The Enigma of the Name Īliyā (= Aelia) for Jerusalem in Early Islam

David M. Jacobson
King's College, London WC2R 2LS

Abstract

Following the Arab conquest of Jerusalem in 638 CE, its official name remained essentially unchanged for over a century, the Latin form Aelia merely being transliterated into the Arabic Īliyā. This fact is attested on coins and seals dating from the Umayyad period. In the early 9th century CE, the name Īliyā fell out of use to be replaced by al-Quds, in recognition of the sacred status of Jerusalem. This study offers an explanation for delayed name change by examining the testimony of earliest surviving sources, including in particular the contemporaneous coins and the foremost Islamic monument that survives from Umayyad rule, the Dome of the Rock. New observations about this early Islamic shrine and its mosaic decoration are reported and analysed. The various strands of evidence are brought together and throw new light on the persistence of the name Īliyā for Jerusalem.

Keywords: Jerusalem, Aelia Capitolia, Īliyā, Dome of the Rock, ʿAbd al-Malik, Solomon's Temple, al-Aqṣā Mosque, *Mi'rāj*, *Isrā'*, *Faḍā'il Bayt al-Maqdis*, early Islamic coinage

1. Background

The great Jewish Revolt against Rome ended in disaster for the Jews of Judaea, with their ancient capital and splendid Temple utterly destroyed. Josephus, the Jewish historian and contemporary witness of that war, describes this ruination in the wake of the Roman conquest:[1]

> Caesar [Titus] ordered the whole city and the Temple to be razed to the ground, leaving only the loftiest of the towers, Phasael, Hippicus and Mariamme, and the portion of the wall enclosing the city on the west: the latter as an encampment for the garrison [of the Tenth Legion] that was to remain, and the towers to indicate to posterity the nature of the city and of the strong defences which had yet yielded to Roman prowess. All the rest of the wall encompassing the city was so completely levelled to the ground as to leave future visitors to the spot no ground for believing that it had ever been inhabited. Such was the end to which the frenzy of revolutionaries brought Jerusalem, that splendid city of world-wide renown.

This description finds resonance with the following passage from the Gospels, written as a prophecy, but actually indicating knowledge that the destruction of Jerusalem had occurred:

"Do you see all these great buildings?" replied Jesus. "Not one stone here will be left on; every one will be thrown down."[2]

---

[1] Jos., *BJ* 7.1
[2] Mk 13.2 [NIV translation]; also, Mt 24.2; Lk 21.6.

In a similar vein, the author of John's Gospel quotes the 'chief priests and Pharisees' predicting that:[3]

> … The Romans will come and take away both our place (i.e.Temple) and our nation.

Jerusalem remained a heap of ruins until Hadrian decided to rebuild the city, but not for the Jews, as Cassius Dio, writing at the end of the 2nd to the beginning of the 3rd century CE, records:[4]

> At Jerusalem, he (Hadrian) founded a city in place of the one which had been razed to the ground, naming it Aelia Capitolina, and on the site of the temple of the god he raised a new temple to Jupiter.[5] This brought on a war of no slight importance nor of brief duration, for the Jews deemed it intolerable that foreign races should be settled in their city and foreign religious rites planted there.

The historian is referring here to the lead-up to the Bar Kokhba rebellion (132 - 135 CE).[6] At this time, the former capital of Judaea was founded as the Roman *colonia*, Aelia Capitolia, a settlement intended for Roman military veterans and their families, with the camp of the Tenth Legion, which had been stationed after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, next to the western city wall, as its nucleus.[7]

The Roman ritual, the *sulcus primigenius* ('first furrow'), of founding a new city is described by the Roman scholar and lexicographer, Marcus Terentius Varro (116 – 27 BCE), thus:[8]

> … with a team of cattle, a bull and a cow on the inside, they ran a furrow around with a plough (for reasons of religion they did this on an auspicious day), that they might be fortified by a ditch and a wall.

Thus, the furrow represented the ditch (*fossa*); and the earth thrown up by the plough, the rampart (*agger*) of the new urban foundation. In the case of Aelia Capitolina, the founding (*condita*) ceremony would have been carried out by the local Roman governor, Tineius Rufus. It is vividly illustrated in a commemorative coin issue of Hadrian (see **Fig. 1**), possibly dating to c.130 CE, not long before the outbreak of the Bar Kokhba rebellion. The *vexillum* shown, a flag-like military standard, symbolises that the new foundation was to be a

---

[3] Jn 11.48.
[4] Dio 69.12.1.
[5] It is probable that although a temple to the Capitoline deities was begun on the site of Herod's Temple, but was never progressed beyond its foundations. By the 4th century CE, all there was to be seen at that site of the former Sanctuary was the "pierced rock" (*al-Ṣakhrā*), marking the summit of Mt. Moriah (*Itin. Burdig*. 591.6). Close-by were two imperial statues, including an equestrian one of Hadrian, attested by Origen (*C.Matt.* 24.15 [fr. 469, iv]) and the Bordeaux Pilgrim (*Itin. Burdig*. 591.4); see Wilkinson 1976, 77-78.
[6] Evidence supporting Dio's contention that the founding of Aelia Capitolina preceded the Bar Kokhba Revolt (rather than followed it) is succinctly reviewed by Mor 2012, 169-76. Di Segni (2014) argues for the refounding date of Aelia Capitolina being as early as 117 CE, but Eck (2019) insists that it could not have happened before the summer of 130 CE; cf. Weksler-Bdolah 2019, 51-54; 2014, 56-58.
[7] Jos. *BJ* 7.2-5; cf. Di Segni and Tsafrir 2012, 406.
[8] Varro, *Ling.* 5.143.

settlement for army veterans, alongside the headquarters of the Xth Legion Fretensis.[9] The Jews, with justification, saw this act by Rufus as the ploughing up of their holy capital, Jerusalem.[10] In any case, the creation of Aelia Capitolina in practice represented the erasure of Jerusalem and therefore the negation on the ancient Judaean capital. Jews were forbidden entry into Aelia Capitolina, except for one day each year when, for the payment of a bribe, they were admitted to the Temple Mount, probably on the 9th of Ab, by tradition the day in the Hebrew calendar when both the First and Second Temples were destroyed, to mourn at the "pierced rock" (*al-Ṣakhrā*). This marked the spot where their Sanctuary had formerly stood.[11] This ban was strictly enforced, with a brief respite during the reign of Emperor Julian II (331/2–363 CE). It was reapplied thereafter until the Arab conquest of the city in 638 CE, when Caliph 'Umar permitted 70 Jewish families to take up residence in Jerusalem.[12]

Fig. 1. Aelia Capitolina (Jerusalem). Hadrian. 117-138 CE. (Æ 22 mm, 10.49 g). Obverse: Laureate and draped bust right; [I]MP CAES TRAIANO HA[DRIANO AVG P P]. Reverse: Tineius Rufus(?) ploughing with yoke of an ox and a cow; vexillum in background; COL AEL KA-PIT COND. Amandry and Burnett 2015, no. 3964; Meshorer 1989, no. 2. Private collection, with permission.

