectival view instead of a three-dimensional map, this panorama is a critical forerunner of the nineteenth-century romanticizing depictions, especially with its portrayal of Jerusalem as an ancient town basking in a biblical ambiance. This early perspectival view of Jerusalem, published in Utrecht in 1698 in de Bruyn’s Reizen door ... Klein Asia ... en Palestijn, shows two identical domes in the southeastern corner of the Haram.98

Two nineteenth-century surveys of the Haram confirm Suq al-Ma‘rifa’s hypostyle theme of two rows of square bays as unveiled by ‘Ali Bey al-Abbasi’s plan. Around 1858, Erneste Pierotti was conducting a survey of the Haram for Suraya Pasha, the Ottoman governor of Jerusalem from 1857 to 1864 (perhaps initiated by the previous pasha) and for which Pierotti hired M.J. Diness to take photographs of the sanctuary and other places.99 His plan of the Haram published in 1864 (fig. 10) was followed by that of Captain Charles Wilson of the Corps of Royal Engineers, who, in 1864, conducted the Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem.100 But where al-Abbasi’s plan shows five bays in each of the two rows, the two latter plans show seven, and according to al-Abbasi’s description, there were seven bays: “The south-east angle of the great court of the temple is occupied by a mosque, composed of two rows of seven arches each, placed upon square pillars: this was formerly the place of prayer of the individuals of the Hanbeli rite.”101 In the plan of the Haram published by Max Van Berchem in 1927, the Suq al-Ma‘rifa is also shown with seven bays in each row, and is labeled Béqueau de Jérusalem in reference to the subterranean commemorative shrine underneath known as Mahd ‘I’sa.102

The Suq al-Ma‘rifa’s façade in David Roberts’s drawing shows the two domes symmetrically flanking a triple-arched entrance. All plans show the front side of Suq al-Ma‘rifa to have been an arcade with seven openings, except ‘Ali Bey’s, which shows five instead. Since Roberts shows this façade primarily as part of a background to his drawing of the Aqṣa and Dome of the Rock, the details of the façade are not necessarily reliable or accurate. This also applies to Ille’s model, the accuracy of whose details may be called into question when zeroing in on a small structure in one of the corners of the Haram. Similarly, the representation of this small structure in the plans is likely to be abstract and schematic. However, one way of reconciling Roberts’s façade with the plans is to suggest that the triple-arched entrance or arcade is a segment of a longer arcade that was blocked temporarily, as was the case with parts of the northern and western porticoes of the Haram.103 The arcade or multiple-arched entrance is a feature associated with an open pavilion affording a fine view, such as that of the sacred space of the Haram. However, the attenuation of the Suq al-Ma‘rifa plan along with the closure of its back side qualifies its two rows of bays with the arcade at front as a loggia.

HANBALITE INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING IN JERUSALEM

The hadith-directed doctrine of the Baghdadi imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal was introduced and disseminated in Jerusalem and Damascus by al-Shaykh Abu al-Faraj ‘Abd al-Wahid al-Shirazi (d. 1093).104 When al-Qadi Muhayy al-Din ibn al-Zaki descended from the minbar of al-Aqṣa Mosque after delivering the first Friday sermon after the conquest of 1187, al-Shirazi’s scion Zayn al-Din ibn Najjyya (d. 1203), also a Hanbalite, sat on the preaching bench and gave a lecture.105 However, it took another hundred and ninety-three years, as far as the literary evidence shows, before a madrasa was endowed as Hanbalite. It was endowed by Sayf al-Din Baydamar al-Khawarizmi in 1379-80 on Tariq Bab al-Hadid, which ends at one of the gates of al-Haram.106 This may be accounted for by the relatively late date of the establishment of the Hanbalite rite, for it was not until after 1177 that Muwaffaq al-Din ibn Qudamah al-Maqdisi (d. 1223) composed al-Mugni,107 an encyclopedia of Hanbalite law which offered a comparative study of the three preceding rites and recognized the new doctrine as a full-fledged school of jurisprudence and the fourth rite of Islamic law. The first appointment of a Hanbali scholar to the chief judgeship of Jerusalem took place as late as 1401.108
Mujir al-Din gives the names of twenty Hanbalite scholars who lived in Jerusalem between 1187 and 1469. Only one, according to Mujir al-Din, held a teaching position at a madrasa, that founded by Faris al-Din Ibbak ibn Qutulmish in 1352-53 at the northern portico of al-Haram al-Sharif. The entries in the main biographical dictionaries of this period offer very sporadic accounts of other Hanbalite teaching posts in Jerusalem, such as that of Siraj al-Din al-Qubabi al-Misri al-Hanbali (d. 1355) at the madrasa of al-Malik al-Jukandar, polo master of Sultan al-Nasir Muhammad ibn Qalawun, at the northern portico of al-Haram and completed, according to its inscriptions, in 1340. Barquq’s Master of the Horse and the founder of the famous Khan al-Khalili in Cairo and charitable foundations in Mecca, the Hanbalite Jarks al-Khalili (d. 1389), whose name appears in the inauguration inscription on the façade and in the courtyard of the khanqah-mausoleum of Sultan Barquq in Cairo (1384-86), is reported by Mujir al-Din to have built the madrasa in Jerusalem known as al-Jaharikisyya, which occupies one half of a church building; the other half was appropriated for the zawiya of al-Yunisyya. Despite the Hanbalite persuasion of the founder, the only documented appointment at this madrasa is that of the renowned Hanafite Sa’d al-Din al-Dayrī (d. 1463).

But where did the rest of the Hanbalites mentioned by Mujir al-Din lecture and study? Mujir al-Din relates that in 1372, the chief judge of Damascus, the Hanbalite ‘Ala’ al-Din al-Aqslanī, allocated funds for a group of Hanbalite students and scholars in Jerusalem from the waqf of a deceased Shams al-Din ibn Mu’ammad, stipulating that they attend the “regular study sessions at al-Masjid al-Aqṣa al-Sharif.” “Al-Masjid al-Aqṣa” was the standard designation for the whole sanctuary until the Ottoman period, when it was superseded by “al-Haram al-Sharif”; “al-Jami’ al-Aqṣa” specifically referred to the Aqsa Mosque, the mughattā or the covered aisles, the site on which ‘Umar founded the first mosque amidst ancient ruins. Although those Hanbalites who received the stipends from Damascus had to go to the Aqsa Mosque for the Friday prayer and possibly the lecture afterwards, it is likely that they also convened elsewhere in al-Haram al-Sharif. The other natural choice would be the place where they performed their daily prayers, namely the arcades of Suq al-Ma’rifa.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SITE OF THE SUQ AL-MA’RIFA IN THE CORPUS OF MUSLIM TRADITIONS OF THE HARAM

Situated in the southeastern corner of the Haram, the Suq al-Ma’rifa appropriates one end of each of two of the Haram walls as its own, the more significant one being the qibla wall which the Aqsa Mosque itself abuts. This may very well be accounted for by expediency, particularly at a time when most of the Ayyubid foundations were being constructed with spolia or incorporated into existing buildings. The southwestern corner, which would also have given them part of the qibla wall, had already been taken by the great hall adjoining al-Aqsa Mosque to the west, which was constructed in the 1160’s as the monastic quarters of the Templar Order, and which became the Jami’ al-Nisa’ (Women’s Mosque) in 1194. But was it solely for practical reasons that they opted for this corner?

