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SYNOPSIS.

The administrative structure, routes and urban geography of south ash-Shām (Palestine and Jordan) during the first four centuries of Islamic history are neglected topics in spite of their relevance to contemporary archaeological research. This thesis uses both literary sources and archaeological results to discuss these questions, thereby establishing the pattern of major settlement in the region.

Four 3rd/9th century Arabic works of historical or descriptive geography on the ajnād (military provinces) of ash-Shām provide the structure on which to conduct a wider survey of the administrative framework and urban geography of the jund of Filastīn (Palestine), the jund of al-Urdunn (Jordan) and adjacent districts of the jund of Dimashq (Damascus). The 4th/10th century geographical works and evidence from recent archaeological excavations add detailed information on the features of the provincial cities and districts identified in the earlier Arabic sources (Ch. 2).

Numismatic sources and Umayyad papyri from Nessana in southern Palestine demonstrate the early origin of the administrative system described by the 'Abbāsid geographers, probably under the Rāshidūn ("Orthodox") Caliph 'Umar (Ch. 3). Later the 4th/10th century geographies record large-scale changes to the system which possibly were the work of the autonomous Ikhshīdid and Fāṭimid dynasties of Egypt (Ch. 4).
The written sources of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th century provide a detailed inventory of the major roads in south ash-Shām, particularly the Damascus -- al-Fustāṭ highway and postal road. Also important was the Pilgrims' Route from Damascus to the Ḥijāz via 'Ammān, and numerous secondary roads centred on Ṭabariyyah, ar-Ramlah, and Jerusalem (Ch. 5).

Together, the geographical sources identify 65 cities, towns and villages in south ash-Shām, and indicate regional changes to the settlement pattern of the region during the first four centuries of Islam (Ch. 6). Information on each of these sites is collected in a gazetteer.
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GLOSSARY OF PLACE-NAMES.

(EAST) JORDAN: The geographical region to the east of the Jordan River (map 1).

FILASTTN: The territory covered by the Early Islamic province of Palestine, as defined in Ch. 2.iii.

AL-URDUNN: The territory covered by the Early Islamic province of Jordan, as defined in Ch. 2.iv.

PALESTINE: The geographical region between the Mediterranean Sea and the Jordan River north to the borders of Lebanon, modern Israel and the West Bank (map 1).

*
ABBREVIATIONS IN THE TEXT.

1) Arabic Sources
(for these see References: Main Arabic Sources, p.319).
Bal. = al-Balādhurī
I.F. = Ibn Faqīh
I.H. = Ibn Ḥawqal
I.Kh. = Ibn Khurradādhibih
Iṣṭ. = al-Iṣṭakhrī
Maq. = al-Maqdisī
Qud. = Qudāmah
Yaʾq. = al-Yaʿqūbī
Yaʾq. = Yaʾqūt
NOTE: Reference to the Arabic sources is by page/line to the B.G.A. editions and is identified by an asterisk; a second reference after an "equals" sign refers to the translations.

2) Non-standard Textual Abbreviations.
Ar. = Arabic
Bib. = Biblical
Heb. = Hebrew
mod. = modern
sec. = section (of a chapter)
transl. = translation
var. = variation.

* * *
INTRODUCTION.

i> Thesis Objectives.

In order to arrive at credible and historically valid conclusions, research into the archaeology of the earlier Islamic periods can not afford to overlook the political, administrative and social contexts of the archaeological material. This point has recently been highlighted in a paper delivered by Michael Bates in Stuttgart at the Numismatic Section of the Internationaler Kongress der Geschichtswissenschaften of 1985. Calling for an urgent restudy of Umayyad coinage within its historical and cultural context, Bates (1984:33) makes the following point:

"The coinage of the first century of Islam, like any Islamic coinage, needs primarily to be studied in a geographical and chronological framework, and in close connection with its administrative and political context."

This approach is clearly applicable to all streams of archaeological research dealing with the earlier Islamic periods, not solely to Umayyad numismatics. Unfortunately such an interdisciplinary treatment of the subject is still rare in the field of Syrio-Palestinian archaeology.
The archaeology of Islamic Palestine and Jordan remains the poor and neglected cousin of Biblical and Roman studies. For instance much of the essential groundwork on the historical geography of the period has yet to be done, and the material culture of the earlier Islamic periods is either largely ignored or misclassified. Little or no effort has been made to establish a soundly based understanding of the economic and social structure of the region from either written or archaeological sources.

This thesis attempts to deal with some of these shortcomings by investigating the administrative geography, routes and urban framework of the two Islamic provinces of the jund of Filastīn and the jund of al-Urdunn during the first four centuries of Islamic history, that is during the Rāshidūn, Umayyad, 'Abbāsid and early Fātimid periods (c. 20-375/640-985). The material for this study comes from a number of varied sources, both literary and archaeological. Particular attention is paid to the Arabic written works of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries, especially those which deal with the historical, administrative and descriptive geography of the Islamic World. Archaeological research has produced further detailed information on the urban centres of Filastīn and al-Urdunn and their administration. In particular a combination of Early Islamic numismatics and the Umayyad papyri documents from Nessana makes a valuable contribution to identifying the administrative structure of these two provinces under the Rāshidūn and Umayyad caliphates. Both the written and
Introduction

archaeological sources are reviewed in greater detail in the following section.
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ii> Source Material.

1) Survey of the Arabic Geographical Sources.

a> Geography as an Islamic science.

The origin of geography amongst the Islamic sciences can be traced back to the translation of Greek works, including the geographies of Claudius Ptolemy and Marinos of Tyre, under the patronage of the early 'Abbāsid Caliphs. However the appearance of the first works of descriptive geography in Arabic is attributable not to primarily academic interests, but to the practical needs of contemporary government and society. For instance government officials, the army, scholars, merchants and pilgrims, required descriptive works on the Islamic World and beyond for information on the location of places and the routes between them (Maqbul Ahmad 1965:576ff; Miquel 1967:85).

The descriptive geographies of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries are commonly divided into two main categories, the "'Irāqī" and "Balkhī" schools (Maqbul Ahmad 1965:579). Works of the 'Irāqī School followed the Iranian Kishwar system, and described all the known world but covered the physical and
human geography of the Islamic domains in more detail. The best-known proponent of this school was Ibn Khurrahdhbih (d. 300/913), who was followed by al-Ya'qūbī (d. 284/897), Ibn Faqīh (flor. 289/902), and Qudāmah (260-337/874-948+9), each displaying a somewhat different scholarly and administrative interest in the subject. The al-Balkhī (d. 322/934) School concentrated its researches on the Islamic World, dividing it into 20 qa'ilīm (sing. icalīm "region") and drawing a separate map for each. Two prominent members of this school were al-Iṣṭakhrī (d. after 340/951) and Ibn Ḥawqal (d. after 378/988). Both authors embarked on extensive fact-finding travels to correct and expand the book of their predecessor, but the inadequacy of these earlier works were revealed by the efforts of al-Maqdisī (d. after 390/1000), who considerably developed the science of geographical research and writing.

b> The Major Arabic geographical sources.

Eight major Arabic sources of the 'Abbāsid and early Fāṭimid periods have been utilized in this study of the administrative and urban geography of south ash-Shām. All of these works deal specifically with the provincial structure or the history of administration in ash-Shām in reasonable detail, however the abbreviated and second-hand accounts of other 3rd/9th and 4th/10th century writers, such as Ibn Rustah (fl.290/903), or the anonymous Hudūd, have been excluded. Due to limitations in both time and space, it became necessary to set aside for now any detailed consideration of both the major Arabic historians except al-Balādhurī and the
vast body of biographical literature on the Islamic scholars from the earlier Islamic periods.

The major Arabic works used in this thesis are:

- iii> Kitāb al-Buldān by al-Ya'qūbī, published in 278/891.
- iv> Kitāb al-Buldān by Ibn Faqīh, published in c.=290/903.
- v> Kitāb al-Kharāj by Qudāmah, published in 316/928.

c> General evaluation of the geographical sources.

The Futūḥ of al-Baladurī (d. 279/892) is a history of the Muslim conquests containing much valuable geographical information on the places and administrative divisions of Early Islamic and 'Abbāsid ash-Shām. Al-Baladurī was a court official of the 'Abbāsids in Baghdad, but travelled widely to collect oral accounts from local scholars and officials on the legal and administrative status of the cities and provinces in the conquered lands. He also had access to earlier written works by Abu Mikhnaf, al-Madāinī and others (Duri 1983:62-63; Becker & Rosenthal 1960:971). Al-Baladurī sub-
jected all of this material to critical evaluation before
writing the *Futūh* (Duri 1983:62-64). His book reflects a keen
interest in the historical geography of each region,
especially the development of its cities, lands and their
administration. He was particularly concerned with establishing
the terms under which the cities and districts were conquered by the Muslims, either by force or by a peace covenant.

An unquestionably important source on the administrative
geography of the Islamic World up to the mid-3rd/9th century
is Ibn Khurraḍādhbih's *al-Masālik*, a highly praised work on
the regions and routes of the Empire and the dominant model
for geographical writing in Arabic for almost a century
(Dunlop 1971:163). Ibn Khurraḍādhbih (211-300/826-913) was
born into a family of government administrators, and attained
the post of Director General of Posts and Intelligence. As a
high ranking member of the 'Abbāsid government, Ibn Khurra-
dādhbih had access to an extensive collection of official
documents including records from his own department, earlier
administrative manuals on the Sassanian Empire and perhaps on
Byzantine Syria and North Africa, and a body of diverse
geographical information gathered during military campaigns
(Maqbul Ahmad 1965:576). *Al-Masālik* was published in
272/885+6, possibly as a revision of an earlier work of
232/847 (see Dunlop 1971:150-1). Both this and Ibn Khurra-
dādhbih's reliance upon government archives suggests his
geography reflects the administration of ash-Shām up to the
middle of the 3rd/9th century.

An equally important work on the administrative and urban geography of the Islamic World is the Kitāb al-Buldān by al-Ya'qūbī (d. 284/897 in Egypt), although the text is incomplete. Al-Ya'qūbī adopted an evaluative and critical style for his geography, comparing and assessing both the verbal and written sources obtained from his extensive travels (Miquel 1967:xxi). His purpose was practical, dealing with the topography, regions, routes and peoples of the Islamic World and beyond (Dunlop 1971:163). This practical, critical approach recommends al-Buldān as a reliable source on ash-Shām under Tulunid rule in the third quarter of the 3rd/9th century.

The surviving geography of Ibn al-Faqīh, the Kitāb al-Buldān, is a one-volume abridgement of an earlier work in five books. Ibn al-Faqīh was essentially a man of letters and a discursive arm-chair compiler who obtained much of his geographical information from earlier writers, particularly Ibn Khurraḍadhbih (Miquel 1967:xxii). Although this material is judged reliable (Maqbul Ahmad 1965:580), the descriptions of ash-Shām date to over half a century before the publication of al-Buldān (290/903).

Qudāmah (250-320/864-932) is mostly remembered within the Arabic literary tradition for his writings on literary criticism and correct literary forms, but also for his valuable Kitāb al-Kharāj (de Goeje 1889, transl. by Ben Shemesh 1965). This work was written about 316/928 and, although only
partly preserved, includes a section dealing with the postal stations, routes and revenues of the Empire (Parts 5 & 6). As Qudāmah held a senior post in the 'Abbāsid government, much of the information contained in the *K. al-Khāraj* would have come from official archives. The *Fihrist* records that he had the reputation of a great author, philosopher and logician (Dodge 1970:285).

The *Kitāb al-Masālik wa-l-Mamālik* (c=340/951) of al-Iṣṭakhrī continued the tradition begun by al-Balkhī of producing a "descriptive atlas" of text illustrated with maps on the Islamic World. Al-Iṣṭakhrī travelled extensively, supplementing oral and written sources with his own observations to produce, in Dunlop's (1971:165) assessment, an original and largely accurate account of the *bilād al-Islām*. The critical al-Maqdisī did not think too highly of segments of this work, as it was "confused in many places and superficial in its commentaries and it does not divide the provinces into districts" (Miquel 1978:223), a significant problem when researching the administrative structure and urban framework of a region. However the section on ash-Shām contains some important new information on the administration of this area after the rise of the autonomous Ikhshīdid dynasty of Egypt.

In 331/943 and 357/968, Ibn Hawqal undertook two major journeys through the Islamic realms to gather information with which to update al-Iṣṭakhrī's *al-Masālik*. The definitive version of his *Sūrat al-Ard* made its appearance in 378/988, and following the format of al-Iṣṭakhrī describes the geogra-
phical and political features of the Islamic World "region by region" (Kramers and Weit 1964:xiv-xv), including information on the routes between towns.

Unquestionably, al-Maqdisī (d. 390/1000) ranks as one of the "greats" in the science of geography (Dunlop 1971:165). His Kitāb Aḥsan at-Taqāsīm fī Ma‘rifat al-Aqālīm, which was published in 375/985 and updated in 378/988 (Kramers 1936:708-9), presents a full and critical account of the Islamic World in the third quarter of the 4th/10th century, much of it written from direct observation (Maqbul Ahmad 1965:582). In arranging and evaluating his subject matter, al-Maqdisī displayed considerable originality indicative of a scientific mind. He treated each region (Ar. iqālīm) of the Islamic World in two parts, topography which included long descriptions of the principal cities and towns, and then an explanation and discussion of special features. In Dunlop's view the Kitāb al-Aqālīm is a descriptive work without peer amongst its contemporaries (Dunlop 1971:166-67). Consequently the section on ash-Shām in al-Maqdisī's book is used extensively in this thesis.

Two other written sources contain further relevant information on the cities and districts of Filasṭīn and al-Urdunn. The first is a Persian travelogue by Nāṣir-i Khusraw, who published an account of his journey to Makkah and Jerusalem in 438/1047. Nāṣir-i Khusraw wrote long and exceptionally detailed descriptions of the places visited, for example ar-Ramlah and Şūr (Tyre). The second source is the large and
systematic geographical dictionary by Yāqūt (c.=575-626/1179-1229), the Mu'jam al-Buldān, which appeared in 623/1225. As a compilation of earlier works, Yāqūt's dictionary incorporates additional material on the major places of Filastīn and al-Urdunn in the first centuries of Islam.

2) Archaeological and Numismatic Sources.

The recent growth in the archaeological exploration of Islamic sites in Palestine and Jordan has produced much new and challenging evidence on the settlement of this region during the earlier Islamic periods. The last decade in particular has seen a considerable refinement of the pioneering ceramic chronology developed by Sauer (1973) and Smith (1973) and especially an increasing awareness of 'Abbāsid and Fātimid occupation in the region, for example at Ṭabariyah/Tiberias (Oren 1971), Aylah/al-'Aqabah (Whitcomb 1987), and at Fiḥl/Pella (Walmsley 1986b). Although the work at these sites and others is still in its infancy, they offer detailed information on the nature and extent of settlement during the earlier Islamic periods and an indication of the quality of life of the inhabitants. This material makes an additional contribution to the descriptions of the cities and districts of the jund of Filastīn and the jund of al-Urdunn in chapter 2.

One major hurdle to the study of the Islamic periods in Palestine and Jordan is the shortage of adequately published material. Many of the major urban centres mentioned later in
this thesis have already been excavated in part or full, for example Baysan, but the upper Islamic levels of these sites were quickly dealt with to expedite the recovery of Biblical remains. Other important sites remain substantially unpublished, for instance the crucial 'Abbāsid and Fāṭimid material from Tabariyah or the three metres of unspecified "Arab" deposits at Qadas (Aharoni 1976). Furthermore the all too frequent misidentification and the resultant misdating of Islamic levels at many locations remains a major problem.

Two categories of archaeological evidence make a particularly valuable contribution to unravelling the structure and chronology of the provincial organization of Syria/Palestine during the Early Islamic Period. The first is an archive of papyri documents from the second half of the 1st/7th century found at Nessana in the Negev (Ar. an-Naqab) of southern Palestine which deal with taxation, public service and other topics. These documents, which were studied and published by C.J Kraemer (1958), place Nessana and other towns in the area under the administration of Ghazzah in the jund of Filasṭīn during the Umayyad Period. The second category covers a large and varied series of copper coins minted in Filasṭīn, al-Urdunn, and the other provinces of ash-Shām. This numismatic evidence demonstrates that the provincial structure described by the 'Abbāsid geographical sources is valid for the Early Islamic Period, and also shows that the establishment of this administrative system took place immediately after the Islamic Conquest of the region.
Chapter Outline and Methodology.

Chapter 1 provides the historical background for the subsequent study into the administrative geography of the jund of Filastīn and the jund of al-Urdunn. The chapter briefly summarizes the causes for the Islamic Conquest of ash-Shām and the reasons for its success, the pre-existing Byzantine administration of the region, and finally the establishment and function of the military provinces (Ar. jund, pl. ajnād) and especially their role in defending ash-Shām from a threatened Byzantine counterattack.

Chapter 2 presents, for the first time, a full analysis of the administrative framework and urban geography of Filastīn, al-Urdunn and the districts of Dimashq to their east during the Early Islamic Period and the first century of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate (1st-3rd/7th-9th centuries). The chapter begins by pointing out the inadequacies and inaccuracies of previous studies. The analysis which then follows has a number of interconnecting objectives:

1. To collate the information on the provincial and district centres of Filastīn, al-Urdunn and neighbouring Dimashq from four 3rd/9th century descriptive works on the Islamic Empire;
2. To identify and locate these centres;
3. To briefly review their historical status;
4. To describe the features of each city and its surrounding district during the earlier Islamic periods;
5. To conclude with a reconstruction of the provincial boundaries for each jund and the structural similarities and differences with the preceding Byzantine organization.

Chapter 3 researches Early Islamic numismatics to demonstrate the general validity of the 3rd/9th century written sources for the previous two centuries. This is achieved by comparing regional variations amongst the copper coins (Ar. fals, pl. fulūs) of the period. In the case of the jund of Filastīn the provincial name is appended to the mint, making its coins easy to identify; while regional styles can be identified for al-Urdunn and Dimashq. In all instances the coinage of the Early Islamic Period indicates that there were only minor structural changes to the ajnād between their founding in about 18/639 and the earliest extant written descriptions of the 3rd/9th century.

Chapter 4 concentrates on the administrative and geographical divisions of south ash-Shām as depicted in four written sources of the 4th/10th century. The earlier sources of this century identify a significant change to the structure of the Filastīn province which involved the transfer of districts in southern East Jordan from the control of Damascus to ar-Ramlah in the earlier part of the century. The value of al-Maqdisī's detailed account of ash-Shām is then discussed, especially his identification of large and important cities not mentioned by the other sources. In particular his study acknowledges the distinct social and economic character and cultural orientation of southern East Jordan,
and this chapter concludes by investigating the archaeological significance of this revelation.

Chapter 5 examines in detail the framework of the 'Abbāsid and early Fāṭimid road system in south ash-Shām as described by the major geographical sources of the time. It begins by reconstructing the itinerary of the highway and post-road from Damascus to al-Fustat via Ţabariyah and ar-Ramlah, and also reviews the Hajj or Pilgrims' road from Damascus to the Ḥijāz. The second half of the chapter investigates the secondary routes of Filastīn and al-Urdunn, especially those centred on the major cities of Ţabariyah, ar-Ramlah, and Bayt al-Maqdis (Jerusalem).

Chapter 6 and the Gazetteer surveys the 65 major urban sites of south ash-Shām identified by the written and archaeological sources studied in chapters 2-5. The discussion in Chapter 6 is subdivided into three broad geographical areas, and attempts to identify regional changes to the settlement pattern of south ash-Shām during Islamic times. This approach establishes a number of interesting discussion points, but does not claim to fully explain the process of settlement change in the region after the Conquest. The gazetteer lists all 65 sites and includes information on their various names, a review of each site's status and occupational history, and finishes with a table of references to the geographical sources used in this thesis.

* * *
Chapter 1

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO THE AJNAD.

1> The Islamic Conquest.

In the year A.H. 12/633 A.D., four Muslim armies set out from al-Madinah in the Hijaz on a military foray into a region known to the Arabs as ash-Sham, or "the North". In the next three years the soldiers of the Islamic State were to undertake a systematic conquest of the Byzantine provinces of Arabia, Palestine, Phoenicia and Syria. Simultaneously other armies of Islam were undertaking campaigns of conquest in neighbouring al-'Irâq and Egypt which very soon led to the acquisition of North Africa and Iran. The Islamic conquests marked the end of Late Antiquity and the beginning of Medieval history. The Sassanid Empire was politically shattered and its traditional cultural identity destroyed. Egypt and Syria, ineffectively subjected to Hellenism since the time of Alexander, were swiftly detached from the Byzantine Empire and rapidly absorbed into the new Islamic polity.

In the light of the momentous historical changes wrought by the Islamic conquests, Western scholarship has endeavoured
to both identify the causes and explain the success of this event. However until recently much of this research has been either tainted with prejudice or superficial in its analysis, usually adopting a climatic, economic or socio-political theme reinforced with a heavy dose of historical determinism (reviewed in Donner 1981:3-7 Hill 1971:9-10). Commonly the emphasis is on a single, simple explanation, even by Arab scholars. Salibi (1977:19) provides a recent example of this approach. In other cases authors confuse the reasons that lay behind the adoption of an expansionist policy by the early Islamic State with the causes of the phenomenal success enjoyed by the Muslim armies (surveyed in Donner 1981:7-8).

The following brief review of the Islamic conquest of ash-Shām focuses on those factors that account for the institution of an unusual form of provincial administration in ash-Shām, the ajnād (sing. jund). The Conquests are considered under three topics. Firstly the causes behind the adoption of an expansionist policy by the early Islamic State, secondly the events of the Islamic conquest of ash-Shām, and finally the underlying causes that resulted in a reasonably easy conquest of this region.

1) The Expansionist Policy of the Islamic State.

When the four Islamic armies set out from al-Madinah in 12/633, they were following a path north into ash-Shām that was very familiar to the Arabs of the Ḥijāz. For centuries the inhabitants of Makkah (Mecca) had benefitted from their
location on the main caravan route between the maritime kingdoms of al-Yaman (South Arabia) and the trading cities of ash-Shām. During the later 5th and 6th centuries A.D. the collapse of the Yamanī kingdoms and the disruption of the northern trade routes through 'Irāq saw the merchants of the Ḥijāz become actively involved in the organization of commercial expeditions between the Yaman and ash-Shām. At this time Makkah developed into an international trading centre supported by treaties and contracts with the surrounding tribes of the Ḥijāz and beyond. These agreements were enforced by a 'defence force' as well as credit, which bound the allied tribes to the Makkān financial system (Shaban 1971:6-7; Watt 1953:3).

It is not surprising, given these historical links, that the Islamic community in its infancy took a keen interest in the affairs of ash-Shām. Indeed it seems as though from very early on Muḥammad aspired to incorporate the Arab tribes that resided there, most of whom were Christian, into the Islamic state (for details see Donner 1977:96-98, 270-71; and Watt 1956:105-6, 145, 189-91; compare with Crone and Cook 1977:4-9, 20, 24 & 32). In practical terms this expansionist policy found expression in a number of military campaigns during Muḥammad's lifetime (Watt 1956:339-43). The most significant of these was the expedition of 9/630, in which a garrison was established at Tabūk in the northern Ḥijāz and a raid launched on the oasis of Dūmat al-Jandal (mod. al-Jawf), which surrendered. This mission also resulted in the settled
communities of Aylah, Adhruḥ, and Al-Jarbā in the far south of ash-Shām entering into agreements with the Islamic State (Donner 1977:101; Watt 1956:115-16). However little progress was made with the tribes further north, as these were traditionally allied to the Byzantine government (Watt 1956:116-7; compare with the view of Donner 1977:99-101).

2) The Conquest of ash-Shām.

After the suppression of the riddah movement that followed Muḥammad's death in 10/632, the Islamic state was in a position to assess its relationship with the as yet unconverted Arab tribes of ash-Shām and al-İrāq. There were two ostensible choices: to rest upon the gains made during the course of the riddah wars, or to continue the policy of expansion. The choice, in fact, was more apparent than real. During Muḥammad's lifetime the conservative elements in the early Islamic community had been defeated in favour of an expansionist policy (see Watt 1956:189-91), and other factors -- religious, economic and political -- reinforced the retention of this policy (Donner 1981:270-71; Hitti 1970:143-44; Lewis 1970a:52; Shaban 1971:24-27).

The 12/633 military expeditions to ash-Shām were one result of the continued implementation of an expansionist policy by the Islamic ruling elite. Their objectives were the same as those for the successful campaigns of the riddah wars, to neutralize any opposition, either active subversion or simply passive rejection, to Islamic hegemony in Arabia.
Yet the rulers of the Islamic state must have been aware of the inherent dangers in such a move. At a time when the Byzantine Empire was undertaking a review of its alliances with the semi-sedentary and nomadic groups on the southeast frontier (see below), the actions of the Islamic state could only bring it into conflict with its powerful neighbour to the north.

There is neither space nor reason to embark upon a detailed blow-by-blow account of the Islamic conquest of ash-Shām. This topic has been thoroughly researched by, amongst others, de Goeje (1900) Caetani (1907, 1910, index), Dennett (1950:49-51), Hill (1971:59-84), and Donner (1981:111-55). In the last of these works, the progress of the Muslim armies in ash-Shām is divided into three phases (Donner 1981:111-12). The first phase encompasses the early campaigns from their beginnings in 12/633 to the arrival of Khālid b. al-Walīd from al-'Irāq in 13/634. The second covers the period of the major battles with the Byzantines, including Ajnadayn in 13/634, Fīl in 13/635, and the great Muslim victory at Yarmūk in Rajab 15/August-September 636. The third and final phase involved the consolidation of Islamic control over the region, including the conquest of a few Hellenized cities that continued to oppose Muslim rule such as Jerusalem, and the conclusive reduction of the Mediterranean littoral and northern ash-Shām.
3) The Reasons Behind the Success of the Conquest.

While the continued application of an expansionist policy by the Islamic State was the principal cause of the Islamic Conquests, the success of these expeditions was the result of various political and cultural factors active in the Arabian Peninsula and the adjacent Byzantine and Sassanid empires during the early 7th century A.D.

Perhaps the single most important factor that turned the Syrian and 'Irāqi military expeditions into a triumph was the cohesive impact of Islam upon tribal Arabia (Donner 1981:268-69; Vaglieri 1970:58-60). In essence Islam presented Arabia with a new political and social order based upon traditional beliefs and practices which transcended, although not completely replaced, the old tribal loyalties. Its effect on Arabian society was revolutionary, integrating its members into one polity while immeasurably expanding their socio-political horizons (Watt 1956:142-50, the Pax Islamica; Donner 1981:258-63). The resultant co-ordinated energies of the Arabian people, reformed by a new ideology and fired with a promise of rewards in this life as well as the next, meshed neatly with the clear political and military goals of the ruling elite to produce a vigorous conquest movement.

The ease with which the Islamic armies achieved their conquest of ash-Shām (also Egypt and al-'Irāq) can in part be explained by the high degree of organization in the Muslim forces. The recruitment of troops, the structure of command, and the conduct of the campaigns were controlled by the
ruling elite in al-Madinah and their commanders in the field (Donner 1981:221-26; cf. Salibi 1977:19). One other military factor also contributed to the initial success of the campaigns. When the Islamic armies appeared on the borders of the Sassanid and Byzantine empires they faced little initial resistance. The military resources of both empires had been exhausted by some 15 years of warfare, and neither had seriously considered the threat posed by emergent Islam (Donner 1981:5-6, 269; Salibi 1980:81). This factor can be over-emphasized however, as in time the Byzantines and Sassanids raised sizable armies of seasoned veterans in order to oppose the smaller and less experienced Islamic forces.

Apart from these military considerations, a number of writers on the rapid conquest of ash-Shām have stressed what could be called the ethno-cultural factor. By the 6th century A.D. Syrian society was deeply divided along broad socio-cultural lines, a division that found expression in the hotly fought Christological disputes of the time (Crone and Cook 1977:68-70; Hitti 1970:153; Tibawi 1974:60). This disunity ran deep, separating the governing Greeks and their Hellenized lackeys of the cities from the predominately rural Aramaic-speaking native population. The reimposition of a rigid Byzantine administration on the indigenous Syrian population after 15 years of informal Persian rule would have highlighted the ethno-cultural differences between government and populace. This would have been especially apparent to the generation of Syrians reared under Persian occupation who
constituted the men of fighting age at the time of the Islamic conquest of ash-Shām.

While the animosity felt by the native Syrians to their Greek rulers weakened the Byzantine opposition to the armies of Islam, the Muslims were actively assisted in some instances by both urban and rural indigenous minority groups during the conquest of ash-Shām. These groups included the urban Jews of Syria and the Samaritans of Palestine, for instance the eventual capture of Qaysāriyah was attributed to the intervention of a resident Jew (Bal.*141.16-19=217). Growing support also came from Syrians of Arab origin, particularly after the battle of the Yarmūk (Lewis 1970a:56; Salibi 1977:18-19; Vaglieri 1970:58-60). In short, the ethnocultural factor deflected any effective opposition to the Islamic armies by the indigenous Syrians because of their cultural and ethnic sympathy with the Muslims on one hand and the rejection of Hellenism on the other.

Probably the most neglected aspect of the Islamic Conquest of ash-Shām is the way in which the Islamic state was able to consolidate its hold on the newly-gained territory in the face of persistent Byzantine hostility. Although the nature of Islamic rule was not harsh, thereby reducing the possibility of internal revolt, there remained the real threat of a Byzantine counter-attack by land and sea. A number of measures were taken to neutralize this threat, the most significant of which was the reorganization, as early as 'Umar's Caliphate, of the region's administrative structure.
This entailed the abolition of the former Byzantine provinces in favour of four, and later five, military provinces or *ajnād*. The new administrative and military system raised revenue with which to pay a sizable body of troops charged with the defence of ash-Shām (details in sec. iii below). These forces were used to man border garrisons and, as the ultimate act of defence, sent into Byzantine territory during the annual summer raids.

This failure by modern historians of the Early Islamic Period to recognize the significance of the ajnād system in ash-Shām also explains the inadequacy of the research into their physical and political structure. As was pointed out in the Introduction, such an understanding is a crucial adjunct to the detailed study of Early Islamic archaeology, and especially social organization during the period. In this thesis it is intended to investigate the political geography of the two Islamic provinces of Filastīn and al-Urdunn and skirting regions. However before embarking on the study (Chs 2-3), this chapter concludes with a review of the Byzantine administration of southern ash-Shām (part ii), as it was that system which the Islamic state was to inherit and subsequently modify to meet their own purposes, and a brief historical background to the establishment of the ajnād in ash-Shām (part iii below).
The Byzantine administrative organization of southern Syria and Palestine during the 6th and early 7th century A.D. was based on a system of executive government introduced by the Romans after the suppression of the Bar-Kokhba revolt in A.D. 135. This war, and the First Jewish Revolt before it (A.D. 66-70) had impressed upon the Roman rulers the need for closer military and administrative control over the widely distributed population of the region. This was brought about, in part, by the reinstitution of a policy of urbanization, that is the establishment of city territories in which an urban centre policed and collected taxes from towns and villages in the surrounding countryside allocated to it.

The general development of the Roman and Byzantine administrative organization of Syria/Palestine has been thoroughly studied by Abel (1938:162-91), Avi-Yonah (1977:108-24), and Jones (1971 Ch. X, Appendix IV tables XXXVIII-XLI). Both Abel and Jones utilize the civil and ecclesiastical lists of the Byzantine period to accurately identify the numerous towns and regions of the provinces during the 6th Century A.D. Using a combination of literary and archaeological sources, Avi-Yonah (1977:127-80) has attempted to reconstruct the territorial extent of these municipal districts. However his methodology has recently been called into question by Isaac and Roll (Isaac 1978:57-
59; Isaac & Roll 1982:11-12, 105), who view the Roman milestones and related sources as unreliable indicators of territorial limits. Until this problem can be resolved, it would be misleading to extrapolate where appropriate these possibly erroneous district boundaries into the Early Islamic period.

By around 400 A.D., the ongoing reorganization of the Eastern Roman Empire begun under Diocletian (A.D. 284-305) had subdivided the region under study into five smaller provinces: the three Palestines, Arabia, and Phoenice (Abel 1938:170-71; Avi-Yonah 1977:121). The creation of these provinces entailed a redistribution of territory and was often accompanied by the multiplication of municipalities, particularly in East Jordan. For instance the establishment of Palaestina Salutaris (later Tertia) in A.D. 357-58 required the removal of territory from the Province of Arabia south of the Wādī Mūjib (or al-Hasā, see Abel 1938:170), and was accompanied by the relocation of rural Trachonitis and Batanaea in Arabia to compensate for this loss (Avi-Yonah 1977:118). By the 6th century A.D. these northern districts had been subdivided into a number of smaller centres, although none could match the large municipalities of adjacent areas (Jones 1971:288-90). A detailed study of Roman Arabia and Byzantine Palaestina Tertia will be found in recent works by Bowersock (1983) and Gutwein (1981) respectively.

As Jones (1971, Appendix III) points out, the documents of Hierocles and Georgius Cyprius on the cities and districts of the Byzantine Empire offer a generally accurate picture of
administration in 6th century A.D. Syria/Palestine. The following review of the Byzantine system is brief but necessary, as it was from this system that the Arab rulers of ash-Shām developed their own administrative organization, the ajnād, after the Conquest.

Most of the region under study was divided amongst the three Palestines (see Abel 1938:171-78; Avi-Yonah 1977:121). Palaestina Prima embraced what can be referred to as the central Palestinian lands of Judaea, Idumaea, Samaria and southern Peraea around the Jordan Valley (map 2). The aspect of this province was predominantly Mediterranean. It included all of the notable seaports of the Palestinian coast south of the Carmel headland one of which, cosmopolitan Caesarea (Ar. Qaysāriyah), also served as its capital. The economy of Palaestina Prima was boosted by its role in Mediterranean trade and pilgrimage to the Holy sites. Palaestina Secunda was made up of the Esdraelon Valley (Ar. Marj ibn 'Amīr), Galilee, Gaulanitis (Ar. al-Jawlān) and some of the Decapolean cities including Scythopolis (Ar. Baysān), which became the province's capital city. As Secunda was a landlocked province, Ptolemais (Ar. 'Akkā) in Phoenice served as its principal Mediterranean outlet. Palaestina Tertia, originally called Salutaris, has already been partially described. Technically the territory of this province covered the Negeb, a large section of the Sinai Peninsula, the 'Arabah including Aela (Ar. Aylah), and all of Moab (Ar. Ma'āb) and Edom (Ar. ash-Sharat) south of the Wādī Mūjib in
East Jordan (Gutwein 1981:15-26). Yet by the 6th century A.D. Byzantine control over ash-Sharāt had been relaxed (Bowersock 1983:184-85; Parker 1986:149-55), opening up the way for Islamic penetration in the early 1st/7th century. The administrative capital of Tertia was located at either Petra or, at least in later times, at Elusa (see Dan 1982:135-37 and Gutwein 1981:10-14 for a discussion of this question).

The Province of Arabia, noted for its Limes and the Via Nova Traiana, was established in A.D. 106 with Bostra (Ar. Buṣrā) as its capital following the annexation of the Nabataean kingdom (see Bowersock 1983, esp. Chs VI & VII). By the 6th century A.D. this province was territorially very different from its 2nd century namesake. According to the lists of Hierocles and Georgius Cyprius (Abel 1938:184-87; Jones 1971:545), the villages of Trachonitis/al-Lajja‘, Batanaea/al-Bathaniyah and Auranitis/Ḥawrān were all in Arabia. The transfer of Ḥawrān was effected in the early 3rd century, and that of the other two districts during the 4th century after the loss of territory to Palaestina Tertia (Brunnow and Domaszewski 1909:263-76). The central lands of Arabia south of the Wādī Yarmūk to the Wādī Mūjib remained unchanged, and included the large city-districts of Gerasa (Ar. Jarash), Philadelphia (Ar. 'Ammān), Esbus (Ar. Ḥusbān) and Mādabā (Abel 1938:185-87).

North of Palaestina Prima and Secunda lay the Province of Phoenice, of which three municipalities are particularly relevant to this thesis. After the Diocletian reforms of the
Empire in the early 4th century A.D., the southern border of Phoenice on the coast was defined by Ptolemais (Ar. 'Akkā) and Tyre (Ar. Ṣūr). In the 6th century Tyre continued to serve as the provincial capital of Phoenice, and retained its large territory eastwards to Cadasa (Ar. Qadas) on the western edge of the Jordan Valley (Avi-Yonah 1977:129-30). Thereafter at the headwaters of the Jordan River lay the town and district of Paneas (Ar. Bāniyās), immediately north of non-municipal Gaulanitis/al-Jawlān in Palaestina Secunda.

The Byzantine administration of Syria/Palestine was interrupted by the Sassanid occupation of the second and third decades of the 7th century A.D., although the decisive defeat of the occupying forces by the army of Heraclius in A.D. 628 swiftly returned Syria/Palestine to the Byzantine Empire and the control of its officials. Yet it appears as though much of the far south remained beyond direct Byzantine rule after the expulsion of the Sassanids, particularly Palaestina Tertia east of the Jordan Rift. This is demonstrated by the position of Aylah, Adhrūḥ and nearby al-Jarbā, who after entering into new alliances with the Islamic State in 9/630 (Bal.*59.12-23=92-3) were not pressured by the Byzantines to renounce these agreements.

After the Byzantine sources of the 6th century A.D., the next reliable written information on the administrative organization of Syria/Palestine is found in the Arabic geographical works composed in the second half of the 3rd/9th century, although in some cases the authors of these works
had recourse to lost sources of the previous century. They describe a system of administration based upon military provinces, the ajnad, the origin of which is considered in the following section of this chapter and their organization in the next chapter.

* 

iii> The Establishment and Function of the Ajnad.

After the crushing defeat of the Byzantine forces at al-Yarmūk in 15/636, all of northern ash-Shām and the Mediterranean littoral lay open to occupation by the Muslim armies (see Donner 1981:148-55). This was achieved with relative ease during the course of the next year or two, although some of the garrisoned urban centres, particularly the strongly Hellenized coastal cities, offered stubborn resistance to the Muslim advance. Caesarea, for example, was not taken until about 19/640 (Bal.*142.15-17=219; Donner 1981:112, 154-5). However these pockets of resistance were little more than a nuisance to the new rulers of ash-Shām, whose main concern at this stage was the consolidation of their control over the region.

Once the rapid conquest of north ash-Shām and most of Palestine was completed, there were a considerable number of military and administrative matters that required the pres-
ence of the Caliph 'Umar. These included the distribution of war booty and deserted property, the payment of allowances ('*aṭa‘* ) and rations (*rizq*), reviewing taxes, and conferring military commands (Hitti 1970:153-4; Donner 1981:151). It was quite unusual for these matters to require the personal attendance of the Caliph, but then there was no comparison between the military and political situation in ash-Shām at the end of the Conquest and that in neighbouring countries.

During the greater part of the Conquest of ash-Shām, the commanders of the Muslim armies conducted their campaigns from the former Ghassanid capital of al-Jābiyah in the Jawlān. It may have been the intention of the ruling elite in al-Madinah to establish a permanent garrison town at al-Jābiyah and administer all of the former Byzantine territory from this central location (Shaban 1971:41; Donner 1981:245). The same policy, intended to maintain the separation between the Arab elite and the indigenous rural peasantry, was also adopted for the conquest of neighbouring regions and beyond. In al-'Irāq the garrison towns of al-Kūfah and al-Baṣrah rapidly developed into major Islamic cities (Djait 1980:345-47; Donner 1981:226-30, 233-36; Levy 1962:409; Pellat 1960:1085; Shaban 1971:51-53), as did al-Fustāṭ in Miṣr and Qayrawān in Ifrīqiyyah (Talbi 1978:824-26). However al-Jābiyah did not undergo a similar transformation in size and importance during the first few years of Islamic rule in ash-Shām (see Donner 1981:245-47). These factors are worth reviewing as they also account for the adoption of the *ajnād* system of
military administration in ash-Shām and its geographical structure.

In general terms, settlement in ash-Shām was spread over a large geographical area characterized by a broken terrain of mountain, valley, and plain. This was in stark contrast to the concentrated linear settlement of riverine al-ʻIrāq and Egypt (von Sivers 1983). The formidable geographical obstacles that divided ash-Shām slowed communications and impeded the movement of armies from one part of the country to another. Therefore both the efficient administration and defence of the region relied upon the establishment of a number of regional centres, a principle confirmed by over 500 years of Roman and Byzantine administration.

Perhaps the major factor in the eclipse of al-Jābiya as the military capital of ash-Shām was the eagerness of the Muslim conquerors to live in the already established Syrian cities, particularly those with which they had traditional ties such as Damascus and Ḥims. This preference stemmed from the widespread Arab presence in the region in Pre-Islamic times, during which Arabs were either citizens of the Empire in the municipalities of Palaestina, Arabia, Phoenice, and Syria, or allied tribal groups (the foederati) to the Byzantine government (Donner 1981:102-8; Shahţd 1984, esp. pp. 17-24, 498-510, 525-66). As a result the towns and at least a section of their inhabitants were not foreign to the troops of conquest as was the case in the neighbouring countries.

The settlement of the Muslims in the urban centres was
facilitated by the widespread availability of properties in the towns and villages of ash-Shām. These properties became vacant at the time of the Conquest through one of two means. In some cases, for instance at Aleppo (Ḫalab) and Ṭabarīyah (Bal.*116.1-2=178, *147.3-4=226), land and dwellings in the towns were handed over to the Muslims in capitulation agreements, but more commonly the exodus of the Hellenized population of the cities in the face of the Muslim advance led to the abandonment of many properties (Donner 1981:245-47).

Ownership of the vacated houses, which reached considerable numbers in some centres, was claimed by the Islamic state in the capitulation agreements (Bal.*116.12-17=179, *123.1-6=189, *126.17-20=194, *131.8-11=201, *152.13-15=234; Dennett 1950:60). For both economic and cultural reasons, however, the Aramaic speaking rural peasantry remained on the land, which was reflected in only a limited settlement of rural regions by Muslim immigrants (Donner 1981:247-50).

Another significant reason for the obscuration of al-Jābiyah was the low level of Arab immigration into ash-Shām after the Conquest. This contrasts with the situation in al-ʾIrāq, where the uncontrolled influx of Arab tribes resulted in the phenomenal growth of al-Kūfah and al-Baṣrah between 17/638 and 35/656 (Donner 1981:233-36; Shaban 1971:51). The restriction on tribal immigration into ash-Shām was the deliberate policy of the Quraysh, probably because they wished to preserve their traditional interests in the region (Donner 1981:249-50; Shaban 1971:43). The implementation of
this policy became possible after many of the indigenous Arab groups of ash-Shām were politically accommodated to Muslim -- or rather Quraysh -- rule following the Battle of Yarmūk (15/636). For instance both the Kalbites and Tanūkhids were to form a powerful element in the ājnād, thereby establishing a crucial link between Byzantine Syria/Palestine and Early Islamic ash-Shām (Shahīd 1984:456-57, 566). One manifestation of this link was the preference of these tribal groups for the pre-existing cities of the region with which they were familiar.

Other factors also undercut the growth of al-Jābiyah into a sizable garrison town for all ash-Shām during the latter stages of the Conquest. The regional objectives of the Muslim campaigns after Yarmūk resulted in the re-division and dispersal of the Islamic forces and the early establishment of local military headquarters and district garrisons (Donner 1981:148-55), most of which rapidly became permanent. For instance Abū 'Ubaydah supervised the submission of northern ash-Shām from a base at Ḥimṣ, which soon after became the capital of a jund. In addition to loosing forces to distant regions, the total number of resident troops was reduced by the departure in 19/640 of a large body of fighting men, many of them veterans of the conquest of ash-Shām, to invade Byzantine Egypt under the leadership of 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ (Bal.*212.8ff=335). The Plague of 'Amawās in 18/639 probably delivered the final blow to the garrison at al-Jābiyah. Numbers declined from a high of 24,000 to just 4,000 after
the plague (Dols 1974:376, Donner 1981:245), a drop in population probably attributable to the whole range of factors outlined above and not just the plague. These numbers could not be replenished after 18/639 due to the restriction on the immigration of new tribal elements into ash-Shām and the preference of the conquering tribes for the established cities.

Quite clearly both short and long term factors, most of them peculiar to ash-Shām, ended al-Jābiyah's chance of becoming another al-Kūfah or al-Fustāṭ. Any hope of recovery after the 'Amawās plague was dashed by the governmental and military reforms undertaken by the Caliph 'Umar while in ash-Shām. The date of 'Umar's northern sojourn is unclear, as is their number (see Donner 1981:151-52), but he undertook at least one journey between 16/637 and 18/639. Sometime within those three years, but certainly by the census of 19/640, 'Umar disbanded the remains of the once sizable garrison at al-Jābiyah and introduced a self-supporting, more flexible system of provincial government better suited to the administrative and military needs of the country and its geographical complexity.

Under the system instituted by 'Umar, ash-Shām was laterally divided into four large military provinces, the ājnād, starting with Filastīn in the south, then al-Urdunn, Dimashq and finally Ḥimṣ in the far north. The main garrison town of al-Jābiyah was replaced by four strategically located regional military centres, namely Ludd in Filastīn, Ṭabariyah
in al-Urdunn, Damascus and Ḥimṣ. In one important respect these new garrisons differed from their predecessor: they were all assigned to already established cities rather than new encampments in deference, as previously noted, to the wishes of the conquering troops. During the following Caliphate of 'Uthmān the four major centres were supplemented by a large number of permanent district garrisons, again in already established cities and particularly, for military reasons, in those along the Mediterranean coast.

The administrative reforms undertaken by 'Umar in or just before 18/639 gave official sanction to the de facto system of military government in operation after the Battle of Yarmūk (15/636). As already noted above, the third and final stage in the conquest of ash-Shām saw each of the Islamic armies operating as independent units out of regional headquarters such as Ḥimṣ. The execution of these military operations indicates that the Islamic elite retained tactical control as in earlier times (Donner 1981:148-50), probably by way of an increasingly complex military administration. The reforms of 'Umar involved converting this administrative infrastructure into a formalized system of provincial government concerned with the preparation of tax registers, the assessment of the indigenous communities, the collection of money and supplies (details in Kraemer 1958:175-79) and their distribution to the military.

The financial management of the ajnad was, to a certain extent, conducted by members of the previous Byzantine
provincial bureaucracy who, because of their indigenous Syrian origin, remained in ash-Shām after the Conquest (Kraemer 1958:176). The Arab rulers deliberately retained the numerous indigenous officials familiar with the fiscal arrangements of the Byzantine administration as the large majority of the tax-paying communities would have been ignorant of Arabic. The mid-1st/late 7th century Arab archive at Nessana (see Kraemer 1958:8, 30-35) demonstrate that official government documents in Filasṭīn, and probably all the ajnād, could either be only in Greek (Kraemer 1958:205-11 nos 72-74, 290-304 nos 92 & 93), or otherwise bilingual in Arabic and Greek as with the entagia or tax demands (Kraemer 1958:175-197, nos 60-67). However general acceptance of Arabic was enhanced by the abolition of Greek as the language of the tax registers later in the Caliphate of 'Abdul-Malik (Bal.*193=301).

The nature of provincial administration in ash-Shām was primarily military, and remained so until the fall of the Umayyads in 132/750, and perhaps for a while during the earlier 'Abbasid Caliphate. It was particularly in fiscal matters that the provinces showed their military bias. In every case the first call on the land tax (Ar. kharāj) was to pay the stipends ('ata') of the military regulars that made up a jund (Levy 1962:413; Sourdel 1965:601). Supplies of wheat and olive oil were also requisitioned from the indigenous communities and distributed to the troops as a food allowance (Ar. rizq, for an example from Nessana see Kraemer 1958:199-201 no. 69). In return the stipendiary soldiery
performed a wide range of defensive and offensive military duties when called upon, and probably from the outset the term jund was synonymous for both the troop and its supporting province.

The military character of provincial government in ash-Shām became entrenched during the governate of Muʿāwiyah (20-41/641-661) under the pressure of continuing hostilities with the Byzantine Empire. The occupation of the Mediterranean littoral and the submission of its towns marked the end of the campaigns of conquest in Byzantine Syria/Palestine (Donner 1981:153-55), and hereafter the attention of the Islamic forces was primarily directed to protection of the newly gained territory. Challenges to Muslim supremacy by the Byzantine Empire came through internal revolt, which occurred for instance at Aṭrābulus, Anṭākiyah and Qinnasrīn (Bal.*127.12-*128.4=195, *145.5-11=224, *147.12-16=227 respectively; Donner 1981:150), destructive Byzantine raiding of northern and coastal border districts (see below), and the ever present threat of a major Byzantine attempt at reoccupation of the lost territories.

The deep concern felt by the Muslim elite over the defence of ash-Shām brought about a significant change in policy towards the manning of the border garrisons. In or about 23/644, the Byzantines retook a number of coastal towns in the jund of Dimashq and perhaps with them 'Asqalān in Filastīn (Bal.*127.1-2=194, *142.20=219). This event exposed a major weakness in ash-Shām's defences, prompting ʿUthmān
early in his Caliphate to replace many of the annually appointed garrisons in the frontier fortresses (Ar. thughūr), including the coastal cities, with permanently settled armed troops. As with the garrisons in the main centres, the new settlers received pay from the revenues of the province and land grants (Ar. qatī'a, pl. qatā'ī') in return for military service when called upon (Dennett 1950:60). This was done, for example, in the coastal cities of the jund of Dimashq (Bal.*128.8-20=96-97), and the jund of Ḍimṣ (Bal.*133.19-*134.4=205), and also in Anṭākiyyah (Bal.*147.16-*148.5=227).

The defence of Anṭākiyyah immediately after the Conquest is an interesting example of the problem facing the rulers of ash-Shām. When the city had fallen to the Muslim army of Abū 'Ubaydah, a paid garrison was appointed to defend the city and its district from Byzantine attacks. However it seems as though there was a problem retaining sufficient soldiers as military personnel, for later Mu'āwiyah was instructed by 'Uthmān to "station in it troops that would never leave and to assign them fiefs (qatā'ī')" (transl. Hitti 1916:227=Bal.*148.1-2). Similarly al-Balādhurī indicates that few soldiers from the army of Abū 'Ubaydah received land until the time of 'Uthmān (Bal.*147.16-*148.5=227).

The unusual circumstances surrounding the implementation of administrative reforms in post-Conquest ash-Shām during the Caliphate of 'Umar influenced both the structure and the nature of provincial government in the region. The formation of the ajnād provided military strength without unimpeded
immigration, and the financial resources to support resident troops of armed men stationed in the established cities. Equally important for the security of ash-Shām was the deliberate strengthening of the region's coastal and land frontier with the Byzantines through the introduction of a new settlement policy. The policy change took place during the Caliphate of 'Uthmān, and involved stationing permanent forces in the fortresses along the vulnerable border zones of the Mediterranean littoral and northern frontier with Byzantium. There was plenty of space for the settlers as the urban centres on both border regions, but particularly the coastal towns, were sparsely inhabited after experiencing a disproportionately high level of emigration by the Hellenized population during the Conquest. By replacing this population with permanently settled Muslim soldiers, the Arab rulers of ash-Shām had effectively denied the Byzantines any immediate chance of recovering Syria/Palestine for their Empire.

