

Chapter II

A New Inscription from the Haram al-Sharif in Jerusalem*

The great Muslim sanctuary of the Haram al-Sharif is remarkable, among many things, for the two facts that its physical appearance and general layout were imposed, to a large extent, by the older and still controversial history of the area, and that, with the partial exception of the Dome of the Rock, its monuments have often changed their significance or physical character. Even though most of the literary sources dealing with Jerusalem are fairly conveniently accessible and the inscriptions masterfully published by Max van Berchem, the actual history of the site and of its different parts has not yet been fully written. Either we have short summaries, rarely dealing in any detail with the period which followed the Crusades, or, as in the case of Max van Berchem's *Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum*, the problems are posed and solved in relation to a certain kind of documentation, for instance inscriptions, and a complete view of the evolution of the site does not always emerge. This complete view will not be achieved without precise studies of individual parts of the Haram. In this brief commentary on a newly discovered inscription an attempt will be made to discuss and solve problems posed by the topography of the Haram.

The inscription is repeated five times on long, narrow (3.68 by 0.14 meters) brass bands affixed with heavy nails on the two wooden doors of the Bab al-Qattanin (Figure 1), one of the most austere gates of the Haram leading to the *sug* of the cotton-merchants, now unfortunately abandoned. The inscription is on the western side of the doors. This means that, when the doors are closed, it is only visible from the *sug*, not from the Haram itself. In that it differs from an inscription in stone, known for many

* First published in *Studies in Islamic art and architecture in Honour of Professor K. A. C. Creswell* (London, 1965), pp. 72–83.

¹ *CIA, Jérusalem*, II, no. 176, pp. 127–9. Our inscription had escaped van Berchem's attention because it was covered with paint. In 1954, with the help of the Jordanian Department of Antiquities, and by permission of the Haram authorities, I was allowed to clean it. I am most thankful to both institutions for their co-operation in this and many other matters pertaining to the history and archaeology of the Haram. I am



1 Jerusalem,
Haram al-Sharif,
Bab al-Qattanin

years,¹ which is set over the gate, but which has been badly weathered and is not entirely readable. The door inscription is set on a background of pock-marks arranged in concentric circles or spirals [75] such as are common on thirteenth and fourteenth-century metalwork. It runs as follows:

[Right door] جَدَّدَ هَذَا الْبَابَ الْمُبَارَكَ فِي أَيَّامِ مَوْلَانَا السُّلْطَانَ الْمَلِكِ النَّاصِرِ الْعَالِمِ الْعَامِلِ الْمُجَاهِدِ الْمُرَابِطِ الْمُتَأَنِّفِ الْمُؤَيَّدِ الْمَنْصُورِ سُلْطَانَ
الْإِسْلَامِ وَالْمُسْلِمِينَ قَاتِلِ الْكُفْرَةِ وَالْمُشْرِكِينَ مَحْيِي الْعَدْلِ فِي الْعَالَمِينَ مَنْصُفِ الْمَظْلُومِ مِنَ الظَّالِمِينَ نَاصِرِ الْمِلَّةِ الْمُحَمَّدِيَّةِ نَاصِرِ الدُّنْيَا وَالْدِّينِ مُحَمَّدِ
بْنِ السُّلْطَانِ [Left door] الْمَنْصُورِ سَيِّفِ الدُّنْيَا وَالْدِّينِ قَلَاوَنِ الصَّالِحِي أَعَزَّ اللَّهُ أَنْصَارَهُ وَخَلَّدَ عَلَى سُلْطَانِهِ وَأَيَّامِهِ وَنَصْرِ
جُنُودِهِ وَأَعْوَانِهِ وَأَعْلَى فِي الْخَافِقِينَ أَلْوِيَّتِهِ وَ[1] عِلَامِهِ بِرِسْمِي حَرَمِ الْقُدْسِ الشَّرِيفِ بِالْإِشَارَةِ الْعَالِيَةِ تَنْكَرُ النَّاصِرِي كَافِلِ الْمَمَالِكِ الشَّرِيفَةِ
الشَّامِيَةِ أَعَزَّ اللَّهُ أَنْصَارَهُ وَأَثَابَهُ الْجَنَّةَ وَذَلِكَ فِي شَهْرِ سَنَةِ سِتٍّ [و] ثَلَاثِينَ وَسَبْعِمِائَةٍ.