Beneath the site of the Suq al-Ma’rifa in the southern wall of the Haram is a small commemorative structure known as the Cradle of Jesus. As early as the Umayyad period, Muqatil ibn Sulayman (d. 767), the commentator of the Qur’an, recounted in his exegesis (tafsir) that Jesus’s miracle of speaking from the cradle took place in Jerusalem. In the first half of the eleventh century, al-Musharraf ibn al-Murajja provided the earliest documented pilgrimage guide or itinerary to the holy sites in Jerusalem in his Fad‘al Bayt al-Magdi wa al-Sham wa al-Khalil, one of the earliest known examples of the Merits of Jerusalem genre. One of those sites is the mihrab of Maryam, also known in Ibn al-Murajja’s treatise as Mahd ‘Isa (Cradle of Jesus). Nasir-i Khusraw, who reached Jerusalem on 5 March 1047, describes a mosque, also dubbed Mahd ‘Isa, as a subterranean area of 15 x 20 ells in the southeastern corner of the Haram and having a stone roof supported by marble columns. The “cradle” itself, which he found in the southern corner, built of stone and large enough for men to pray in, served as a mihrab for the mosque. He also noticed two other mihrabs in the east side of this mosque: the mihrab of Maryam and that of Zakariyya. This is the second mihrab mentioned by Nasir-i Khusraw which has Zakariyya the prophet as its eponym, the first being the dome near Bab al-Asbat on the northern border of the Haram. Whereas the inscription on this dome explicitly indicated to Nasir-i Khusraw that it was the mihrab of Zakariyya the prophet,
the two niches in the east side of this subterranean mosque displayed the Qur'anic verses about Zakariyya and Maryam. The mosque was lit by many hanging brass and silver lamps which were kept burning throughout the night. Two sources dating from the post-Crusade period, al-UNS al-Falid by Mujir al-Din (d. 1521) and Ihâf al-akhiyâb bī fâdâ’il al-Masjid al-Qâqâ by al-Minhaji Shams al-Din al-Sibuti (d. 1475), mention that Maryam’s place of worship was called in their days Mahd ‘Isa. Mujir al-Din adds that the mosque known as Mahd ‘Isa lies underneath the place called Suq al-Ma‘rîfa. During his pilgrimage (ziyârat) to the Haram in 1693, ‘Abd al-Ghani al-Nabulsi and his companions visited the Qubbat al-Arawah (Dome of the Spirits), Qubbat al-Mi‘raj, Qubbat al-Silsila, the qubba built over the piece of rock believed to have been carved out of the Rock (al-Sakhrâ), the mihrab of ‘Ubâda ibn al-Samit, Bab al-Tawba, Bab al-Rahma, and the site of the throne (kurî) of Sulayman, after which they descended to the Mahd ‘Isa, where the maqâm (shrine?) of the disciples of Jesus (al-Hawariyyun) and the maqâm (shrine?) of al-Khadr (Elijah?) are to be found, and then ascended to the mihrab of Dawud, Suq al-Ma‘rîfa, and Jami’ al-Magharibah.

The sequence of al-Nabulsi’s pilgrimage stations may have been dictated by more than just topographical expediency. To those Arab, Turkish, and Kurdish troops approaching the walls of Jerusalem under the command of Salah al-Din al-Ayyubi, the site of the holy city must have triggered a web of associations and images of a fabled city inculturated by the Merits of Jerusalem literature that lamented the tragic loss of the first qibla of Islam during the ninety years of Frankish rule. In his biography of Salah al-Din, Ibn Shaddad (d. 1234) portrays this army as one abounding in scholars who flocked to Salah al-Din from Syria and Egypt. Many of them must have studied, if not memorized, the various Islamic traditions about the sanctity of Jerusalem. From among these mujâhid scholars came the savants who attended the councils held under the auspices of Salah al-Din in Jerusalem in 1187, which entailed, among other things, the conversion of the palace of the patriarch into a Sufi ribât (al-khanqâh al-Salahiyya) and the church of the monastery of St. Anne into a madrasa for the Shafi‘ites (al-Madrasa al-Salahiyya). More interesting yet, some of these scholars were directly involved in architecture and construction in Jerusalem. Salah al-Din appointed Ibn Shaddad, a former mu‘tâd (repetiteur or teaching assistant) at the Madrasa al-Nizamiyya in Baghdad, for example, not only as the director and shaykh of the Madrasa al-Salahiyya but also as the supervisor of the construction of the Bimaristan al-Salahi. The proliferation of the fâdâ’il genre prevented Jerusalem and its sacred sites from falling into the oblivion that afflicted the Muslims of Spain after the Reconquista. The eagerness of the Muslim generation of the conquest to heal the rupture in the continuum of Islamic life in the holy city is best represented by an inscription above the entrance to the Ayubid Qubbat al-Mi‘raj (1200-1) indicating that it was built to commemorate an older structure which was erected during the early Islamic period and was believed to be the starting point of Muhammad’s ascension to heaven, but which had disappeared during the Crusader occupation. Although some of the biblical connections to Islamic sites may have been a concoction of the fâdâ’il genre, the highly eulogizing and propagandistic tenor of which may well have included apocryphal accounts, there is little doubt that the southeastern corner’s association with Jesus and Mary in the corpus of Muslim traditions concerning the Haram was established well before the Crusades, and that this genre preserved those associations from waning during the absence of Muslim worship in Jerusalem. But could the resurfacing of these associations have been somehow intensified by Crusader activities in the Haram? And can one correlate the toponymical shift from Mihrab Maryam to Mahd ‘Isa, as reported by Mujir al-Din and al-Suyuti, to the contest for Jerusalem?