In the 20 years between the appointment of Muʿāwiya as Governor of ash-Shām (20/641) and his elevation to the Caliphate in 41/661, the ajnād system of provincial administration transformed ash-Shām into a strong and unified military region. The presence of a large body of loyal fighting men in ash-Shām was to play a crucial part in the establishment and survival of the Umayyad Caliphate until the Battle of the Zāb in 132/750. For instance Muʿāwiya's army played a decisive factor in the defeat of 'Alī and his factionalized 'Irāqī supporters during the civil war that
followed 'Uthmān's assassination in 35/656 (Hitti 1970:179-83; Lewis 1970:60-63; Shaban 1971:71-78; Vaglieri 1970:69-72). Yazīd I (60-64/680-83) consolidated this power base, while strengthening the land border with Byzantium, by establishing a fifth jund named after Qinnasrīn out of the northern half of the jund of Ḫimṣ. In later times the Marwānids were to depend upon the soldiery of ash-Shām to police the trouble spots of the Empire. During Abdul-Malik's Caliphate for example, troops were dispatched to North Africa to quell a Berber revolt and to al-‘Irāq on more than one occasion to suppress pro-'Alid rebellions. As Shaban (1971:114-15) remarks, the army of ash-Shām "... was gradually transformed from a regional militia, concerned only with the region's frontiers, into an imperial force to control the whole empire".

* * *
Chapter 2

THE ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORK AND URBAN GEOGRAPHY
OF SOUTH ASH-SHĀM
IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES OF ISLAM.

Introduction.

Although modern scholarship usually acknowledges the important role of the ājnād in the political and military history of the Umayyad Caliphate (see Ch. 1.iii), very few writers have paid sufficient attention to the administrative geography of ash-Shām in the first centuries of Islam, particularly the identity and salient features of the major towns and districts in each ħund. This neglect is very apparent in a number of general reference works on the period, in which both the descriptions of the ājnād and the accompanying maps lack precision and often repeat the same errors (below sec. ii). Until these problems are overcome it will remain difficult, if not impossible, to reliably assess the significance of geographical and regional factors in the social and economic development of ash-Shām during the first four centuries of Islamic history.
In this chapter, an attempt is made to reconstruct the administrative framework of south ash-Shām during the first three centuries Islam and, in the process, to identify the prominent features of the provincial cities and their surrounding lands. The first step towards this objective involves formulating an inventory of cities and districts for the jund of Filastīn and the jund of al-Urdunn as recorded in the four 3rd/9th century Arabic sources of al-Baladhurī, Ibn Khurrazādhbih, al-Ya'qūbī, and Ibn Faqīh. As tables 1 and 3 show (see pp. 130, 132), the sources give generally compatible accounts of the administrative subdivisions in both provinces. These are discussed and compared with the Byzantine system considered to be in operation at the time of the Conquest (tables 2 and 4, pp. 131, 133).

Although the 3rd/9th century sources are shown to accurately reflect the administrative structure of the jund of Filastīn and the jund of al-Urdunn during the Umayyad, 'Abbāsid and Ṭūlūnid periods, they offer only limited information on the features of each centre and its surrounding lands. Other sources are available to fill this lacuna including written works of the following two centuries, especially the detailed geography of al-Maqdisī, and the results of archaeological research. These sources are all brought together to provide a reasonably full account of the urban geography of southern ash-Shām.

The administrative structure of the jund of Filastīn and the jund of al-Urdunn during Early Islamic times (18-132/639-
750) is considered in the following chapter, as the relevant numismatic information from this period acquires a greater significance when treated within its provincial context (see Ch. 3.i). However some other archaeological material dating to the Umayyad Period is brought into the discussion of centres and districts in this chapter.

Time has precluded any systematic consideration of the major historical works, except al-Balādhirī, and other literary sources in Arabic, especially the extensive body of biographical literature on scholars from the Islamic World. Although these works could be expected to yield both useful and interesting information, their study would require a multiplication of effort for comparatively little return.

*  

ii> Previous Studies.

The administrative geography of the ajnād, that is the identification and location of district centres and their territorial extent, has not attracted sufficient interest within the field of contemporary Islamic studies. Two reasons appear to account for this insouciance, firstly the unchallenged belief that the Islamic geographical sources of the period are confused and contradictory and therefore unsuitable for analysis, and secondly uncertainty about the
Fig. 1. The Ajnād of ash-Shām, According to Hitti (1970:151).
identification and precise location of the district administrative centres named for each jund. As these attitudes have prevailed until the present, modern Islamic historians are satisfied with generalized written descriptions, and only occasionally produce a map to illustrate the geographical position of the ajnād.

At the end of the last century, Le Strange published a systematic translation of Arabic geographical texts on the places and features of ash-Shām in which he included a reasonably full description of the territorial divisions of the region in Islamic times (Le Strange 1890:24-43). Unfortunately the information was presented in a confused manner, as Le Strange made little attempt to explain the apparent conflict in the accounts of the Islamic geographers. Noting that the region was divided into five ajnād, he proposed that the jund of al-Urdunn encompassed "Galilee, the sea of Galilee and the lowlands of Jordan, down to the Dead Sea"; while the Filastīn jund included "all the countries lying to the south of the great plain of Acre and Esdraelon - to the west of the Jordan Cleft and the Dead Sea" (Le Strange 1890:25).

Almost 50 years later Philip Hitti was to include a brief description and a generalized map of the ajnād in his well-known "History of the Arabs" (first published in 1937). The map (fig. 1, from Hitti 1970:151) shows ash-Shām divided into five laterally positioned provinces with borders that extend inland at roughly right angles to the coast and
Fig. 2. The Ajnād of ash-Shām, According to Salibi (1977:22).
terminate inconclusively in the eastern steppe. The border between al-Urdunn and Dimashq begins at a point just south of Tyre/Sūr, thereby putting Sūr in the jund of Dimashq, and extends inland south of the Ḥūlāh lake to include a section of the Jawlān in al-Urdunn while placing most of al-Bathaniyah and all of the Ḥawrān in Dimashq. The common border between al-Urdunn and Filastīn on the map is a roughly straight line which begins on the coast just south of the Carmel Range and runs inland in a E.N.E.-W.S.W. direction to pass between Baysān and Fīh, thereby erroneously placing the latter in Filastīn. This province, according to Hitti's map, also embraced all of East Jordan south of Jarash but did not extend beyond coastal Rafaḥ in the southwest. In the accompanying text Hitti gives few particulars. Al-Urdunn is simply described as "comprising Galilee to the Syrian desert", while Filastīn covered "the land south of the great plain of Esdraelon" (Hitti 1970:154). Hitti's slovenly treatment of the subject is difficult to comprehend considering his earlier translation of al-Balādhurī's Futūh al-Buldān, an important work of historical geography containing detailed information on the towns and regions in each jund. Equally inaccurate is Salibi's more recent account of the ajnad in his general history entitled "Syria Under Islam" (Salibi 1977:23). Both his description and map deviate only slightly from that of Hitti (compare figs 1 and 2), and contradict one another.
Fig. 3. The Ajnād of ash-Shām in the 2nd/8th and 3rd/9th centuries, According to Berman (1976:16).
A new attempt at depicting the territorial limits of the ajnād in southern ash-Shām was published as part of an exhibition catalogue of Islamic coins by the L.A. Mayer Memorial Institute for Islamic Art (fig. 3 = Berman 1976:16). This map features a number of interesting comparisons with those of Hitti and Salibi. Firstly the jund of Dimashq extends southwards as far as Aylah/al-'Aqabah to the east of al-Urdunn and Filastīn. The only land east of the Jordan River to remain in Filastīn under this arrangement is 'Ammān and its district of al-Balqā'. Secondly all of northern East Jordan, from Jarash to Adhri'āt is considered part of al-Urdunn, as is a long stretch of the Mediterranean coast line north of Şūr. Thirdly the southern reaches of the Filastīn jund extend far into the Sinai Peninsula. No explanatory text accompanies the map in the catalogue, making it unclear whether numismatic or literary sources were used to define the limits of the ajnād. In either case Berman made a number of fundamental errors when setting the borders of Filastīn and al-Urdunn, as did Hitti and Salibi before him.

D. Sourdel, writing on Filastīn in the new edition of the "Encyclopaedia of Islam", provides a description of the province's borders in the Umayyad Period, but lacks the necessary details to produce a map (Sourdel 1965c:910-11). The jund of Filastīn, he states, encompassed Biblical Samaria and Judea and the coastal littoral from Mount Carmel (Ar. al-Karmal) to Ghazzah, and it was only later, in the 4th/10th century and after, that Filastīn came to include the terri-
tories to the east of the Jordan Rift, and to the south the Negeb (Ar. an-Naqab) and Mount Sinai (Ar. Ṭūr Sīnā). Sourdel rightly presents the varying descriptions of the Filastīn jund in the earlier Islamic geographical sources as reflecting the logical development of provincial government over several hundred years and not the undisciplined work of misinformed authors. There are two important points here. Firstly the descriptions of the provinces, regions and towns of ash-Shām in the Islamic geographies possess an intrinsic reliability, even though these accounts often omit important information and, in some cases, rely upon earlier writings. Secondly the administrative structure was repeatedly modified in response to changing political, economic and social circumstances, and these modifications often can be accurately defined by dealing with the sources in chronological order. These two premisses define the starting point for the following survey of the towns and territory of Filastīn, al-Urdunn and the districts on their eastern borders in the first three centuries of Islam.
The Jund of Filastīn (tables 1 & 2, map 3).

Each of the four major 3rd century A.H. written sources on the administrative geography of ash-Shām are in broad agreement on the composition of the jund of Filastīn (table 1, p. 130). The earliest of these works, the Futūh of al-Baladhurī, describes the subjugation of 13 cities and their districts during the Conquest in the context of the Filastīn jund. However in the geographical works by Ibn Khurradādhbihī, al-Ya'qūbī and Ibn al-Faqīh, only 12 districts (Ar. kūrah) are nominated for Filastīn, as all three omit Rafaḥ from their district lists. Apart from this niggling problem, which is considered in more detail below, there is little difficulty in identifying the cities and districts which belonged to Filastīn.

Table 2 (p. 131) lists the urban territories of the jund of Filastīn based upon the four geographical sources, and also names their Byzantine equivalents. Maps 2 and 3 and the gazetteer provide further information on these sites. The identification, location, history and description of each is briefly examined below according to the following order.

The survey begins with an examination of the province’s two capital cities during Early Islamic and 'Abbāsid times, starting with ar-Ramlah and followed by the original capital of Ludd. The five heavily fortified coastal centres and their districts are considered next, firstly Qaysāriyyah and then Yāfā, Yubnā, 'Asqalān, and Ghazzah. Finally, attention is
directed to the five inland cities and districts of Sabastî-yah, Nābulus, Iliyā (Jerusalem) otherwise known as Mudīnat Bayt al-Maqdis, 'Amawās in between Iliyā and the capital, and the large district of Bayt Jibrīn in the south. Apart from beginning with the capitals, this order of presentation is geographical and not hierarchical.

1) Ar-Ramlah.

Identification: A previously vacant site on the coastal plain called ar-Ramlah after the sandy nature of the area (Bal.*143.9-18=220-21; Ya'q.116/*328.7-10).

History: In keeping with the Islamization policies of the Marwānids, Sulaymān ibn 'Abdul-Malik decided to move the capital of Filastīn away from Ludd while governor during the Caliphate of al-Walīd I (86-96/705-715; Bal.*143.8-10). The new city quickly developed into the leading and largest city of Filastīn and an important stop between Egypt and Damascus.

Description: Ar-Ramlah in the sources is a large city, over a square mile in area according to al-Maqdisī (*165.1). Originally the city obtained its water from the Baradah canal, wells and rain-water cisterns (Bal.*143.15-16; Ya'q.116/*328.10-12), but Maqdisī (*36.12, *164.15) states it lacked running water and obtained its supplies from salty wells and enclosed cisterns. This suggests that the Baradah canal had fallen into disrepair by the 4th/10th century.

According to the 5th/11th century traveller Nāṣir-i Khusraw, ar-Ramlah had strong walls of mortared stone with
iron-doored gateways (transl. Marmardji 1951:83). Al-Maqdisī (*165.2-3) identifies eight of the gates, including exits to Jerusalem, Ludd, Yāfā and Egypt. The central mosque, the famous White Mosque (Ar. al-ja'mī' al-Abyad) was more elegant (Ar. arshaq) than that at Damascus, at least in the eyes of al-Maqdisī (*165.4-5). The mosque was started by Sulaymān while governor and finished on a smaller scale by the Caliph 'Umar II (Bai.*143.12-14), leaving the Caliph Hishām to add a minaret (Maq.*165.6-7). Other building included hotels, baths and houses, all of cut stone and brick (Maq. *164.10-11, *165.1). The highly decorated, multi-coloured marble facades and columns of these buildings greatly impressed the well-travelled Nāṣir-i Khusraw (transl. Marmardji 1951:83).

The population of 3rd/9th century ar-Ramlah was mixed, consisting of Arabs, non-Arabs (Ar. al-'ajam) and their Samaritan clients (Ya'q.116/*328.12-13). International and local trade played an important part in the economic life of the city. According to al-Maqdisī (*36.14-15, *164.7-8), ar-Ramlah's commerce was enhanced by its proximity to the large Egyptian market and its location between the "two seas" (the Mediterranean and Red seas?). The international overland trade route of the 3rd/9th century passed through the city (Ibn Kh. *154) and it served as the banking centre of Filasṭīn (Cairo Geniza, Goitein 1967:245; 1980:329). Industrial activity at the site is represented by an 'Abbāsid potters' workshop (Rosen-Ayalon and Eitan 1969) and the shawls of ar-Ramlah were famous in al-Maqdisī's day (Maq.*181.3),
indicating the presence of textile manufacturing.

The sources depict the surrounding lands as productive and settled with towns and villages. Ar-Ramlah was noted for its fine fruits, especially figs and dates (*Maq. 164.10-13). The figs were exported to surrounding regions (Nāṣir-i Khusraw, transl. Marmardji 1951:83), probably including Egypt.

2) Ludd.


History: This ancient settlement, renamed Diosopolis in A.D. 200, developed into an influential Byzantine city of Palaestina Prima famous for its Church of St. George (Abel 1938:370). Following the Conquest Ludd became the capital of all the Filasṭīn jund until the construction of ar-Ramlah (above), after which the city became a district centre in the administration of the province (table 1, p. 130).

Description: Al-Ya'qūbī (116/*328.9-10, 14-15) says that Ludd was depopulated and "ruined" (Ar. kharāb) by the construction of ar-Ramlah. However this is an overstatement, as in the 4th/10th century the town, although small, was known for both the church and also a mosque which served as a popular gathering point for the people of ar-Ramlah and surrounding villages (Maq. *176.18-21).
3) Qaysāriyah.


History: Byzantine Caesarea served as the civil capital of Palaestina Prima and was the main Mediterranean outlet for Baysān/Scythopolis and East Jordan south of the Wādī Yarmūk. At the time of the Conquest the stout defences and entrenched Hellenism of Qaysāriyah proved a serious obstacle to the Muslim armies (Donner 1981:154-55). This, and its exposure to Byzantine attack (Bal.*143.4-7), explains its demotion from provincial to district capital after the Conquest. However the geographical sources reviewed below suggest that this loss of political primacy did not have a drastic effect upon Qaysāriyah's prosperity.

Description: The geographical works depict Qaysāriyah as a strongly fortified, thickly populated and well provisioned city. It was one of the strongest cities of early 'Abbāsid Filastīn (Ya'q.116/*329.2-3), and in the 4th/10th century consisted of a populated domestic quarter outside an impenetrable fortress which obtained its drinking water from wells and cisterns (Maq.*174.14-15). In the next century Nāṣir-i Khusraw observed running water in the city (transl. Marmardji 1951:169), which may have come from either the famous aqueducts or was lifted by wheels as at ar-Ramlah.

It was common for the Muslims to build congregational
mosques in the conquered cities of ash-Shām almost immediately after the Conquest, for example at Ţābariyah (Bal.*116.14), Ḥimṣ (Bal.*131.7) and al-Lādhiqiyah (Bal.*133.5-6), and Qaysāriyah was no exception. This is clear from al-Balādhurī (*143.1-8=219-20), who records the destruction by a Byzantine raiding party of the Qaysāriyah mosque during the second civil war and its subsequent rebuilding by 'Abdul-Malik. In later times al-Maqdisī (*174.15) praised the mosque in this city, and Naṣir-i Khusraw described it as overlooking the Mediterranean Sea (transl. Marmardji 1951:169). A Geniza letter of the 5th/11th century locates a synagogue in Qaysāriyah (Goitein 1967:321).

Qaysāriyah in the 4th/10th century was famous for both its fruit and buffalo milk (labān al-jāmūs; Maq.*174.14). Naṣir-i Khusraw names trees of bitter orange and citron as well as date palms at Qaysāriyah. Travelling south to ar-Ramlah he also noted fig and olive trees (transl. Marmardji 1951:169).

The prosperous Qaysāriyah of the Islamic geographical sources is largely missing from the excavation reports of the Joint Expedition to Caesarea Maritima (eg. Wiemken and Holum 1979:40-41). This apparent lacuna in the archaeological evidence stems from the misdating of a "destruction layer" to the Muslim capture of the city in 19/640 (Toombs 1978). As Lenzen (1983:398-421) demonstrates, the pottery from these excavations, which includes glazed and thin white wares, indicates a fairly continuous occupation of the site from the
mid-6th century A.D. into 'Abbasid and Fātimid times. There is evidence for a reconstruction of the city under 'Abdul-Malik, subsequent Umayyad occupation, and the central role of the harbour during the 'Abbasid and Fātimid periods (Lenzen 1983:415-17). This re-interpretation of the stratigraphy and architecture at Qaysāriyah eliminates the requisite Muslim destruction of the city while acknowledging a major Islamic presence at the site into Fātimid times.

4) Yāfā.


History: An ancient settlement, Yāfā was the capital of a small district in Palaestina Prima during the Roman and Byzantine administration (Abel 1938:355; Avi-Yonah 1977:147), and continued this function after the Conquest (table 1). Yāfā also served as the principal Mediterranean port for ar-Ramlah and Jerusalem (see following).

Description: Yāfā was a small town according to al-Maqdisī (*174.9-11), but with a first-rate (Ar. jayyid) harbour and a mosque which looked down on the sea. Its fortress was impenetrable and equipped with iron-clad gates and a sea gate all of iron. Al-Maqdisī names Yāfā as one of seven ribāṭāt (fortified outposts) on the Filastīnī coast (Ch. 4.iii.2, table 7), while the earlier Qudāmah (*255.10-
11) lists Yāfā as a maritime fortress (Ar. thaghr) of Filastīn.

In addition to its administrative and military duties, the Early Islamic sources emphasize the commercial function of Yāfā. It served as the port for ar-Ramlah and the entrepôt of Filastīn (Ya'q.117/*329.7, Maq.*174.9-10), and was located at the head of the important road to Jerusalem via ar-Ramlah (Ch. 5.vi.2).

5) Yubnā.


History: Yubnā fell short of becoming a large and important centre in Byzantine Palaestina Prima in spite of its location on the major Coast Road (Ch. 5.ii.2). The city retained its administrative function after the Conquest, and as in pre-Islamic times gained access to the Mediterranean Sea through a minor port on the Nahr Rūbīn.

Description: Al-Ya'qūbī (116/*329.4-7) says Yubnā was an ancient city with a citadel and a population of Samaritans. It had a fine mosque according to al-Maqdisī (*176.22-23), and was a source of the exquisite Dimashqī dates. Qudāmah (*219.17-18=167) notes that the land between ar-Ramlah and Azdūd, that is in the vicinity of Yubnā, was intensely culti-
vated and populated with villages. The port, Māḥūz Yubnā, housed a ribāṭ in the 4th/10th century (Maq.*177.12).

6) 'Asqalān.
Identification: Roman Ascalon, ancient Ashkelon, on a good source of subterranean water where low cliffs interrupt the extensive southern sand dunes of the Palestinian coast, 42 kms S.W. of ar-Ramlah (Abel 1938:252-53).

History: Byzantine Asqalān was famous for its wines and an annual fair (Abel 1938:252; Avi-Yonah 1976:32; Avi-Yonah and Eph'al 1975:121-24, who barely mentions a Muslim presence). At the time of the Conquest the city resisted the Islamic armies, perhaps rebelling against Arab rule after first surrendering to 'Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, but eventually made peace (Ar. sulḥ) with Muʿāwiya following the capture of Qaysāriyah (Bal.*142.19-*143.1=219; Hartmann and Lewis 1960:710). Thereafter 'Asqalān became a district capital (table 1) of Filasṭīn and was settled with Arab immigrants on two occasions (Bal.*143.1-4=219, *144.11-14=221-22).

Description: Islamic 'Asqalān appears in the geographical sources as a Mediterranean port with strong defences and a thriving commercial life. The city was (re)fortified early in the Caliphate of 'Abdul-Malik (Bal.*143.3-4), and in the 4th/10th century was a garrisoned seafort with a ribāṭ (Qud.*255.10-11; Maq.*174.6-8). Al-Maqdisī also mentions that the city's mosque was located in the marble-paved market of the cloth-merchants, while in the middle of the next century
Nāṣir saw markets and a fine mosque during his stay (transl. Marmardji 1951:140).

'Asqalān produced a wide variety of fruits and was a noted source of the sycamore fig (Maq.*174.6-7). These fruits along with less exotic foods were grown in the vicinity, as Qudamah (*219.18=167) describes the 20 miles from Azdūd to Ghazzah as cultivated countryside. In addition to the cloth-merchants' market previously mentioned, evidence for a textile industry at 'Asqalān comes from the city's reputation as a producer of a superior silk (Maq.*174.4). Linen was also manufactured in the city, as Egyptian flax found a market there (Cairo Geniza, Goitein 1967:197). The significance of seaborne trade to the economy of 5th/11th century 'Asqalān is indicated by the frequent appearance of the city in the documents of the Cairo Geniza (Goitein 1967:212 & index).

7) Ghazzah.

Identification: Gaza, situated 60 km from ar-Ramlah in southern Palestine and 4km. inland of the Mediterranean shore line (Abel 1938:327-28; Avi-Yonah 1976:59).

History: As in earlier centuries, trade played an major role in the economy of Byzantine Ghazzah and its dependent port of Maiumas (Ar. MĪmās). From the mid-5th century A.D. onwards the city functioned as the principal Mediterranean outlet for the Arab merchants of the Ḥijāz. Thus the Caliph 'Umar grew rich here before Islam (Iṣṭ.*58.5-6; I.H.*172.12-13=169), and of these Ḥijāzī traders at least one, Muḥammad's
great-grandfather Ḥāshim ibn 'Abd Manāf, was buried in this city (Ya'q.117/*329.10-11; Iṣṭ. *58.4-5; I.H.*172.10-11=169; Maq.*174.5). Ghazzah of the 6th century A.D. was renowned for the hospitality of its people and the beauty of its buildings (Abel 1938:328).

Ghazzah was one of the first destinations of the Muslim army dispatched to Filasṭīn under the command of 'Amr. Near this city the Arabs achieved an encouraging victory over a local force commanded by the Byzantine governor of Ghazzah (Bal.*109.7-11=167-68; Donner 1981:115), and apparently the city submitted soon after this battle (Bal.*138.10). Thereafter Ghazzah enjoyed continued prosperity as a district capital (table 1, p. 130) and market centre (following).

Description: The geographical sources give few details about the geographical features of Ghazzah and its district in the Early Islamic Period. Al-Ya'qūbī (117/*329.10) defines it as a city on the sea littoral, but makes no mention of the kurāh of Ghazzah listed by Ibn Khurradadhbih (*79.8, cf. 'Asqalān). Al-Maqdisī (*174.3-5) describes the city as large with a splendid mosque and the tomb of Ḥāshim previously mentioned.

The territorial extent of Ghazzah's administrative duties in the Early Islamic Period is not defined by the geographical sources. However, the excavations at the urban site of Nessana (Ar. Naṣṭān, modern 'Auja al-Hāfir) in the Negev steppe (Ar. an-Naqab) have recovered a collection of papyri documents in Greek and Arabic with first-hand and
detailed information on the topic (background in Kraemer 1958:6-8, 30-35, excavation results in Colt 1962). These papyri are dated by Kraemer to the second half of the 1st/7th century and cover taxation, public service, military, private business and personal matters.

The most explicit set of documents on the nature of local administration in the area are the eight bilingual entagia of 54-70/674-689 (Kraemer 1958:175-97, nos 60-67). These requisitions for wheat and (olive) oil were dispatched to the people of Naṣṭān, that is to their representative, from the office of the district administrator in Ghazzah (Ar. ʿĀmil, so-described in Bal. *127.12-19, 150.9-10). Their common form of address is revealing. For instance document no. 62 (Kraemer 1958:184-85), which is the best preserved of the entagia, is directed to:

Arabic text
"The people of Naṣṭān, of the kūrah of Ghazzah, of the Iqlīm of al-Khalūṣ."

Greek text
"The people of Nestana, region of Elusa, province of Gaza."

This papyrus, which represents seven out of the eight entagia, shows that al-Khalūṣ formed an administrative subdivision of the kūrah of Ghazzah (Kraemer 1958:32-33), and Naṣṭān was within this division. The eighth requisition was addressed to an unknown village in the "region of Sycomazon, province of Ghazzah" but sent to Naṣṭān by mistake (Kraemer 1958:188-90, no. 64). It demonstrates that Sycomazon was also
part of the kūrah of Ghazzah.

Other records dealing with the collection and payment of the poll and land tax confirm the administrative link between Naṣṭān and Ghazzah (e.g. nos 55, 59 and 70, Kraemer 1958:153-55, 172-74, 202-203). Evidence of a similar relationship between Ghazzah and Sobata (Ar. Subayta 19kms west of Naṣṭān), is contained in a private letter written by one Samuel, probably of al-Khalūṣ, to Naṣṭān and another unnamed place, perhaps Ruhaybah between the two, seeking support for a protest delegation on taxation rates to the "Governor" at Ghazzah (Kraemer 1958:121-14, no. 75). After making his case, Samuel states that he has also written to Sobata on the same topic, and in doing so inadvertently reveals that this settlement also formed part of the Ghazzah district.

There is no information in the papyri on the Umayyad status of the three Byzantine municipalities of Birosaba (Ar. BṬr as-Saba') 20 kms to the northeast of al-Khalūṣ, Eboda (Ar. Abdah) 17 kms to the southwest of Subayta, and Mampsis (modern Kurnub) 40 kms to the west of al-Khalūṣ. However it is not unreasonable to suppose that these towns became administrative subdistricts on a par with al-Khalūṣ and Sycomazon and equally subject to the gubernatorial authority of the Ghazzah ṭāmil.

The entagia and other documents dealing with taxation matters indicate a centralized and hierarchical system of government in ash-Shām, a view previously advanced by Dennett (1950:61-62), even before the major reforms of 'Abdul-Malik
in about 72/691. Requisitions of money, goods or services drawn up from the central registers were addressed to the whole community, which had a collective responsibility to see they were paid (Kraemer 1958:175-79). Taxes could be collected by a village commission or paid directly to the Ghazzah bureaucracy where the records were kept (Kraemer 1958:153, 168-69). Their payment would have involved a journey of 80kms from Naṣṭān via al-Khalūṣ, or 69kms direct. In spite of this greater centralization, Samuel's letter shows that the taxpayers of a district could see its administrator almost on demand, and that the 'āmil had discretionary powers to change the level of taxation on the communities under his jurisdiction, most likely after consultation with a higher authority.

The district of Ghazzah probably included the town of Rafaḥ on the postal road, mentioned by Ibn Khurraḍādhbih (*83.4-5=60), al-Ya'qūbī (118/*330.6) and Ibn Fāqīh (*57.13-14) as the last centre in ash-Shām before the borders of Egypt. Unlike the other sources, al-Baladhurī (*138.17) treats Rafaḥ on a par with the other cities of Filasṭīn (table 1). This may imply the appointment of a 'āmil and a garrison to the town after its conquest, prior to the neutralization of Byzantine Egypt. After the fall of Egypt this threat was considerably reduced, resulting in the removal of the 'āmil and the administration of Rafaḥ from Ghazzah.

The agrarian economy of Ghazzah and its hinterland is barely discussed by the sources, although Qudāmah (*219.18-19) mentions cultivated fields in the country next to the
post-road between Azdūd and the city followed by 10 miles of orchards until the sands. This suggests that the produce of Ghazzah was similar to 'Asqalān (above). The Ghazzah area was also noted for its barley cultivation in Fāṭimid times (Cairo Geniza, Goitein 1967:119). The Nessana papyri and palaeobotanical material of the late 1st/7th century identify the different types and relative importance of the crops grown in the dry al-Naqab region (for an analysis see Mayerson 1962:227-231). Wheat was the prominent grain and gave a seven-fold return, while barely came a poor second in area sown but gave a slightly higher eight-fold yield (Kraemer 1958:237-243, no. 82). Other crops which appear in the late 1st/7th century papyri are olives (the entagia) and dates, although the documents on the date trade with Egypt seem to belong to pre-Conquest times (Kraemer 1958:261-89, nos 90 and 91). Fig cultivation is also known from a Byzantine papyrus (Kraemer 1958:102-3, no. 32), but surely continued into Umayyad times (cf. Mayerson 1962:231). Analysis of the palaeobotanical evidence has identified grapes, pomegranates, almonds, walnuts and peach, some of which were possibly imported (Mayerson 1962:225, 258). Evidence for grape growing at Naṣṭān is also found in four 6th century A.D. papyri (Kraemer 1958:45-51, 95-101, 107, 312, nos 16, 31, 34 and 97) and, in Mayerson's view, proven by the ubiquitous stone heaps around the site (Mayerson 1962:230, 249-57).

Naṣṭān also imported various foodstuffs, probably by way of Ghazzah, and these may have been grown there or in nearby
areas of 'Asqalān and Bayt Jabrīn. Two papyri list pickled herrings by the Ghazzah jar load, fish paste and honey amongst the exotic foods purchased outside Naṣṭān (Kraemer 1958:245-49, nos 85 and 86). The acquisition of "five bed coverings" is also recorded in document no. 85, which is a reminder of Ghazzah's later reputation as a producer of textiles.

8) Sabastiyah.


History: Sabastiyah/Sebaste prospered under Roman rule, but by the 4th century A.D. the city was overshadowed by its more important neighbour of Nābulus/Neapolis (Abel 1938:445-46; Wilkinson 1977:169). Its diminished status continued into the Islamic Period (Ya'q.116/*329.1).

Description: Sabastiyah is mentioned by all four 3rd/9th century sources (table 1). To Ibn Khurramdūhbih and Ibn Faqīh Sabastiyah is a kūrah, while al-Ya'qūbī remarks on its proximity to the more important Nābulus. Sabastiyah formed the northernmost inland district of Filastīn with Qaysāriyyah to the west and Nābulus to the south. Its northern limits, which marked the border between Filastīn and al-Urdunn, may have passed south of Jannīn as Yāqūt's geography locates this village in the latter (transl. Marmardji 1951:48).
9) **Nābulus.**

**Identification:** Neapolis, founded by Vespasian in A.D. 72 at the spring-fed head waters (Rās al-'Ayn) of the Wādī Sha'rīn 50 kms north of Jerusalem (Abel 1938:396-97; Avi-Yonah 1976:83).

**History:** Both its strategic location and a large, agriculturally fertile territory ensured a prosperous future for Nābulus, and the Byzantine city developed into the major urban centre of northern Filastīn (Avi-Yonah 1977:153-54). This trend continued into the Islamic Period, when Nābulus retained its administrative role (table 2).

**Description:** Nābulus appears as a large and flourishing city in the Arabic sources. Al-Maqdisī (*174.16-18) mentions the highlights of Nābulus: its main sūq from "gate to gate" which suggests a city-wall, a secondary market near the city-centre, a neatly-paved mosque in the middle, stone buildings, a running stream and wonderous mills. Ruined mills in the surrounding valley remain a feature of the modern town.

Nābulus' agricultural prosperity had earned it the nickname of "little Damascus" by the 4th/10th century and was principally known for its olive cultivation (Maq. *174.16*). Sources from the Mamlūk Period, especially Dimashqī (c. 700/1300), detail the export of both the oil and a soap manufactured from it to the Islamic lands and beyond (transl. Mārmardji 1951:199), and Nābulus is still known for its olive products.

The Samaritans remained an important element in the
population of Nābulus throughout Islamic times. They are mentioned in the geographical works of al-Ya'qūbī (*116/*329.1), ḲasbaT/Ibn Ḥawqal (*58.2-3/*172.7-9) and later sources, for example Yāqūt (7th/13th century) and Dimashqī (transl. Marmardji 1951:198-99).

10) Iliyā (Bayt al-Maqdis).

Identification: Jerusalem, Roman Aelia Capitolina, located above the spring of Umm ad-Daraj in undulating hill country 37 kms east of ar-Ramlah. Iliyā is also known as Madīnat Bayt al-Maqdis or, from the 4th/10th century, simply Al-Quds in the contemporary works (Goitein 1980:322-23).

History: In A.D. 135 the Emperor Hadrian (A.D. 117-138) resettled the site of destroyed Biblical Jerusalem with the Roman colony of Aelia Capitolina, whence the Early Islamic name of Iliyā. Under the Byzantines provincial Jerusalem was transformed into the spiritual capital of all Christianity and bedecked with magnificent religious edifices, headed by the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. In the early 7th century A.D. the city suffered damage at the hands of the Persians before making a covenant (ṣulḥ) with the Muslims (Bal.*138.18-*139.4).

The arrival of Islam heralded a new and glorious phase in the history of Jerusalem. The Umayyad Caliphs, especially Muʿāwiya, ‘Abdul-Malik and al-Walīd, constructed an array of religious and government buildings on and around the site of Herod's Jewish temple as a powerful physical expression of
the Muslim presence in Iliya. The 'Abbāsid Caliphs ordered repairs and restorations to the standing monuments and undertook journeys to the city during the earlier part of the Caliphate. The growth of pious associations with Jerusalem brought long-term prosperity to the city (Goitein 1966:140-48). It became a centre of pilgrimage and Nāṣir-i Khusraw (439/1047) remarked that up to 20,000 people could assemble in Jerusalem during the month of pilgrimage (trans. Marmardji 1951:29).

The Islamic history of Jerusalem is an immense topic which rests outside the parameters of this thesis. A recent review of the subject by Goitein (1980) will be found in the new edition of the Encyclopaedia of Islam.

Description: The Islamic geographies give long and detailed accounts of Jerusalem's monuments, especially the Dome of the Rock, the Aqṣā mosque and related buildings. These monuments and the literary references to them have been well studied in the last 100 years (summary and bibliography in Grabar 1980), which stands in stark contrast to the negligent treatment of the other major Islamic sites in both Palestine and, until recently, East Jordan. Considerable interest has been shown in the Dome of the Rock and particularly the reasons for its construction since Goldziher ([1890] 1971:44-46) endorsed al-Ya'qūbī's explanation that 'Abdul-Malik intended to divert the annual Pilgrimage away from rebel controlled Makkah (Ya'q. Ta'rīkh II.311, published 260/874; transl. Marmardji 1951:210). Goitein (1950:104-8,
revised 1966:139-48), Grabar (1959:38-62; 1973:52-67) and Hamilton (1978:197) have rejected al-Ya'qūbī's "Shi'ite fable" (Goitein 1966:147), and conclude that the monument dedicated by 'Abdul-Malik, but probably planned before his Caliphate, represented in an earthly form the religious legitimacy and domination of Islam as the final revelation of God to man, a universal faith to succeed both Judaism and Christianity. The other sacred monuments within the Masjid al-Aqṣā are also described and discussed by the Islamic geographical sources, who pay particular interest to the Aqṣā mosque built by al-Walīd and the Dome of the Chain.

The written sources indicate that both Bayt Laḥm and Ḥabrā (var. Masjid Ibrāhīm) were within the confines of the district of Iliyā. Ibn Faqīh (*101.16-17) mentions Bayt Laḥm at the end of his long section on Jerusalem, noting that this village was the birth place of Jesus (Ar. 'Īsā b. Maryam), and also Masjid Ibrāhīm (I.F. *101.17-18). In a similar manner Iṣṭakhrī (*57.11-*58.2), Ibn Hawqal (*171.22-*172.7) and al-Maqqdisī (*172.4-*173.7) describe both Bayt Laḥm and Ḥabrā as a finale to their descriptions of Jerusalem, thereby establishing the close ties between Iliyā and the two towns to the south. However the most conclusive evidence comes from Ibn Khurradādhbih (*78.19-*79.1), who includes Masjid Ibrāhīm in his discussion of the kūrah of Iliyā. The limits (Ar. ḥadd) of Jerusalem as set by al-Maqqdisī (*173.7-12) can not correspond to those of the older kūrah of Iliyā.

The sources, particularly al-Maqqdisī, give an unusually
full account of the agricultural and industrial products from the Jerusalem district. The city was famous for its cheese, raisins, apples, bananas and pine nuts (Maq.*180.13-14, n.'m'). Maqdisī (*172.11-130) also mentions the apples and grapes of the Ḥabrā region and their export to Egypt. In addition olive, fig, sycamore-fig and other fruit trees were cultivated in this area, as in all Filastīn (Iṣṭ.*58.1-2/Ibn Ḥ.*172.5-6). In the 5th/10th century Nāṣir-i Khusraw mentions the villages, fields and orchards between Jerusalem and Ḥabrā, and grape, fig, olive and summāq horticulture (transl. Marmardji 1951:59). Manufactured goods originating from Jerusalem included cotton cloth, mirrors, lanterns, and pins/needles (Maq.*180.13-15), and the city was known for its merchants particularly in the wool and clothing industries (Cairo Geniza, Goitein 1967:155). The active commercial life of Jerusalem in the 5th/11th century is demonstrated by the operation of a courier mail service which conveyed private correspondence to and from Old Cairo (Cairo Geniza, Goitein 1967:292-94).

11) 'Amawās.

Identification: Hellenistic Emmaus or Nicopolis after A.D. 221, but with the Conquest 'Amawās was reinstated as the official name. The site is located in the strategically important Wādī ash-Shallāl 15 kms from ar-Ramlah.

History: 'Amawās was conquered by the Muslims without undue difficulty, and for a short time housed the Arab army
in Filastîn (during the siege of Jerusalem?) until the nomination of Ludd as the province's capital (Sourdel-Thomine 1960d; Tibawi 1974:62; Maq. *176.23-*177.1). The city was remembered in later times for the plague of 17-18/638-9, which killed thousands including the first two Muslim governors of ash-Shām (Bal. *139.18-*140.5=215; Dols 1974:376).

Description: The geographical sources do not have much to say about 'Amawās. It appears in the lists of all four 3rd/9th century works (table 1, p. 130) and in al-Maqdisî's book (*176.23-177.1) of the next century. However he did not include 'Amawās amongst the main urban centres of Filastîn as, explains al-Maqdisî, inadequate water supplies compelled the shift of its population to a new capital (viz. ar-Ramlah) on the coastal plain (table 9). Yâqūt (7th/13th century) repeated this story in his geographical dictionary quoting earlier sources (transl. Marmardji 1951:150-51).

12) Bayt Jibrîn.


History: Bayt Jibrîn was granted municipal rights as Eleutheropolis in A.D. 200 and endowed with a large territory. The Byzantine city was a prosperous market for local products and goods in transit between the major centres of First and Third Palestine (see Abel 1938:272; Sourdel-Thomine 1960e:1140). Bayt Jibrîn retained both its administrative
position and trading function after the Conquest (below).

Description: The Bayt Jibrīn of the earlier Islamic geographical texts emerges as a prominent district capital located in the midst of an agriculturally rich and populated area. Al-Balādhorī (*138.15-16) states that at the time of the Conquest the commander of the Muslim forces in Filasṭīn, 'Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, gained a country estate in Bayt Jibrīn. Its administrative role in the jund of Filasṭīn is noted by Ibn Khurraḍādhbih (*79.8) and Ibn al-Faqīh (*103.2). Al-Yaʿqūbī (117/*329.9-10) gives a few details on the district (kūrah) of Bayt Jibrīn, noting that its people were of the Judhām tribe and that the Dead Sea, considered part of the district, was a producer of bitumen.

The pivotal role of Bayt Jibrīn in the local economy of inland southern Filasṭīn is clearly portrayed in al-Maqdisī's description of the town and its district (Maq.*174.1-3). He acknowledges the significance of its intermediate location between the Mediterranean littoral and the mountains, and ascribes to Bayt Jibrīn the functions of district depository and supplier of provisions to the capital (i.e. ar-Ramlāh). Al-Maqdisī also says that the land around Bayt Jibrīn, called ad-Dārūm (cf. Heb. darom, "the south", see Abel 1933:420-23; Sourdel-Thomine 1965c:163), had marble quarries and produced good quantities of unspecified quality goods.
Conclusions on the Jund of Filastīn.

The four 3rd/9th century sources provide a demonstrably accurate account of the administrative geography of the Filastīn jund. There is a high degree of agreement between the four authorities, and furthermore each work is internally consistent in its description of the province. The brief account by Ibn Khurradādhbih is probably the more reliable of the four sources, as he was producing an official work based on government documents from his own department. However the same structure was used by Ibn Faqīh, who often relied on Ibn Khurradādhbih, al-Ya‘qūbī in his short but informative geography, and in al-Balādhurī’s history of the Conquests (table 1). Only occasionally do these sources engage in a detailed discussion of the district or its principal city, the main exception being Ibn Faqīh on Jerusalem. However the human geographies of the 4th/10th century, namely Iṣṭakhrī, his student Ibn Hawqal, and the independent al-Maqdisī, make up this deficiency by providing an in-depth account of each city and its dependent district in Islamic Filastīn.

The preceding survey has shown that the jund of Filastīn was composed of a capital city, ar-Ramlah, and 11 other administrative districts (table 2). Each kūraḥ consisted of a chief city which controlled the towns and villages in the immediate vicinity, e.g. Mīmās, al-Khalūs and Nastān in the case of Ghazzah. The territorial extent of a district was determined by the land area owned by its dependent towns and villages. However the brievery of the sources precludes a
full and accurate reconstruction of district boundaries in Filastīn. All of the district capitals of Filastīn had functioned as administrative centres in the preceding Byzantine Period and before (see table 2). The arrival of Arab rule in ash-Shām resulted in a partial return to the original Semitic place names (discussed in Jones 1971:228-29), for instance Diospolis became Ludd (Heb. Lod) once again. New foundations or sites substantially repopulated retained their Classical name in an Arabized form. Thus Caesarea, for example, became Qaysāriyah, while Neapolis was known as Nābulus (now Nablus) after the Conquest.

The provincial boundary of the Filastīn can be accurately reconstructed from the known geographical location of the 12 city-districts (map 3). The western border is the easiest to delineate. It followed the Mediterranean coastline from just south of Rafaḥ to a point north of Qaysāriyah, perhaps al-Kanīṣah as this site is the only stop identified by al-Maqdisī on the 'Akkā -- Qaysāriyah road (table 12.4). The northern border of the province began at this point on the Mediterranean coast before heading inland in a southeast direction, thereby placing the Karmal promontory outside the jurisdiction of Filastīn, before following the southern foothills of the Marj ibn 'Amīr (Vale of Esdraelon). Both Jinnīn and al-Lajjūn (sec. iv, below) on the southern margin of the plain were just north of the border. After rounding the northeast corner of the Central Palestinian range the eastern border of Filastīn followed a complex path along the western
edge of the Jordan Valley scarp to the Dead Sea. South of Baysān, where the scarp encroaches upon the valley (map 1), the border would have reached, or almost reached, the Jordan River. After the Wādī Fasā'il the scarp retreats westwards from the river and the border followed suit, as ArṬā (Jericho) and the surrounding Valley floor lay outside of the Filastīn jund. South of ArṬā the border turned eastwards, again following the scarp, to meet the western shore of the Dead Sea. Thereafter the southeast boundary of Filastīn was located along the axis of the Wādī 'Arabah, leaving the mountains of southern East Jordan in Dimashq.

The location of the southern border of Filastīn was probably never well defined due to the area's sparse and partially nomadic population. As Aylah was governed from al-Fusṭāṭ, the southeast corner of the province must have been located further north in the 'Arabah, most likely at the water-rich site of Ghadhian (a post station, see Ch. 5.vi.4). From this point to the coast the southern limits of Filastīn were decided by the settled communities in the Naqab steppe to the north of the Wādī al-Azāriq, the northern tributary of the Wādī al-'Arīsh. The southwest end of the province on the Mediterranean coast lay south of Rafaḥ at Shajaratayn ("two-trees"), as al-'Arīsh was considered part of Egypt.

The jund of Filastīn was the territorial successor to the Byzantine province of Palaestina Prima (compare maps 2 and 3). However a number of significant structural differences between the two provinces suggest that the pre-existing
Byzantine system was considerably modified to meet new requirements after the Islamic Conquest. These changes were of two types, one involving an internal reorganization and the other external alterations to the boundary.

The internal reorganization of provincial districts involved the absorption of numerous smaller centres into the territory of their larger neighbours (table 2 p.131, bracketed entries). The late 1st/7th century bilingual entagion from Nessana show that following amalgamation these formerly autonomous centres still retained considerable local powers and responsibilities. For instance civic leaders were charged with ensuring the payment of taxes, and the local administrative hierarchy was retained. The papyri demonstrate that, in the Umayyad Period, Nessana remained under the administrative control of the formerly autonomous Elusa, even though Elusa itself was assimilated into the kūrah of Ghazzah (Kraemer 1958:175-97, documents 60-67). Most likely the enlargement and reorganization of the districts was part of 'Umar's rationalization in 18/639 or the census of 20/640.

The second change involved major alterations to the eastern and southern boundaries. The rural districts on the east bank of the Jordan Valley and the estate of Jericho were transferred from the province of Filastīn to the jund of Dimashq, resulting in a substantial shift to the west for the eastern border of the province. Perhaps to compensate for the loss of these lands, a number of sizable settlements from
pre-Islamic Palaestina Tertia east of the Jordan Valley were added to Filasṭīn.

In spite of these changes, the jund of Filasṭīn incorporated all of the major centres of the former Byzantine province, while at the same time retaining Palaestina in its Arabic form of Filasṭīn.

*  

> The Jund of al-Urdunn (tables 3 & 4, map 4).

The four 3rd/9th century written sources that contain information on the administrative organization of ash-Shām are not in complete agreement on the constituent districts of the jund of al-Urdunn during the Earlier Islamic periods (see table 3, p. 132). All four sources list the following seven sites: Ṭabariyah, the province's capital, Šūr, 'Akkā, Qadas, Baysān, Fiḥl, and Jarash. Seven other localities in al-Urdunn are mentioned by one or more, but not all, of the early 'Abbāsid sources. These are: Śaffūriyah, al-Jawlān, Sūsiyah, Afīq, Jadar, Bayt Rās and the problematic as-Sāmirah. This apparent confusion amongst the sources over the districts of al-Urdunn is principally attributable to errors of omission, in part due to the different intentions of the authors (see the discussion of the sources in the Introduction). There is also some evidence for minor changes to the organization and
settlement of the province during the course of the 2nd/8th and 3rd/9th centuries. These points are further considered in the conclusion to this section. However, by concentrating on the earlier and informed works of al-Baladhrī and Ibn Khur-radadhbih, a reasonable degree of certainty can be reached on the administrative structure and territorial extent of the jund of al-Urdunn.

The first source, the Futuh al-Buldan by al-Baladhrī, identifies 12 localities in al-Urdunn (table 3). Fīl quickly requested peace with the Muslims after the famous battle of 13/635 (Bal.*115.12-15, see below), while Ṭabarīyah and seven other inland places concluded peace covenants (Ar. sulḥ) with the Muslim general Shurahbīl ibn Hasanah (Bal.*116.12-20=179). Shurahbīl may have also conquered 'Akkā, Šūr and Ṣaffūriyah (Bal.*116.20-22=179), but a more detailed account quoted by al-Baladhrī (*116.22-*117.5=179-80) attributes the conquest of the Mediterranean littoral of al-Urdunn to the two generals Yazīd and 'Amr. This conforms with the Byzantine provincial structure at the time of the Conquest, when 'Akkā and Šūr were outside Palaestina Secunda, the apparent object of Shurahbīl's campaigns. The list of towns and districts in the jund of al-Urdunn as given by al-Baladhrī appears to reflect an earlier, perhaps the earliest, structure of this province. In particular the Futuh al-Buldān is the only work to include the Jawlān district east of the upper Jordan Valley in the jund of al-Urdunn, which is allocated to Dimashq in the other sources. Al-Baladhrī is also alone in
mentioning At-Taq in company with the other conquered cities of al-Urdunn (*116.17-20), all of which were to become district capitals in the Early Islamic Period. However this evidence by itself does not demonstrate the equal administrative standing of At-Taq. The town did not play an important role in the government of Palaestina Secunda, when it was part of the Susiyah/Hispo district (Abel 1938:176, 471; Avi-Yonah 1977:169-70), and does not appear as a kūrah in any of the later geographies (table 3). Rather, the inclusion of At-Taq by al-Baladhurī probably stems from its importance in Umayyad and 'Abbasid times as a town on the highway between Damascus and ar-Ramlah (Ch. 5.v.1, cf. Rafaḥ above sec. iv.7).

In the Kitāb al-Masālik wa'l-Mamālik, Ibn Khurradadhbih records the names of thirteen administrative districts in the jund of al-Urdunn (table 3), the greatest number of any geographical source. Ten of these names also appear in the inventory of conquered cities given by al-Baladhurī, but the other three are new localities. There is some evidence to accept two of them, the neighbouring Jadar/Gadara and Ḍibil/Abila, as distinct city-districts of Umayyad and 'Abbasid al-Urdunn. Both were Byzantine municipalities endowed with productive territories (Abel 1938:176; Avi-Yonah 1977:174-75), and were occupied well into the Early Islamic Period. The third new district listed by Ibn Khurradadhbih as belonging to al-Urdunn is as-Sāmirah, or Samaria. Ibn Faqīḥ also places this district in al-Urdunn, adding as-Sāmirah was Nābulus. As both sources place Nābulus in Filasṭīn (above),
this is clearly an impossible arrangement. Perhaps as-Sāmīrah referred to the lowlands between Jinnīn and al-Lajjūn, an area otherwise unaccounted for and called the "plain of Samaria" by the 1st century A.D. writer Josephus (War 3.3:4-48). Otherwise it may mean the Samaritan people of al-Urdunn in a non-geographic sense, as until the Caliphate of Yazid I they enjoyed an advantageous tax status in the province (Bal.*158=244).

A few years later than Ibn Khurradādhbih, al-Ya'qūbī published an independent account of the jund of al-Urdunn based partly upon administrative records and partly on his own researches and observations. As a government official serving the independent Tulūnīd Dynasty of Egypt (254-292/868-905), al-Ya'qūbī's first-hand account of 278/891 gives a trustworthy appraisal of al-Urdunn in the later 3rd/9th century when the province was under the control of his Tulūnīd masters. This description identifies a total of eight cities and districts in al-Urdunn (table 3) but concentrates on Ṣabariyah and Šūr, the two major cities of the province. Six of Ibn Khurradādhbih's districts are omitted by al-Ya'qūbī. Of these Sūsiyah may have joined its former satellite town of Khisfīn in Dimashq (Ya'q.115/*327.13), while Jadar, Ābil and Bayt Rās to the south of the Wādī Yarmūk in East Jordan were replaced by as-Sawād, a generalized reference to the agricultural lands of the province north of al-Balqa' (cf. Bal.116.20=179; Yaqūt III.162, transl. Marmardji 1951:94).
Finally, the literary compilation of Ibn Faqīh lists eight districts in al-Urdunn (table 3). After excluding the five central entries of Ibn Khurradādhbih’s list (i.e. Bayt Rās to Ṣaffūriyah), the district lists of these two works are identical in content and order of presentation. Curiously al-Ya'qūbī fails to mention these same five places, and the similarity of his account to that of Ibn al-Faqīh can not be an accident. They may have drawn on common source material when assembling their district list for the province, and there is some evidence that the differences reflect genuine settlement changes in the second half of the 3rd/9th century (see Ch. 6.v.b&c).