“This blessed gate was built anew² in the days of our Lord the Sultan, the King, the Assisted, the Wise, the Ruler, the Fighter in the Holy War, the Champion of the Faith, the Frontier Defender, the Helper, the Victorious, the

particularly thankful to M. Stuart Perowne for having brought to my attention the existence of this document.

² See the commentary below for the possible interpretation of this word.

Sultan of Islam and of the Muslims, the Killer of unbelievers and polytheists, the One who reestablishes justice in the worlds, the Protector of the oppressed from the oppressor, the Helper of the Muslim community, Nasir al-Dunya wa'l-Din Muhammad son of the Sultan [left door] al-Mansur Sayf al-Dunya wa'l-Din Qalawun al-Salihi. May God strengthen his victories, perpetuate his rule and his days, give help to his armies and his guards, and raise his flags and standards up at both ends of the world. For the Noble Haram of Jerusalem, by high order of Tankiz al-Nasiri, the guardian of the Noble Syrian kingdoms; may God give strength to his helpers and grant him paradise. This was in the months of the year 736" (AD 1336).

The Naskhi style of writing and the list of titles do not present any significant departure from the norm of Mamluk inscriptions of the first half of the fourteenth century. The interest of the inscription, however, lies rather in the fact that it raises two separate questions: how extensive and significant was Tankiz's work in and around the Haram, and was there an earlier gate on the site of the present Bab al-Qattanin?

The texts and inscriptions gathered by Max van Berchem permit us to acquire a fair idea of the extent of the work undertaken by the great viceroy of Syria from 712 to 740 AH. It can be divided into three separate parts. First, Tankiz participated in the task of rebuilding and restoring the Haram and Jerusalem after the definite end of the episode of the Crusades. This work, certainly sponsored by the Sultan Muhammad al-Nasir himself, consisted in the repairing of the water works of Jerusalem,³ in the rebuilding of the minaret near the Bab al-Silsila, the major western entrance to the Haram,⁴ in repairs and modifications in the Aqsa Mosque,⁵ and, probably, in repairs on the ceilings of the Dome of the Rock,⁶ although Tankiz's name is not mentioned in the often redone and constantly shortened inscriptions commemorating the numerous reworkings of [76] these ceilings. In such activities Tankiz acted, quite appropriately, as the agent of the established Muslim rule over the Holy City.

Second, a series of buildings are private religious foundations of his own and serve to emphasize his piety. As was the medieval Muslim custom, all these foundations have a social purpose. They include a *madrasa*, still standing and the most beautiful one in Jerusalem (it is curiously referred to in the dedicatory inscription as a *makan*), which is situated right next to the main entrance to the Haram,⁷ a *khanqa* for Sufis, a school for orphans, and a *dar al-hadith* – the latter three being known only through texts.⁸

³ CIA, *Jérusalem*, I, no. 76, p. 244; II, pp. 127–9.

⁴ CIA, *Jérusalem*, II, no. 175, pp. 123–7.

⁵ Ibid., nos 283–4, pp. 422–5.

⁶ Ibid., no. 225, pp. 289–98.

⁷ CIA, *Jérusalem*, I, no. 80, pp. 252–61.

⁸ List given in *ibid.*, p. 257.