The significance of the Haram’s subterranean structure to the Knights Templar was purely utilitarian; its new function as a stable was bereft of any associations with the events surrounding the Nativity of Jesus, which they celebrated at the Crusader Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem. In his travel guide to sacred sites and tombs of prophets and saints, entitled al-Ishârât ilâ ma’rifat al-siyârât and dating from the post-conquest period, ‘Ali ibn Abi Bakr al-Harawi (d. 1215) provides a description of the Haram as he saw it during his visit to Jerusalem in 1173. In this rare Muslim eyewitness account of the Haram under Crusader rule, al-Harawi refers to this subterranean structure as the Stable of Solomon, showing there already was Crusader influence on the nomenclature of the Haram; henceforth it was to be the standard designation in the Islamic sources. Inside it, al-Harawi adds, is to be found a cave which is said to contain the Mahd ‘Isa. Al-Harawi’s situation of the cradle there is a continuation
of a pre-Crusade fādāʿil legacy even though he does not cite any sources in connection with its location.

Among the things al-Harawi situates in Bayt Lahm (Bethlehem), however, is the birthplace of Jesus.133 Yaqt al-Hamawi (d. 1229), who composed his famous geographical lexicon, Muʿjam al-Buldān, during the Ayyubid period, states that Bayt Lahm is the site of the Mahd ‘Isa,135 whereas Jesus’s miracle of speaking from the cradle took place in Jerusalem.136 However, Bethlehem’s prominence in the corpus of Islamic traditions about Jesus is evident well before the Crusades. The geographer Ibn al-Faqih al-Hamadhani, who wrote a comprehensive Kitāb al-buldān around 903,137 makes a clear distinction between Mahd ‘Isa, the cradle from where according to the Qurʾan (3:46) Jesus performed the miracle of speaking while still an infant and which, according to Ibn al-Faqih, is to be found in Jerusalem,138 and the birthplace of Jesus, which Ibn al-Faqih situates in the town of Bethlehem.139 Among the pre-Crusades authors who also locate the birthplace, but not the Mahd ‘Isa, in Bethlehem are the Andalusian littérateur Ibn ‘Abd Rabbih al-Andalusi (d. 940),140 the geographer al-Muqaddasi al-Bashshari (d. 985),141 and Abu Bakr al-Wasiti,142 who dictated in his house in Jerusalem his compilation of the fādāʿil to ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Nasiby in 1019 and is therefore the earliest known compiler of this genre.143

In contrast to the period following the first conquest by ‘Umar ibn al-Khattab, the symbols of Christianity in the holy city during the counter-crusades were no longer perceived by the Muslims to be innocuous because they were no longer restricted to the biblical sites of the New Testament. Instead, they had engulfed a Muslim sacrum that buttressed one of the foundations of the Islamic faith and its formative history: Muhammad’s nocturnal journey to the Masjid al-Aqsa (the distant shrine or temple), which signified, among other things, the bequesting of Masjid Bani Isra’il to Islam. The Masjid al-Aqsa had become a site of Christian worship and administration, a development unprecedented in Jerusalem’s Christian history. Islam’s claim to the derelict Masjid Bani Isra’il after centuries of Christian neglect alerted the Crusaders to its biblical salience. Expunging all traces of impurity in the Holy City was a twofold process. First, all physical signs of past Crusader hegemony over Jerusalem, but particularly in al-Haram al-Sharif, were systematically effaced. Second, unwelcome ideologies were to be warded off by the Sunni creed. Numerous teaching institutions were founded to promulgate Sunni dogma. Considered in this context, the Suq al-Ma’rifah, one of the earliest of these institutions built on a site associated with Jesus, takes on a significance no smaller than the powerful Christian biblical imagery on Ayyubid metalwork, such as the so-called d’Arenberg basin, which was made for Sultan al-Salih Najm al-Din Ayub, leader of the conquest of Jerusalem of 1244 and patron of Qubbat Musa in the Haram.144

The appropriation of Jesus into the culture of the counter-crusades can clearly be seen in the literature of this period, particularly poetry. This highly effective form of expression is divided into two phases: one predating the liberation of Jerusalem and one dating from the conquest. The latter, which the Muslim savants of the period like Abu Shama and al-Imad al-Asfahani call “al-Qudsiyyāt,”145 is highly panegyric; the former is referred to by al-Hakim ‘Abd al-Man‘im al-Jilani al-Andalusi as “al-Mubashshirat” (harbingers of victory),146 and is imbued with nostalgia and religious zeal. One of its themes is to invalidate any Crusader claim to the Holy Land by demonstrating that the Crucifix, the banner under which they rallied support, was alien to Jesus, who in fact was a prophet of Islam. In a long poem which he composed in 1148-49, possibly after Nur al-Din Zangi’s abolition of Isma‘ili and Shi‘i practices in Aleppo,147 Ibn Munir al-Tarabulsī (d. 1153) wrote:148

في بيت معمر العبد قد بينا إلى سفيفك متصنماء
(THIS IS FROM JOHN 19:38)

Al-Salih Tala‘ī (d. 1160 or 1162), the Fatimid vizier for Caliph al-Adid, composed a poem of condolence for his friend Usama ibn Munqidh, ruler of Shayzar, when the latter lost his family in a series of earthquakes which began in 1156,149 in which he imputes the catastrophe to the prevalence of the Crusader creed in Jerusalem:

لسان الشيرش فلأبت القاعد للاسماءات ننقدم
إن علمي الله مثلا شهامة ومنها السعيب
(THIS IS FROM JOHN 1:14)

إن هذا لن غاية ساحة القدس وما الإسلام فيها نسبي

(THIS IS FROM JOHN 1:14)
Al-Nabulsi’s sojourn in Jerusalem in 1693 centered on a *ziyāra* of a specific itinerary, one which was very likely suggested by the servants of the Haram or followed a pilgrimage guide. The earliest of these guides, that of Ibn al-Murajja, had Mahd ‘Isa, then also known as Mihrab Maryam, on its route. It was from there that the chanting of the Qur’an by Ibn al-Kazaruni poured out onto the Haram esplanade and permeated a vast area outside the Haram.