The Temple area lay largely desolate through the later Roman and Byzantine periods, until the arrival of the Arabs.[13] It seems to have been called the *Kodra*.[14] This was probably a

[9] On the *colonia* of Alia Capitolina and its resettlement with Roman army veterans, see Isaac 1980/81; Millar 1990, 29. Visible evidence for Hadrian's construction of Aelia Capitolina is provided by Weksler-Bdolah (2019; 2014) in excavation of the eastern Cardo. For a history of this Roman *colonia*, see Bieberstein 2007. None of the evidence offered by this last author (idem, 153-55) convincingly demonstrates any Jewish settlement in Aelia Capitolina, at least prior to Constantine.
[10] *m.Ta'an*. 4.6; *b.Ta'an*. 29a; *j.Ta'an*. 25b.
[11] *Itin. Burdig*. 591.6; Jer., *C. Soph*. 1.15
[12] Levy-Rubin 2009; Gil 1996a, 165-71.
[13] The ruins were left in situ for theological reasons. For the Temple Area in the Byzantine period, see Wilkinson 2002, 357-59.
[14] *Chronicon Paschale* in *Patrologia Graeca* 92, 613.

Greek form of the Latin *quadra*, meaning a "square (area)". According to tradition, when the Arabs arrived, they found it being used as a refuse dump.[15]

From the time of Hadrian until Late Antiquity, Aelia Capitolina remained the official name of the city and its usual geographical designation.[16] It passed over into Arabic after the Arab conquest of Jerusalem as Īliyā. This is illustrated by the first coins bearing Arabic inscriptions minted in Jerusalem; see **Fig. 2**. The same applies for the lead market seals of the city of the Umayyad period,[17] which all carry the name Īliyā, as do milestones that refer to Jerusalem.[18]

Fig. 2. ʻAbd al-Malik (ruled 685–705 CE), Fals (Æ 20 mm, 3.21 g.), Īliyā, Filasṭīn (Jerusalem) mint. Dating from mid-late 680s to 696. Obverse: Standing caliph; to l. and r. *Muḥammad rasūl ʾAllāh* ("Muhammad is the apostle of Allah"). Reverse: 'M', to l. and r.: (*Īliyā* [Jerusalem] and *Filasṭīn* [Palestine]). Album, no. 125; Goodwin 2005, nos. 8-9; Walker 1956, 79. Private collection, with permission.

This situation is reflected in the earliest Muslim religious traditions preserved in the Ḥadīth. For example, in Ḥadīth 1.6, concerning Heraclius, ʻAbd Allāh ibn ʻAbbās said that Abū Sufyān ibn Harb, the father of the future caliph Muʻāwiya, informed him that Heraclius had sent a messenger to him while he had been accompanying a caravan from Quraysh.[19] They were merchants doing business in al-Shām (Syria, Lebanon, Palestine and Jordan), at the time when Allāh's apostle had a truce with Abū Sufyān and Quraysh infidels. So Abū Sufyān and his companions went to Heraclius at Īliyā (Aelia Capitolina). The name Īliyā is also used for Jerusalem in the famous Pact of Umar, as recorded in al-Ṭabarī (ed. Friedmann 12, 191-92).

---

[15] Gil 1992, 65-67.

[16] E.g., Aelia is stipulated as the city from which miles were measured (Eucherius 12; see Wilkinson 2002, 314); also, throughout Eusebius' *Onomasticon* and in Jerome's Latin translation and expansion of this work). Of course, Christian writers of the Byzantine period mostly prefer to use the name [H]ierosolyma (Jerusalem in its Greek New Testament form) in their literary and theological works.

[17] Amitai-Preiss 2015/16, 106-11.

[18] El-Awaisi 2011, 15-16. The year of the Arab conquest of Jerusalem is generally recognised by scholars to be 636 CE (15 AH); see Nees 2015, 5-6.

[19] This story of an encounter between the Emperor Heraclius and Abū Sufyān, a relative of Muhammad, forms part of a compilation of Ḥadīth by Muḥammad Ismāʻīl al-Bukhārī (810-870 CE).

These examples are typical: in all the Ḥadīth literature the name Jerusalem is consistently given as Īliyā, The celebrated late Umayyad poet, Al-Farazdaq (Tammām ibn Ghālib Abū Firās), who lived until AH 110 (728/9 CE), followed suit,[20] and Masʿūdī (Abū al-Ḥasan ʻAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Masʻūdī), writing in c. AH 345 (956 CE), notes that the name Īliyā was still being used in his day.[21]

We also find Bayt al-Maqdis, clearly a direct Arabic translation from the Hebrew, *bēt ha-miqdāsh* (i.e., the Jerusalem Temple), in Arabic texts from the mid-9th century onwards.[22] There is a literary tradition that for some time before then this name had been used as an alternative for the al-Aqṣā Mosque and also, it would seem, for the entire Ḥaram al-Sharīf.[23]

2. Early Islamic Jerusalem and the Dome of the Rock

In view of the sanctity of Jerusalem for Islam, and in particular the claimed link of Muhammad to that city that has gained currency, it is counterintuitive that the representatives of the new religion would accept and continue use the name Īliyā, which had a pagan derivation and implicitly was a denial of Jerusalem. This is surely cogent evidence to show that in the early phase of Islam, Jerusalem was not considered as a sacred city associated directly with Muhammad. There is a strong tradition that Muhammad chose Jerusalem as the first *qibla* (direction of prayer), although this is nowhere stated explicitly in the Qur'ān. It is only mentioned in later biographies of Muhammad and Ḥadīth collections.[24] Verses 2.142-44 of the Qur'ān have been interpreted as a change in the *qibla* towards the Ka'aba in Mecca ordained by Muhammad, but the wording is quite ambiguous.

Prior to ʻAbd al-Malik, there is evidence that several key administrative roles including responsibility for minting coins were delegated to Christians.[25] Rare coins struck in Jerusalem by Christian moneyers, which are dated to the caliphate of Muʻāwiya, the founder of the Umayyad dynasty who ruled from 661-680 CE, display a cross and refer to the city as Ierosolyma in Greek, and not Aelia/Īliyā; see **Fig. 3**.

The oldest dated Islamic inscriptions in Jerusalem are those in the Dome of the Rock within the Ḥaram al-Sharīf, the Arabic name that has been given to the Temple Mount. The two long bands of text in blue-and-gold glass mosaic, which encircle the respective inner and outer faces of the outer octagonal arcade form part of the decorative scheme from the time of Caliph ʻAbd al-Malik and are considered primary documents for the condition of the Qur'ānic text in the first century of Islam. These mosaic inscriptions are still preserved in

[20] El-Awaisi 2011, 17-18.
[21] Gil 1996b, 10.
[22] One of the early writers to use the name Bayt al-Maqdis for Jerusalem was al-Khawārizmi, in 847 CE (AH 232).
[23] For relevant texts, see El-Awaisi 2011, 21-24.
[24] For a discussion and bibliography of publications dealing with change in the *qibla*, see Gil 1996a, 196-97; Elad 1995, 30-31.
[25] A Greek inscription from the time of Muʿāwiya, and dated to AH 42 (662/3 CE), commemorates the restoration of the thermae at Hamat Gader. The official responsible for the baths at that time was one Ionnes, clearly a Christian, and the inscription begins with the sign of the cross (Di Segni 1997, 237-40, inscription 54 and fig. 50).

