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Notes on Conventions

The transliteration of Arabic words follows the conventions used in the International Journal of Middle East Studies with the exception that the tā marbūṭa is indicated by a final “h” in the nonconstruct position. Common names of people and places (e.g., the prophet Muhammad, the Quran, Mecca) are given in standard English transliteration or simplified transliteration. All dates, unless otherwise indicated, are given according to the common era (BCE and CE).
Introduction

Speaking on the topic of sacrifice and the origins of religion among the Semites, William Robertson Smith makes a number of insightful statements regarding the character of the “holy” and its relationship to certain locations and objects associated with those places. Perhaps his most fundamental contribution is his definition of holy places and objects as social conventions. He expresses this in explaining traditions concerning the Arabian concept of sanctuaries.

On the whole, then, it is evident that the difference between holy things and common things does not originally turn on ownership, as if common things belonged to men and holy things to the gods. . . . The approach to ancient sanctuaries was surrounded by restrictions which cannot be regarded as designed to protect the property of the gods, but rather fall under the notion that they will not tolerate the vicinity of certain persons (e.g. such as are physically unclean) and certain actions (e.g. the shedding of blood). . . . Holy places and things are not so much reserved for the use of the god as surrounded by a network of restrictions and disabilities which forbid them to be used by men except in particular ways, and in certain cases forbid them to be used at all.  

Robertson Smith’s emphasis on the common ownership of holy places and objects represents a significant shift away from the notion that the holy is perceived to be inherent in certain things. He recognizes that the rules regarding what actions may and may not be performed in relation to particular places and objects delineate the boundaries of what is holy and what is common.
Robertson Smith is also careful to point out that sacred things do not necessarily reflect an accurate image of society but are symbols with which society identifies itself. This is illustrated in his conception of the camel as a totem animal because it was, for the ancient Semites, the primary symbol for the domestication of animals, just as cattle were in other cultures. The sacrifice of oxen among the Nuer is predicated on the significance of cattle as providing milk, carcasses for tools, ornaments, sleeping hides, and sun-dried dung to fuel smudges. These domesticated animals are considered “sacred and kindred for they are the source of human life and subsistence.” The domesticated camel is used for its milk, transportation in the desert, and as a marker of status and wealth but not as a source of meat. Society defines the camel as sacred by restricting access to it: no individual may kill and eat the camel privately. In those examples of the private eating of camel which do exist, it is clear that the camel is not regarded as sacred.

According to Robertson Smith, the ancient Semitic notion that the domesticated camel was considered to be a part of human society further underlines the symbolic character of the camel. The camel was regarded as part of society because of its close symbiotic relationship to desert society at its origins. Just as the domestication of the camel allowed for the survival of people in the desert, so a certain level of social development was necessary for the care and maintenance of the camel. The domestication of animals is explicitly linked to that point in time when society first came into existence.

Animal husbandry, like agriculture, became necessary only after the end of the golden age, when food no longer grew by itself and the cultivation of plant and animal products was required to provide clothing and shelter. Although not fully appreciated by all the followers of his work, this linkage made by Robertson Smith between the restrictions placed on the domesticated camel and the myth of a golden age is directly pertinent to defining the relationship of the sacred to society. For Robertson Smith,
the camel was considered sacred because for certain groups it epitomized and may have been the only example of the domesticated animal. The domesticated camel represented the one thing perceived to have allowed for the existence of present society and to link society with its mythical origins at the end of the utopia of the golden age. Claude Lévi-Strauss highlights this conception by emphasizing that the sacred character of the camel can only be understood by society as being futile: "While myth resolutely turns away from the continuous to segment and break down the world by means of distinctions, contrasts and oppositions, ritual moves in the opposite direction: starting from the discrete units that are imposed upon it by this preliminary conceptualization of reality, it strives to get back to the continuous, although the initial break with lived experience effected by mythic thought makes the task forever impossible. . . . [It is this] mixture of stubbornness and ineffectiveness which explains the desperate, manic aspect of ritual."19 The apparent sacrilege of eating the camel in the context of the ritual is a recognition that present society does not live in the golden age without need for domesticated animals and agriculture.20 It is a recognition that such a style of living is now impossible, and thus following the restrictions relating to sacred things is a conscious affirmation of the present social order.21 For Roberston Smith, the definition of the sacred is self-conscious in the sense that it orients attention toward a lost utopian past which affirms, at least implicitly, the present social order, and the need for its government by the chieftain.22

In his detailed study of bear-hunting rituals, Jonathan Z. Smith points out an analogous dichotomy separating the utopia of the ritual to the social order of everyday life. He contends that the bear hunters he studies are conscious of the discrepancy between actual bear hunts and the way they talk about and ritualize the hunt. The hunters claim that the bear offers itself to be killed, as confirmed by the hunters' disclaiming their role in the bear's death.23 The hunter must never kill a bear while it is sleeping in its den, for the hunter is said to address the bear face-to-face with poems of praise before dispatching it in hand-to-hand combat.24 In reality, however, the bear is almost always killed in its den, or immobilized by a trap before the hunters approach.25

[N]ot only ought we not to believe many of the elements in the description of the hunt as usually presented, but we ought not to believe that the hunters, from whom these descriptions were collected, believe it either. . . .

. . . The hunter does not hunt as he says he hunts; he does not think about his hunting as he says he thinks. But, unless we are to suppose that.
Robertson Smith is also careful to point out that sacred things do not necessarily reflect an accurate image of society but are symbols with which society identifies itself. This is illustrated in his conception of the camel as a totem animal because it was, for the ancient Semites, the primary symbol for the domestication of animals, just as cattle were in other cultures. The sacrifice of oxen among the Nuer is predicated on the significance of cattle as providing milk, carcasses for tools, ornaments, sleeping hides, and sun-dried dung to fuel smudges. These domesticated animals are considered "sacred and kindred for they are the source of human life and subsistence." The domesticated camel is used for its milk, transportation in the desert, and as a marker of status and wealth but not as a source of meat. Society defines the camel as sacred by restricting access to it: no individual may kill and eat the camel privately. In those examples of the private eating of camel which do exist, it is clear that the camel is not regarded as sacred.

According to Robertson Smith, the ancient Semitic notion that the domesticated camel was considered to be a part of human society further underlines the symbolic character of the camel. The camel was regarded as part of society because of its close symbiotic relationship to desert society at its origins. Just as the domestication of the camel allowed for the survival of people in the desert, so a certain level of social development was necessary for the care and maintenance of the camel. The domestication of animals is explicitly linked to that point in time when society first came into existence.

[Just as in the Greek fable of the Golden Age, man, in his pristine state of innocence, lived at peace with all the animals, eating the spontaneous fruits of the earth; but after the Fall he was sentenced to earn his bread by agricultural toil. At the same time his war with hurtful creatures (the serpent) began, and domestic animals began to be slain sacrificially, and their skins used for clothing. . . . The original Hebrew tradition is that of the Jahvistic story, which agrees with Greek legend in connecting the sacrifice of domestic animals with a fall from the state of pristine innocence.]

Animal husbandry, like agriculture, became necessary only after the end of the golden age, when food no longer grew by itself and the cultivation of plant and animal products was required to provide clothing and shelter.

Although not fully appreciated by all the followers of his work, this linkage made by Robertson Smith between the restrictions placed on the domesticated camel and the myth of a golden age is directly pertinent to defining the relationship of the sacred to society. For Robertson Smith,
the camel was considered sacred because for certain groups it epitomized and may have been the only example of the domesticated animal. The domesticated camel represented the one thing perceived to have allowed for the existence of present society and to link society with its mythical origins at the end of the utopia of the golden age. Claude Lévi-Strauss highlights this conception by emphasizing that the sacred character of the camel can only be understood by society as being futile: "While myth resolutely turns away from the continuous to segment and break down the world by means of distinctions, contrasts and oppositions, ritual moves in the opposite direction: starting from the discrete units that are imposed upon it by this preliminary conceptualization of reality, it strives to get back to the continuous, although the initial break with lived experience effected by mythic thought makes the task forever impossible. . . . [It is this] mixture of stubbornness and ineffectiveness which explains the desperate, maniacal aspect of ritual." The apparent sacrilege of eating the camel in the context of the ritual is a recognition that present society does not live in the golden age without need for domesticated animals and agriculture. It is a recognition that such a style of living is now impossible, and thus following the restrictions relating to sacred things is a conscious affirmation of the present social order. For Roberton Smith, the definition of the sacred is self-conscious in the sense that it orients attention toward a lost utopian past which affirms, at least implicitly, the present social order, and the need for its government by the chieftain.

In his detailed study of bear-hunting rituals, Jonathan Z. Smith points out an analogous dichotomy separating the utopia of the ritual to the social order of everyday life. He contends that the bear hunters he studies are conscious of the discrepancy between actual bear hunts and the way they talk about and ritualize the hunt. The hunters claim that the bear offers itself to be killed, as confirmed by the hunters' disclaiming their role in the bear's death. The hunter must never kill a bear while it is sleeping in its den, for the hunter is said to address the bear face-to-face with poems of praise before dispatching it in hand-to-hand combat. In reality, however, the bear is almost always killed in its den, or immobilized by a trap before the hunters approach.

[N]ot only ought we not to believe many of the elements in the description of the hunt as usually presented, but we ought not to believe that the hunters, from whom these descriptions were collected, believe it either. . . . The hunter does not hunt as he says he hunts; he does not think about his hunting as he says he thinks. But, unless we are to suppose that,
as a "primitive," he is incapable of thought, we must presume that he is aware of this discrepancy, that he works with it, that he has some means of overcoming this contradiction between word and deed.26

That the hunter recognizes the utopian character of how he claims to hunt is evident from the fact that he does not actually hunt the way he claims to hunt. According to J. Z. Smith, scholars who fail to acknowledge this not only miss the point of the discrepancy but also attribute a kind of "cuckoo-land" irrationality to the hunters, construing them as "some other sort of mind, some other sort of human being."27

J. Z. Smith makes the case that it is the hunters' recognition of the discrepancy between what they say and what they do that typifies the ritual character of the hunt. Like Robertson Smith, J. Z. Smith shows how society acknowledges the conventional nature of the rituals it uses to talk about itself. The hunters ascribe meaning to their actions, performed in the context of the bear hunt, that differs from what these actions actually accomplish.28 "(R)itual represents the creation of a controlled environment where the variables (i.e., the accidents) of ordinary life may be displaced precisely because they are felt to be so overwhelmingly present and powerful... Ritual relies for its power on the fact that it is concerned with quite ordinary activities, that what it describes and displays is, in principle, possible for every occurrence of these acts. But it relies, as well, for its power on the perceived fact that, in actuality, such possibilities cannot be realized."29 The ritual aspect of the hunt is found, for example, in addressing the bear and in "killing" it after it is already dead. Similar is the treatment of the bear carcass as a live bear in the later ceremonies, including feeding the bear, providing it special entrance into the tent, and giving it gifts, all while the bear is already dead. Only after it is dead may the people safely rear the bear as a guest, as a natural object upon which social significance may be placed.

This point is illustrated even more clearly in the special bear ritual practiced among the Ainu, Gilyak, Orochi, and Olcha, in which a bear is raised as a domesticated animal and slaughtered.30 As with the wild bear, the domesticated bear is treated as though it has given itself up to be killed, though it is immobilized by being tied between stakes and poisoned by bow and arrow.31 Because it is domesticated, the bear can be controlled and the killing staged in ways impossible in the wild. But although the ritual can control the domesticated bear to a greater degree, J. Z. Smith argues, following Lévi-Strauss's characterization of ritual, that people still recognize the futility of their actions: "It is not that 'magical' rituals compel the world through representation and manipulation; rather they express a
realistic assessment of the fact that the world cannot be compelled.” For J. Z. Smith, the ritual is not an attempt to change the reality inherent in the natural relationship between bears and people, but rather a recognition of this reality. Even the more docile domesticated bear must still be tied up and poisoned before it can be killed, and the domesticated bear still needs to be dead before it will allow itself to be eaten.

Drawing on these examples, J. Z. Smith emphasizes the importance of seeing the rationality of ritual, the need to recognize that the hunters understand the incongruity between the ideal portrayed in the ritual and the experience of everyday life: “There is a ‘gnostic’ dimension to ritual. It provides the means for demonstrating that we know what ought to have been done, what ought to have taken place. But, by the fact that it is ritual action rather than everyday action, it demonstrates that we know what is the case.” J. Z. Smith contends that this incongruity is “recollected” in normal everyday life. Ritual marks certain actions, just as the “holy” marks certain objects and locations, as having social significance apart from their ordinary, natural character. As Robertson Smith points out with the camel sacrifice, bringing to mind the absence of the utopian past reaffirms the present social order, including the individual and group obligations made necessary by this loss. “Ritual is a means of performing the way things ought to be in conscious tension to the way things are in such a way that this ritualized perfection is recollected in the ordinary, uncontrolled, course of things.” It does not appear to be the case, however, that the ritual and the unrealistic talk about hunting depict a world in which the ideal hunt is possible or even desirable. The lost utopian existence imagined by the ritualized hunt is one in which there is no hunting, a world in which the first bear has never been killed.

The myths associated with bear rituals by the people who perform them suggest that the bear ritual and the description of the hunt are not understood only as evidence of an incongruity between perception and reality. It is not so much that the world “should be” another way, but rather the recognition that the world “no longer is” the way it used to be. Talking about and ritualizing the bear hunt commemorates the natural hardships people have overcome to survive, by hunting and through social organization, in a non- or post-utopian existence.

The link between the practice of the hunt and the taming of bears for a ritualized hunt can be found in prehistoric times and is not limited to those groups that sacrifice domesticated bears. In many of these cultures similar symbolic associations are made between the bear, whether tamed or dead, and the origins of civilization. Often the tame bear or the bear carcass is adorned with jewelry, including strips of copper for bracelets and collars.
marked with grass threads. The bear is also given amulets, and amulets are made from the different body parts of the bear. Around Hudson's Bay, pieces of the bear are attached to small objects such as saws, drills, and other implements of civilization. A number of cultures associate planting and agriculture with the bear, planting posts in the ground, tied together with string. The Eskimo attach the bear's bladder to a stick placed upright near the encampment for three days. The Oroke set up spruce trees to which were tied special shavings (inau) in the dwellings of the tame bears, and they associated these trees with the cosmogonic and civilizing activities of the hero Khadau.

The tamed bear and bear carcass are also treated as though they represent the king or leader of the society. Among the Nootka, the bear carcass is positioned opposite the chieftain at a ceremonial meal, dressed like the chieftain, and served a special tray of food. Among the Koryak, food is presented to a wooden representation of the bear, while the Chukchi slaughter reindeer and serve it to the bear. In several cultures, people refer to the bear as "king" of the animals. Ostyak myths state that the bear is actually a divine being in human form wearing a bear skin. In other cultures, people make the bear carcass smoke a pipe, and place tobacco in the bear's mouth. Special burials are arranged for the bear in which the carcass is taken apart at the joints so that nothing of the bear's skeleton is broken or cut. The Evenk bundle the bear's dried bones and place them upon a high tree stump or a raised platform and place the head above them nearby.

Tamed bears and carcasses are closely associated with gender segregation and sexual reproduction in human society. Among the Turkic tribes of Siberia, hunters make movements in imitation of sexual intercourse over the body of the slain bear. One of the older hunters stands behind the younger hunters and pushes them toward the bear with a stick opposite his penis (kocugan kan). In Lapland, the hunter who kills the bear thrusts his spear into the carcass three times following its death, for fertility and strength. Similar cult sticks are used among the Ainu. According to Irving Hallowell, all married women without children, young girls, and dogs are required to leave the camp and stay away during the time when the bear carcass arrives and is cooking. Among the Mistassini, unmarried women must cover their faces when the carcass is brought into the camp. Some Even did not allow women to participate in any part of the eating of the bear. The Nentsi, on their bear-hunting expeditions, took along pregnant women, from behind whom the men would shoot at the bear, believing that the bear would not attack pregnant women. Other cultures regard the hunt and the bear feast as a punishment for men's killing the bear and therefore exempt women from eating certain parts of the bear (head, eyes, heart, entrails).
In the mythology of the peoples who practice the bear hunt and its rituals, the bear is seen as an agent of civilization. Among the Yenisey Evenk the legend is told of a bear that sacrificed itself in order to provide humans with reindeer as domesticated herds. In an Ainu myth, a bear gives to a human woman the gift of a son whose descendants become the Ainu people. The Udegeys and other Lower Amur peoples also tell the story of the marriage of a human girl with a bear. In other accounts, the bear is responsible for bringing gifts of civilization, and for instituting the ritualized bear hunt to commemorate its own death. A Ket legend tells how a “kaigus” (son of a woman by a bear) wanted to marry a human girl but was killed by the girl’s people after issuing instructions for the bear ritual and the use of his carcass in divination.