As the foregoing shows, there is common agreement between all four 3rd/9th century works on seven localities in al-Urdunn but confusion over another seven. Ibn Khurradādhbih provides the most complete list, which because of his official position and source material clearly reflects all the administrative subdivisions of the province. Accordingly this arrangement is favoured in the following survey of the cities and districts of the jund of al-Urdunn.

1) Ṭabariyah.


History: Byzantine Tiberias was a prosperous city of Palaestina Secunda which was walled and contained many chur-
ches and synagogues (Abel 1938:483; Wilkinson 1977:174). The city was taken twice during the Conquests, both times by sulh (covenant of peace) according to al-Balādhrī (*116.12-17=179). In both instances the Muslims claimed all of the evacuated lands of Ṭabarîyâh and space for a mosque, guaranteeing the rights of the inhabitants in return. As the capital of al-Ūrdujn, the city developed rapidly during the Early Islamic and 'Abbāsid Periods, far outgrowing the confines of the Byzantine walls constructed in Justinian's time (527-65 A.D.; Foerster 1978:1171).

Description: The geographical sources and archaeological evidence show Ṭabarîyâh as a large, prosperous and densely populated city during the earlier Islamic periods. Located between the hills and the lake, Ṭabarîyâh was nearly a farsakh long (as much as 3 miles) but lacked breadth (Maq.*161.1-2). Drinking water for the town came from the lake (Iṣṭ.*59.7; Ibn Ḥawqal *174.5=171; Maq.*161.9; Nāṣir-i Khusraw, transl. Marmardji 1951:128). The sources show considerable interest in another water source at Ṭabarîyâh, namely the hot springs a short distance to the south (Ar. Ḥammām Ṭabarîyâh). The water from these springs, described as "boiling" by al-Maqdisī (*185.5), was cooled by mixing with cold water before use in Ṭabarîyâh's eight baths and for ablutions (Ya'q.115/*327.15-17; Iṣṭ.*58.12-15; Ibn Ḥawqal *173.15-19=170; Maq.*161.3-4, *185.4-7).

Islamic Ṭabarîyâh was walled except on the eastern side where the town lay open to the lake (Nāṣir-i Khusraw, transl.
Marmardji 1951:128). The wall was interrupted by at least two gates, between which stood the market (Maq.*161.2-3). The main mosque of Ṭabarayyeh was located in the market and had an unusual pebble-paved courtyard (Maq.*161.4-5, *182.8), while Naṣir-i Khusraw states that a bath was located at its entrance. He mentions a second mosque in the west of the city named after the Jasmine bushes around it (transl. Marmardji 1951:128). Willibald found "a large number of churches and Jewish synagogues there" in A.D. 724, while the Commemoratorium of c.=808 A.D. lists five churches, a nunery, a bishop and 30 other church clergy for Ṭabarayyeh (transl. Wilkinson 1977:128, 138).

Excavations at the site of Ḥammam Ṭabarayyeh have exposed two synagogues in use during the first four centuries of Islam (Dothan 1978; 1983, but their Islamic occupation levels await a second volume; Oren 1971:275-77). Foerster (1978:1173-76) has excavated the southern city-gate, shops and houses built in the 2nd/8th century and in use until the 5th/11th century. During this time buildings encroached upon the open space around the gate and the paved street, while the formerly vacant lands southwards to Ḥammām Ṭabarayyeh were built over with domestic structures.

The produce of Ṭabarayyeh mentioned by al-Maqdisī (*161.7-8, 11) included fish, sugar cane and the lotus fruit (Ar. nabq). However the trade products from the city were largely manufactured goods, specifically kapok, paper and clothing (Maq.*180.16), and also straw prayer mats (Naṣir-i
found evidence for other industries while excavating at Ḩammām Ṭabarīyah, particularly glass manufacture and a 3rd-4th/9th-10th century potters workshop producing glazed wares.

2) Šūr.

Identification: Tyre, at the end of an artificial peninsula on the Mediterranean coast 63 kms from Ṭabarīyah.

History: Šūr's ancient importance continued uninterrupted into the Byzantine Period, when it served as the capital of the Phoenice province (Abel 1938:488-89; Jones 1971:544). Šūr with 'Akkā fell to a Muslim army under the joint command of Yazīd and 'Amr (Bal.*116.20-*117.5=179). Muʿāwiyah repaired both cities and increased their populations with Persians, while 'Abdul-Malik renewed the cities after they had become ruined (Bal.*117.5-13=180). The Caliph Hishām (105-125/724-743) acknowledged the advantages of Šūr's safe natural harbour and based the workshops (Ar. Dār aṣ-Ṣinā'ah) for the Mediterranean fleet there (Bal.*117.20-23=180; Yaʿqūt transl. Marmardji 1951:146), and thereafter Šūr easily overshadowed 'Akkā as the most important port of al-Urdunn (Yaʾq.115/*327.19-20).

Description: The Islamic sources remark upon the strong fortifications of Šūr (Yaʾq.115/*327.20; Īṣṭ.*59.4; Ibn Ḥawqal *174.1-2=170). In particular al-Maqdisī (*163.14-*164.1) describes the city as encircled by the sea and entered by way of a single bridge and gate, although the
strongest defences, a three-walled keep, were reserved for the inner half of the city. The harbour entrance was closed by a chain at night to protect the ships (Maq.*164.1-2).

When Nāšir-i Khusraw passed through Şūr he observed five and six storied buildings, a well-stocked market and public fountains (transl. Marmardji 1951:120). Both he and al-Maqdisī (*164.2-3) mention that an arched aqueduct brought water to the city. The people of Şūr were of mixed stock (Ya'q.115/*327.20), and engaged in specialised industries (Maq.*164.3) particularly cut glass and other manufactured goods for export (Maq.*180.17-18). A 5th/11th century document from the Cairo Geniza records the shipment of 37 bales of Şūr glassware to Egypt (Goitein 1967:421). The port also attracted a voluminous transit trade from centres further east, including cotton from Damascus and Khorāsānian silk by way of Aleppo (Cairo Geniza, Goitein 1967:60, 81).

3) 'Akkā.


History: Byzantine 'Akkā was an important city in Phoenice and the major Mediterranean outlet for Ṭābariyah and Damascus (Thomsen 1917:68-69, Route XXVII). The fleet needed for the first conquest of Cyprus (29/649) assembled at 'Akkā (Bal.*153.3-4), and the naval dockyards remained here until moved to Şūr under Hishām. In 247 A.H. the 'Abbāsid Caliph
Mutawakkil restationed fighting ships at 'Akkā (Bal.*118.1-3=181), and under the Tulūnids and Fāṭimids the city once again became a major naval base on the Mediterranean coast.

Description: 'Akkā is simply mentioned as either a kurah or a city by the 3rd/9th century sources (table 3, p. 132), whereas the works of al-Maqdisī and Nāṣir-i Khusraw contain detailed accounts of the city in later times. Al-Maqdisī (*162.12-*163.12) describes at length the new fortifications of Ibn Tulūn (254-70/868-84) around the port of 'Akkā, a project directed by al-Maqdisī's own grandfather. The walls, wrote al-Maqdisī (*163.6-7) were of mortared stone bound with thick poles and incorporated a sea gate on the western side. This was bridged with an arch and closed every night with a chain as at Šūr (Maq.*163.10-11). Nāṣir (transl. Marmardji 1951:145) remarks upon the solid fortifications of 'Akkā, and describes the port and chained entrance to the harbour.

'Akkā boasted a large mosque with marble columns and a stone-paved courtyard growing oil-producing olive trees (Maq.*162.11-12, Nāṣir transl. Marmardji 1951:145). The mosque, noted Nāṣir, was taller than the other buildings of 'Akkā, which suggests that the city lacked the multi-storied blocks found at Šūr (above). No special products are mentioned as coming from 'Akkā, although the Cairo Geniza records the export of dried peaches to al-Fustāt by land in the 5th/11th century (Goitein 1967:278, 427).
4) Qadas.

Identification: Biblical Kadesh of Naphtali, Hellenized into Cadasa, located on a large interjacent plateau between the Hūlah Valley to the east and upper Galilee to the west, 36 kms from Ṭabaríyeh (Abel 1938:416; Avi-Yonah 1976:44).

History: Qadas in Roman and Byzantine times was considered a dependency of Šūr/Tyre, and marked the eastern end of its territory (Avi-Yonah 1977:130). During the Conquest the Muslims led by Shuraḥbīl conquered Qadas by ṣulḥ (Bal. *116.19). Thereafter it became a district centre of al-Urdunn, as Ibn Khurradādhbih lists Qadas amongst the kūrah of the province and all four 3rd/9th century works mention the town in company with the other district centres of al-Urdunn (table 3, p. 132). The promotion of Qadas to a significant administrative position in al-Urdunn after the Conquest may appear to counter the acknowledged trend towards greater centralization of government in Early Islamic times. However this move probably represents an extention of direct governmental control over the Roman/Byzantine rural district of Tetracoma, just as, for example, neighbouring Bāniyās was given responsibility for all of al-Jawlān and Adhrūḥ for the largely rural ash-Sharatāt.

Description: Al-Ya'qūbī (115/*327.21) says Qadas is a most splendid place, an opinion which finds general support from al-Maqdisī. He says (Maq.*161.11-13) it is small but hot, having three springs for drinking water, a mosque in the suq and a bath below the town. The city was renowned for its
specialist garments (Maq.*180.17). The produce of the region was considerable. From the dammed Hūlah lake came various species of fish and reeds, which were made into straw mats and ropes (Maq.*162.1-3, *180.17). The villages of nearby Jabal 'Āmilah (region of Upper Galilee), an area watered by rain and endowed with springs, grew grapes and other fruits, olives and was noted for its honey (Maq.*162.3-4, *184.7-8).

5) Ṣaffūriyah.


History: Pre-Islamic Ṣaffūriyah was a large Jewish centre and a municipality of Palaestina Secunda (Abel 1938:305-6, Wilkinson 1977:155). According to al-Balādhurī (*116.22=179) the city was taken by Shurāḥbīl along with the coastal towns of Şūr and 'Akka (cf. with above under 2) Şūr: History). The post-Conquest history of Ṣaffūriyah is obscure. It is known from a ḥadith (transl. Marmardji 1951:117-18), but this refers to Pre-Islamic times.

Description: Ṣaffūriyah was an administrative unit in al-Urdunn according to Ibn Khurradādhbih, although the other sources overlook the place (table 3). Equally uninformative are the 1931 excavations at the site by the University of Michigan (Waterman 1937), although the coin report lists four Arab-Byzantine copper coins in the catalogue (Bunnell
The excavators concluded that the upper part of the mound at Şaffūriyah was abandoned between the 6th century A.D. until the construction of the Crusader fort (Yeivin 1937:31, 33), but this is not credible. For instance the "basilica" of trench S-II (Manasseh 1937:4-6; Yeivin 1937:32-34), correctly reinterpreted as a house by Avi-Yonah (1978:1053-54), was probably destroyed well after the mid-6th date proposed by Yeivin. The lack of details in the report preclude any certainty on the question, although the bone objects from the cellar of this "basilica"/house (see Yeivin 1937:33, pl. 1.2) are duplicated in the mid-8th century earthquake destruction level at Fihl (PJ 1 Ch. 7).

Şaffūriyah's administrative duties as part of the ajnād system of government obviously extended to Nazareth (Ar. al-Nāṣirah) a mere 4 kms to the south. Nāṣirah of the mid-4th/10th century is described by al-Mas'ūdī (Murūj adh-Dhahab 1.123, transl. Marmardji 1951:200) as the village of the Messiah in the al-Lajjūn district (see below) with a church (of the Annunciation) venerated by Christians. This same church, as well as another, is mentioned by 1st/7th and 2nd/8th century pilgrims (Wilkinson 1977:109, 129, 165).

Şaffūriyah may have also administered the town of al-Lajjūn (Roman Legio, Byzantine Maximianopolis) located midway along the southern edge of the Marj Ibn 'Amīr. Being one of the lesser cities of Palaestina Secunda (Jones 1971:547), al-Lajjūn was probably amalgamated with a neighbouring district to form an enlarged kūrah in the increasingly centralized
administration of the post-Conquest period. Clearly al-Lajjun does not appear in the list of governmental units in Ibn Khurradadhbih or in the accounts of the jund of al-Urdunn in the other works of the 3rd/9th century (table 3), even though it is repeatedly mentioned as a major stop in al-Urdunn near the border with Filastīn on the route between Damascus and Egypt (e.g. Ibn Kh.*78.14=57; Qud.*228.12=172; below Ch. 5.iv.2; map 8). Al-Masʿūdī's passage on al-Nāṣirah demonstrates the close geographic ties between lower Galilee and al-Lajjun and this may reflect an earlier administrative arrangement.

6) Baysān.

Identification: Biblical Beth Shean, the Scythopolis of Greco-Roman times, located on the lower Nahr Jalūd at the junction of the Marj Ibn 'Amīr and the Jordan Valley (Abel 1938:281; Avi-Yonah 1976:93).

History: Baysān/Scythopolis had a long, turbulent history before its appointment as capital of Byzantine Palæstina Secunda (Abel 1938:280-81; Rowe 1930:44-53; Sourdel-Thomine 1960f). Baysān fell by šuḥr to the Muslims along with all inland al-Urdunn (Bal.*116.19), and remained a major town after the Conquest but with the reduced status of district capital in the province (table 3).

Description: Al-Maqdīṣī (*162.6-7) says that Baysān has abundant water, many palm trees, and produced the rice for Filastīn and al-Urdunn. This rice along with the blue dye
indigo and dates were the major commercial goods from Baysān in the 4th/10th century (Maq.*180.18), and the Baysān district was renowned for its wines in the Umayyad Period (sources quoted in Rowe 1930:5).

The excavations by the University of Pennsylvania Museum at Baysān encountered extensive 'Abbāsid occupation levels on the main mound of Tall al-Ḥuṣn (Fitzgerald 1931). Although the final report is very confused, some general statements can be made about Baysān in the 3rd and 4th centuries of Islam. The settlement on the main mound of the site covered an area of 180 by 140 metres and was probably enclosed by a wall. Entry was by a single gateway in the northwest corner of the wall, after which a Z-shaped paved street lined with houses led to the summit of the mound (Fitzgerald 1931:4-14). Here stood a large public building, probably the residence and offices of the district administrator for Baysān. The building was separated from the rest of the town by a wall with a single entrance from the street to the west, and internally consisted of a central access way flanked by bayt apartments. The plan of this structure is remarkably similar to that of the Umayyad Palace Complex on the 'Ammān Citadel (Northedge 1980:143-53), although on a less grand scale. However the dating of the Baysān building to the late 2nd/8th or early 3rd/9th century by graffiti on the fallen columns of the Byzantine church (see Fitzgerald 1931:16), leaves Northedge's Umayyad date for the 'Ammān complex in some doubt (Walmsley, in preparation).
7) Al-Jawlān.

Identification: Greco-Roman Gaulanitis from an original Semitic name, and a tract of land defined by the Jordan, Yarmūk and 'Allān valleys on its west, south and east respectively, and reaching to the southern flanks of the Jabal ash-Shaykh (Hermon) to the north (Sourdel 1965a:498).

History: Prior to the Islamic Conquest, the area of al-Jawlān was divided between two administrative districts, non-municipal Gaulanitis which belonged to Palaestina Secunda and Paneas/Caesarea Philippi (Ar. Bāniyās) from Phoenice (Jones 1971:544, 547). These were subsequently combined to create the large kūrah of al-Jawlān (Ya'q.114/*326.16, map 4). Al-Balādhurī (*116.20=179) considers the Jawlān as part of the jund of al-Urdunn which Shuraḥbīl took by sulḥ, but Ibn Khurradādhbih (*77.7=56) and the later sources unquestionably place the area in the Dimashq jund (also the view of Sourdel 1965a:498). However Ibn Khurradādhbih retains the district of Susiyah (see the following) in al-Urdunn (table 3,p. 132).

Description: The geographical sources have little to say about the features of Bāniyās and the Jawlān. Al-Ya'qūbī (114/*326.16-17) notes that the people of Bāniyās were of the Arab tribe of Qays, and al-Maqdīsī (*160.12, n.'g') describes it as the entrepôt of Damascus producing cotton and rice. In his time refugees from the thughūr in the north were settling in Bāniyās (Maq.*160.10-11).
8) **Sūsiyah.**

Identification: Hellenistic Hippus, modern Qal'at al-Huṣn, positioned midway up the strategic Wāḍī Afīq or Fīq (Ch. 5.v.1) overlooking the Buhayrat Ṭabariyah 11 kms across the lake from the capital (Abel 1938:471, Avi-Yonah 1976:65).

History: After an eventful early history (see Abel 1938:471-72; Epstein 1976:521), Byzantine Sūsiyah had a quiet but prosperous existence before its surrender to the Muslims by šūlḥ during the Conquest (Bal.*116.19).

Description: Although listed amongst the kūraḥ of Filastīn by Ibn Khurradādhbih (table 3), Sūsiyah has no standing in the later geographical sources of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries. By this time the town was probably included within neighbouring al-Jawlān in the jund of Dimashq, as al-Ya'qūbī (115/*327.13) allocates Khisfīn -- originally part of Sūsiyah -- to this province. Ibn Khurradādhbih's reference to Sūsiyah, and its reappearance in Yāqūt (transl. Marmardji 1951:94), invalidates Epstein's pronouncement that "the city was probably abandoned after the Arab conquest at the beginning of the seventh century" (Epstein 1976:521).

9) **Jadar.**

Identification: Gadara, modern Umm Qays, a site which dominates the Jordan Valley from a ridge between the Wāḍī Yamūk and Wāḍī 'Arab, 19 kms southeast of Ṭabariyah.

History: Jadar/Gadara was major Roman and Byzantine
centre, as its monuments show, and formed an important link on the road between Baysan and Buṣrā/Bostra, capital of Arabia, to the east (Bowersock 1983:176-77).

Description: Ibn Khurradādhbih lists Jadar as a kūrah of al-Urdunn (table 3). Al-Ya'qūbī makes no reference to Jadar in his geographical work, nor to the neighbouring towns of Ābil and Bayt Rās (see below for these sites). Rather, he adopts the general term of as-Sawād in reference to the agricultural lands of al-Urdunn (Ya'q.115/**327.22), as did al-Baladhurī (*116.20) before him, which may indicate a contraction in these urban sites during the 3rd/9th century (discussed in Ch. 6.v.3). In the next century al-Maqdisī (*162.4-6) portrays the region as prosperous and occupied by villages within the orbit of Adhri‘at, but does not refer to Jadar, Ābil or Bayt Rās by name. However he does describe the medicinal benefits gained from bathing in the thermal waters of al-Ḥammah, located 3 kms to the north of Jadar in the Wādī Yarmūk (Maq.*185.7-13). Al-Maqdisī’s tale about the dismantling of the bathing facilities at al-Ḥammah suggests that the Roman baths, recommissioned by the Caliph Mu‘āwiyyah (Hirschfeld and Solar 1981; Green and Tsafrir 1982), were no longer functioning.

10) Ābil.

Identification: Modern Quwaylbah situated on a perennial water source on the Wādī Quwaylbah, a southern tributary of the Yarmūk, 33 kms southeast of Ṣabariyah and 17 kms east of
Jadar (Mare et al. 1982:37-40; Wilkinson 1977:149).

History: Abil's history mirrored that of neighbouring Jadar. It belonged to the Decapolis, became a Roman municipality, and later the seat of a bishop (Abel 1938:201, 234-35).

Description: Abil is listed by Ibn Khurradadhbih as an administrative district of al-Urdunn, but is not mentioned by the other sources (table 3, p. 132). However the site is known to Yaqút (I:56, transl. Marmardji 1951:1), both from a hadīth and as Abil az-zayt, "Abil of the (olive) oil". The area is still distinguished by its olive trees.

Recent archaeological investigations led by Mare have identified a strong Umayyad presence at the site, but only sporadic evidence for settlement in 'Abbāsid, Fāṭimid and Ottoman times (Mare et al. 1982:40, 47-48). Soundings on the main mound in 1982 recovered material ascribed to the Umayyad Period from a church and evidence of Mamlūk occupation (Mare 1984:40-41). Unfortunately Mare's reports to date are confused and inadequate, for example no pottery is published, which makes it difficult to assess these conclusions.

11) Bayt Rās.

Identification: Roman/Byzantine Capitolias on a conspicuous hill in an undulating terrain north of modern Irbid, at a distance of 37 kms to the southeast of Ṭabariyah (Abel 1938:294-95; Sourdel-Thomine 1960a).

History: The former Nabatean settlement of Bayt Rās

Description: Bayt Rās made its fame amongst the Arabs in pre-Islamic and Early Islamic times as a source of fine wines and the town favoured by the Umayyad Caliph Yazīd II (101-5/720-4; Yāqūt I 776, transl. Marmardji 1951:23; Sourdel-Thomine 1960a:1149). Its administrative role as a kūrah of al-Urdunn is recorded by Ibn Khurraḍādhbih (table 3, p. 132), although as early as 96/715, Bayt Rās was combined with Ḥabil and Jadar and placed under the control of a single 'āmil or governor (Peeters 1939:305-6, 310, 313-14).

According to the manuscript on the Passion of St. Peter of Capitolias, Bayt Rās in the early 2nd/8th century had a mosque, a church dedicated to the Virgin and a mixed population of Muslims and Christians (Peeters 1939:302, 304). Although the lack of archaeological activity at Bayt Rās is a legitimate cause for complaint (Sourdel-Thomine 1960a:1149), this is being addressed by the recently instituted Irbid-Bayt Rās regional project (Lenzen and McQuitty 1983).
12) Fihl.

Identification: Ancient Pehel, Greco-Roman Pella, located at a perennial water source to the south of a fertile alluvial plateau on the eastern edge of the Jordan Valley, 38 kms southeast of Tabariyah (Smith 1973).

History: Pella/Fihl flourished in Roman and Byzantine times due to the considerable commercial benefits obtained from both its strategic location on the Jarash -- Baysan road and the fertility of the surrounding lands (Smith 1973:1-2, 23-70). One of the earlier battles between the Muslims and the Byzantines for the domination of ash-Sham was fought near Pella (13/635), after which the inhabitants of the city entered into a covenant with the Muslims, agreeing to pay both a poll tax and land tax (Bal. *115.13=177).

Description: The town retained its administrative function under 'Umar's ajnad system of government, as all three of the 3rd/9th century geographers list Fihl as a kurah in the jund of al-Urdunn (table 3, p. 132; sources also in Smith 1973:70-76). In the K. al-Buldān of al-Ya'qūbī (115/*327.22), the place-name of Fihl is spelt Faḥl (i.e. with a fatha in place of the original kasra) which reflects, it would seem, current pronunciation. The use of the vernacular indicates that al-Ya'qūbī is writing about contemporary conditions in al-Urdunn, at least on this occasion.

The excavations by the Sydney-Wooster Joint Expedition to Pella, modern Tabaqat Faḥl, have identified significant occupation levels dating to the Early Islamic and 'Abbāsid
Fig. 4.
Tabaqat Faḥl, showing the excavated areas.
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periods dispersed over a wide area of the site. Reasonably detailed reports on the results of these excavations have already been published elsewhere by this writer and others (see esp. PJ 1 Chs 7 & 8; PJ 2 Ch. 9; Smith 1973 Ch. IV & VI), however for the purposes of this thesis a summary of the relevant conclusions from these excavations is presented here.

Any evidence for a sudden or violent end to Byzantine Pella at the time of the Islamic Conquest is completely missing from the archaeological record. On the contrary, excavations in both the churches (Smith 1967:164-65; PJ 1:127; PJ 2 Chs 8 & 9) and the residential quarters (McNicoll and Walmsley 1982:339; PJ 1:130; PJ 2 Ch. 9) demonstrate the uninterrupted transition from Byzantine to Muslim rule over the city. This interpretation agrees with the previously discussed account by al-Baladhuri of Fiḥl's Conquest by the Muslims.

The widespread devastation of Fiḥl by an earthquake in 129/747 offers a rare insight into the nature of provincial life in southern ash-Shām at the end of the Umayyad Period (PJ 1:127-41; PJ 2 Chs 8 & 9; Smith 1973:165-66). This is apparent from the almost complete excavation of one house, known as house 'G' (PJ 1:138-39; PJ 2 Ch. 9), at the eastern end of the tell (Area IV, fig. 4). After a major rebuild in the mid-1st/7th century, house G stood as a two-storied structure with walls of roughly dressed stone downstairs and unbaked bricks of pebbles and yellow clay upstairs. The upper
Fig. 5. House 'G' in Area IV, of the late Umayyad Period.
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living rooms were reasonably luxurious, with plain white mosaic floors, plastered walls painted in red and white, and reused marble fittings from the churches. The roof was made of matting over oak beams, sealed with clay. During the earthquake all of these upper walls, floors and roof collapsed into the rooms downstairs, preserving the house contents in the process.

The ground floor plan of house G (fig. 5) was dominated by a columned entrance hall (room 6), either roofed or partly open with balconies on three sides. The hall was paved, and incorporated at its eastern end a wide staircase ascending to the north and animal feed benches along the north and west walls. The main entrance to the hall was from an external courtyard to the east, while four other doorways gave access to smaller internal rooms on the north, west, and south of the hall (rooms 1-5, 7). The excavation of five animal skeletons, long feed benches, bins and tethering holes in rooms 1-3 and 5 demonstrate their use as stables, while room 4 served as a small workshop equipped with a cement floor, bench, shallow pits (one containing plaster powder) and storage jars. This was a later modification to the building, as originally the sealed-off rooms 8 and 9 had performed this function. Room 7 was the living quarters for one of the building's occupants, probably a stable hand. Both he and his possessions were caught by the collapsing building, as were a human couple in the northeast corner of the central hall.

A wide variety of domestic utensils and organic remains
were recovered from the debri of house G, some of which were mentioned in the previous paragraph. Important for the chronology of the building was the discovery of ten dinars, the latest dating to 122/739-40, and a number of copper fulūs including one from room 7 minted in 126/743-4, that is some three years before the 129/747 earthquake. The domestic pottery from room 7 has already been published by the author of this work as part of an interim study of the late Umayyad ceramics from Area IV (PJ 1:143-52; also in Walmsley 1982:358-62). Pre-eminent amongst the organic remains are the textiles, identified as silk, found around the couple in the entrance hall of the building (PJ 2 App. 8). Other organic remains are indicative of the day to day foods consumed in the region. The cow skeletons betray the popularity of milk products, and remind one of the buffalo herds of the Qaysāriyah and Ḥūlah marshes mentioned by al-Maqdisī. More mundane consumables are represented by chicken skeletons (for eggs and meat), carbonized olive pips, date stones, the common club wheat, and two species of barley.

The recognition of a reasonably sized 'Abbāsid settlement at Fīl is a recent development in the archaeological investigation of the site. Initially stratified remains identified as belonging to the first half of the 3rd/9th century were found in 1985 during the excavation of a large ruined building in the Wādī Khandak to the northeast of the tell (Walmsley 1986b). This building, perhaps the caravan-serai and market of Islamic Fīl, had two levels of 'Abbāsid
occupation and a third, earlier, level of uncertain date. Two rubbish pits associated with the 'Abbāsid use of the building were found to contain a wide range of broken pottery jars, jugs, bowls, and casseroles in a variety of fabrics (catalogue and discussion in Walmsley 1986b), and also an iron dagger, nails, a limestone box, glass fragments and bone, especially chicken. Very similar pottery types along with lamps, glass bowls and ink bottles were recovered from a deep pit in the centre of the main mound in the most recent season of work at the site (1987). Although this material awaits detailed study, the connection of the pit with a large but as yet unexcavated building immediately to the east indicates a major 'Abbāsid presence on the tell.

Two major points can be drawn from the excavation of Umayyad and 'Abbāsid occupation levels at Fiḥl. The first is the reasonably high living standard enjoyed by late Umayyad society, demonstrated by both the quality of housing and the portable wealth of its inhabitants. Secondly the excavations have identified a sizable 'Abbāsid presence at the site, including the possible continued operation of the town's market and caravanserai. The delayed recognition of 'Abbāsid settlement levels at Fiḥl is attributable to a number of factors. In particular there is a marked reluctance to acknowledge any permanent occupation of the site after the late Umayyad earthquake, a view which continues to find support from Smith (1984:59; 1985:485-88). Furthermore both Sydney and Wooster have overlooked the remains of the succes-
sive Islamic settlements in the centre of the tell by concentrating on the east and west ends of the mound. Finally as the 'Abbāsid houses were probably demolished to make way for the Ayyūbid/Mamlūk village (PJ 2 Ch. 9; Walmsley 1983:354-60), the remains of this settlement are obscured by later human activity on the tell.

13) Jarash.

Identification: Gerasa, a direct transliteration into Greek of the semitic name retained in Jarash/Jurash, and located on a northern tributary of the Wādī Zarqā' at the powerful Qarawān spring.

History: Although Byzantine Gerasa did not emulate the monuments of the Roman city, its size equalled and perhaps exceeded that of its illustrious predecessor. Its churches extended from the Hadrianic arch (Bāb 'Ammān) to the North Theatre (JAP I:137-62, 303-42), and houses began encroaching onto the open spaces of the city, especially the Oval Piazza. Jarash was the only district from Byzantine Arabia transferred to al-Urdunn after the Conquest (see Ch. 3.ii), however the city retained its local administrative function as the district centre of a kūrah (table 3).

Description: The 'Abbāsid sources pay little attention to Jarash apart from recording the official role of the city. Al-Maqdisī briefly describes the Jabal Jarash as the region of Adhri'āt with many villages (Maq. *162.5-6), while in 623/1225, Yaqūt (II 61, transl. Marmardji 1951:46) refers to
the ruins of Jarash (viz the Roman monuments), but describes the region as populated with villages, some large, and with watermills in the Wādī Jarash.

Renewed archaeological activity at Jarash in the last five years has witnessed the acceptance of widespread Early Islamic and 'Abbāsid occupation of the site (see reports in JAP I). Although evidence for one or both of these periods was recognized in most of the excavated areas, particularly informative results came from the unearthing of shops and domestic buildings to the north of the South Decumanus on its west side by a Polish team (Gawlikowski 1986). The original Umayyad structures consisted of adjacent shops along the street front and behind them a large house with two wings of rooms either side of a central open court. In the latter part of the 2nd/8th century, according to the excavator, the Umayyad house was subdivided into three and the shops converted into another house (Gawlikowski 1986:114-15). By the 3rd/9th century these dwellings had been destroyed, perhaps by an earthquake, and the area turned into a potters workshop with four kilns (Gawlikowski 1986:117).

The production of lamps and pottery was obviously a major industry of Early Islamic and 'Abbāsid Jarash. Other areas with kilns include the courtyard of the Artemis Temple published by Fisher (1938:133,138), who consistently misdated Umayyad ceramics to the 6th century A.D. (cf. Pierobon 1986), the North Theatre (Schaefer and Falkner 1986), and its portico (Walmsley 1986a:355-57). The likeness of the wares and
shapes of the Jarash-made pottery to those found at Pella has already been noted by this author (Walmsley 1986a:355-57) and others (Schaefer and Falkner 1986:433-35), and is tangible evidence for close commercial links between the two towns in Umayyad and 'Abbāsid times.

Conclusions on the Jund of al-Urdunn.

Although the four 3rd/9th century sources do not agree entirely on the administrative structure and territorial limits of al-Urdunn during the first two centuries of Islam, the preceding survey has identified twelve city-based districts for the province at the height of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate. This was one less than in Umayyad times, when al-Jawlān also belonged to the province. These districts and their Byzantine equivalents are listed in table 4 (p. 133), the compilation of which was based on the information presented in table 3 and discussed above. Map 4 at the end of the thesis shows the location of each district's centre.

None of the district capitals was a new foundation, although Qadas had never served as a major administrative centre in pre-Islamic times. The status of other centres also changed with the establishment of the jund of al-Urdunn. Tabariyah was promoted from district to provincial capital at the expense of Baysān and Šaffūriyah, while other Byzantine municipalities such as al-Lajjūn and Bāniyās were absorbed into their larger neighbours (table 4, bracketed entries). As in Filasṭīn, a number of these cities officially regained
their pre-Hellenistic names, for example Scythopolis became Baysan and Ptolemais was abandoned for the original 'Akka.

As al-Baladhurī makes quite clear, all of the inland centres of the jund of al-Urdunn were captured during the Conquest by sulh, or peace covenant, in which the inhabitants of the city were permitted to retain their personal property (i.e. individual liberty), churches (i.e. religious beliefs) and the city walls (i.e. community rights and responsibilities) if they paid both a poll tax and a land tax. Consequently these cities would have been largely unchanged after the arrival of Islam, a conclusion confirmed by the excavations at Fīql and Jarash. Neither location has produced evidence for a violent or destructive occupation at the time of the Conquest, and the material culture from both sites displays a common unbroken development from Byzantine into Early Islamic times and beyond.

The territorial extent of the jund of al-Urdunn in the Early Islamic and 'Abbāsid periods can be accurately reconstructed from the geographical location of the province's principal cities (map 4). The western border was defined by the Mediterranean coast, from al-Kantāsh in the south (see above under Filasṭīn) to a point north of Şūr, probably the Līṭānī outlet. From here the common al-Urdunn/Dimashq border would have approximately followed the Līṭānī River, taking in the northern Jordan Valley before passing along the southern flank of the Jabal ash-Shaykh. At this point the border turned south and followed the Wādī 'Allān until reaching the
Wādī Yarmūk. After the transfer of al-Jawlān to Dimashq in 'Abbāsid times the boundary would have traced the western edge of the Ḥūlah basin before turning eastwards to leave Sūsiyāh in al-Urdunn. South of the Wādī Yarmūk the border in both periods probably moved gradually to the east around the elevated lands of Jarash before descending onto the Wādī az-Zarqā'. This wādī delineated the southern border of al-Urdunn east of the Jordan River, as 'Ammān and its large district of al-Balqā' to the south belonged to the jund of Dimashq (see below sec. v; Ch. 3.ii). The southern border of al-Urdunn west of the Jordan was the same as the Filastīn's northern border previously discussed.

Thus the territory of the jund of al-Urdunn, when at its largest in the Umayyad Period, included a section of the Mediterranean Coast, all of the Galilee region, the Jawlān, and northern East Jordan. It encompassed most of the catchment area of the Jordan River, particularly its source at Bāniyāṣ, and the upper Jordan Valley around the Ḥūlah and Ṭabariyah lakes. It was also this river, called in Arabic al-Urdunn (cf. the Hebrew ha-Yarden "that which descends", for which see Abel 1933:474-76), that gave its name to the province.

The jund of al-Urdunn was the administrative replacement for Byzantine Palaestina Secunda (compare maps 2 & 4). However the territory of the Islamic province in its original form was considerably enlarged by the addition of four districts from the abolished provinces of Arabia and
Phoenice. Although nearly all of Arabia was administered from Dimashq (below sec. v), Jarash was moved to al-Urdunn, perhaps because of its economic and cultural affinity with the northern cities of East Jordan (see above under Jarash and Ch. 3.ii). The dismantling of Phoenice led to major changes in the north and west. Bāniyās was transferred to al-Urdunn and joined with al-Jawlān, while the jund also gained the Mediterranean frontier districts of Ṣūr and 'Akkā. These changes, especially the addition of the maritime cities, originated in the new offensive/defensive military role performed by the ajnād of ash-Shām in the conflict with the Byzantines (discussed in Chs 1.iii, 3.iv)

* 

v> Districts to the East of Filastīn and Al-Urdunn (table 5).

The lands to the east of the jund of Filastīn and the jund of al-Urdunn, comprising the Jordan Valley south of Baysān, the Wādī 'Arabah, and much of East Jordan, were administered as part of the jund of Dimashq in 'Abbāsid times. Although the region lies outside the primary concern of this chapter (i.e. the administrative geography of Filastīn and al-Urdunn), the following short survey of the districts and chief cities of southern Dimashq is necessary
for two reasons. Firstly it further assists in the definition of the eastern limits of Filastīn and al-Urdunn, especially the status of ArThā, and secondly these places and their centres form an integral part of the discussions later in this thesis on the Ikhshīḍīd and Fāṭimid administration of southern ash-Shām (Ch. 4) and the communication routes of the region (Ch. 5).

The four 3rd/9th century sources agree in general on the districts of Dimashq south of Damascus, although only the official works of Ibn Khurradādhbih and al-Faqīh offer a seemingly detailed breakdown of the administrative subdivisions in this area (table 5, p. 134). Both of these writers identify a total of ten administrative units, not all of equal standing, to the east of Filastīn and al-Urdunn. The nine districts of al-Yaʿqūbī do not rigidly conform to these governmental divisions, although he does not dispute the territorial extent of the Dimashq jund in this area. Al-Balādhurī deals with its Conquest in only six generalized districts, one of which -- al-Jawlān -- he places in the jund of al-Urdunn (already discussed in sec. iv).

Passing over al-Jawlān, the following survey covers the districts of al-Bathaniyah and Ḥawrān in the north, then the various districts of the Arḍ al-Balqāʾ and finally both Jibāl and ash-Sharāṭ in the south.
1) **Al-Bathaniyah** (map 4).

Al-Bathaniyah, known as Batanea in Greco-Roman times, is usually associated with a flat and particularly fertile plain to the east of al-Jawlān (Sourdel 1960a). According to al-Iṣṭakhrī (*65.3-5) and Ibn Hawqal (*185.9-12), both al-Bathaniyah and neighbouring Ḥawrān were rural districts in which the fields could be cultivated without the need of irrigation. As these sources also state that both districts joined with al-Balqāʾ to the south, al-Bathaniyah may have included the southern tributaries of the upper Yarmūk system immediately east of the districts of ʿAbil and Bayt Rās in al-Urdunn, perhaps reaching to Fudayn (mod. Mafraq) in the southeast. The chief city of al-Bathaniyah was Adhrīʿāt (Bal.*126.9-12=193; Yaʿq.113/*326.8), which had a reputation for fine wines (Yaʿq. I:170, transl. Marmardji 1951:3).

2) **Hawrān** (map 4).

To the east of al-Bathaniyah lay Ḥawrān, the Classical Auranitis, an extensive area of mountainous land with Buṣrā as its chief city (Bal.*126.7-12; Yaʿq.113/*326.7; Sourdel 1971). Buṣrā had a distinguished history, and served as the capital of both the Nabatean Kingdom in its latter years and of Roman/Byzantine Arabia (Bowersock 1983:72-73; Megdad 1982). The city and its district entered into a peace covenant (ṣulḥ) with the Muslims before the capture of Damascus (Bal.*112.18-*113.10=173, *126.6-12=193). In the works of Ibn Khurraḍāḏbih and Ibn Faqīh, Buṣrā and Ḥawrān are listed as
two separate units in the administration of Dimashq, with Ibn Khurradādhibih classifying them as independent kūrah (table 5). This arrangement may have applied to only the collection of taxes, as all of the Hawrān seems to have been governed by one 'āmil (Bal.*128.20-*129.3; cf. Bayt Rās, Ābil and Jadar, see above sec. iv.11).

Excavations at the tell of Buṣrā have uncovered a domestic structure, thought to be a "farmhouse", dating to the end of the Umayyad Period (Wilson and Sa'd 1984:40-52). The discovery of kiln wasters may indicate the presence of a local potting industry, but agriculture remained the main economic activity during the 2nd/8th century. The excavators conclude that Buṣrā experienced a period of economic growth in Umayyad times (Wilson and Sa'd 1984:78).

3) Ard al-Balqā' (map 3).

The Ard al-Balqā' referred to a large tract of territory between the Wādī Zarqā' and Wādī Mūjib made up of high, water rich hills around 'Ammān and the flatter tablelands south of Ḥusbān (Sourdel-Thomine 1960g). Ibn Khurradādhibih and Ibn Faqīh subdivide al-Balqā' into three districts: 'Ammān, Zāhir ("outlying") al-Balqā' and al-Ghawr, all three of which were kūrahs according to Ibn Khurradādhibih (table 5. p. 134). Outlying al-Balqā', as viewed from Damascus, probably referred to the undulating plains of Ḥusbān and Mādabā. These sites are otherwise unaccounted for by the geographical sources, although both were major Byzantine centres with unbroken
occupation into Umayyad and 'Abbāsid times (Jones 1971:545; Sauer 1982:330-33, with references).

Al-Ya'qūbī (113-114/*326.9-10) dealt with the Ard al-Balqāʾ into two sections, namely az-Ẓāḥir with 'Ammān as its city and the Ghawr with its city of (A)rīthā. This would suggest that Arīthā was the main centre in the kūrah of Jabal al-Ghawr of Ibn Khurradadhbih, which presumably joined Byzantine Jericho with the other rural districts of Amathus, Livias (Ar. Bayt ar-Rām) and Gador (Ar. Jaydūr, mod. aṣ-Ṣalt) on the rugged east Jordan Valley scarp. This amalgamation may have taken place prior to the Conquest, as Hierocles omits the regios of Amathus, Jericho, Livias and Gador and adds Arīza (Jones 1971:546), which could only be Arīthā.

As al-Baladhurī (*126.13-14) makes clear, 'Ammān was the chief city of all the Ard al-Balqāʾ'. This was still the case in al-Maqdisī's time, although by then the district was considered part of Filastīn (see below Ch. 4.iii.1). He describes 'Ammān and al-Balqāʾ' as a land of villages, fields and water mills which produced grain, sheep, goats, fruits and honey (Maq.*175.3-7, *180.16). Al-Maqdisī's account is complemented by the archaeological evidence. The "Palace Complex" on the Citadel has already been mentioned (above sec. iv under Baysān), while nearby excavations of domestic structures has turned up extensive occupation of an Umayyad and Fatimid date (see esp. Bennett 1979; Bennett and Northedge 1977/78; Harding 1950:7-16; 1960; Northedge 1983).
4) **Maʿāb** and **Zughar** (map 3).

Although al-Baladhūrī (*113.6-.10=173) included Maʿāb in the al-Balqa’ district (as does Yāqūt in his al-Buldān IV:377, transl. Marmardji 1951:191), the three geographical sources consider Maʿāb as an independent district in Dimashq (Ibn Kh. *77.7=56; Yaʾq. 114/*326.12; Ibn Faqih *105.5). Set between al-Balqa’ in the north and ash-Sharāṭ to the south, Maʿāb’s hilly territory lay between the Mūjib and Ḥasā valleys. The district received its named from its principal city, the Biblical Rabbath Moab (hence Maʿāb and modern ar-Rabbah), but was known as Areopolis during Roman and Byzantine times (Abel 1938:425). Al-Maqdisī (*178.7, *180.18) remarks about the numerous villages around Maʿāb which cultivated grapes and almonds, and exported the latter.

Al-Yaʾqūbī (114/*326.12-14) alone adds Zughar to the places of Dimashq. The 6th century A.D. Madaba map depicts "Balak, also Segor, or Zoora", i.e. Zughar, as a walled town surrounded by palms on the southeastern shore of the Dead Sea (Bowersock 1983:77, Wilkinson 1977:178, map 12). Mittmann (1982:175) argues convincingly for identifying Zughar with Khirbat ash-Shaykh ʿIsā, a water-rich site on the alluvial fan of the Wādī al-Ḥasā in the Ghawr as-Sāfī. In ʿAbbāsid and Fāṭimid times Zughar was a busy market town and noted for its indigo and dates (Ibn Ḥawqal *184.17-185.3; Maq.*178.5).
5) **Jibāl (map 3).**

The district of Jibāl, "the mountains" (whence the Greco-Roman Gabalitis), is recognized by all four of the 3rd/9th century sources (table 5). Al-Ya'qūbī (114/*326.11) identifies 'Aranda! as the chief city of Jibāl, the conquest of which by sulh is recorded by al-Baladhurī (*126.16). 'Aranda! can only be Roman Arindela, now Khirbat Gharandal 15 kms to the S.S.E. of Ṭafīlah (Abel 1938:178). The site is located in a small but fertile valley near a powerful spring, yet in spite of its potential contribution to the settlement history of East Jordan in Early Islamic and 'Abbāsid times Khirbat Gharandal awaits systematic archaeological investigation. The southern limit of the Jibāl district is unknown, although as the junior neighbour to ash-Sharat it its territory was probably small and did not extend beyond the Wādī Fidān (Sourdel-Thomine 1965a:535).

6) **Ash-Sharat (map 3).**

The mountainous ash-Sharat district, listed by all four of the 3rd/9th century sources (table 5, p. 134), marked the southern limit of Dimashq east of the Jordan Rift Valley. Historically ash-Sharat was the homeland of the trade-based Nabataean Kingdom around their original capital at Petra, but after Rome's annexation of the kingdom in A.D. 106 it formed part of Arabia and later eastern Palaestina Tertia. The chief city of ash-Sharat was located at the spring-fed site of Adhruḥ (Ya'q.114/*326.14), the former Roman military station
of Adru on the Limes Arabicus and perhaps renamed Augustopolis in the 5th and 6th centuries A.D. (Abel 1938:204; Killick 1983b:110-12; cf. Avi-Yonah 1976:33 and Jones 1971:293). The inhabitants of Adhruh made a peace covenant (ṣulḥ) with the Muslims towards the end of the Prophet's life (Bal.*59.21-22=92), and in al-Maqdisī's time a treaty signed by Muḥammad was still in their possession (Maq.*178.8-9). Excavations at Adhruh by Killick (1983a; 1983b) has tentatively identified Islamic occupation over a long time span, including probable Umayyad rebuilding of the tower defences.

The southern limit of ash-Sharat was defined by the elevated lands around al-Ḥumaymah, which al-Yaʿqūbī (114/*326.15) and others place in this district. However Eadie (1984) found it difficult to identify a sizable Umayyad presence during a survey of the site (see further, Ch. 4.iv). Further south the town of Aylah (Byzantine Aila, see Abel 1938:311-32) at the head of the Gulf of 'Aqabah was controlled by the Governor of Egypt during the 3rd/9th and early 4th/10th centuries (Ibn Kh.*81.10=59; Ibn al-Faqīh *57.13-14, *69.6-8; Qud.*247.11). This arrangement is attributable to Aylah's central location on the Pilgrimage route from Egypt to the Ḥijaz (Yaʿq.129/*340.15-*341.3; see Musil 1926:321-26). For Aylah/al-'Aqabah see Ch. 4.iii&iv and also Musil (1926:83-85).
Conclusions.

The preceding survey of the four 3rd/9th century Islamic sources has identified ten administrative districts spread over six generalized geographical divisions in the lands to the east of Filastīn and al-Urdunn. These same sources, except for al-Balādhurī, place all of this territory in the jund of Dimashq during the early 'Abbāsid Period. The survey has also reinforced the reliability of the information contained in the four sources, as it does not contradict the analysis and conclusions reached in the previous inquiry into the administrative structure of the two provinces central to this thesis.

Ibn Khurradādhbih's information on the administrative extent of the jund of Dimashq in early 'Abbāsid times is an indication of the continued interest by this dynasty in the affairs of East Jordan, and demonstrates the major role of 'Ammān and Buṣrā in the government of these lands. Their concern here was not simply the collection of taxes and the control of the Empire, but the protection and maintenance of the Pilgrim's route from Damascus to Makkah via 'Ammān (see Ch. 5.v.2 for the itinerary of the Hajj route). As pilgrimage from Damascus began immediately after the Conquest of ash-Shām, the Orthodox and Umayyad caliphates would have also taken a keen interest in securing the route of the Darb al-Hajj.

The structure of Islamic administration in East Jordan during Early Islamic and 'Abbāsid times was substantially
different from that in force during the preceding Byzantine Period. At the local level the numerous municipal districts recorded for the late 6th and early 7th centuries A.D. (see Jones 1971:545-47) were amalgamated into larger units after the Islamic Conquest. For example Ḥusbān and Madaba were probably combined within the new district of Zāhir al-Balqā'.

On a wider scale the Byzantine provinces of Palaestina Tertia and Arabia were completely disbanded with the institution of the ajnād system of administration. Arabia was unevenly divided between two ajnād. One district, Jarash, was added to al-Urdunn (above sec. iv), while the rest of the districts in al-Bathaniyah, Hawrān and al-Balqā' were allocated to Dimashq. This jund also gained the southern districts in Ma'āb, Zughar, al-Jibāl and ash-Sharāt, all of which formerly constituted eastern Palaestina Tertia.