their entirety, except for the substitution of the name of the ‘Abbāsid caliph al-Ma’mūn (AH 198-218 / 813-33 CE) for that of ‘Abd al-Malik; al-Ma’mūn did not, however, change the date included by ‘Abd al-Malik, AH 72 (691/2 CE), which attests to the year of their installation[26]. The inscription begins on the inner south side of the octagon with the *basmalah* (“In the name of Allah, the Merciful and Compassionate”) and then the opening clause of the *shahādah*, the declaration of faith (“There is no god except Allah, and one [is] he; [there is] no partner to him”), in the same wording as on the reform coinage of ‘Abd al-Malik launched five years later, and this is followed by a series of polemical quotations mostly Qur’ānic, with some variant wording from the canonical text in places, interspersed with brief invocations.[27]

Fig. 3. Early Umayyad Imperial Image Coinage. AE 19 mm, 1.57 g. Jerusalem Mint. Dated to c. 660-680 CE. Obverse: Standing figure of an emperor holding globus cruciger and long staff with legend to right (nonE?). Reverse: Large ‘M’ with inscription running clockwise: IEP[O] to left, [C]O[ΛY] to right and [MWN] in exergue (= “of the people of Jerusalem”). Goodwin 2005, 87 fig. 1 var. Foss 2009, 44, 133 no. 45; Meshorer 1996, 415-16 no. 1; cf. Album and Goodwin 2002, 90. Gemini, LLC, Auction 7 (9 Jan. 2011), lot 1068. Courtesy Gemini Numismatic Auctions, LLC

To summarise the content, on the inner face of the octagon the declaration of faith is followed by conflated verses describing the powers of Allah. Next, the prophet Muhammad is introduced, with a blessing that is not a direct quotation from the Qur’ān. Then follows a proclamation recognising Jesus as a prophet, although emphasising that he was a mere mortal, and abjuring the notion of a Trinity, there being only one true God. Finally, there is a command to believe in the true religion of Islam and a reminder that those who disbelieve in the divine revelations will be called to account. The inscription on the outer face consists of six sections separated by ornaments, the last comprising the dedication notice. The five other sections encapsulate the major themes of the inscription on the inner face, each beginning

[26] It is widely agreed by scholars that the year AH 72 also marked the completion of the Dome of the Rock; see Milwright 2016, 42-43.

[27] On these inscriptions, see in particular Milwright 2016, 60-82. A rendering of the entire composite inscription into modern English is given in idem, 69-72; Blair 1992, 86-87; cf. Kessler 1970. A complete and clearly readable set of photographs (albeit some misidentified and presented in incorrect order) has been published by Nuseibeh and Grabar (1996, 82-105).

with the *basmalah* and, in the first four, followed by the version of the *shahādah* as described above.

Scholars have long pointed out that the entire text is concerned with a one basic theme – a denial of the divinity of Jesus along with the negation of the Christian dogma of the Trinity and, instead, asserting the oneness of God.[28] Like the edifice of the Dome of the Rock itself, the inscription constitutes a political and theological refutation of Christian supremacy, Jerusalem being a principal destination of Christian pilgrimage. It is instructive that this long compilation of mainly Qur'ānic quotations does not include the verse about the Nocturnal Journey from *al-Masjid al-Ḥaram* in Mecca to *al-Masjid al-Aqṣā* (the *Iṣrā'*; Sura 17.1). What this material evidence confirms is that the Dome of the Rock was built before the idea took hold that Muhammad ascended to heaven (the *Mi'rāj*) from the protruding rock (*Ṣakhrā*), enshrined within the monumental building.[29]

By building the Dome of the Rock over the *Ṣakhrā*, the remaining physical marker of the site of the ancient Temple Sanctuary, 'Abd al-Malik was appropriating Judaism's most sacred site for Islam. Elad accepts the interpretation of the majority of early Muslim historians for 'Abd al-Malik's decision to build the Dome of the Rock, which is also endorsed by several modern historians,[30] namely that the Dome of the Rock was intended to be an erstwhile substitute for the Ka'ba in Mecca and the faithful were encouraged to circumambulate this centrally planned building. The reason for the intentional diversion of the *ḥajj* to Jerusalem was that a dissident tribal leader in Mecca, 'Abdallāh ibn al-Zubayr, a nephew of Aisha, the third wife of Muhammad, staged a revolt against the Umayyads in 680 CE, that lasted until his death in 692, and took control of Mecca.[31] Acting in response, 'Abd al-Malik strove to raise the religious and political profile of Syria at the expense of Arabia. As part of this initiative, he made a strenuous "effort to exalt and to glorify the religious and political status of Jerusalem,"[32] with emphasis placed on the site of the ancient Jewish Temple.[33] The building the Dome of the Rock by 'Abd al-Malik undoubtedly sought to advance his political aspirations.[34] By constructing this magnificent domed shrine on the spot

---

[28] The inscription encompasses all the Christological passages of the Qur'ān; see Ettinghausen and Grabar 1987, 32. For a full exploration of the polemical function of this building, expressed not only through the inscriptions but also through the choice of site and the architectural form, see Grabar 1959; Busse 1981. Rabbat (1989) has provided some refinements and modifications to Grabar's interpretation. On the other hand, Rosen-Ayalon (1989, 67-68) has cited references in the inscriptions to angels and to the cycle of Jesus' birth, death, and resurrection, out of context, in support of her interpretation of the building as a representation of paradise. These allusions, even if they carry some weight, are, however, subsidiary or even incidental to the candid anti-Trinitarian messages contained in the inscriptions which encircle this monument.

[29] The belief in Muhammad's Ascension from the protruding rock (*al-Ṣakhrā*) within the Dome of the Rock only dates from the beginning of the 8th century, i.e. sometime after it was built; see Rabbat 1989, 12.

[30] Enumerated in Elad 1995, 159 and n. 53. Like Rabbat, Elad has examined the early documentary sources relating to 'Abd al-Malik's decision to construct the Dome of the Rock; see Elad 2008. For a review of studies of the motivations of the sixth Umayyad caliph for building the Dome of the Rock, see Lassner 2017, 151-79; Milwright 2016, 38-44. See also other references in Levy-Rubin 2017, 441-42 n. 1. Milwright (ibid, 254) remarks that there is "no conclusive evidence to suggest that any part of the current structure of the Dome of the Rock dates from earlier than the caliphate of 'Abd al-Malik.

[31] Creswell 1969, 65-66.

[32] Elad 1992.

[33] Elad 2008, passim; 1995, 147, 159, 162-63; Kaplony 2002, 38-48.

[34] Rabbat 1989, 17-18; idem 1993,73.

hallowed by Kings David and Solomon, who are held up as paragons of virtue and wisdom in the Qur'ān and much admired in popular Muslim tradition, he strove to bask in their glory and present his caliphate as their worthy successor.