Several myths make explicit that the death of the bear represents a contest between the natural world of animals and the artificial world of human society. In Even folklore, a girl gives birth to two sons, one of them by a bear. The human son grows up to be Torgani, the legendary hero of the Even. This Torgani kills his brother, the bear, with the result that his people must now hunt the many bears that will stalk them, and must perform a special ceremony for the eating of the bears that are hunted. This ceremony ensures that the bears will not seek retribution for this initial killing of the brother bear. The Ayan Evenk and Orochi have a similar myth, in which two rival brothers fight, one a bear and one a human, with the result that the bear is killed, but not before bequeathing the ritualized bear hunt to his brother and his people. According to Vogul mythology, humans originally were covered with hair and had long nails and horns, like other animals. In these accounts, the world before the killing of the bear is one in which animals and humans live together, and the killing of the bear represents the transition to human mastery of the natural world, marking the passage to a state of existence dominated by the use of tools, agriculture, and domesticated animals to maintain the growing size of human society.

That the ritualized hunt and the sacrifice of the domesticated bear might serve as a commemoration of the transition between nomadic and settled society is consistent with sacrificial practices in other cultures. The bear is a symbol like the camel, kangaroo, and cattle in certain pastoral societies. Like these other animals, the bear is regarded as kin with the society that hunts and sacrifices it. Bears are referred to with various kinship terms including “cousin,” “grandfather,” “old man,” “guest,” and “four-legged human.” The bear is also called a spirit or god, one which disguises itself with black fur, sharp claws, and a large body, said to be the image of humans as they once lived. Bears are hunted as a source not only of food, but also clothing, shelter,
and items of exchange. More important than this, however, is the conception of the bear as prey or sacrificial victim, demonstrating the society's capacity to kill the bear (rather than be killed by it). Perhaps the bear was chosen because of its anthropomorphic features, because of the relative difficulty in subduing a bear in the wild, or from a memory of the bear's importance in prehistorical times. Note also that the bear hunt and ritual is found far outside the areas in which bears were common enough to serve as an easy source of food or would have been a significant nuisance to society. Like the camel, the bear also appears to have been treated as a symbol of society's existence because it can best represent, through myth and ritual, the incongruity between the natural, utopian world and the social animal husbandry of settled society. It is not the animal itself, but the restrictions and prescriptions with which the animal is delimited and made sacred to communicate a message that concerns the origins of the social order and the need for establishment and governance of it.

RITUAL, RELICS, AND THE MECCAN SANCTUARY

The observations of Robertson Smith and J. Z. Smith highlight some of the major theoretical issues relevant to the larger study of ritual and relics associated with Mecca and the origins of Islam. Of particular importance is how ordinary objects and actions are set apart and construed in terms of their conventional significance as symbols of society. The camel and the bear can be seen as natural objects that represent social concepts for the societies in which they serve as symbols. Certain locations and objects are likewise defined as sacred and protected from private trespass by both prohibiting and prescribing certain types of behavior in relation to these objects and locations. The examples of the ancient Semites and the bear hunters show that it is the process of restricting access, not only to the physical objects and locations themselves, but also to their conceptualization, that singles out such objects and locations as sacred. The face-to-face killing prescribed for bears and the designation of a given location as the abode of the god amount to fictions which, by virtue of their common acceptance as necessary social conventions, help to explain and legitimize the existence of society.

MUSLIM EXAMPLES OF RITUAL AND RELICS

Muslim exegetical and legal traditions attribute special significance to everyday objects (clothing, utensils, hair and nails, weapons and armor, speech) as relics, and ordinary actions (sitting, standing, and not eating or having
sex) as rituals. In the examples of J. Z. Smith, the discrepancy between what the hunters say they do and what they actually do in their hunting indicates that the hunters recognize the relationship between the bear, their hunt, and the origins of their society. According to Robertson Smith, the use of a domesticated camel in the sacrifice of the ancient Semites is an affirmation of the need for domesticated animals and the social order that accompanies it. Both the bear and the camel are symbols of the transition from nomadic to settled life. The killing of the camel and the bear epitomize a transition from a primeval, natural past to a constructed and social present.

Muslim scholarship also links selected objects, actions, and locations to the origins and development of Islamic civilization. One example, considered in chapter I, is the accounts of the discovery of the treasure of the Ka‘bah, consisting of golden gazelles from pre-Islamic Arab and Iranian kings, and swords and armor from the Israelite prophets. Muslim accounts draw extensively on a number of ancient and late antique motifs, such as the burial of the temple implements, the divine origins of weapons, and the king as the guardian of the sanctuary. Analysis of how these motifs are appropriated into Muslim accounts shows that the objects contained in the treasure of the Ka‘bah are employed as part of larger narrative framework incorporating the prophet Muhammad and Islam into a history of prophets and kings going back to Adam following his expulsion from the garden of Eden. Specific descriptions associated with the golden gazelles, swords, and armor of the treasure portray these objects as symbols of the mythological origins of Islam within the context of the genesis of civilization on earth.

Not unlike the camel and the bear, the contents of the treasure of the Ka‘bah signify a transition between fundamentally different states of human existence and society. For both the bear hunters and the ancient Semites, the transition from nomadic to settled society is understood in light of the difference between a utopian golden age and the present social order. By tying the objects contained in the treasure of the Ka‘bah with particular pre-Islamic prophets and kings, Muslim accounts delineate a transition from the utopian existence in the garden of Eden to the current state of human civilization culminating in the prophet Muhammad and Islam. The accounts of the discovery of the treasure of the Ka‘bah link Islam with the origins of human civilization and the fall from Eden, just as accounts of the hunt tell of a contest between nature and culture that explains the absolute break between the world as it used to be and the world as it is now.

Central to both Robertson Smith’s and J. Z. Smith’s analyses is that the rituals surrounding the killing of the camel and the bear, and the objects associated with these rituals, function as regular physical reminders of the myth explaining the origins of present society as the result of a fall from a
utopian golden age. Chapters 2, 3, and 4 examine how the definition of rituals, relics, and territory in Islamic exegetical and legal texts is related to the more general mythological depiction of the origins of Islamic civilization seen in the accounts of the recovery of the treasure of the Ka'bah. In part, this is related to the centrality of the Meccan sanctuary in major rituals such as pilgrimage (hajj) and prayer (salāt), and the symbolic link between Eden and Mecca in ritual purification (tahārah) and offering (zakāt).

Muslim rituals contrast civilization, focused on Mecca as the origin of human civilization (Adam) and Islamic civilization (Muhammad), with the garden of Eden where the activities of the rituals are unnecessary or impossible. The relics attributed to the prophet Muhammad (hair and fingernails, footprints, hadith reports, clothing, other artifacts) are closely linked with the origins of civilization at Mecca and are said to have been dispersed by his followers from the Meccan sanctuary to the various locations which became outposts of Islamic civilization after the early Islamic conquests. Many of these relics were transported by Muslim rulers to centers within the area of Islamic civilization (Dār al-Islām) and were used in the establishment of buildings representative of Islam and the spread of knowledge from the prophet Muhammad, such as mosques and madrasas. The giant length of the tombs of certain prophets is also a physical reminder of the loss of Eden and the subsequent development of civilization. They testify to the existence of prophets, from before the time of Abraham and the Israelite prophets, including Adam, Seth, Idris, Noah, Hud, and Salih. These are prophets who played an integral role in the earliest development of human civilization and are thus described as being of giant size, representing the original stature of humanity before a decrease in size that accompanied an increase in technology and the arts of civilization.

**MYTHOLOGICAL ORIGINS OF CIVILIZATION**

The way in which definitions of ritual, relics, and territory relate to the mythological origins of civilization is stressed in J.Z. Smith’s insistence that ritual represents a rational process of thinking about the incongruity between the present social order and the utopian past. Robertson Smith likewise uses the example of the camel sacrifice to argue that the use of sacred actions, objects, and locations is how society is able to organize and maintain its structure. Similarly, my overarching aim in this book is to illustrate how the mythology of the fall from Eden and the origins of Islamic civilization represented by Muslim rituals and relics can be interpreted as a narrative expression of an ideology stipulating the necessity of religion and the state.69
This ideology and the mythology by which it is expressed can be uncovered from a combination of details concerning specific rituals and relics and how these actions and objects are related to particular episodes in the accounts of the origins of human and Islamic civilization. Muslim historical and exegetical texts describe the dispatch of prophets with different revelations over the course of civilization, from its origins in the fall from Eden to its culmination on the Day of Resurrection. Rituals and relics are described in Muslim legal texts and other sorts of sources as relating directly to the succession of prophets and their role in establishing religion and society to govern and guide humanity in its fallen existence. Taken individually, no single Muslim source provides a synthetic overview linking rituals, relics, and civilization, though state patronage of scholarship and religious sites might account for the confluence of these concepts. According to the ideology behind the definition of these concepts, the state is required to organize society in accordance with the stipulations of religion, which are themselves designed to remind people of the disjunction separating their current existence and the utopia of Eden.

In order to uncover some of the ways rituals and relics connect with a larger mythology and ideology of Islamic civilization, it is necessary to go beyond the confines of categories generated by attempts to fit Islamic materials into preconceived notions of the differences between Islam and other religions. Such an approach is similar to the attitude and method adopted by Robertson Smith in his eschewal of prejudices which excluded biblical religion, especially Christianity, from the comparative study of religion. Robertson Smith's wide-ranging combination of textual and ethnographic sources allowed him to recognize the outlines of a more general concept of sacrifice and religion that was otherwise obscured by what constituted the proper subjects for the study of the Bible. It should also be noted that although Robertson Smith did provide a model which could be applied in other contexts, he focused his attention on explaining the specific details of the ancient Semites rather than generalizing from a superficial understanding of the sources.

Following the example of Robertson Smith, this book pays careful attention to philological detail and the specific terminology and concepts of different Islamic textual genres as a means to transcend the categories of secondary scholarship and to open Islamic materials to fresh comparison. Such specialized research is to be combined with the insights of cultural anthropologists, art historians, and literary critics to help integrate the Islamic examples into the generic study of religion. The focus here is not on any particular instance of ritual or relic but rather on the synthesis of more general models of ritual and relics from a variety of Islamic sources.
It may be that the Islamic conception of ritual, relics, and territory, and their relation to myth and ideology, will challenge conventional, generic understandings of these terms. The goal of this book, however, is to provide a theory that is judged by whether it makes sense of and provides a rational explanation for the existence and use of rituals, relics, and territory in their Islamic contexts.

The following four chapters use a number of comparisons to highlight the distinctive character of Islamic conceptions of ritual, relics, and territory. Some of these examples might be related, as historical influences, to the earliest Islamic sources. These include late antique Christian traditions regarding relics and the recovery of sacred sites, inscriptions from the ancient Near East, and the Hellenistic accounts of the distribution of the relics of Horus in Egypt. Such examples help to explain the larger cultural context within which Islamic materials are situated. Other examples are treated as analogies and are not intended to indicate any historical influences. These include references to the ritual bear hunts, Taoist and Buddhist burials of bronze mirrors and texts, the Sumerian myth of the distribution of the “Me” by Enki, the distribution and burial of the parts of the Buddha’s body, Iroquois conceptions of wampum and its relationship to land ownership, European and American curiosity shops compared with the patronage and display of relics as sites for visitation, Hindu and Hawaiian definitions of kingship based on different conceptions of the pure and the sacred, the worldview of contemporary surfing culture as a contrast to the utopian character of ritual, and the Lele Pangolin cult as described by Mary Douglas as displaying the conscious use of natural symbols to think about social issues.

It would be absurd to reduce the interpretation of the larger Islamic examples under consideration to the terms of these analogies, just as it would be a mistake to reduce an Islamic example to the sum of its historical influences. In his study of the ritual bear hunts, and in other contexts, J. Z. Smith insists on the need to use analogies which highlight not historical connections but the logical connections of different examples to theorize about religion. In part, this is to help make explicit the perspective and disciplinary framework which scholars employ in the selection and interpretation of their examples. It is also necessary in order to avoid too much reliance upon received categories that would hinder the distillation of more generic models from a wider variety of sources. Such comparisons are used in this book as heuristic models suggesting fresh patterns in the Islamic materials under consideration, and ultimately I consider the Islamic material itself as an example in the larger study of religion. This book will have served its purpose if it succeeds in stimulating new ways of thinking about
the use of sacred objects, actions, and locations in the display of political power and religious authority in different cultural and historical contexts.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

The four chapters in this book develop different issues related to ritual, relics, and territory in Islam. The chapters are not arranged according to types of sources, nor are they chronologically bounded. Each of the chapters might be seen as a transparency laid atop one another, and, as such, they are interrelated and meant to be read together, though each of the chapters addresses separately the larger thesis of the book. Chapter 1 provides an example of the mythology of the origins of human and Islamic civilization. Chapters 2, 3, and 4 show how this narrative mythology is reflected in Islamic definitions of ritual, relics, and the tombs of prophets. Various accounts of the stories of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden, their fall, and the establishment of civilization at Mecca are present throughout all the chapters, as is the conclusion that a more general ideology of the necessity of the state underlies this mythology and its representation in ritual and relics. The relationship of the mythology and ideology is made explicit in the course of the four chapters through the uncovering of specific details of certain rituals and relics and the role of both rituals and relics in delineating the sacred status of the sanctuary at Mecca.

Chapter 1 provides an outline of the more general myth of the origins of Islamic civilization by examining the accounts of the recovery of the treasure of the Ka'bah by 'Abd al-Muttalib, the paternal grandfather of the prophet Muhammad. The accounts are drawn from some of the earliest extant Islamic sources on Mecca, including Ibn Sa'd and Ibn Ishāq's biography of the prophet Muhammad (extant in the recension of Ibn Hishām), the world histories of al-Ṭabarī and al-Yaḥṣūbī, and al-Azraqī's history of Mecca. Section 1 compares 'Abd al-Muttalib's role in the recovery of the treasure and the details of its contents to ancient Near Eastern foundational and offering inscriptions, Jewish and Samaritan traditions regarding the loss and recovery of the tabernacle and temple vessels, and other examples of treasure burial, including the late antique and Islamic motif of the Cave of the Treasure associated with the tomb of Adam. Section 2 outlines the association of the treasure with the named swords and armor of the prophet Muhammad from Sunni and Shi'i collections of hadith reports and their commentaries in the historical and biographical works of al-Waqīqī. Ibn Sa'd, Ibn al-Athīr, al-Dhahabī and in the Quran commentaries of Ibn al-Jawzī, Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Qurṭūbī, and Ibn Kathīr. References to metalurgical texts, such as those attributed to al-Kindī and al-Bīrūnī, help
to inform the discussion of the origins of certain metals and swords, and such information is also recorded in lexical and geographical works.

Chapter 2 focuses on definitions of certain obligatory rituals related to the garden of Eden and the origins of civilization at the sanctuary of Mecca. These definitions are drawn from a variety of Sunni and Shi‘i texts from all the major legal schools, including collections of legal opinions, commentaries on these collections, and legal commentaries on hadith reports. Section 1 examines the positions of various Sunni and Shi‘i legal theorists regarding the opinion that touching the penis (and related genitalia) requires the performance of ritual purification (wuḍū‘). This is supplemented by more general comparative works of legal theory, such as those of Ibn Rushd, Ibn Qudāmah, and Ibn Taymiyyah. In section 2, the stories of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden and their residence in Mecca after the fall are extracted from commentaries on the Quran, the stories of the prophets, and hadith reports, including those of al-Ṭabarī, al-Tha‘labi, al-Qurṭubi, and Ibn Kathīr. A comparison of these different genres and texts shows the close correspondence between the narrative of exegetical stories concerning the origins of civilization and the more systematic, technical definitions of purity and other obligatory rituals in legal scholarship.

Chapter 3 draws on a wide array of Islamic and non-Islamic sources for details about the treatment of the relics of the prophet Muhammad and how these relics relate to the sacred status of the sanctuary at Mecca. The dispersal and collection of the prophet Muhammad’s hair and nails, footprints, hadith reports, and various artifacts are recounted in hadith collections, biographical dictionaries, and legal commentaries used in earlier chapters. These are examined in section 1. Section 2 highlights accounts from Quran commentaries and world histories concerning the relics of other prophets and the association of prophetic relics with the origins of human civilization. Section 2 also uses information on prophetic relics from the accounts of travelers, geographers, and pilgrimage guides, such as those of al-Maqdisī, Ibn al-Ḥawrānī, al-Harawi, Mujīr al-Dīn, al-Suyūṭī, ʿAbd al-Ghānī al-Nābulṣī, and various European travelers. This is supplemented by certain state histories of different Middle Eastern and Asian Islamic dynasties to describe the identification and patronage of relics, highlighting attempts to demonstrate authority through linkages to the prophets and the locations of their activities.

Chapter 4 investigates the long tombs associated with the earliest prophets who are mentioned in the Quran and its exegesis. Section 1 outlines the depictions of these tombs found in the accounts of Muslim pilgrims, European travelers, and art historical and archaeological surveys done in the past two centuries. These sources describe long tombs of prophets, up to 150
meters in length, in the Middle East, Central Asia, and South Asia. The so-called "nine-yard" (nau-gaz) tombs of South and Southeast Asia, attributed primarily to the Muslims who died during the earliest conquests of Sind, are also included in this analysis. In order to contextualize these tombs and explain their extraordinary length, section 2 examines various accounts of giants and the recovery of their remains in the Quran, Muslim exegesis, the Bible, ancient Greek sources, and European folklore. These accounts demonstrate the Muslim appropriation of a widespread mythological motif in which giants represent a stage in human history away from which civilization has developed with the rise of technology and the law-based state.