* * *
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghazzah (138.10)</td>
<td>Ibn Khurradadhbih (de Goeje 1889)</td>
<td>Ludd (328.7-10, 14)</td>
<td>Ibn Faqих (de Goeje 1885)</td>
<td>ar-Ramlah (78.17)</td>
<td>Ibn Khurradadhbih (de Goeje 1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabastiyah (138.11)</td>
<td>ar-Ramlah (78.17)</td>
<td>ar-Ramlah (328.14)</td>
<td>ar-Ramlah (102.6-20)</td>
<td>Iliyа (78.17)</td>
<td>Ibn Khurradadhbih (de Goeje 1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nablus (138.11)</td>
<td>'Amawās (79.2)</td>
<td>'Amawās (328.15)</td>
<td>Ludd (103.1)</td>
<td>Ludd (79.4)</td>
<td>Ibn Khurradadhbih (de Goeje 1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludd (138.13)</td>
<td>Yubnā (79.7)</td>
<td>Nablus (328.15)</td>
<td>Yubnā (103.1)</td>
<td>Yubnā (79.7)</td>
<td>Ibn Khurradadhbih (de Goeje 1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yubnā (138.13)</td>
<td>'Amawās (138.13)</td>
<td>Sabastiyah (329.1)</td>
<td>Yafā (103.1)</td>
<td>Yafā (138.14)</td>
<td>Ibn Khurradadhbih (de Goeje 1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qaysāriyāh (328.14)</td>
<td>Yafā (138.14)</td>
<td>Qaysāriyāh (329.2)</td>
<td>Qaysāriyāh (103.2)</td>
<td>Nablus (79.7)</td>
<td>Ibn Khurradadhbih (de Goeje 1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yafā (138.14)</td>
<td>Nablus (79.7)</td>
<td>Yubnā (329.4)</td>
<td>Qaysāriyāh (103.2)</td>
<td>Nablus (103.2)</td>
<td>Ibn Khurradadhbih (de Goeje 1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafah (138.15)</td>
<td>Sabastiyah (79.8)</td>
<td>Yafā (329.7)</td>
<td>Nablus (103.2)</td>
<td>Sabastiyah (103.2)</td>
<td>Ibn Khurradadhbih (de Goeje 1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliyа (139.4)</td>
<td>'Asqalān (79.8)</td>
<td>Bayt Jarin (329.8)</td>
<td>'Asqalān (city 329.9)</td>
<td>'Asqalān (141.10-11)</td>
<td>Ibn Khurradadhbih (de Goeje 1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qaysāriyāh (141.10-11)</td>
<td>Ghazzah (79.8)</td>
<td>Ghazzah (city 329.10)</td>
<td>Ghazzah (103.3)</td>
<td>Ghazzah (city 142.19)</td>
<td>Ibn Khurradadhbih (de Goeje 1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Asqalān (142.19)</td>
<td>Bayt Jarin (79.8)</td>
<td>Ghazzah (city 329.10)</td>
<td>'Asqalān (103.3)</td>
<td>ar-Ramlah (143.9-10)</td>
<td>Ibn Khurradadhbih (de Goeje 1889)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2.
The Districts (kūrah) of the Jund Filastīn, with their Byzantine Equivalents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Byzantine name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-RAMLAH [M]</td>
<td>(Founded by 96/715)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludd [M]</td>
<td>... Diosopolis (Ono Antipatris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qaysāriyah</td>
<td>... Caesarea (Dora, Sozusa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yāfa</td>
<td>... Joppa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yūbnā [M]</td>
<td>... Jamnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Asqalān [M]</td>
<td>... Ascalon (Azotus, Diocletianopolis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghazzah [M]</td>
<td>... Gaza (Anhedon, Constantia, Raphia, S. Gerariticus, Sycomazon, Elusa*, S. Constantiniaces, Bittylius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabastūyah</td>
<td>... Sebaste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nābulus</td>
<td>... Neapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliyā [M]</td>
<td>... Aelia,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Amawās</td>
<td>... Nicopolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayt Jibrīn [M]</td>
<td>... Eleutheropolis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key.
Order is CAPITAL city, then geographical (Ch. 2.iii).
[M] = Early Islamic Mint (see Ch. 3.ii)
* = Transferred from Palaestina Tertia (Ch. 2.iii.7)
Bracketed entries show those Byzantine districts probably appended to the enlarged kūrah.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Region</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>City/Region</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>City/Region</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Baladhur</td>
<td>(de Goeje 1866)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tabariyah</td>
<td>(de Goeje 1889)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fihl</td>
<td>(*115)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tabariyah</td>
<td>(*78.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabariyah</td>
<td>(*116.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>as-Samirah</td>
<td>(*78.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sur</td>
<td>(*327.19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baysan</td>
<td>(*116.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baysan</td>
<td>(*78.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Akkâ</td>
<td>(*327.21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sûsiyâh</td>
<td>(*116.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fihl</td>
<td>(*78.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qadas</td>
<td>(*327.21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atq</td>
<td>(*116.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jarash</td>
<td>(*78.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baysan</td>
<td>(*327.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurash</td>
<td>(*116.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bayt Râs</td>
<td>(*78.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fihl</td>
<td>(*327.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayt Râs</td>
<td>(*116.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jadar</td>
<td>(*78.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jarash</td>
<td>(*327.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qadas</td>
<td>(*116.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abîl</td>
<td>(*78.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>as-Sawâd</td>
<td>(*327.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Jawlân</td>
<td>(*116.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sûsiyâh</td>
<td>(*78.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Akkâ</td>
<td>(*116.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saffûriyâh</td>
<td>(*78.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur</td>
<td>(*116.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Akkâ</td>
<td>(*78.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saffûriyâh</td>
<td>(*116.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qadas</td>
<td>(*78.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sur</td>
<td>(*78.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.
The Districts (kūrah) of the Jund al-Urdunn, 
with their Byzantine Equivalents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Byzantine name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) TABARIYAH [M]</td>
<td>Tiberias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Şūr [M]</td>
<td>Tyre**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 'Akkā [M]</td>
<td>Ptolemais**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Qadas</td>
<td>Cadasa (from Tyre + Tetracomia?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Şaffūriyah [M]</td>
<td>Diocesaria (Helenopolis, Gabae, Legio/Maximianopolis?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Baysan [M]</td>
<td>Scythopolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) al-Jawlān</td>
<td>Gaulanitis &amp; Caesarea Philippi**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Susiyah</td>
<td>Hippos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Jadar</td>
<td>Gadara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Abil</td>
<td>Abila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Bayt Rās</td>
<td>Capitolias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Fiḥl</td>
<td>Pella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Jarash [M]</td>
<td>Gerasa*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) As-Sāmirah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key.
Order is CAPITAL city, then geographical (Ch. 2.iv).
[M] = Early Islamic Mint (see Ch. 3.iii)
* = Transferred from Arabia (Ch. 2.iv.13)
** = Transferred from Phoenice (Ch. 2.iv.2&3)
Bracketed entries show those Byzantine districts probably appended to the enlarged kūrah.
### TABLE 5.
The Cities & Districts of the Jund Dimashq (East of Filás-Tin and al-Urdunn).
According to Four 3rd Century A.H. Sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>al-Balādhrī</th>
<th>Ibn Khurradādhibh</th>
<th>al-Ya'qūbī</th>
<th>Ibn Fāţih</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(de Goeje 1866)</td>
<td>(de Goeje 1889)</td>
<td>(de Goeje 1892)</td>
<td>(de Goeje 1885)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma‘āb (*113.8-10)</td>
<td>K. al-Banthaniyāh (*77.6)</td>
<td>Ḥawrān/Busrā (*326.7)</td>
<td>Bathaniyāh (*105.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawrān/Busrā (*112.18-*113.10; *126.7-12)</td>
<td>K. Ḥawrān (*77.6)</td>
<td>al-Banthaniyāh/Adhri'āt (*326.8-9)</td>
<td>Hawrān (*105.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Banthaniyāh/Adhri'āt (*126.9-12)</td>
<td>K. al-Jawlān (*77.6)</td>
<td>az-Zāhir/‘Ammān (*326.9)</td>
<td>Jawlān (*105.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Balqā’/‘Ammān (*126.16)</td>
<td>Jabal al-Ghawr (*77.7)</td>
<td>al-Ghawr/Arandal (*326.9-10)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--/‘Arandal (*126.16)</td>
<td>Jibāl/‘Arandal (*326.11)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ash-Sharat/ -- (*126.17)</td>
<td>K. Ma‘āb (*77.7)</td>
<td>Ma‘āb (*326.12)</td>
<td>al-Ghawr (*105.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a&gt; In Arq al-Balqā’</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b&gt; &quot;Two cities of Arq al-Balqā’&quot; (*326.10).</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3

THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF FILASTĪN AND AL-URDUNN
IN THE EARLY ISLAMIC PERIOD (UNTIL C.132/750):
The Numismatic Evidence.

i> Introduction.

The 'Abbāsid and Ţūlūnīd sources of the 3rd/9th century on the administrative geography of south ash-Shām provide a reasonably coherent, but considerably abbreviated, account of the ajnād and their districts. The jund of Filastīn, jund of al-Urdunn, and districts of the jund of Dimashq in East Jordan have been fully described in the previous chapter, and the intention of this chapter is to establish the administrative structure of these regions in the earlier Rāshidūn and Umayyad caliphates, and to indicate the date of its inception.

The written sources do not consider these questions in any detail (see Introduction: Survey of the Sources). The Kitāb Futūḥ al-Buldān of al-Balādhurī, although purporting to describe ash-Shām at the time of the Islamic Conquest, is based upon an administrative framework taken from later
Umayyad or early 'Abbāsid sources. However as a historian al-Baladhurī was interested in change and development, for example the transfer of the naval workshops from 'Akkā to Șūr, and it can be assumed that he would have reported any major revisions to the administrative structure. Ibn Khurraḍādhbih also had access to earlier sources, some of which may have been of Umayyad origin, but probably his description is valid for the late 2nd/8th and first half of the 3rd/9th centuries.

Fortunately there is convincing numismatic evidence for an early, in fact pre-Umayyad, origin for the administrative structure of ash-Shām as described by the 'Abbāsid geographers. The evidence is in the form of a varied and prolific series of copper coins (Ar. fals, pl. fulūs) produced by the numerous mints of ash-Shām during the Rashidūn and Umayyad caliphates (see Walker 1956, esp. pp.lxx-xcv). Because an understanding of these coins is considerably improved by their provincial context, a consideration of the administrative structure of Filastīn and al-Urdunn during these two historical periods has been held over until now.

The coins from Filastīn and al-Urdunn, as with all ash-Shām, display a great deal of stylistic variation attributable to provincial traditions, and clearly identify the mint-cities of each jund. In the case of Filastīn the evidence is unquestionable, as the name of the province is appended to that of the mint, while the excavations at Jarash have produced convincing reasons for the early transfer of this city to the administrative control of Ṭabariyah. Through
a critical evaluation of this material and also the Nessana papyri, it can be demonstrated that the Early Islamic administrative organization of south ash-Shām differed little from the structure depicted in the 3rd/9th century sources, and that this system was initiated during the time of the Rāshidūn Caliphs, most probably in 18/639 under 'Umar.

Walker's "Catalogue of the Muhammadan Coins in the British Museum", in spite of its methodological shortcomings (see Bates 1984:33), remains the most detailed study of Early Islamic numismatics. In his preface to Volume II, Walker (1956:iii) remarks "alas, a complete Corpus is still a desideratum", and after 30 more years of excavations on both sides of the Jordan this need has become even greater. Unfortunately even the first step towards this goal, the full publication of excavated coins and collections, has not been reached. The publications of Berman (1976:17-31) and Mitchener (1977:55-56, 61-62) offer some new material on the fulūs of ash-Shām, but Early Islamic coinage remains a confused subject as is revealed by the recent survey of Broome (1985).

The copper coinage of ash-Shām during the Rāshidūn and Umayyad caliphates falls neatly into two broad groups, commonly referred to as "Arab-Byzantine Coinage" and "Post-Reform Coinage", both of which Walker further subdivides into types. These types are defined by linguistic characteristics or legends and, in the case of the Arab-Byzantine group, also on stylistic grounds (Walker 1956:xv-xviii).
The Arab-Byzantine coins, as their name suggests, were locally manufactured copies of Byzantine styles. The early issues reproduced the figure of the Emperor, usually Justin II or Heraclius, and sometimes his family as well. These probably date to the time of the Rāshidūn Caliphate and perhaps the first Umayyads. By the time of 'Abdul-Malik (65-86/685-705) new types had made an appearance which featured the standing Caliph wearing a traditional Arab head-dress and with his right hand on his sword. Some of the coins in this series, which forms the largest surviving group of pre-reform fulūs, include the name and titles of this caliph. In general the legends of the Arab-Byzantine coins are short, usually including the mint-name in Greek and/or Arabic and, in some instances, one or both of the religious formulae "There is no God but Allah, He alone" and "Muhammad is the Messenger of God". The chronology of the pre-reform coins remains poorly understood, as dates do not appear with any frequency on the fulūs until after 'Abdul-Malik's reform of the coinage in about A.H. 77-79 (Broome 1985:13-14; Mitchener 1977:55; Walker 1956:xviii-xxxvii).

The introduction of a new and distinctly Islamic currency under 'Abdul-Malik was part of a much wider reform of the administrative and economic structure of the Islamic Kingdom. Although the currency was reformed as part of 'Abdul-Malik's general Arabization and centralization policy, the post-reform Umayyad copper coins, as with the earlier Arab-Byzantine specimens, exhibit considerable regional variation
which at times includes the use of symbols (e.g. stars and/or crescents) or the depiction of plants and animals (e.g. palm leaves or various animals). Only one of Walker's three types of post-reform fulūs includes the name of the producing mint. However as there are many specimens in this group, it makes a valuable contribution to the study of provincial organization during the Umayyad Period (Broome 1985:14-19; Walker 1956:lxvii-lxviii).

One notable feature of Umayyad numismatics in ash-Shām and all of the Islamic Empire is the large number of mints which were authorized to issue fulūs (Walker 1956:xciii). Many of the mints in ash-Shām had produced city-coins under the Romans, but were denied this privilege under Byzantine rule. Why only some of the district centres in Filastīn and al-Urdunn were permitted to mint fulūs is unclear, but it may reflect the differing administrative status and function of the ajnād cities under the Umayyads.

*  

ii> The Early Islamic Mints of the Jund Filastīn.

Seven of the twelve district capitals of Filastīn are known to have minted copper coins in the Umayyad Period (see table 2 p. 131, where they are identified by an [M]). Six of these are easily recognized because of the common practice of
sufffixing "Filastīn" to the mint name on the coins during the Early Islamic Period. Examples with the "Filastīn" suffix are known from ar-Ramlah, Iliyā, Ludd, Asqalān and Ghazzah (Walker 1956:lxiii, lxxxiv-v, lxxxviii) as well as Yubnā (Berman 1976:29 no.60). No specimens with this suffix are known from the seventh mint of Bayt Jibrīn, which is probably due to the fact that only a few fulūs are known from this source. Walker (1956:33 no.s 105 & 1.2, 239-41 no.s 781, Th.14 & 782) published two doubtful Arab-Byzantine and three post-reform coins, and remarked upon the rarity of issues from Bayt Jibrīn. However the post-reform types attributable to this mint are stylistically very close to those of neighbouring Yubnā (Walker 1956:240 f.n. to Th.14). Thus there can be no question that these seven centres belonged to the jund of Filastīn in the Umayyad Period.

In general the coins from the mints of Filastīn are large, frequently between 2.0 and 2.5 cms in diameter and weighing between three and four grams. The close likeness in both the fabric and style of die engraving employed in the minting of fulūs from Filastīn suggests a degree of centralized provincial control over their production in the Umayyad Period (Walker 1956:xciv). This occurs, for example, with a series of post-reform fulūs from ar-Ramlah (as Filastīn), Ludd, 'Asqalān, and Ghazzah. Both the obverse and reverse of this coin-type features a standard religious formula within a single, sometimes beaded, circle surrounded by a marginal legend, the beginning and end of which is marked by a palm
leaf on the reverse (e.g. Walker 1956:273 no. 903, from Asqalān). Two variations of this type are worth noting. The first is from ar-Ramlah, where on the obverse a double circle with striations replaces the marginal legend, while on the reverse the palm branch is placed within the circle (Walker 1956:255 no. 846). The second variation, known from Iliya, results from the substitution of the marginal legend on the obverse with a triple circle and the omission of the palm leaf on the reverse (Walker 1956:235 no. P.124). This kind of fals is also known from Bayt Jibrīn (Berman 1976:29 no. 62), Asqalān and Yubnā (Walker 1956:274 no. P.139, 288 no. Th17), although in a modified form. These mints omitted the circle around the religious legend in the field on the reverse, thereby producing a fals similar in style to a type common in al-Urdunn (below sec. iii).

According to both Walker (1956:xciv) and Berman (1976:16), 'Ammān was another mint of Filastīn in the Early Islamic Period. Neither writer fully explains his reasons for holding this view, although Walker apparently based his decision on perceived stylistic similarities between the coins of 'Ammān and the products of the mints of Filastīn. Yet the numismatic evidence poses two major objections to placing 'Ammān in Filastīn during the Early Islamic Period.

Firstly there is no known fals issued in 'Ammān with "Filastīn" suffixed to the mint-name, even though a reasonable number of coins are known from this mint (Walker 1956 index; Hadidi 1975). Secondly both the Arab-Byzantine and
post-reform fulūs of 'Ammān are closer in design to the issues of the Dimashq and Hims provinces. For example the common type of pre-reform fals from 'Ammān has the standing figure of the Caliph with or without his name and titles on the obverse and the modified "cross on steps" symbol on the reverse (Hadidi 1975:*9-*14; Walker 1956:29 no. 96, 38-9 no.s 126-131). This is a popular style at Damascus, Ba'labakk, and Halab (Walker 1956:26-27, 32-35, 37) as well as other northern centres of ash-Shām, but is unknown in Filastīn with the possible exception of two doubtful specimens from Jibrīn. Both of these examples are poorly preserved, making the mint difficult to read, and the elongated form of the transformed "cross on steps" on their reverses would suggest a northern origin (Walker 1956:xxxii, 33). The "standing caliph" coin type, with specimens from Iliyā and Yubnā, has a rounded "M" on the reverse in Filastīn (Berman 1976:27-28 nos 50-54, 29 no.60; Mitchener 1977:56 no.15; Walker 1956:22-25). In addition the post-reform coins of 'Ammān display a greater affinity with those from the mints of Dimashq. They are generally smaller and lighter than the fulūs of Filastīn and their obverse layout is significantly different, having either an ornamental trefoil design and the marginal legend "Muḥammad is the Messenger of God, 'Ammān" in Kufic, or simply "this fals was struck at 'Ammān" within a circle (Berman 1976:26 no.49; Walker 1956:274-75). The style of these types differ significantly from that usually employed for the post-reform coins from Filastīn described
earlier in this section, whereas the latter type in particular is similar to issues from the mints of Buṣrā and Damascus in the jund of Dimashq (Walker 1956:236 no. p.126, 251-52 nos 828-34 & B.47).

In concluding the evidence offered by Rāshidūn and Umayyad numismatics leaves little doubt that ar-Ramlah, Iliyā, Ludd, Yubnā, Asqalān, Ghazzah and Bayt Jibrīn all belonged to the jund of Filastīn during the Early Islamic Period. On the other hand 'Ammān was clearly outside of this province during the period. As far as it is known, the five cities of Yāfā, Qaysāriyah, Sabasṭiyah, Nābulus and 'Amawās in Filastīn did not mint coins after the Islamic Conquest. Bellinger (1938:141) refers to an Arab-Byzantine coin from Qaysāriyah, but must be a Ṭabariyah issue as the word TIBEIO (sic) would suggest (cf. Walker 1956:15-16). If indeed these five northern centres of Filastīn did not produce fulūs it was due to an intentional policy decision by either the provincial governor or the central government in Damascus, as Walker (1956:xciv) suggests that the coin dies were engraved in the capitals of the ajnād before distribution to the district centres. Thus the apparent exclusion of Yāfā, Qaysāriyah, Sabasṭiyah, Nābulus and 'Amawās from this responsibility could reflect the lower administrative status of these centres in Filastīn.
Early Islamic Structure

iii> The Early Islamic Mints of the Jund al-Urdunn.

1) The Fulūs of al-Urdunn.

Six out of the twelve district capitals of the jund of al-Urdunn are known to have minted fulūs during the Early Islamic Period (table 4 p. 133, mints identified by [M]). Walker (1956:xciv) has published coins from five of these, but recently both Arab-Byzantine and post-reform fulūs have been identified from Jarash (Bowsher pers. com.; Gawlikowski 1986:111). Unfortunately the numismatic tradition of al-Urdunn, unlike Filasṭīn, did not extend to suffixing the name of the province to that of the mint, but the close family resemblance of the coins from these mints would place them in the same province.

The Pre-reform copper coins produced in the jund of al-Urdunn are predominantly of Walker's "Imperial Type", a type unknown in Filasṭīn, with published specimens from the mints of Ṭabarīyah, Baysān and Jarash (Gawlikowski 1986:111; Walker 1956:xxiii, xciv). All of these coins are unusually large, and have a large majuscule 'M' on the reverse and three types of obverses. The first, which only occurs at Baysān, has an enthroned Emperor and Empress with the legend "Scythopolis" in Greek. It was a direct copy of a follis issued in the reign of Justin II and Sophia (A.D. 565-78), faithful to the original at first but becoming increasingly stylized later in its history (Bellinger 1938a:14-20, 119-22; Berman 1976:19 no.16; Walker 1956:xviii-xx, 1-2). The second
obverse-type depicts the Emperor standing with his two sons, a design also borrowed from a Byzantine follis, and is only known from Ṭabariyāh (Walker 1956:xxiii, 15-17). In contrast this city shared the third kind of obverse -- a standing Emperor -- with the mints of Baʿlabakk, Dimashq and Ḥimṣ, where it was a very popular type especially at the last two mints (Walker 1956:xxiii, 4-11). This probably reflects the higher administrative status of Ṭabariyāh as the capital of the jund of al-Urdunn.

Less common are coins in the style of the "Standing Caliph" type produced during the Caliphate of ʿAbdul-Malik (65-86/685-705). Fulūs with an obverse of twin standing figures depicted in the standard Caliphal pose were probably minted at Baysān (Bellinger 1938:132-33; Gawlikowski 1986 pl. XV.A; Walker 1956:43-44; all found at Jarash), although the single standing Caliph-type of obverse is not known from the mints of al-Urdunn (Walker 1956:xxiv).

All six of the mints in al-Urdunn produced post-reform copper coins during the Umayyad Period. The commonest type of these fulūs, which is known from numerous mints in ash-Shām, features centrally placed religious formulae in Kufic on both the obverse and reverse. These are surrounded by a triple circle on the obverse and a marginal legend, the bismillah ("In the name of God, this fals was minted in [name]"), within a circle on the reverse. 'Ākkā, Baysān and Ṣaffūriyāh, on the basis of published examples, produced only this kind of post-reform fulūs (Berman 1976:25-6, nos 42-43,48; Walker
1956:240, 266, 274), although not surprisingly the greatest number and variety of this coin type comes from Ṭabariyāh, the capital of the jund (Berman 1976:26; Walker 1956:267-68). The issues of the "al-Urdunn" mint, almost certainly from Ṭabariyāh, conform to the description above except that a star is depicted below the legend on the obverse (Walker 1956:228-29). Ṣūr is not known to have minted coins of this type; its rare issues are in a class of their own (Berman 1976:25 no. 41; Walker 1956:266), and may reflect some special status enjoyed by this town in the jund of al-Urdunn (Ibn Faqīh *105.7).

The preceding survey of the copper coins issued by the mints of the jund of al-Urdunn has identified stylistic consistencies on a provincial level, although the evidence for this is less conclusive than that of neighbouring Filastīn. The obverse designs on the Arab-Byzantine fulūs are mostly of the Imperial type, with the one series in the style of the Standing Caliph type attributed to Baysān. The issues of each mint often conform to a particular form, indicating some degree of provincial independence, but also central control over the district centres by Ṭabariyāh. The Post-Reform coins of al-Urdunn conform to a popular type known from mints throughout ash-Shām, which may reflect a weakening of the administrative independence, or perhaps a less parochial outlook, of this jund under the Marwānīds (65-132/685-750).
2) The Coins from the Jarash Excavations.

The Umayyad coins from excavations at Jarash by both Yale University (1928-34) and the recent Department of Antiquities Jarash Project (1981-83) provide further numismatic evidence on the provincial structure of al-Urdunn during the Early Islamic Period. This information shows that Jarash, the only city transferred to al-Urdunn from Byzantine Arabia after the Conquest, was administered from Tabariyah under the Umayyad and Rashidun caliphates.

An analysis of the mints as represented by the coins found at Jarash during the Yale excavations reveals the following totals (from Bellinger 1938a:119-133):

1. The Jund of al-Urdunn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Pre-reform</th>
<th>Post-reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tabariyah</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27 specimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Urdunn*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 specimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baysan</td>
<td>34 specimens**</td>
<td>1 specimen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 34 33

* Minted in the capital, i.e. Tabariyah.

** one example overstruck with post-reform formulae.

2. The Jund of Filastīn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Pre-reform</th>
<th>Post-reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 specimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Asqalān</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 specimen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 4
3. The Jund of Dimashq.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-reform:</th>
<th>Post-reform:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimashq</td>
<td>1 specimen</td>
<td>12 specimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ammān</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 specimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buṣrā?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This material clearly shows that Jarash joined Ṭabarīyah and Baysān in the same administrative and economic unit during the Early Islamic Period, which indicates that the jund of al-Urdunn at that time had a similar, and probably the same, structure to that described in the written sources of the 3rd/9th century. Out of a total of 87 positively identified Arab-Byzantine and post-reform coins with a mint-name, over three-quarters originated from al-Urdunn (67 specimens), with the mints of Baysān and Ṭabarīyah being about equally represented (35 and 32 respectively). Damascus, the Umayyad capital of the Islamic Empire, was the next most important mint (13 coins) followed by nearby 'Ammān of the Dimashq jund (only 3 specimens, and all post-reform). The scarcity of 'Ammān coins at Jarash, especially an absence of Arab-Byzantine issues from that mint, is a probable reflection of the low level of commercial activity between the neighbouring cities in the 1st/7th and 2nd/8th centuries. Rather the economic orientation of Jarash was towards the north and west, especially Ṭabarīyah, after 'Abdul-Malik's Caliphate.
Initial work on the Islamic coins from the excavations of the Jarash Project has, not surprisingly, produced similar results (Bowsher pers. com.; the following figures are provisional).

1. **The Jund of al-Urdunn.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-reform:</th>
<th>Post-reform:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tabariyah</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10 specimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Urdunn</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 specimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baysan</td>
<td>11 specimens</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarash</td>
<td>3 specimens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Akkā</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 specimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **The Jund of Filastīn.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-reform:</th>
<th>Post-reform:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 specimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filastīn</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludd</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yubnā</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Asqalān</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 specimen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayt Jibrīn</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 specimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **The Jund of Dimashq.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-reform:</th>
<th>Post-reform:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimascus</td>
<td>2 specimens</td>
<td>12 specimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These figures, although incomplete, confirm the domination of the al-Urdunn mints at Jarash. The vast majority of the Arab-Byzantine coins (11 out of 16) were issued by Baysān, and 3 others were from Jarash itself. Of the post-reform coins, the most specimens from a single mint came from Ṭabariyah (23, including the al-Urdunn examples) with Damascus the next most important mint with 12 specimens. These statistics also reflect the commercial development of Jarash during the Early Islamic Period. The pre-reform coins are almost exclusively from mints in al-Urdunn, suggesting that Jarash was economically isolated from its surrounding provinces, while a much greater range of mints belonging to the two adjacent provinces of Filastīn (13 specimens from six mints) and Dimashq (12 specimens from Damascus) are represented in the post-reform fulūs. This would indicate an economic resurgence of the Jarash district during the first half of the 2nd/8th century, for example by the expansion of the city's potting industry, following a period of adjustment after the Islamic Conquest.

The numismatic evidence from the excavations by Yale University and the Jarash Project clearly shows that Jarash and its district lay within the administrative and economic confines of the jund of al-Urdunn during the Early Islamic Period. It is particularly significant that these excavations have produced such unusually detailed material for this early period, as the transfer of Jarash to al-Urdunn represented a
much larger post-Conquest provincial reorganization of ash-Shām that required the dismantling of Byzantine Arabia and Palaestina Tertia. Thus a change to the provincial status of Jarash would mark the institution of the ajnād system of administration by the Islamic State. The numismatic evidence demonstrates that Jarash was already administered as part of al-Urdunn when the earliest Arab-Byzantine coins -- those of the Imperial type -- make their first appearance, as this category is dominated by specimens from the Baysān mint. Berman (1976:19, no. 16) is probably correct in dating the Baysān Imperial series to the Rāshidūn Caliphate, which suggests that the system of administration depicted in the earlier 'Abbāsid geographical works had its structural origins in the immediate post-Conquest period. As is argued further in the next section, the most likely date for the establishment of this new structure for the administration of ash-Shām was during the Caliphate of 'Umar, specifically his provincial reorganization of 18/639.

*
iv> Historical Conclusions.

The language of government, numismatic evidence, and numerous comments in the Islamic written sources leave no doubt that the practise of administration in Early Islamic ash-Shām was indebted to the pre-existing Byzantine system (see above Chs 1.iii, 2.iii & iv). Yet even before the last of the Byzantine forces had been expelled from the Mediterranean coastal cities, the Islamic State undertook a radical revision of the function and territorial extent of each province. Quite clearly these reforms did not reflect any executive preferences of the Hijāzī Arabs, as the new elite was not in the habit of disturbing the mechanics of government in the conquered countries. They were, rather, symptomatic of wider security issues:
- the need to effect the complete expulsion of Byzantine forces from coastal locations,
- the subsequent defense of the Mediterranean littoral from seaborn raids,
- finally the ever-present threat of a sustained land and sea Byzantine counter-attack to retake Syria and Palestine for their Empire.

In discussing the historical events surrounding the establishment of the ajnād of ash-Shām (Ch. 1.iii), particular attention was paid to the dual defensive/offensive function of these military provinces. The Mediterranean sea, which in Roman and Byzantine times formed the heart of the
empire, was transformed into a zone of conflict by the Islamic Conquest of ash-Shām. Thereafter the seaports rapidly assumed their primary role as frontier fortresses (Ar. thugūr) with the Byzantine Empire, although trade continued to play an important role in the economy of the Mediterranean littoral. At first, during the Caliphate of 'Umar, the ajnād and their coastal cities performed an exclusively defensive function, but later 'Uthmān placed permanent garrisons in the ports and instigated bold naval actions against the Byzantines (Ch. 1.iii; also the view of El'ad 1982:146-47). During Mu'āwiyyah's own Caliphate Persian settlers were sent to 'Akkā and Šūr to bolster up the military capabilities of these ports, and the first shipyards on the Mediterranean coast were constructed at 'Akkā. Under the later Umayyad Caliph Hishām (105-125/724-743), the workshops were shifted from 'Akkā to Šūr (above Ch. 2.iv.2 & 3).

The territorial restructuring of the administrative divisions of south ash-Shām after the Islamic Conquest reflected the new military task required of the provinces. The transformation of Palaestina Secunda into the jund of al-Urdunn clearly illustrates this point. The former Byzantine province, the smallest of the three Palestines, was a landlocked territory reliant on 'Akkā/Ptolemais and Šūr/Tyre, the two main cities and ports of southern Phoenice, for its Mediterranean outlets (map 2). However both the small size of Palaestina Secunda and its non-maritime character left the province administratively dysfunctional in the changed
politico-military climate of the post-Conquest period. To create a more relevant unit of government, 'Akka and Şūr were taken from dismantled Phoenice and, with Jarash from the defunct Provincia Arabia, rejoined to the districts of Secunda to form the new Arab military province of al-Urdunn (above Ch. 2.iv, map 6). As a result this new jund took responsibility for two major Mediterranean seaports while being of sufficient size to secure their protection.

The circumstances of Palaestina Prima were markedly different from those of Secunda. As a Byzantine province (Ch. 1.ii, map 2), Palaestina Prima already controlled a large stretch of the Mediterranean Coast and was of a reasonable size, making its conversion into a jund a relatively straightforward affair. The territorial changes that do take place (above Ch. 2.iii) are attributable to the adoption by the Islamic State of a policy of centralization towards the administration of newly-conquered ash-Shām.

On the other hand the sparsely populated and land-bound province of Palaestina Tertia -- whether it was re-formed upon the expulsion of the Sassanids or not -- retained no administrative purpose after the Conquest, which resulted in its division between the Dimashq jund and the Filastīn jund. In addition Damascus, as the capital of ash-Shām, was favoured with the Ghawr districts from Palaestina Prima and all of Byzantine Arabia excepting Jarash. Through this region ran the crucial Damascus -- al-Hijāz Hajj route (Ch. 5.v.2), which largely explains the desire of Damascus to retain
direct control over East Jordan south of Adhri'āt.

Thus the territorial restructuring that produced the ajnād of Filasṭīn, al-Urdunn and Dimashq reflected the new political and military reality in ash-Shām in the wake of the Islamic Conquest. The east Mediterranean seaboard now formed a zone of conflict with the Byzantine Empire, and the coastal cities were thrust into the forefront of the military battles between the two powers. The ajnād were intended to provide the appropriate financial and human resources for the defense of the realm, leading to the reworking of the Byzantine system of administration until each jund encompassed a section of the Mediterranean coast and a supporting hinterland.

Both literary and archaeological evidence dates this restructuring of the provincial territories in ash-Shām to the immediate post-Conquest period (Chs 1.iii; 2.iii; this chapter sec. iii), and although literary sources are subject to later modification the results of archaeological research are not open to such corruption. Excavations at the sites of Nessana and Jarash, both key settlements from dismantled Byzantine provinces reallocated to the enlarged jund by the reform of the administration, have produced convincing evidence to date the structural reorganization of the provinces long before the Caliphate of 'Abdul-Malik (65-86/685-705). Firstly the papyri from Nessana (see above Ch. 2.iii.7) show that this former village of the Elusa district in Palaestina Tertia was placed under the administrative control of the kūrah of Ghazzah, itself a district of the Filasṭīn jund. The
earliest of these papyri dates to A.H. 54 (i.e. 674 A.D.), which provides a clear *terminus ante quem* for the formal abolition of Palaestina Tertia and the foundation of Filastīn and Dimashq (which took the eastern half of Tertia) in the form described by the 3rd/9th century written sources. Secondly further evidence originates from the excavations at Jarash, where two-thirds of the identifiable Umayyad coins were minted in the al-Urdunn *jund*. As already noted (above sec. iii), the overwhelming number of Arab-Byzantine coins at Jarash from the mint of Bāyṣān demonstrates an early date for the transfer of Jarash from the dismantled province of Arabia to the the *jund* of al-Urdunn, almost certainly during the Rāshidūn Caliphate and probably at the time of 'Umar's reorganization of the provinces in 18/639.

* * *
Chapter 4

THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF SOUTH ASH-SHAM
IN THE 4TH/10TH CENTURY
UNDER THE IKHSHIDIDS AND FATIMIDS.

i> Introduction and Sources.

For nearly three centuries after the Islamic Conquest, the provincial framework of south ash-Shām was indebted to the ajnād system of administration set up by 'Umar in 18/639. Both the coinage and government documents from Early Islamic Filastīn and al-Urdunn, when compared with the descriptions in the 3rd/9th century Arabic sources, indicate that there were very few modifications to the structure of these provinces over this time (cf. Chs 2 and 3). The late 3rd/9th century geography by al-Ya'qūbī, who was an official of the autonomous Ṭūlūnīd dynasty and died in Egypt, suggests that at least in theory the same structure continued under this government. Information on the first significant changes to the administration of south ash-Shām, the subject of this chapter, is found in the Arabic geographies produced in the mid-4th/10th century. These changes can be attributed to the
activity of the Egyptian Ikhshīdīd dynasty in ash-Shām during the second quarter of the 4th/10th century and the extensive political and economic reorientation of Filastīn and al-Urdunn in this century towards the new dominant power in the region (below sec. iv).

The major written sources on south ash-Shām in the 4th/10th century are the regional geographies of al-İṣṭakhrī, Ibn Hawqal and al-Maqdisī, to which can be added a quasi-official work on the Islamic World by Qudāmah. The background to the composition of these works and their general attributes has been reviewed in the Introduction to this thesis.

The earliest of these works is the Kitāb al-Kharāj of Qudāmah, which appeared in 316/928 after ash-Shām had temporarily returned to direct 'Abbāsid control (between 292-323/905-935). As a government official Qudāmah had access to state documents, and his list of the seaports belonging to each jund in ash-Shām, the section relevant to this chapter, would have come from these sources.

The Kitāb al-Masālik wa'l-Mamālik by al-İṣṭakhrī, which appeared in 340/951, was revised and expanded by Ibn Hawqal before being republished in 367/978 as the Kitāb Sūrat al-Ard. The changes introduced to al-İṣṭakhrī's work by Ibn Hawqal for south ash-Shām were usually concerned with either places and sometimes events, however the two books share a common structure. Both sources divide the Islamic World into 20 aqālīm and state that, in the case of the iqṭām of ash-Shām, each jund constituted a kūrah or geographical district
(Iṣṭ. *55.19-*56.1; I.Ḥ. *168.7-8=165). This would suggest that the geographical divisions adopted by al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal for Filastīn and al-Urdunn correspond, at least in theory, to the contemporary administrative divisions of ash-Shām.

The Kitāb Aḥsan at-Taqāsīm fī Ma'rīfat al-Aqālīm by al-Maqdisī, a native of Jerusalem, was published in 375/985 and includes long and detailed accounts of Filastīn and al-Urdunn based upon his own travels and observations. Unlike al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal, al-Maqdisī makes no explicit connection between his subdivisions (kūrah) of the Iqlīm ash-Shām and the administrative practices of the day.

The mid-4th/10th century geographical sources of al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal identify a major administrative reorganization of south ash-Shām, especially to Filastīn, during the time of the independent Ikhshīd Dynasty of Egypt (323-58/935-69). This could have taken place in 327/939 when Muḥammad ibn Tughj the Ikhshīd (d.335/946) ceded ash-Shām north of Filastīn to Ibn Rāʾiq, governor at Raqqah. Although the Fātimid caliphs (after 358/969) found ash-Shām difficult to hold, nearly all of the lands south of Damascus became an Egyptian dependency in the time of Al-'Azīz (365-86/975-96), and it was during this time that al-Maqdisī produced his geographical work. Thus it remains possible that al-Maqdisī based his subdivisions of ash-Shām on the Fātimid administration of the region, just as al-Iṣṭakhrī/Ibn Ḥawqal obtained
the framework for their books from the earlier Ikhshīdīd system and al-Yaʿqūbī likewise from the ʿAbbāsid/Ṭūlūnid provincial structure.

* 

ii> Al-ʾIṣṭakhrī, Ibn Ḥawqal and Qudāmah
(Table 6, Maps 5 and 6).

After defining the general limits of the ʾIqlīm ash-Shām, al-ʾIṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal begin with a reasonably detailed description of Filastīn in the far southwest of the region, particularly the religious sites. Both sources offer a shorter treatment of neighbouring al-Urdunn by restricting their accounts to the main cities and features of the district (see table 6, p. 184). Ibn Ḥawqal makes quite substantial revisions and additions to the text of al-ʾIṣṭakhrī on Filastīn, for example by adding a long section on the administration of the region by Kāfūr under the Ikhshīdīd dynasty (I.H.*172.18-*173.11), but leaves the description of al-Urdunn virtually unchanged. In neither case does Ibn Ḥawqal make any alterations to the territorial limits of Filastīn and al-Urdunn set by al-ʾIṣṭakhrī, which is particularly important for dating the new administrative structure of south ash-Shām to the time of the Ikhshīd.
1) Filastīn (Table 6.1).

Ibn Ḥawqal (*170.19-21) follows al-Iṣṭakhrī (*56.8-10) by describing Filastīn proper -- that is the jund -- as extending from Rafaḥ in the southwest to the boundary of al-Lajjun (in al-Urdunn), and from Yāfā on the Mediterranean Coast to Arṭā in the east. Accordingly all of the land west of the Jordan River is labelled as "Filastīn" on the accompanying map of Ibn Ḥawqal (see maps 5 & 6 at the end of this work). These limits match those of the Filastīn jund during the 3rd/9th century except for the inclusion of Arṭā, which as previously shown was part of the Dimashq jund (Ch. 2.v.3).

Both al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal immediately qualify their statement on the limits of Filastīn with an important rider: in their day the areas of Zughar, the lower Ghawr ("the land of Lot's people"), Jibal and ash-Sharatāt as far as Aylah were annexed to Filastīn and formed part of its administration (Iṣṭ.*56.10-11; I.H.*170.21-2=167). Thus at its greatest extent the kūrah of Filastīn, as distinct from the jund of Filastīn, took six stages (i.e. days) to cross (Iṣṭ.*65.18-*66.3; I.H.*186.4-7). The journey began at Yāfā on the coast and passed through ar-Ramlah, Jerusalem, Arṭā, Zughar, the mountains of Ash-Sharatāt and Adhrūḥ until Muʿān was reached. Under this arrangement, all of the Ghawr south of Baysān, the Dead Sea and the Wādī 'Arabah to Aylah belonged to Filastīn, although Baysān itself and the Jordan Valley to its north remained in al-Urdunn (Iṣṭ.*59.2-3; I.H.*173.22-3=170). Al-Balqā' was also considered part of Filastīn by al-
Iṣṭakhrī/Ibn Ḥawqal, as the area was included in the table of distances between the major centres and regions of the province (Iṣṭ.*66.13-14; I.H.*186.19=184). Maʿāb is not mentioned in either work, but must have also belonged to Filastīn because of its intermediate position between al-Balqāʾ and Jibāl (see maps 3 & 7). Perhaps al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal viewed the town and its lands as part of al-Balqāʾ, as did al-Balāḏurī (*113.6-10=173) in the century before and Yaḥqūṭ (IV:377 transl. Marmardji 1951:191) in his encyclopaedic work of the 7th/13th century.

After setting the geographical and administrative limits of Filastīn, al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal embark on a description of selected places (see table 6.i p. 184 for a summary of the more detailed account of Ibn Ḥawqal). Ar-Ramlah remained the principal city of Filastīn (see Ch. 2.ii.1), although Bayt al-Maqdis with its fine Haram area was only fractionally smaller. The size of Bayt al-Maqdis, and the interest shown by al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal in this town and the villages of Bayt Laḥm (Bethlehem) and Masjid Ibrāhīm (Hebron, the Ḥabrāʾ of al-Maqdisī) indicates the continuing importance of the religious sites in Filastīn (discussed in Chs 2.iii.10, 6.iv.2).

The eleven remaining towns and regions specifically mentioned by al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal were either major inland agricultural and market centres or coastal fortress-towns, but unfortunately both writers are short on details about each group. Furthermore they fail, on their own
admission, to mention all of the urban centres with a Friday Mosque (i.e. with a minbar) in Filastīn, of which there were about twenty in spite of the district's small size (Iṣṭ.*58.6-7; I.H.*172.14).

Al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Hawqal do not engage in discussion on the coastal cities of Filastīn. They mention Rafaḥ in the context of this district, placing it right on the edge of ash-Shām, and also the Mediterranean cities of Ghazzah, Yāfā, 'Asqalān and Qaysāriyyah (for these centres see Ch. 2.iii), but the last two are dealt with only in the section on intraprovincial distances (Iṣṭ.*66.9-16; I.H.*186.15-22). The map of ash-Shām which accompanies Ibn Hawqal's text locates all of these major coastal centres on the Filastīn littoral (maps 5 and 6), and adds a few secondary places including Mīmās (map 6.2), Tīda (no.3) al-Māḥūz (of Azdūd, no.5) and, floating off the coast, the towns of al-Kanīsah (no.17) and Arsūf (no.18). In another part of his book, Ibn Hawqal produces a map of the Mediterranean Sea (Ar. Bahr Rūm) which depicts only Yāfā and 'Asqalān between Bayrūt and al-Faramā in Egypt (Kramers 1938:*193=Kramers & Weit 1964 map 8), presumably because both ports were the leading Mediterranean trading centres for Filastīn around this time (see Ch. 2.iii.4&6).

One further source of information on the coastal cities of Filastīn in the early 4th/10th century is Qudāmah's K. al-Kharāj (316/928). This work lists five seaports (Ar. thughūr al-bahriyah) for the jund of Filastīn, namely Qaysāriyyah, Arsūf, Yāfā, 'Asqalān, and Ghazzah (Qudāmah *255.10-11=195).
Apart from providing their names, Qudāmah says nothing else about them; however, his list does indicate the seniority of these ports in the early 4th/10th century. As a seaport, Rafah was not considered part of Filastīn by Qudāmah, but was listed with the maritime towns of Egypt (Qudāmah *255.11=195). This suggests that the administration of Rafah had been transferred to Egypt prior to 316/928, probably around 256/870 when Ahmad ibn Tulun gained control of the border lands between Egypt and ash-Shām.

The two contiguous inland districts of ash-Sharāt and Jibāl in southern East Jordan are described as fertile regions by al-Istakhri (*58.7-10) and Ibn Hawqal (*173.12-14=170), but inhabited by the "'Arabs" (i.e. beduin) who have gained the upper hand there. Both works name Adhruḥ as the city of ash-Sharāt (see above Ch. 2.v.6) and Ruwāth for al-Jibāl. Ruwāth is identified with the small Byzantine site of Rabatha at the head of the strategic Wadi ar-Rihāb south of Ṭafīlah (Abel 1938:183; Sourdel-Thomine 1965a:535). The Arabic sources display some confusion over this place, especially about the spelling of its name (Ist.*58 n.'h'), and a surface investigation of Ruwāth by Graf (1979:124) yielded inconclusive evidence for an Islamic presence at the site. Also of note is the trading-town of Zughar, a producer of indigo and yellow dates, which on Ibn Hawqal's map is shown at the northeast corner of the Dead Sea (maps 5 and 6 of this work), however Ibn Hawqal is clearly mistaken on the location of this town (for which see above Ch. 2.v.4).
To conclude, the works of al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal reveal that the administrative structure of Filastīn had undergone a major reorganization since the appearance in 278/891 of al-Yaʿqūbī's quasi-official book on the ajnād of ash-Shām under the Tulūnīs (254-292/868-905). All of the Ghawr south of Baysān, the Wādī Arabah to Aylah, and all the East Jordan localities of al-Balqa' (with Ma'āb), Jībal and ash-Sharāṭ had been transferred from Damascus to the governor of Filastīn in ar-Ramlah. These changes were probably implemented in 327/939 as part of the treaty between the Ikhshīd and Ibn Raʾiq in which ash-Shām was divided between them (discussed below, sec. iv).

2) Al-Urdunn (Table 6.ii).

Compared with Filastīn, the jund of al-Urdunn gets scant treatment in the K. al-Masālik waʾl-Mamālik of al-Iṣṭakhrī and the K. Surat al-Ard of Ibn Hawqal. Noting its small size, these works devote their descriptions of the province to its main city of Ṭabariyyah, Šūr on the coast, the northern Ghawr including Baysān and the distances between the major towns (Iṣṭ.*58.11-*59.7, *66.16-*67.1; I.Ḥ.*173.15-*174.3=170, *186.22-*187.2=184). The major urban centres of al-Urdunn mentioned in these sources are listed in table 6.ii (p. 184), with two places attracting their interest. Ṭabariyyah located on the lake was the principal city of the province (described above, Ch. 2.iv.1), while the coastal city of Šūr remained thickly populated and well defended (ditto, Ch. 2.iv.2).
As with Filastīn, Ibn Hawqal's map identifies some secondary coastal cities of al-Urdunn (maps 5 and 6 of this work). In addition to Šūr and 'Akkā (map 6.8&10), the map depicts a place called Sukkariyah between the two (no.9, perhaps Kābul ?), and remarks on Ḥayfah's location between 'Akkā and Qaysāriyah. In the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries Ḥayfah (commonly Hayfā) developed into a significant port serving Ṭabarīyah, and was noted for its ship-building industry (Naṣir-i Khusraw and al-Idrīsī, transl. Marmardji 1951:58). Although quite small in early Ottoman times (Hutteroth and Abdul fattah 1977:158, 11), the construction of the Hayfā branch of the Hijāz railway in the last century brought considerable prosperity to the town (Zaidi 1971:365).

The slightly earlier K. al-Kharāj of Qudāmah (*255.9-10) lists 'Akkā and Šūr as the thughūr belonging to the jund of al-Urdunn, and specifically mentions the naval workshops located in Šūr (described above, Ch. 2.iv.2). This source illustrates the continuing dominant role of these two coastal towns in early 4th/10th century al-Urdunn, and especially the enhanced position of 'Akkā after the improvement of its harbour and fortifications under Ibn Ṭūlūn (see Ch. 2.iv.3, esp. Maq.*162.12-*163.12).

The descriptions of al-Urdunn by al-ʾIštakhrī, Ibn Hawqal and Qudāmah indicate that no significant territorial changes were made to the province in Ṭūlūnid times. Its northern and eastern border with Dimashq was unaltered, as Ḥawrān, al-
Bathaniyah which included Adhri'āt, and Ṣaydā remained in Dimashq (I.H.*187.6-7=185). However both al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Hawqal ignore the position of al-Jawlān and the Jarash area, which presumably remained under the administration of Dimashq and al-Urdunn respectively.

* 

iii> **Al-Aqālīm** of Al-Maqdisī (tables 7-10, map 7).

Although al-Iṣṭakhrī travelled extensively to check and update the written and oral sources at his disposal, the usually accurate description of the Islamic World in the K. al-Masālik wa'l-Mamālik was marred by the omission of important information and a poorly organized method of presentation within the iqṭām structure. Even after the revisions of Ibn Hawqal the work still neglected notable places, for instance Qaysāriyah on the coast of Filastīn. Al-Maqdisī, a native of Jerusalem (see Introduction: source material), dismissed al-Iṣṭakhrī's book because of its confused and superficial nature, especially when dealing with the towns and districts of each region (Miquel 1978:223). The inadequacies of al-Iṣṭakhrī's researches propelled al-Maqdisī to write a new geography of the Islamic World, entitled the Kitāb Ahsan at-Taqāsīm fi Ma'rīfat al-Aqālīm ("Book on the Best Classification for the Knowledge of the Regions"), which
was completed by 375/985. This work was intended by al-Maqdisī to be both systematic in its presentation and reliable in its factual content, and there is little doubt that he more than adequately fulfilled both of these objectives.

Al-Maqdisī arranged the geographical information in the K. al-Aqālīm according to a set format based on the Iqlīm system, with topical subdivisions within each region. Much of this material came from al-Maqdisī's own detailed observations made during the course of his journeys. The description of the Iqlīm of ash-Shām, his own region, is particularly thorough. According to al-Maqdisī (*154.7-8), ash-Shām was subdivided into six districts (Ar. kūrah) known as (from north to south) Qinnasrīn, Hims, Dimashq, al-Urdunn, Filastīn and ash-Sharāt. He then provides, district by district, a brief list of their urban centres and areas (Maq.*154.8-155.3) before embarking on a detailed analysis of each.

Tables 7-10 (pp. 186-91) provide a summary of the information in al-Maqdisī on the places in the districts of Filastīn, ash-Sharāt, al-Urdunn and, in outline, Dimashq.

While the geographical sources of the 3rd/9th century and the earlier 4th/10th century works of Qudāmah and al-Iṣṭakhrī based their accounts of south ash-Shām on the provincial structure of the time, al-Maqdisī makes no explicit statement on the degree of correlation between his subdivisions of the Iqlīm of ash-Shām and the contemporary administrative organization. Unlike al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Hawqal, al-Maqdisī no longer uses the formal term of jund.
when referring to the six Kurah of ash-Shām, although he adopts all the names of the former ajnad for five of these. In some instances his criteria for allocating a certain town to one region and not another are set by the social customs of its people, and not the administrative status of the place. For example Madyan, although a town of the Hijaz frontier, was allocated to the iqāl of ash-Shām because its customs and measures were of ash-Shām (Maq.*178.13-179.2), and likewise the small port town of Aylah (Maq.*179.2-4). Nevertheless this does not discount the possibility that al-Maqdisī utilized the Fatimid administrative structure in south ash-Shām as the framework for his description and was simply justifying the existing arrangement, particularly as his book appeared soon after the Caliph Al-'Azīz (365-86/975-96) had extended Fatimid sovereignty over much of the region.

1) The Kurah of Filastīn (Table 7, Map 7).

The description by al-Maqdisī of his home district, even making allowances for possible chauvanism in this source (cf. Zaideh 1953:59), indicates that Filastīn remained populous and wealthy in the later 4th/10th century. Twelve major cities, eight secondary towns and the adjoining countryside are described in detail by al-Maqdisī (see table 7 p. 186 for a list of these places and a summary of their attributes). His account, like those of al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal, reveals that the urban centres of Filastīn under Egyptian control continued to serve provincially important market,
manufacturing and religious functions, and often a combination of these. In addition al-Maqdisī gives a valuable insight into rural Filasṭīn, a topic largely ignored by al-Iṣṭakhrī/Ibn Ḥawqal, and demonstrates the important contribution of agriculture and pastoralism to the region's economic prosperity.

Al-Maqdisī names and describes 12 major cities in Filasṭīn (table 7.1, map 7), of which all but two, namely Mīmās and Arsūf, appeared in the 3rd/9th century geographical sources. Ar-Ramlah as the principal city (Ar. qasabah) of the district and Bayt al-Maqdis clearly maintained their superior status in the province. The K. al-Aqālīm offers a detailed insight into the features and commerce of each, and gives a full description of the numerous public buildings in both cities, especially the Masjīd al-Aqṣā in Jerusalem and, for ar-Ramlah, the gates, baths and khans of the city which are no longer extant (for these accounts see Ch. 2.iii.1&10).