Through this imposing piece of Byzantine monumental architecture, the caliph "was showing his will and power to use the enormous resources of Byzantine skill and experience to promote the Muslim cause."[35] According to Levy-Rubin the building of the Dome of the Rock was inter alia an expression of political and ideological rivalry with Byzantium that ran high during the late 7th century CE. Levy-Rubin suggests that this rivalry incentivised ʿAbd al-Malik to build a monument on the site of Solomon's Temple, which the Christians had left derelict for so long, one that would rival in splendour the churches of Constantinople, including Justinian's Hagia Sophia.[36]

3. The Significance of the Ḥaram al-Sharīf in the Umayyad Period

Unfortunately, none of the Arabic literary sources on Jerusalem and references to traditions that survive predate the middle of the 9th century CE,[37] so for the earliest references to the Temple Mount, we need to turn to Christian writings.[38] One of the first descriptions, by date, of Jerusalem after 638 CE is the one by Bishop Arculf from the 680s CE, preserved in a book about the Holy Places by Adomnan, the Abbot of Iona[39]. The Byzantine Chronicle of Theophanes (d. 818 CE) has an entry under *annus mundi* 6127 (according to the 'Alexandrian era', corresponding to 634/5 CE[40]), mentioning that Caliph 'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb entered the Holy City and sought the location of Solomon's Temple, so that he might make it a place of worship for his coreligionists.[41] A second entry under the year 6135 (642/3 CE) states that in that year 'Umar started to build the 'temple' at Jerusalem, which was presumably the Aqṣā Mosque.[42] Mango has noted that this information derives from a Syriac chronicle of c. 780 CE, now lost.[43]

In addition, there are two Georgian accounts, which seem to be based on even earlier Greek sources and are believed to date from the second half of the 7th century CE.[44] The first of

[35] Kaplony2002, 48.
[36] Levy-Rubin 2017. Another Byzantine building that might have provided a spur to the building of the Dome of the Rock may have been nearer at hand. A prime candidate would have been the domed octagonal church at Caesarea, which stood on a raised platform and dominated the skyline of Caesarea into the early Islamic period. It also happened to be of comparable dimensions to the Dome of the Rock; see Whitcomb 2011, 409-11 and figs. 11-12.
[37] Rabbat 1989, 12.
[38] For other contemporaneous non-Arabic sources on early Islam, see Hoyland 1997.
[39] See Wilkinson 2002, 18-19 (brief biographies of Arculf and Adomnan); 167-83 (translation of Adomnan's *De Locis Sanctis*). On Arculf's description of the first primitive mosque in Jerusalem preserved in Adomnan, see Nees 2015, 26, 28, 34-35.
[40] The date of Creation (year 1) was computed in 412 CE by Christian scholars in Alexandria to be 25 March 5493 BCE; see Bickerman 1980, 73. The date given by Theophanes is incorrect by a few years. It is generally accepted that Jerusalem fell to the conquering army of 'Umar in early 638 CE; see Mango 1992, 2; Gil 1996b, 6.
[41] Theophanes, in De Boor 1883/85, I, 339.
[42] Ibid., 342.
[43] Mango 1992, 1.
[44] Flusin 1992, 17-19.

these recounts that when the Arabs entered Jerusalem, they proceeded directly to a place called *Kapitolion* and undertook the construction of a mosque there. This source tells us that Patriarch Sophronius, who had been in office when the Arabs entered Jerusalem in 638 CE was still alive during this building operation, so it must have occurred in about the same year, because the Patriarch died in either 639 or 640 CE.[45] As confirmed by the second of these Georgian documents, the *Kapitolion* (where we were told in the previous document that the first mosque was built) was located on the Temple Mount and very likely on the site of the ancient Jewish Sanctuary, because it is referred to as the "Temple of God."[46] As Mango suggests, this may refer to an actual temple of Jupiter, the one referred to by Dio (see above), or to a designated spot because that temple, although planned, was never actually built or completed.[47]

These Christian testimonies are largely consistent with traditional Islamic accounts of the beginning of Arab rule of Jerusalem, which were written down much later. In the version handed down by Rajā' ibn Ḥaywa (early 8th century CE) and cited by the Persian scholar and historian, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (839–923 CE),[48] known simply as al-Ṭabarī, 'Umar entered the Temple area at dusk with an entourage. The guide was Ka'b al-Aḥbār, a Yemenite Jew who had converted to Islam and recognised in the Arab sources as an authority on Jewish tradition and customs. The visitors paused at the protruding rock (*Ṣakhra*) at the summit of the Temple Mount, pointed out by Ka'b as the *Miḥḥrāb Dāwūd*, (literally, sanctuary of David), which is referred to obliquely in the Qu'rān.[49] 'Umar ordered the accumulated garbage that covered the site to be cleared and the party stopped there to pray.[50]

This and other accounts of the conquest of Jerusalem contained in the earliest Arabic sources concentrate on the identification and veneration of the site of the ancient Jewish Temple. They emphasise the importance of Jerusalem to the Jews and their concern about the derelict condition of the Temple Mount, following centuries of effort by the preceding Christian custodians of Jerusalem to obliterate reminders of the Jewish Temple.[51]

Early Jewish accounts of what took place are consistent with the episode recorded by al-Ṭabarī but less dramatic. Thus, a letter from the Jerusalem academy (*yeshiva*) to Diaspora communities (probably in Egypt), found in the Cairo Geniza and dating from the middle of the 11th century CE, mentions that when the Arabs arrived in Jerusalem, they were accompanied by Jews who showed them the site of the Temple.[52] A Judeo-Arabic chronicle from the same Cairo archive and of similar date (now in the Cambridge University Library) records that the Muslims and Jews were ordered to clear the refuse from the Temple Mount, under the watchful eye of 'Umar:[53]

---

[45] von Schönborn 1972, 97 n. 136.
[46] Flusin 1992, 25-31.
[47] Mango 1992, 2-3.
[48] al-Ṭabarī (translated and annotated by Friedmann, 1992), 194-95.
[49] Qu'rān 38.21. On the original identification of the *Miḥḥrāb Dāwūd* with the *Ṣakhra*, see. Busse 1984, 79, 99.
[50] Gil 1996a, 163-64.
[51] Ibid., 165.
[52] Document in the Firkowicz Collection, St. Petersburg; see Gil 1983, vol. 3, 14-18 (no. 420); idem 1996a, 167 and n. 4.
[53] Cairo Geniza Collection, document T-S 6.1; see Gil 1983, vol. 2, 1-3 (no.1); idem 1996a, 167.

> ‘Umar supervised the work at all times. Whenever any ancient remnant was uncovered, he [‘Umar] would ask the elders among the Jews about the Rock [*Ṣakhrā*], namely, the Temple’s Foundation Stone, and one of the sages would point out the boundaries of the site until it had been uncovered ….

An early Muslim text that extols the sanctity of the Temple especially, is a piece ascribed to Abū Khālid Thawr ibn Yazīd al-Kalā’ī, an associate of the ‘Abbāsid caliph al-Manṣūr, who had lived in Ḥimṣ (Homs) but died in Jerusalem around 770 CE, runs as follows:[54]

> The most holy spot [*al-quds*] on earth is Syria; the most holy spot in Syria is Palestine; the most holy spot in Palestine is Jerusalem [*Bayt al-Maqdis*]; the most holy spot in Jerusalem is the Mountain; the most holy spot on the Mountain [of the Holy House] is the place of worship [*al-masjid*] and the most holy spot on the place of worship is the Dome.

As J. van Ess (loc. cit.) has pointed out, this formula was actually taken, with a slight variation, from the older Jewish dictum, set out in the *Midrash Tanhuma, qadoshim* 10:

> The Land of Israel is situated in the middle of the world, Jerusalem in the middle of the Land of Israel, the Sanctuary [*bēt ha-miqdāsh*] in the middle of Jerusalem, the Holy of Holies [*ha-hēḥal*] in the middle of the Sanctuary, the Ark of the Covenant in the middle of the Holy of Holies, and the foundation rock from which the world was founded in front of the Holy of Holies.