A synthesis of these various sources suggests some more general conclusions relevant to the study of Islam and religion. The identification and patronage of relics, along with the mosques, madrasas, and tombs in which they are preserved, may be seen as resulting in the establishment of physical reminders of the loss of Eden and the concomitant need for religion and the social order maintained by the jurists and the state. Rules pertaining to purification and other obligatory rituals supply a map of the jurists' broad conception of the oppositions denoting the pure and impure, and the sacred and profane. Not unlike the physical symbols of relics, this categorization of the pure and impure, and the sacred and profane, reflects the separation of Eden and human civilization. The same separation between Eden and civilization is exemplified in the narrative accounts of the treasure of the Ka'bah and the swords of the prophet Muhammad. The sort of ideology exhibited in this mythology, and its representation in relics and ritual, appears to be a justification for the existence of society and the state, necessitated by the loss of the Edenic utopia.

This book is not a systematic overview of relics and ritual in Islamic contexts, nor does it provide a full analysis of the history of the definitions of the sanctuary in Mecca. Rather, select concepts from diverse historical and geographical settings are highlighted to suggest the outlines of a larger theory of how certain objects and actions are defined in relation to the territorial origins and spread of Islamic civilization. In short, this book studies discrete examples of relics and rituals used to define the authority of the prophet Muhammad and the largely interpretive Muslim scholarship that is built upon that authority. It does so in order to raise larger questions about the definition of authority vis-à-vis religious myth and ritual. The following analyses suggest that this image of authority relies upon the myth of the fall from a utopia to justify the continued existence of an imperfect social structure based upon absolute notions of right and wrong perpetuated by the institutions of Quran exegesis and Islamic law.
CHAPTER ONE

Treasure of the Ka‘bah

In his biography of the prophet Muhammad, ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Hishâm (d. 834) cites a report, on the authority of Muhammad b. Ishâq (d. 768), regarding ‘Abd al-Muṣṭälîb’s recovery of the well of Zamzam and a buried treasure: “He [‘Abd al-Muṣṭälîb] continued digging until the top of the well appeared to him. He praised God because he knew that he had been right [about its buried location]. When he continued digging he found in it two gazelles of gold. These were the two gazelles which the Jurhum had buried in the well when they left Mecca. He also found in it Qal‘î swords and armor.”

“‘Abd al-Muṣṭälîb made the swords into a door for the Ka‘bah, and pounded the two gazelles of gold into the door. This was the first gold ornamentation of the Ka‘bah. Then ‘Abd al-Muṣṭälîb began giving the water of Zamzam to the pilgrims.”

The well of Zamzam is said to have been discovered originally by Ishmael and his mother Hagar at the place that would later be identified with the precincts of the sanctuary at Mecca. The Jurhum are said to have settled in Mecca with Ishmael and Hagar and continued as the guardians of the sanctuary until they were forced to leave by another group of people called the Khuzâ‘ah. An almost identical account is found in the history of Muhammad b. Jarir al-Ṭabarî (d. 923), and Ahmad b. Abî Ya‘qûb al-Ya‘quî (d. 905) records that ‘Abd al-Muṣṭälîb uncovered swords, weapons, and two gazelles of gold. In his history of Mecca, Muhammad b. ‘Abdallâh al-Azraqî (d. 921) mentions the two gazelles of gold that were in the Ka‘bah and the Qal‘î swords that were buried in the well of Zamzam.

Ahmîd Ibn Sa‘îd (ca. 784–845) mentions another version of this account, which specifies the number of swords and armor and the type of armor uncovered by ‘Abd al-Muṣṭälîb but does not indicate that the discovery was related to the well of Zamzam: “Ibn ‘Umar: When the Jurhum were preparing to leave Mecca they buried the two gazelles, seven Qal‘î swords, and five com-
plete suits of armor. 'Abd al-Mu'ttalib excavated this. It had been desecrated and was the cause of great abomination. He pounded the two gazelles, which were of gold, as a plating on the face of the Ka'bah, and he hung the swords on the two doors by which he wanted to protect the treasury of the Ka'bah [khizanat al-Ka'bah], and he made keys and a lock from gold.” In this account and others there is agreement on the fact that the treasure consisted of the two golden gazelles, Qal'i swords, and armor. The accounts also agree that this treasure was uncovered by 'Abd al-Mun'alib, the paternal grandfather of the prophet Muhammad, and that the treasure had been buried by the Jurhum when they left Mecca. Most of the accounts also describe how 'Abd al-Mun'alib used the treasure to adorn and protect the Ka'bah.

Little attention has been paid to the details of the treasure. Later Muslim scholarship often mentions but does not elaborate on its significance, and there is no explicit connection among the recovery of the treasure, the recovery of the well, and the reestablishment of the sanctuary at Mecca under the prophet Muhammad. Recent scholarship interested in reconstructing the origins of the sanctuary at Mecca has focused on the significance of the well of Zamzam, especially the accounts of its rediscovery by 'Abd al-Mun'alib, but has commented on the treasure only in passing. G. R. Hawting studies some of the accounts of the recovery of the treasure and the well of Zamzam, also focusing not on the contents of the treasure but on how the accounts of its recovery are associated with Zamzam. A number of details in the accounts of the treasure still require further comment, including the expression “Qal'i swords” and the reason for the burial of arms and armor in the sanctuary at Mecca.

This chapter examines a number of issues related to the early Muslim accounts of the recovery of this treasure. The description of the treasure and its discovery is a part of and an example of the larger mythological conception of the origins of human and Islamic civilization. Section 1 focuses on the different accounts of the burial and recovery of objects at the sanctuary in Mecca, with reference to Hawting's theory concerning the origins of the Muslim traditions in Jewish eschatology. Analysis of various traditions about the burial of objects in the sanctuary in Mecca suggests that the Muslim accounts of the treasure are best understood as purposeful attempts to describe the origins of Islam in terms familiar from the ancient and late antique Near East. Section 2 concentrates on the particular contents of the treasure, especially the swords and the armor, to illustrate how these items are used in Muslim sources to link the origins of Islam with certain pre-Islamic kings and prophets. The golden gazelles, swords, and armor have specific symbolic associations upon which the Muslim accounts draw to
delineate a certain conception of territory and its relation to the relics of the prophet Muhammad.

1: TEMPLE IMPLEMENTS AND TREASURE OF THE KA'BAH

In his 1980 article, G. R. Hawting asserts that the Muslim accounts of the disappearance and rediscovery of Zamzam are derived from what he calls Jewish traditions regarding the loss and recovery of the temple implements or sacred sanctuary objects:

There are, therefore, a number of obvious similarities between these [Jewish] traditions and the Muslim traditions associated with the loss of Zamzam. The loss of objects of great importance for the sanctuary and its cult, which is the main theme of the Jewish traditions, can be discerned in the Muslim traditions adduced to account for the loss of Zamzam. The recovery of the objects, which in Judaism is consigned to eschatology, has in Islam become an historical fact. The loss and recovery of the hiding place of the sacred objects, which is the main theme of the Muslim traditions, can also be seen in the Jewish traditions about the loss of the sacred objects.\(^6\)

Hawting illustrates these close parallels with a number of examples—specifically, the account of the hiding of the temple implements by the prophet Jeremiah in 2 Maccabees 2:4–8 and several accounts involving Samaritan traditions regarding the loss and recovery of special objects.

These parallels might appear to suggest that the accounts of Zamzam and the buried treasure of the Ka'bah found their way into Muslim sources by accident and that Muslim sources were at odds trying to explain their significance. Citing A. J. Wensinck, Hawting posits that the earliest Muslim conception associated the sanctuary of Mecca with a pit, related to the more general Semitic notion of the sanctuary as the "navel of the earth."\(^9\) According to Hawting, this conception was derived from Jewish ideas, including the notion that this pit was the hiding place of the temple implements. When Muslim accounts associated the pit with the well of Zamzam, however, the original significance of the buried objects was forgotten or displaced.\(^10\)

With its emphasis on the Jewish origins of the treasure motif and lack of attention to possible reasons for its purposeful inclusion in Muslim accounts of the sanctuary at Mecca, Hawting's explanation is misleading. His approach and conclusions are not unlike the explanations commonly given for the parallels between Jewish and Muslim interpretations of the Bible and
Quran. Scholars routinely cite Jewish (and Christian) parallels with Muslim texts as evidence that the Quran and Muslim exegesis is derived from the Bible and the interpretive traditions of Jews and Christians. Discrepancies between the parallels are used to demonstrate that the transmission from Jewish and Christian sources was garbled, and that the Muslim texts are unaware of the original or "correct" significance of the motifs and narratives they have adopted.\textsuperscript{11}

The limitations of this approach are evident in the texts and traditions cited by Hawting as parallels for the Muslim accounts of the treasure and its recovery. Hawting cites two examples from Samaritan texts, in addition to an account recorded by Josephus.\textsuperscript{12} The fullest example comes from a late chronicle, which is a continuation of an earlier chronicle composed in the fourteenth century CE.\textsuperscript{13} In this and other late Samaritan texts, the recovery of the temple vessels is associated with the messianic figure called the Ta-heb.\textsuperscript{14} Hawting also cites an earlier text, the Memar Marqah, a collection of sermons attributed to the Samaritan thinker Marqah, who lived in the third or fourth century CE.\textsuperscript{15} Linguistic and textual analysis has shown, however, that the Memar Marqah was redacted multiple times over the centuries, and the extant text is difficult to date before the eleventh century CE.\textsuperscript{16} Also, the account in the Memar Marqah is not about hiding the vessels of the Jerusalem temple, but rather about hiding the tabernacle and the tabernacle implements used by the Israelites in the wilderness of wandering.\textsuperscript{17} This motif of hiding the tabernacle and its implements appears to be a separate tradition, perhaps related to the hiding of the temple vessels but attested separately in other contexts such as the Babylonian Talmud (Sotah 9a), which states that the implements from the wilderness tabernacle were stored in the crypts under the temple in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{18}

Limiting the origins of the motif of hiding the temple vessels to Judaism is too restricting. As does 2 Maccabees 2:4–8, the pseudepigraphical Lives of the Prophets (2:11–19) states that Jeremiah took the "Ark of the Law and the things in it" and caused them to be swallowed up by a rock.\textsuperscript{19} The Babylonian Talmud (Keritot 5b, Yoma 53b, Sanhedrin 26b, Zebahim 62a, Horayot 12a) and Jerusalem Talmud (Sotah 8:22c) record that the temple vessels were hidden under a rock in Jerusalem by King Josiah.\textsuperscript{20} Other rabbinic texts, such as the Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael (5:51b) and the Pesiqta de Rab Kahana (32a),\textsuperscript{21} explicitly refer to the recovery of the objects in a messianic context, and one of the Sibylline Oracles (2:188) makes reference to Elijah as the one who will restore the objects to the temple in Jerusalem at the end of time.\textsuperscript{21}

In the Syriac 2 Baruch (6:7–9) an angel takes the veil, ephod, mercy seat, two tablets, priestly raiment, altar of incense, forty-eight precious stones, and all the "holy vessels of the tabernacle" and causes the earth to swallow
them. Eusebius, citing Alexander Polyhistor, states that the temple vessels were taken to Babylon, except for the ark and the tablets, which were left in the possession of Jeremiah. These various texts demonstrate that the motif of the hidden temple vessels was widespread and can be found in a number of different religious traditions.

There are many examples of objects with religious significance being hidden that are not directly related to the motif of the temple vessels from Jerusalem or the tabernacle in the wilderness of wandering. The Copper Scroll (3Q15) from Qumran provides a list of some sixty items, including gold, silver, furniture, aromatics, utensils, scrolls, and a copy of a more detailed list of other things hidden in various underground locations. Many of the hiding places are identified as "pits" or "cisterns," and the description of the treasure is given. The various explanations given for these buried treasures include that the Copper Scroll is from the library of the sectarians at Qumran, from the Jerusalem temple, from the Bar-Kokhba revolt, or from the medieval period and that it is a fraud designed to mislead treasure-hunting invaders. Also found in the vicinity of Jerusalem but unconnected to the Israelite temple is a collection of artifacts from the so-called Cave of the Treasure discovered at Nahal Mishmar. The buried cache, which dates to the Chalcolithic period, consists of both weapons and armaments (mace-heads, copper crowns, standards), numerous instruments representing gazelles, copper horns, and a variety of jars, ivory objects, and other miscellaneous objects. Examples from further afield, such as the ritual burial of bronze mirrors in Han China, attest to the variety and widespread character of the purposeful burial of certain objects.

A number of Jewish and Christian texts refer to the Cave of Treasures, in which Adam or his son Seth hid certain objects. The Life of Adam and Eve mentions tablets of stone and clay which Eve commanded her children to make and bury. These tablets are later uncovered by Solomon. Josephus refers to these tablets or pillars erected by the children of Adam and Eve as containing astronomical secrets, and the Syriac Treatise of Shem attributes such calendrical and astrological knowledge to the son of Noah. The Abot de Rabbi Nathan (31), Genesis Rabbah (26), 2 Enoch 33:8–12, and Philo in his Life of Moses (2:36) also refer to this testament left by the children of Adam and Eve. The Syriac Testament of Adam is an account of prophecies concerning the hours of the day, and the Coptic Three Stoles of Seth contain the revelation of three pillars inscribed by Seth with hymns to a trinity of heavenly beings. These texts are said to have been buried by Seth in the Cave of Treasures along with the things Adam had removed from the garden of Eden, including the gold, myrrh, and frankincense which the Magi would retrieve and offer as gifts to Jesus at the time of his birth.
lim sources mention a Cave of the Treasure in which Adam is supposed to be buried. The burial of secret books is also known from many other contexts, including the Arabic Hermetical tradition and Buddhism.35

**CONTENTS OF TREASURE AND VOTIVE OFFERINGS**

None of these examples, however, seems to parallel closely or explain the particular description of the contents of the treasure recovered by ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib. Nor do these parallels account for the specific mention that the treasure consisted in part of swords and armor. A more detailed examination of early Islamic accounts of the treasure and the history of the sanctuary at Mecca suggests that the treasure is understood to be linked with votive offerings made to the Ka’bah and Zamzam by pre-Islamic kings. The contents of the treasure and its burial are also closely linked in Islamic sources to the custodianship of the sanctuary at Mecca. Emphasizing these elements, the Islamic accounts of the treasure associate ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib with the widespread Near Eastern motif of the king as founder of the national sanctuary.

In some accounts, the foundation of the Ka’bah by Abraham is specifically linked with the treasure. Hawting claims that “along with the gazelles and swords the Jurhum chief buried the ḥajār al-rukn’ when the Jurhum were ousted by the Khuzā’ah.36 The ḥajār al-rukn is the “foundation stone” usually connected with the building of the Ka’bah by Abraham and Ishmael. The mention of the swords, however, does not occur in all of these accounts of the burial by the chief of the Jurhum. According to al-Ṭabarī, after the death of Nabī, the son of Ishmael, and Ishmael’s Jurhum wife, the Jurhum took control of the custodianship of the Ka’bah. When the Jurhum began to misappropriate the belongings which had been given to the Ka’bah as votive offerings and commit fornication inside the Ka’bah itself, God sent plagues against the Jurhum and the Khuzā’ah attacked them. The leader of the Jurhum, ‘Amr b. al-Ḥārith b. Muḥād, brought out the two gazelles of the Ka’bah and the foundation stone (ḥajār al-rukn), asking God for forgiveness, but God did not respond. So he threw the two gazelles and the foundation stone into Zamzam, buried them, and left Mecca with the rest of the Jurhum who had survived.37 A similar account is given by Ibn Hishām, though it states only that the leader of the Jurhum buried the two gazelles and the foundation stone, omitting the description of the Jurhum leader’s use of the objects in the attempt to gain God’s help.38

In another context, al-Azraqī links the burial of the objects with the son of the Jurhum leader featured in the accounts of al-Ṭabarī and Ibn Hishām, Muḥād b. ‘Amr b. al-Ḥārith b. Muḥād.
When Mudād b. 'Amr b. al-Ḥārith b. Mudād saw what the Jurhum were doing in the sanctuary [al-ḥaram], what they were stealing from the property of the Ka'bah, both in secret and openly, he went for the two gazelles which were in the Ka'bah, of gold, and the Qal'ī swords. He buried them in the place of the well of Zamzam. The water of Zamzam had dried up and disappeared when the Jurhum had done what they had done in the sanctuary, so that the place of the well had been hidden and obliterated. Mudād b. 'Amr and his son got up in a dark night and dug deeply in the place of the well of Zamzam and then buried in it the swords and the two gazelles.39

In this account the burial of the gazelles and swords seems designed to hide them from the Jurhum, who were defiling the sanctuary, whereas in the accounts of al-Ṭabarî and Ibn Hishām the burial seems designed to hide the treasure from the invading Khuzā'ah. None of these accounts mentions armor as part of the treasure buried, although it is consistently mentioned as part of the items recovered by 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib. These accounts do link the treasure with custodianship of the sanctuary.