Both al-Wasiti and Ibn al-Murajja speak of a Bab al-Tawba (Gate of Repentance) adjacent to Mihrab Maryam. They both report that when one of the Children of Israel sinned, he would find the sin written on his forehead and his doorpost, and that God would not erase that sin until the sinner prayed at Bab al-Tawba for forgiveness. And whereas Ibn al-Faqih (ca. 903) situates Mihrab Maryam inside Bab al-Tawba, al-Muqaddasi al-Bashshari (d. 985) associates this mihrab with a gate with multiple openings (Abwāb Mihrab Maryam), which is identified by Burgoyne as the present Triple Gate. By the time of Nasiri Khusraw’s visit in 1047, the name Bab al-Tawba had already shifted to the gate adjacent to Bab al-Rahma (Gate of Mercy), one of the two doorways of the Golden Gate in the eastern wall of the Haram, henceforth the standard identification. Nasiri Khusraw ascribes the name Tawba to God’s acceptance of David’s repentance at the threshold of these two doors, referred to by al-Muqaddasi al-Bashshari as the two Gates of Mercy (*bābāyī al-raḥma*). Four centuries later Mujir al-Din still identifies Bab al-Tawba as the gate adjacent to Bab al-Rahma, but he states that the site of Suq al-Ma‘rīfa was where Bab al-Tawba, according to one of the historians, stood during the time of the Bani Isra’il. From this unamed source, Mujir al-Din also copies the above account of repentance.

Even though the Suq al-Ma‘rīfa had already, by the time of Mujir al-Din, ceased to function as the Hanbalite place of prayer, that al-Nabulsi stopped there almost immediately after ascending from Mahd ‘Isa indicates that it may still have retained an edifying function, such as a place for meditation and reflection on the Mahd miracle, owing to its proximity to Mahd ‘Isa. If we disregard Mujir al-Din’s incredulity about the genuineness of the name, a Sufi function could account for the choice of the word *ma‘rīfa*, which suggests the introspection usually associated with the Sufi quest for esoteric knowledge, as opposed to ‘ilm, or general knowledge. Such a distinction is expounded in most of the Sufi treatises dating from the counter-crusades, such as *Kisā bi al-muridi* by ‘Abd al-Qadir al-Suhrawardi (d. 1168), the renowned Sufi and professor of Shafi‘i law at the Madrasa al-Nizamiyya in Baghdad. Al-Nabulsi hailed from a strong Sufi tradition steeped in both Naqshabandi and Qadiri rites. He would have been keen to visit a shrine affiliated with Sufi practice: his book recounting his travels in Syria, Egypt, and the Hijaz is full of accounts of such visits. Although al-Nabulsi makes no reference to Sufi functions in connection with the Suq al-Ma‘rīfa, his elaboration on Mujir al-Din’s account of the repentance of the Children of Banu Isra’il at this site is contextualized within Sufi gnosis. Through prayer, repentance, and erasing sin from the doorpost, explains al-Nabulsi, sinners know with full certainty (yirfūn) that God has granted them forgiveness. The veracity of this perception, he concludes, probably accounts for the choice of the word *ma‘rīfa* (as opposed to ‘ilm).

Al-Dhahabi credits al-Mu‘azzam ‘Isa with the construction of a loggia (tārima) at Bab al-Hadid in Damascus. Ibn Manzur (d. 1511-12), the compiler of the largest Arabic lexicon of the Mamluk period entitled *Lisan al-ʿArab*, defines tārima as a wooden structure like a dome (*bait min khshab kāt qubba*) and categorizes
it as an Arabized noun of Persian origin. Assuming that the erection of this domed loggia in Damascus was a continuation of an earlier legacy of attaching such structures to important gates for the reception of visitors, the Suq al-Ma‘rifa, a stone version of a domed loggia or tarima, may similarly have been intended both to mark the nearby gate giving access to the Madh ‘Isa underneath, whose pilgrimage traffic could have been growing, and to receive visitors as well. The transmutation of a tarima from wood into stone may have fulfilled an antiquating purpose, especially by its association with the entrance to this ancient, subterranean part of the sanctuary animated by the faḍā’il genre with its Qur’anic miracles and events. But an aura of antiquity would be most congenial to the site of an ancient gate that was a stage for the cathartic experience of repentance and expiation in the ancient times of Banu Isra’il, an experience which Muslim traditions also attach to another ancient but extant gate, that in the northern wall of the Haram known as Bab Hitta (the gate of remission or supplication for atonement). For those pilgrims descending to Madh ‘Isa underneath, this Hanbalite shrine must have appeared as a suspended or hanging loggia with two domes, which, when viewed from the east or the south as one approaches this most prominent exterior angle of the Haram, emerge as two pinnacles. This rendition of a tarima also departs from the concept of the one at Bab al-Hadid in Damascus in being built atop the structure in which the gate is embedded instead of next to it. The theme of a domed religious shrine surmounting a gate, however, is not without precedent in Jerusalem, the striking parallel being al-Zawiya al-Nasiriya atop the Golden Gate, particularly after it was rebuilt, presumably with a dome, by al-Mu‘azzam ‘Isa.

THE TRIPARTITE THEME

The Suq al-Ma‘rifa’s tripartite configuration of two identical domes flanking an entrance is not without parallel from this period. A number of Mamluk foundations have twin domes flanking a portal, as exemplified, in Damascus, by the mausoleum of al-Tawashi (the eunuch) Mukhtar (d. 1316) and known as the madrasa of al-Shaykh Hasan Ra‘i al-Hima, the mausoleum built by the viceroy Sayf al-Din Tankiz in 1330 for his wife Khawand Sutaya bint Sayf al-Din Kawkabay al-Mansuri, hence the name al-Turba al-Kawkabay (fig. 111), the Rashidiyya Mausoleum built most likely — by Mankilbugha al-Shamsi in 1366-67 and the mausoleum of Tanibak al-Hasani and his wife (al-Turba al-Taynabiyya) built in 1394-95, in which the prominent Amir Taghri Bard was interred in 1412. An example in Jerusalem is the mausoleum of Amir Bahwan ibn Qaradshah al-Gilani (al-Turba al-Kilaniyya) built in 1352, and in Cairo the mausoleum of Khawand Tughay Umm Anuk, wife of Sultan al-Nasir Muhammad, which is part of her khanqah complex presumably built between her trip to Mecca in 1339 and her death in 1349, and the spectacular structure known as al-Sultaniyya, believed to be the mausoleum of the mother of Sultan Hasan, dating from the 1350’s-60’s. In both the Cairene examples, the central entrance and vestibule are replaced by an iwan, possibly under Anatolian influence. Since only one of the two domed chambers in many of these Mamluk foundations serves a clearly defined funerary purpose, the inclusion of an identical, non-funerary domed chamber at the opposite flank of the entrance in a highly symmetrical fashion is curious indeed.