Finally, Tankiz also undertook a series of what we may call business foundations. A badly preserved inscription in the *suq al-qattanin* mentions a *suq* and probably a *khan*,⁹ and the texts mention a *qaysariya* and two baths.¹⁰ It is to this group, as well as to the first one, that the gate of the market of the cotton-merchants properly belongs. The inscription identifies it as a Haram gate, and so it was. But, as Max van Berchem has already shown, the curious characteristic of the stone inscription above the gateway is that it faces the Haram and is in reality announcing the *suq* which is west of it rather than the holy area which is to the east, although a certain amount of sanctifying ambiguity is certainly present in the inscription as well as in the location of the market. The door and the gateway thus fulfilled slightly different purposes: one was an entrance to the Haram from the city, the other was a symbol of a *suq* in the holy place. All together, however, these points, added to the existence of the damaged inscription inside the *suq*, would strongly argue for the conclusion that the whole complex of the *suq al-qattanin* with its monumental façade, its doors, its *khan*, and probably somewhere there its baths, now disappeared, was a foundation of Tankiz's conceived and imagined as one single "business center."¹¹ We shall examine below whether this complex was established on the spot of some previous construction. For its dating we possessed, until now, only the fragmentary inscription on stone above the gateway. Only the first letter of its last digit has remained, a *sin*, which was understood by Max van Berchem, on the basis of Mujir al-Din's reading, to be the beginning of *sab'a*, seven. The new inscription on the wooden doors, which could hardly have been put on before the whole gateway was built, indicates rather that the whole construction was finished a year earlier and probably that the *sin* stands for *sitta*, six, although the point is obviously of minor importance.

The more interesting conclusion to emerge from this brief enumeration of Tankiz's building activities in Jerusalem is rather the curious versatility of one of the great officials of the early Mamluk régime. He serves his master and his faith in works of restoration; he accomplishes his own private obligations as a Muslim by investing in philanthropic foundations which will perpetuate his name; and [77] finally, he engages in commercial building, on a choice location between the holy area and the city. In all three of these he follows a pattern of building which is characteristic of his time, and parallel activities by other high officials of the Mamluk empire can be found in Cairo, Aleppo and Damascus. In the last-named city, which was his capital, Tankiz himself was quite active, although his activities there seem to have been limited to pious foundations or restorations of old

⁹ Ibid., no. 81, pp. 262–5.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 265.

religious buildings.¹² In Jerusalem it is also interesting to note that the “business complex” (736 AH) is dated several years later than the pious foundations and public works (727–8, 729 and 730 AH). This may be quite accidental, but since we know from the information given by al-Maqrizi for Cairo¹³ and from a precise text of al-‘Umari’s¹⁴ that commercial enterprises were often established as *waqf* properties whose revenues were used for religious institutions, it is tempting to conclude that the order in which Tankiz’s buildings were erected corresponds to a conscious plan in which revenue-bearing institutions were the culmination of a major program of construction.

The inscriptions of the Bab al-Qattanin also raise an important problem concerning the medieval topography of Jerusalem. The latter has been remarkably confused by an over-abundance of texts – Christian, Jewish and Muslim – concerned with religious lore rather than descriptions, a great scarcity of adequate archaeological investigations, and a plethora of second-hand studies, most of which deal with the possible interpretation of existing monuments for the pre-Christian history of Jerusalem rather than with the standing monuments themselves. Essentially, the problem can be defined as follows: the inscription uses the word *jaddada* for Tankiz’s construction, and Mujir al-Din, followed by most contemporary writers, adds: “this indicates that there was there a gate of old.”¹⁵ This, of course, does not necessarily follow, since the word means really “to originate, innovate, do newly for the first time”¹⁶ and, as far as the commercial buildings are concerned at least, their novelty is assured by the almost contemporary testimony of al-‘Umari.¹⁷ As far as the gate alone is concerned, the matter is less clear, and it is indeed possible to assume that there had been an earlier gate there leading from the Haram to the city. But, if so, which one? Thus, the whole problem of the medieval entrances to the Haram is pertinent to an understanding of our inscription. In the past the problem had been taken up by [78] Sir Charles

¹² H. Sauvaire, “Description de Damas,” *Journal Asiatique*, 9ème sér. (1894), I, pp. 285, 315; II, p. 315; (1895), II, pp. 232 and 279; (1896), I, pp. 213–14, 237–8. Inscriptions referring to his work in Damascus and elsewhere in Syria and Palestine are to be found in the RCEA (*Répertoire Chronologique d’Epigraphie Arabe*).