Uri Rubin has noted a number of reports of votive objects' being cast into the well of Zamzam, many of which mention both golden gazelles (although not always two of them) and swords, often along with other items. Rubin uses these examples to dispute Hawting's denial that the treasure could have been, as the Muslim sources claim, items given to the Ka'bah as votive offerings.40 In one account cited by Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī al-Maš'ūdī (d. 956), it is stated that the Sasanian Sāsān b. Bābāk put into Zamzam two gold gazelles, swords, and some gold.41 Another report, cited on the authority of Ibn al-Kalbī, records that it was the Iranian king Bābāk b. Sāsān who buried swords and jewelry in the place of the well of Zamzam.42 Other reports given on the authority of Saʿīd b. Jubayr, ʿIkrimah, Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab, and al-Zuhri mention the swords and gazelles as having been votive offerings but do not associate them specifically with Iranian kings.43

Royal votive offerings to shrines and sanctuaries were widespread in the ancient Near East, and numerous examples are attested for the Arabian Peninsula. An inscription from Assur mentions the placing of precious stones and spices from the king of Saba in the foundation of a temple built for the New Year's Festival (biṭ Akiru).44 Other offerings included perishable items such as food and drink offerings but also figurines and statuettes in human or animal form made of stone, metal, and other substances.45 The spoils of war, including arms and armor, and the spoils of the hunt, including live and slain animals and animal images, are attested as offerings to the gods.46 Stelae and statues often portray gods clad in armor and armed with weapons, and
the image of the deity as a warrior figure is widespread in the Near East and elsewhere. That the burial of arms and armor was not uncommon in the Arabian Peninsula is demonstrated by archaeological finds such as the burial of armor in a second-century-CE grave at Janussan on the island of Bahrain. An Aramaic inscription from North Arabia describes the dedication of two camel figurines to Dushara, and a Sabaeen inscription records the offering of a bronze horse and rider to Almaqah. Other Semitic inscriptions, such as the Temple of Ba’al inscription, provide evidence that gold and other items could be substituted for the offering of actual animals.

Gazelles and horns associated with game are also widely attested as votive offerings in the Near East and in Arabia. In a Ḥadrami inscription from about the third century CE, the king of Ḥadramawt makes an offering of twenty-five gazelles on the occasion of his rebuilding of the temple and fortress in the city of Shabwah. Offering the quarry from a ritual hunt at the founding of a sanctuary was a regular practice among the kings of South Arabia, as attested by numerous inscriptions and reliefs. In both classical and more recent examples of hunting among the Arabs, the killing of gazelles and the distribution of meat is a ritual that reaffirms the authority of the chief and the loyalty of his subjects to him. In classical Ḥadrami practice the head huntsman is the priest-king, and the ritual hunt involves purification and the circumambulation of cultic rocks both before and after the hunt. Numerous horns are reported in connection with the Ka’bah and the sanctuary at Mecca, including crescent horns of gold and the horns said to be from the ram offered by Abraham instead of his son Ishmael.

According to Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Biruni (d. 1048), ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib’s gift of the gazelles and swords to the Ka’bah was an example of a royal votive offering that was imitated later by ’Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, who hung two crescent moons or horns conveyed to him from the capture of Mada’in along with his earnings and divination arrows made from gems. That votive offerings were given to the Ka’bah by South Arabian kings is also evident from the widespread tradition that the first covering (kiswa) was given to the Ka’bah by the Tubba’ king of South Arabia identified as As’ad Abū Karib al-Himyarī. In his exegesis of Q 44:37, ‘Imād al-Dīn Ismā’il Ibn Kathir (d. 1373) relates that one of the kings of Tubba’ intended to destroy the Ka’bah but was advised by two Jews that it had been built by Abraham and would be of great importance to a prophet sent at the end of time. The king of Tubba’ circumambulated the Ka’bah and dressed it with fine cloths before calling all the people of Yemen to the religion of Moses. Other accounts state that the ‘Tubba’ king provided the Ka’bah with a lock, as did ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, and it is reported that the ‘Abbasid caliph Mu’tasim presented the Ka’bah with a gold lock (qufl) weighing a thousand mithqals. According to al-Azraqi, the treasury of the
Ka'bah used to hold all the votive offerings, including arrows used for divination, jewelry for adorning idols, and gold. It is reported that the prophet Muhammad uncovered a large amount of gold in the well of the Ka'bah. He left it there, and it was untouched until Husayn b. 'Ali removed it.

Examples of weapons and armor sent as gifts are well known in the early Islamic period. The Kitāb al-hadayā wa al-tuhaf attributed to al-Qādi Ibn al-Zubayr (d. 1167) mentions the gift of a mounted horseman armed with a sword embossed with reptile skin and set with precious stones. The king of Tibet is reported to have sent one hundred gilded Tibetan shields along with one thousand mana of musk (no. 3). Frequently, gifts of arms and armor are sent between rulers, such as the swords, girdles, spears, shields, and equipped beasts of burden sent from the ruler of Khurasân to the caliph Ja'far al-Muqtadîr, and the swords, shields, and spears sent to al-Muktâfi from a European queen (nos. 69, 70). The Byzantine emperor sent to the caliph al-Râdî a treasure of ornamented knives and a battle-ax studded with precious stones and pearls (no. 73). These treasures are also closely associated with ancient and famous kings. The Byzantine emperor is said to have sent al-Mustanṣîr three heavy saddles of enamel inlaid with gold and saddles from Alexander the Great (no. 90). Another report mentions the discovery of saddles locked in a crate of palm fronds, one of them being one of the six saddles that had belonged to Dhū al-Qarnayn and later transferred from him to the Byzantine state treasuries (no. 99).

The Muslim accounts which describe 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib's discovery of the treasure and subsequent gift to the sanctuary at Mecca closely parallel other ancient Near Eastern narratives of sanctuary foundations. The inscription on bricks found at Mari for the dedication of the Shamash temple mentions King Yahdun-Lim's securing and establishment of the house for Shamash, and the gift of a mighty weapon to the king by Shamash. Other Near Eastern accounts also associate the establishment of the sanctuary with weapons, such as the Gudea inscriptions and the Ugaritic accounts of the sanctuary at Zaphon. The Assyrian king Hammurabi also is depicted as securing the land, establishing sanctuaries, and providing water for his people. Likewise, the accounts of Samsuiluna, the king of Babylon, the verse account of Nabonidus, the Moabite Stone, and the building inscription of Azitawadda of Adana link the civilizing activities of kings, primarily the conquest of peoples and the fortification of cities, with the establishment of sanctuaries. A similar link between the establishing of the sanctuary and the construction of cities and the accoutrements of civilization can be found in South Arabian inscriptions, such as that found on the door of the Minaean capital at Ma'in.

Similarly, 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib is portrayed as establishing his rightful claim
to the custodianship of the sanctuary, as rebuilding the Ka'bah, providing a door and a lock as well as ornamentation, and he provides water for the people of the area. The recovery of the treasure by 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib is explicitly linked with the prophecies concerning the future prophethood and leadership of Muhammad.67 Qaṣayy is also closely associated with the reestablishment of the sanctuary at Mecca and with 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib. He drives the Khuzā'ah out of Mecca, takes control of the sanctuary, and settles the Quraysh there.68 Many sources describe Qaṣayy in terms commensurate not only with ancient Near Eastern kings but also with other mythical civilizing figures such as the Greek Atlas or the Iranian king Oshahanj, who, according to al-Ṭabarī, was the first to build buildings, mosques, and the cities of Babylon and Susa.69 Both Qaṣayy and 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib also establish themselves as hereditary custodians of the sanctuary, as did the priest-kings of South Arabia.70 Akkadian texts prescribe certain rituals for the repair of temples, and Hittite texts describe special rituals for the erection of new buildings, including houses and palaces.71 Qaṣayy was responsible for the administration of the Dār al-Nadwah, providing pilgrims with food (rifāda) and drink (siqāyah), and with the supervision of the Ka'bah (sidāna, ḥijāba). After his death these responsibilities reportedly were divided among his sons, but 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib took control of both the provisions and the supervision of the Ka'bah with his recovery of the treasure.

Muslim sources describe the Ka'bah and the Meccan sanctuary in terms familiar from the descriptions of other temples of the ancient Near East. In his history of Mecca, al-Azraqi gives detailed measurements of the Ka'bah and the surrounding sanctuary.72 He also provides a number of traditions regarding the vessels of the Ka'bah and its ornamentation, with particular attention to the dressing of the Ka'bah with the kiswa cloth.73 Such descriptions of the dimensions and accoutrements of temples is widespread and characteristic of temple registers in other Near Eastern contexts, including the accounts of the Israelite tabernacle in Exodus 26–40 and the Jerusalem temple in Ezekiel 40–42, the Temple Scroll, and the Mishnaic tractate Middot.74 Elaborate and often striking descriptions of temple and city walls, and their connection with sovereignty, are common in the ancient Near East.75

It is important to note that in the various reports of his discovery of the treasure in Mecca, 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib does not recover the black stone or “foundation stone” (ḥajar al-rukn) that is reported to have been buried along with the two gold gazelles by the Jūrum. Nor is such a foundation stone mentioned in the reports of the various votive offerings, outside the accounts of the burial of the implements by the Jūrum chieftain. The marked absence of this stone from the recovered treasure is significant. Such stones,
especially black stones, were used as the main cult objects for the worship of other Arabian gods. According to Epiphanius, the Nabataean god Dhu-Shara (Dhū al-Shārā) was represented by something called a "khaabou," which represented the deity. The Byzantine lexicographer Suidas reports that this was a black stone, roughly square, four feet high by two feet wide. Antoninus Placentinus relates that in Sinai the local Arabs had an idol which changed from snow white to pitch black, perhaps related to the shedding of blood over it. Q 5:3 refers to the food slaughtered on stone altars. Ibn al-Kalbi relates that a number of Arab deities were represented by stones.

In the accounts concerning 'Abd al-Mu'talib's recovery of the treasure, however, the object uncovered at the establishment of the sanctuary is not the cult object but rather the well of Abraham and Ishmael, the swords of the Israelites, and the gifts of Arab and Iranian kings. This is in striking contrast to the fact that 'Abd al-Mu'talib is said to recover Zamzam in a location near the two idols where the Quraysh used to perform their sacrifices. In other Arabian contexts, the custodian of the sanctuary is often portrayed as gaining his office by establishing the altar or cult object. For example, a limestone stela from Tayma shows the priest-custodian of the god Salm performing the ritual installation of his cult object. Often, the custodian is said to practice divination, and the foundation of the sanctuary sometimes includes receiving a dream from the deity, as is the case in the accounts of 'Abd al-Mu'talib and Zamzam. The many accounts of the recovery of the True Cross and the building of the churches in Palestine likewise emphasize the priority of the uncovering of the cult object. Also evident in the legends of the True Cross is the close connection between the discovery of the cult object by the king figure and the establishment of cult sanctuaries. In these legends of the True Cross, examples from the ancient Near East, and the accounts of 'Abd al-Mu'talib, the establishment of the sanctuary is linked to the civilizing function of the royal or priestly figure who recovers lost territory. Similar examples can be adduced from ancient China, Rome, Egypt, and Southeast Asia. The recovery of relics and the rituals accompanying the establishment of the sanctuary or state capital mark the origins of a new age of civilization.

2: SWORDS AND THE ORIGINS OF ISLAM

Although he does not develop the idea, Hawting does refer to the eschatological significance of the loss and recovery of the temple implements in the Bible and in Samaritan sources. It is possible that the early Muslim sources reflect a conscious attempt to use the account of the recovery of the trea-
sure to signal the dawn of a new prophetic age. The swords and armor, in particular, are relevant to this attempt. According to a number of sources, pilgrims were not supposed to take swords or other weapons into the sanctuaries at Mecca and at other locations. The rules for the visitation of other sanctuaries in the area also prohibited the carrying of weapons and required abstaining from sex while in the sanctuary. Like other Semitic sanctuaries, the sanctuary at Mecca is said to have been a place, marked by stones, considered inviolable, a place of refuge, and a place in which blood was not to be shed. This suggests that the swords and armor, as the two gold gazelles, were not understood as random objects buried in the sanctuary.

LEXICAL REFERENCES TO SWORDS AND METALS

The specific designation of the recovered swords as “Qal‘i swords” is pertinent to the mythological significance of the accounts of the treasure. According to Abū 'Abdallah Yaqūt (d. 1229), the adjective “Qal‘i” may refer to a number of different things, including the name of a mountain in Syria:

Qal‘ah is the name of a tin mine from which the adjective is derived. It is also said that it is a mountain in Syria. Mis‘ar b. Muhlahal the poet says, in the account of his travels to China: “I returned from China to Kalah. It is the first city of India on the border with China. The caravan stopped there and did not go further. In it is a great fortress [qal‘ah] in which is a tin [al-raṣāṣ al-qal‘i] mine which is only in this fortress. In this fortress are pounded the Qal‘i swords which are of ancient India [al-hindiyyah al-‘atīqah]. The people of this fortress obey their king when they want and disobey him when they want, because there is a tin mine in this fortress. Between it and Sandābul the Chinese city is three hundred parasangs. Around it are well-ordered spread-out cities.” Abū al-Riḥān says: “Tin is obtained from Sarnadib, an island in the Indian Ocean.” In al-Andalus is the region of al-Qal‘ah from Kūrāh Qabrāh. I think the term “tin” [al-raṣāṣ al-qal‘i] is related to it because it is obtained from al-Andalus and therefore it is called after it or after some place else that is named al-Qal‘ah there. Qal‘ah is [also] a place in Yemen and it is from here that the legal scholar al-Qaṣī derives his name.

The notion that “Qal‘ah” refers to a mountain in Syria directly links the recovery of the treasure with the traditions about the hiding of the temple implements on a mountain outside Jerusalem. That the term “Qal‘ah” or the swords themselves are associated with a location in Syria is also mentioned by several sources cited by Ibn Manẓūr. Both Muḥammad b. Mukarram Ibn Manẓūr (d. 1312) and Yaqūt relate opinions that Marj Qal‘ah is a village
outside the district of Hulwān in Iraq, that it is in open country connected somehow with swords, and that it refers to a place in Yemen. In his dictionary, Muhammad b. Yaʿqūb al-Firuzābādī (d. 1415) locates Qalʿah in Yemen, and Yāqūt claims that the name is associated with Spain. These multiple identifications may, in part, be due to the fact that the term “qalʿah” can refer in a generic sense to any fortress or stronghold, as indicated by Yāqūt’s account of the fortress in which the tin is mined in Kalah.

The name Qalʿah and its relation to the adjective apparently formed from it as a descriptive of certain swords is unclear. In his work on minerology, al-Bīrūnī cites al-Bāhīlī, who wrote a work on weapons, to demonstrate that the adjective “Qalʿi” refers to Qalʿah, just as the type of sword known as Mashrafi refers to Mishrāf. Continuing with his descriptions of swords, al-Bīrūnī states that the term “Qalʿah” refers to a place and specifically to the type of sword which is made from the metal mined in that place, just as other swords are called Indian or Yemeni, referring to the origins of the materials used to make them. He describes these swords as being broad, and explains that the association of the swords and the adjective “Qalʿi” with other apparently unrelated objects such as sails, types of boats, and mountains arises from the “white” color of the metal used to make the swords. Ibn Manẓūr also explains that using the adjective “Qalʿi,” as in “Qalʿi lead” (al-raṣāṣ al-qalʿi), is like saying “good lead” (raṣāṣ jayyid) or “tin,” which is also called “white lead” (al-raṣāṣ al-abyād) because it is white in color.” A number of other poetic sources mention “Qalʿi” swords, and some appear to identify these as being of Indian or Yemeni origins.

In his work on swords, Yaʿqūb b. Ishāq al-Kindī (d. ca. 866) lists “Qalʿi” swords as one of three types of “ancient” (ʿāiq) steel-bladed swords used by the Arabs, including “Yemeni” and “Indian” (Hindi or Hindīwānī) swords. He explains that these swords are of non-Arab origin but does not specify the location of Qalʿah other than distinguishing it from Yemen and India. A possible location for Qalʿah suggested by later sources is China or the eastern edge of India on the border with China. Yāqūt, citing Misʿār b. Muhlahal, identifies Qalʿah with the city of Kalah located in India on the border with China. Ibn Saʿīd says that the town of Kalah, in the thirteenth century CE, had a fortress in which a certain type of sword was forged. According to Pliny, the Romans and Parthians used iron from China because it was best known, until exports from Europe increased. The use of Chinese iron is also attested in Islamic times by Ibn Khurradādhbih and Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Idrīsī (d. 1165). Others have identified Qalʿah with the region of Kalah in the Malay Peninsula, a successful trading center in later centuries, and have noted the use of the term in various forms to designate tin in other languages, such as Persian, Turkish, Greek, and Portuguese.
Thus, it is possible that the sources reflect a lack of certainty about the origins of Qal‘i swords or the existence of multiple origins for swords given the “Qal‘i” adjective. The use of tin is one of the oldest metallurgical technologies for hardening metals and dates back to a stage immediately preceding the use of copper. Tin is also one of the metals that is least durable but easiest to treat, and it was not used in the sword making described in Muslim sources such as al-Kindī and al-Bīrūnī. The association of Qal‘i swords with tin, and their connection to the iron imports of China and the East in general, may signify an attempt to demonstrate the antiquity of the swords and the craft utilized to produce them. The uncertainty about the identification of Qal‘ah in these later etymological and geographical sources may also be due to a lack of continuity with earlier historical sources that mention certain Qal‘i swords.