The ten other important urban centres in the kūrah of Filasṭīn according to al-Maqdisī included Nābūlus with its olive groves and Bayt Jibrīl (var. of Bayt Jibrīn), both of which functioned as significant marketing centres for the local agricultural produce in the north and south of the district respectively (Ch. 2.iii.9&12). Also important for its horticulture was Arībāda, which produced bananas, dates, indigo and flowers. East of the Jordan Rift only al-Balqāʾ and its principal city of 'Ammān were counted as part of Filasṭīn by al-Maqdisī. He describes al-Balqāʾ as a predomin-
stantly rural area in the late 4th/10th century and noted for its flocks, grainfields and water-driven flour mills. Al-Maqdisī also mentions the Cave of the Seven Sleepers at ar-Raqīm near 'Ammān, which al-Iṣṭakhrī (*64.11) mentions as a small town in al-Balqā' and Ibn Ḥawqal depicts as a separate place in ash-Shām (maps 5 and 6, no. 29).

One further prominent city of Filastīn in al-Maqdisī's view is Qaysāriyah on the Mediterranean coast, which he describes as fortified, populous and well provisioned (Ch. 2.iii.3). His portrayal of Qaysāriyah as a large and wealthy city stands in stark contrast to the neglect of this centre by al-Iṣṭakhrī/Ibn Ḥawqal, whose attitude is perhaps attributable to Qaysāriyah's failure to become one of the ribāṭāt on the Palestinian coast. The other major coastal cities of Filastīn according to al-Maqdisī were Arsūf, Yāfah (var. of Yāfā), 'Asqalān, Ghazzah and its port of Mīmās, all of which doubled as ribāṭāt or coastal watch stations.

The ribāṭāt of Filastīn encompassed seven coastal sites between Ghazzah in the south to Arsūf in the north (table 7.iii). According to al-Maqdisī each fortress was equipped with a high watch tower from which the approach of Byzantine shipping could be observed. The primary purpose of these ribāṭāt was to defend from Byzantine raiding the coastal areas of Filastīn, particularly ar-Ramlah, and ultimately the important religious centres further inland, especially Bayt al-Maqdis. The ribāṭāt seaports also doubled as a place of trade -- for example Yāfā continued to serve as the port for
ar-Ramlah -- and as a point for ransoming Muslim prisoners (three for 100 dinars) with Byzantine merchants (Maq.*177.2-12, El'ad 1982:155-7).

The territorial limits of al-Maqdisī's kūrah of Filastīn extended beyond those of the Early Islamic, 'Abbāsid and Tūlūnīd jund with the same name to include 'Ammān and all of al-Balqā' (map 7). However it covered considerably less territory than the Filastīn of al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal, as al-Maqdisī brought together Zughar, the Wādī 'Arabah, Ma‘āb, al-Jībāl and ash-Sharāt into a new kūrah which took its name from the predominant Sharāt mountain range in southern East Jordan. Thus Filastīn as depicted in the K. al-Aqālīm embraced the Mediterranean coastal plain from south of Ghazzah to north of Qaysāriyah, the elevated hinterland beyond around Jerusalem, Nābulus and Bayt Jibrīn, the Ghawr south of Baysān to the Dead Sea, and a small section of East Jordan, specifically 'Ammān and the surrounding hills of al-Balqā'.

2) The Kūrah of ash-Sharāt (Table 8, Map 7).

Al-Maqdisī places all of the Wādī 'Arabah and the East Jordan highlands south of the Wādī Mūjib in the kūrah of ash-Sharāt. He identifies seven major centres in this kūrah headed by Šughar (popular var. of Zughar), which was the qasabah of the district (Maq.*155.2). The other centres included the port town of Waylah (var. of Aylah) on the Gulf of 'Aqabah, the three sites of Ma‘āb, Adhrūḥ and Mu‘ān in the
mountains of southern East Jordan, and the two small centres of Tabūk and Madyan in the northern Hijāz (table 8 p. 189, map 7).

Zughar and particularly Aylah located at the north and south ends of the Wādī 'Arabah respectively were reasonably sized settlements with a thriving commercial economy based on the Red Sea trade in early Fāṭimid times (for Zughar see Ch. 2.v.4). Al-Maqdisī gives an informative account of Aylah in the later 4th/10th century (for a recent discussion see Whitcomb 1987), describing it as a small port (Ar. fardah) for Filastīn and the entrepôt for the Hijāz (Maq. *178.11, 179.4). There was, he continued, disagreement over whether Aylah belonged to ash-Shām, al-Hijāz or Egypt -- clearly an indication of the cosmopolitan outlook of the town -- but decided upon ash-Shām because the people of Aylah used Šāmī weights and measures.

The 1986 season of fieldwork by Donald Whitcomb at the beach-side site of ancient Aylah located immediately to the west of the commercial centre of modern al-'Aqabah has identified a small walled city ca. 120 by 120 metres with continuity of occupation from late Byzantine to Fāṭimid times (7th to 12th centuries A.D.). Although this work is in its early stages, Whitcomb suggests that the 'Abbāsid and Fāṭimid periods in particular saw considerable prosperity at Aylah. Excavations in four small areas of the site have exposed part of the towered city-wall, private dwellings and perhaps a public building, and the recovery of fine imported ceramics
from these soundings demonstrate Aylah's widespread trading contacts with Egypt, al-Irāq and locations further east in 'Abbāsid/Fātimid times (Whitcomb 1987).

As both Zughar and Aylah belonged to the kūrah of ash-Sharāt, this district also covered the entire length of the Wādī 'Arabah between them. However al-Maqdisī (*249.12-13) describes the 'Arabah road between these two settlements as under the influence of the desertous steppe of the "'Arabs" (i.e. beduin), indicating that the authority of the Fātimid garrisons did not effectively extend outside of Zughar and Aylah. A similar situation prevailed on the roads out of 'Ammān to Taymā', one of which passed through Mu'tān (Ch. 5.v.2; Maq.*249.13-*250.8).

Al-Maqdisī identifies three major centres in the highlands of southern Jordan to the east of the Dead Sea and the Wādī 'Arabah (table 8 p. 189). The northernmost of these was Ma'āb located in the midst of a fertile area noted for its horticulture (for a description see Ch. 2.v.4). Within its territory, he noted (Maq.*178.7-8), stood the village of Mu'tah where, in 8/629, a Muslim expeditionary force was defeated by an allied army of the Byzantines. Further south came Adhrūḥ (see Ch. 2.v.6) and nearby Mu'tān, the latter already noted by al-Īṣṭakhrī (*65.2-3) and Ibn Ḥawqal (*185.8-9) as a fortress of ash-Sharāt where travellers could rest and obtain provisions. Both sites are located at spring heads on the gently sloping but drier eastern flanks of the Jabal ash-Sharāt range (map 7). Beyond Aylah along the east
coast of the Red Sea were Tabūk and Madyan, both more correctly towns of the Hijāz than ash-Shām (Maq.*178.13).

From the location of these seven centres it can be inferred that the kūrah of ash-Sharāt in al-Maqdisī's opinion extended from the Wādī 'Arabah in the west to the Pilgrim road between 'Ammān and the Hijāz on the eastern fringes of the bādiyāh. The northern boundary of the district was marked by the imposing geographical features of the Wādī Mūjib and the Dead Sea, while to the south it trailed off into the northern reaches of the Hijāzī coast. Territorially the kūrah of ash-Sharāt included all of the southern extension into East Jordan of the original jund of Dimashq except al-Balqā' (compare maps 3 and 7). The actions of the Ikhshīd in ash-Shām resulted in the transfer of these lands from Dimashq along with Aylah to the administration of Filastīn, however the cultural independence and perhaps local administrative autonomy of southern East Jordan is suggested by the appearance of a new district in the work of al-Maqdisī (see below sec. iv).

3) The Kūrah of al-Urdunn (Table 9, Map 7).

The kūrah of al-Urdunn as depicted in al-Maqdisī's K. al-Aqālīm included eight major and two secondary centres within its territory (table 9 p. 189). Compared to the short report in the books of al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal, al-Maqdisī provides a detailed insight into the cities, towns and countryside of al-Urdunn. He pays particular attention to the
economy of the district, both its urban-based manufacturing industries and the rural agricultural products.

Tabariyah, condemned by al-Maqdisī because of its insalubrious climate, continued as the district's principal city (qasabah) in Fatimid times. In spite of its climatic problems, Tabariyah is described as prosperous, endowed with hot springs that supply the baths, and a lake which provided drinking water, fish, and a means of communication to the numerous villages around its shore (see the description in Ch. 2.iv.1). The prosperity of this city, according to al-Maqdisī (*162.4-6), was further enhanced by its proximity to the agriculturally productive hill zones of Jabal ʿĀmilah and Jabal Jarash. Both were predominantly rural, and populated with large and small village communities producing olives, various fruits including grapes, and honey. This along with rice growing around Baysān, vineyards at al-Farāḍhiyah and sugar plantations near Kābul, indicates that agriculture constituted the major economic activity throughout much of the al-Urdunn countryside in Fatimid times.

Al-Maqdisī records the presence of manufacturing industries in the larger urban centres of Šūr, Qadas and Tabariyah (table 9.i.1-3). Šūr was noted for its craftsmen, Qadas for its specialist garments, while Tabariyah produced kapok, cloth and paper (see Ch. 2.iv.1,2&4). Both Šūr and ʿAkkā appear as populous and stoutly fortified cities of the Mediterranean seaboard in the K. al-Aqālīm, and al-Maqdisī records that his grandfather oversaw the expansion of the
city walls of 'Akka to include the harbour during the time of Ahmad ibn Tulun (Maq.*162.12-*163.12; see Ch. 2.iv.2&3).

Three sites largely omitted by the earlier geographical sources make an appearance in the description of the kūrah of al-Urdunn by al-Maqdisī. The town of Kabul, located 15 kms inland from Akka, is listed amongst the major centres of al-Urdunn and described as a madinah (city) in the text (table 9.i.6). Kabul was noted for its sugar and, according to Ibn Hawqal (*184.21-*185.1), a superior type of indigo. Al-Farādhiyah and al-Jashsh were large qaryah or "villages", of which al-Jashsh (mod. al-Jish) is described as approaching the size of the district's principal city (i.e. Ṭabariyyah).

Although al-Maqdisī's claim may be something of an exaggeration, the brief report by Meyers et al. (1978:1-2,7) on a surface reconnaissance of the site mentions continuous Islamic occupation on the tell of ancient al-Jish. This work was part of a larger survey of sites which has identified a substantial increase in the density of settlement in Galilee after the Islamic Conquest (Meyers et al. 1978:8-10). The same situation was probably true for Jabal Jarash in East Jordan as al-Maqdisī describes this area and Jabal 'Āmilah together, indicating that they had a common economic structure. By the later 4th/10th century Adhri'āt served as the social, economic and perhaps administrative focal point for the rural communities of Jabal Jarash area (Maq.*162.4-5).

To conclude, the limits of the kūrah of al-Urdunn (see
map 7) were set in the west by the fortified Mediterranean seaports of Šūr and ‘Akkā, Qadas in rural Jabal ’Āmilah to the northeast, Adhri‘āṭ on the bādiyah fringe and Jabal Jarash in East Jordan, while the larger towns of al-Lajjūn and Baysān marked al-Urdunn’s southern boundary with Filasṭīn. Thus apart from the addition of Adhri‘āṭ, al-Urdunn in al-Maqdisī’s time was little changed from its 3rd/9th century counterpart as it stood after the transfer of al-Jawlān, the Ḥūlah valley and Sūsiyah to the Dimashq jund.

4) The Kūrah of Dimashq (Table 10).

Although the orientation of Adhri‘āṭ was towards the Jabal Jarash area of al-Urdunn in the later 4th/10th century, its former territory of al-Bathaniyah continued to belong to the kūrah of Dimashq. Al-Maqdisī (*154.13, *160.16-17) considers Nawa’ as the principal city of al-Bathaniyah, which was an area noted for its wheat and (other) cereals. The regions of Ḥawrān, al-Jawlān and al-Ḥūlah with its town of Bāniyās, along with Ṣaydā on the Mediterranean coast and the Biqāʾ valley inland, also were counted as part of Dimashq, and defined the dividing line between it and the kūrah of al-Urdunn (table 10 p. 191, map 7).

The allocation by al-Maqdisī of these regions and centres to the kūrah of Dimashq suggests that the boundary between this district and al-Urdunn was substantially the same as the border between the jund of al-Urdunn and the jund of Dimashq in the 3rd/9th century. Only at the eastern end,
in the vicinity of Adhri‘āt, did this line deviate from the provincial borders. Previously a southern confluence of the Yarmūk River, east of Abīl, served as the common boundary between al-Urdunn and Dimashq (above, Ch. 2.iv). However with the placement of Adhri‘āt in al-Urdunn the dividing line presumably passed just north of the town before diverting southwards along another feeder of the Yarmūk catchment, thereby leaving the Hawrān in the kūrah of Dimashq (map 7).

*  

Conclusions, a Possible Chronology, and Implications.

The descriptions of Filastīn, al-Urdunn and Dimashq in the geographical works of al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal identify major changes to the administrative structure of south ash-Shām in the early 4th/10th century. This involved, in particular, the territorial expansion of Filastīn at the expense of Dimashq. All of East Jordan south of the Wādī Zarqā’, that is the districts of al-Balqā’ including the Ghawr around ArThā, Ma‘āb, Jībāl, ash-Sharāt and the Wādī ’Arabah, were removed from the jund of Dimashq and placed under the administration of Filastīn.

The transfer of the East Jordan districts to Filastīn probably took place during the early years of the Ikhshīdid
Dynasty (323-58/935-69), and obviously prior to the publication of the *K. al-Masālik wa-l-Mamālik* by al-Iṣṭakhrī in 340/951. Between 278/891, when al-Yaʿqūbī's *K. al-Buldān* appeared, and 340/951 ash-Shām had returned to direct 'Abbāsid control after a period of Tūlūnīd rule. This, however, was only a temporary arrangement, as before long Muḥammad ibn Tughj the Ikhshīd (d. 334/946) was able to established an autonomous Egyptian dynasty in the Tūlūnīd mould (323/935). Within the space of a few years, however, the Ikhshīd faced considerable opposition to his dynastic ambitions from the 'Amīr Ibn Rāʾiq of ar-Rakkah. While in c. 325/937 the Ikhshīd could list the ajnād of Hims, Dimashq, al-Ūrdunn and Filastīn within his government, he was compelled to cede all of these provinces except Filastīn to Ibn Rāʾiq two years later (Guest 1936:675-76). Perhaps as part of the terms of this agreement, al-Balqāʾ and all of the districts to its south were transferred from the Dimashq jund to Filastīn.

At about the same time responsibility for Aylah, a major rest-stop for both the Filastīnī and Egyptian pilgrim caravans, was taken from Egypt and passed to the governor at ar-Ramlah. However as the governor of Filastīn was directly answerable to the ruling dynasty in Egypt, this change in the status of Aylah was a simple transfer of power to an intermediary that did not entail the weakening of Egypt's position or influence in the town. Similarly the addition of East Jordan south of the Zarqāʾ was of direct benefit to Egypt.

The replacement of Damascus with the geographically closer...
ar-Ramlah improved al-Fustāt's access to the taxes and produce of this region, but also increased its control over the important hajj route between Damascus and the Hijāz, particularly at 'Ammān.

Unlike al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal, al-Maqdisī makes no clear reference to the structure of Fatimid administration in south ash-Shām. There is some possibility that each of his kūrah was based on, or represented, a contemporary provincial unit as in the earlier 4th/10th century regional geographies, in which case a new administrative district named ash-Sharāt was established in East Jordan south of the Wādī Mūjib by the early Fatimids, probably Al-ʿAzīz (365-86/975-96). This may have been associated with the appointment of garrisons to the main centres of southeastern ash-Shām to consolidate their hold on the revitalized Red Sea and Hijāz trade routes to South Arabia. Of the original Dimashqī districts in East Jordan only al-Balqa' remained bound to Filastīn, perhaps again because of the important role of 'Ammān as an assembly place for the annual pilgrimage.

Whether the account of Filastīn, ash-Sharāt and al-Urdunn in the K. al-Aqālīm paralleled the contemporary administrative structure or not, each of al-Maqdisī's kūrah revolved around the social and economic affiliations of the region's cities, towns and villages. Quite frequently local cultural affiliations corresponded with the former ajnād, for instance his kūrah of al-Urdunn encompassed the same centres and territory of the previous jund with Adhri'āt on the
boundary with Dimashq as the only addition. This line of reasoning has important implications for southern East Jordan, the zone of al-Maqdisī's kūrah of ash-Sharāt.

The identification by al-Maqdisī of a separate cultural region to the south and east of the wādīs Mujib and 'Arabah respectively is supported by recent archaeological work in south Jordan. Whitcomb (1987) notes that the 'Abbāsid material recovered from the 1986 season of excavations at the site of Islamic Aylah is "very different" from the early 'Abbāsid pottery of Fīl/Pella in the north of Jordan (Walmsley 1986). Also largely absent at Aylah are the diagnostic Umayyad wares produced at Jarash (Pierobon 1986; Schaefer and Falkner 1986; Walmsley 1986) and known from Fīl (Walmsley 1982), 'Ammān (Harding 1951) and numerous other sites (see Sauer 1982:330-32), nearly all of which are located north of the Dead Sea and Wādī Mujib. In addition the Islamic pottery from the excavations at Adhrūḥ appears unrelated to the Umayyad and 'Abbāsid ceramics of north Jordan (Killick 1983:125-29; pers. com.), which further endorses the cultural status of al-Maqdisī's kūrah of ash-Sharāt.

The presence of a local cultural tradition in the south of Jordan explains why archaeological surveys in the area have continued to experience difficulties in recognizing the material culture, particularly pottery, of the earlier Islamic periods. MacDonald (1980:179-80; 1982a:40; 1982b:129, pottery read by J. Sauer) could identify only a few Umayyad sherds from 552 sites on the south bank of the Wādī al-Ḥasā
and saw nothing familiar from either the 'Abbāsid or Fāṭimid periods. A similar difficulty faced Parker (1976:28; 1986:12, again Sauer dated the pottery) with the material from his survey of the Limes Arabicus. In central Moab/Ma‘āb Miller (1979a:49-50; 1979b:90, pottery by Sauer) noted "occasional" Fāṭimid sherds but makes no mention of either Umayyad or 'Abbāsid material and occupation.

The problem continues into the present. Hart (1986:54, 58) asserts that settlement in south Edom (i.e. ash-Sharāt) was only "scattered" in Islamic times based on a survey to the west of Mu‘ān. Further south at the site of Ḥumaymah Eadie collected -- that is could identify -- only a "sprinkling of Umayyad sherds" (Eadie 1984:220), which led him to state the following:

"Whether the paucity of Ummayad (sic) pottery reflects a demographic decline following the Byzantine period or simply an accident of survival is at present uncertain." (Eadie 1984:221).

The answer is almost certainly neither of these. Rather the supposed vacuum in the settlement history of south Jordan after the Islamic Conquest, a view which Sauer (1982:331) does not question, is an archaeological fiction, created by an ignorance of the material culture from the the Early Islamic, 'Abbāsid and Fāṭimid periods in the region.

*
### TABLE 6.
Filastīn and Al-Urdunn According to Ibn ʿAwqal (367/978).

#### 1> Jund Filastīn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region or Centre</th>
<th>Notes &amp; References (Kramers 1938)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) ar-Ramlah</td>
<td>Capital of Filastīn (*171.3). To Ṣabarliyā: three days (*185.16); to Yāfā: half a stage (*186.16); to 'Asqalān: a stage (*186.17); to Rafā: two days (*185.17); to Bayt al-Maqdis: a day (*186.17-18); to Qaysāriyāh: a stage (*186.20); to Nābulus: a stage (*186.20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Yāfā</td>
<td>(*170.21). To ar-Ramlah: half a stage (*186.16).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 'Asqalān</td>
<td>To ar-Ramlah: a stage (*186.17); to Ghazzah: less than one stage (*186.17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Ghazzah</td>
<td>One of the last towns of Filastīn before Egypt (*172.9-10). To 'Asqalān: less than one stage (*186.17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Rafāh</td>
<td>In Filastīn on the edge of ash-Shām (*170.20). To ar-Ramlah: two days (*185.17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Bayt al-Maqdis</td>
<td>Almost the size of ar-Ramlah; located in high hills. It possesses a great mosque (*171.3-22). To ar-Ramlah: a day (*186.17-18); to Masjid Ibrāhīm: a day (*186.18); to Rīhā: a stage (*186.19); to al-Balqa: two stages (*186.19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Bayt Lahm</td>
<td>Birthplace of Jesus (*171.22-*172.2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Masjid Ibrāhīm</td>
<td>A small town in a valley; its mosque contains the tombs of Abraham, Issac, and Jacob (*172.2-7). To Bayt al-Maqdis: a day (*186.18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Rīhā</td>
<td>(*170.21). To Bayt al-Maqdis: a stage (*186.19); to Zughar: two stages (*186.21).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) al-Balqa</td>
<td>To Bayt al-Maqdis: two stages (*186.19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Qaysāriyāh</td>
<td>To ar-Ramlah: a stage (*186.20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Nābulus</td>
<td>City of the Samaritans (*172.7-9). To ar-Ramlah: a stage (*186.20).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued over...)
TABLE 6 (Cont). Filastīn and Al-Urdunn According to Ibn Ḥawqal (367/978).

13) Zughar

Although hot it is a busy trading centre and produces indigo dye and sweet yellow dates. Nearby is the Dead Sea (*170.21, *184.17-*185.3). 
To Rīḥā: two stages (*186.21); to as-Sharāṭ: a stage, or two to its furthest point (*186.21-2).

14) al-Jibal

Its chief town is Ruwāth. A fertile and prosperous area, but inhabited by the Beduin (*170.21, *173.12).

15) ash-Sharāṭ

Its chief town is Adhrūḥ, and like al-Jibal is a fertile and prosperous area also inhabited by the Beduin (*170.21, *173.12). To Zughar: a stage, or two from its furthest point (= Muʿān?, *186.21-2).

In addition the towns of Ayah and Muʿān are mentioned in text (*173.24, *185.8-9).

**Jund al-Urdunn.**

1) Ṭabariyah

Capital of al-Urdunn. Set on a lake and blessed with hot springs (*173.15-19). To ar-Ramlah: three days (*185.16); to Dimishq: four days (*185.16); to Şūr: a day (*186.22); to the Pass of Fīq: a day (*187.1); to Baysān: two short stages (*187.1); to 'Akkā: a day (*187.2).

2) Şūr

Strongly fortified and densely populated coastal town; fertile area (*174.1-3). To Ṭabariyah: a day (*186.22).

3) Baysān

In that part of the Ghawr which belongs to al-Urdunn on the border with Filastīn (*170.22-24, *173.22-23). To Ṭabariyah: two short stages (*187.1).

4) 'Akkā

To Ṭabariyah: a day (*187.2).

*   *   *
### TABLE 7.
The Cities, Towns and Villages of Filasṭīn and Their Attributes,
According to Al-Maqdisī (375/985).

> The Principal Centres of Filasṭīn (de Goeje 1877: *154.17 - *155.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Notes &amp; References (de Goeje 1877)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) ar-Ramlah</td>
<td>Capital of Filasṭīn, situated on a plain between the sea and mountains. A prosperous city with many public buildings (mosques, baths, and khans), busy markets, and fertile lands (*154.17, *164.6ff). To al-Lajjun via Qalansuwah: two stages (*191.2); to al-Lajjun via the post road through Kafar Sābā: two stages (*191.3); to Bayt al-Maqdis, Bayt Jibrīl, Ghazzah, 'Asqalān and Kafar Sābā: one (or half) stage (*192.1, notes a &amp; c); to Nābulus, Kafar Sallām, Masjīd Ibrāhīm, Qaysāriyah and ArĪḥā: a stage (*192.2-3 n.'c'); to Yāfah, al-Ḥūz, Arsūf, Azdūd, and Rafāḥ: a stage (*192.3-4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Bayt al-Maqdis</td>
<td>A large and magnificent city, full of travellers. Its climate is ideal, its produce plentiful, and its people moral. Al-Masjīd al-Aqṣā, entered by 13 gates, is the principal public structure. Within this enclosure are al-Mughatta (the Aqṣā Mosque) and the Qubbat al-Ṣakhrah (the Dome of the Rock, *154.17, *165.12-*171.10). To Nābulus: a stage (*191.4-5, *192.6); to ar-Ramlah: a stage (*192.1); to Bayt Jibrīl, Masjīd Ibrāhīm, and the River Jordan: a stage (*192.4-5); from the River Jordan to 'Ammān: a stage (*192.9); to ArĪḥā: two post-stages (*192.6-7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Bayt Jibrīl</td>
<td>A market town, serving the adjoining territory of ad-Dārūm. Its produce is plentiful, and supplies ar-Ramlah. There are marble quarries in the vicinity (*155.1, *174.1-3). To ar-Ramlah: a stage (*192.1); to Bayt al-Maqdis: a stage (*192.4-5); to Ghazzah: a stage (*192.7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Ghazzah</td>
<td>A large centre near the sea on the road to Miṣr. It has a fine mosque (*155.1, *174.3-5). To ar-Ramlah: a stage (*192.1); to Bayt Jibrīl, Azdūd and Rafāḥ: a stage (*192.6-7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) MTmās</td>
<td>Small fortified town on the sea belonging to Ghazzah (*155.1, *174.5-6).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8) Arsûf  Smaller than Yāfah; fortified and well populated (*155.1, *174.11-12). To Ramlah: a stage (*192.4); to Qaysâriyah: a stage (*192.14).

9) Qaysâriyah  Situated on the Baḥr Rūm (= the Mediterranean), this populous city has strong walls, and a fine Great Mosque. Its produce is plentiful; wells and cisterns provide drinking water (*155.1, *174.13-15). To ar-Ramlah: a stage (*192 note c); to Kafar Sallām, Kafar Sābā, Arsûf, and al-KanTsah: a stage (*192.13-14).

10) Nābulus  A town in a valley amongst hills, with many olive trees whence its (nick)-name 'little Damascus'. Its markets are large ("from gate to gate"); and the Great Mosque paved. Water comes from a stream, where there are some mills (*155.1, *174.16-18). To Baysūn via Ta'āsTr: four post-stages, and to Bayt al-Maqdis: a stage (*191.4-5, *192.6); to ar-Ramlah: a stage (*192.2-3); to A'rThâ: a stage (*192.9-10).

11) A'rThâ  Bananas, dates, indigo and flowers grow profusely in its hot climate. Its people are dark, its water (the lightest in all Islam) is from springs (*155.1, *174.18 - *175.3). To ar-Ramlah: a stage (*192.2-3); to Nābulus: a stage (*192.9-10); to Bayt al-Rām: two post-stages, thence to 'Ammān: a stage (*192.10-11).

12) 'Ammān  Capital of al-Balqā', a region of villages and farms supporting grainfields and flocks. Mills are found on its many streams. The town's mosque is decorated with mosaic, and the cost of living is cheap. However the roads are poor. Nearby is ar-Raqīm and the Cave of the Seven Sleepers (*155.2, *175.3-*176.15). To the River Jordan: a stage, thence to Bayt al-Maqdis: a stage (*192.5,9); to Bayt al-Rām: a stage, thence to A'rThâ: two post-stages (*192.10-11); to Ma'āb and az-Zarqā': a stage (*192.11-12).

(continued over...)
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ii> Secondary Centres in Filastîn.

1) Bayt Lahm  Birthplace of Jesus, having a fine church (of the Nativity, *172.4-7)

2) Ḥabrâ  Or Masjid ʿIbrâhîm, the site of the mosque and sepulchre of Abraham, Issac, Jacob and their wives, with a resthouse to feed the pilgrims. Its adjoining territory is called Jabal Naṣrah, a beautiful area producing fine grapes and apples. Much of this produce is sent to Egypt (172.7ff). To ar-Ramlah: a stage (*192.2-3); to Bayt al-Maqdis: a stage (*192.4-5); to Ṣughâr via Qāwûs (le Strange 1890:483-4): two stages (*192.8).

3) Ludd  A mile from ar-Ramlah. It has a well-frequented mosque and a splendid church (of St. George, *176.18-21).


5) 'Āqir  A big village, with a large mosque, on the Makkah route. (*176.21-2).

6) Yubnâ  It has a fine mosque, and produces figs (*176.22-3).

7) 'Amwâs  Was once the ancient capital (*176.23 - *177.1).

8) Kafar  A village of Qaysâriyah, very populated with a mosque, on the inland road (*177.1-2). To ar-Ramlah: a stage (*192.1-3); to Qaysâriyah: a stage (*192.13).

iii> The Coastal Watch Stations (Ribaṭāt).

These are: Ghazzah, Mīmâs, 'Asqalân, Māḥûz Azdûd, Māḥûz Yubnâ, Yâfah, and Arsûf (*177.11-12).
### TABLE 8.
The Cities, Towns and Villages of Ash-Sharāt and Their Attributes, According to Al-Maqdisī (375/985).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Notes &amp; References (de Goeje 1877)</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Şughār</td>
<td>This place, the chief city of ash-Sharāt, is called 'hell' by those from adjacent districts because of its evil climate and bad water. However its markets are busy. Located on the Dead Sea shore (*155.2, *178.1). To Ma‘āb: a stage (*192.11); to Masjid Ibrāhīm via Qāwūs: 2 stages (*192.8); to Waylah: 4 stages (*192 note 'k', *249.12).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Ma‘āb</td>
<td>In the mountains, with many villages producing almonds and grapes (*155.2, *178.7-8). To Şughār: a stage (*192.11); to 'Amāmān: a stage (*192.11).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Mu‘ān</td>
<td>(*155.2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Tabūk</td>
<td>A small town (*155.2, *179.4-5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Adhruṣ</td>
<td>On the frontier with the Ḥijāz (*155.2, *178.8-9).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Madyan</td>
<td>Although located within the Ḥijāz, the customs of its people are Syrian (*155.3, 178.13ff).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 9.
The Cities, Towns and Villages of Al-Urdunn and Their Attributes, According to Al-Maqdisī (375/985).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Notes &amp; References (de Goeje 1877)</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Ṭabarīyah</td>
<td>Capital of al-Urdunn. A long, narrow city with an unhealthy climate on the shores of a lake. Both its market and mosque are large and excellent. The lake, full of fish, supplies drinking water for the people. Hot springs provide water for eight baths. At the lower end of the lake is a bridge on the road to Dimishq (*154.16, *161.1-11).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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To Dimashq: Two days (*190.11-12); to al-Lajjun, Baysan, Jubb Yusuf, Aftaq and al-Jashsh: a stage (*190.14, 16-191.2); to 'Akka: two stages (*191.9), to Qadas: a stage (*191 n.'a').

2) Qadas
A town near the Jabal 'AMLah having springs, a bath, and a mosque in the market (*154.16, 161.11-14). To Baniyas: two post-stages (*190.14-15); to Sur: two post-stages (*191.8); to Tabariyah: a stage (*190 n.'a').

3) Sur
A fortified city on the sea, noted for its craftsmen. An aqueduct supplies water (*154.16, 163.14ff). To al-Jashsh and Saydelta: a stage (*191.7); to 'Akka: a stage (*191 n.'h'); to Qadas: two post-stages (*191.8); to Baniyas via Majdel Salam: four post-stages (*191.8).

4) 'Akka

5) al-Lajjun
A city bordering Filasfin (*154.16, 162.8-9). To Tabariyah: a stage (*190.16-191.2); to ar-Ramla via Qalansuwh: two stages (*191.2); to ar-Ramla via the post road through Kafar Saba: two stages (*191.3).

6) Kabeul
A coastal town noted for its sugar (*154.17, 162.9).

7) Baysan
All of the rice for Filasfin and al-Urdunn comes from here. Water is plentiful (*154.17, 162.6-7). To Tabariyah: a stage (*190.16-191.2); to Nabulus via Ta'asTr: four post-stages (*191.4).

8) Adhrisht
Belonging to it is the Jabal Jarash, which like Jabal 'AMLah (see Qadas above) has many villages. Tabariyah's prosperity results from its proximity to these two regions (*154.17, 162.4-6). To Zarqa: a stage (*192.12); to Dimashq: two stages (*192.13).

Secondary Centres of al-Urdunn.

1) al-
A large village with a mosque. Vineyards and water are plentiful Faradhiyah (*162.10-11).

2) Jashsh
Its size approaches that of a provincial city (*163.13-14). To Tabariyah: a stage (*190.16-191.2); to Sur: a stage (*191.7).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centres</th>
<th>Notes &amp; References (de Goeje 1877)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Damascus</td>
<td>(*154.13) To Ṭabarīyāh, Bāniyās, Ḥawrān and al-Bathaniyāh: two days (*190.11-12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Bāniyās</td>
<td>(*154.13) To Damascus: two days, to Qadas: two post-stages (*190.11-12, 14-15); to Ṣūr via Majdal Salam: four post-stages (*191:8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Ṣaydā</td>
<td>(*154.13).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Bayrūt</td>
<td>(*154.14).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Notes &amp; References (de Goeje 1877)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) al-Bīqā̀</td>
<td>With Baʿlabakk (*154.14, 15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) al-Ghūtah</td>
<td>(*154.15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Ḥawrān</td>
<td>(*154.15) To Damascus: two days (*190.11-12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) al-Bathaniyāh</td>
<td>(*154.15) To Damascus: two days (*190.11-12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) al-Jawlān</td>
<td>(*154.15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) al-Ḥūlah</td>
<td>(*154.16).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5

THE ROADS OF SOUTH ASH-SHÄM DURING THE 'ABBÄSID AND EARLY FÄTIMID PERIODS.

Introduction.

The lands of Palestine and Jordan have historically played host to an array of major highways and subsidiary feeder roads in spite of its awkward topography. This was, however, by no means a static system, and in each historical period changing political, military and economic circumstances had a powerful influence on the character of the road network. Thus in many ways the varying fortunes of the communication routes reflect wider changes to social and economic conditions in the region, especially settlement patterns and administration (Isaac and Roll 1982:x). Kennedy (1982:137) puts it most succinctly:

"The justification for seeking the roads and routes of a region is simple. Knowledge of the age-old lines of communication and trade will suggest the militarily significant locations in the region; new routes or developed routes point to the lines that were regarded
as important. Roads and tracks allow us to deduce much about the level of development of a region. The network as a whole provides the framework upon which we may hang the individual sites."

All the more remarkable then that there has been no attempt to methodologically research the road network of ash-Shām during Umayyad, 'Abbāsid and Fāṭimid times.

This chapter seeks to rectify the situation by reconstructing the road network in south ash-Shām during the 3rd/9th and 4th/10 centuries, mostly through reference to contemporary written sources. As with the previous survey into the political geography of the region, there are no surviving written sources for the Early Islamic Period, and only very limited archaeological information on either the upkeep or neglect of specific routes after the Conquest (but see Sharon 1960). However a number of significant trends in the political, military and commercial structure of the region are revealed by contrasting the earlier Byzantine structure with that in force during the 'Abbāsid Period. Consequently this chapter begins with a brief outline of the pre-Conquest road system in south ash-Shām, including both the major Biblical routes and the subsequent upgrading of the road network in Palestine and East Jordan under the Romans. Particular attention is paid to the socio-political context of the systems, both to illustrate the scope of road research and to identify possible causes behind alterations to the overall structure of the communications system of the region.
Background: The Pre-Roman and Roman/Byzantine Road Systems.

Up until the Islamic Conquest, as after it, the location of politically and militarily significant countries to the north, southwest, and east had a profound effect upon the growth or decay of the major highways which passed through Palestine and East Jordan. Internal conditions also influenced the relative importance of the secondary routes, although no one factor was as significant as the Jewish rebellions of the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D. and the annexation of the Nabataean Kingdom in 106 A.D. that encouraged the Romans to upgrade the system. This upgrading, as a result, is a suitable point around which to conduct this review of the pre-Conquest road network.

1) The Pre-Roman Routes.

Prior to the imposition of the Pax Romana on Palaestina and Arabia in the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D., the road system of this region revolved around two major highways with Damascus as their destination. The more important of the two was the main Trunk Road between Egypt and Damascus, also known as the "Way of the Sea" (Isa. 9.1). The itinerary of this route is of particular relevance to the Early Islamic road structure, for after the Conquest it was reinstated as the principal highway through the region (for route maps see Aharoni 1966:40; Baly 1974:95; May 1974:49, 59, with concise
gazetteer of sites).

In the Biblical, Egyptian and Assyrian records, the Trunk Road entered south Palestine from Egypt at Rafaḥ on the coast. Near Ghazzah the route northwards divided into two parallel paths. One stayed close to the coast and passed through 'Asqalān and Yāfā before diverting inland to Aphek (mod. Ar. Rās al-'Ayn). The other followed the eastern edge of the coastal plain, reaching Aphek via 'Aqir and Ludd (Abel 1938:217-18, Aharoni 1966:44-45, Baly 1974:97, Smith 1931:116). North of Aphek the Trunk Road returned to a single path located away from the coast at the base of the Samaritan range, as the swamps and forests of the north Palestinian Plain behind Qaysāriyyah (Bib. Sharon) formed a forbidding obstacle to traffic (Karman 1961). It then crossed into the Marj ibn 'Amīr by the pass of the Wādī 'Arāb, after which the road divided into three. The major route crossed the plain and continued to Damascus via the Wādī al-Ḥammam, Kinneret at the northwest corner of Lake Tiberias, the Biblical site of Hazor and the nearby Jordan ford of Jīsr Banāt Ya'qūb between the Ḥūlah and Tiberias lakes (Abel 1933:162-63; Sourdel-Thomine 1965b), while the two side branches went either northwestwards to coastal 'Ākka/Accho, Šūf/Tyre and the rest of coastal Lebanon or eastwards to Baysān and thence to Damascus over the plateau of Bathaniyah (Abel 1938:218-19, Aharoni 1966:41-49, Baly 1971:96-98, Smith 1931:278).

This last leg of the Trunk Road joined up with another important longitudinal highway, the Biblical "King's Highway"
(Num. 20.17 & 19; 21.22), near Karnian (mod. Ar. Shaykh Sa'ad) south of Damascus. This road followed a tortuous path along the mountain ranges of East Jordan before reaching Aylah at the head of the Gulf of 'Aqabah. On the way it passed through Biblical Ramoth-Gilead (mod. Ar. Tall ar-Rumayth), 'Ammān (Bib. Rabbath-Ammon), Ḥusbān (Bib. Heshbon), Mādabā, Dhibān (Bib. Dibon), Karak (Bib. Kir-hareseth), Busayrah (Bib. Bozrah), and Petra (Abel 1938:220, Aharoni 1966:49-52, Baly 1971:97), all of which were politically and militarily active during Biblical times. The presence of springs and the security of settled communities along the way assured the continued use of the King's Highway for the transport of exotic goods from South Arabia to the markets of Damascus.

A number of secondary routes crossed laterally between these two international highways during Biblical times, and in the process formed a road network that connected the other cities of the region with one another and ultimately the realms beyond. Some of these routes attained a reasonable level of importance in response to the changing political and economic fortunes of the ancient empires. For example one prominent lateral route crossed from Aphek and Ludd on the Trunk Road to Ḥusbān on the King's Highway, passing through Jerusalem and Jericho on the way. Jerusalem was also an important centre on the north -- south road that serviced the hill country of Palestine. To the south it reached Ḥabrā before descending into the Jordan rift. From here the road
crossed into ash-Sharāt (Bib. Edom) or followed the 'Arabah to Aylah. The route north of Jerusalem passed through Nābulus (Bib. Shechem), Sabasṭiyah (Bib. Samaria) and Biblical Dothan before entering the Marj ibn 'Amīr (Aharoni 1966:55-57, May 1974:49). The importance of these routes out of Jerusalem was determined by the changing fortunes of the city.

North of the Marj ibn 'Amīr a number of lateral routes linked Damascus with the Mediterranean seaports of 'Akkā and Ṣūr. In particular the parallel transverse valleys of lower Galilee encouraged lateral passage between the Plain of 'Akkā and the Trunk Road on its way to Damascus (Aharoni 1966:56, Smith 1931:278). Nevertheless one route of some import did cross the more arduous terrain of upper Galilee. This left the Jordan Valley at a point north of Hazor and passed through Qadas (Bib. Kedesh Naphtali) to emerge in the Plain of 'Akkā at az-Zib (Aharoni 1966:57).

As will be observed later (below part v), many of these secondary routes regained much of their former significance after the Islamic Conquest, especially with the political and religious enhancement of Damascus and Jerusalem under the Umayyads.

2) The Roman Road Network (Map 2).

The progressive imposition of Roman rule over Palestine and East Jordan, and in particular the arrival of military engineers with the occupation army, resulted in the systematic replacement of the existing cleared tracks with a
formalized network of either stone-paved roads or wide, well marked tracks. In many cases, however, the paths chosen by the Roman engineers for their roads were virtually the same as those of earlier times, as the presence of passes -- notably valleys and coastal plains -- in a zone of rugged topography allowed for the circumnavigation of the more inhospitable spots. Only rarely were new roads forged through previously impenetrable country, usually in response to either the emergence of new settlements or variations in the politico-military requirements of the Imperial government (for a detailed study of these itineraries see Thomsen (1917), and also Bowersock (1983:83, 93, 164-86), Isaac and Roll (1982) and Kennedy (1982:137-86) for recent work on specific itineraries).

Although these roads served a multifarious purpose, the Roman upgrading of the road system had specific military and political objectives associated with the subjugation and efficient administration of the region. The first spate of such road improvements in Palestine took place during and immediately after the First Jewish Revolt of A.D. 66-70. A beginning was made with the Coast Road during the Emperorship of Nero (A.D. 54-68), especially as it formed a crucial link between the two major Classical cities of the Eastern World; Antioch in northern Syria and Alexandria in Egypt (map 2). From Şūr/Tyre the route followed the coast as far as Qaysāriyah/Caesarea, passing through az-Zib/Ecdippa, 'Akkā/Ptolemais, and the Phoenice -- Palaestina borderpost at
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Certha (mod. Ar. Khirbat Dustrī). Thereafter the road divided into two. A minor branch continued to follow the coast to Arṣūf/Sozusa and Yāfā/Joppa before diverting inland to Yubnā/Jamnia, while the major route retraced the path of the Biblical Trunk Road along the edge of the Palestinian foothills to Antipatris (Bib. Aphec), Ludd/Diosopolis and Yubnā. From Antipatris a side road, built in the A.D. 70's, struck east and ascended to Iliyā/Aelia, the home of the Roman Xth legion. Another side road from Ludd covered the short distance to Yāfā on the Mediterranean shore. After Yubnā the Coast Road reverted to a single track and headed off southwards to Azdūd/Azotus, 'Asqalān/Ascalon (via a short branch road), Gazzah and finally Rafaḥ before continuing southwards along the coast to Egypt (Abel 1938:224; Avi Yonah 1940:42; Thomsen 1917:15-20, Route I; Wilkinson 1977:20).

The second major road-building project by the Romans was the Via Traiana Nova, constructed during Trajan's reign after the annexation of the Nabataean Kingdom (A.D. 106). This road was the successor to the King's Highway and involved the upgrading of the Nabataean trade route to Buṣrā and Damascus. From the Red Sea port of Aylah, the Via Nova headed northwards to 'Ammān/Philadelphia along the route of the former "King's Highway" by way of Ḫumaymah/Hauarra, Adhruḥ/Adru and Rabba/Areopolis, the Maṭāb of later sources (Eadie 1984:211-14; Graf 1979; Parker 1986 index). According to the Peutinger Table (as interpreted by Bowersock 1983:172-79 and Kennedy 1982:144-59), the road north of 'Ammān divided into two after...
Hatita (modern Khirbat Samrā', see Desreumaux and Humbert (1981) for evidence of Pre-Islamic Arab and Early Islamic occupation). One route passed through Qanawāt/Canatha to Damascus, the other went to Buṣrā and then Bayt Rās/Capitolias and Jadar/Gadara further west.

Thus in A.D. 115 Roman Palaestina and Arabia were crossed by two parallel longitudinal roads, one of which was essentially coastal while the other -- the Via Nova -- ran the length of the East Jordan mountains. Both were major highways intended to connect the Syrian cities of Antioch and Damascus with Egypt and the Red Sea.

The land between these highways was transversed by numerous local routes (Abel 1938:224-31; Avi-Yonah 1940:42-46; Thomsen 1917). Most were lateral crossings serving the smaller cities and towns of Palaestina and Arabia, although a number of notable longitudinal routes ran down the centre of Palestine into the Naqab with branches to Aylah and the Coast Road (Aharoni 1954; Avi-Yonah 1940:44-45; map 2). In most cases the upgrading of these secondary roads did not occur until the time of Hadrian (A.D. 117-138), who in response to the Bar-Kokhba revolt instituted a programme of frenzied road building throughout Palaestina (Avi-Yonah 1977:183-86).

The function of the regional roads in the Roman Period, as with the inter-provincial highways, was essentially military and administrative. This is demonstrated by the early upgrading of the ancient route between Damascus and Baysān/Scythopolis by way of Nawā/Naveh and Afīq/Apheca, including
the construction of a bridge -- the Jisr al-Majāmi' -- at the point where the road crossed the Jordan River immediately south of the Jordan -- Yarmūk confluence (Abel 1933:64; 1938:226; Smith 1931:279; maps 2 and 8). This was to remain an important road until its eclipse by the Jisr Banāt Ya'qūb route during Fatimid times (below part iv).

The military function of the roads is clearly shown by the construction of numerous roads in north Palaestina after the establishment of a new legionary camp at al-Lajjūn/Legio in the wake of the Bar-Kohkba rebellion. These roads had as their destinations Qaisariyyah (via the Wadi 'Arā), 'Akkā, Baysān and Saffūriyyah/Diocaesarea (Avi-Yonah 1977:185).

Another route from al-Lajjūn to receive attention was the central highlands road through Jannān/Ginae, Sabastiyyah/Sebaste and Nābulus/Neapolis to Jerusalem. Road upgrading also took place on the 'Akkā -- Tabariyyah route through Saffūriyyah and the Tabariyyah -- Damascus route north of Lake Tiberias by way of Khan al-Minya and the Jordan crossing at Jisr Banāt Ya'qūb (Abel 1933:162-62; 1938:226; Dussaud 1927:384).

By the end of Hadrian's reign, all of the major municipal centres of Palestine and East Jordan were an integral part of a comprehensive network of paved roads. Upgrading of local tracks, such as that between Baysān and Jericho (Thomsen 1917:73, Route XXXII), continued on a diminished scale after Hadrian's time, although the reign of Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 161-180) saw a flurry of activity. A number of
these minor routes are mentioned later in this chapter in the context of their Islamic successors (parts iv and v).

Thereafter, during Byzantine times, the state road system was maintained and public facilities, such as inns and hospices, developed for private travel and pilgrimage (Wilkinson 1977:16-18). A general economic downturn in Palaestina and Arabia after the boom times of Justinian and Justin II probably reduced the ability of the provinces to repair the roads, which led to a running down of the system.

* 

iii> The DTwān al-Barīd.

The centralized nature of government in the Early Islamic and 'Abbāsid periods, and the existence of a hierarchical system of provincial administration, required the services of a fast and efficient communications network throughout the Islamic Empire. This role was played by the DTwān al-Barīd -- the Department of Posts and Intelligence -- which, as a state postal service, conveyed messages from the capital (Damascus in the Umayyad Period, thereafter Baghdad) to the provinces and visa versa. There is no doubt that the system was in constant use. Orders, requests, and all types of civil and military information passed to and fro between district towns, provincial capitals, and central government.
Even an area as remote as the Naqab Desert in south ash-Shām was the destination of numerous official documents during the Umayyad Period, some apparently emanating from the central government offices in Damascus (Kraemer 1958:30-5, see especially documents nos 60-67, 70-74, & 92). The provincial officers of the barīd were permanent government officials who, as one of their main functions, collected information on the activities of other government functionaries and the general state of affairs in the province. Once gathered, this intelligence was dispatched to the capital where it was collated and assessed by the ministry (Levy 1962:299, Sourdel 1960b:1045).

The barīd was a major ministry of the Umayyad and 'Abbāsid governments, attaining its greatest territorial extent and political influence in the 2nd/8th and 3rd/9th centuries. In the early 4th/10th century the State budget for the Department of Posts and Intelligence was only exceeded by expenditure on the Holy Cities and the defence of the frontier (Levy 1962:324). The barīd was an official service and generally not available for private use, although in exceptional cases individuals could use the system to send messages or travel between regions with permission of the Caliph or his deputies (Dunlop 1971:255, see also Kraemer 1958, documents no.68 & perhaps no.75). By the 5th/11th century a regular, inexpensive and reasonably speedy commercial mail service was operating in North Africa and Western Asia, including south ash-Shām (Cairo Geniza, in Goitein
1967:281-95). This service was largely modelled on the barīd, and probably had a long history prior to its appearance in the documents of the Cairo Geniza.

* 

Sources.

The most authoritative and detailed source material on the highway between Damascus and Egypt and other routes in ash-Shām is contained in five factual geographical works of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th century. The five relevant sources for ash-Shām are:


For an introductory review of these works and their authors see the section Introduction: source material.

Ibn Khūrrahādhibih and Qudāmah were both government officials in Baghdad -- the former Director-General of the Diwān al-Barīd and the latter an official in the...
Kharāj -- and thus had access to both contemporary and earlier government records. Their works give detailed itineraries of the routes between the main centres of the Islamic Empire, and as these itineraries include accurate intervening distances they were most probably based upon government milestone surveys. Al-Ya'qūbī had close connections with the Tulunid Dynasty in Egypt and through them access to government records on the roads in the Islamic World, as details on other administrative matters in his work, such as the tax revenues of each province in the Empire (e.g. Ya'qūbī 115/*327.10, *328.5-4, 117/*329.17-18 for Dimashq, al-Urdunn and Filastīn respectively), could have only come from official sources.

In addition to these quasi-official sources, the literary works of descriptive geography by Ibn Hawqal and al-Maqdisī contain further details on the routes and distances between the urban centres in the Islamic World, a great many of them outside the barīd network. Apart from their own travels and observations, these writers were also able to consult government documents on the administration of the Empire.

*
The various needs of government, pilgrimage, and trade ensured the maintenance of an extensive road network throughout much of south ash-Shām during the first four centuries of Islam. It was a two-tiered system, consisting of a central core of major inter-provincial highways and pilgrimage routes, both of which also doubled as roads for the barTd, surrounded by numerous secondary and largely intra-provincial feeder roads. This section looks at the major highways and postal roads, while the following section (vi) investigates the surrounding network of provincial roads.

Mu'āwiyah's elevation to the Caliphate and the resultant promotion of Damascus, his adopted city, to the centre of the Islamic World in the mid-1st/7th century had profound effects on the administrative organization of the Islamic State in the following centuries. This is quite clearly reflected in the changing structure of the communications network throughout the Empire, especially the state postal service, the barTd. With the completion of the Conquest and the subsequent changes to the provincial organization of the territories, the prevailing Sassanid and Byzantine post networks were no longer adequate. In the first place, these Imperial communication systems were designed to execute the administrative requirements of two separate empires, not one. Secondly,
perhaps more importantly, many of the former provincial capitals were dropped in favour of others, which forced a shift in barīd routes. In south ash-Shām for instance, Ṣabariyā replaced Baysān in al-Urdunn and Ludd (later ar-Ramlah) substituted for Qaysāriyā in Filastīn. Finally neither system took account of the burgeoning role of Madinah and Makkah in the Islamic World, especially governmental needs to gather intelligence on events there.

Most probably there were de facto changes to the pre-Islamic road system until 'Abdul-Malik's methodical reforms towards the end of the 1st/7th century. At this time, the basic framework of the Early Islamic state road network was rebuilt to accommodate Makkah's new position as a place of pilgrimage, the enhanced political status of Damascus, and the promotion of new provincial capitals. 'Abdul-Malik commemorated the reorganization of the road system by erecting milestones on the main routes, and a number of these are known from the route between Damascus and Jerusalem (Sharon 1966).