¹³ Al-Maqrizi, *al-Mawa’iz wa’l-I‘tibar fi dhikr al-khitat wa’l-athar* (Bulaq, 1270/1853), II, pp. 86–91.

¹⁴ Al-‘Umari, *Masalik al-absar fi mamalik al-amsar*, as quoted in A. S. Marmadji, *Textes géographiques arabes sur la Palestine* (Paris, 1951), p. 241. Al-‘Umari’s text was not available at the time of writing.

¹⁵ Mujir al-Din, *al-Uns al-jali bita’rikh al-Quds wa’l-Khalil* (Cairo, 1866), p. 383; Guy Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems* (London, 1890), pp. 187–8; *CIA, Jérusalem*, I, no. 81, pp. 264–5; II, no. 176, pp. 127–9.

¹⁶ E. W. Lane, *An Arabic–English Lexicon* (8 vols, London, 1863–85), II; cf. note on the meaning of the word in *CIA, Jérusalem*, II, p. 301 and E. Herzfeld, *MCIA, Alep* (Cairo, 1956), p. 162.

¹⁷ Marmadji, *Textes géographiques*, p. 241.

Wilson¹⁸ and Guy Le Strange,¹⁹ but their conclusions have been received with some scepticism by Max van Berchem.²⁰

Any solution to the problem is complicated by the fact that, until the fourteenth century, no description specifically indicates which gates were on what side of the Haram. In addition, from the very beginning (the earliest text listing the gates is Ibn al-Faqih, AD 903), the names of the gates were of two kinds: either names closely related to some religious concept (Hitta, Rahma, Tawba) or personage (David, Prophet) or names of local topographical significance (Valley, House of the Mother of Khalid, etc.). Now, during subsequent centuries, the latter tended to drop out or change, as the city itself changed in character, whereas the former, having acquired a precise religious significance, remained as names but moved from place to place, as old gates were closed and new ones created. In other words, in order to explain the history of the Haram gates, we must keep in mind the existence of two constants: that of a given religious nomenclature which may move from one place to the other, and that of the topographical position of immovable entries to the holy area which may change names. To the first category belong the Bab al-Sakina, shown first to have been on the southern side – probably one of the sides of the Double Gate – and migrating to the northern part of the Bab al-Silsila (on the western side of the Haram) at some undetermined date,²¹ but probably after the Crusades when the southern entrances to the Haram were blocked off; the Bab Hitta, also originally to the south or the southwest, but this time migrating to the north;²² and perhaps the Bab al-Nabi, which seems to have been in pre-Crusading times²³ on the southern wall, but which moved in later times to its present site, below the Bab al-Maghariba, in the southern part of the western wall.²⁴

To the second category, that of traditional gates which may change names, belong, first of all, the Golden Gate (Bab al-Rahma, Bab al-Tawba), which eventually fell into disuse, although it is not quite certain when this happened.²⁵ Another permanent gate was a large one at the northeast corner of the Haram generally known as Bab al-Asbat. The variations in the localization of the Bab al-Asbat described by Le Strange²⁶ need not imply a shifting of the name from

¹⁸ Sir Charles Wilson, "On the Transference of the Arab Names of some of the Gates of the Haram," Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement, 1888, pp. 141 ff.

¹⁹ Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, pp. 173 ff., has accepted Wilson's conclusions.

²⁰ *CIA, Jérusalem*, II, pp. 128–9 and *passim*. For the city itself see now the remarks of A. Miquel, "Jérusalem arabe," *Bulletin d'Etudes Orientales*, 16 (1958–60).