**Swords of the Prophet Muhammad**

One of the swords attributed to the prophet Muhammad is said to be a Qal‘i sword or a sword named al-Qal‘. In his section on the distribution of booty, Muḥammad b. Ismā‘il al-Bukhārī (d. 870) cites a number of hadith reports in which there is mention of items that belonged to the prophet Muhammad and were still in use after his death: “Section: What is mentioned concerning the arms of the prophet, his rod, his sword, his arrow, and his ring, and what the successors [khulāfā’] used after him about which there is no mention that he apportioned it, and concerning his hair, his shoe, and his vessels [ānīyah] which his companions and others considered blessed after his death.” This section of al-Bukhārī includes six hadith reports. The first hadith report refers to the ring of the prophet Muhammad, the second to his shoes, the third to some of his clothing, the fourth to his arrow, the fifth to his sword, and the sixth to his giving of some alms (ṣadaqah). In his collection of hadith reports, Muḥammad b. ʿIsā al-Tirmidhī (d. 893) preserves a report that the prophet Muhammad had a sword of silver and gold. He also cites a report that the pomel of the sword of the Prophet was of silver, and a similar report is recorded by Muḥammad b. ʿUthmān al-Dhahābī (d. 1348) in his biography of the prophet Muḥammad. Both Muḥammad b. Yazīd (d. 887) and al-Tirmidhī record a report, transmitted on the authority of Sulaymān b. Ḥabīb, that swords were ornamented with silver and gold. There is also a report related by al-Tirmidhī and al-Dhahābī in which Ibn Sīrīn claims to have made his sword from the sword of Samurah b. Jundab, and that Samurah made his sword from the sword of the prophet Muḥammad.

There are a number of other swords attributed to the prophet Muḥam-
mad in Muslim sources. Nine swords are mentioned by name in verses re-
corded in the fifteenth century by al-Bulqini: "We gave nine swords: Rasūb,
al-Mikhḍham, Dhū al-Faqār, Qaḍib, Ḥarf, al-Battār, 'Adb. Qal‘ī, and
Ma‘thūr al-Fījār. They were decreed to be equivalent with the signs of Moses,
all for the enemy the cause of ruin." The names of many of these swords
can be traced back to earlier sources, where other names are also provided.
In the ninth century, Ibn Sa‘d mentions Ma‘thūr, Dhū al-Faqār. Battār,
al-Ḥarf, al-Mikhḍham, and a Qal‘ī sword in the section of his work on the
"swords of the apostle of God," along with various traditions related to the
swords. He follows this with several sections devoted to the armor, shield,
spear, horses, camels, and other possessions of the prophet Muhammad.
In his biography of the prophet Muhammad, al-Dhahabi includes a sec­
tion on the "weapons of the prophet Muhammad, his armor, and other war
implements," in which he lists a number of traditions related to the named
swords of the prophet Muhammad. Among these, he cites the tenth-
century scholar Ibn Fāris al-Qazwīnī as a source for eight named swords:
"The weapons of the prophet Muhammad included Dhū al-Faqār, which
was a sword he took as spoil on the day of Badr. He had a sword that was be­
queathed to him by his father. Sa‘d b. Ḥubādāh gave him a sword called al-‘Aḍ
b. He took as spoil from the weapons of the Banū Qaynuqā‘ a Qal‘ī sword,
and in another report he had one called al-Battār and al-Lakhīf. He had al-
Mikhḍham and al-Rasūb. There were eight swords." According to the edi­
tor of al-Dhahabi’s text, "al-Lakhīf" is Persian for "al-Ḥanfīf," also related to
"al-Ḥanfī," another name given to this sword. Based on the Arabic orthog­
raphy, it is possible that the "al-Ḥanfī" mentioned here is to be identified
with the "al-Ḥatf" mentioned by Ibn Sa‘d and other sources.

Other items related to the military campaigns of the prophet Muham­
mad are mentioned in early Muslim sources. Ibn Sa‘d has separate sections
on the armor, shields, lances, riding animals, pack animals, and camels of
the prophet Muhammad, and al-Bukhārī mentions a rod and arrows of the
prophet Muhammad. Ibn Mājah mentions his helmet, armor, bow, and
lance. In his collection of hadith reports, al-Dārimi mentions the helmet
of the prophet Muhammad and the silver pommel of his sword. He is
also reported to have owned and used a number of lances, armor, and rods
known by name, and sources make reference to a number of banners, flags,
and a tent (fuṣṭāṭ) that belonged to him. In his work on the biography
of the prophet Muhammad, Ibn Kathīr lists three lances, three bows, six
swords, armor, a shield, a signet ring, an arrow, flags, and banners. Abū
al-Ḥasan ‘Ali b. al-Athīr (1160–1233) lists all of the named weapons of the
prophet Muhammad:
He had Dhū al-Faqār. He took it as spoil on the day of Badr. It belonged to Munabbih b. al-Hajjāj, and, it is said, to others. He took three swords as spoil from the Banū Qaynuqā: a Qal‘ī sword, a sword called Battār, and a sword called al-Khayf [ms. B: al-Ḥarf]. He had al-Mikhdham and Rasūb. He took two swords with him to Medina, one of which, named al-‘Aḍb, was present at Badr. He had three lances and three bows: a bow named al-Rawḥā’, a bow called al-Bayḍā’ and a nab’ wood bow called al-Ṣafra’. He had armor called al-Sa’diyah and he had armor called Dhar al-Fūlul, which he wore on the day of Uhud. It was silver. He had a shield on which was a representation of the head of a ram.}

Many of these items are preserved in the Topkapi Museum in Istanbul and are mentioned as having been included in the treasuries of the ‘Abbasid, Fatimid, Mamluk, and Ottoman dynasties.}

al-Ma‘thūr The first sword acquired by the prophet Muhammad was al-Ma‘thūr, or Ma‘thūr al-Fijār, bequeathed to him by his father, ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib. Ibn Suhayl reports that the prophet Muhammad came to Medina at the time of the Hijrah with this sword, which had belonged to his father. It is also reported that the prophet Muhammad accompanied the procession for the marriage of his daughter Fāṭimah to ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭalib with his sword unsheathed, protected by the swords of the Banū Hāshim. Sharīf al-Dīn al-Dimyāṭi is cited by al-Dhahabi as reporting that the first sword owned by the prophet Muhammad was al-Ma‘thūr and that people say it was made by the Jinn. After the death of the prophet Muhammad, ownership of the sword is said to have been transferred to ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭalib, although the emphasis in all the reports appears to be upon the fact that the prophet Muhammad inherited the sword from his father. There is a sword preserved in the Topkapi Museum in Istanbul which is identified as the al-Ma‘thūr sword. It is ninety-nine centimeters in length with a gold handle encrusted with emeralds and turquoise, shaped like two serpents. Inscribed on the handle is the inscription “‘Abdallāh b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib,” in a Kufic script. The close linkage of this sword with both ‘Abdallāh b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib and ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, son of Hāshim, suggests that the sword is a symbol of the Hāshimī lineage of the prophet Muhammad and his association with the custodians of the sanctuary at Mecca.

Dhū al-Faqār The sword called “Dhū al-Faqār” is the best known of the named swords that are attributed to the prophet Muhammad. Ahmad b. Nūr al-Dīn ‘Alī b. Hajar (d. 1448) identifies the sword mentioned in
al-Bukhari’s section on the weapons of the prophet Muhammad as Dhū al-Faqār, a sword which the prophet Muhammad took as spoil at the battle of Badr. A sword taken by the prophet Muhammad as booty is also mentioned in the hadith collection of Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj b. Muslim (d. 875). In his commentary on Q 8:41, Ibn Kathir refers to this sword by name and cites al-Tirmidhi’s report transmitted on the authority of Ibn ‘Abbās. This is also reported by Ibn Mājah and al-Bayhaqi on the authority of Ibn ‘Abbās. In his commentary on al-Bukhari, Abū al-‘Abbās Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Qasāsī (d. 1517) states that the sword mentioned in connection with the prophet Muhammad’s weapons is Dhū al-Faqār, adding that the sword was given as a gift to ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib and was passed on to his descendants after his death, as indicated by the text of the hadith itself. According to al-Dhahabi, the name derives from the blade of the sword, which resembled the vertebrae of a spinal cord. He cites a description by al-Dimyāṭī in which the sword is said to have accoutrements of silver.

According to a report transmitted on the authority of ‘Ikrimah, Dhū al-Faqār belonged to al-‘Āṣ b. Munabbih al-Sahmi, who was slain at the battle of Badr by ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib, and the sword was taken by the prophet Muhammad as spoil. Al-Dimyāṭī explains that the sword had belonged to al-‘Āṣ b. Munabbih, the brother of Nābiḥ b. al-Ḥajjāj b. Āmir al-Sahmi, who was killed along with his father and his paternal uncle while still unbelievers at the battle of Badr. Other reports link a sword with al-‘Āṣ b. Wā’il of the Banū Sahmi, and with the revelation of Q 19:77–80. Abū Dā’ūd al-Sijistānī (d. 889) cites a report which mentions that the prophet Muhammad killed Abū Jahl and took from him his sword. In all of these reports the sword is closely associated with one of the more prominent of the Meccan opponents to the prophet Muhammad. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 856) and Ibn Mājah preserve a report from Ibn ‘Abbās according to which the prophet Muhammad took his sword Dhū al-Faqār as spoil on the day of Badr, and that it was this sword in which he saw the vision on the day of Uhud. According to another report cited by al-Ṭabarī, on the authority of Abū Hurayrah, the sword had belonged to Munabbih b. al-Ḥajjāj, the father of al-‘Āṣ b. Munabbih, who was also killed during the battle of Badr.

Dhū al-Faqār is commonly associated with ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib and his descendants in later centuries. According to al-Ṭabarī, the sword is reported to have been used by ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib against a group of the unbelievers of the Quraysh at the battle of Uhud: “Then the apostle of God saw another group of the unbelievers of the Quraysh and said to ‘Ali: ‘Attack them!’ ‘Ali attacked them, divided them, and killed Shaybah b. Mālik of the Banū ‘Āmir b. Lu‘ayy. Then Gabriel said: ‘Apostle of God, this is for consultation.’ The apostle of God said: ‘He is of me and I am of him.’ Gabriel said: ‘I am of
both of you.' They heard a voice saying: 'There is no sword but Dhū al-Faqār, and no companion but 'Ali.'" Ibn Mājah and al-Tirmidhī also cite reports of people hearing the voice making a statement about the sword and 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib. It is also reported on the authority of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq that the prophet Muhammad saw a vision of God sitting on his throne and making this statement. Later accounts closely associate Dhū al-Faqār with 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib and the leaders of the Shi‘ah, including the Fatimid caliphs. The Ismā‘ili scholar al-Qāḍī al-Nu‘mān b. Muhammad (d. 962) describes how the sword was taken from the caliphal palace in Baghdad after the murder of the 'Abbasid al-Muqtadir in 932 and returned to its rightful owner, the Fatimid caliph, in Cairo.

According to al-Dhahabi, the name “Dhū al-Faqār” is derived from the appearance of the sword, being the plural of “fiqrah,” which means “vertebra,” because the sword is said to have had notches or pits on the blade. He explains the source of the iron used to make the sword: “It is said that the source of the iron was found buried at the Ka‘bah, [taken] from that which the Jurhum buried. From it [the iron] was made Dhū al-Faqār. It was crafted by ‘Amr b. Ma‘dī Karib al-Zubaydī and was given to Khālid b. Sā‘īd b. al-‘Āṣ.”

The sword is tied to eschatological contexts in Ibn Ḥajar’s commentary on al-Bukhārī, in which he compares the battles against Muslims at the end of time to the Meccan opposition to the prophet Muhammad. A tradition cited by Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Shahrāshūb (d. 1192) states that this sword was a gift from Bilqīs the Queen of Sheba to Solomon the prophet and king of the Israelites. These traditions connect Dhū al-Faqār to the burial and offering of swords at the sanctuary of Mecca and suggest a link between their recovery by ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib and the prophet Muhammad.

**Swords Associated with 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib**

Four other swords attributed to the prophet Muhammad are closely associated with 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib and later Shi‘i figures. Among these are the swords known as al-Rasūb and al-Mikhdham. According to some accounts, the prophet Muhammad sent 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib and 150 men on an expedition to al-Fuls, against the idol of the Tayyi’, and when 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib destroyed the idol he found in the treasury there the two swords al-Rasūb and al-Mikhdham. Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Waqīdī (d. 822) mentions a third sword that was not given to the prophet Muhammad but was kept by 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib: “'Ali went out to al-Fuls, destroying and leveling it. He found in its temple three swords: Rasūb, al-Mikhdham, and a sword known as al-Yamānī.” Ibn Shahrāshūb mentions a report in which Gabriel commands 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib to destroy an iron idol in Yemen, and it is from this idol that two swords are made: Mikhdham and Dhū al-Faqār. Both Rasūb and Mikhdham are men-
tioned by al-Dhahabi as having been made from the idol of the Ṭayyi’. In another account, ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib discovers the swords when he is sent by the prophet Muhammad to raze Mināḥ. The two swords, said to have been in the possession of the Ghassānīd king al-Ḥārith b. Shamr, had been offered as gifts to the local idols. Both swords were then given by the prophet Muhammad to ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib to pass down to his family. There is a sword in the Topkapi Museum identified as al-Rasūb and bearing the name of Ja’far al-Ṣādiq, and Ahmad b. ‘Ali al-Maqrizi (d. 1442) mentions swords of al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib and Ja’far al-Ṣādiq in the treasuries from the Fatimids. Another sword in the Topkapi Museum is identified as al-Mikhdham and bears the name ‘Ali Zayn al-‘Ābidin.

The Shi‘i scholar al-Majlisi (d. 1698) preserves a tradition that the Shi‘ah maintained a weapons storehouse (Dār al-Ṣilāh) for the weapons of the family of the prophet Muhammad, which included these swords, just as the Israelites kept their implements, like the Ark of the Covenant, in the storehouse of the ark (Dār al-Tābūt). The swords known as al-Qadīb and al-‘Aḍb, the names of both of which mean “cutting,” are also attributed to the prophet Muhammad and associated with ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib and his descendants. A sword identified as the al-Qadīb sword is housed in the Topkapi Museum and is inscribed with the names of Muhammad, his father, and his grandfather. A sword identified as the al-‘Aḍb sword is now kept in the Husayn Mosque in Cairo.

Swords and Armor from the Israelites The three remaining named swords of the prophet Muhammad—al-Qal‘i, al-Battār, and al-Ḥatf—are all said to have been taken as spoil by the prophet Muhammad from the Jewish tribal grouping of the Banū Qaynuqa‘. According to al-Waqīdī, the prophet Muhammad took a number of weapons and armor from the Banū Qaynuqa‘: “The apostle of God took their weapons: three bows, a bow called al-Karāmūm which he used at Uḥud, a bow called al-Rawḥā, and a bow called al-Baydā’. He took two suits of armor from their weapons, a suit of armor called al-Ṣaghdiyyah, and another of silver, and three swords: a Qal‘i sword, a sword which is called Battār, and another sword, and three lances. They found many weapons in their strongholds and implements for smithing, for they were smiths.” The same statement is preserved by ‘Ali b. Ahmad b. Ḥazm (d. 1064) in his collection of reports on the life of the prophet Muhammad, and al-Dhahabi mentions three swords and two suits of armor.