Because this Arab writer uses the term *Bayt al-Maqdis* for Jerusalem, rather than for the Temple, as in the Hebrew (*Bēt ha-Miqdāsh*), he is obliged to add the Mountain [Moriah] as the location of the Temple. Quite naturally, Thawr substitutes the Dome of the Rock, a shrine of Islam, for the Temple Sanctuary. However, in the traditional account given by Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī (1186-1256 CE) of the construction of the Dome of the Rock in his *Mir’āt al-Zamān*, he informs his readers that Ka‘b al-Aḥbār described the building as the Temple (*al-Haykal*).[55] Grabar has noted that in all the early texts, the whole area of the Ḥaram al-Sharīf appears primarily as representing the precinct of the Jewish Temple.[56]

Thawr ibn Yazīd’s predilection for Jerusalem and the Ḥaram al-Sharīf, rather than for Mecca and the Ka‘ba was somewhat extraordinary for the ‘Abbāsid period and seems to be connected with the fact that the writer’s family had lived in Syria for generations, although it had roots in Southern Arabia (van Ess 1992, 90). Indeed Thawr, as quoted by Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Wāsiṭī, an early 11th century preacher of al-Aqṣā Mosque, noted that in the opinion of Ka‘b al-Aḥbār (reflecting the Jewish viewpoint) Jerusalem should rightly be called Bayt ’Alḹāh al-muqaddas (literally, the holy House of God) instead of Īliyā (van Ess 1992, 97 n. 53). Thawr is evidently echoing sentiments of earlier generations.

---

[54] J. van Ess 1992, 89.

[55] Elad 1995, 58, 162 (for a different Muslim source containing the same attestation). The complete Arabic text and English translation of Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī’s description of the Dome of the Rock in his *Mir’āt al-Zamān* (Bodleian Library, ms. Marsh 289, fols. 153b-155b) are presented in Elad 1992, 53-58 (Arabic), 33-38 (English).

[56] Grabar 1987, 51.

The pictorial content of the Umayyad mosaics, which have remained essentially in their original state seems to reinforce the association of the Dome of the Rock with the ancient Jewish Temple.[57] It studiously avoids figurative subject matter, human and animal, being mostly vegetal, consisting of largely of vine-like coils issuing forth clusters of fruit (mostly bunches of grapes, but also citrons and pomegranates), as well as date palms and other trees.[58] There are also motifs that include winged devices enclosing crowns. The scrolling plants seem to allude to the trailing vine with clusters of grapes of gold, which was a famous feature of the Sanctuary in Herod's Temple,[59] while winged devices would refer to the winged seraphim that were fashioned around the Ark of the Covenant housed in the Holy of Holies of Solomon's Temple.[60] Even the crowns that occur in the decorative scheme of the Dome of the Rock feature in the description of the Temple Sanctuary recorded in the Mishnah, in the very paragraph that describes the golden vine.[61] Moreover, it has been noted that the length and breadth of the Dome of the Rock reproduce fairly closely the dimensions of the Temple Sanctuary, as defined in the Mishnah and Josephus.[62]

The picture painted by the variety of literary sources that have been reviewed, and reinforced by the evidence from the Dome of the Rock, is that many of the beliefs and practices in early Islam were strongly informed by Judaism,[63] and that normative Islam, as we know it, developed over time. On one hand, most orientalists are highly critical of the radical hypothesis floated by Crone and Cook that "the early Muslims initially were, or considered themselves to be, a continuation of a Judeo-Christian religious heresy which emerged as a reaction to the desecration of the Temple site by late Byzantine mainstream Christianity".[64] Yet, on the other hand, Bashear, from his dispassionate reading of the documentary sources,

---

[57] For a description of the Umayyad mosaic decoration of the interior of the Dome of the Rock, see Milwright 2016, 55-60; 107-250 (on contextual issues relating to the inscriptions). Soucek (1976, 85-88, 95-98, 109) and Shani (1999) have argued that the opulent decoration of the Dome of the Rock bears testimony to the awareness of those responsible for its construction of the ancient Israelite Temple. Shani (ibid., 107) sees in some of the decorative motifs specific references to Solomon's Temple, which convince her that the Dome of the Rock was intended to be "the actual successor to the Solomonic Temple". Shani may be going too far in her claim because, as Milwright (2015, 254-58) cautions, there is no mention of David, Solomon or, for that matter, Abraham in the Dome of the Rock inscriptions. Of course, this fact on its own is not conclusive regarding 'Abd al-Malik's motivations for the building's construction.

[58] Even buildings, which appear rather prominently in the Umayyad mosaic decoration of the Great Mosque in Damascus are absent in the mosaics of the Dome of the Rock, possibly because of their specific connection with human beings. Rosen-Ayalon (1989, 46-69) has suggested the decorative scheme conveys an eschatological message, referring to the Day of Resurrection.

[59] Jos., *BJ* 5.210; *AJ* 15.395; Tac., *Hist.* 5.5.5: *m.Midd.* 3.8.

[60] 1 Kgs 8.6-7; 2 Chron 5:7-8; cf. 1 Chron 28.18.

[61] *m.Midd*. 3.8; cf. Jos., *AJ* 14.488

[62] Length and breadth of the Herodian Sanctuary = 100 cubits (Jos., *BJ* 5.207; *m.Midd*. 4.6-7) = 46.4 m, based on an Attic foot of 0.308 m, with 3 feet = 2 cubits; and 600 feet = 1 Attic *stadion* measuring 185 m; see Jacobson 1990/91, 49; Cuntz 1923, 111 (on the Attic *stadion*). By comparison, the diameter of the Dome of the Rock to its octagonal faces = 49.3 m; see Wilkinson 1981, 168, table 3. A foot of 0.308 m harmonises well with the 0.309 m value worked out by R. Grafman from remaining structures in his reconstruction of Herod's Royal Basilica at the southern end of the Temple Mount; see Grafman 1970.

[63] For example, the rituals performed in the early Islamic period in the Dome of the Rock seem to have echoed the ceremonies held in the ancient Jewish Temple (Elad 1995, 162-63 and nn. 61-64).

[64] As heavily paraphrased in Bashear 1989, 238; cf. Crone and Cook 1977.

has demonstrated that there can be little doubt that Islam arose within the context of Judaism and Christianity.[65]

During the 690s, ‘Abd al-Malik undertook a radical administrative and religious reorganisation, one manifestation of which was a radical restructuring of the coinage.[66] Hitherto, the Umayyad realm had employed the existing monetary systems of their Sassanian and Byzantine predecessors and the coins bore images, which included that of the caliph himself; see **Fig. 2**. In the year AH 77 (696/7 CE) a unified currency was introduced, and the new coins were shorn of human imagery; they bore only text, mostly from the Qur’ān, including the *shahāda*, the profession of the Muslim faith[67]; see **Fig. 4**. As with the mosaic inscriptions of the Dome of the Rock, the coins asserted the oneness of Allah and Muhammad as His last Messenger.[68] Apart from building the Dome of the Rock, ‘Abd al-Malik, or the Caliph Mu‘āwiya (r. 661-680 CE), can be credited with commence the construction of the congregational mosque at the southern end of the Temple Mount platform, although it is unlikely at that stage to have been connected with Muhammad’s Nocturnal Journey (*Iṣrā’*), mentioned in Sura 17.1, and known as al-Aqṣā at that stage.[69]