A number of variations, both structural and functional, on the double-dome theme can be extricated from the religious-funerary architecture of Egypt and Syria in this period. The mausoleum of Amir Bahwan ibn Qaradshah al-Gilani (al-Turba al-Kilaniyya, 1352) is a rare example of the tripartite type with both domed chambers intended for funerary purposes. Although only the eastern chamber contains a tomb, the presence of a barrel-vaulted crypt under the floor of the western chamber confirms that it was meant for a funerary purpose as well. Similarly, the south-
ern domed chamber of the Mamluk mausoleum of Mukhtar built about 1316 seems not to have been used as a mausoleum until 1354 when Ahmad Pasha, brother of Grand Vizier Iyas Pasha, was interred there. Two identical domes, each covering a burial chamber from this period, is the Ayyubid mausoleum in the Dama-scene suburb of al-Salibiyya known as al-Madrasa al-Jaharkisiyya built by Amir Sarim al-Din Khatluha (d. 1238) for one of the most renowned state officials under Sultan Salah al-Din, his master Amir Fakhr al-Din Jaharks al-Nasiri al-Salahi, whom he had buried underneath one of the two domes after his death in 1211; Sarim al-Din reserved the second dome for his own sepulchre. The two domes rise side by side as a rare architectural expression of an eternal bond, which was recalled in Cairo in 1503-4 by the two contiguous burial chambers in the religious complex of one of the most powerful amirs in the reign of Sultan al-Nasir Muhammad, Amir Sanjar al-Jawili, who had his long-time companion (khashdâsh) Amir Salar interred in the chamber which he had distinguished with a larger dome and more decoration as a token of love and respect.

Unlike the tripartite type, the two burial chambers in both the Jaharkisiyya foundation and the complex of Salar and Sanjar are not separated by a portal or vestibule; having the two chambers abutting each other emphasizes the bond between the two souls whose lives were intertwined. And whereas the two domed spaces of the Jaharkisiyya comprise one detached unit, those of Salar and Sanjar are incorporated into a philanthropic foundation.

A funerary structure perched on an outcropping of rock at the foot of the Citadel of Cairo is similar in composition to the Jaharkisiyya but somewhat different in function. It is known as the mausoleum of Amir Ya’qub Shah, mhikmandâr (chief of protocol) for Sultan Qaytbay. Built in 1495-96, it was unique among the funerary foundations of Islamic Egypt, if not the Islamic world, in including a cistern, probably thought to be, in this desolate location, more useful than the usual sabi’ incorporated into many of the urban Mamluk philanthropic and funerary foundations. Placed side by side to make up a free-standing unified whole, the burial space and the cistern are each marked by a dome. The tirâz band that usually runs the length of a Mamluk façade is here replaced by an elaborate inscription commemorating the triumph of the Mamluk forces over the Ottoman troops at the Battle of Adana (1486), thus rendering this curious structure a monument of victory.

A fourth structural variation of this double-dome phenomenon is presented by the khanqah-mausoleum of Sultan Faraj ibn Barquq in the Northern Cemetery of Cairo (1400-11), where two identical domes, each rising up out of a square burial chamber, are separated, not by a portal and vestibule or by an iwan like the Sultaniyya mausoleum, but by a hypostyle sanctuary, hence also a variation on the tripartite configuration. Two funerary domes of unequal size but also flanking a prayer hall are to be seen in Cairo in the madrasa dedicated by Sultan Sha’ban in 1368-69 to his mother Khawand Baraka. According to Maqrizi, the design of the Jami’ al-Mu’ayyad (madrasakhanqah of Sultan al-Mu’ayyad) in Cairo (1416-21) included two domed mausolea flanking the sanctuary. The dome over the eastern mausoleum was built following the burial of al-Mu’ayyad there in 1421; the western dome, planned to be over the chamber where his daughter was interred during the construction of the mosque, was never built.

It is conceivable then that this double-dome theme originated in the two contiguous domed mausolea and later evolved into the tripartite disposition of funerary affiliations, which Suq al-Ma’rifa alludes to stylistically and structurally though not functionally. Our grasp of this functional or institutional disparity remains tenuous until we have explored all the functional aspects of the Syrian funerary tripartite-type foundations where only one of the two identical domes flanking a portal marks a mausoleum. Freeing the precise function of the non-funerary domed chamber from obscurity is hampered by a serious paucity of literary sources to explicate their modes of operation. However, some identifications can be surmised from dedicatory inscriptions and architectural remains, and from Tamâm al-sâlih wa al-dâris fi ‘ahsâl dur al-Qur’ân wa’l-Hadith wa’l-madâris by ‘Abd al-Qadir ibn Muhammad al-Nu’aymi (d. 1521), a socio-topographical history of the religious institutions of learning in Damascus and a critical pendant to Maqrizi’s Khutâb of Cairo.

Near the ruins of a once-domed Ayyubid mausoleum that houses the tombs of al-Zaki ibn Ghanim ibn Yusuf al-‘Asqalani known as al-Musajjaf (d. 1218) and his son Badr al-Din ‘Abd al-Rahman (d. 1237), who had it renovated in 1220, is a detached domed chamber bearing an inscription which designates it as a masjid attached to the mausoleum. It is possible that
they were attached by a portal or vestibule; but no archaeological investigation has been made, so this is conjecture. Khwand Surata is reported to have ordered that a dome be built over her tomb, and this is corroborated by an inscription above the entrance which states that the mausoleum, built at the behest of Tankiz, was completed in Dhu’l-Hijja 750 (1330), that is, five months after her death, which, as specified by Ibn Kathir (d. 1323), occurred in Rajab 730 (1330) in her husband Tankiz’s house in Damascus known as Dar al-Dhahab. Al-Nu’aymi quotes ‘Alam al-Din al-Barzali (d. 1359), the shaykh of the dar al-hadith of Nur al-Din in Damascus, as relating that Surata also expressed her wish to have a masjid and a hospice (ribât) for women built next to her mausoleum, whence it can be inferred that the non-funerary domed chamber, which — like the burial chamber — has a mihrab, served as a prayer place for the women of the hospice. Tankiz’s charitable foundation at Bab al-Silsila in Jerusalem also includes a women’s hospice which was also endowed in 750 (1350) evidence of his wife’s benevolence toward Damascus.