In practical terms the reform of the barīd into a system responsive to the needs of the new Islamic State resulted in a significant alteration to the relative importance of the long-established inter-urban routes south of Damascus, with a concomitant impact on the settlements on the way. The highways and their feeder roads formed the backbone of the system, reaching beyond the region to the great Islamic centres beyond. In this study the Damascus -- al-Fusṭāṭ high-
way and post-road will be looked at first, followed by the Makkan pilgrimage/post routes of the 
badīyah in the far south of ash-Shām.

1) The Highway and Post-Road from Damascus to al-Fustāṭ.

The itinerary of the major highway and post-road (Ar. tarīq al-barīd) from Damascus to al-Fustāṭ is described in varying depth by all five of the 'Abbāsid geographical sources (above part iv). The authoritative works of Ibn Khurraḍādhbih and Qudāmah provide considerable detail on each section of the official route, including the names of places separating the major centres, absolute distances between each, and the number of post-stages on the way. Both sources use the "mile" (Ar. mīl) as the measure of distance for the itineraries, which in the 'Abbāsid Period consisted of 4,000 cubits (Ar. dhira' al-barīd) each of 48.25 cms, making a mile the equivalent of 1.93 kms (Hinz 1965). The general geographical accounts of al-Ya'qūbī and Ibn Ḥawqal are much less comprehensive in their description of the road, for neither were intended to be administrative manuals. Absolute distances are omitted, as are the names of intervening towns in some cases. However these itineraries can be considered reliable, as both writers probably travelled along at least some of the route in the course of their geographical researches. Ibn Ḥawqal also depicts the post-road on his map (see maps 5 and 6), although its accuracy, as with the whole map, is questionable. Al-Maqdisī's account of the stations on the
main post-road through Filastīn and al-Urdunn is the most exhaustive for the 4th/10th century, although like al-Ya'qūbī and Ibn Hawqal he does not supply figures of the actual distances between towns for this region.

Table 11 (pp. 249-50) provides a comparative list of the information on the route between Damascus, Tabariyah, ar-Ramlah, and al-Fustāt from these five geographical works. Page/line references to the sources are also given in the table. Following the format preserved for the post-road in the three earlier works, this study will consider the route in three legs: Damascus -- Tabariyah, Tabariyah -- ar-Ramlah, and ar-Ramlah -- al-Fustāt (but only to Rafah).

The First Leg: Damascus to Tabariyah.

Discussion of the sources.

Ibn Khurrahābīh and Qudāmāh agree on the itinerary of the post-road from Damascus to Tabariyah (table 11, p. 249). Both place three centres between the two cities, namely al-Kuswah 12 miles (c. 23 kms) out from Damascus, then al-Jāsim after another 24 miles (c. 46.5 kms), and Afīq after the same distance. Tabariyah was finally reached six miles (c. 11.5 kms) after Afīq, making a total of 66 miles (c. 127.5 kms) from Damascus to the capital of al-Urdunn. These distances appear correct, as far as it is possible to tell. According to the two quasi-official sources the journey from Damascus to Tabariyah was accomplished over 13 post-stations (Ar. sikkah, pl. sikak); seven to Dayr Ayyūb and the
other six to Ṭabariyah, an average of 5.08 miles (9.8 kms) per sikkah.

Al-Maqdisī's schedule of the journey from Damascus to Ṭabariyah conforms with that of Ibn Khurrahādhbih and Qudāmah even though it was written up to a century later (table 11). However instead of giving absolute distances between centres, al-Maqdisī relies upon generalized units of measurement. These indicate either an approximate distance recorded in post-stages (Ar. barāt) or the approximate time required to complete the journey as a marhalah (pl. marāhil), or a day's journey. On the basis of the Damascus -- Ṭabariyah route, a post-stage (barāt) was roughly equivalent to six miles, or 16.32 kms.

Both al-Ya'qūbī and Ibn Ḥawqal give a general indication of the total time required to travel from Damascus to Ṭabariyah -- four marāhil and four days respectively -- but no absolute distances (table 11). Of greater interest is al-Ya'qūbī's variation to the itinerary of the post-road. In his order the first stage out of Damascus ended at Jāsim, not al-Kuswah, with another stop at Khisfīn before reaching Afīq. This itinerary, although disproportionate in its arrangement, clearly shows that the Damascus -- Ṭabariyah post-road passed through Khisfīn, and that a sikkah was located there.

The map of Ibn Ḥawqal, on first inspection, is at variance with all of the other sources. It depicts the southwest road out of Damascus passing by the north, not south, end of Lake Tiberias (maps 5 and 6); although as he does not discuss
the actual itinerary of the route there is no certainty that his intention was to show the post road. Although it is possible that Ibn Ḥawqal chose the increasingly popular alternative northern way to Damascus over the Jisr Banāt Ya’qūb through Qunaytra (map 8; Smith 1931:278-80), the use of a straight line to represent the road suggests he probably never intended to show its precise path.

b> Analysis of the route.

The five Arabic geographical sources present a coherent picture of the route taken by the Damascus -- Ṭabarīyah highway and post-road. Fortunately there is no difficulty in locating all of the sites named by these sources, making it possible to accurately trace the path of the tarīq al-barāt (map 8).

The road left Damascus in a S.S.W. direction, crossing the Jabal al-Aswad by the pass of Shuhurah before descending to the strategically important town of al-Kuswah (mod. al-Kiswah) in the fertile valley of the Nashr al-'Awaq (Dussaud 1927:327; Smith 1931:426; Le Strange 1890:488). This leg of the route followed the same path as the main south (pilgrimage) road from Damascus (below, this section), but soon after al-Kuswah the Damascus - Ṭabarīyah post-road diverged to the south-west on its own. It crossed into the plain of al-Bathaniyah, perhaps passing through Sanamayn (pre-Islamic Aere) to reach the town of Jāsim, the pre-Islamic Gasimea (Avi-Yonah 1976:27, 59; 1977:168). According to both al-Ya'qūbī and al-Mas'ūdī, Jāsim belonged to Damascus and al-
Mas'ūdī locates it near al-Jābiyah and Nawā in the Jawlān district (Ya'q.115/*327.12; Dussaud 1927:333; Le Strange 1890:463).

Leaving Jāsim, the road headed due south to the sikkah of Dayr Ayyūb, probably passing al-Jābiyah on the way. Once again al-Maqdisī and Mas'ūdī provide some details by identifying Dayr Ayyūb as a regionally important site of pilgrimage near Nawā, the ancient Naveh of Batanaea, which in their time was the chief centre in al-Bathaniyah and the Ḥawrān (Avi-Yonah 1976:82; 1977:167; Dussaud 1927:341-42). The deeds of the Prophet Job were celebrated at Dayr Ayyūb, where there was a famous spring, his tomb, a monastery (built in A.D. 641) and a mosque (Smith 1931:425; Le Strange 1890:427, 515-16). It is probably because of Dayr Ayyūb's fame that both Ibn Khurradādhbih and Qudāmah indicate its place on the Damascus -- Ţabarqiyah road. No other sikkah is named for this leg of the journey.

After Nawā the post-road to Ţabarqiyah abruptly turned W.S.W. towards KhisfĪn, crossing the Naḥr 'Allān and the deep WādĪ Ruqqad at the Jisr ar-Ruqqad in the process. At KhisfĪn the highway joined an alternative northern route from Damascus, which by-passed al-Bathaniyah to the west by coming down through Meliha and Hara (Dussaud 1927:340-41, 385). In the Roman-Byzantine Period Khisfīn/Caspein belonged to Sūsiyah (Avi-Yonah 1977:169-70), but by the time al-Ya'qūbī produced his geographical work (278/871) this town, and all of the Jawlān, belonged to the administrative district of Damascus.
From Khisfīn the Ṭabarīyah post-road steered south-westwards, first reaching Nāb (ancient Nub), then the strategically significant site of 'Āl, and finally AfĪq/FTq, (Dussaud 1927:381). AfĪq's importance came from its dominant position at the head of a major pass into the Jordan Rift Valley, the 'Aqabat FTq. The highway followed the relatively easy descent offered by this pass, arriving in the Valley at the south-eastern shore of the Buhayrat Ṭabarīyah (Ya'q. 115/*327.13; Dussaud 1927:383; Smith 1931:297; Le Strange 1890:385). A Kufic inscription found at the southern end of the Buhayrat Ṭabarīyah commemorates the upgrading of this road through the 'Aqabat (of AfĪq) during the Caliphate of 'Abdul-Malik (Sharon 1966:367-72). The road continued south of the Buhayrat Ṭabarīyah and crossed the Jordan River at either the Jisr al-Majāmi' or, more likely, a second bridge to the north, the Jisr aṣ-Ṣidd (Maq.*161.8-9; Smith 1931:279 n.1; Le Strange 1890:335). Just to the west of the crossing, the road would have combined with the Ṭabarīyah -- Baysān route to enter the capital of al-Urdunn from the south.

The Second Leg: Ṭabarīyah to ar-Ramlah.

Discussion of the sources.

The itinerary of the highway and post-road between Ṭabarīyah and ar-Ramlah is reasonably well described in the geographical manuals of Ibn Khurradādhibih and Qudāmah,
although neither gives a full account of the route station by station (table 11 p. 249). Both writers identify two major towns on the way to ar-Ramlah. The first, and more important, of these was al-Lajjūn at a point 20 miles (c. 38.5 kms) and four sikak out from Ṭabariyyah. Thereafter the route negotiated the lion-infested pass of the Wādī 'Ara' (Qudāmah *219.15-16=167) to arrive at Qalansuwhah, 20 miles from al-Lajjūn. The final leg from Qalansuwhah to ar-Ramlah was another 24 miles (c. 46.5 kms), with stations at Kafr Sāba' and Kafr Sallām (Maq.*177.1-2, *191.3). A total of nine sikak covered the 44 miles (c. 85 kms) from al-Lajjūn to ar-Ramlah, making on average 4.92 miles (9.5 kms) between each post over the full length of the road.

According to Qudāmah it was also possible to reach al-Lajjūn from Ṭabariyyah on an indirect route through Baysān (table 11). However as it was 16 miles (c. 31 kms) to Baysān and then another 18 miles (c. 34.5 kms) to al-Lajjūn, this diversion would have added another 14 miles (c. 27 kms) to the journey. The other sources do not mention the alternative Baysān itinerary for the main post-road to ar-Ramlah, although the Ṭabariyyah -- Baysān route is listed on its own by both Ibn Ḥawqal (two short journeys) and al-Maqdisī (one marhalah).

As with the Damascus -- Ṭabariyyah post-road, al-Ya'qūbī, Ibn Ḥawqal and al-Maqdisī provide fewer details on the route to ar-Ramlah. Al-Ya'qūbī and Ibn Ḥawqal simply state that the trip to the capital of the jund of Filasṭīn took three marāhil.
but neither source nominates the intermediate stops in-text. However Ibn Ḥawqal's map locates Kafar Sābā just before ar-Ramlah on the road from Damascus (maps 5 and 6). Al-Maqdisī is a little more thorough, as he places both al-Lajjūn and Qalansuwa on the way to ar-Ramlah with one marḥalāh between each (table 11).

b> Analysis of the route.

The confirmatory nature of the evidence from the non-official sources leaves little doubt as to the route of the post-road from Ṭabariyah to ar-Ramlah (map 8). The direct route to al-Lajjūn involved a demanding journey over the granite hills of south-eastern Galilee and the swampy Marj ibn 'Amīr. This began with a steep ascent westwards out of Ṭabariyah onto the eastern edge of the Ḥittīn Range, probably along the route of the modern road. At the southeast edge of the Horns of Ḥittīn, the al-Lajjūn road diverted southwards from the combined Ṣaffūriyah/'Akkā route along a mostly easy path to the water-rich site of Khan at-Tujjar, with a caravanserai of the 2nd/8th and 3rd/9th centuries A.D. (Gal 1985:70; Smith 1931:71). After the khan, a gradual descent around the south flanks of Jabal at-Ṭur (Mount Tabor) led into the upper north-eastern reaches of the Marj ibn 'Amīr. The approach to al-Lajjūn over the plain passed by the western slopes of the Little Hermon before reaching 'Affūlah, a strategically located town on the narrow watershed between the plain and the Wādī Jālūd. This section between the junction with the Ṭabariyah -- 'Akkā road and 'Affūlah was never
part of the paved system of roads in Roman Palestine, during which time travel to Ṭabariyah was accomplished by using either the Baysān/Scythopolis or Ṣaffūriyah/Diocaesarea roads (Issac and Roll 1982:4).

During the Early Islamic and 'Abbāsid periods 'Affūlah or, more likely, nearby al-Fūlah 1.5 kms to the east marked the junction of the two Ṭabariyah roads, the direct road via Jabal at-Ṭūr and the traditionally important west road up the Wādī Jālūd from Baysān. Both sites have archaeological remains identified to Crusader and Ayyubid/Mamlūk times, although the construction of a castle at al-Fūlah by the Crusaders emphasizes the strategic importance of the site (see Dothan 1955; 1975 for excavations at ‘Affūlah; Kedar and Pringle 1985 for the castle at al-Fūlah). From that point both routes followed a common path over the upper reaches of the Nahr al-Muqatta' to al-Lajjun (Isaac and Roll 1982:34-35).

The stretch of road between Baysān and al-Fūlah lost some of its former primacy after the Conquest, although this has been exaggerated in a recent study of the route. Following the appointment of Ṭabariyah as the capital of al-Urdunn, the highway from Damascus to Egypt moved northwards, partially bypassing Baysān in the process, and of the five 3rd/9th and 4th/10th century geographical sources only Qudāmah mentions the Baysān -- al-Lajjun road (table 11 p. 249). Isaac and Roll (1982:88-91) argue for a substantial reduction in the level of secondary settlement along the road between
Baysān and 'Afūlah in the Early Islamic Period, but the informal and incomplete nature of Zori's survey (see Isaac and Roll 1982:87) invalidates their conclusions. Rather, archaeological and literary evidence indicates that Baysān retained a significant administrative and economic role after the Conquest (see Ch. 2.v.6), while the Nessana papyrus for compulsory service on the Qaysāriyah -- Baysān road demonstrates the continued relevance of the west-bound route from Baysān at the end of the 7th century A.D. (Ch. 2.iv.7).

Qudāmah explicitly routes the post-road from al-Lajjūn to Qalansuwh through the Wādī 'Arā, a narrow but water-rich valley over the eastern Karmal Range of ancient importance (Baly 1974:150; Isaac and Roll 1982:4-5). This would strengthen the argument in favour of locating the Roman road between al-Lajjūn/Legio and Antipatris in this pass (Isaac and Roll 1982:35; Thomsen 1917:69-70, Route XXIX). Once on the northern coastal plain, the post-road continued on its way S.S.W. along the base of the Samaritan foothills, thereby avoiding the swamps behind Qaysāriyah. Thus at Qalansuwh the road was still some 13 kms away from the Mediterranean coast.

The third and final leg of the road to ar-Ramlah did not have to contend with any major geographical barriers except for the inconvenience of an occasional wādī crossing (Baly 1974:133-36). The absence of obstacles allowed for the basically straight course from Qalansuwh to Kafr Sādā, Kafr Sallām and finally ar-Ramlah, probably along the line of an earlier Roman road.
The Third Leg: Ar-Ramlah to al-Fustāṭ.

a> Discussion of the Sources.

The ar-Ramlah to al-Fustāṭ section of the highway and post-road between Damascus and Egypt is described in reasonable detail by four of the Arabic geographical sources. However these accounts, especially those of al-Ya'qūbī and al-Maqdisī, demonstrate some uncertainty over the road's exact itinerary.

The manuals of Ibn Khurraḍādhbih and Qudāmah include an authoritative and congruent description of the government post-road (table 11 p. 249). According to their itineraries, the first significant town after ar-Ramlah was Azdūd, 12 miles (c. 23 kms) on the highway to al-Fustāṭ. This road, remarked Qudāmah (*219.17-18=167), passed by many villages and cultivated fields. The route then covered another 20 miles (c. 38.5 kms) to Ghazzah, also through cultivated countryside (Qudāmah *219.18=167). After Ghazzah, 10 miles of orchards followed by six miles of sand led to Rafaḥ (Qudāmah *219.19=167), the last stop in Filastīn and a total of 48 miles (c. 92.5 kms) from ar-Ramlah to Rafaḥ. Al-Fustāṭ was reached only after another nine towns, of which the first was al-'ArTsh 24 miles (c. 46 kms) beyond Rafaḥ. Qudāmah places nine sikak between ar-Ramlah and a post-station probably close to Rafaḥ called al-Mu'ayyanah, an average of 5.33 miles (10.29 kms) per station.

Al-Ya'qūbī's version of the towns on the road to Egypt in the Filastīn jund omits Azdūd and replaces it with Yubnā
and "'Asqalān on the sea coast". After 'Asqalān came Ghazzah, followed by Rafaḥ before the first two stops in Egyptian territory of ash-Shajaratain (‘two-trees’) and al-ʿArīsh (Yaʿq.117-118/*330.4-7). This itinerary suggests that both Yubnā and 'Asqalān were either on or near the main south road into Egypt.

The apparently detailed first-hand knowledge of the roads of Filastīn found in al-Maqdisī’s book turns out, on closer inspection, to be little more than a generalized list of individual connections. Distances between centres are very imprecise; for example the length of the journey from ar-Ramlah to both Azdūd and Rafaḥ is recorded as "one ṣaḥāḥah" (Maq.*192.3-4), even though the latter is almost at the Egyptian border. Consequently the contribution of this work to an analysis of the ar-Ramlah -- Rafaḥ route is very limited.

Analysis of the route.

Fortunately there is sufficiently detailed information in Ibn Khurradadhbih, al-Yaʿqūbī and Qudāmah to accurately reconstruct the itinerary of the Early Islamic and 'Abbāsid highway/post-road between Filastīn and Egypt (map 8). The road left ar-Ramlah in a south-westerly direction and went through fertile and populated countryside to Yubnā, i.e. not by the pilgrimage route through 'Āqīr (below, this part), and thereafter from Yubnā to Azdūd. Both towns were situated on wādī crossings, and each had a port on the coast at the point where these valleys entered the sea. As previously mentioned,
Māhūz Azdūd was particularly important in the first centuries of Islam, and was serviced by a side-road from the highway (Maq.*192.3, table 11).

The next stage of the post-road also passed through cultivated lands, and thus east of the coastal sand dunes, until reaching Ghazzah. Travel to 'Asqalān in between required a short (c. 5 km) diversion off the main south road, because unlike the other southern towns 'Asqalān was located immediately on the Mediterranean shore. The sources confirm the view that 'Asqalān was a city of great consequence in 'Abbāsid and Fāṭimid times (see Ch. 2.iv.6), as both Ibn Ḥawqal and al-Maqdisī list the route and al-Ya'qūbī includes the town in his southern itinerary.

Next after Ghazzah and the last stop within the territory of Filastīn was at Rafaḥ, a much-needed watering place at the start of the desertous al-Jifār region. Thereafter the road to al-Fusṭāṭ entered Egyptian territory, with al-'Arīsh as the first significant centre on the way (Ibn Kh.*80.2-10=58-59; al-Ya'qūbī 118/*330.6; Qudāmah *219.19=167).

Concluding Remarks on the Damascus -- al-Fusṭāṭ Highway and Post-Road.

The preceding analysis of five 3rd/9th and 4th/10th century written sources has accurately identified the route taken by the highway/post-road from Damascus to al-Fusṭāṭ. Before progressing onto a similar, but shorter, study of the minor routes in Filastīn and al-Urdunn, it is opportune to
make a few remarks on the significance of this post-road during the Umayyad and 'Abbāsīd periods.

The changed political and economic circumstances in ash-Shām after the Islamic Conquest had a profound effect upon the orientation of the road system in this region. The establishment of a new capital away from the Mediterranean Coast at Damascus (later Baghdad), the escalating conflict with Byzantium, and changes to eastern trade routes all resulted in the downgrading of the two major Roman/Byzantine highways of Palaestina, viz. the Alexandria -- Antioch road and the Via Nova between Aylah and Buṣrā. In their place arose a new highway, which also doubled as the official post-road, from Damascus to Egypt by way of the provincial capitals of Ṭabariyāh and ar-Ramlah. This change probably occurred almost immediately after the Islamic Conquest with the implementation of the new administrative arrangements for ash-Shām. A papyrus from Nessana (in Kraemer 1958:209-11) indicates that the maintainence of the road system remained a regional responsibility in the later 7th century A.D., perhaps until the reforms of 'Abdul-Malik and the establishment of an Empire-wide system of post-roads.

The Umayyad and Abbāsīd highway and post-road between Damascus, Ṭabariyāh, ar-Ramlah and al-Fustāṭ utilized the pre-existing Roman roads over most of its length. The only exception was the leg from al-Fūlah to the 'Akkā -- Ṭabariyāh road already referred to above. The well-trodden Roman and Byzantine route from the Mediterranean Coast inland to Damas-
cus via Baysān /Scythopolis was modified after the Islamic Conquest to connect Ṭabariyah, the newly appointed capital of al-Urdunn, to both ar-Ramlah and Damascus. This modification involved a northerly diversion at al-Fūlah to join the 'Akka -- Ṭabariyah road by way of Jabal at-Tūr in preference to the longer route through Baysān (map 8). After Ṭabariyah the post-road followed the south-bound route to Baysān before diverting eastwards around the southern end of Buhayrat Ṭabariyah to rejoin the old Baysān -- AfTq -- Damascus road near the southeastern corner of the lake.

Although use of the state-maintained barTd was generally restricted to official business, the post-roads usually also doubled as the major trade routes of the Islamic World. This is clear in the sources used here from a passage in Ibn Khurradadhbih in which he describes the route travelled by Slav merchants. While journeying to the far East, these traders traversed North Africa (Ifrīqiyyah) to "the Egyptian Capital", i.e. al-Fusṭāṭ, then ar-Ramlah and Damascus before crossing to al-'Irāq (Ibn Kh.*154.17-*155.6). In spite of the abbreviated nature of the itinerary in Ibn Khurradadhbih, the inclusion of ar-Ramlah -- a town noted for its markets (Maq.*164.8; Ch. 2.iv.1) -- on the way from al-Fusṭāṭ to Damascus indicates that the Slav traders found the post-roads convenient for their travels. Quite naturally these roads suited the business needs of the merchants for they both connected the major market-cities of the Empire and also probably provided a safer way in between.
2) The Pilgrim Road Between Damascus and Makkah.

"And proclaim the Pilgrimage
Among people: they will come
To thee on foot and (mounted)
On every kind of camel,
Lean on account of journeys
Through deep and distant
Mountain highways"

Performing the Hajj, the "Pilgrimage to Mecca, 'Arafat and Minā, the fifth of the five "pillars" (arkan) of Islam" (Lewis 1971:31), is obligatory for all adult Muslims of sound health and sufficient means (Qur'an S.II.196, S.III.97). Until the advent of modern transport, undertaking the Hajj entailed an often perilous journey through difficult terrain and, at times, hostile peoples. However the formation of caravans and the provision of installations, such as wells, reservoirs and infirmaries by the State and religious endowments (Ar. awqāf), somewhat ameliorated these harsh conditions.

The maintenance of the Pilgrim Road to Makkah, the Darb al-Hajj, was one of the many obligations prescribed by the position of Amīr al-Mu'minīn. The construction or improvement of public facilities along the roads was considered a pious
act; thus the Umayyad Caliph al-Walīd ibn 'Abdul-Malik built reservoirs and infirmaries on the Damascus -- Makkah road (Ibn Faqīh *106.17-20), and as-Sitt Zubaydah, wife of the 'Abbāsid Caliph Hārūn ar-Rashīd (170-193/786-809), had wells dug along the Pilgrim Road from Baghdaḍ and marked its course with a wall (Dunlop 1971:258). This dynasty also saw to the publication of official roadbooks which included the itinerary of the major pilgrim roads, although these itineraries were probably in circulation long before their compilation into one work during the 3rd/9th century.

a> Discussion of the sources.

The earliest surviving roadbooks, those of Ibn Khurraḍadhbih and Qudāmah, include a basic description of road itineraries to Makkah from the principal urban centres of the Islamic World. They name the significant stops on the main pilgrimage roads from al-Fustāt, Damascus, Baghdaḍ, and other centres, but fail to stipulate absolute distances between stations. Although these are 'Abbāsid accounts, there is little doubt that the development of the Pilgrim Roads dates back to the earliest days of Islam (Musil 1926:326-27). Details on the itineraries of the following 4th/10th century are found in al-Maqdisī's al-Aqālīm, which names the significant stations on the way to Makkah through the Bādiyyah and stipulates the number of stops between them.

The works of Ibn Khurradadhbih and Qudāmah offer only a bare outline of the itinerary between Damascus and Makkah (Ibn Kh.*150.5-6=112; Qud.*191.6-8=150), and the extra detail
contained in the 4th/10th century work of al-Maqdisī demonstrates that both these sources limited their descriptions to the very basics. Al-Maqdisī deals with the route of the Pilgrim Road in different sections of his book. Two legs are of relevance to this study; the road between Damascus and 'Ammān in ash-Shām (Maq. *192.11-13) and the section through the bādiyah from 'Ammān to Taymā', for which al-Maqdisī identifies three independent paths (Maq. *249.13-250.7). In contrast to all of these sources, al-Ya'qūbī (*117.*329.19-*330.2) traces another road from Damascus that went by way of Jerusalem, the latter being a centre of Islamic pilgrimage in its own right (for this route see below sec. v.2).

As the Damascus pilgrim route according to the Arabic sources has been reasonably well researched by Musil (1926:326-31 and appendix XV; 1927:516-20), there is little point in doing so again, especially as the Hajj road is only of secondary interest to this thesis. Thus the intention here is to summarize his conclusions and draw out a few relevant points. A survey of the Ottoman forts on the route within Jordan has recently been carried out by Petersen (1987), but a detailed reconsideration of the Darb al-Hajj in all periods -- a thesis in its own right -- has yet to be done.

b> Analysis of the route.

Both de Goeje (1889:112) and Musil (1926:327-28) propose that Ibn Khurradādhbih's first stop out of Damascus, indistinctly named manzil ("way station") and his third stop of dhāt al-Manāzil ("provided with way stations"), are to be
identified with al-Kuswah and Adhri'āt respectively. This would conform with the itinerary of the south road from Damascus given by al-Maqdisī (*192.12-13), the other sources of a later date quoted by Musil, and the route followed by Doughty in 1876 (below). Thereafter, following Ibn Khurradādhbih's itinerary, came an enormous gap of 330 kms between dhāt al-Manāzil and the next halting place of Surar.

By the 4th/10th century, if not before, 'Ammān had become an important assembly point for the pilgrims from ash-Shām (Maq.*250.9-10). A number of local roads joined 'Ammān with the regionally significant centres of ar-Ramlah, Jerusalem, and Zughar (see below part v), as well as Damascus. According to al-Maqdisī (*192.11-13), the Damascus -- 'Ammān route took two marāhil to Adhri'āt, one more to Zarqā', and a final marhalah to 'Ammān. From there three independent tracks left for the oasis of Taymā' (Maq.*249.13-*250.7); and in the Umayyad Period all three, depending on the season, were used to carry the official mail to the Ḥijāz (Maq.*250.7-8). The two eastern routes passed by way of "WubaTr" (mod. BayIr, with a castle and wells; see Stein in Kennedy 1982:255-58; King, Lenzen and Rollefson 1983:398-99; Musil 1927:324); and the second through al-‘Auniyīd (mod. al-‘Uwaynid, with fort and wādī tower; see Kennedy 1982:113-28 with references), both of which are discussed by Musil (1927:517-18). However the track of principal interest to this thesis is the westernmost one, but unfortunately the itinerary is not very detailed. After 'Ammān and two watering places came Mu'ān.
then Tabūk after three further watering places (Maq. *249.13-*250.2; for Tabūk see Musil 1926:167-69, 318-21). Four more watering places led to Tayma” (for which see Musil 1926:327-28). South of 'Ammān locating water sources and obtaining supplies became a major preoccupation of the pilgrims.

This itinerary of the Damascus -- Tabūk Pilgrim Road displays no significant variations from the route followed by Doughty in 1876 (Doughty [1888] 1921:4-33). After the first stop at al-Kuswah, he passed by as-Sanamayn to reach Muzayrib 13 kms to the northwest of Adhri'āt. It was here, in preference to 'Ammān, that the Syrian caravan assembled before starting the first of its 40 marches to Makkah.

Both Doughty and the 16th century Italian traveller Varthema (in Freeth and Winstone 1978:24) speak of the assembly point at Muzayrib. Doughty's comments on the tradition of caravan assembly points is of interest (Doughty 1921:4):

"It is the custom in these caravan countries that all who are to set forth, meet together in some common place without the city. The assembling of the pilgrimage multitude is always by the lake of Muzeyrīb in the high steppes beyond Jordan, two journeys from Damascus. Here the hajjies who have taken to the field are encamped, and lie a week or ten days in the desert before their long voyage."

During this time a market sprung up at Muzayrib to provision the pilgrims, however both Varthema and Doughty (1921:6) remark that quality could be poor and prices inflated, as the
next market was not until Mu'ān.

After Muzayrib the caravan camped at Ramtha, some 10kms to the southwest of Adhri'āt, before striking southeastwards to the Wādī Zārqa by way of Mafraq. The next stop was just east of the "proud Greekish ruins of Philadelphia, now 'Ammān" (Doughty 1921:18), and after two further days at the birkah of al-Qatrānāh (described in Brunnow and Domaszewski 1905:85). By riding 12 hours the next day the caravan arrived at the well of al-Ḥasā (see Brunnow and Domaszewski 1905:17-19); after which came two further days until the first rest station at Mu'ān was reached, 9 days out from Muzayrib or 11 from Damascus. This makes al-Maqdisī's six stops between Damascus and Mu'ān difficult to accept. Doughty's itinerary after Mu'ān took him further south to Tabuk by way of Dhāt Ḥajj; a long, hard journey of just over two days.

Although mentioned by both Ibn Ḥawqal and al-Maqdisī (tables 6, 7 & 12), the earlier Islamic history of Mu'ān is not well understood (Musil 1926:247-48). However its abundant water and the availability of produce established it as an important market town on the Darb al-Hajj, and Ibn Ḥawqal (*185.8-9) mentions that travellers could obtain provisions from this small town. In later times Burckhardt (1829, in Brunnow and Domaszewski 1905:1-2) explains Mu'ān's raison d'être in the following terms:

"The inhabitants have scarcely any other means of subsistence than the profits which they gain from the pilgrims in their way to and from Mekka, by buying up
all kinds of provisions at Hebron and Ghaza, and selling
them with great profit to the weary pilgrims... The
inhabitants cultivate figs, pomegranates and plums in
large quantities, but do not sow their fields. They
purchase wheat from Kerek, which their women grind; and
at the passage of the Hadj they sell the flour as well
as their fruits to the pilgrims; which is their means of
subsistence."

This extract from Burckhardt emphasizes the economic signifi-
cance of the annual Hajj to Mu'ān and the other marginal
communities on the edge of the bādiyāh. For Mu'ān in more
recent times see Brunnow and Domaszewski (1905:1-6), Doughty
(1921:32-35), Jaussen and Savignac (1909:33-41), Musil

The 'Abbāsid and later sources show that the route of
the Darb al-Hajj, or Pilgrim Road, between Damascus and
Makkah displays a remarkable consistency over time, although
the precise itinerary often varied in response to local
events. Map 8 depicts the principal path of the Pilgrim Road
in the first four centuries of Islam, based upon the informa-
tion in Ibn Khurradādhbih and al-Maqdisī. Its itinerary
corresponds almost exactly with the course chosen for the
Hijāz Railway (Zaidi 1971), as on its tracks ran steam
engines more thirsty than humans and animals.

Both the lack of absolute distances and a certain degree
of uncertainty over the itinerary in the sources suggests
that the Pilgrim Road was not surveyed to the same extent as
the post-roads, a point already discussed by Musil (1926:327). Perhaps the administrative and military needs of both the Umayyad and Abbāsid administrations demanded an absolute knowledge of distances and travel-times between the principal cities of the Empire, whereas for the Ḥajj such precision was not essential.

Al-Maqdisī stresses the pivotal role played by 'Ammān on the Pilgrim Road during the Early Islamic Period. Its function as an important assembly spot for the Syrian caravan in the 4th/10th century almost certainly originated in the Umayyad Period when 'Ammān, a district capital of the Dimashq jund, was joined to Makkah by three barīd routes. The collection of a multitude of pilgrims near 'Ammān would have brought an annual prosperity to the Balqā' region, and also encouraged the sanctification of local landmarks such as the Cave of the Seven Sleepers at ar-Raqīm (Maq. *175.9-*176.15).

To a lesser extent the other settlements on the Darb al-Ḥajj also gained financial benefits from the annual passage of pilgrims. As already noted Mu'ān developed into a major stop and market centre on the route, while expenditure on public works, especially wells and reservoirs, and the stationing of garrisons for protection along the way would have made a notable contribution to the local economy. Thus the continuing significance after the Conquest of the water-rich sites of 'Ammān, Mu'ān, Adhruḥ and Adhri'āt on the eastern desertous fringe of ash-Shām is partly attributable to their proximity to the Pilgrim Road (see Ch. 6.v.c).
vi> The Secondary Routes of Filasṭīn and al-Urdunn (Table 12 and Map 8).

The central highway between Damascus and al-Fusṭāṭ formed the backbone of a wide network of provincial roads within Filasṭīn and al-Urdunn. These roads performed both an administrative and commercial function in the province by linking each of the numerous secondary towns to its capital and to its neighbours, sometimes crossing provincial boundaries in the process. As a result all of south ash-Shām was covered with a complex series of interlocking cross-country roads centred on Ṭabaríyah and ar-Ramlah (map 8).

The analysis of provincial roads during the early 'Abbāsid Period is severely restricted by the lack of source material for the 3rd/9th century. Ibn Khūrradābih includes side routes to selected destinations in Filasṭīn (Ibn Kh. *78.17-*79.1, 10-12=57-58) and the itinerary of the Mediterranean Coastal Route (Ibn Kh. *98.6-8=71 for al-Urdunn and Filasṭīn), but neglects the other provincial roads. Qudāmah likewise concentrates on a full description of the post-road, but also lists the stations on the northern route from Ba'āl-bakk to Ṭabaríyah (Qudāmah *219.5-8=166-67). The mass of detailed information provided by Ibn Ḥawqal and especially al-Maqdisī gives a much clearer picture of the road network in south ash-Shām during the 4th/10th century. Considering the critical and reliable nature of al-Maqdisī's work (see
Introduction: source material), his exhaustive list of the minor roads in the region is of particular value as it highlights the major provincial cities and towns of Filastīn and al-Urdunn in that century.

The secondary routes of Filastīn and al-Urdunn divide into four categories (table 12 p. 251-52). Firstly there are the minor roads radiating out from Ṭabariyāh to the coast and north into the Biqāʾ Valley (table 12.1). The second group similarly consists of feeder roads to ar-Ramlah which extended both to the coast and inland (table 12.2). The religious significance of Iliyā/Bayt al-Maqdis resulted in the maintenance of a comprehensive network of feeder roads to that town, both from a number of points on the Damascus-al-Fustāṭ highway and from centres in East Jordan. These roads make up the third group (table 12.3). The final category includes significant alternative inter-provincial routes in the south of ash-Shām, notably a coastal road between the towns on the Mediterranean shore, horizontal routes to inland centres, a vertical track running up the length of the region, and finally connections with the badiyah Pilgrim Road (table 12.4).

As with the Damascus -- al-Fustāṭ highway, the itineraries of the secondary roads were necessarily very similar to those of their Roman predecessors, especially as most of them transversed mountainous country where the number of passes were limited. However the significance of these roads lies in the information they provide on settlement distribution and
population concentration in 'Abbasid and Fatimid times, and these objectives have influenced the structure of the following study into the secondary routes of Filastīn and al-Urdunn.

1) Secondary Routes from Tabariyah (Table 12.1, Map 8).

The two important intra-provincial routes of al-Urdunn connected the capital city of Tabariyah with the major coastal towns of 'Akka and Sūr (map 8). As already seen, both of these centres played a crucial role in the commercial and military activities of the Umayyad and 'Abbasid Dynasties.

The road to 'Akka could have initially run in common with the post-road until the al-Fulah turn off, and then continued westwards along the route of the Roman road pass Saffūriyah to 'Akka (Abel 1938:224; Avi-Yonah 1940:42; Thomsen 1917:68-69, Route XXVII). However the eclipse of Saffūriyah in the first two and a half centuries of Islam suggests that the old Roman route may have been abandoned in favour of the 'Akka road via Ramah, particularly as this route continued eastwards to Damascus by way of Ṣafad and Jisr Banāt Ya'qūb (Smith 1931:278).

The route of the Tabariyah -- Sūr road is equally unclear, although al-Maqdisī places Jashsh midway between the two (for Jashsh see Ch. 4.iii.3). The road probably followed the Ba'labakk route north of Ṣafad (an Islamic village fortified by the Crusaders). After
Jashsh two routes were possible, either northwards to join the Bāniyās-Ṣūr road at Tibnīn (later the site of the Crusader castle of le Toron, see Dussaud 1927:24; Le Strange 1890:545-56), or westwards to the coast-road between 'Akka and Şūr (the Crusaders also saw to the fortification of this route by the construction, in A.D. 1226, of a castle at Montfort).

The other important road out of Ṣabariyah had Ba'labakk as its destination, a town of the Dimashq jund much favoured in the writings of Islamic scholars. Both Qudāmah and al-Maqdisī provide a detailed description of this route, although the stages on their itineraries do not exactly correspond (table 12.1 p. 251, map 8; cf. Dussaud 1927:397-98). The road left by the northern outskirts of Ṣabariyah and followed the western shore of the Buhayrat Ṣabariyah until reaching al-Minya, where there is a large Umayyad building (see Grabar et al. 1960 for recent excavations) and a Mamlūk khan. Thereafter the road climbed to Jubb Yūsuf, al-Maqdisī's first stop on the route. Just to the north of Jubb Yūsuf, the Šafad road forked off to the left (west), and was followed shortly by the northern route to Damascus east over the Jisr Banāt Ya'qūb. The Ba'labakk road, however, continued straight along the western edge of the upper Jordan rift. A further branch led westwards to Qadas and eventually to Şūr on the coast, while the main road north carried on to a junction with the Şūr -- Bāniyās route before reaching Qariyat al-'Aiyūn (mod. Tall ad-Dibbin), a distance of two marches from
Jubb Yusuf. Hereon the road followed the eastern side of the Biqa' Valley to Qar'ūn, a town with a nearby bridge over the Litānī River on the road to Ṣaydā, then 'Ayn al-Jarr, and finally Ba'labakk. 'Ayn al-Jarr, modern 'Anjar, was built between 95-96/714-15 as a fortified agricultural settlement based upon extensive hydraulic works (Dussaud 1927:400-1; Sourdel-Thomine 1960c:787), while at Ba'labakk the main group of Roman ruins were converted into a fort during the Early Islamic Period (Dussaud 1927:403-4; Sourdel-Thomine 1960b:970). Qudāmah's journey involved one less stop, i.e., four instead of al-Maqdisī's five, over a total distance of 70 miles or 135 kms (Qudāmah *219.5-8=166-67). Jubb Yusuf and al-'Aiyūn, although mentioned on the route, are replaced by the unidentified site of Kafar Laylā, perhaps a mis-spelling of Kafar Kilā (de Goeje 1877:*191 note 'a'; Dussaud 1927:398).

2) Secondary Routes from ar-Ramlah (Table 12.2, Map 8).

The replacement of Ludd as the capital of Filastīn by the new construction of ar-Ramlah would have involved only minor changes to the existing road system because of the close geographical proximity of the two towns. These changes were apparently easily accomplished, as by the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries ar-Ramlah was the centre of a wide network of routes with both coastal and inland destinations.

Probably the most important of all the secondary roads from ar-Ramlah was the short journey to the port town of
Yāfā, the Mediterranean outlet for both the capital and Bayt al-Maqdis further east. The Yāfā -- ar-Ramlah route and its continuation to Bayt al-Maqdis primarily served a commercial function, as the port at Yāfā gave the two great cities of Palestine access to the Mediterranean sea trade. The importance of this route is indicated by its uncharacteristic inclusion in the work of Ibn Khurradādhbih (table 12.2 p. 251).

The other coastal destinations of the secondary roads of Filastīn from ar-Ramlah require little comment. The route to Qaysāriyah probably ran in common with the main highway between ar-Ramlah and Ṭabarīyah until Qalansuwah, at which point the Qaysāriyah road would have branched off in a westerly direction to the coast. The Qalansuwah -- Qaysāriyah road was operational from the 2nd or 3rd century A.D. (Dar and Applebaum 1973:93, fig. 4). The route of the Arsūf road is unclear, but it could have passed by either Yāfā on the old Roman coastal road (Abel 1938:224), or inland via Kafar Sābā/Kafar Sallām. The road to al-Māḥūz (of Azdūd) would have involved a short diversion from the post-road at Yubnā, similar to the previously discussed arrangement for 'Asqalān.

The routes from ar-Ramlah to inland Filastīn concentrated on four destinations (table 12.2). The road to Nābulus may have begun its ascent into the northern Palestinian hills at Kafar Sābā on the highway and post-road, and this direct but reasonably easy route is still used today. Another inland road, that to Bayt al-Maqdis, has already been mentioned.
This followed the Roman route through 'Amawās (Abel 1937:225; Avi-Yonah 1940:43), as a group of 3rd/9th century Christian pilgrims mention passing through the village on the way to Jerusalem from ar-Ramlah (Wilkinson 1977:142). A third route headed southeast from ar-Ramlah to Ḫabrā in the hills of south Filastīn, probably by way of 'Aqir and Bayt Jibrīn (cf. the Roman Ludd -- Ḫabrā road in Abel 1938:225; Avi-Yonah 1940:43; Thomsen 1917:78&84, Route XXXIX). Ḫabrā itself was connected with centres further southeast by the road to Zughar (see below).

When describing the site of 'Aqir, al-Maqdisī remarks that the road from ar-Ramlah to Makkah passes through this large village (table 9.ii.5, p. 190). As is clear from the road itineraries elsewhere in his book, this route crossed the desertous steppe (bādiyah) of southern Filastīn before joining the Pilgrim Road from Egypt at Aylah. Starting from ar-Ramlah, the road went through 'Aqir before reaching the village of Sukkariyah after one marhalah (Maq.*192.1). The site of Sukkariyah has not been identified, and quite clearly it can not be equated with the coastal town with the same name between 'Akka and Ṣūr on Ibn Hawqal's map (maps 5 and 6 of this work). Al-Maqdisī reserves his discussion of the Sukkariyah -- Aylah road until his section on the bādiyah of the 'Arabs (Maq.*248.8ff, see table 12.2 for the itinerary). He justifies this arrangement by saying that although the road was technically within ash-Shām, both it and the Zughar -- Aylah road (discussed below) passed through and were
restricted by the desolate badiyah (*249.12-13). At-Tulayl is a generalized geographical name and thus can not be accurately pinpointed; but two marches on was Ghamr, a valuable water source located in the Wādī 'Arabah between Zughar and 'Ayn Gharandal (Maq.*253.5-6, map 8). South of Ghamr two further marāhil led to Aylah. This leg probably shared the path down the centre of the Wādī 'Arabah through 'Ayn Gharandal and Ghadhian with the Zughar -- Aylah road, although al-Maqdisī's two marches between Aylah and Ghamr seems disproportionate to the four marāhil required to reach Aylah from Zughar (Maq.*249.12). At Aylah both routes joined the Pilgrim Road between al-Fustāṭ and Makkah, the itinerary of which is discussed by Musil (1926:321-26). According to al-Ya'qūbī (129/*340.15-*341.3) and Ibn Hawqal (*40.16-20), Aylah served as an important assembly point for the Pilgrims from Egypt, the rest of North Africa, and also "ash-Shām", specifically Filastīn.

3) Roads from Bayt al-Maqdis to other Regional Centres (Table 12.3, Map 8).

The religious significance of Bayt al-Maqdis in early Islam encouraged the maintenance of an extensive road network to neighbouring towns and beyond. In the 5th/11th century up to 20,000 Muslims visited Jerusalem annually, and both Jewish and Christian pilgrimage continued throughout the Islamic Period (Gil 1983; Wilkinson 1977). As with most of the secondary routes already considered, there is no certainty about
the precise itinerary of these roads but as before their Roman predecessors can often be taken as a reliable indication of the most likely path.

Bayt al-Maqdis lay at the centre of a main north-south route that extended along the length of the Palestinian hills. Yet instead of coming to a sudden stop at either end, this axial route joined up with others originating from towns outside of the hill region. Thus these roads further increased the importance of the axial route by facilitating the transit of pilgrims to and from the Holy City while being conducive to trade.

The northern hill road led to Nābulus, where it joined another road coming from Baysān in al-Urdunn via Ta'āsīr, the ancient Aser (table 12.3 p. 252, for the Roman route see Thomsen 1917:70-75 Routes XXXI & XXXIV). This road was connected to Damascus -- al-Fustāṭ highway by the road between Tabariyah and Baysān or another road over the Jisr al-Majāmī' (Abel 1933:164; Thomsen 1917:70-72 Route XXXI), thereby forming the link between Damascus and Jerusalem (Sharon 1960:368, 371-72). The south hill road joined Bayt al-Maqdis with Ḥabrā (Thomsen 1917:81-83 Route XLIII), the burial place of the Patriarchs and another site of pilgrimage, before continuing southeastwards to Zughar in the Jordan Rift via the unknown site of Qawus. Ways out of Zughar led northeastwards to Ma'āb probably along the way of the unpaved Roman road (Mittmann 1982:178-79), southeastwards to Mu'ān through Adhruḥ, and perhaps most importantly southwards along
the Wādī 'Arabah to the trading port of Aylah, a long journey of four marāhil (table 12.4).

Two other roads with Bayt al-Maqdis as their start were sufficiently important in the 4th/10th century to warrant a mention by al-Maqdisī (table 12.3). The first ran to Bayt Jibrīn, where it crossed the ar-Ramlah -- Ḥabrā road, and then on to Ghazzah (Thomsen 1917:79-81 Route XLI), thereby effecting another link with the Damascus -- Fustāṭ highway and a direct path to Egypt. The second road crossed the Jordan to 'Ammān, a major town east of the Ghawr and capital of al-Balqā'. According to al-Maqdisī there were two ways to reach 'Ammān, one in three sections through Arīḥā and Bayt al-Rām (perhaps via Ḥusbān) and the other a direct approach, probably by way of the Wādī Naʿūr, with one stop at the Jordan River (table 12.3). He was, however, not at all complementary about the condition of the roads to al-Balqāʾ (Maq. *175.8).

4 Other Secondary Routes (Table 12.4, Map 8).

Although the subsidiary road network around the Damascus -- al-Fustāṭ highway concentrated on the provincial capitals and Bayt al-Maqdis, a number of other significant routes integrated the more remote, but often no less important, centres into the system. In some cases these routes made their own way to Damascus, or joined up with the Pilgrim Road along the eastern fringe of ash-Shām.

From Šūr two lateral routes crossed the high hills of
northern Galilee to Bāniyās in the upper Jordan Valley. The direct route passed through Majdal Salam, which probably is identifiable with the village Majdal Salīm located to the northeast of Tibnīn in southern Lebanon (Dussaud 1927:35; Hutteroth & Abdulfattah 1977:181). The road then descended into the Jordan Rift, most likely about Hunin (where the Crusaders were to build a commanding castle, see Dussaud 1927:25). This itinerary is slightly different from that proposed by Dussaud (1927:22) and Smith (1931:278). A second but somewhat longer route went southeastwards to Qadas perhaps via Tibnīn and Qūnīn (Dussaud 1927:22), and from there up the Rift Valley on the Ba'labakk road west of the Ḥūlah marshes to join the direct Sūr -- Bāniyās route below Hunin. From Bāniyās it took two days to reach Damascus by way of a road around the southern foothills of the Jabal ash-Shaykh. At Sa'sa' this road joined the northern route from Ṭabarīyah over the Jisr Bināt Ya'qūb and Qunaytra.

In addition to the lateral routes to Bāniyās, Qadas and Ṭabarīyah, Sūr was a principal stop on the road from ar-Raqqah in al-Jazīrah down the Mediterranean Coast to Ghazzah. This road is given prominence by Ibn Khurradādhbih (*97.18-*98.8=71), who routes it south of Bayrūt through Ṣaydā, Sūr, Qadas, Qaysāriyah, Arsūf, Yāfā, 'Asqalān to Ghazzah. Qadas, 36 kms inland from Sūr over mountainous terrain, is surely a mistake for 'Akka, particularly as al-Maqdisī places 'Akka and then al-Kanīsah between Sūr and Qaysāriyah (table 12.4 p. 252).
The geographical sources of the 4th/10th century identify a network of roads revolving around the trading town of Zughar at the southeast corner of the Dead Sea in the Wādī 'Arabah. To the northwest the road to Ḫabrā‘ climbed out of the 'Arabah and passed through Qawus before reaching its destination. The second route stayed in the Jordan Rift and headed north to Arīthā, probably by way of the more hospitable western shore of the Dead Sea. Thereafter this valley road continued northwards until ascending the eastern slopes of the Samaritan hills to Nābulus. The precise path of the road after Arīthā is unclear, however the preference for pack animals in Islamic times would have favoured the direct route through Khirbat Fasā‘il (Roman Phasaelis) and 'Aqraba. The track south of Zughar to Aylah along the Wādī 'Arabah has already been discussed (above under ar-Ramlah). The road to the mountains of ash-Sharāt mentioned by Ibn Ḥawqal presumably went to Adhrūḥ and Mu‘ūn. However al-Maqdisī ignores this route, which is somewhat surprising considering the close ties between these two centres and Zughar (table 8 p. 189). The final road from Zughar passed through Ma‘āb, 'Ammān, az-Zarqā‘ and Adhri‘āt before reaching Damascus (table 12.4 p. 252). This road primarily served a commercial function by connecting Damascus with the trading markets of Zughar and Aylah, and further explains, in addition to the Hajj (above part iv), the ongoing importance of 'Ammān, Adhri‘āt and az-Zarqā‘ in the 3rd-4th/9th-10th centuries.
5) **Conclusions on the Secondary Routes.**

The secondary routes of 3rd/9th and 4th/10th century ash-Shām south of Damascus constituted a complex network of interconnecting roads that served the administrative, commercial, and religious requirements of the region. Accordingly the lines of communication concentrated on the provincial capitals of Ṭabariyāh and ar-Ramlah, the trading centre of Zughar particularly in later times, and the religious towns of Bayt al-Maqdis and Ḥabrā. Other roads led to the furthermost parts of the provinces and connected these trading and military centres, for instance Aylah and Šūr, with the principal cities of the region.

The proceeding reconstruction of the subsidiary road network around the Damascus -- Fusṭāṭ post-road is especially reliant upon the detailed road-lists supplied by al-Maqdisī. About one quarter of the secondary routes also appear in Ibn Ḥawqal, but only a fraction of those in the earlier and less detailed works of Ibn Khurraḍādhbih and Qudāmah. Consequently any deductions on settlement distributions based on the road network detailed above can only refer to the 4th/10th century. Nevertheless these deductions are still of crucial importance. The itineraries of the secondary roads identify the towns of local consequence, and also define the major transport routes outside of the Damascus -- Fusṭāṭ post-road and Pilgrim Road to Makkah. By combining this information on road itineraries with that drawn from the previous investigation into the administrative structure of Filasṭīn and al-
Urdunn (above Ch. 3), a very clear picture emerges as to the nature of settlement organization in the 4th/10th century (see Ch. 6.iii).