Fig. 4. Post-reform Dīnār of ‘Abd al-Malik, AH 77. *Æ* 20 mm, 4.24 g. Unnamed mint, Damascus? Dated to 696/7 CE. Obverse: *lā-ilaha illa-Allāh waḥdahu la sharīkalahu* (“there is no god except Allah, and one [is] he; [there is] no partner to him”) in three lines; in outer margin: *Muḥammad rasūl Allāh arsalahu bi-l-huda wa dīn al-ḥaqq liyudhhiran ‘ala al-dini kullahi* (“Muhammad is the messenger of Allah; him He sent with guidance and true faith to make it prevail over all other faiths). Reverse: *Allāhu aḥad Allāhu al-ṣamad lam yalid wa-lam yulad* (Sura 112 [*al-ikhlas*]; “Allah [is] One;

[65] See, e.g., Bashear 1989; idem, The title “Fārūq” and its association with ‘Umar I, *Studia Islamica* 72, 1990.
[66] ‘Abd al-Malik is credited with a programme of Arabicization (making Arabic the lingua franca throughout the Umayyad Caliphate) and Islamisation (by which is meant the spreading of Islam to non-Arabs and making the religion the political language of rule). He also undertook a redaction of the Qur’ān, establishing and enforcing a uniform text, as explained in Robinson 2005, 93-100, 123-28. On ‘Abd al-Malik’s reform of the coinage, see ibid., 71-75.
[67] Ibid., 73-75; Grierson 1960; Bacharach and Anwar 2012.
[68] Post-reform coins of ‘Abd al-Malik and his Umayyad successors struck in Jerusalem continue to display its name as Īliyā; see Baidoun 2015/16, 145-46.
[69] For a discussion of the evidence relating to the date of construction of al-Aqṣā Mosque by the‘Umayyads, see Milwright 2016, 26-28; Johns 1999; Creswell 1969, 373-74. On the design of that building and its resemblance to al-Walīd’s congregational mosque in Damascus, see Grafman and Rosen-Ayalon 1999.

Allah [is] the Eternal, the Absolute; not begetting and not begotten") in three lines; in outer margin, *bism Allāh ḍuriba hadhā al-dīnār fī sanat sabʿ wā sabʿin* ("in the name of Allah struck this dinar in the year seven and seventy [after the Hijra]"). Nicol 2009, no. 1; Walker 1956, 186. CNG Triton XIX (4 Jan. 2016), lot 712. Courtesy of Classical Numismatic Group, Inc.

In the passage of al-Ṭabarī referred to earlier, which that author ascribed to an early 8th century source, ʻUmar and those accompanying him are said to have recited Sura 38 (*Ṣād*) and Sura 17 (*al-Isrā'*) while pausing beside the *Ṣakhra*. While the first of these suras discusses beliefs held prior to Islam and refers to important biblical figures, including King David, the second, of course, mentions Muhammad's Nocturnal Journey (*Isrā'*), thereby alluding to the connection between the *Ṣakhra* and the prophet of Islam (which has come to be widely accepted by Muslims) just as does the naming of the congregational mosque as al-Aqṣā, by ʻAbd al-Malik, which would have enhanced the qualification of Jerusalem for a *ḥajj*. It is just possible that the association of the *Ṣakhrā* with Muhammad's Ascension (*Miʻrāj*) arose not long thereafter.

The 8th century CE saw the debut of a new genre of Arabic literature, known as *Faḍā'il al-Buldān*, (literally "The Merits of the Countries") or works in praise of cities and lands.[70] These compositions focused on the legends and traditions which gave lustre to a particular city or region. Early works of this type extolled Mecca and Medina, but later other cities were the subject of *Faḍā'il* literature. Notably missing from the list in the initial centuries of Islam was Jerusalem. According to Hasson, the first such work in praise of Jerusalem was the *Faḍā'il Bayt al-Maqdis* of Abū'l-ʻAbbās al-Walīd ibn Ḥammād al-Ramlī, who died in c. 912/3 CE, but it is only known through citations.[71] The first *Faḍā'il* compositions on Jerusalem to survive in its entirety were those written by al-Wāsiṭī and Abū al-Maʿālī al-Musharraf ibn al-Murağğā (first half of the 11th century CE).[72] Two other works of this type devoted to Jerusalem were written during the same century, and thereafter there was a steady stream of them through the Middle Ages. But why did the first works praising Jerusalem appear so relatively late in comparison with those featuring other cities? This may have to do with the lack of a recognised connection of Muhammad with Jerusalem in Islam through the 7th century CE. From the evidence presented, it may be understood that this tradition took time to take hold.

Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn ʿUmar Ibn Waqid, or al-Wāqidī for short (d. AH 207 / 822 CE), seems to have been one of the first writers to have used the name al-Quds for Jerusalem,[73] while the earliest coin bearing the present Arabic name al-Quds for Jerusalem was struck only in 832 CE, during the reign of the ʻAbbasid caliph, al-Maʾmūn[74]; see **Fig. 5**. By the early 11th century, the Ḥaram at Jerusalem had taken root in Islamic theology as the destination of Muhammad's night journey. Accordingly, the dedicatory inscription of the shimmering gold and green glass mosaic on the arch over the principal nave of al-Aqṣā

[70] Hasson 1996.
[71] Hasson 1996, 350.
[72] Kaplony 2002, 9.
[73] El-Awaisi 2011, 29.
[74] al-Gil 1996b, 10 and n. 13; Baidoun 2015/16, 146.

Mosque contributed by the Fatimid caliph, al-Zāhir (1021-1036 CE), reproduces Sura 17.1 verbatim.[75]

4. Conclusions

Drawing on different strands of evidence, documentary, epigraphic and numismatic, it has been shown that in the first few decades of Arab rule over Jerusalem, the city was mostly respected for its sanctity to its elder monotheistic religions, and as the site of the ancient Jewish Temple. A search of the historical record has shown that Jerusalem comes to the fore as the third holy city of Islam in the 8th century CE through its identification with miraculous events connected with Muhammad, in the wake of the raised status accorded to Jerusalem by the Umayyad caliphs and the building programme initiated there by ‘Abd al-Malik. This culminated in his construction of the Dome of the Rock followed by the great congregational mosque close by, which was endowed with the name al-Aqṣā.[76] It seems likely that it was at

Fig. 5. al-Ma’mūn (813–833 CE), fals (*Æ* 20 mm, 3.66 g), Jerusalem mint. Dated AH 217 (832 CE). Obverse: Three-line inscription within a circle fringed by a hatched band: *lā ilah il-Allāh* / *Allāh waḥdahu* / *lā sharīk lahu* (“There is no God but Allah; there are no others with him.”); below two crescents. Reverse: Four-line inscription within inner circle: *Muḥammad* / *rasūl* / *Allāh* / *bakh* (“Muhammad is the apostle of Allah; good [or genuine]”.). Peripheral inscription: *bism Allāh ḍarb hadhā al-fils bi’l-Quds sanat sab‘ wa‘ashr wa mi’tayin* (“in the name of Allah, this fals of al-Quds was struck in the year two hundred and seventeen”). Ilisch and Korn 1993, no. 32; Shamma 1998, no. 41. Numismatica Genevensis Auction 8 (24 Nov. 2014), lot 253; courtesy Numismatica Genevensis SA.

[75] van Berchem 1927, 452-53 no. 301 (recorded by G. Wiet); Kaplony 2002, 121-22 and ill. 65; Grabar 1996, 149-51.