The foundation, built in 1349 by Amir Araq al-Silahdar (d. 1353), a manluk of Sultan al-Nasir Muḥammad ibn Qalawun, is unique among the examples of this group in having its waqf deed inscribed in stone above its doorway. The deed itself does not mention functions, other than its being the resting place of the departed. The size of the waqf suggests that its revenue defrayed expenses for simple operations, such as the salary of a reciter of the Qur’an in the burial chamber, a keeper of a prayer room, and/or a teacher of a school for orphans (muktab ayām). The latter two functions most likely occupied the non-funerary chamber, which M. Talas, in his addendum to Yusuf ibn ‘Abd al-Hadi’s (d. 1503) Thīmār al-maqāṣid fī dīhk al-masājid, designates as a prayer room (musalla). Interestingly, this example, along with the mausoleum of Tankiz al-Hasawi (al-Turba al-Taynabiyah) and the mausoleum of Sultan al-‘Adil Kitbugha (d. 1302) or al-Turba al-Adiliyyah al-Barraniyyah (extra-muros), all show in their schemes a minaret surmounting the portal between the two domes. However, only the minaret of the al-Adiliyyah, of which the square base remains, appears to have been built coevally with the rest of the foundation. The minarets of the first two foundations are either later additions or replacements of earlier ones, in which case they indicate communal prayer functions in the non-funerary chamber, particularly in al-Taynabiyah, where the chamber has a mihrab, and the funerary one does not.

Related to this group functionally, though not structurally, are the two contiguous domed chambers in the cemetery of Shaykh Arsalan outside Bab Tuma at Damascus. The accepted designation of the domed chamber abutting the domed mausoleum of Amir Badr al-Din Hasan (d. 1421) and built in 1411 as the mausoleum of Amir Jamal al-Din Aqquš al-Rusaymi (d. 1309), which Ibn Kathir situates opposite the domed mausoleum of Shaykh Arsalan, is suggested by Shihibi to be a misnomer, particularly since there is no sign of a tomb. He argues that it is the masjid and, possibly, a muktab ayām which al-Nu’aymi said Badr al-Din built as part of his funerary complex.

The non-funerary domed chamber in most Syrian tripartite-type foundations was essentially a small masjid with informal or secondary teaching functions. No madrasa programs seem to have been included, and therefore it should not be taken as an institution of learning. The typical visual preponderance of the funerary part of philanthropic foundations with a dome is in this group counterbalanced by the thrust of an identical dome above the philanthropic part. The external expression of the non-funerary chamber in a mausoleum-like manner along with the identical volumetric treatment of both parts within a symmetrical whole may originally have been prompted by the benefactor’s desire to demonstrate that he was as keen on perpetuating his charity, be it as modest and basic as a musalla or muktab ayām, as he was on perpetuating his name. This manipulation of domes has transformed the single-dome mausoleum into a highly conspicuous structure without overstating the funerary part by size or lavish decoration, the permisibility of which in Islamic law had been, since the early period, quite controversial.

Assuming that the Suq al-Ma’rīfa was conceived during the rule of al-Mu’azzam ‘Isa (governor, 1200-18; sultan, 1218-27), its tripartite configuration predates all the above variations on this theme. It is possible, however, that the Suq al-Ma’rīfa and the earliest extant example of the Syrian tripartite type both derived from a common Ayubid funerary prototype which has long since disappeared, an emulation which, in the case of Suq al-Ma’rīfa, was inspired purely by aesthetics, as the building serves no known funerary purpose.
MEANING OF A HYBRID OF A QUBE A AND A LOGGIA

Had Mujir al-Din read an inscription on the façade of Suq al-Ma‘rifā or come across a waqf deed for the foundation, he would have included the building in his discussion of the Muslim institutions of learning and worship in Jerusalem. The absence of such written documentation suggests that it was not a product of princely or sultanic patronage, but instead founded by the Hanbalites themselves, and its expenses were defrayed by the generosity of individuals like the above-mentioned Shams al-Din ibn Mu‘ammar of Damascus. By this time, many congregational mosques had a main mihrab in the qibla wall, usually assigned to the predominant rite or that favored by the ruler, and smaller ones in the qibla wall or elsewhere for the other rites. But by granting the Hanbalites the right to build a prayer place above a significant site like the Mahd ‘Isa, al-Mu‘azzam was extending a privilege to a school of law and theology that had suffered considerable marginalization. Their traditionalist dogma was antithetical to the rationalist dialectic (kalâm) of Abu al-Hasan al-Ash‘ari (d. 935-36), largely espoused by Shafi‘ites and Malikites, and Abu Mansur al-Maturidi (d. 944), generally adopted by Hanafites. The Hanbalites’ intransigent stance on most matters of ‘aqidah (the foundation of the faith) often rankled the rationalist sensibilities of the Shafi‘ites of the Nizamiyya Madrasa in Baghdad during the eleventh century and fomented serious riots between the two groups, such as the one cited in Ibn al-Athir’s chronicle under the events of 475 (1082). Such contentiousness gave way to cohesion under the reconciliatory campaign launched by the Abbasid caliph al-Nasir (r. 1180-1225), which culminated in bringing all four schools of Islamic law under one roof in the madrasa built by Caliph al-Mustansir (r. 1226-42) in Baghdad between 1227 and 1233. This unitary approach must have struck an empathetic chord in Syria, where disunity and discord among Muslims were blamed for the loss of the Holy Land to the Crusaders. When al-Mu‘azzam first acceded to power, the Hanbalites had neither an official religious representation in the Haram nor a madrasa in the city. By ensuring that all four schools were adequately represented in the spiritual center of his kingdom, al-Mu‘azzam may have been responding to the new religious climate in Baghdad. Al-Mu‘azzam broke the Shafi‘ite mold of Ayubid religious policy by becoming a Hanafite, which is why he is so often portrayed as the maverick Ayubid. He also broke the Maturidi mold of Hanafite theology by following the traditionalist ‘aqida of Abu Ja‘far al-Tahawi. His nonconformist religious persuasions may therefore account for his amenable position in letting a fringe minority like the Hanbalites assert its presence at the qibla wall of the Haram.

When al-Mu‘azzam found out that the muezzins of the Haram performed tabligh for a congregational prayer led by a Shafi‘ite imam, he was incensed. Clearly, he did not tolerate any action that undermined or compromised the Hanafite supremacy in the Haram. Al-Mu‘azzam ‘Isa or his governor in Jerusalem probably limited the Hanbalites to an attenuated plan to minimize the building’s projection into the Haram space. A hypostyle layout was the natural choice for a prayer place, but they probably had to obtain the governor’s approval for the scheme which called for two arcades parallel to the qibla wall to form two rows of bays with seven bays in each row.