* 

The Road System of South ash-Shām in Historical Perspective.

From one historical period to another, the character of the road network in south ash-Shām responded to both local and inter-provincial transport needs. As these controlling factors changed over time, so too did the structure of the network. Thus in pre-Roman times the Trunk Road from Egypt to Damascus and the Kings Highway of East Jordan formed the backbone of a system of roads serving the locally important centres of the region. The imposition of the Pax Romana wrought significant changes and improvements to the system. The Mediterraneaean Coast Road from Antioch to Alexandria and the Via Nova between Buṣrā and Aylah became the major Imperial routes through Palaestina and Arabia, with important connecting roads between Qaysāriyah and Damascus via Baysān and also other routes from Baysān to Buṣrā through Adhri‘āt or to 'Ammān via Fihl and Jarash.

The vigorous political and social re-orientation of the East after the Islamic Conquest had an acute impact upon the
structure of the road network in southern ash-Shām. The rationalization of the Byzantine and Sassanid state postal services into a centralized bar ṭd system at the end of the 1st/7th century further emphasized the primacy of Damascus, the Umayyad capital, in the Islamic World. From Damascus the military and administrative needs of the expanding Islamic Kingdom were evaluated by means of an official communications network that reached from western North Africa to beyond Persia. One important link in this network was the post-road from Damascus to al-Fustāṭ in Egypt by way of Ṭabarīyah and ar-Ramlah, the capitals of al-Urdunn and Filasṭīn provinces respectively.

After the fall of the Umayyads, when for almost two centuries the direction of ash-Shām's political and social life came under the influence of Baghdad, the Damascus -- al-Fustāṭ highway retained its importance. From the time of al-Manṣūr (136-158/754-775) until the mid-3rd/9th century the 'Abbāsid regime retained a firm grip on the empire through a centralized administration regulated by the Department of Posts and Intelligence. As a formally surveyed post-road, the route from Damascus to al-Fustāṭ formed part of the main line of communication from the Caliph and his officers in Baghdad to the governor of Egypt.

In the latter half of the 3rd/9th century, the road between al-Fustāṭ and Damascus acquired renewed significance due to the rise of Egypt as an independent political and military power in Islam, and the new role of ash-Shām as a
buffer zone between the Egyptian dynasties and rival states further east (Lewis 1970b:191-92). Damascus was given a leading role in defending the interests of the dynasts as it usually housed an Egyptian garrison and the city's governor could report on events in the region, specifically local insurrection or the military intentions of opposing powers. The Damascus -- al-Fustāṭ highway would have played a crucial part in this arrangement. The appointment of Aḥmad ibn Ṭūlūn (d. 270/884) as governor of Egypt in 254/868 was the first step in the establishment of the autonomous Ṭūlūnid dynasty, the territory of which included ash-Shām after Aḥmad's campaigns of 264/878 (Hassan 1960:278-79; Lewis 1970b:179, 192-93). Following the collapse of this dynasty in 292/905, the region reverted to ineffectual 'Abbāsid control until the appearance of a new Egyptian dynasty, the Ikhshīdid, in 323-358/935-969. Ash-Shām once again became an Egyptian dependency, although the Ikhshīdids had to contend with a number of minor independent states with ruling families often of beduin origin, such as the Ḥamdānids of Ḥalab/Aleppo (Guest 1936; Lewis 1970b:182, 193-94). The ability of these petty rulers to survive during the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries contained Fāṭimid attempts to dominant ash-Shām, and this Egyptian dynasty never gained a firm hold there, particularly over Damascus (Lewis 1970b:194).

The new religion of Islam, especially its obligatory act of pilgrimage, had a profound effect on the status of the steppe tracks from the Ḥijāz to Egypt, ash-Shām, and al-Īraq.
The ancient origin of these tracks is attributable to the role of South Arabia and the Hijāz in international trade before Islam, and at the time of the Conquest it was these familiar paths which conducted the armies of Islam into the territory of the Byzantine and Sassanid empires. The routes to ash-Shām and Egypt clearly illustrate this point. As shown above, the usual itinerary of the Pilgrim Road from Damascus was the road through Tabūk. This important oasis on the ancient route north had been taken and garrisoned by the Muslims during Muḥammad’s lifetime (9/630, see Ch. 1.i.1); then in 12/633 Abī ‘Ubaydah, Yazīd and Shurabahī l led their armies into ash-Shām along this same road through Tabūk (Bal.*108.15-16=167; Donner 1981:115; Musil 1926:326). Likewise the Pilgrim Road from Egypt by way of Aylah followed the path of a second Hijāzī highroad. At Aylah a track led northwards up the Wādī ‘Arabah to the oasis of Ghamr, where the track climbed the western scarp of the depression and headed northwestwards to Ghazzah on the Mediterranean coast. In the last decades before the Conquest both routes formed a major outlet for the Makkan traders, and in 12/633 the army of ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ marched along the Aylah -- Ghamr -- Ghazzah road to conquer Filasṭīn (Bal.*108.14-15=166; Donner 1981:115; Musil 1926:321; for Ghazzah see Ch. 2.iv.7). In later times this same route was to carry pilgrims from ar-Ramlah to the assembly point at Aylah.

The changing nature of military and commercial activity in Palaestina and Arabia from the 5th century A.D. onwards
had a profound effect on the fabric of the road system. The greater reliance on pack-animals, especially the camel and donkey, and the dominant role played by the cavalry in the military reduced the need for wide-paved roads. Gradually a network of cleared tracks -- wide with facilities in the case of the post-road and Pilgrim Road -- formed the road system for Filastīn and al-Urdunn in the 4th/10th century.

Changing transport priorities both within and between the provinces of Filastīn and al-Urdunn progressively altered the character of the local road system during the first four centuries of Islam. Regional centres having an important political, military, commercial or religious role were well serviced with roads to all parts of the province. In particular Iliyā, viz Madinat Bayt al-Maqdis, was approachable from all four points of the compass; from Damascus, Ṣabā'īyah and Nābulus to the north, Ḫmān and Arīḥā to the east, Ḥabrā and Zughar in the south, Ghazzah to the southwest, and finally Yāfā and ar-Ramlah to the west (see map 8). The secondary towns on these locally important routes gained an economic benefit from the passing traffic between regional centres, for example Nābulus mid-way on the Ṣabā'īyah -- Iliyā road. In contrast the isolated areas of north-west Jordan and inland southern Palestine were void of recognized routes to major centres by the 4th/10th century, both reflecting and reinforcing an identifiable ongoing change to settlement distribution in these regions (below Ch. 6.iii).
# TABLE 11.

The Post-Road Through Southern Ash-Shām According to Five Geographical Sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Ibn Khurrahādhibih (de Goeje 1889)</th>
<th>al-Ya'qūbī (de Goeje 1892)</th>
<th>Qudūmah (de Goeje 1889)</th>
<th>Ibn Hawqal (Kramers 1938)</th>
<th>al-Maqdisī (de Goeje 1877)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dimashq - Ṭabarīyah.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimashq - al-Kuswah:</td>
<td>12 m. (*78.1)</td>
<td>12 m. (*219.10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 p. stg (*190.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Kuswah - Jāsim:</td>
<td>24 m. (*78.1-2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24 m. (*219.10)</td>
<td>days</td>
<td>1 stg (*190.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāsim - (A)fīq:</td>
<td>24 m. (*78.4)</td>
<td>stages</td>
<td>24 m. (*219.11)</td>
<td>(*185.16)</td>
<td>1 stg (*190.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)fīq - Ṭabarīyah:</td>
<td>6 m. (*78.4-5)</td>
<td>(327.12-14)</td>
<td>6 m. (*219.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 p. stg (*190.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ṭabarīyah - ar-Ramlah.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭabarīyah - Baysān:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16 m. (*219.14)</td>
<td>2 short stg's</td>
<td>1 stg (*191.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baysān - al-Lajjūn:</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 m. (*219.14)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(*187.1)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭabarīyah - al-Lajjūn:</td>
<td>20 m. (*78.14)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20 m. (*219.13)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 stg (*190.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Lajjūn - Qalansuwah:</td>
<td>20 m. (*78.14)</td>
<td>stages</td>
<td>20 m. (*219.15)</td>
<td>days</td>
<td>1 stg (*191.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qalansuwah - ar-Ramlah:</td>
<td>24 m. (*78.15)</td>
<td>(328.7)</td>
<td>24 m. (*219.16)</td>
<td>(*185.16)</td>
<td>1 stg (*191.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ar-Ramlah - al-Fustāṭ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah - Azdūd:</td>
<td>12 m. (*80.1)</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>12 m. (*218.17)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azdūd - Ghazzah:</td>
<td>20 m. (*80.1-2)</td>
<td>text,</td>
<td>20 m. (*219.18)</td>
<td>days</td>
<td>text,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghazzah - Ṭafāḥ:</td>
<td>16 m. (*80.2)</td>
<td>Ch. 5.v.1</td>
<td>16 m. (*219.19)</td>
<td>(*185.17)</td>
<td>Ch. 5.v.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

then 24 m. through sand to al-'Ariṣh, thereafter a further 8 centres to al-Fustāṭ (Ibn Kh. *80.2-10).

(continued over ...)
### TABLE 11 (Cont.).

The Post-Road Through Southern Ash-Shām According to Five Geographical Sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Stations</th>
<th>Stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimashq - Dayr Ayyūb</td>
<td>7 stations (Ibn Kh. *117.5-6, Qudāmah *228.10-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayr Ayyūb - Ṭabarīyah</td>
<td>6 stations (Ibn Kh. *117.6, Qudāmah *228.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭabarīyah - al-Lajjūn</td>
<td>4 stations (Ibn Kh. *117.7, Qudāmah *228.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Lajjūn - ar-Ramlah</td>
<td>9 stations (Ibn Kh. *117.7-8, Qudāmah *228.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah - Sikkah al-Mu'aynāh</td>
<td>9 stations (Qudāmah *228.14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY.**

- **m.** = a mile (Ar. mīl) of 4,000 cubits (Ar. dhirā' al-barTd, each 48.25 cm.). Thus 1 mile = 1.93 kms.
- **stg** = a stage (Ar. marḥalāh, pl. marḥālīl), a day's journey or leg of a journey of no apparent fixed length.
- **post-stage/p.stg** = postal stage (Ar. barTd).
- **post-station/p.stn** = governmental station house on the post-road (Ar. sikkah, pl. sikak).
TABLE 12.
The Secondary Routes in Southern Ash-Shām According to the Arabic Sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Qudāmah (de Goeje 1889)</th>
<th>Ibn Hawqal (Kramers 1938)</th>
<th>al-Maqdisī (de Goeje 1877)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. From Tabariyah.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabariyah - 'Akkā: 1 day (*187.2) 2 stg's (*191.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabariyah - Sūr: 7 p.stn (*229.16) 1 stg/day (*186. --)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabariyah - Jashsh: 13&amp;22 1 stg (*191.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jashsh - Sūr: 1 stg (*191.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabariyah - Jubb Yusuf: see 1 stg (*190.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubb Yusuf - al-'Ayun: 2 stg's (*191.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-'Ayun - al-Qara'ūn: 1 stg (*191.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Qara'ūn - 'Ayn al-Jarr: 15 m. (*219.5-6) 1 stg (*191.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ayn al-Jarr - Ba'ilabakk: 20 m. (*219.5) 1 stg (*191.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabariyah - Qadas: 1 stg (*191 n.a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ibn Khurraḍādhibh (de Goeje 1889)</th>
<th>Ibn Hawqal (Kramers 1938)</th>
<th>al-Maqdisī (de Goeje 1877)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. From ar-Ramlah.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah - Qaysāriyah: 1 stg (*186.20) 1 stg (*192 n.c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah - Arṣūf:    1 stg (*192.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah - Yārā: 8 m. (*79.10-11) 1 stg (*186.5,16) 1 stg (*192.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah - al-Māḥūz: 1 stg (*192.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah - 'Asqalān: 1 stg (*186.17) 1 stg (*192.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah - Kafar Sallām: 1 stg (*192.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah - Nābulus: 1 stg (*186.20) 1 stg (*192.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah - Ḥabrāq:   1 stg (*192.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah - Arīḥā:    1 stg (*192.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah - Bayt al-Maqdis: 18 m. (*78.18) 1 stg (*186.5,17) 1 stg (*192.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-Ramlah - as-Sukkariyah: 1 stg (*192.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as-Sukkariyah - at-Tulayl: 2 stgs (*249.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at-Tulayl - al-Ghamr: 2 stgs (*249.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ghamr - Aylah: 2 stgs (*249.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued over...)

### TABLE 12 (Cont.). The Secondary Routes in Southern Ash-Sham.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. From Bayt al-Maqdis (Iliyā) to other regional centres.</th>
<th>Ibn Khurradadhibh</th>
<th>Ibn Hawqal</th>
<th>al-Maqdisī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayt al-Maqdis - Nābulus:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 stg (*191.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nābulus - Ta‘āsīr:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2 p.stgs (*191.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta‘āsīr - Baysan:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2 p.stgs (*191.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayt al-Maqdis - Ḥabrā:</td>
<td>13 m. (*79.1)</td>
<td>1 day (*186.18)</td>
<td>1 stg (*192.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥabrā - Qawus:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 stg (*192.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qawus - Zughar:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 stg (*192.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayt al-Maqdis - Bayt Jibrīn:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 stg (*191.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayt Jibrīn - Ghazzah:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 stg (*192.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayt al-Maqdis - ArTḥā:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 stg (*186.6, 19)</td>
<td>2 p.stgs (*192.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArTḥā - Bayt ar-Rām:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2 p.stgs (*192.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayt ar-Rām - ’Ammān:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 stg (*192.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayt al-Maqdis - River Jordan:</td>
<td>2 stg's</td>
<td>1 stg (*192.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Jordan - ’Ammān:</td>
<td>(*186.19)</td>
<td>1 stg (*192.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Other Routes.

| Şūr - Majdal Salam:                                       | 2 post-stages (Maq. *191.8) |
| Majdal Salam - Bāniyās:                                  | 2 post-stages (Maq. *191.8) |
| Bāniyās - Dimashq:                                       | 2 days (Maq. *190.11)       |
| Şūr - Qadas:                                             | 2 post-stages (Maq. *191.8) |
| Şūr - Saydā:                                             | 1 stage (Ibn Kh. *98.6, Maq. *191.7) |
| Şūr - ‘Akkā:                                             | 1 stage (Maq. *191 n. ‘h’)   |
| ‘Akkā - al-KanTsah:                                      | 1 stage (Maq. *191 n. ‘h’)   |
| al-KanTsah - Qaysāriyah:                                 | 1 stage (Maq. *192.14)       |
| Qaysāriyah - ArSūf:                                      | 1 stage (Ibn Kh. *98.7, Maq. *192.14) |
| ArSūf - Yāfā:                                            | 1 stage (Ibn Kh. *98.7-8)    |
| Yāfā - ‘Asqalān:                                         | 1 stage (Ibn Kh. *98.8, Maq. *192.14) |
| ‘Asqalān - Ghazzah:                                      | 1 stage (Ibn Kh. *98.8, Yaq. *330.5-6) |
| Qaysāriyah - Kafar Sallām:                               | 1 stage (Maq. *192.13)       |
| Qaysāriyah - Kafar Sābā:                                 | 1 stage (Maq. *192.13)       |
| Nābulus - ArTḥā:                                         | 1 stage (Maq. *192.9-10)     |
| ArTḥā - Zughar:                                          | 2 stages (Ibn Hawqal *186.21, cf. with *186.5-6) |
| Zughar - Aylah:                                          | 4 stages (Maq. *192 n. ‘k’, *249.12) |
| Zughar - Adhrūḥ:                                         | 1 stage (Ibn Hawqal *186.6,21) |
| Adhrūḥ - Mu‘ṣūn:                                         | 1 stage (Ibn Hawqal *186.6-7,21-22) |
| Zughar - Ma‘āb:                                          | 1 stage (Maq. *192.11)       |
| Ma‘āb - ’Ammān:                                          | 1 stage (Maq. *192.11)       |
| ’Ammān - Zarqā’:                                         | 1 stage (Maq. *192.11-12)    |
| Zarqā’ - Adhrī‘āt:                                       | 1 stage (Maq. *192.12)       |
| Adhrī‘āt - Dimashq:                                      | 2 stages (Maq. *192.12-13)   |

**KEY.** - See Table 11.
Chapter 6

THE PATTERN OF SETTLEMENT IN SOUTH ASH-SHĀM


Introduction.

The principal objectives of this thesis (see Ch. 1.1.3) were attained by acknowledging the scholarly worth of the early descriptions of the Islamic World provided by eight major Arabic geographers and historians (for these see Introduction: source material) and analysing their accounts within a chronological framework (Chs 2.iv-vi, 4.ii-iv). This historio-geographical approach revealed a historical development in the urban and provincial geography of south ash-Shām between the 1st/7th and late 4th/10th century in response to changes in the social conditions and political character of the region after the Islamic Conquest. This chapter continues the analysis by focusing on the individual settlements of the region rather than its provinces and thereby lays the initial groundwork for a settlement study of south ash-Shām during the first centuries of Islam.
As Hutteroth points out, the reconstruction of settlement patterns is a requirement for understanding the cultural landscape of this region in the post-Roman period. He remarks:

"The question has not yet been solved as to what the cultural landscape looked like in the long period between the Roman Empire and the nineteenth century. Is it possible to record more than a general decline of settlements? Are there intermediate stages? Can the general pattern of density of settlements be reconstructed for a specific period of time? (Hutteroth 1975:3-4).

Unfortunately the written sources for the period under study do not compare with the precise information contained within the Ottoman tax registers studied by Hutteroth and Abdulfattah (1977) and Cohen and Lewis (1978). The authors of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th century geographical accounts had limited and specific objectives, and are thus frustratingly short on details, often erratic in the selection of their material, and sometimes factually incorrect (see Introduction: source material). Yet while keeping these limitations in mind, the sources offer an important account of the principal cities, towns and occasionally villages of south ash-Shām which, when compared with the 6th century A.D. Byzantine occupation in the same area, reveal a complex pattern of settlement development after the Islamic Conquest. This allows the initial identification of possible regional
trends, and the questioning of supposed settlement decay in the region after the Conquest. Furthermore this approach institutes a new guideline -- or hypothesis -- for archaeological research into the nature of Islamic settlement in south ash-Shām.

* 

**Method of Study.**

As already seen, the historical events of the first four centuries of Islam strongly influenced the structures of provincial administration in south ash-Shām (Ch. 2.iv&v; 3.iv; 4.iv). Likewise the individual urban centres within the provinces were subject to the same historical factors, many of which had a profound effect on the long-term level of human occupation in the cities and towns of the region. The 65 urban sites identified by the geographical sources for the area under study separate into three zones on the basis of their geographical location. These are:

a> The Mediterranean littoral, which remained intimately involved in the political and economic affairs of the eastern Mediterranean area as a whole.

b> The hill country of central Palestine including Galilee, the Marj ibn 'Amīr and the west Jordan Valley because of their close ties with hill country.
The highlands of East Jordan, incorporating the east bank of the Jordan Valley and Wādī 'Arabah. The eastern edge of this zone was defined by a line of towns on the Hajj route. It also includes the Jabal Ajlūn area, which because of its elevated position remained relatively isolated from the pervasive influence of the desert steppe and its inhabitants.

The incidence of urban growth and decay within the three zones can be attributed to the diversity in physical features, historical events and cultural conditions of each zone. As these developments were not bound by the administrative boundaries of the original ajnād, the following study into the urban framework of Early Islamic, 'Abbāsid and Fāṭimid ash-Shām is structured according to the three geographical zones outlined above.

The 65 urban sites named in seven geographical works of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th century are listed in tables 13-15 (pp. 290-92) according to the geographical zone to which they belong. In addition the sources usually contain sufficient information to evaluate the relative status of these centres. The major cities in each source are shown by a plus sign ("+") in the tables. This symbol represents a city or town that was a district or provincial capital in the works of the 3rd/9th century and, for the 4th/10th century, either rates a mention by Ibn Hawqal or is classified as a "city" (Ar. madinah) with a minbar in the main (i.e. Friday) mosque by
al-Maqdisī (tables 7-10, pp. 186-91). Secondary centres are shown by a "+2", representing sites which are solely mentioned in the more detailed transport route itineraries or are mentioned by al-Maqdisī as small towns without a Friday mosque. The third category records the omission of a site from the written sources, indicated in the tables by a minus sign ("- "). In many cases the failure of the Islamic geographers to mention a site can be attributed to their scholarly objectives or availability of information, however the repeated omission of a once important centre, for example Bayt Rās or Sūsiyāh (table 15 p. 292), is taken to indicate a substantial reduction in its position as a politically and economically important city. Using this material, the status of each urban site can be roughly assessed on a five-level scale: high, medium-high, medium, medium-low or low, and may reveal changes to the urban significance of a centre during the first four centuries of Islam.

For comparative purposes tables 13-15 also include information on the status of these settlements immediately before and after the periods under study. Their place in the Byzantine administrative hierarchy of the 6th century A.D. is extracted from Jones' definitive study on the cities of the Roman Empire (Jones 1971), while information on later times comes from Ziadeh (1953) for the Mamlūk Period and from Hutteroth and Abdul fattah (1977) for the region under Ottoman rule in the late 16th century A.D. Because of the complex nature of the information extracted from these disparate
sources symbols have been used in the tables, all of which are fully explained in the Key after table 15.

* iii> The Urban Centres of the Eastern Mediterranean Littoral (table 13).

The Arabic geographical works of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries identify a total of 22 major urban centres between Şūr in the north and Rafaḥ to the south on coastal Filastīn and al-Urdunn. Nine of these continue as major cities throughout the period, and in all but one case (ar-Ramlah) they had formerly held a similar position in Byzantine times. In fact the overriding impression gained from the sources is the continuity of settlement on the Mediterranean littoral after the Islamic Conquest, and a pattern of settlement distribution and urban occupancy in this zone which reflects the considerable value placed upon the eastern Mediterranean Sea by the successive Islamic governments of Damascus, Baghda and al-Fustāṭ.

The names of the coastal cities and towns found in the sources are listed in table 13 on page 290 (for locations see maps 3,4,7 & 8). These centres may be considered in two subgroups.

1) The seaports on the Mediterranean coast, comprising
six major cities and seven lesser towns (table 13.i).

2) The centres located on the coastal plain away from the shore of the Mediterranean (table 13.ii). Ar-Ramlah, the capital of Filasṭīn by 96/715 and at the crossroad of two major transport routes, held a clear political and economic superiority over the eight other sites identified for this group.

1) The Seaports of the Mediterranean Coast (Table 13.i).

The four geographical sources of the 3rd/9th century place six major cities at traditionally strategic points on the Mediterranean seaboard. In the north of the area under study was Šūr, the foremost naval base for ash-Shām in the late Umayyad and early 'Abbāsid periods (Ch. 2.v.12). To the south of Šūr came 'Akkā, then Qaysāriyah, Yāfā, 'Asqalān and finally Ghazzah located slightly inland on the far south coast. Each of these six cities was a former Byzantine municipality (table 13 p. 290, Byzantine Status), and went on to serve a similar administrative role within the jund of al-Urdunn or the jund of Filasṭīn after the Islamic Conquest. Their importance was maintained throughout the 3rd/9th century, as the sources dating to the latter part of the century -- especially the usually accurate al-Ya'qūbī -- list all six centres (table 13.i, sources 3 & 4). The same cities lead al-Maqdisī's description of the seaports of Filasṭīn and al-Urdunn towards the end of the 4th/10th century (table 13.i, source 7), which is in broad agreement with the earlier
accounts of Qudāmah and Ibn Ḥawqal (table 13.i, sources 5 & 6). Thus all seven of the 3rd-4th/9th-10th century geographical works record the early revival and continued importance of the seaboard cities during the Early Islamic, 'Abbāsid and Fātimid periods, a situation attributable to the political, military and commercial factors discussed earlier in this thesis (above Ch. 3.iv, 4.iv).

Located between these cities on the Mediterranean seaboard were seven secondary ports, most of which only find mention in the more detailed regional geographies of the 4th/10th century. Five out of the seven, namely Arsūf, Māḥūz Yubnā, Māḥūz Azdūd, Mīmās and Rafaḥ, were significant towns of Byzantine Palestine, as four of these were formerly municipalities (table 13.i, Byzantine Status) and Māḥūz Yubnā larger than its parent city. All five, except for Rafaḥ, do not appear in the concise accounts of 3rd/9th century sources, as these works were primarily interested in the administrative centres, post routes and revenues of the ajnād, in this case Filasṭīn (table 13.i, sources 1-4). The five centres appear as reasonably important seaports of Filasṭīn in the 4th/10th century geographies, and in particular Mīmās was large enough to have a Friday Mosque and thus was a madināh according to al-Maqdisī (table 13.i, source 7). In brief the sources reveal that although Arsūf, Māḥūz Azdūd, Mīmās and Rafaḥ did not retain their former administrative position after the Conquest, they along with Māḥūz Yubnā continued as significant secondary seaports on the coast of
Filasṭīn. The two other secondary seaports which first appear in the geographies of the 4th/10th century are al-Kanīsah and the still minor Ḥayfā (table 13.i, sources 6 & 7). Neither was a major centre in Byzantine and Early Islamic times.

As Ziadeh (1953:52-59) points out, the seaports of Filasṭīn and al-Urdunn languished only after the arrival and subsequent expulsion of the Crusaders and the destruction of their former coastal strongpoints by the Ayyubids and Mamlūks. The defences and harbours of Ṣūr, 'Akkā, Qaysāriyah, Arsūf, Yāfā, and 'Asqalān were left inoperable by Salāḥ ad-Dīn (564-89/1169-93), Baybars I (658-76/1260-1277) and al-Ashraf Khalīl (689-93/1290-94) in an attempt to prevent the Crusaders from reoccupying them (see table 13.i under "Mamlūk status"). Both Ghazzah and Rafaḥ were spared this fate. In particular Ghazzah, located a short way inland and thus not entirely reliant on its role as a Mediterranean port, subsequently grew into a major trading town on the road between ash-Shām and Egypt (Zaideh 1953:65-67).

The late 16th century A.D. Early Ottoman defters record limited resettlement of the demolished coastal cities (see table 13.i under "Late 16th C. Status"), which probably reflects the situation in latter Mamlūk times. Ṣūr and 'Akkā are reasonably sized villages, however Ḥayfā had experienced a higher relative gain in population. Further south Yāfā, 'Asqalān and Rafaḥ remained small but Ghazzah, a town of some 6,000 inhabitants, retained its primacy amongst the coastal centres of Palestine (Hutteroth and Abdulfattah 1977:52).
2) Settlements on the Coastal Plain (Table 13.ii).

The Arabic geographical sources identify a total of nine significant urban sites on the coastal plain in the first four centuries of Islam. The sources of the 3rd/9th century identify Ludd, ar-Ramlah and Yubnā as the primary cities of the coastal plain during the Umayyad and 'Abbāsid periods (table 13.ii p. 290, sources 1-4). Both Ludd and Yubnā were Byzantine municipalities although after the foundation of ar-Ramlah (before 96/715) these cities, and Ludd in particular, took second place to the new capital of Filastīn. This is clear from the 4th/10th century works of Qudāmah, Ibn Ḥawqal and particularly al-Maqdisī, in which both centres are either omitted or relegated to a minor position as towns on the highway and postal route (table 13.ii, sources 5-7). At the same time the northern town of Kabul, an ancient settlement in a fertile area, appears as a madinah in al-Maqdisī. Its omission from the sources of the previous century is due to the limited administrative objectives of these works and the brevity of the descriptions.

Of the five secondary sites on the coastal plain, only Qalansuwanah and Azdūd are mentioned by the 3rd/9th century sources, and in both cases as additional stations on the highway between Damascus and al-Fustāṭ (table 13.ii, sources 2 & 4). The more detailed works of the following century add Kafar Sābā and Kafar Sallām to the stops, as well as Ḍaqīr on the Ḥajj route from ar-Ramlah to Aylah (table 13.ii, sources 6 & 7). Although these settlements do not enter the geograph-
ies until this time, their enhanced position would date back to the post Conquest period with the institution of annual pilgrimage from the capital cities of ash-Shām and the setting up of the barīd (Ch. 5.iv.1). Furthermore Qudāmah (*219.17-18) mentions the presence of numerous (unnamed) villages between ar-Ramlah and Ghazzah, and much of the fertile coastal plain would have been similarly covered with other agricultural settlements whose names are not recorded by the sources.

After the turbulent Ayyūbid campaigns to expell the Crusaders from Palestine, the towns of the coastal plain fared better than their seaboard counterparts. Ar-Ramlah, after an initial setback, returned to its former prosperity during the subsequent Mamlūk and Early Ottoman times (Ziadeh 1953:64, Hutteroth and Abdulfattah 1977:86-88). Yūnāba and Azdūd also remained sizable "villages" into the late 16th century A.D., while the smaller population figures for Kābul, Qalansuwh, Kafar Sābā, and 'Aqīr still matched -- and often exceeded -- those of the nearby seaports (table 13.ii, under Late 16th C. Status).

3) Summary.

The sources summarized in table 13 reveal the predominant trends in the settlement history of the southern Eastern Mediterranean littoral during the first four centuries of the Islamic period, and in a general way the drastic changes brought about by the Crusader interlude in Palestine. A total
of 22 sites are identified for the coast of Filasṭīn and al-Urdunn, and of these 13 had been major and two lesser Byzantine centres. The seven other settlements were either new establishments or previously minor villages. Eight former Byzantine municipalities in this zone are not specifically mentioned by the geographical sources after the Islamic Conquest. The omission by the sources of Dora, Ono, Mauma of Ascalon/'Asqalān, Anhedon, Sycamazon, Bittylius, Menios of Saltus Constantiniaces and Antipatris can be largely attributed to the absence of details in their descriptions of Filasṭīn. Furthermore most of these municipalities were never major Byzantine centres (see Jones 1971:546-57), or had experienced a severe reversal of fortunes prior to the Conquest, as in the case of Dora (Isaac and Roll 1982:21). The various small towns around 'Asqalān and Ghazzah, which were the last to acquire municipal status in Roman/Byzantine times, are probably to be included amongst Qudāmah's villages in the area.

The sources of both the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th century confirm the continuing importance of the ports on the Mediterranean seaboard, but at the same time record a contraction by some of the towns on the coastal plain largely in response to the rapid growth of ar-Ramlah. After the expulsion of the Crusaders there is a clear reversal of this situation. Apart from Ghazzah, the coastal centres failed to recover from the "scorched earth" policy adopted by the Ayyūbid and Mamlūk armies, and in the later Mamlūk and early
Ottoman periods the primary centres of settlement on the south Mediterranean littoral were confined to Ghazzah and the inland sites on the coastal plain.

* 

iv> The Urban Centers of Central Palestine (Table 14).

Within an area bound by Qadas in the north, Ḥabrā in the south and the Jordan River to the east, the Arabic sources identify a total of 16 settlements (table 14 p. 291), six fewer than that for the littoral. The rougher terrain and overall isolated aspect of the Palestinian hill country would explain this difference (Baly 1974 Chs 14-16). Nine of these settlements, all former Byzantine municipalities, were major cities of the period, although by the end of the 3rd/9th century three of them had seen a severe contraction of their urban status. Thereafter the sources of the following century devote more space to the important religious sites of Filastīn.

The Islamic sites listed in table 14 are further divided on the basis of three subzones. These are:

1) The Galilean hills, encompassing two major cities, each with a considerable history, and two secondary towns (table 14.i).
2) The Central Palestinian Range centred on Biblical Judea and Samaria, with at first five but later three cities and two smaller towns.

3) Three major and two secondary settlements in the west Jordan Valley at the foot of these two elevated regions. The following analysis shows that the social and economic life of these sites was inextricably bound to events in the Palestinian hills during the period under study.

1) Settlements in the Galilean Hills (Table 14.i).

As is apparent from the geographical sources quoted in table 14 on p. 291, the traditional non-urban character of Galilee before the Islamic Conquest (Ch. 1.ii) continued without interruption thereafter. Even the region's two major centres of Qadas and Şaffûriyah lay on its eastern and southern edges respectively (map 4), and not in the elevated and isolated interior. Of these sites Qadas in upper Galilee was by far the more important, particularly as it functioned as a district capital in the 3rd/9th century and gets a favourable report by al-Maqdisī in the following century (table 14.i, sources 1-4, 7). In spite of its importance Ibn Ḥawqal managed to overlook this city (table 14.i, source 6), which indicates the unreliability of his account. Şaffûriyah appears as another major settlement, or at least as an administrative unit, in the 3rd/9th century works of al-Balādhurī and Ibn Khurradadhbih (table 14.i, sources 1&2). After that time it no longer appears in the record and particularly not
in al-Maqdisī. This omission by these later geographers probably reflects the contraction of Šaffūriyah from a reasonably sized population centre in the region to a local village, partly as a delayed response to the growth of Ṭabariyah after the Conquest.

The two Galilean villages of al-Jashsh and al-Farādhiyah are nominated by al-Maqdisī as the most prominent of the secondary sites in al-Urdunn during the 4th/10th century (table 8.ii, 14.i source 7). Al-Jashsh was an ancient settlement and in Byzantine times appears as the major centre in Tetracomia. Both villages lay on the major Islamic communication routes through the region, and served the additional function of local market centres in a fertile rural area occupied by a large number of other villages (see Chs 2.iv.4&5; 4.iii.3).

By Mamlūk times, there has been a clear change in the settlement of Galilee. Qadas was unable to recover its former position as the region's major urban centre after the expulsion of the Crusaders, and thereafter Šafad assumed this role (Cohen and Lewis 1978 index, Hutteroth and Abdul fattah 1977:52, 86; Ziadeh 1953:52, 54, 64). At the same time there was an improvement in the fortunes of Šaffūriyah, as by the late 16th century A.D. it had become one of the larger villages of Galilee. Al-Jashsh, now al-Jish, and al-Farādhiyah continued to be occupied at this time (Hutteroth and Abdul fattah 1977:188.M65, 176.P16, 177.P33).
2) The Cities and Towns of the Central Range
(Table 14.ii).

The geographical works of the 3rd/9th century identify five urban centres in the central Palestinian range. All five cities -- Sabasṭiyah, Nābulus, 'Amawās, Iliyā/Bayt al Maqdis, and Bayt Jibrīn -- were district capitals of Byzantine Palaestina Prima, an administrative position they continued to hold after the Islamic Conquest as part of the Filasṭīn junk (table 14.ii p. 291, see under "Byzantine Status" and sources 1-4). Although these five centres are listed by all four 3rd/9th century sources, only three are able to retain their former place in the following century (table 14.ii, sources 6&7). Sabasṭiyah is not mentioned by Ibn Ḥawqal nor, more significantly, by al-Maqdisī, while 'Amawās is only classified as a secondary town without a Friday Mosque in the work of al-Maqdisī. Ibn Ḥawqal also omits both 'Amawās and Bayt Jibrīn from his account of ash-Shām, although the latter appears as a major city and market centre for the surrounding villages in al-Maqdisī's al-Aqālīm. However between these two sources there is little doubt that Bayt al-Maqdis, Nābulus and Bayt Jibrīn were the three primary cities of the Central Range of Palestine in the 4th/10th century.

The exalted status enjoyed by Bayt al-Maqdis, which found expression in its religious edifices built by the Umayyads (see Ch. 2.iv.9), had a profound impact upon its prosperity. As the raison d'ètre of the city was substantially religious, and only by inference political, Jerusalem
emerged relatively unscathed from the dynastic struggles that brought about the rise of the 'Abbāsids. Thereafter the successive dynasties repaired and improved the Early Islamic religious monuments located within the Ḥaram area, and the city continued to draw pilgrims (Ch. 5.vi.3). During and after the Crusades, Bayt al-Maqdis became the subject of an extensive body of religious literature known as the ṣadaqā' al-Quds (Goitein 1966:141; 1980:331-32; Sellheim 1965:729).

The works of regional geography by Ibn Ḥawqal and al-Maqdisī also paid considerable attention to the holy sites of Ḥabrā and Bayt Laḥm, while Ibn Faqīḥ described Masjid Ibrāhīm (i.e. Ḥabrā) within the kūrah of Iliyā. The growth of these towns, especially Ḥabrā, during the first centuries of Islam is attributable to the presence of religious shrines within each and the concomitant benefits of pilgrimage and religious endowments to those places by the pious. In addition the lands around both and the commercial expertise of their peoples made a further contribution to the successful economies of these towns.

The character of settlement in the central Palestinian Range as revealed by the sources of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries continues without major interruption after the Crusader interlude. In Mamlūk times both Bayt al-Maqdis and Nābulus retained their importance, principally because of their religious and commercial roles respectively (Ziadeh 1953:67-69). This situation continued into the late 16th century A.D., as the contemporary Ottoman records show Al-
Quds (Jerusalem) and then Nablus (for Nābulus) as the main towns of the region (table 14.ii, under "Medieval and Late 16th C. Status")

3) Related Sites of the West Jordan Valley and the Marj Ibn 'Amīr (Table 14.iii).

Three major settlements are located by the sources of the 3rd/9th century along the western edge of the Jordan Valley adjacent to the Palestinian and Galilean foothills. All four sources list the notable urban centres of Ẓabariyyah and Baysān in the northern Valley (table 14.iii p. 291, source nos 1-4). Both settlements were significant municipalities in the Byzantine Period, although Baysān/Scythopolis, as the capital of Palaestina Secunda at the centre of an extensive road network, was at that time the more important of the two. However this situation was reversed after the Conquest with the appointment of Ẓabariyyah as capital of the jund of al-Urdunn, and the routing of the post-road through that city. South of Baysān, there was sparse occupation of the desolate western part of the Jordan Valley until the luxuriant oasis of Arīthā. This settlement is mentioned by name in the last two works of the 3rd/9th century and its district listed by Ibn Khurradādhbih, but appears as the junior partner of the two northern cities in the Ghawr as during the Byzantine Period (table 14.iii, Byzantine Status and sources 3&4).

The geographical works of the 4th/10th century (table
14.iii, sources 5-7) reveal few changes from the situation in the previous century. The descriptions by Ibn Hawqal and al-Maqdisī demonstrate the expanding prosperity of Ṣabariyah, although as already noted al-Maqdisī indicates that the people of Baysān continued to live in favourable circumstances (Ch. 4.iii.3, table 8 p. 189). In addition to the agricultural fertility of the area, Baysān also benefitted from passing traffic from Ṣabariyah on its way to Nābulus via the village of Ta'asīr (Ch. 4.v.1, vi.3, map 8). Also to gain from the improved position of Ṣabariyah was the secondary Jubb Yusuf, a stopping place on the road north from the city only mentioned in the more detailed writings of the 4th/10th century (table 12.1 p. 251). Finally the burgeoning economic role of ArThā in that century can be attributed to the growth of the market in Bayt al-Maqdis and its location on the transport routes to the flourishing trading centres of Zughar and Aylah and also the assembly point for the Hajj at 'Amman.

The cities of Ṣabariyah and Baysān failed to recover from the disruption brought about by the arrival and eventual expulsion of the Crusaders. Ṣabariyah was destroyed, and any possible return to its former prosperity made unlikely by the rise of nearby Safad (see above). Baysān, never an important Crusader centre, remained a small town in the Mamlūk Period. ArThā fared somewhat better, essentially because of its propinquity to the urban centre of Jerusalem (table 14.iii, Mamlūk Status). This situation continued into early Ottoman times, when all three settlements had small populations and
Arīthā rivaled Ṣabariyah for seniority (table 14.iii, Late 16th C. Status).

The cleft of the Marj ibn 'Amīr between Galilee and the central Palestinian hills was dominated by the town of al-Lajjun. Although demoted from its role as a district capital after the Conquest, the status of al-Lajjun was obviously buoyed up by the passing of the post-road (Ch. 2.v.5, 5.iv.2). Three of the geographical sources mention the town for this reason; only al-Maqdisī refers to al-Lajjun in its own right although he can say little about it (table 14.iii, sources 2, 4, 5&7). In Mamlūk and early Ottoman times al-Lajjun was responsible for the administration of the sparsely populated plain and surrounding lands, which may have guaranteed the continued occupation of the site (table 14.iii, Mamlūk and Late 16th C. Status).

4) Summary.

The concise presentation in table 14 of information from the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th geographical works has identified the major patterns of settlement in the Palestinian axial highlands and related lowlands. The sources name 17 places for this zone, ten of which were former Byzantine municipalities and five district villages. The other two sites, Jubb Yusuf and al-Farādhiyah, are unidentified in the pre-Islamic sources. Six minor Byzantine municipalities listed by Jones (1971:547) are not recorded in the Islamic descriptive geographies of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th century, although none of
these had been of major importance in the 6th century A.D. The three northern cities of Helenopolis, Gabae, and Nais /Nairn held small territories, and of these only the site of Nais has been positively identified (Avi-Yonah 1977:137-41). The three municipalities of Mampsis, Elusa, and Birosaba located in the southern steppe of Palestine were marginal settlements which experienced considerable growth in the Byzantine Period due to the resurgence of overland trade between Aylah and Ghazzah and associated military expenditure on garrisons and tributary Arabian tribes. The retention of the name Elusa in the form of al-Khalaṣah (Avi-Yonah 1976:54) suggests continued occupation of this town into the first century or two of Islam. In contrast Mampsis does not reappear in later records, and the modern unrelated name of Kurnub strongly implies that the site was near-deserted soon after, if not before, the Islamic Conquest. In the 4th/10th century, al-Maqdisī's itinerary of the road from Ghamr north-eastwards includes the geographical point of at-Tulayl, but makes no mention of a settlement after Ghamr in the vicinity of Mampsis (table 12.2 p. 251).

The written sources considered above demonstrate that there were a few notable changes in the pattern and density of major settlement in the Palestinian hill zone between the Conquest and the end of the 4th/10th century. The omission of Șaffūriyah from the sources after Ibn Khurraḍādhbih (272/885+6, table 14.i) -- especially by al-Ya'qūbī and al-Maqdisī -- may reflect the final stages of a severe contrac-
tion in the urban status of this centre. The same is also true for Sabastiyah in the first half of the 4th/10th century, as neither Ibn Ḥawqal nor the detailed al-Maqdisī mention this site (table 14.ii). However the appearance of these names in the early Ottoman defters (Hutteroth and Abdul fattah 1977:188, 129), and their persistence into modern times, argues against the complete abandonment of either settlement. The urban and political standing of 'Amawās endured a similar deterioration after the end of the 3rd/9th century, although its mention by al-Maqdisī indicates the presence of a reasonably sized village in the late 4th/10th century.

Apart from Şaffūriyah, Sabastiyah, and 'Amawās, the distribution of settlements in this zone during the first four centuries of Islam reflected the Byzantine pattern. At the same time however, the emergence of new economic and religious factors had a strong impact on the long term size and relative importance of these cities, and the changes they caused were already well underway with the appearance of the earliest geographical sources. In particular the prominence of Jerusalem, and the promotion of Ḥabrā and Bayt Laḥm, is explained by the sacred qualities ascribed to these cities and the accompanying benefits of pilgrimage (table 14.ii). In other cases, the sustained importance of centres such as Nābulus, Qadas, Ṭabariyah, Baysan, Bayt Jibrīn and Arīṯā is attributable to local economic factors, especially the expansion of the rural economy and the marketing of agricultural
produce in the major cities of southern ash-Shām and Egypt.

In the long term, neither ʻTabariyyah nor Qadas recovered from the destructive occupation and subsequent expulsion of the Crusaders and the resultant displacement of their populations, their place being taken by Șafad and the resurgent Șaffūriyyah. However the sacred towns of Nābulus, Jerusalem and a considerably enlarged ʻAbra quickly recovered to once again become the major urban centres of Mamlūk and Ottoman Palestine. The relatively large populations they housed and pilgrimage by the pious sustained a localized economic system and transport network that encompassed a number of subsidiary villages in the area. Arṭā and Bayt Jibrîn belong to this category, the latter as the foremost stop on the Jerusalem -- Ghazzah road.

* 

v> The Urban Centres of East Jordan (table 15).

The Arabic geographical sources place a total of 26 settlements to the east of the north-south axis of the Jordan Rift Valley. The four geographies of the 3rd/9th century collectively name 15 (or 16, if ʻUsbān was the chief city of Ṣāhir al-Balqā') major administrative centres or their districts in this zone, all of which served a similar administrative role in Byzantine times. However some of them only
appear in one or two of the sources, and al-Ya'qūbī does not mention four of the 15 sites (table 15 p. 292, source 3). Almost a century later al-Maqdisī omitted the same four places from his list of cities with a Friday Mosque as well as three more sites (table 15, source 7), which meant that he could account for just over half of the 15 major early 'Abbāsid settlements of East Jordan. Thus the sources disclose a perceivable shift in the nature of human settlement and economic activity in East Jordan during the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries, and leave little doubt that these changes were already underway with the appearance of the earliest surviving geographical works on the Islamic World.

As with both of the previous zones, the settlements of East Jordan can be divided into geographical subgroups. Two such divisions are recognizable for this zone.

1) The eastern Jordan Valley and Wādī 'Arabah, incorporating five major towns and one secondary site between Bāniyās and Aylah (table 15.1 p. 292). The location of these settlements at the foot or on the lower scarp of the eastern highlands had a significant impact on their social and economic well being, as was the case with the towns on the other side of the Valley.

2) Sites of the East Jordan Range and dissected plateau around the Wādī Yarmūk in the highlands to the east of the Jordan Rift. This area contained ten major towns and ten minor settlements, including the five towns on the Darb al-Hajj in the eastern steppe country.
appear in one or two of the sources, and al-Ya'qūbī does not mention four of the 15 sites (table 15 p. 292, source 3). Almost a century later al-Maqdisī omitted the same four places from his list of cities with a Friday Mosque as well as three more sites (table 15, source 7), which meant that he could account for just over half of the 15 major early 'Abbāsid settlements of East Jordan. Thus the sources disclose a perceivable shift in the nature of human settlement and economic activity in East Jordan during the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries, and leave little doubt that these changes were already underway with the appearance of the earliest surviving geographical works on the Islamic World.

As with both of the previous zones, the settlements of East Jordan can be divided into geographical subgroups. Two such divisions are recognizable for this zone.

1) The eastern Jordan Valley and Wādī 'Arabah, incorporating five major towns and one secondary site between Bāniyās and Aylah (table 15.i p. 292). The location of these settlements at the foot or on the lower scarp of the eastern highlands had a significant impact on their social and economic well being, as was the case with the towns on the other side of the Valley.

2) Sites of the East Jordan Range and dissected plateau around the Wādī Yarmūk in the highlands to the east of the Jordan Rift. This area contained ten major towns and ten minor settlements, including the five towns on the Darb al-Ḥāji in the eastern steppe country.
1) Settlements on the Eastern Bank of the Jordan Rift (Table 15.i).

In the 3rd/9th century the sources identify five towns of consequence at the foot or on the lower scarp of the eastern highlands. Three of these were on the east bank of the Jordan River, while the other two lay in the Wādī 'Arabah to the south of the Dead Sea.

North of the Yarmūk River were Bāniyās and Sūsiyāh, the former set midway on the Dimashq -- Šūr route (table 12.4 p. 252) in the midst of a rich agricultural area near the Ḥūlalah lake. While Bāniyās enjoyed continued prosperity during this and the following centuries, Sūsiyāh's status as an important town of the area was eclipsed by emergent Afīq located a short distance to the east at the head of the strategic wādī of the same name. Sūsiyāh appears in the first two works of the 3rd/9th century (table 15.i p. 292, sources 1&2), but is omitted by all the sources from al-Ya'qūbī onwards after its amalgamation with the Jawlān district (table 15.i, sources 3-7, Ch. 2.v.9). Considering the greater reliance of these earlier works on often outdated government documents, rather than contemporary observations, the administrative and urban contraction of Sūsiyāh probably dates from the earlier part of the 3rd/9th century.

Between the Yarmūk and the Dead Sea was one major Islamic site, that of Fiḥl on the lower slopes of the eastern Jordan scarp. This town is mentioned by all four 3rd/9th century sources (table 15.i, sources 1-4), but its omission
by Ibn Hawqal and especially al-Maqdisī in the following century indicates a progressive weakening of its urban status particularly during the 'Abbāsid Period (table 15.1, sources 6&7).

In contrast to the situation in the north as outlined above, the towns of the eastern Wādī 'Arabah experienced a relative economic boom during the later 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries in spite of the hostile terrain in which they were situated. Zughar appears as a centre of some note in al-Ya'qūbī's geography, and thereafter is a prominent feature in the works of the 4th/10th century (table 15.1, sources 7&8). As Zughar was also a prominent site in the 6th century A.D., its omission by the earlier Islamic sources is attributable to the limited aims of their authors (table 15.1, sources 1-2). Further south the town of Aylah at the head of the Red Sea's eastern arm benefitted from both pilgrimage and trade during the Islamic Period. The port is mentioned by all seven geographical sources (table 15.1), and both al-Ya'qūbī and al-Maqdisī (table 7) report on the cosmopolitan nature of the town due to the presence of merchants and the passage of Egyptian, North African and Syrian pilgrims to and from the Ḥijāz.

In addition to the five towns noted above, al-Maqdisī mentions one minor settlement for this area, namely the transit point of Bayt ar-Rām on the Bayt al-Maqdas -- 'Ammān road (table 12.3 p. 252). Bayt al-Rām is to be identified with the site of Bethramtha or Livia, modern Tell ar-Ramah.
(Avi-Yonah 1976:75, Wilkinson 1977:164), and probably retained its appeal to travellers crossing to 'Ammān in Islamic times because of its hot baths and produce.

The towns of Bāniyās and Aylah at either end of the Jordan Rift carried their importance into later times, although on a reduced scale (table 15.i, Mamlūk Status). The population centre of Damascus was supplied with imported goods from the Mediterranean and Red seas through Șūr and Aylah, but the rise of Mamlūk Egypt diverted much of this trade away from Aylah (Ziadeh 1953:58). Ziadeh suggests that Zughar was never a town of any consequence in al-Maqdisī's time, and shrunk further into a small village after the expulsion of the Crusaders (Ziadeh 1953:52-3 quoting Yāqūt, 59-60). However the omission of this settlement from the late 16th century Ottoman daftars, and the appearance of Șāfiyyah in its place (Hutteroth and Abdulfattah 1977:172.M22), suggests that the site was deserted for a reasonable period prior to reoccupation of the area sometime during the Mamlūk Period.

2) Settlement in the Eastern Highlands (table 15.ii).

The description of the administrative organization and post-road itinerary of south ash-Shām by the written sources of the 3rd/9th century realize ten major and seven secondary settled communities in the elevated lands to the east of the Jordan Rift Valley. These centres form into three groups, with the sites in each sharing a common settlement history,
economic purpose and, in some cases, political function. The three groups are:

a> the five post-road villages of the plateau region north of the Wādī Yarmūk,

b> four towns located in the axial highlands between the Yarmūk and Zarqā' rivers, all of which fail to appear in the sources of the 4th/10th century,

c> six towns and a village located on the eastern fringe of the highlands zone or in the south along or near the Darb al-Hajj. The works of the 4th/10th century add four other villages to this group, two of which are identified as intermediary stops on the Pilgrim route.

a> Villages of al-Jawlān and al-Bathaniyah.