[76] We are informed that Mu‘āwiya was crowned caliph in Īliyā in the year AH 40 (661 CE); see Gil 1996b, 11 n. 14. There is no evidence that the primitive early mosque on the Temple Mount seen by bishop Arculf in the early 680s CE was called al-Aqṣā (Adomnan 1.1.14; Wilkinson 2002, 170; cf. Milwright 2016, 26; Elad 1995, 29-33). The testimony of the mid-10th century CE writer al-Muṭahhar ibn Tāhir al-Maqdisī; that Mu‘āwiya built a mosque called al-Aqṣā is open to serious doubt. This source is referenced in Elad 1995, 24. See the discussion about this controversial issue in Milwright 2016, 26, 256.

this juncture that a significant episode in the life of Muhammad, namely the Nocturnal Journey (*Iṣrā'*), mentioned in Sura 17.1, became attached to Jerusalem, thereby intensifying the holiness of that city for Muslims.[77] Up till then, "the Qur'ānic concept of al-Aqṣā Mosque was less clearly defined and this allowed for various assumptions, particularly that which referred to a heavenly temple."[78] Over time, the story about Muhammad's Nocturnal Journey became coupled with the prophet of Islam's Ascent to Heaven (*Mi'rāj*) and became set in stone[79].

For more than a century after Jerusalem was brought under Arab hegemony, it is an indisputable fact that the official Roman name for the city, Aelia in the Arabic form Īliyā, continued in use, as attested by Umayyad coins, seals and milestones. The new Arab rulers were content to continue calling Jerusalem by that name, even though they celebrated its biblical past and former Temple. Once the doctrine that Jerusalem was the location of miraculous events involving the prophet of Islam became established, which definitely occurred by the first third of the 9th century CE during 'Abbasid rule, Jerusalem's official Arabic name was duly changed to al-Quds ('the holy [city]').

[77] Hasson 1996, 357-58.
[78] Ibid., 358; cf, Busse 1991, 37-38.
[79] Ibid., 358-359; van Ess 1992, 92-93.

Bibliography

Album, S., and Goodwin, T., 2002. *Sylloge of Islamic coins in the Ashmolean Museum*, Vol. 1: *The Pre-Reform Coinage of the Early Islamic Period*, Oxford: Ashmolean Museum.

Amandry, M and Burnett, A., 2015. *Roman Provincial Coinage: Vol. 3 Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian (AD 96-138)*, London: British Museum / Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale de France.

Amitai-Preiss, N., 2015-16. 'Early Islamic lead seals: evidence for commercial connections', *Israel Numismatic Journal* 19, 106-14.

El-Awaisi, K., 2011. 'From Aelia to al-Quds: the names of Islamic Jerusalem in the early Muslim period', *Mukadimme* 4, 1-41.

Bacharach, J. L., and Anwar, S., 2012. 'Early versions of the shahāda: a tombstone from Aswan of 71 A.H., the Dome of the Rock, and contemporary coinage', *Der Islam* 89.1-2, 60-69.

Baidoun, I. M., 2015-16. 'Arabic names of Jerusalem on coins and in historical sources until the early 'Abbāsid period', *Israel Numismatic Journal* 19, 142-50.

Bashear, S., 1990. 'The title "Fārūq" and its association with 'Umar I', *Studia Islamica* 72, 47-70.

Bashear, S., 1989. 'Qur'ān 2:114 and Jerusalem', *BSOAS* 52, 215-38.

Bickerman, E. J., 1980. *Chronology of the Ancient World* (Aspects of Greek & Roman Life) (2nd edn.). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Bieberstein, K., 2007. 'Aelia Capitolina', in Z. Kafafi and R. Schick (eds.), *Jerusalem before Islam* (BAR International Series), Oxford: Archaeopress, 134-68.

Blair, S. S.,1992. 'What is the date of the Dome of the Rock?', in Raby and Johns (eds.) 1992, 59-87.

Busse, H., 1991. 'Jerusalem in the story of Muhammad's Night Journey and Ascension' *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 14, 1-40.

Busse, H., 1984. ''Omar b. al-Ḥaṭṭāb in Jerusalem', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 5, 73-119.

Busse, H., 1981. 'Monotheismus und islamische Christologie in der Bauinschrift des Felsendoms in Jerusalem', *Theologische Quartalschrift* 161, 168-78.

Creswell, K. A. C., 1969. *Early Muslim* Architecture, Vol. 1 in 2 parts, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cuntz, O., 1923. *Die Geographie des Ptolemaios: Galliae, Germania, Raetia, Noricum, Pannoniae, Illyricum, Italia. Handschriften, Text und Untersuchung*, Berlin: Weidmann.

De Boor, C., (ed.), 1883-85. *Theophanes*, Chronographia (in Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, ed. B. G. Niebuhr), 2 vols., Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

Di Segni, L., 2014. 'Epiphanius and the date of foundation of Aelia Capitolina', *Liber Annuus* 64, 441-51.

Di Segni, L., 1997. 'The Greek inscriptions of Hammat Gader', in Y. Hirschfeld, *The Roman Baths of Hammat Gader* (Final Report), Israel Exploration Society: Jerusalem, 185-266.

Di Segni, L., and Tsafrir, Y., 2012. 'The ethnic composition of Jerusalem's population in the Byzantine period (312-638 CE)', *Liber Annuus* 62, 405-54.

Eck, W., 2019. 'Die Colonia Aelia Capitolina: Überlegungen zur Anfangsphase der zweiten römischen Kolonie in der Provinz Iudaea-Syria Palaestina', *Electrum* 26, 129-39.

Elad, A., 2008. ‘ʿAbd al-Malik and the Dome of the Rock: a further examination of the Muslim sources’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 35, 167-226.

Elad, A., 1995. *Medieval Jerusalem and Islamic Worship: Holy Places, Ceremonies, Pilgrimage* (Islamic History and Civilization: Studies and Texts 8), Leiden / New York / Köln: E. J. Brill.

Elad, A., 1992. ‘Why did ‘Abd al-Malik build the Dome of the Rock? A re-examination of the Muslim sources’, in Raby and Johns (eds.) 1992, 33-58.

Ettinghausen, R., and Grabar, O., 1987. *The Art and Architecture of Islam 650-1250*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Flusin, B., ‘L’esplanade du Temple à l’arrivée Arabes d’aprés deux récits byzantines’, in Raby and Johns (eds.) 1992, 17-31.

Foss, C., 2008. *Arab-Byzantine Coins. An Introduction, with a Catalogue of the Dumbarton Oaks Collection*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gil, M., 1996a. ‘The Jewish community’, in J. Prawer and H. Ben-Shammai 1996, 163-200.

Gil, M., 1996b. ‘The political history of Jerusalem during the Early Muslim period’, in J. Prawer and H. Ben-Shammai (eds.) 1996, 1-37.

Gil, M., 1992, *A History of Palestine, 634-1099*, Cambridge / New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gil, M., 1983. *Palestine during the First Muslim Period (634-1099)*, 3 vols., Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University [Hebrew].

Goodwin, T., 2005. *Arab-Byzantine Coinage* (Stuidies in the Khalidi Collection 4), London: Nour Foundation / Azimuth Editions.

Grabar, O., 1996. *The Shape of the Holy: Early Islamic Jerusalem*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Grabar, O., 1959. ‘The Umayyad Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem’, *Ars Orientalis* 3, 33-62.

Grafman, R., 1970. ‘Herod's foot and Robinson's Arch’, *IEJ* 20, 60-66

Grafman, R., and Rosen-Ayalon, M., 1999. ‘The two great Syrian Umayyad mosques: Jerusalem and Damascus’, *Muqarnas* 16, 1-15.

Grierson, P., 1960. ‘The monetary reforms of ‘Abd al-Malik, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 3, 241-264.