Muslim sources mention that the raid against the Banū Qaynuqa‘ took place following the battle of Badr in the second year after the Hijrah to Medina. According to a report cited by al-Bukhārī, the Banū Qaynuqa‘ were smiths, and they left behind their tools and arms when they were ex-
pelled from Medina. A number of exegetes claim that Q 3:12 refers to this confrontation between the prophet Muhammad and the Banū Qaynuqa’. According to Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Qurtubi (d. 1273) and ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Bakr al-Suyūṭī (d. 1505), both citing Ibn Ishāq, the Jews refused to acknowledge the prophethood of Muhammad despite the fact that they knew of him from references in the Torah. In his exegesis of Q 3:12, Mahmūd b. ‘Umar al-Zamakhshari (d. 1144) relates how the Jews acknowledged Muhammad to be the Gentile prophet (al-nabi al-ummi) about whom Moses had spoken, but they still refused to accept him. Other exegetes link this incident to the revelation of Q 8:55–56. Muqāṭil b. Sulaymān (d. 767) states that the verses refer to the Jews, and ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Ali b. Muhammad b. al-Jawzī (d. 1201) and al-Ṭabarī say that the verses refer to the Banū Qurayzhah. It is known that the Muslims took a cache of weapons from the Banū Qurayzhah when they were killed, and the Banū Qurayzhah are said to have been Aaronites through their ancestor Qurayzhah the son of al-Khazraj b. al-Ṣarih. Given the parallels between the Banū Qaynuqa’ and the Banū Qurayzhah, and the timing of the raid on the Banū Qaynuqa’ immediately following the battle of Badr and the first division of spoils among the Muslims, it is possible that the traditions of taking arms and armor as booty from these Jewish groups overlap and may be conflated.

The swords and armor taken from the Jews of Medina, the Banū Qaynuqa’ in particular, are closely linked with the history of the ancient Israelites. According to al-Dhahabi, the armor taken as spoil by the prophet Muhammad from the Banū Qaynuqa’ originates with King David: “He [the prophet Muhammad] had a suit of armor, called Dhāt al-Fadil because of its length, brought to him by Sa’d b. ‘Ubadah when he campaigned at Badr. Also [he had] Dhāt al-Wishāh, which was ornamented, Dhāt al-Hawāshi, and two suits of armor from the Banū Qaynuqa’. They were al-Sughdiyah and al-Fidādah. Al-Sughdiyah was the armor of ‘Akrūr of the Qaynuqa’. It was the armor of David which he wore when he killed Goliath.” The swords taken by the prophet Muhammad also are said to have originated with King David and other Israelite prophets. The sword al-Battār, in particular, is said to be the sword of Goliath which David took from him after felling him with the sling, the sword with which he cut off the head of Goliath. One of the swords attributed to the prophet Muhammad and housed in the Topkapi Museum, identified as al-Battār, has on the blade a picture of David cutting off the head of Goliath. It is inscribed with the names of the prophets David, Solomon, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, Zechariah, John, Jesus, and Muhammad. The sword al-Hafṣ is said to have been made by David when he was old enough to make his own weapon for use in battle.
Exegesis on Q 2:251 explains that David slew Goliath with a sling and cut off Goliath’s head with Goliath’s own sword. In some accounts David is not able to wear the armor or use the weapons given to him by Saul (Ṭalâr) because Saul was much taller than David, so instead David used the sling with which he protected the animals he shepherded. According to ʿAli b. ʿIbrahîm al-Qummî (d. 940), it had been prophesized that Goliath would be defeated by someone wearing the armor of Moses, and David was wearing this armor when he confronted Goliath, who was mounted on an elephant. According to ʿAḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Thaʿlabî (d. 1036), David cut off a signet ring from the hand of Goliath and presented the severed head to Saul. The defeat of Goliath is compared to the victory of the prophet Muhammad at the battle of Badr in al-Thaʿlabî. According to this tradition, David took the sword of Goliath after his defeat as spoil and as a symbol of his victory. That the sword was kept as spoil for David is also attested in 1 Samuel 21:9–10, where the priest Ahimelech explains that the sword of Goliath is being kept wrapped in a cloth behind the ephod.

David’s defeat of Goliath is directly linked to his special knowledge, which included the making of swords and armor. According to Muqâʾîl b. Sulaymân and al-Ṭabarî, it was upon the defeat of Goliath that God gave David the knowledge to make arms and armor. Al-Thaʿlabî explains that David was the first person to make chain mail, and that he could work the metal with his hands as though it were clay. He would sell the suits of armor he made and use the proceeds to feed his family and distribute food to the poor and homeless. Similar accounts given in the exegesis of Q 34:10–11 emphasize that David was able to work with metal without heating it up in the forge. In the exegesis on Q 21:79–80 it is stated that David’s ability to make armor also included the making of weapons. Al-Ṭabarî says that David made all weapons and armor, including swords and lances. Al-Qurṭubi explains that the armor and weapons made by David include all the weapons of the Arabs, and al-Suyūṭî says that David is responsible for all arms and armor.

The swords and armor transferred from the Banû Qaynuqâ’ to the prophet Muhammad were the arms and armor of the Israelite prophets. The sword al-Battâr is also called the “sword of the prophets” because it is said to have been passed from David to Solomon to Zechariah to John to Jesus, and finally to the prophet Muhammad. Exegesis on Q 19:6, in which Zechariah is described as being the custodian of the Jerusalem temple, states that the temple is where the Israelites kept their weapons under the guardianship of the Levites. When the temple was destroyed, a group of the Israelite tribes who were dispersed took the swords and armor and brought them to the
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Arabian Peninsula, where they settled in Yathrib. The swords and armor then passed into the hands of the prophet Muhammad and his successors. It is one of these swords which will be used by Jesus at the end of time to defeat the anti-Christ al-Dajjāl. According to reports cited by al-Bukhārī and al-Tirmidhī, Jesus will wield a sword when he returns to slay the Dajjāl, and when he has defeated the Dajjāl, he will show the people his sword with the blood of the Dajjāl on it as a sign of his victory.  

**Weapons and Other Relics Associated with Prophets and Kings**

Related to the swords of the prophet Muhammad are the swords of his companions and successors. It is reported that Abū Bakr had a special sword which he used at Uhud to defend the prophet Muhammad. A sword identified with this one is now housed in the Topkapi Museum. 'Umar b. al-Khaḍrāb had a special sword called Dhāt al-Wishāh, also known as the Sword of the Rāshīdūn. This is said to be the sword he used to kill 'Ayyanah b. Ḥiṣn al-Fazārī at the time of the latter's apostasy. In the Topkapi Museum there is a sword engraved with the name of 'Uthmān b. 'Affān, which some sources say is related to the revelation of Q 2:137. There are four different swords attributed to Khalīd b. al-Walid, one of which is famous for its use in his conquests. Swords identified as those of Sharḥabīl b. Khusnāh, 'Ammār b. Yāsir, and al-Zubayr b. al-'Awwām are housed at the Topkapi Museum after having been acquired by Ottoman sultans.

The association of the swords of the prophet Muhammad with earlier prophets is also evident from the discovery of other treasures associated with the Israelites. 'Isā b. 'Abdallāh reports on the authority of his uncle 'Abdallāh b. Umar that 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib narrated an account of a special mirror brought down from Eden:

When Adam was brought down from the Garden, God raised him to the top of Abū Qubays and lifted the entire earth for him until he could see it. Then he said: "All this belongs to you and your children." Adam said: "Lord, how may I know what is in it?" So God created the stars for him and said: "If you see such and such a star it means such and such." Thus Adam used to know such things by means of the stars, and when that became too difficult for him, he complained about this to his lord. So God sent him a mirror [mir'āh] from heaven, through which he could see whatever he wished on earth.

When Adam died a devil called Faqtash sought out the mirror, broke it, and built over it a city in the east called Jāburq. When Solomon b. David became king he already knew of the mirror, and he asked about it. He
was told that Faqrash had taken it, so he summoned the devil and asked him about it. Faqrash said: "It is beneath the foundations of Jābūr." Solomon said: "Bring it to me." Faqrash said: "But who will destroy these foundations?" Solomon said: "You will." Solomon told him this and Faqrash brought the mirror to Solomon. Solomon restored it piece by piece and shored it up on all sides with a leather band. Then he looked into it and saw whatever he wanted.

When Solomon died, the devils pounced on the mirror and bore it away. Only one fragment was left, which was inherited by the Israelites, until it reached the exilarch of the Jews [Ras al-Jālūt], who gave it as a gift to Marwān b. Muhammad b. Marwān during his wars with the 'Abbasids. Marwān would rub it, place it on top of another mirror, and see things that displeased him. When this had gone on for a while, he threw it away and beheaded the exilarch of the Jews. One of Marwān's slave girls then took it and kept it with her.

When Abū Ja'far al-Manṣūr became caliph, he already knew of it, and so he inquired about it. He was informed that it was in the possession of a slave girl of Marwān. He searched for it until he found it. It remained with him where he would look into it, and then remained in the caliph's treasuries for a long time until it was lost. 187

Ibn al-Jawzī mentions the seven cities in Babylon, each of which had a wondrous object, including the fourth city, in which there was an iron mirror through which a family could see its absent members. 188 In his conquest of al-Andalus, Tāriq b. Ziyād is said to have recovered a "table" (mā'idah) which had belonged to Solomon b. David. It is said that it was brought to al-Andalus by a king of the Maghrib who had taken it from Jerusalem. The table was inlaid with gold, silver, and precious stones. 189

There are also a number of traditions relating to the discovery of the remains of the prophet Daniel and relics associated with him. Ibn Išḥāq records that the Muslim conquerors who entered Tastar found the preserved corpse of Daniel and a book that was then transcribed into Arabic by Ka'b al-Ahbar. Abū al-Ash'ath al-Ahmari relates that Abū Mūsā discovered a box containing the nerves and veins of Daniel in Tastar, and Ibn Abi al-Dunyā reports that the box discovered by Abū Mūsā contained a book. Several accounts mention the discovery of a ring along with the corpse of Daniel. According to Abū Burdah and Ibn Abi Burdah, the ring depicted two lions licking Daniel. In another report, Abū Mūsā is said to have discovered the corpse of Daniel, a book, dirhems, a ring, and a jar of fat.
Numerous rings are associated with prophets and kings, indicating that the mention of prophetic and royal relics in early Islamic sources was part of a larger symbolism used to represent authority. Qādī Ibn al-Zubayr mentions rings that increase the sexual potency of the person wearing them, and rings of protection against illness. Several rings are associated with a large ruby stone, including that of Ibrāhīm b. al-Mahdi, which was transferred to the Fatimid treasuries and later lost by ʿĪsā b. Abī Jaʿfar al-Mansūr bi-Allāh. Other rings with a similarly unusual ruby stone, called al-Jabal, al-Minqār, and al-Muṭṭalibi, are associated with the caliph al-Mutawakkil. It is said that this large gemstone was originally owned by the Sasanian kings, who had it engraved with their names upon being enthroned. In his Murūj al-dhahab, al-Maṣūdi mentions nine signet rings owned by the Sasanian kings, and other Iranian rings are listed, each associated with a specific royal function. Other unusual gifts are attributed to Iranian kings and later said to have been inherited by the ʿAbbasids, including a great throne, a fireproof turban, and a phoenix.

Swords and their discovery are specifically linked to great kings of the past. Qādī Ibn al-Zubayr mentions the discovery of two cases and two leather bags in which were eleven swords, the armor of Khusrav, the armor of the Byzantine emperor, the armor of the Türkic Khāqān, the armor of the Indian Dāhir, the armor of Bahram Chobin, the armor of King Siyāwūkhs (grandson of Kaykāʾūs), and the armor of the Lakhmid king al-Nuʿmān. The swords were those of Khusrav, Hurmuz, Qubādh, Fayrūz, Heraclius, the Khāqān, the Dāhir, Bahram, Siyāwūkhs, and al-Nuʿmān. Swords associated with the Tubbaʿi kings of Yemen are reported to have been discovered, such as the two dozen found by Abū al-Ḥasan, along with 160 other ancient Himyarī swords, when he conquered the palace of Sayf b. Dḥī Yazān in Ghumdān. The sword called al-Šamsāma was in the possession of ʿĀmr b. Maʿdikarib al-Zubaydī and was said to have originated in South Arabia, where it once belonged to the people of ʿĀd and to Ibn Dḥī Qayfān, the last of the Himyar kings of the Dḥū Jadaṯ family. The swords associated with the kings of Gurjara (Arabic malik al-juzār) include a famous sword housed in the capital of Bhīmālā (Arabic Bilāmān) called Sulaymāniyāh and a “sword of Japheth” (Yāfīth). Swords and weapons are mentioned as part of a treasury discovered, along with other emblems of kingship, such as girdles, thrones, and knives. During the caliphate of al-Manṣūr, Hishām b. ʿĀmr al-Taghlibī uncovered a treasure in his conquest of India: “There he found a thick iron column [sāriyāh] 70 cubits long. He dug for its base and found it sunk 30 cubits into the ground. Its length was thus 100 cubits. He asked the people of al-Qundahār about it, and they replied: ‘These are the swords of the Persians from the time when..."
they, together with Tubba' the Himyarite, defeated us and conquered the
countries. When they entered al-Qundahar, they collected their swords,
hammered them together, and formed this column. Other accounts
mention the private holdings of arms and armor and huge treasures of
kings discovered by Muslim commanders when they conquered Iraq and
Iran.

CONCLUSIONS: SWORDS AND THE ORIGINS OF CIVILIZATION

In many of these accounts, the discovery of treasure, and of swords and
armor in particular, is closely associated with conquest and the passing on
of royal authority. The association of swords with royal symbolism is found
in many different cultural traditions. Swords are used in various cultures as
symbols of investiture. The sword, and the rod for which it is a substitute,
is also used as a mark of religious authority. Swords are used in Islamic law,
deriving from ancient legal practices associated with kings and prophets, to
conclude contracts. All of these are linked with the primary offices of civiliza­
tion and its governance.

Perhaps more directly pertinent to the account of 'Abd al-Mu'talib's dis­
ccovery of certain swords and armor in the treasure of the Ka'bah is the use of
swords and armor as marking the origins of civilization or the dawn of a new
civilization. Swords, armor, and other forged weaponry require a certain
level of technology. A great deal of time and expertise is also necessary for
the production of forged items. These conditions depend, in turn, upon a
certain level of civilization having been achieved. The divine origins of
swords and their role in establishing civilization epitomizes the founding
myth of many societies, especially in the ancient Near East. Linking the
establishment of a new order to the recovery of an older order, one which
has ties to the origins of civilization, is not uncommon. Accounts of the dis­
ccovery of the hidden treasure in Zaphon at Ugarit tell how sacred weapons
were given in order to aid in the reestablishment of the cosmic order. The
so-called Jewish tradition of the hidden vessels seems to be part of this larger
Near Eastern motif in which the recovery of treasure heralds a new age.

A number of myths make the link between forged weapons and the ori­
gins of civilization, and they often include an account of the divine revelation
of weapons and the conquest of chaos. The relationship of the divine
smith and the first king is widespread in the cosmogonic mythologies of the
ancient Near East. Biblical tradition preserves this link in the accounts of
Enoch bringing down swords and the other implements of civilization to
a fallen humanity as reminders of their current state. Muslim exegesis on
Q.57:25 maintains that swords and metallurgy related to weapons were revealed by God because of humanity’s fallen state. Ibn Kathir states that God gave iron to humanity to establish justice and civilization in the world, as demonstrated by the fact that God decreed fighting by the sword for the prophet Muhammad and his followers against those who reject the Quran. Ahmad b. Hanbal and Abu Da’ud both cite a hadith report on the authority of Ibn ’Umar according to which the prophet Muhammad said: “I was sent with the sword in my hands so that people would worship God alone without associating anything with him.”

Other exegetes relate Q.57:25 even more specifically to the swords of the prophet Muhammad. According to Ibn Shahrāshūb, the verse refers to Dhū al-Faqār: “The exegesis of al-Suddi on the authority of Ibn ‘Abbās concerning the word of God: ‘We sent down the iron.’ He [Ibn ‘Abbās] said: God sent down Adam from the Garden and with him was Dhū al-Faqār created out of the leaves of the myrtle tree in the Garden. Then God said: ‘With it is great harm.’ With it Adam fought his enemies from among the Jinn and Satans. On it was written that prophets would not cease to fight with it, prophet after prophet, righteous after righteous, until it was inherited by the Commander of the Faithful, who would fight with it on behalf of the Gentile Propher.” Ibn Shahrāshūb reports that Gabriel caused Dhū al-Faqār to fall from the heavens, ornamented with silver. Ibn ‘Abbās is reported to have said that God gave Dhū al-Faqār to Adam, and that the sword was sent from heaven to the prophet Muhammad, who then gave it to ‘Alī b. Abī Tālīb. “It is also reported on the authority of other scholars that what is meant by this verse is that Dhū al-Faqār was sent down from heaven to the Prophet, who gave it to ‘Ali.” Other exegetes explain that the sending down of the sword in Q.57:25 indicates that victory comes only by the instruments of war.

The divine origins and earthly dispersal of tools, weapons, and other implements and arts of civilization is found in other ancient Near Eastern conceptions of territory and civilization, like the dispersal of the Me in Sumerian myth. In the myth of Inanna and Enki, Inanna is said to acquire the Me from Enki at his Absu fortress in Eridu. The list of Me provided in this text includes about a hundred different Me ranging from simple skills such as making bread and planting crops to more elaborate religious rituals and rules for war and diplomacy. Among the items listed are the following relating to kingship, religion, state offices, war, music, and the sciences:

man.en = office of “en”
nam.lagar = office of “lagar”
nam.dingir = divine function
Although more elaborate, the list of the Me given in Sumerian sources parallels the sorts of artifacts and arts of civilization associated with the fall of Adam from the garden of Eden, and the subsequent spread of civilization from Mecca. Like the knowledge of the prophet Muhammad dispersed in the form of hadith reports, the Me are conceptualized as discrete written texts stored on tablets, one tablet for each civilizational skill. Other myths describe Enki's travels throughout the world and distribution of the Me in various locations, such as Ur and Egypt, leading to the origins of civilization in those places, not unlike the distribution and collection of hadith reports at the centers of Islamic civilization.