As in the earlier Roman/Byzantine Period, the settlement of al-Jawlān and al-Bathaniyah north of the Wādī Yarmūk was restricted to smaller villages after the Conquest (Ch 1 ii). The more important villages in this area were located on or near the highway and postal road between Damascus and Ṭabarānīyāh. The geographical works identify five of these villages, namely al-Kuswah, Jāsim, Dayr Ayyūb/Nawā, Khisfīn and AfĪq (table 15 ii sources 2-7 p. 292, Ch. 5 vi.1), although smaller settlements would have existed around the eight unnamed post-stations on the way and along the northern route across the Jawlān (table 11 p. 249, Ch. 5 vii.1). The sources of the 3rd/9th century single out AfĪq as the chief village of the five, with al-Balāḏūrī going so far as to list it amongst
the conquered cities of al-Urdunn (table 4 p. 133). In the next century Aftq had to share this honour with Nawā, after the latter developed into the main centre of al-Bathaniyah. However neither site was classified as a madinah by al-Maqdisī, emphasizing the continued rural character of al-Jawlān and al-Bathaniyah.

b> Towns of northern East Jordan.

Ibn Khurraḍādhbih presents the four district capitals of Jadar, Ābil, Bayt Rās and Jarash in northern East Jordan as performing a crucial administrative function in the early 'Abbāsid government of al-Urdunn (table 15.ii, source 2). This would suggest that the occupation of these urban centres continued at a reasonable scale after the Islamic Conquest, although the other sources from both centuries indicate a steady contraction of the central highland sites during the 2nd/8th and 3rd/9th centuries, but not their total depopulation and abandonment.

A notable deterioration in the level of urban settlement in this area appears to have taken place during the 3rd/9th century, a time of considerable unrest amongst the rural populations of south ash-Shām especially during the Caliphate of al-Mu'taṣim (218-227/833-842, Hitti 1951:540-44, Salibi 1977:37-42). The district towns of Bayt Rās, Jadar and Ābil were particularly effected, as none of them see out the end of the century. The last two are overlooked by al-Balādhurī (table 15.ii, source 1), and his mention of Bayt Rās may result from its fame as both a wine producer and the resi-
dence of the Caliph Yazīd II (Sourdel-Thomine 1960a:1149). All three towns are excluded by al-Ya'qūbī (table 15.ii, source 3), who instead mentions the as-Sawād district of al-Urdunn, a general geographical term for rural lands under cultivation (Ch. 2.v). Thereafter Bayt Rās, Jadar and Ābil are unknown in the works of descriptive geography on Islamic ash-Shām (table 15.ii, sources 4-7).

The urban contraction of Jarash proceeded at a slower rate. The writings of al-Ya'qūbī and Ibn Faqīh suggest that Jarash retained a modicum of regional importance until at least the end of the 3rd/9th century (table 15.ii, sources 3&4), which in part is a reflection and continuation of this town's pre-Islamic primacy in the area (Ch. 2.v.5). However by al-Maqdisī's time it seems as though Jarash was only one of many villages in the fertile rural lands between the Yarmūk and Zarqā' rivers.

The early Ottoman sources give some indication of the level of occupation in northern East Jordan after the 3rd/9th century (table 15.ii, Late 16th C. Status). Villages with the names of Jarash and Bayt Rās are registered in the defters, indicating a fairly continuous occupational history. However the names of Ābil and Jadar fail to appear in the tax lists, although the village at the latter site is now called Mkīs (Hutteroth and Abdulfattah 1977:202.MZ55). The omission of these names implies the abandonment of these settlements for an extended period after the 4th/10th century, during which time their Early Islamic names were forgotten.
c> The towns in the east and south.

The prolonged occupation of the six major and five secondary settlements along the eastern edge and in the south of the East Jordan highlands is attributable to their location on or near the path of the Darb al-Hajj, and the commercial benefits they obtained from both the passage of pilgrims and state expenditure on the organization and maintenance of the route (Ch. 5.v.2). However two other factors made their contribution to the economic well-being of these towns. Firstly the six major settlements of Adhri'āt, Buṣrā, 'Ammān, Ma'āb, 'Aranda' and Adhruḥ were district capitals of the Dimashq jund in the 3rd/9th century (Ch. 2.vi), and thus acted as the economic and political centre of their territories. Secondly the later loss of this administrative function, which brought to a conclusion the demise of the northern towns in East Jordan (above), was offset by the revival of the overland trade routes to Arabia in the 4th/10th century and the conveyance of goods to Damascus (Ch. 3.iv).

The four towns of Adhri'āt, Buṣrā, 'Ammān and Adhruḥ, or their districts, are mentioned by all of the geographical sources. In the Umayyad and early 'Abbāsid period each town was charged with the administration of a large territory (table 15.ii, sources 1-4, Ch. 2.vi.2&3), which in the case of Adhruḥ included the village of al-Ḥumaymah, the birthplace of the successful 'Abbāsid plot against the Umayyads. Hitti (1970:283) explains the choice of this spot by noting its proximity to the Darb al-Hajj. All four towns remained the
principal political and economic centre of their districts during the 4th/10th century (table 15.ii, sources 6&7, Ch. 3.iii.1&4). The key role played by 'Ammān in the movement of peoples and goods to the north and south of East Jordan along the Pilgrim Route has already been discussed (Ch. 4.v.2).

Ma'āb and 'Aranda! in the heart of the southern highlands are listed as either towns or districts by the four earliest 'Abbasid sources (table 15.ii, sources 1-4), but are less prominent in the regional geographies of the 4th/10th century. Ma'āb midway on the Zughar -- 'Ammān road is mentioned by al-Maqdisī although he pays greater attention to its produce and many villages, one of which was Mu'tah (table 15.ii source 7). The situation with 'Aranda! and the Jibāl district is more complex. Ibn Ḥawqal follows al-Iṣṭakhrī by nominating the nearby site of Ruwāth as the principal city of Jibāl (table 6.i p. 184), while al-Maqdisī ignores the district altogether. This would suggest that the demise of 'Aranda! as a centre of any note took place in the late 3rd/9th or early 4th/10th century, during which time the infiltration of the Beduin into the whole southern region became a recognized problem (Ch. 4.i).

The passing of the Darb al-Hajj promoted the interests of two other settlements on the eastern fringe of the highlands during the Islamic Period. Zarqa' to the northeast of 'Ammān is mentioned by al-Maqdisī in his itinerary of the Zughar -- Damascus route through Ma'āb and 'Ammān (table 12.4
p. 252), indicating the additional contribution of trade to the economy of this village. Mu'ān to the southeast of Adhruḥ appears in al-Maqdisī's account of the western Ḥajj route dating to Umayyad times (Ch. 4.v.2). The development of Mu'ān into a service town for the pilgrims in transit to the Ḥijāz would, by inference, date to this time, and is a partial explanation for the continued relevance of the road between Ḥabrā and Mu'ān via Zughar and Adhruḥ.

3) Summary and Conclusions.

The urban settlement of East Jordan as depicted in the geographical sources sees a progressive reduction in the number of major towns in the region during the first four Islamic centuries. For example only three of Ibn Khurradadhbih's eight or nine city-districts in the eastern highlands south of the Wādī Yarmūk are specifically mentioned as madinah by al-Maqdisī (table 15.ii). However the urban and parallel economic reorientation of the region began prior to the Islamic Conquest, particularly south of the Wādī Mūjib. For instance Bitarus, modern al-Lajjūn, was abandoned by the mid 6th century A.D. (Parker 1986:58-74).

The primary cause of the change to Byzantine settlement south of the Wādī Mūjib was economic. During the the late 5th and 6th century A.D. the Byzantine government withdrew its troops and subsidies from the fortified Arabian frontier in Palaestina Tertia, resulting in the widespread abandonment of forts, watchstations and associated settlements (Parker
The southeastern frontier was particularly effected, as after the Sassanid occupation of 614-628 no regular garrison was stationed south of the line of forts along the Arabia -- Palaestina Tertia border of the Wādī Mujib (Parker 1986:154). The absence of a Byzantine military presence in Palaestina Tertia after 628 A.D. reflected the low level of government involvement in this province, and by this time the towns and villages of the region served the local needs of an agricultural population. Thus the first major changes to the urban structure of East Jordan took place during the last years of Byzantine rule in the region, although after the Conquest this downward trend was probably arrested by the region's proximity to the Ḥijāz and the passage of pilgrims along the Darb al-Hajj.

The earlier 'Abbāsid works of geography indicate that the urban centres of northern East Jordan were overshadowed by their larger neighbours of 'Ammān and Adhri'āt during the latter half of the 3rd/9th century. No longer performing any administrative function, Ābil, Jadar and Bayt Rās disappear from the sources by the last quarter of the century, while Fiḥl and Jarash followed suit at the beginning of the next century. It would be unduly apologetic to explain al-Maqdisī's omission of all five sites as just an oversight; rather the reduction of these settlements to sizable villages of Jabal Jarash is probably to be explained by the political and economic reorientation of 'Ammān and the lands south of it with Damascus in the first two centuries of Islam, and the
impact this had on communication routes in the region.

In different parts of this thesis particular stress has been placed on the close political and economic relationship between 'Ammān and Damascus during Umayyad, 'Abbāsid and Fāṭimid times. For instance it was shown that all of the towns and districts south of 'Ammān in East Jordan formed an integral part of the Dimashq jund well into the 3rd/9th century (Ch. 2.vi), and that the three bādiyah post-roads from the Ḥijāz converged at 'Ammān before continuing along a single path to Damascus (Ch. 5.v.2). The growing economic reliance of 'Ammān on its larger neighbour to the north was reflected in the contemporary coinage (Ch. 3.iii), as Damascus offered 'Ammān a large market for its primary produce. In short this new administrative and financial arrangement restored the urban basis of 'Ammān after the Conquest, and it quickly grew into the most important town in East Jordan south of the Wādī Zarqā'.

While 'Ammān prospered, these changes left a distinctly negative imprint on the urban history of five towns to the northwest. Following the administrative reorganization of ash-Shām after the Conquest, the towns of Jarash, Fiḥl, Bayt Rās, Ābil and Jadār found themselves politically and economically separated from the other centres of East Jordan; an isolation that, as the coins from Jarash show, resulted in their greater economic involvement with Ṭabariyah. The subsequent reduction in the movement of people and commercial goods on the overland routes from 'Ammān through Jarash and
Fiḥl, and from Buṣrā and Adhriʿāt through Bayt Rās and Jadar, had a gradual impact on the level of urbanization in each town. At first the economic effects of the change in routes was ameliorated by the continued role of these centres in the administration and economy of their districts. This resulted in an uneven rate of urban contraction, as the towns of the two larger districts of Jarash and Fiḥl found support in a stronger local economy, and would have still benefitted from the reduced shipment of merchandise to Baysān, Ṭabarīyah and perhaps out to Ṭakkā along the old trade route. However the urban status of Jarash and Fiḥl was probably further undermined by the widespread social unrest that characterized the later part of the 3rd/9th century. By al-Maqdisī's time Jabal Jarash was a fertile region inhabited by numerous villages which relied upon Adhriʿāt as its major urban centre.

The sources are silent as to the destination of the former urban populations of northern East Jordan. During the Umayyad Period plague (Dols 1974), earthquakes (Amiran 1951, Russell 1985) and migration (Ar. hijrah) by the earliest converts to Islam to the large politically important cities (Bulliet 1979:53-57) would have been a particularly lethal mixture for the communities in the area. However these explanations do not account for the situation in the following ʿAbbāsid Period, during which time as ash-Shām experienced a sizable net population increase on the back of a "Medieval green revolution" (Ashtor 1976:90-92; Issawi 1981:381, 385; Watson 1981), and conversion no longer required migration to
an Islamic city. Instead the economic isolation of northern East Jordan, which dated from the Umayyad Period, would have further undermined the lucrative trading, service and manufacturing industries of the region, encouraging either a return to the land or reallocation in the growth cities of the coast or in the market and manufacturing centres led by ar-Ramlah, Damascus and Tabariyah.

* * *

* * *
TABLE 13.
Urban Centres of the East Mediterranean Littoral South of Şur
Between the 1st/7th and 4th/10th Centuries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Centre</th>
<th>Byz.</th>
<th>Arabic Sources</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i&gt; Seaports of the Mediterranean Coast.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şur</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + +</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Akka</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + +</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfah</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>− − − − − − − +2</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Kanīsah</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>− − − − − − +2 +2</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qaysariyah</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + +</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arṣūf</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>− +2 − − + + +2</td>
<td>L&gt;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yafā</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + +</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māçu Yubna</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>− − − − − − +2</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Māçu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>− − − − − +2 +2</td>
<td>M/L&gt;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Asqalān</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + +</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghazziyah</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + +</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīmās</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>− − − − − − +2</td>
<td>M/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafāḥ</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + +2 +2 +2 +2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii> Settlements on the Coastal Plain.

| Kābul             | +2   | − − − − − − + + | L>M    | V      | V:64   |
| Qalansuwah        | −    | − +2 +2 +2 +2 −2| L>M    | −      | V:29   |
| Kafar Sābā        | −    | − − − − +2 +2 | L      | −      | V:42   |
| Kafar Sallām      | ?    | − − − − − − +2 | L      | −      | −      |
| Ludd              | +    | ++ + + + + −2   | H>M/L  | −      | V:498  |
| AR-Ramlah         | +    | ++ + + + + + + | O>H    | ST>T+  | T:308  |
| 'Aqīr             | +2   | − − − − − − +2 | L      | −      | V:31   |
| Yūnkh             | +    | + + + + − − +2 | M/H>M/L| V      | V:129  |
| Azdūd             | +    | − +2 − − +2 +2 | M/L    | −      | V:314  |

KEY: See fold-out after table 15.
TABLE 14.
The Urban Centres of Inland Filastīn and al-Urdunn West of the Jordan River between the 1st/7th and 4th/10th Centuries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Centre</th>
<th>Byz.</th>
<th>Arabic Sources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>E. Isl.</th>
<th>Mamlūk</th>
<th>Late 16th C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i&gt; Settlements in the Galilean Hills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QADAS</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>V:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Jashsh</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- +2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V:91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Farādhiyah</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- +2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŞAFFURIYAH</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + - -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M/H&gt;L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V:400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii&gt; The Cities and Towns of the Central Range.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SABAS̲T̲IYAH</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M/H&gt;L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MĀBULUS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>M/H&gt;H</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td>T:859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta‘āsIr</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- +2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>V:48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘AMAWĀS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>- +2</td>
<td>H&gt;L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILIYAH/BAYT AL-MAQDIS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>Rlg</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td>T:1406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYT Laḥm</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>- - - +</td>
<td>+ +2</td>
<td>Rlg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V:287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥabrā</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>- +2 - +</td>
<td>+ +2</td>
<td>Rlg</td>
<td>T+</td>
<td>T:725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYT JIBRĪN</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>V:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii&gt; Related Sites of the West Jordan Valley and the Marj lbn ‘Amr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubb Yusuf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>+2 - +2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABARIYAH</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>V:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Lajjūn</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>- +2 - +2</td>
<td>+2 - +</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>V:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSAN</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>+2 + +</td>
<td>H&gt;M/H</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>V:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArThā</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>- - + +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>M/L&gt;M</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>V:51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:** See fold-out after table 15.
### TABLE 15.

Urban Centres of East Jordan Between the 1st/7th and 4th/10th Centuries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Centre</th>
<th>Byz. Status</th>
<th>Arabic Sources Status</th>
<th>E. Isl. Value</th>
<th>Mamluk Value</th>
<th>Late 16th Cent. Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Centre</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bāniyās</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Rg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sūsīyah</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fīḥl</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bayt ar-Rām</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zughar</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ayllah</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlements on the Eastern Bank of the Jordan Rift.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Al-Kusawah</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jāsim</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dayr Ayyūb</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>/Nawā</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Khīṣfīn</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aṭīq</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adhrī'at</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Rg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buṣrā</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Rg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ṭabil</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jadara</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bayt Rās</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jarash</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zarqa</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'Ammān</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ma'āb</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mu‘ṭah</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'Arandal</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Rg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ruwaθ</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adhrūh</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Rg</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Rg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mu‘ān</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Al-Humaymah</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:** See fold-out after this table.
**KEY FOR TABLES 13-15.**

- \(\dagger\) = Byzantine municipality; \(\dagger 2\) = Secondary town;
- \(\_\) = Not mentioned or unknown.

**B)** Islamic Sources (see Introduction for biographical details).
1) Al-Baladhurī, 255/869 (see tables 1, 3 & 5).
2) Ibn Khurradadhbih, 272/885 (tables 1, 3, 5 & 11).
3) Al-Ya‘qūbī, 278/891 (tables 1, 3, 5 & 11).
4) Ibn Faqīh, 290/903 (tables 1 & 3 & 5).
5) Qudāmah, 316/928 (tables 11 & 12, also Ch. 4.11).
7) Al-Maqdisī, 375/985 (tables 7-12).

Status: \(\dagger\) = Major city; \(\dagger 2\) = Secondary town; \(Rg\) = Region listed, but not its principal city; \(\_\) = Not mentioned; \(?\) = Uncertain or unclear; (blank) = Source does not cover the area concerned.

**C)** Status in the earlier Islamic periods (discussed in Ch. 6.iv).
- \(H\) = High; \(M\) = Medium; \(L\) = Low; \(O\) = Insignificant; \(?\) = Unclear;
- \(\geq\) = Changing to...; \(Rg\) = function primarily religious.

**D)** Mamlūk Status (after Ziadeh 1953:52-54).
- \(D\) = Destroyed due to Crusader interlude; \(V\) = Village;
- \(A\) = Administrative centre; \(ST\) = Small Town; \(T\) = Town which persisted or increased in size.

**E)** Late 16th Century A.D. Status (from Ottoman tax lists in Hutteroth and Abdulfattah 1977).
- \(T\) = Town with census no. of adult males; \(V\) = Village with census no. of adult males; \(Mj\) = Settlement on the Ḥajj road from Damascus;
- \(\_\) = Not recorded in the tax lists; abandoned; (blank) = Source does not cover the site concerned.

**F)** Comments.
1> Site names in capitals represent major centres of the earlier Islamic periods as identified in the accompanying commentary (Ch. 6.iii-v).
2> Ordering of sites within groups is geographical.
GAZETTEER:
The Principal Islamic Sites of South ash-Shām from the
First/Seventh to Fourth/Tenth Centuries.

Introduction.

The aim of this gazetteer is to review the features of the 65 cities, towns and villages of southern ash-Shām described in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th century Arabic sources on the geography of the Islamic World (listed in tables 13-15). It provides an index of names, a synopsis of each site's occupational history, and references to the main written sources used in this thesis.

The sites are arranged according to the Latin alphabet and are identified by the names preserved in the geographical sources. Up to three other names are also given for each site. These are:

1) an alternative spelling or name as used by the Arabic sources, cross-indexed where necessary;
2) the Roman/Byzantine name, with information on its Byzantine provincial affiliation and status;
3) modern names when clearly different from the original.
The ensuing statement on the status and settlement history of each site is based upon the information provided by the geographical works and analysed in chapters 2 and 4-6. Reference is made to both chapter locations and individual sources when relevant and in some cases archaeological research is included in these summaries, however it is not the intention of this gazetteer to provide a detailed survey of Islamic archaeological sites in the region. Pringle (1981) has produced a preliminary study, although this already requires updating, while more recently Homes-Fredericq and Hennessy (1986) have published an extensive bibliography for East Jordan covering all archaeological periods.

The format used for each entry is as follows:

**EARLY ISLAMIC NAME** [ALTERNATIVE NAME] Palestine grid ref.

**BYZANTINE NAME** (Provincial status) Modern name

Statement on the status and settlement of each site as revealed by the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th century geographical works and expanded, where appropriate, by archaeological evidence.

Reference(s) to the Arabic sources.

The following additional abbreviations are used in the gazetteer:

P.I = Palaestina Prima, P.II = Palaestina Secunda,
P.III = Palaestina Tertia, Ph = Phoenice, Ar = Arabia,
Isr = Israeli.
AAbil

ABILA (P.II/4) Quwaylībah

Administrative centre and district on the eastern limits of the jund of al-Urdunn. Does not appear in the other sources, although probably included within al-Ya'qūbT's non-specific as-Sawād region of al-Urdunn (Ch. 2.iv).
I.Kh.*78.10.

ADHRUḤ  

ADRAA (Ar/3) Dera'ā

Chief city of the al-Bathaniyah district in the jund of Dimashq until c. mid-4th/10th century (Ch. 2.v.1), after which it was closely associated with the rural Jabal Jarash region of al-Urdunn (Ch. 4.iii.3). Probably equivalent to the Dhat al-Manāzil on the Pilgrim route (Ch. 5.v.2b).

Bal.*126.9-12; I.Kh.*77.6; Ya'q.113/*326.8; I.F. *105.4; Išt.*67.3; I.H.*187.6; Maq.*154.17, *162.4, *192.12-13, *186.13.

ADHRUḤ  

ADRU/AUGUSTOPOLIS? (P.III/2) Udhrūḥ

District centre of ash-Sharāt, a mountainous region in the south of East Jordan, within the jund of Dimashq (Ch. 2.v.6). By the time al-Iṣṭakhrī wrote, Adhrūḥ with ash-Sharāt had been joined to Filastīn (Ch. 4.ii.1). Al-Maqqdisī considered Adhrūḥ part of a larger kūrah of ash-Sharāt which had Zughār as the chief city (Ch. 4.iii.2).

AFTQ 216.242

APHECA (in Hippos)  F†q

Although mentioned as a city of al-Urdunn by al-Balādhurī, AFTq was probably administered as part of the Susiyah district (see Ch.2.iv and below under Susiyah). The continued importance of AFTq stemmed from its strategic location on the Damascus -- Tabariyah section of the highway between Damascus and al-Fustat (Ch. 5.v.1).

Bal.*116.19; I.Kh.*78.4; Ya'q.115/327.13; Qud.*219.11;
Išt.*66.17; I.H.*187.1; Maq.*190.14.

'AKKĀ 155.259

PTOLEMAIS (Ph/2)

A fortified seaport and chief city of a district in the jund of al-Urdunn (Ch. 2.iv.3). The Arab fleet was stationed in 'Akkā until the Caliph Hishām moved it to Šur, after which Šur dominated coastal al-Urdunn. The harbour of 'Akkā was fortified under Aḥmad ibn Tūlūn and was a populous city in the 4th/10th century (Maq., Ch. 4.iii.2). Located on the coastroad between Šur and Qaysāriyah, and the start of an inland route with Ṭabarīyah as its terminus (Ch. 5.vi.1&4).

Bal.*116.22, *143.7; I.Kh.*78.11; Ya'q.115/327.21;
I.F.*116.16; Qud.*255.10; Išt.*66.17; I.H.*187.2;
Maq.*154.16, *162.11-*163.13, *191 n.'h'.

'AMAWĀS 149.138

NICOPOLIS (P.1/6) 'Imwās

An important town of Filastīn during and immediately after the Conquest, during which time it may have served as the provisional capital before Ludd (Ch. 2.iii.11). The
plague of 17-18/638-39 supposedly began here. Thereafter 'Amawās was the chief city of a district with the same name, but relegated to a secondary position by al-Maqdisī. On the ar-Ramlah -- Iliyā road (Ch. 4.vi.2).

Bal.*138.12, *139.18-*140.5; I.Kh.*79.2;
Ya'q.116/328.15; I.F.*103.1; Maq.*176.23-*177.1.

'AMMĀN  238.151

PHILADELPHIA (Ar/9)

Chief city of the Aqd al-Balqā', an area subdivided into three administrative districts (I.Kh., I.F.), located between the Zarqā' and Mūjib rivers. 'Ammān and all al-Balqā' belonged to the jund of Dimashq until the early 4th/10th century (Chs 2.v.3, 3.ii&iv), when it was transferred to Filastīn (Ch. 4.ii.1, iii.1&iv). 'Ammān developed into the major town of East Jordan south of the Wādī Yarmūk during the first four centuries of Islam, in part due to its role as an assembly point on the Darb al-Hajj (Ch. 5.v.2; 6.v.2c).

Bal.*126.12-14; I.Kh.*77.7-8; Ya'q.113/326.9;
I.F.*105.5-6; Iṣṭ.*64.11, *66.14; I.H.*186.19;
Maq.*155.2, *175.3-*176.15, *180.16, *186.13, *192.9-11,
*250.9-10.

'ĀQIR  133.141

ACCARON? (in Azotus) Qiryat Eqron (Isr)

A large village located in Filastīn on the Pilgrim road from ar-Ramlah to Aylah (Ch. 5.vi.2).

Maq.*176.21-22.
'ARANDAL

ARINDELA (P.III/3) Kh. Gharandal

Chief city of the Jibāl district in the jund of Dimashq (Ch. 2.v.5; 6.v.2c). Both al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal put Jibāl under the administration of Filastīn, and replace 'Arandal with Ruwāth (Ch. 4.ii.1). Neither these towns nor the region are mentioned by al-Maqdisī.

Bal.*126.16; I.Kh.*77.7-8; Ya'q.114/*326.11; I.F.*105.5.

ARTHA

[ARTHĀ] 192.140

JERICHO (P.I/27)

RĪTĀ

The main town of the lower Ghawr between Baysān and the Dead Sea. ArThā and the Ghawr formed part of the jund of Dimashq until the early 4th/10th century, when it was incorporated into Filastīn (Iṣṭ./I.H., Ch. 4.ii.1). The town was noted for its fruits, flowers and indigo (Ch. 4.iii.1), and was at the junction of the Iliyā -- 'Ammān and Zughar -- Nābulus roads (Chs 5.vi.3&4, 6.iv.3).


ARSUF

131.178

SOZUSA/APOLLONIA (P.I/19)

Small but flourishing coastal town of Filastīn 17 kms north of Yāfā, listed by Qudāmah as a seaport of the jund of Filastīn, and a madinah with a ribāṭ in al-Maqdisī's time. A stop on the Mediterranean coast road and with its own road to ar-Ramlah (Ch. 5.vi.2&4).
'ASQALĀN

ASCALON (P.I/24)

Major seaport and administrative centre on the south coast of the jund of Filastīn. Fortified and garrisoned from the earliest days of Islam (Bal.), prominent in the 3rd/9th century and becoming particularly important after the rise of the Egyptian dynasties (Chs 2.iii.6, 6.iii.1). The city had a ribāṭ and is described by al-Maqdisī as having a fine mosque, busy markets and prosperous industries, particularly silk. Seaborne trade played an important role in the economy of Fāṭimid 'Asqalān (Ch. 2.iii.6).

AYLAH

AYLAH (P.III/11)

AELA (P.III/11) Al-'Aqabah

A port on the eastern arm of the Red Sea governed from Egypt until the early 4th/10th century (Chs 2.v.6, 4.ii.1&iv). Thereafter administered as part of Filastīn (Iṣṭ./I.H.), but placed in the kūrah of ash-Sharāt by al-Maqdisī (Ch. 4.iii.2). Aylah was a cosmopolitan town noted for its merchants and served as a small port for Filastīn and the storehouse of the Hijāz (Ya'q. & Maq.). Pilgrims on the annual Hajj from Egypt, the Maghrib, and Filastīn gathered here before continuing onto the Hijāz (Ya'q., Ch. 5.vi.2), and was
the terminus of roads from Jerusalem, 'Ammān and beyond through Zughar (Ch.5.vi.3&4).

Bal.*59.14-19, *108.15; I.Kh.*81.10;
Ya'q.117/*330.1, 129/*340.15-*341.3;
I.F.*57.13-14, *69.6-8; Qud.*247.11;
Išt.*56.11, *59.4; I.Ḥ.*170.22, *173.24;

AZDŪD 117.128

AZOTUS HIPPINUS (P.I/8) Isdūd

A stop in Filasṭīn on the highway to Egypt, 27kms south-west of ar-Ramlah (Ch. 5.v.1).

I.Kh.*80.1; Qud.*218.17-18; Maq.*192.4.

BAYSĀN 197.211

SCYTHOPOLIS (P.II/1)

A major inland city of the jund of al-Urdunn and chief city of an administrative district (Ch. 2.iv.6). The prolific series of Arab-Byzantine coins from Baysān suggest this city at first rivalled Ṭabarshiyah until the early 2nd/8th century, when it took second place to the capital (Ch. 3.iii.1&2). However Baysān continued to prosper well into Fāṭimid times, and was noted for its rice (Maq.). The city was a stop on the Ṭabarshiyah -- Iliyā route and on the highway and alternative postroad from Ṭabarshiyah to al-Lajjūn (Ch. 4.v.1, vi.3).

Bal.*116.19; I.Kh.*78.7; Ya'q.115/*327.22; I.F.*116.16;
ELEUTHEROPOLIS (P.I/9)

Administrative centre of a large district which included ad-Dārūm in the southeast of Filastīn (Ch. 2.iv.10). Bayt Jibrīn was a sizable market town for the local region and supplied ar-Ramlah in the 4th/10th century (al-Maqdisī).

Strategically located between the Mediterranean coastal plain and the highlands around Ḥabra, and at the junction of the ar-Ramlah -- Ḥabra and Iliyā -- Ghazzah routes (Ch. 4.vi).

Bal.*138.14; I.Kh.*79.8-9; Ya'q.117/*329.8; I.F.*103.2;

BAYT LAḤM

169.123

BETHLEHEM (in Aelia)

Noted by the Arabic geographers because of its large Church of the Nativity and the Christian pilgrims (for contemporary Christian sources see Wilkinson 1977:151-52).

I.F.*101.16-17; Išt.*57.11-13; I.H.*171.22-*172.2;
Maq.*172.4-7.

BAYT AL-MAQDIS [see ILIYĀ]

BAYT AR-RĀM

212.137

LIVIAS (P.I/28)

Tall ar-Rām

A stop on the Iliyā -- 'Ammān road (Ch. 5.vi.3).

Maq.*192.10.

BAYT RĀS

231.233

CAPITOLIAS (P.II/5)

Chief city of an administrative district with the same name on the eastern edge of the jund of al-Urdunn under the Umayyads and early 'Abbāsids (Ch. 2.iv.11). Although a place
favoured by the Umayyads, its omission from the later sources probably reflects its small size in the later 3rd/9th century and after (Ch. 6.v.2b).

Bal.*116.19; I.Kh.*78.8.

BĀNIYĀS 215.295

PANEAS/CAESAREA PHILIPPI (Ph/13)

Bāniyās was the chief city of the enlarged administrative district of al-Jawlān in the jund of al-Urdunn, but by the mid 3rd/9th century Bāniyās with the al-Jawlān was in Dimashq (Ch. 2.iv.7). Al-Maqdisī discusses Bāniyās in the context of the Ḫūlah basin, indicating its commercial interests there. The town was the mid-point on the itinerary of the Šūr -- Damascus road (Ch. 5.vi.4).

I.Kh.*77.6-7; Ya'q.114/*326.16; I.F.*105.4;

BUṢRĀ 289.215

BOSTRA (Ar/1)

Chief town of the productive Ḥawrān district in the jund of Dimashq. In the 4th/10th century Buṣrā was not known as an important site to the geographical sources, perhaps reflecting the impact of Qarmatian raiding.

Bal.*112.2,15-*113.6, *126.6-12; I.Kh.*77.8;
Ya'q.113/*326.7; I.F.*105.4, İst.*65.3-5; I.H.*185.9-12;
Maq.*154.15, *160.16-17.

FAHL [see FIHL]
AL-FARĀDHIYAH

PAROD (in Tetracomia)

Large village in the kūrah of al-Urdunn noted for its viticulture (Ch. 4.iii.3, 6.iv.1).

Maq.*162.10-11.

FIHŁ

PELLA (P.II/2)

Chief city of an administrative district in the Jund al-Urdunn listed in the descriptive geographies, including al-Yaʿqūbī, until the end of the 3rd/9th century (Ch.2.iv.12, 6.v.2b). The political and economic reorientation of northern East Jordan after the Conquest had an adverse effect on Fiḥl, but like Jarash it remained a locally important centre well into 'Abbāsid times, if not later (Ch. 6.v.1-3).

Bal.*115; I.Kh.*78.7; Yaʾq.115/327.22; I.F.*116.16.

GAZZAH

GAZA

A major city just inland from the south Mediterranean coastline of the jund of Filastīn, and endowed with a considerably enlarged administrative district after the Conquest (Ch. 2.iii.7). By the late 3rd/9th century the town dominated the region (Yaʾq.), with further growth in the following century including a ribāṭ and sea trade through Mītmas (Ch. 4.iii.1). Ghazzah was also a major station on the highway and postroad from ar-Ramlah to al-Fustāţ (Ch. 5.v.1).

Bal.*109.7-11, *138.10; I.Kh.*79.8, *80.1-2, *98.8; Yaʾq.117/*329.10-11, 118/*330.6; I.F.*103.3; Qud.*219.18-19, *255.11; Iṣṭ.*58.3-6, *66.12;
A village of Filastīn in the administrative district of Iliyā and site of religious pilgrimage to the Mosque of Abraham (Ar. masjid Ibrāhīm), the burial place of the Patriarchs (Ch. 2.iii.10). In the 4th/10th century the surrounding Jabal Nuṣrah region was under intense cultivation and was especially noted for its fine orchards and vineyards, the products of which reached Egyptian markets (al-Maqdisī). Roads connected Ḥabrā with Zughar, Iliyā and Ghazzah or ar-Ramlah through Bayt Jibrīn (Ch. 5.vi.2,3).

HAIFA [HAIFA] 149.248

Mentioned on Ibn Hawqal's map as existing between 'Akkā and Qaysāriyah along with associated forts on the Mediterranean coast.

I.H.(map 8, between sites 7 and 8).
ILIYĀ [BAYT AL-MAQDIS] 171.131

AELIA CAPITOLINA (P.I/10) Al-Quds

The 3rd/9th century administrative manuals simply list Iliyā as the chief city of an administrative district in the jund of Filastīn (Ch. 2.iv.3), although the large palace of Umayyad construction to the south of the al-Aqṣā mosque (see Ben-Dov 1971:37-44; Mazar 1975:97-101) indicates the significance of this city in the political affairs of the early Islamic state. Furthermore as the sacred city of both Jews and Christians, Jerusalem offered the new ruling elite of ash-Shām the perfect location for an earthly expression of Islam's religious orthodoxy and primacy. This found embodiment in the Dome of the Rock (Goitein 1966:139-48; Grabar 1959:38-62; 1973:52-67; Hamilton 1978:197). The exalted status bestowed upon Iliyā guaranteed its long term prosperity (Ch. 2.iii.10, 6.iv.2), and the descriptive geographies of Ibn Faqīh, Ibn Ḥawqal and al-Maqdisī (who was writing about his own birthplace) provide detailed accounts of this city, especially its monuments and people.

JADAR 214.229

GADARA (P.II/3) Umm Qays

Chief centre of an administrative district with the same name in the jund of al-Urdūn according to Ibn Khurradādhbih (Ch. 2.iv.9). Jadār is overlooked by all of the later sources
Gazetteer

as the town contracted in response to a reorientation of trade lines in northern East Jordan after the Conquest (Ch.6.v.2b). However the nearby hot springs in the Wādī Yarmūk are discussed by al-Maqdisī (*185.7-13).

I.Kh.*78.10.

JARASH [JURASH (Bal.)] 234.187

GERASA (Ar/7)

Chief city of an administrative district north of the Wadi Zarqā' in the southeastern corner of the jund of al-Urdunn. The sources attest continued occupation on a reasonable scale through the late 3rd/9th century, a conclusion supported by the recent excavation of 'Abbāsid housing and pottery industries at the site (Ch. 2.iv.13). In the 4th/10th century Jarash was probably a large village of the Jabal Jarash region in the kūrah of al-Urdunn which had Adhri'āt as its nearest large centre (Ch. 4.iii.3, 6.v.2&3).

Bal.*116.19; I.Kh.*78.8; Ya'q.115/*327.22; I.F.*116.16.

AL-JASHSH 191.270

GISCHALA (head village of Tetracomia) al-JTsh

A sizable village in northern al-Urdunn positioned midway on the Ṭabariyah -- Şūr route.


JASIM 250.267

GASIMEA

Village and station on the highway and postroad from Damascus to Ṭabariyah in the jund/kūrah of Dimashq.

I.Kh.*78.4; Ya'q.115/*327.12; Qud.*219.10-11;

Maq.*190.14.
JUBB YUSUF

The "pit of Joseph" (Gen. 37.22, Qur'ān S. XII.10,15,19) a stop on the road north out of Ṭabariyah (Ch. 5.vi.1).

Qud.*219.8; Maq.*190.16-*191.1,5.

JURASH [see JARASH]

KAFAR SĀBĀ 147.178

CAPHAR SABA (in Antipatris)

Large village on the coastal plain of Filastīn and an important stop on the Damascus -- al-Fustāṭ highway and post-road between Ṭabariyah and ar-Ramlah south of Qalansuway.

I.H.*166.5 (map 8 site 21); Maq.*176.21, *191.3, *192.1,13.

KAFAR SALLĀM 143.168

ANTIPATRIS?? (P.I/3) Rās al-'Ayn

According to al-Maqdisī, Kafr Sallām is a village of Filastīn on the Tabariyah -- ar-Ramlah highway and post-road belonging to Qaysāriyah. Its identification with Antipatris, a town otherwise unknown in the early geographies, is tempting but unlikely, as this would place the site at an unacceptable distance south of Qaysāriyah.


KĀBUL 170.252

CHABOLUN (in Diocaesarea)

A town of al-Urdunn noted for its sugar and indigo on the eastern edge of the plain of 'Akkā. (Chs 4.iii.3, 6.ii.2).

I.H.*184.21-*185.1; Maq.*154.17, *162.9, *186.9.
AL-KANTSAH

DORA (P.I/2) Kh. al-Burj at-Tantūrah

A coastal village at the mouth of the Wādī Tamāsīn at the north end of the coastal plain of Filastīn according to Naṣir-i Khusrau (Marmardji 1951:176). Appears on Ibn Hawqal's map and mentioned in the route distances of al-Maqdisī.

I.H.*166.2 (map 8 site 17); Maq.*191 n.'h', *192.14.

KHISFTN

CASPEIN (in Hippus)

A village administered by Damascus on the highway and postroad from Damascus to Ṭabariyyah according to al-Ya'qūbī. Ya'q.115/*327.13.

AL-KUSWAH

First stop immediately south of Damascus on both the highway/postroad to Egypt via Ṭabariyyah and ar-Ramlah and the Darb al-Hajj via 'Ammān to the Ḥijāz (Ch. 5.v.1&2).

I.Kh.*78.1; Qud.*219.10; Maq.*190.13.

AL-LAJJUN

MAXIMIANOPOLIS/LEGIO (P.II.10)

As this town rated a lowly tenth out of the 14 municipalities in 6th century A.D. Palæstina Secunda, its administrative functions were amalgamated with a larger centre, probably Saqqūriyyah, after the Conquest (Ch. 2.iv.5). However the site retained a strategic importance because of its location on the Damascus -- al-Fustāṭ highway and postroad.

I.Kh.*78.14, *117.7; I.F.*116.18,20-*117.5;
Qud.*219.13-14, *228.12; Išt.*56.9; I.H.*170.20;
LUDD 140.151

DIOSPOLIS (P.I/4)

The original capital of the jund of Filastīn after the Conquest until the foundation of ar-Ramlah in the early 2nd/8th century. Thereafter Ludd remained the chief town of an administrative district and was an oft-visited village of Filastīn in the 4th/10th century according to al-Maqdisī.

Bal.*138.13; I.Kh.*79.4; Ya'q.116/328.7-10,14;
I.F.*103.1; Maq.*176.18-21.

MA'ĀB 220.076

AREOPOLIS (P.III/5) Ar-Rabbah

Ma'āb and its administrative territory formed part of the jund of Dimashq according to three of the 3rd/9th century sources, the exception being al-Baladhurī who included it in the Arḍ al-Balqā'. In the following century Ma'āb would have been administered from ar-Ramlah as part of of Filastīn (Ch. 4.iii.1), while al-Maqdisī included it in the kūrah of ash-Sharatāt. On the road from Zughar to 'Ammān.

Bal.*113.6-10; I.Kh.*77.7; Ya'q.114/326.12; I.F.*105.5;

MĀHZUZ AZDUDD [AL-MĀHZUZ] 114.132

AZOTUS PARALIUS (P.I/7)

A small port town of Filastīn on the Mediterranean seaboard between Asqalān and Yāfā, and one of the seven Filastīn ribāṭāt in the 4th/10th century.

I.H.*165.14 (map 8, site 5) Maq.*177.11-12, *192.3.
MAHÚZ YUBNÁ

JAMNIARUM PORTUS

A minor port on the coast of Filasṭīn which housed a ribāṭ in the 4th/10th century.

Maq.*177.12.

MIMĀS

MAIUMA/CONSTANTIA NEAPOLIS (P.I/22) Al-Minah

The fortified port of Ghazzah in Filasṭīn which attained renewed importance following the rise of the Egyptian dynasties and the parallel growth in trade (Ch. 4.iii.1 I.H.*165.14 (map 8 site 2);

Maq.*155.1, *174.5-6, *177.11.

MU'ĀN

A small service town of the Darb al-Hajj located on the eastern limits of ash-Sharāt. Al-Iṣṭakhri describes Mu'ān as a fort (Ar. ḥiṣn) belonging to ash-Sharāt.

Iṣṭ.*65.2-3, *66.3; I.H.*185.8-9, *186.7; Maq.*155.2.

MU'TAH

216.056

A village of Ma'āb remembered for an early Muslim defeat (8/629) by an allied army of the Byzantines (Ch. 4.iii.2).

Maq.*178.7-8.

NĀBULUS

174.180

NEAPOLIS (P.I/11) Nablus

Important urban centre and administrative district in the northeast quarter of Filasṭīn (Ch. 2.iii.9). The sources depict Nābulus as a large, walled city with prosperous markets based upon the local rural economy with a mixed population, including Samaritans. Major roads led to ar-
Ramlah, Baysān, Bayt al-Maqdis and ArĪḤā (Ch. 5.vi.2-4).

Bal.*138.11; I.Kh.*79.7; Yaʿq.116/*328.15-*329.1;
I.F.*103.2; Išt.*58.2-3, *66.14; I.H.*172.7-9, *186.20;

NAWĀ

NEVE (Ar/19)

The close ties between Adhriʿāt and the Jabal Jarash area in the kurāh of al-Urdunn in the 4th/10th century resulted in the elevation of Nawā to the position of chief town in al-Bathaniyah (Chs 4.iii.4, 6.v.2a). Nearby to Namā was Dayr Ayyūb on the Damascus -- Ṭabariyah leg of the highway and postroad to al-Fustāt (Ch. 5.v.1).

I.Kh.*117.5-6 (Dayr Ayyūb); Qud.*228.10-11 (Dayr Ayyūb);
Maq.*160.16-17 (Nawā).

QAYSĀRIYAH

CAESAREA (P.1/1)

A strongly fortified seaport with an adjacent garden suburb on the northern coast of Filastīn. Replaced as the capital of Palestina Prima/Filastīn, Qaysāriyah remained the chief city of an administrative district under the aimbledon system of government. The absence of a ribāṭ in the later 4th/10th century suggests the strength of the town's defences and the size of its population did not warrant the deployment of extra forces.

Bal.*140.9-*141.3, *141.9-*142.17, *143.4-7; I.Kh.*79.7,
*98.7; Yaʿq.116/*329.2-4; I.F.*103.2; Qud.*255.11;
QADAS 200.279

CADASA (in Tyre)

A major urban centre in the mid-north of al-Urdunn and endowed with a sizable administrative district. Set in the midst of the fertile Jabal 'Āmilah, Qadas was a prosperous city in 'Abbāsid and Fātimid times when Tabariyah was the main market for its agricultural produce and woven garments (Chs 2.iv.4, 4.iii.3, 6.iv.1). Connected to Ṣūr, Bānīyās, and Tabariyah by roads (Ch. 5 vi.1, 4).


QALANSUWAH 148.212

A large village in Filastīn and an important stop on the Damascus -- al-Fustāt highway on the leg from Tabariyah to ar-Ramlah. The side road to Qaysāriyah from ar-Ramlah probably began at al-Qalansuwah (Ch. 5.vi.1, vi.2). However the site was not described by al-Maqdisī amongst the secondary settlements of Filastīn.

I.Kh.*78.14; I.F.*116.18; Qud.*219.15; Maq.*191.2.

RAFĀḤ 077.078

RAPHIA (P.I/23)

Although mentioned separately by al-Baladhurī in his account of the Muslim Conquest of ash-Shām, Rafāḥ would have been administered from Ghazzah until the latter part of the 3rd/9th century (Ch. 2.iii.7), at which time control of this town was transferred to Egypt (Ch. 4.ii.1&iv). In the following century Rafāḥ was considered part of Filastīn as the town
that marked its southwestern edge. Rafah was an important station on the highroad to Egypt (Ch. 4.v.1).


AR-RAMLAH 138.148

The new capital of the jund of Filastīn established by Sulaymān ibn Abdul-Malik shortly before 96/715. Its proximity to Ludd, the former capital, would have made this a relatively simple administrative operation. After a rather shaky start, ar-Ramlah grew into the primary urban and trading centre of southern ash-Shām during the 'Abbāsid and Fāṭimid periods (Chs 2.iii.1, 4.ii.1&iii.1). The walled city was over a square mile in size and its main mosque, markets and produce were famous, but the lack of running water was seen as a serious disadvantage. Ar-Ramlah lay at the centre of an extensive road network, with the highway/postroad between al-Fustāṭ and Damascus, the road from Yāfā to Iliyā, and the pilgrim road to Aylah via ’Āqīr of particular importance (Ch. 5.v.1, vi.2).

RUWĀTH 211.014
ROBOTHA (P.III)

Chief town of Jibāl district in Filastīn during the first half of the 4th/10th century according to al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥawqal, thereby replacing 'Arandal (Ch. 4.ii.2). Iṣṭ.*58.9; I.Ḥ.*173.13.

SABASĪYAH 168.187
SEBASTE (P.I/12)

District centre in the hills of northern jund Filastīn until the end of the 3rd/9th century (Ch. 2.iv.11). Thereafter not mentioned by the critical geographies, reflecting the political and economic eclipse of Sabasīyah by ascendent Nābulus during the 'Abbāsid/Fāṭimid period.

Bal.*138.11; I.Kh.*79.8; Yaʾq.116/329.1-2; I.F.*103.2.

ṢAFFŪRIYAH 176.239
DIOCAESAREA (P.II/9)

A city endowed with a large administrative district in the jund of al-Urdunn, probably incorporating the Byzantine municipality of al-Lajjūn (Ch. 2.iv.5). The omission of this settlement by both al-Yaʿqūbī and al-Maqdisī may reflect a reduction in the status of Ṣaffūriyah from the mid-3rd/9th century onwards (Ch. 6.iv.1). However this centre was not unduly important in Byzantine times either, only ranking ninth in Byzantine Palaestina Secunda (Jones 1971:547).

Bal.*116.22; I.Kh.*78.10.

ṢUGHAR [see ZUGHAR]
TYRE (Ph/1)

A district centre and prominent fortified seaport of the jund of al-Urdunn in which the Umayyad caliph Hishām based the Mediterranean fleet and their workshops (Ch. 2.iv.2). Its importance was enhanced by Fātimid trading activity in the Mediterranean during the 4th/10th century, when Šūr was noted for its markets, artisans and craft industries (Ch. 4.iii.3). From Šūr important inland roads led to Damascus through Bāniyās and Ṭabarīyah via al-Jashsh (Ch. 5.vi.1&4).

Bal.*116.20-*118.3, *143.7; I.Kh.*78.11, *98.6;
Ya'q.115/*327.18-20; I.F.*116.17; Qud.*229.16, *255.10;
Iṣṭ.*59.4-5, *66.8,16; I.H.*174.1-3, 186.13,22;

SUSIYAH

HIPPOS (P.II/6)

Qal‘at al-Ḥuṣn

Administrative centre and district in the jund of al-Urdunn until the latter part of the 3rd/9th century, when Susiyah was absorbed along with its villages of Afīq and Khisfīn into the al-Jawlān region of the jund of Dimashq (Ch. 2.iv.8).

Bal.*116.19; I.Kh.*78.10.

TA‘_ASTR

ASER (in Neapolis)

A village of Filastīn midway on the road from Nābulus to Baysān (Ch. 5.vi.3).

Maq.*191.4.
TABARIYAH

TIBERIAS (P.II/7)

A large and populous walled city located on the west bank of the Buḥayrah Ṭabariyah and the capital of the jund of al-Urdunn. Both the Early Islamic coinage and evidence from the excavation of the site suggests that Ṭabariyah did not overtake Baysān as the principal economic centre of the province until the beginning of the 2nd/8th century (Chs 2.iv.1, 3.iii), but by the 4th/10th century Ṭabariyah was a major manufacturing centre, mostly of domestic consumer goods, and a market for the agricultural products from the villages and farms of Jabal 'Āmilah and Jabal Jarash (Ch. 2.iv.1, 6.iv.3). The city lay at the centre of an extensive road network, with routes to Damascus, ar-Ramlah, Ṣūr, 'Akka and Bala'bak amongst others (Ch. 5.v.1&vi.1).

JOPPA (P.I/20)

A small but flourishing coastal city with a good harbour and the chief centre of an administrative district in the jund of Filastīn. Yāfā was the principal port for ar-Ramlah and Iliya (Ch. 2.iii.4), and the site of a ribāṭ (Ch. 4.iii.1). From Yāfā a much-travelled road led inland to
Iliyyā via ar-Ramlah (Ch. 5.vi.2).

Bal.*138.14; I.Kh.*79.7,10-11, *98.8;
Ya'q.117/*329.7-8; I.F.*103.1; Qud.*255.11;
Iṣṭ.*56.9, *66.1,11; I.H.*170.21, *186.5,16;

YUBNA 126.141

JAMNIA (P.I/5) Yibnā

The chief city of an administrative district in the jund of Filastīn but without sufficient Muslim population for a Friday Mosque in al-Maqdisī's time (Ch. 2.iii.5). Yubnā was situated on the highway from Damascus between ar-Ramlah and al-Fustāt (Ch. 5.v.1) in the midst of numerous villages and cultivated fields.

Bal.*138.13; I.Kh.*79.7; Ya'q.116/*329.4, 117/*330.5;
I.F.*103.1; Maq.*176.22-23.

AZ-ZARQA′

GADDA

A stop on the Darb al-Hajj according to al-Maqdisī, which Kennedy (1982:152) equates with the fortified road station of Gadda on the Trajanic via nova.

Maq.*192.12.

ZUGHAR [ṣUGHAR] 194.050

ZOARA (P.III/6) Kh. ash-Shaikh Issa

A bustling market town on the southeast shore of the Dead Sea. At first in the Dimashq jund (Ya'q.) and later governed from Filastīn (Iṣṭ./I.H.), al-Maqdisī makes Zughar the chief town of the kūrah of ash-Sharāt (Chs 2.v.4, 4.iii.2). The town particularly benefitted from the revival
of the trade routes through the Red Sea and southeast ash-Shām under the Egyptian dynasties. From Zughar roads went to Aylah, Habrā, 'Amman and Mu'ān (Ch. 5.vi.4).

Ya'q.114/*326.12; Išṭ.*56.10-11, *64.12-17; *66.2,15;
I.Ḥ.*170.21-23, *184.17-*185.3, *186.6,21; Maq.*155.2,

* * * *
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