Hasson, I., 1996, ‘Jerusalem in the Muslim perspective: the Qur'an and tradition literature’, in Prawer and Ben-Shammai (eds.) 1996, 349-385.

Hoyland. R.G.,1997. *Seeing Islam As Others Saw It. A Survey and Evaluation of Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian Writings on Early Islam* (Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam 13), Princeton, NJ: The Darwin Press.

Ilisch, L., and Korn, L., 1993. *Sylloge Numorum Arabicorum Tübingen. Palästina: IVa Bilād aš-Šām I*, Tübingen: Ernst Wasmuth.

Isaac, B., 1980/81. ‘Roman colonies in Judaea: the foundation of Aelia Capitolina’, Talanta 12/13, 31-54 = idem 1998, *The New East under Roman Rule: Selected Papers*, Leiden / New York/ Koln: Brill, 87-111.

Jacobson. D. M., 1990/91, ‘The plan of Herod’s Temple’, *BAIAS* 10, 36-66.

Johns, J., 1999. ‘The “House of the Prophet” and the concept of the mosque’, in idem (ed.), *Bayt al-Maqdis, Pt. 2: Jerusalem and Early Islam* (Oxford Studies in Islamic Art 9.2), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 62-64.

Kaplony, A.,2009. ‘635/638-1099: The mosque of Jerusalem (Masjid Bayt al-Maqdis)’, in O. Grabar and B. Z. Kedar (eds.), *Where Heaven and Earth Meet: Jerusalem’s Sacred Esplanade*, Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi / Austin, Tx: University of Texas Press, 101-131.

Kaplony, A., 2002. *The Ḥaram of Jerusalem 324-1099. Temple, Friday Mosque, Area of Spiritual Power* (Freiburger Islamstudien 22), Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
Kessler, C., 1970. ‘‘Abd al-Malik’s inscription in the Dome of the Rock: a reconsideration’, *JRAS* 102, 2-14.
Lassner, J., 2017. *Medieval Jerusalem. Forging an Islamic City in Spaces Sacred to Christians and Jews*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Levy-Rubin, M., 2017. ‘Why was the Dome of the Rock built? A new perspective on a long-discussed question’, *BSOAS* 80, 441-64.
Levy-Rubin, M., 2009. ‘Were the Jews prohibited from settling in Jerusalem following the Arab conquest? – the authenticity of al-Ṭabarī's Jerusalem surrender agreement’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 36, 63-82.
Mango, C., 1992. ‘The Temple Mount AD 614-638’, in Raby and Johns, 1-16.
Meshorer, Y, 1996. ‘Coins of Jerusalem under the Umayyads and the ‘Abbāsids’, in Prawer and Ben-Shammai (eds.) 1996, 413-19.
Meshorer, Y., 1989. *The Coinage of Aelia Capitolina*. Jerusalem: Israel Museum.
Millar, F., 1990. ‘The Roman Coloniae of the Near East: a study of cultural relations’, in H. Solin and M. Kajava (eds.), *Roman Eastern Policy and other Studies in Roman History: Proceedings of a colloquium at Tvärminne 2-3 October 1987* (Commentationes Humanarum Literarum 91), 7-58 = idem 2006. In H. M. Cotton and G. M. Rogers (eds.), *Rome, the Greek World, and the East, Vol. 3: The Greek World, the Jews, and the East*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 164-222.
Milwright, M., 2016. *The Dome of the Rock and its Umayyad Mosaic Inscriptions* (Edinburgh Studies in Islamic Art), Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Mor, M., 2012. ‘Are there any new factors concerning the Bar-Kokhba Revolt?’, *Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica* 18, 161-93.
Nees, L., 2015. *Perspectives of Islamic Art in Jerusalem* (Arts and Archaeology of the Islamic World 5), Leiden / Boston: Brill.
Nicol, N. D., 2009. *Sylloge of Islamic Coins in the Ashmolean Museum*, Vol. 2: *Early Post-Reform Coinage*, Oxford: Ashmolean Museum.
Nuseibeh, S., and Grabar, O., 1996. *The Dome of the Rock*, New York: Rizzoli / London: Thames and Hudson.
Prawer, J., and Ben-Shammai, H., 1996. *The History of Jerusalem: The Early Muslim Period, 638-1099*, Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi Institute / New York: New York University Press.
Rabbat, N.,1993. ‘The Dome of The Rock revisited: some remarks on al-Wasiti’s accounts’, *Muqarnas* 10, 67-75.
Rabbat, N., 1989. ‘The Meaning of the Umayyad Dome of the Rock’, *Muqarnas* 6, 12-26.
Raby, J., and Johns, J., (eds.), 1992. *Bayt al-Maqdis. Pt. 1: ‘Abd al-Malik’s Jerusalem* (Oxford Studies in Islamic Art 9.1), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Robinson, C. F., 2005. *‘Abd al-Malik* (Makers of the Muslim World), Oxford: Oneworld Publications.
Rosen-Ayalon, M., 1989. *The Early Islamic Monuments of al-Haram al-Sharif: An Iconographic Study* (Qedem 28), Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
Shamma, S., 1998. *A Catalogue of 'Abbasid Copper Coins*, London: al-Rafid.
Shani, R., 1999. ‘The iconography of the Dome of the Rock, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 23, 158-207.

Soucek, P. P., 1976. 'The Temple of Solomon in Islamic legend and art', in J. Gutmann (ed.), Archaeological Fact and Medieval tradition in Christian, Islamic and Jewish Art, Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 73-123.

al-Ṭabarī [Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Jarīr], 1992. *The History of al-Ṭabarī* (English translation of *Ta'rīkh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk*), Vol. 12: *The Battle of al-Qadisiyyah and the Conquest of Syria and Palestine*, translated and annotated by Yohanan Friedmann Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

van Berchem, M., 1927. *Matériaux pour un Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum, Pt. 2: Syrie du Sud, Vol. 2: Jérusalem "Haram"* (MIFAO 44), Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

van Ess, J., 1992. 'Abd al-Malik and the Dome of the Rock, an analysis of some texts', in Raby and Johns (eds.) 1992, 89-103.

von Schönborn, C., 1972. *Sophrone de Jérusalem, vie monastique et confession dogmatique* (Institut Catholique de Paris, Théologie Historique 20), Paris: Editions Beauchesne.

Walker, J., 1956. *A Catalogue of the Arab-Byzantine and Post-reform Umaiyad Coins* (A Catalogue of the Muhammadan Coins in the British Museum 2), London: British Museum.

Weksler-Bdolah, S., 2019. *Aelia Capitolina – Jerusalem in the Roman Period in Light of Archaeological Research* (Mnemosyne, Suppl. 432), Leiden: Brill.

Weksler-Bdolah, S., 2014. 'The foundation of Aelia Capitolina in light of new excavations along the eastern cardo', *IEJ* 64, 38-62.

Whitcomb, D., 2011. 'Jerusalem and the beginnings of the Islamic city', in K. Galor and G. Avni (eds.), *Unearthing Jerusalem: 150 Years of Archaeological Research in the Holy City*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Wilkinson, J., 2002. *Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades*, Warminster: Aris and Phillips.

Wilkinson, J., 1981. 'Architectural procedures in Byzantine Palestine', *Levant* 13, 156-72.

Wilkinson, J., 1976. 'Christian pilgrims in Jerusalem during the Byzantine period', *PEQ* 108, 75-101.