In the following chapter, the discovery of the treasure of the Ka'bah is to be understood as an example of the mythology of the origins of civilization.
on earth, and the association of the sanctuary at Mecca with Adam and his fall from Eden. In this mythology, it is the prophets who establish the sanctuary at Mecca and act as its custodians, using the implements of civilization revealed to them by God: “It [the Ka‘bah] had not had a guardian since the time of Noah, when it was raised up. Then God commanded Abraham to settle his son Ishmael by the House of God intended as a mark of honor to the one whom he honored by his prophet Muhammad. Abraham and his son Ishmael were custodians of the House after the time of Noah. At this time Mecca was uninhabited, and the area around Mecca belonged to the Jurhum and Amalekites.”

The founding of the sanctuary by Adam is the civilizing of the first place on the earth, and Adam’s act of civilizing is connected with Abraham and the prophet Muhammad’s subsequent re-establishment of the Meccan sanctuary. The recovery of Mecca by Qusayy, the recovery of the treasure by ‘Abd al-Mut‘alib, and the pilgrimage of the prophet Muhammad are successive episodes in the early Islamic account of the establishment of Mecca as the symbolic capital and center of Islamic civilization. Accounts of the recovery of the Meccan treasure draw upon Near Eastern mythological traditions to identify the gazelles, swords, and armor with the implements used by prophets and kings in the founding and development of civilization. These accounts link the founding of the sacred capital at Mecca and the origins of Islamic civilization with the beginnings of religion and society in human history.
Chapter 2 showed how the items in the treasure uncovered by ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib had symbolic associations which link the prophet Muhammad with the origins of civilization. Muslim sources draw upon mythological accounts of the divine origins of weapons and other implements of civilization. The discovery of the treasure of the Ka'bah is understood as a reference to the founding of the Meccan sanctuary by Adam as the first place of civilization on the earth after his fall from Eden. The swords and armor inherited by the prophet Muhammad are symbolic reminders of the fall from Eden and the role of prophets and kings in the development of civilization.

Chapter 2 shows how Muslim legal theorists interpret and define certain obligatory rituals as practicable symbols reminding people of this distinction between civilized life on earth and the utopian existence of Eden. Section 1 examines legal definitions of impurity, especially as the conception of impurity relates to genitalia and sex. Despite the variety of opinions, the general agreement of Muslim jurists on certain principles suggests that the impurity associated with touching the penis is logically related to other conditions that invalidate ablution (wudu') and ritual washing (ghusl). These conditions defined by the jurists suggest a correspondence between purity laws and the detailed descriptions of the state of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden. Building upon this explanation, section 2 focuses on how the rules pertaining to other rituals, such as the fast (ṣawm), offering (zakāt), and pilgrimage (ḥajj), relate to purity laws and Eden. The correspondences between these rituals and the descriptions of Eden suggest the outlines of a broad ideology expressed by Muslim jurists through two systems of oppositions between the pure and impure, and the sacred and profane.
I: TOUCHING THE PENIS

In the 
Muwat'ta', there is an unusual report transmitted on the authority of Mālik b. Anas (d. 795), from the grandson of Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās, Ismā'il b. Muḥammad.

[Yahyā'] related to me, on the authority of Mālik, on the authority of Ismā'il b. Muḥammad b. Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās, that Muṣ'ab b. Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās said: "I was holding a copy of the Quran [ mushaf] for Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās, and I rubbed myself. Sa'd asked: 'Have you perhaps touched your penis?' I said: 'Yes.' So he said: 'Go and perform ablution [ wudu']. So I went and performed ablution, and returned.'"

Although the 
Muwat'ta' includes five other reports in the same section with the heading "Ablution for Touching the Genitals" ( wudu' min mass al-farj), this is the only report in which touching the penis appears to be accidental, or at least unintentional. It is also the only report in which the requirement to perform ablution is linked with touching the Quran. Other reports state that a person who touches his penis is to perform ablution, or that touching the penis requires ablution before prayer. Discussions concerning the link between touching the penis and the requirement of ablution are to be found in all the different schools of Islamic law.

Despite the widespread acknowledgment of the regulations against touching the penis, there are few attempts to explain the connection between the touching of genitalia and impurity in Islamic law. Some Muslim jurists argue that "touching the penis" refers to masturbation, but others maintain that the impurity associated with "touching the penis" is attached to physical contact with impure substances that might be on the surface of, or emitted from, the penis and other genitalia. Still others hold that ablution is required for insouciant touching, touching the genitalia of a corpse, of certain animals, or of severed genitalia. What all of these opinions have in common, however, is the basic principle that contact with the genitalia or substances emitted from them results in impurity.

That touching the penis requires one to perform ablution is also found in later Mālikī texts, and in Shāfi'i and Ḥanbali texts. In many cases, this requirement is said to be based upon a report from Busrah bt. Sufwān concerning a statement made by the prophet Muḥammad. This is the first report listed in the 
Muwat'ta', citing several early authorities:

Yahyā' related to me, on the authority of Mālik, on the authority of 'Abdal-lāh b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad b. 'Urwah b. Ḥazm, that he heard 'Urwah
b. al-Zubayr say: "I came upon Marwân b. al-Ḥakam [b. Abî al-ʿĀṣî], and we were mentioning things which required ablution. Marwân said: 'Ablution is required for touching the penis.' "Urwah said: "'I did not know that.' Marwân b. al-Ḥakam said: 'Busrah bt. Șufwân related to me that she heard the apostle of God saying: 'When one of you touches his penis [dhakar], let him perform the ablution.'"³

A variant of this report is given on the authority of Umm Ḥābibah, Abû Hurayrah, and Abû Ayyûb, replacing "penis" (dhakar) with "genitals" (farj).⁴ All of the Sunnî schools of law cite these reports, although there is little agreement among or within the schools concerning the legal implications of the reports. Hanafî jurists cite the report of Busrah but do not require ablution for touching the penis.⁵ Mâlikî, Shafiʿî, and Ḥanbali jurists agree that ablution is required but have differing opinions about what qualifies as "genitals" (penis, vagina, anus, testicles), what kind of "touching" is intended (unintentional, purposeful, masturbation), and whether the impurity occurs when any genitalia are touched (those of the same or the opposite gender, genitalia of a hermaphrodite, animal genitalia) or only when persons touch their own genitalia.

One of the explanations given by Muslim jurists for the connection between touching genitalia and impurity is that "touching the penis" refers to masturbation. This is evident in the opinions of some jurists that only intentional and not accidental touching of the penis causes impurity. In his commentary on the Muwaṭṭa', Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Baqî al-Zurqānî (1645–1710) interprets the report of Ismāʿîl b. Muḥammad b. Saʿd b. Abî Waqqâs as an example of intentional touching. The comments of al-Zurqānî are made in reference to specific words and expressions from the original text quoted in the Muwaṭṭa':

("... that he said: 'I was holding a copy of the Quran ...') that is, "I took it ..." ("... to Saʿd b. Abî Waqqâs ..."), meaning his father. That is, [he took the copy of the Quran] in order that his father would be able to recite from it whether in private or in public view. ("... and I rubbed myself ...") that is, "under my robe." ("Saʿd said: 'Have you perhaps touched ...') with a kasra on the first "sin" is clearer than with a fathāh. That is, "have you touched with your palm ..." ("... your penis?") that is, without a cover. ("He said: ...") Muṣʿab ("... I said: 'Yes.' And he ...") Saʿd ("... said: 'Go and perform ablution.' So I went and performed ablution, and returned.")

By adding the details that Muṣʿab rubbed himself under his robe, with the palm of his hand, with nothing between the palm and the penis, al-
Zurqānī dismisses the accidental nature of the touching apparent from the plain text of the report and is able to use the text to reinforce the idea that ablution is required for intentional touching of the penis.

The reasoning for such an interpretation is given by al-Zurqānī in his interpretation of the report from Busrah:

("... that she heard the apostle of God say: 'If one of you touches his penis...') without anything in the way, with the palm of the hand, according to the report: "If a person causes his hand to come into contact with his genitals with nothing covering [them]..." The "causing of the hand to come into contact with" [iḍā'] is an expression for touching [mass] with the palm of the hand.6

Using more explicit language from the text of the report given on the authority of Abu Hurayrah, al-Zurqānī takes the phrase "touching the penis" as a reference to intentional touching, with the palm of the hand, and without anything between the hand and the penis.

In his discussion of the question, Abu al-Walid Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Rushd (1058–1126) gives a similar explanation, linking intention, pleasure, and use of the palm of the hand:

First there are those who distinguish between a person who does it [touches the penis] for pleasure and a person who does not do it for pleasure. Second there are those who distinguish between a person who touches it with the palm of his hand and a person who touches it with the back of the hand. They require ablution for the case of the person who does it for pleasure but not for the person who does not do it for pleasure. Likewise, the other group requires ablution for the person who does it with the palm of his hand but does not require ablution for the person who touches it with the back of his hand. Both of these opinions are transmitted by the followers of Mālik. Taking into account the palm of the hand is related to the consideration that it [the penis] is being touched for pleasure. There is also a group which distinguishes between intentional and accidental touching, requiring ablution for a person who touches intentionally, but not requiring it for a person who touches accidentally. This is transmitted on the authority of Mālik, and is the opinion of Dāūd and his followers.7

Ibn Rushd adds that some Mālikī jurists in the Maghrib regard performing ablution for touching the penis only as "customary" (sunnah) but not required (wājib). He also gives an account of the different reports used to support the view that touching the penis requires ablution but he does...
not mention the report, transmitted by Malik on the authority of Isma'il b. Muhammad b. Sa'd b. Abi Waqqas, which suggests that unintentional touching of the penis also results in impurity.

Ibn Rushd explains that the requirement of ablution for touching genitals is closely related to the requirement of ablution for noncoital sexual contact between a man and woman:

One group holds that if a person touches a woman with his hand in an open area, and between her and him there is no covering or obstruction, then ablution is incumbent upon him. This is likewise the case if a person kisses a woman, because a kiss, according to this group, is a type of touching, whether for pleasure or not. This is the opinion of al-Shafi'i and his followers, except that on one occasion he made a distinction between the one touching and the one being touched, requiring ablution for the one touching but not for the one being touched; another time he required it equally for both of them. Also, one time he made a distinction between women who are forbidden to be married to the one touching and women eligible to be married to him. He required it for the one touching the woman eligible to be married to him but not the woman whom he is forbidden to marry; another time he required it equally for both of them.

Others say that ablution is required for touching when the woman is accompanying the man for sexual pleasure or the intention of the touch is pleasure, when this occurs with or without an obstruction, with any part of the body. This does not include kissing unless pleasure is stipulated in this. This is the opinion of Malik and some of his followers.

Those who reject the requirement of ablution for touching women are the followers of Abü Hanîfah.8

The same distinctions seem to apply mutatis mutandis here as they do in relation to touching the penis. According to Ibn Rushd, the difference of opinion here also depends upon whether “touching” with the hand is to be understood metaphorically as “sexual contact,” thus making ablution a requirement, according to the exegesis of Q 3:43, and in accordance with reports about the prophet Muhammad touching 'A'ishah with his hand during prayer without the intention of sexual pleasure.9 The Shafi'i opinion also appears to rely on the presumption that the “touch” is sexual in nature, owing to the distinctions made for intention and marriageable women.

Ahmad b. Taymiyah (1263-1328) agrees that the requirement of ablution for touching the penis is tied to the intention and sexual pleasure of the persons performing the act. Making the link between touching the penis and masturbation more explicit, Ibn Taymiyah states that if a person...
touches his penis, even with the palm of his hand and the tips of his fingers, but does not intend to do so, then ablution is not required of him. As an example of this, Ibn Taymiyah argues that touching the genitals of animals does not require ablution, presumably because the activity was not initiated with the intention of sexual pleasure but for some other reason. Like Ibn Rushd, Ibn Taymiyah follows this discussion with a review of the requirements of ablution for kissing and touching a woman, and also the issue of whether camel milk causes impurity. The tenth-century jurist Ibn Abi Zayd al-Qayrawâni also puts “touching the penis” together with kissing and touching a woman for sexual pleasure. In their commentaries on the Risâlah of Ibn Abi Zayd, both Qâsim b. ’Isâ b. Nâji (d. 1436) and Ahmad b. Muḥammad Zarrûq (d. 1493) make a connection between touching genitalia and the intention of deriving sexual pleasure.

In the Kitâb al-umm, Muḥammad b. Idrîs al-Shâfi’î (767–820) makes the same connection as other jurists between the report of Buhra and the report of Abu Hurayrah, citing the two reports one after the other. The Mukhtasar of Ibrâhim al-Muzanî (791–878) provides a further interpretation of the reports in a summary of the Shâfi’î position on actions and substances that invalidate and thus require ablution, illustrating Ibn Rushd’s statement about Shâfi’î’s not stipulating intention in the act of touching genitals.

(al-Shâfi’î said:) That which requires ablution includes [contact with] feces and urine, sleep whether while leaning or sitting or bowing or prostrating, whether it is a lot or a little sleep, the mind being overcome by insanity, sickness whether it requires lying down or not, gas which comes out of the anus, sexual play between a man and woman, play that involves the man causing some part of himself to come into contact with [yufdi] the body of the woman, her touching him without a barrier between them, his kissing her, touching [mass] the genitals [fajar] of himself or someone else with the palm of the hand whether [the person whose genitals are touched] is old or young, alive or dead, male or female. It is the same whether the genitals are of the front or the rear, and [also applies to] touching her area around the anus. There is no ablution required for touching the genitals of beasts because it [such touching] is not forbidden. All that is emitted from the rear or the front, whether worms, blood, seminal fluid, or wetness, all of these things require ablution. There is no purification of the anus [istinjâ] for sleep or if gas is emitted from it.

Note that al-Muzanî uses the term “causes to come into contact with” (yufdi, ifdâ) as a gloss upon the less specific “touch” (mass) and also specifies that touching the genitals is limited to using the palm of the hand. This limi-
tation, and the explicit connection with other forms of sexual touching, like the linkage established by Ibn Rushd, seems to indicate that it is only intentional touching of genitals that requires ablution. In addition, however, al-Muzanī adds details that mitigate against the interpretation that “touching the penis” refers to masturbation or sexual stimulation. He states that ablution is also required when intentional contact is made with the anus, the area around the anus, and even touching the genitals of a youth or a corpse.

'Abdāllah b. Ahmad b. Qudāmah (1147–1223) provides details on legal opinions that contradict the notion that the impurity caused by touching the penis is tied to masturbation or intentional contact. His section “Touching the Genitals” is divided into eleven different issues relating to the interpretation of the reports of Busrah, Umm Ḥabībah, and Abū Ayyūb. Ibn Qudāmah specifies the opinion of Ahmad b. Hanbal: ablution is required for the intentional touching of one’s own penis or vagina (or both) with the palm of the hand, with the intention of sexual pleasure. In each case, however, Ibn Qudāmah provides evidence of jurists and legal authorities who disagree with the Ḥanbalī interpretation. For example, some jurists hold that ablution is required for touching the penis unintentionally (as in the report of Ismā‘īl b. Muḥammad b. Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās), while others maintain that any touching which has the intention of sexual pleasure (whether with the back of the hand or the arm) requires ablution. Al-Shāfī‘ī regards the penis of a youth, the anus, and the genitals of a corpse as requiring ablution, whereas Ibn Qudāmah argues that “if a person were to touch the foreskin which is cut from a circumcision before it [the foreskin] is cut, then it [touching] invalidates his ablution because it [the foreskin] is still part of the flesh of the penis, but if a person touches the foreskin after it is cut then it [touching] does not invalidate ablution because the foreskin ceases to be a penis in name and in being forbidden” once it is separated from the living human body. Umar b. al-Ḥusayn al-Khiraqī (d. 945) records the opinion of Ḥishāq b. Ibrāhīm, according to whom touching a severed penis results in the requirement of ablution. Ibn Qudāmah records that al-Layth b. Sa‘d (b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān) requires ablution for the touching of animal genitals, and ‘Aţa’ b. Abī Rabāh holds that ablution is required for touching the penis-sheaf of a donkey but not for touching the teat of a camel.

The opinions of some jurists seem to be at odds with the position that touching the penis requires ablution. The Ḥanafis maintain that physical contact with the penis does not require ablution but touching the area of the genitals does when it causes a person to come into contact with substances which require ablution because they originate from the genitals.
Regarding the penis itself, Muhammad b. al-Hasan al-Shaybānī (d. 804) cites several opinions from Abū Ḥanīfah:

Abū Ḥanīfah related to me, on the authority of Ḥammād b. Ibrāhīm, on the authority of ‘Ali b. Abī Tālib, he said concerning touching the penis: "There is no harm [in that]. I touch it or the end of my nose."