²¹ *CIA, Jérusalem*, I, p. 109, with bibliography.

²² Texts and discussions in Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, p. 181; cf. *CIA, Jérusalem*, II, pp. 102 ff., whose scepticism may not be fully justified in this instance.

²³ Texts in Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, pp. 182, 189.

²⁴ Mujir al-Din, *al-'Uns*, p. 383.

²⁵ The Golden Gate poses a series of problems of its own to which I hope to return in the near future.

²⁶ Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, pp. 185–6.

one place to the other. They most probably derive from the fact, ascertained by authors as early as al-Maqdisi, that there were several doors within this one gate and, following the practice known for instance from the Golden Gate, it is likely [79] that the various doors had more or less established names of their own. Thus may be explained the Gate of the Pool of the Children of Israel (al-Maqdisi), the Gate of Gates (Nasir-i Khosro), perhaps also the Gate of al-Walid (al-Maqdisi, Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi), and the Gate al-Hashimi (Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi). It may well be that there was another permanent gate on the north side of the Haram, since it is indeed curious that the present Gate of Obscurity (Bab al-'Atm) has the same name as the Herodian gate on the north wall of the Temple, Gate Tadi.²⁷ But the name Bab al-'Atm is quite recent and its older names known to us, such as Bab al-Dawadariya or Bab Sharaf al-Anbiya',²⁸ do not go back further than the middle of the fourteenth century. Beyond that no listed gate can easily be fitted there. Finally, there was a permanent gate on the western side of the Haram. This is the present Bab al-Silsila, formerly known as Bab Da'ud, a double gate whose magnificence in Fatimid times was described by Nasir-i Khosro,²⁹ and which is still today, in spite of being in need of repair, one of the most striking entrances into the sanctuary. It was the main gate to the Temple area at the time of the Crusaders, and the existence of Wilson's arch just below strongly suggests that it was a major gate earlier as well. It is all the more interesting, therefore, to see that it changed names several times during the centuries.

A last general consideration should be brought out in order to explain the history of the Haram gates to the west, and hence our specific problem of the Bab al-Qattanin. Some time in the Fatimid period a major change of orientation took place in the whole topography of the holy city in relation to the Haram. Up until then the city had developed on three sides of the sanctuary, the western, southern and northern ones, the eastern side being occupied quite early by a huge cemetery. In the Fatimid period the walls were shortened toward the south and the present configuration of the walls came into being. As a result most of the southern wall of the Haram became also the city wall, and it is toward the north and especially the west that all major lines of communication with the city were established. This trend was continued under the Crusaders, who used the southern gates mostly for military purposes. It is to be fully expected, therefore, that in the later medieval periods, new gates would have been created on the northern and western sides of the Haram.

²⁷ CIA, *Jérusalem*, I, p. 216; CIA, *Jérusalem*, II, pp. 88 ff.; L. H. Vincent, *Jérusalem de l'Ancien Testament*, 2 vols (Paris, 1954), II, p. 553.

²⁸ Mujir al-Din, *al-'Uns*, p. 381; L. A. Mayer, "A Mediaeval Arabic Description of the Haram of Jerusalem," *QDAP* (*Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine*), I (1931), p. 79.

²⁹ Nasir-i Khosro, *Safar Namah*, ed. and tr. by Charles Schefer as *Relation de voyage de Nassiri Khosrau* (Paris, 1881), tr. p. 73.

At present there are nine entrances on the western side of the Haram. From north to south these are (Figure 2): Bab al-Ghawanima, Bab al-Seray, Bab al-Nazir, Bab al-Hadid, Bab al-Qattanin, Bab al-Mathara or al-Mutawadda', the double gate Bab al-Salam-Bab al-Silsila, Bab al-Maghariba. Such is already the list provided by Mujir al-Din, with the substitution of Bab al-Sakina for Bab al-Salam and the [81] omission of the Gate of the Seray, because it is a recent Turkish one.³⁰ The same number is already present in al-'Umari (c. 1350), with, curiously, the name Bab al-Salam for the northern half of the double gate, the name *Ribat al-Mansuri* for the Bab al-Nazir, and no name for Bab al-Qattanin. The present arrangement existed, therefore, at least as early as the middle of the fourteenth century.