The arcade in the Suq al-Ma‘rifā’s façade bears a thematic resemblance to three architectural works in the Haram undertaken by al-Mu‘azzam ‘Isa. The first is the free-standing arcade or colonnade at the top of the stairs rising from the Haram esplanade to the southeastern corner of the platform of the Dome of the Rock. The inscription on the colonnade dates its restoration to 1211-12 and attributes it to al-Mu‘azzam ‘Isa, but also mentions the governor’s name, Amir ‘Izz al-Din ibn Yaghmur. The second is the reconstruction (as indicated by the term juddida [renewed] in the inscription) in 1213-14 of part of the northern pre-Crusade portico of the Haram, possibly that described by al-Muqaddasi. The third is the arcade comprising the façade of the front porch of the Aqsa Mosque. An inscription above the central arch credits al-Mu‘azzam ‘Isa with the construction of the porch’s façade in 1217-18. According to Hamilton, this inscription refers to the three central bays of the present seven-bay porch. He argues that these three bays comprised the whole of the Templars’ porch, and their remodeling by al-Mu‘azzam included the rebuilding of their façade largely with Crusader masonry and vousoirs. The two outermost western bays were added in 1345 in the days of the Mamluk sultan al-Kamil Sha‘ban, and the outermost eastern ones in 1350 in the days of his brother Sultan Hasan. Both additions took place under the supervision of ‘Izz al-Din Aybak al-Misri, warden of the two Noble Sanctuaries.
The announcement of a religious building by a porch is unknown in the extensive Islamic architecture of Syria predating the Ottomans. Ayyubid and Mamluk religious monuments are usually announced by a muqarnas portal. The only known occurrence of a front porch in the architecture of Muslim Egypt dating from before the reign of al-Mu'azzam 'Isa is that of the Fatimid mosque of al-Salah Tala'i' in Cairo, which, interestingly, was conceived as a pilgrimage shrine to keep the head of al-Husayn in after it was taken from 'Asqalan on the eve of a major Crusader offensive against that city. The architectural origin of the Aqsa porch is Crusader, since the evidence of extensive use of Crusader spolia in the façade and the original Crusader vaults covering the two side bays is unimpeachable.

The colonnade at the top of the southeastern stairs of the platform of the Dome of the Rock stands on the site of an older colonnade which was the pre-Crusade pilgrimage station referred to by Nasir-i Khusraw as Maqam al-Nabi. The attention it received shortly after the conquest once again underscores the role of the fada'il genre in engraving the image of the holy city with all of its shrines in the collective memory of the umma. It is but another demonstration of the Muslim's keenness to bridge the rift of time by retracing the paths in the Haram followed by the pious over the centuries. On those paths were the stations at which they worshiped, like the Maqam al-Nabi, and places where legendary scholars spread knowledge and edified other pilgrims, like the Zawiya al-Nasiriyya, also reconstructed by al-Mu'azzam.

Those leaving the Dome of the Rock from its qibla side are beckoned by two gates to descend to the forepart of the Haram. The central one is a colonnade whose pre-Crusade version was referred to by Nasir-i Khusraw as Maqam al-Ghuri. It sits astride the Rock-Aqsa axis, thus emphasizing the binary relationship between the two monuments. The southeastern gate is the colonnade restored at the order of al-Mu'azzam, and is the platform's exit closest to Mahd 'Isa and Suq al-Ma'rif. Its restoration therefore supports the theory that Jesus and his cradle were becoming among the more important symbols on the pilgrimage itinerary during this period, a symbolism that would certainly make the site more desirable to the Hanbalites. The direct, visual, thematic identification which the arcade in the Suq al-Ma'rif's façade establishes with this restored colonnade may very well have been a deliberate one.

This type of visual dialogue between consecutive pilgrimage stations is as old in the Haram as the Rock-Aqsa axis, which was also accentuated by al-Mu'azzam 'Isa. First, a large fountain known as al-Ka's (cup) was introduced along this axis between the steps descending from the platform and the Aqsa porch in 1210-11. Second, al-Mu'azzam introduced a dome on pendentives over the central bay of the Aqsa Mosque's front porch when he had its three bays remodeled in 1217-1218. The dome over the central bay emphasizes the main entrance to the mosque as well as the Rock-Aqsa axis which it stands astride. Like the muqarnas dome or muqarnas vault surmounting a portal, the dome over the central bay of the porch highlights the entrance.

Both aesthetically and structurally, the most logical way of introducing domes into a hypostyle plan consisting of rows of square bays is to place each dome over one bay. The composition of multiple domes set off by columns is as old in the Haram as two of the Umayyad double gates: the Golden Gate and Bab al-Nabi. However, the chronological and topographical proximity of the Aqsa porch suggests that it may have been the structural prototype for the Suq al-Ma'rif. The theme of the porch's domed bay finds a direct antecedent in the now destroyed domed porch of the Crusader Chapel of the Repose of Christ perched on top of the Antonia Rock. It became a mausoleum for the Hakkari Kurdish shaykh Ibn Darbas in ca. 1200, hence the name Madfan (mausoleum) al-Shaykh Darbas. It is also possible that the original central bay of the 'Templars' porch itself was covered with a dome, for although nothing is known of its Crusader roofing, it stood higher than the two side bays. One may then date the construction of the Suq al-Ma'rif to the years 1217-18, the years the porch of the Aqsa was rebuilt, and only a few years after the restoration of the southeastern colonnade on the platform of the Dome of the Rock (1211-12) and the reconstruction of part of the northern portico of the Haram (1213-14). The porch, colonnade, and portico are related thematically to the Suq al-Ma'rif's façade, and therefore may have influenced its conception. If Hamilton is correct in asserting that the Aqsa porch which al-Mu'azzam rebuilt had three bays only, one may also propose, in the light of the above theory of visual dialogue between consecutive pilgrimage sites, that the Suq al-Ma'rif was conceived with a triple-arched en-
trance or arcade as depicted in David Roberts's lithograph (fig. 6).