For the earlier periods the problem is more complicated: al-Musharraf (eleventh century AD)³¹ and those descriptions by Crusaders I have been able to consult do not give complete lists of gates. Before the Crusades only one gate is obvious: as we have seen before, Bab al-Silsila must be equated with the ancient Bab Da'ud. Its northern half does not usually appear, except in Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi, who, next to Bab Da'ud, mentions a Bab Sulayman.³² The association David–Solomon, otherwise unknown, is logical enough in folklore and probably corresponds to some popular tradition, if it was not simply made up by some imaginative compiler. The Bab al-Maghariba is on top of an older gate, which is either the ancient Bab Hitta or the ancient Bab al-Nabi.³³ Its new name does not occur before the end of the Crusades, and it is interesting, as we shall see, because it refers to a quarter outside the sanctuary wall rather than to a feature associated with the Haram itself. The Bab al-Mathara is a minor gate, of Mamluk origin, leading to places for ablutions, lavatories and water reservoirs.³⁴ Bab al-Ghawanima, at the extreme north, under its Mamluk name refers to a tribe or family which settled in that part of the city.³⁵ But, as Mujir al-Din adds, it is also known as Bab al-Khalil, that is, Gate of Abraham. One such gate is mentioned by al-Maqdisi, and Ibn al-Faqih mentions a cavern of Abraham as being related to that gate.³⁶ There is little doubt, therefore, that the present gate goes back at least to the tenth century.

Between the Gate of David and the Gate of Abraham, al-Maqdisi mentions the Gate of the Mother of Khalid; and Ibn al-Faqih, whose order of gates is

³⁰ Mujir al-Din, *al-'Uns*, II, p. 383.

³¹ As quoted in Ibn al-Firkah, ed. C. D. Mathews, *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, 15 (1935), pp. 66 ff. I was unable to check this passage with the unique manuscript of al-Musharraf which exists in Tübingen.

³² Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, p. 174; Marmadji, *Textes géographiques*, p. 212.

³³ Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, pp. 181 ff.; Nasir-i Khosro, *Safar Namah*, has the Gate of the Prophet on the southern wall.

³⁴ Mayer, "A Mediaeval Arabic Description," p. 81.

³⁵ Mujir al-Din, *al-'Uns*, p. 383.

³⁶ Ibn al-Faqih's text is not very clear as to whether there really was a Gate of the Cavern of Abraham.

less clear, lists a Gate of the House of the Mother of Khalid. Nasir-i Khosro mentions a Bab al-Saqar (gate of Hell) some way north of the Gate of David. There is little doubt that the two Arab authors deal with the same gate, although we cannot guess at the reason for the notoriety of Khalid or of his mother. The Bab al-Saqar has been identified either with the Bab al-Hadid of today or with the Bab al-Nazir.³⁷ Neither identification is satisfactory, for their proponents have always [82] worked on the assumption that all present gates must have had an older name. There are two points which may rather lead to the opinion that the Persian traveler's gate should be identified with the Gate of Abraham. The first one is that the name of the gate is a religious one which could well have been connected with the cave otherwise known as Abraham's. The second one is that Nasir's text suggests, without making it very clear, that the Bab al-Saqar was beyond the colonnade of sixty-four marble-covered pillars which went northward from the Gate of David. Neither the Bab al-Hadid (120 meters) nor even the Bab al-Nazir (295 meters) seem to have been far enough removed to allow the presence of sixty-four arches between them and the Gate of David. But this identification of the Bab al-Saqar with the Gate of Abraham must still remain as a pure hypothesis.

It is similarly difficult to identify the Gate of Khalid with any of the three possible gates: Nazir, Hadid, Qattanin. The only arguments in favor of the Bab al-Qattanin are the use of the word *jaddada* in the inscription and the fact that the inscriptions say that the gate was for the Haram. But the word *jaddada* is ambiguous, as we have seen. In favor of the Bab al-Nazir we find the late evidence of Mujir al-Din, who mentions that it had been known under the name of the Gate of Michael, and it has been suggested that this name is derived from a Crusaders' church in that area.³⁸ Later on a bit of Islamic religious lore (Gabriel tying up Buraq) was attached to it, but does not seem to have taken a permanent character. Since we have no record of the Crusaders building a gate on the western side of the Haram, it could well be that the Bab al-Nazir was the ancient Bab of Khalid, but the matter cannot yet be settled definitely. No evidence exists for an early history of the Iron Gate, which must therefore be a Mamluk creation, perhaps an Ayyubid one.

The point of importance, however, seems to be that, whatever the previous position of gates to the Haram from the city, at least two were new ones added by the Mamluks before 1350. In addition, as is well known, they rebuilt most of the others. And a strong suspicion remains that the Bab al-Qattanin was as original a Mamluk creation as the *suq* which stood west of

³⁷ Nasir-i Khosro, *Safar Namah*, transl., p. 74.

³⁸ The point was first made by Charles Clermont-Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches in Palestine during the years 1873-1874*, 2 vols (London, 1896-9), I, pp. 127 ff.; *CIA, Jérusalem*, II, pp. 56-9.

it. The possibility may not be excluded that, at the time of its creation, some sanctifying legend had been connected with the Bab al-Qattanin, which would justify the verb in the inscription, but no evidence, to my knowledge, exists for it.

In conclusion, one last remark may be made. It has been pointed out earlier that the gates created by the Mamluks – or whose names appear for the first time in Mamluk times – tend to acquire names connected with the constructions on the border of the Haram rather than religious names associated with the sanctuary itself: Maghariba, Mathara, Qattanin, Ghawanima, Nazir, to name only those on the west side. This point is interesting in two ways. First, it emphasizes the importance of Mamluk constructions in the area immediately to the [83] west of the Haram.³⁹ This is the time when the level of the medieval city was raised and when, except in the southwestern corner, the western wall of the Haram, still apparent at the time of the Crusades,⁴⁰ almost disappears from view. Second, it illustrates a phenomenon apparent also in other cities developing at that time, Aleppo, Damascus and Cairo, i.e. the mixture of religious and secular purposes in the architecture which followed the Crusades in the Islamic Orient. This is particularly significant in the case of Jerusalem, whose peculiarity, when compared to the other major cities of the Mamluk and Ayyubid worlds, was its religious meaning to the faithful and its character as a symbol of the victory over the Crusades rather than its political or economic significance. And indeed, as Max van Berchem has masterfully shown,⁴¹ the whole purpose of Muslim architectural activities immediately after the reconquest was to reestablish the holy city on its pre-Crusade pattern. Thus one can explain the migration of religious names attached to gates. But, in reality, except for the key monuments of the Dome of the Rock and of the Aqsa Mosque, the city of Jerusalem and its holy Haram were not merely rebuilt as they had been in the past. As the latter became surrounded with schools, baths, hospitals and bazaars, the whole aspect of the city was changed. But the pattern of change was not one imposed by the religious character and the symbols of the Haram. It is rather a new fashion, created first in other cities of Syria and Egypt, of carefully interwoven pious and mercantile foundations which was imposed on the holy city and its old sanctuary.

³⁹ Most of these monuments have still not been adequately studied.

⁴⁰ See *Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society* (London, 1894), pp. 12–13.

⁴¹ *CIA, Jérusalem*, II, pp. 23–31, 37 ff., etc.