The Suq al-Ma'rifā's odd number of bays suggests that its mihrab, which was mentioned in al-Nabulisi's description, was embedded in the qibla wall of the Haram in the middle of the central bay. It also means that the builders could have introduced a single dome over the central mihrab bay, had the structure been intended exclusively as a masjid analogous to that attached to Syrian madrasas from this period. Instead, it exhibits two domes disposed in tripartite fashion. The domes do not seem to convey a commemorative meaning, inasmuch as the Mahd 'Isa underneath, as inferred from the literary evidence, is the actual pilgrimage shrine and not the Hanbalite prayer hall. However, in the light of Mujir al-Din's situation of the Israeliite Bab al-Tawba on the site of the Hanbalite shrine, one is tempted to propound a semantic connection between the two domes of Suq al-Ma'rifā and the twin domes displayed by three of the double gates of the Haram: the Golden Gate (al-Rahma/al-Tawba), Bab al-Nabi (Double Gate), and al-Silsila/al-Sakina Gate. Such a connection is particularly suggested by the Golden Gate, for apart from sharing the name Tawba — since at least Nasīr-i Khusrāw's visit in 1047 — with the Israeliite gate, it is the only gate whose twin domes are visible from the outside. This, coupled with Suq al-Ma'rifā's use of pillars to set off multiple domes, suggests an allusion to the Golden (Rahma/Tawba) Gate. But whether an allusion to an extant Bab al-Tawba was intended to conjure up the Israeliite Bab al-Tawba that once stood on this site or whether such an allusion was conscious at all is difficult to ascertain without literary evidence.

On the other hand, transmitting knowledge in or next to pilgrimage shrines is a legacy that dates from at least the Seljuq period. Among such places are al-Ghuywar next to Mihrab Zakariyya, al-Sakina, Qubbat al-Silsila, and Mahd 'Isa. But as the centrality of Jesus to the Islamic faith was being unequivocally stressed by both religious scholars in their poetry and rulers as evident from the iconography on some of the metalwork made for them, the Hanbalites, I suggest, chose Mahd 'Isa as the shrine to which they would attach their scholarly activities. The proximity to the qibla wall of the Haram was therefore probably an advantage but not the driving force. The open layout of the tarīma is suitable for the reception of pilgrims, especially those ascending from the pilgrimage shrine underneath, just as al-Mu'azzam's tarīma in Damascus received visitors as they entered or exited by the Bab al-Hadid. Furthermore, it can be easily adapted to the hypostyle plan.

The arcade beckons the pilgrims leaving the subterranean structure to visit the Suq al-Ma'rifā. The two domes, in light of the scholastic symbolism reinvented into the Haram dome by al-Mu'azzam, can be seen as an expression of the transmission of knowledge which, as I have proposed, may very well have been a regular activity in the Suq al-Ma'rifā. In this scholarly context, a semantic relation to the Golden Gate as a site associated with the transmission of knowledge appears to be more tenable: after all, it was the site of the Nasīrīyā/ Ghazaliyya Zawiyā which was rebuilt and revived by al-Mu'azzam 'Isa. But the simple fact that the zawiyā activities took place in an independent structure built atop the Golden Gate and not inside its space poses a serious challenge to such a semantic relation.

Alternatively, the multiplication of the dome in the Suq al-Ma'rifā finds a strong compositional analogy in those tripartite funerary foundations. The introduction of a second, identical dome in a symmetrical fashion in those foundations rendered the structure conspicuous without overstating the funerary aspect as one large dome would have done. Given the nature of al-Mu'azzam's commitment to Hanbali dominance in the Haram, one presumes that the governor advised the Hanbalites not to overstate their musallā. The Hanbalites therefore contrived this mirror-image duplication of a small dome in the Suq al-Ma'rifā to compensate, in a grand yet understated way, for their marginalization and underscore, with not one but two domes, their dedication to the advancement of knowledge. A second dome also provided visibility badly needed in this remote corner of the Haram and amplified the "pinnacle" impression this structure gave when viewed from outside the city.

GENESIS OF A NOVEL TYPE

In the absence of literary evidence and inscriptions that bear directly on the purpose and meaning of a historical monument, one can enhance the semiotics of the architectural form by ferreting out the events and personages that populated its space, as well as the societal forces that shaped the culture, both spiritual and material, of which it is a product. Though speculative, this approach is more apt to explain the idiosyncracies of a form than one which is based solely on the analysis of the form's intrinsic architectonic
qualities, which are also likely to be swayed by twentieth-century visual identifications and perceptions.

The genesis of the Suq al-Ma'rifā may have joined a ritualistic with a scholastic theme. But the primacy of the dome as a symbol of the transmission of knowledge cannot be stressed enough. This special meaning remained peculiar to the Haram until the Ottomans appropriated the single-domed chamber for teaching functions. The novelty of the Suq al-Ma'rifā lies in its appropriation of the revived scholastic meaning of the dome from the simple setting of the detached square chamber into a loggia. Though this loggia may have had more than one purpose, the appropriated dome most likely retained its association with the transmission of knowledge.

Four Haram madrasas from the Mamluk period display domed loggias as part of their original spatial schemes. These are the madrasa of Majd al-Din al-Iṣ'ardi, endowed in 1359;213 the madrasa of Manjak al-Yusufi, built ca. 1561;214 the madrasa of 'Abd al-Ḥasīb, endowed in 1431;215 and the madrasa of Isfahan Shah Khatun, built in 1437.216 All four madrasas have part or all of their space, including the loggia, built atop the Haram portico, which runs along its western and northern sides. This “hanging madrasa” theme was introduced for the first time on top of the Haram portico by Amir Sayf al-Din Tankiz al-Nasiri in his foundation at Bab al-Silsila (1328-29) as a response to the exigencies of the site and the dearth of land.217 Unlike the Suq al-Ma'rifā, these domed loggias have no known function other than the transmission of knowledge. The typical spatial composition of the hanging loggia is simply that of a qubba: a square chamber covered by a dome. Its frontage on the Haram, however, is taken up by a double arch through which one enjoys a spectacular view of the Dome of the Rock (Fig. 12). Surmounting a portico, these loggias comprise a novel structural type virtually unknown anywhere else in the Muslim world, at least from this period. The multi-bay loggia comprising the Suq al-Ma'rifā has been reduced here to simply one bay and the arcade in the facade shrunk to a double arch. The Suq al-Ma'rifā was never repeated in whole, possibly because its hybrid composition was determined by a number of factors, some of which were unique to the site. Nevertheless, it can be seen as a conduit via which the qubba, the detached domed square chamber serving as an institution of learning, metamorphosed into a hanging loggia incorporated into another institution of learning. Similarly, if the double-arch is indeed

Fig. 12. The facade of the madrasa of Majd al-Din al-Iṣ'ardi (endowed 1359) surmounting the northern portico of the Haram al-Sharif. (Drawing: from Burgoyne, Mamluk Jerusalem, p. 377, fig. 33.6).

derived from the arcade of the Suq al-Ma'rifā, its origin may then be sought in the southeastern colonnade of the platform of the Dome of the Rock, the northern portico of the Haram, or the porch of the Aqsa Mosque.
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