Abū Ḥanīfah related to me, on the authority of Ḥammād b. Ibrāhīm, that Ibn Mas‘ūd asked about ablution for touching the penis. He said: "It is impure [najas], so cut it off!" meaning that there is no harm in it.

Abū Ḥanīfah related to me, on the authority of Ḥammād b. Ibrāhīm, that Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās passed by a man who was washing his penis. He said: "What are you doing? This is not required of you." The opinion of Abū Ḥanīfah is that washing it [the penis] is preferred when one urinates.

The first and second of these reports are related to the oft-cited report, transmitted on the authority of Talq b. ‘Ali [b. al-Mundhir b. Qays], concerning what the prophet Muhammad said about the penis: "Talq b. ‘Ali said: We were with the apostle of God when a man, like a Bedouin, came to him and said: ‘Apostle of God, what do you think about a man touching his penis after performing ablution?’ He [the prophet Muhammad] said: ‘What is it but a piece of your flesh?’" Many jurists consider this report to have been abrogated by later reports requiring ablution, such as those of Busrah, Abū Ayyūb, Abū Hurayrah, and Umm Ḥabibah, but it does continue to indicate for others that the penis itself is not the cause of the impurity. Imāmī Shi‘ī jurists, some basing their opinions upon the opinion of ‘Ali b. Abī Tālib recorded in al-Shaybānī, likewise do not require ablution for touching the penis but do require it for a person who comes into contact with a monkey, dog, pig, or other thing which is considered to have an offensive smell.

Many of the opinions held by Muslim jurists regarding the link between touching the penis and ablution are contradictory. Those jurists who limit ablution to cases of intentional touching do not agree whether the touching must also be for sexual pleasure, and many jurists include touching the anus and testicles as requiring ablution, which indicates that the impurity caused by touching the penis is not limited to the act of masturbation. The stipulation limiting ablution to persons touching naked genitals is also not wholly consistent with tying impurity to masturbation, for sexual pleasure may be sought without direct contact between the skin of the genitals and palm of the hand. Other anomalous cases include requiring ablution for
touching the genitals of a corpse, a youth, animals, and severed penises, all acts which could be intentional but (presumably) not for the physical pleasure of the thing being touched. Another theory is that the impurity arises from the substances (and gas) which issue from genitalia. This too is contradicted by many cases in which the requirement of ablution is not dependent upon the presence of urine, feces, semen or other discharge.

Common to all of these cases, including the report of the apparently nonpremeditated rubbing by Muṣʿab b. Saʿd b. Abī Waqqās, is a more basic concept: that any touching of genitals that makes one conscious of the genitals’ existence requires ablution. The Ḥanafī and Imāmi Shiʿī position (i.e., that emissions from the genitals make ablution required for physical contact) basically understands the touching of genitalia as an extension or sign of the impurity that attaches to the physical results of other normal bodily functions (which exit the body from the genitals). It is not necessary that the touching be intentional or for sexual pleasure, or that there be an emission, but the penis and other genitalia are to be understood as features of the human body that are linked both physically and symbolically to the presence of substances and activities that require ablution and ritual washing. Note that touching the nose does not invalidate ablution even though the nose may be the source of recurrent bleeding, nor does touching the mouth require ablution, even though the mouth may be the source of vomiting. Unlike the nose and mouth, the genitals are features of the human body that regularly emit substances that require ablution, in addition to being features of the human body linked with sexual reproduction.

Ablution and ritual washing serve to separate a person from eating, bodily functions, and sex. Performance of ablution includes, in addition to the obligation of washing the face, hands, and feet, the customary practice (sunnah) of using the toothpick (siwāk), rinsing the mouth, snuffing, wiping the ears, and combing the beard with the fingers.22 A Ḥanafī text describes the conditions that invalidate, or require, ablution, excluding the touching of genitals: “That which invalidates ablution is everything that comes out of the two apertures [urethral and anal], blood, pus, and purulent matter when it comes out of the body and comes into contact with a place [part of body] attached to the area of purity, vomit if it fills the mouth, and sleep while in a bed, reclining, or leaning against something that, if it were moved away from the sleeper, would cause him to fall, and the mind being overcome by unconsciousness, madness, and a guffaw during any prayer in which there is bowing and prostration.”23 These are all bodily functions that occur naturally, some regularly, in everyday human existence. Ibn Rushd classifies these substances and actions as being those that issue from the body, such as urine, feces, and gas.24 Additional
substances that exit the body with less regularity but still require ablution include blood, pus, and vomit. Other activities unrelated to substances issuing from the body include sleeping and other forms of unconsciousness, touching a woman, eating something touched by fire, laughing during prayer, and carrying a corpse.

Ritual washing is specifically associated with sexual reproduction in a list of actions that invalidate or require it. A list is given in a Hanafi legal text: “That which necessitates ritual washing [ghusl] is the ejaculation of semen in a gush, the passion of a man and woman, contact between genitalia without ejaculation, menstruation, and parturition.” Note that the actions and conditions requiring ritual washing are distinct from those requiring ablution. Ibn Rushd reiterates this distinction in his discussion of certain substances which require ritual washing (such as semen) that issue in the case of male genitalia, from the same opening as substances that require ablution (such as urine and prostatic fluid). He also lists the opinions of jurists and discusses the distinction between menstrual blood, which requires ritual washing, and nonmenstrual blood (such as blood from a nosebleed), which requires ablution. Menstruation requires ritual washing because it is linked with sexual reproduction, as does semen, but a nosebleed and the release of prostatic fluid do not require ritual washing.

All the activities listed as requiring ablution and ritual washing, and the substances these activities produce, are natural occurrences necessary to the continued functioning of individual human beings and human society. Ablution relates to the continued existence of individuals and ritual washing to the continued existence of society. It is not so much that these activities and the production of substances cannot be controlled as that the natural human condition includes urination, defecation, and sleep. Certain actions that require ablution, such as touching the penis, carrying a corpse, and eating something touched by fire, are not outside human control to avoid. The actions and substances that require ritual washing, except for menstruation, are likewise susceptible to human control. But requiring ablution for things that cannot be controlled and for things such as sexual reproduction which are necessary for the continuation of the human species underlines the fact that the natural existence of human beings is a perpetual state of impurity. Ablution and ritual washing allow people to enter a temporary and artificial state of purity for specific ritual activities.

2: ADAM AND EVE'S GENITALS

This same opposition between the natural state of impurity and the temporary state of purity effected by ablution and ritual washing is found in
Muslim exegesis of the accounts of Adam and Eve in the Quran. In the
garden of Eden, Adam and Eve existed in a state of perpetual purity. In his
exegesis of Q 2:36, al-Ṭabari preserves a report to this effect, transmitted
on the authority of Abū al-ʿĀliyah: “Abū al-ʿĀliyah said: Adam and Eve ate
of the tree [of immortality]. It was a tree that made whoever ate from it
impure [ḥadatha], but there was not allowed to be any impurity [ḥadath] in
the garden, so God drove Adam out of the garden.”Muslim jurists use the
term “ḥadath” as a reference to impurities which require ablation, but the
term can also refer more specifically to defecation and feces. It could simply
mean that eating from the tree was a condition that required ablation and
thus that anyone being in a state requiring ablation was not allowed to be
in the garden of Eden. Reports regarding the nature of the manna con­
sumed by the Israelites in the wilderness of wandering indicate that the
food of Eden did not cause defecation, and a number of exegetes relate
accounts linking the manna of the Israelites with the food of Eden.

According to the exegesis of Q 7:22–26, Adam and Eve did not have cloth­
ing in the garden of Eden but did not know they had genitals, because their
bodies, and their genitals in particular, were covered with light, feathers, or
fingernails. Ibn Kathūr reports that Adam and Eve did not have sex while in
the garden of Eden but did later after their expulsion, when they were taught
the function of their genitals by Gabriel: “Adam did not have sex with his wife
while in the garden, until he fell from there on account of the sin of eating
from the tree. Both of them slept alone, side by side on the open ground, until
Gabriel came and commanded Adam to produce his family. Gabriel taught
him how to produce it. After Adam had sex with Eve, Gabriel asked: ‘How
did you find your wife?’ He said: ‘Upright.’” Another account, reported on
the authority of Ibn ʿAbbās, states that Adam fell to earth in India and Eve in
Jedda, and the circumstances of their sexual meeting near Mecca account for
the etymology of the names of Muzdalifah, ʿArafat, and Jam’. According to
Ibn ʿAbbās, after their fall, Adam and Eve fasted for forty days and Adam ab­
stained from having sex with Eve for a hundred years.

This account is consistent with the notion that Eve was punished with
menstruation and the bearing of children in pain upon her fall from the
garden of Eden. Muslim exegesis of Q 2:34–38 preserves a report by Ibn
Zayd to this effect: “When Adam blamed Eve for their sin, God said: ‘It is
incumbent upon me to make her bleed once every month just as she made
this tree bleed, and I will make her foolish though I created her smart,
and I will make pregnancy and childbearing reprehensible though I had
made pregnancy and childbearing easy.’ If it were not for the affliction that
was set upon Eve, then the women of this world would not menstruate,
they would be smart, and they would be pregnant and bear children with
It is also reported that the water of Zamzam first appeared in Mecca so that Eve could purify herself from the blood of her menstruation. Another account, found in al-_Tabari and al-\hashibi, states that God caused Eve to bleed because when she ate from the tree in the garden of Eden she caused it to bleed. In the garden of Eden there would have been no need for Adam and Eve to be aware of using their genitals for sexual reproduction, since they were already immortal.

In another report, transmitted on the authority of Ibn \hasha, the eating from the tree in the garden of Eden and the discovery of genitalia are specifically linked. Adam and Eve's genitalia appear to them as a result of their eating, not sex: “The tree that God forbade to Adam and his spouse was grain [sunbulah]. When they ate from it, their private parts were revealed to them, for their private parts had been hidden from them by their fingernails.” In another account, provided by al-\Tabari, Gabriel is said to have brought bags of wheat (hintah) or seven grains of wheat to Adam after his fall. The fruit of the tree in Eden, the eating of which causes Adam and Eve to defecate and/or require them to perform ablution, is thus the same food Adam is compelled to cultivate on earth for sustenance. Adam and Eve did not use their genitalia for the release of bodily wastes in the garden of Eden because they had no cultivated produce and did not eat the meat of animals. Adam is given seeds to grow fruit produce and is taught the skills necessary for the cultivation and preparation of it. It is this earthly food, requiring tending and preparation, that produces the bodily wastes that require ablution.

These parallels between the temporary state of purity effected by ablution and ritual washing and the garden of Eden help to explain the linkage of impurity with touching the genitalia. Urination, defecation, bleeding, and other natural bodily functions require ablution because Adam and Eve’s bodies did not produce these impure substances in the garden of Eden. When Adam and Eve fell from Eden, their punishment was to become human, and thus their descendants are required to perform ablution and ritual washing. In the garden of Eden, Adam and Eve were not aware of their genitals, did not need to defecate or urinate, and did not require sexual reproduction for their continued existence. Touching the penis seems to require ablution because performing ablution reminds people that their natural earthly state is a fallen state, that human nature is fallen. Becoming conscious of one’s genitals, either as a source of impure substances or as the instrument of sexual reproduction, thus requires ablution as a reminder of the absence of genitals in the garden of Eden. Ablution is required for those conditions necessary for and definitive of earthly human existence, in sharp contrast to the state of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden.
Some of these same stipulations are also found in restrictions and prohibitions applied in certain Muslim rituals. During the month of Ramadān, people are prohibited from activities (eating and having sex) that correspond directly with the activities that would require performance of ablution and ritual washing. Intentional sex breaks the fast just as sex and the bodily substances associated with it invalidate ritual washing. Breaking the fast by intentional eating, whether by consuming something normally eaten or not (such as a pebble), is considered equivalent to the conditions invalidating ablution, many of which are already closely associated with eating and the production of bodily wastes.

Other actions and conditions are also at issue for breaking the fast and correspond to the requirements of ablution and ritual washing. Thawbān and Rāfiʿ b. Khudayj report that the prophet Muhammad said both the one letting blood and the one being bled break the fast.44 This is the position held by a number of jurists, including Ahmad b. Hanbal, Abū Dā‘ūd, and al-Awzā‘ī.45 Mālik b. Anas also preserves a report that Ibn ‘Umar would not let his blood while fasting, although Mālik b. Anas appears to hold the position that letting blood is only reprehensible but does not break the fast.46 The disagreement over the status of voluntary bloodletting contrasts with the unanimous agreement of the jurists that menstruation breaks the fast. Voluntary bloodletting is both intentional and temporary, whereas menstruation precludes any participation in the fast, since menstruating women would be in a perpetual state of breaking the fast because of their bleeding.47 According to the Aytāllāh Khomeini (d. 1989), the flowing of any nonmenstrual blood is reprehensible during fasting.48 According to the laws of purity, menstrual blood requires ritual washing whereas nonmenstrual blood requires ablution.49

Vomiting breaks the fast, and it requires ablution under certain conditions. This position is based upon a number of hadith reports, including one given on the authority of Abū al-Dardā‘ that the prophet Muhammad vomited and broke the fast. In a related account it is reported by Ma‘dān b. Abī Ṭalḥah that Thawbān imposed ablution for vomiting during the fast. Abū Hurayrah reports that the prophet Muhammad stated that it is only when the vomiting is induced by the person fasting that the fast is broken but that a person vomiting uncontrollably does not break his fast.50 Mālik b. Anas reports a similar opinion on the authority of Ibn ‘Umar.51 Jurists argue from these reports that whether or not vomiting breaks the fast depends upon both the volume of the vomit and whether it was induced or due to sickness.52
The relationship between intentional vomiting and breaking the fast is also evident in the opinions concerning whether kissing results in breaking the fast. One report from Maymūnah bt. Sa'd states that when the prophet Muhammad was asked about kissing during fasting, he said that both people kissing break the fast.\(^5\) Another report, transmitted on the authority of 'A'ishah and Umm Salamah, claims that the prophet Muhammad used to kiss when he was fasting, presumably without breaking his fast.\(^5\) An issue among the jurists is whether the kissing is intentional in the sense that it leads to or is related to sex.\(^5\) Mālik b. Anas cites a report on the authority of Ibn 'Abbās that kissing is allowed for old men but reprehensible for young men.\(^6\) Mālik b. Anas also cites reports which imply that the prophet Muhammad's kissing of his wives was a special allowance.\(^7\) Ibn Qudāmah states that kissing breaks the fast only when it is accompanied by ejaculation, like masturbation that results in ejaculation and repeated looking or thinking about something that causes the emission of semen.\(^8\)

In all three cases (bleeding, vomiting, kissing), breaking the fast is tied to the intention of the person fasting. The conditions that break the fast coincide with the conditions that invalidate ablution and ritual washing, but the actions that break the fast can be avoided temporarily. The conditions that invalidate ablution are unavoidable, whereas when bleeding and vomiting occur without artificial inducing they are not considered to break the fast. Demonstrating this same logic, Muḥammad b. 'Ali Ibn Bābūyāh (d. 991) states that a nocturnal emission does not break the fast but marriage does.\(^9\) Kissing breaks the fast only insofar as it is consciously associated with sex. This relationship is stated succinctly in the Ḥanafi opinion described by Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Qudūrī (d. 1037):

If he [the person fasting] sleeps and he has a nocturnal emission, looks at a woman and ejaculates, or anoints himself with oil, cups himself, applies kohl, or kisses, he has not broken the fast. If, by a kiss or touch, he ejaculates, then making up the fast is incumbent upon him without expiation. There is no harm in the kiss when he is in control of himself, but it is reprehensible if he is not in control of himself. If vomit overpowers him, he has not broken the fast. If he vomits on purpose, filling his mouth, then making up the fast is incumbent upon him without expiation.\(^6\)

Unintentional ejaculation, like eating out of forgetfulness, does not break the fast, but the intentional eating of rocks or metal and having sexual intercourse with something other than the vagina of a woman (even without ejaculation) does break the fast.\(^6\) The Ayātallāh Khomeini adds the purposeful passing of gas and entering a bathhouse (ḥammām) as being
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reprehensible for the person fasting. Likewise, the requirement to fast adheres even after the death of the person fasting, so that the statement of intention to fast obligates others to fast or otherwise redeem the deceased from the fast. Because the fast is temporary, it allows the person fasting a relatively sustained but artificial state apart from human nature, analogous to that signified by the performance of ablution and ritual washing.

OFFERING

A similar state separating people from regular human civilization is signified by the requirements for the offering (zakāt). The laws of offering stipulate giving away a percentage of certain items, including domesticated animals, money, merchandise, and cultivated produce. Ibn Rushd provides the list of items upon which there is agreement among the jurists that offering should be given: "There is agreement that offering is given for two types of minerals: gold and silver not used for ornamentation; three types of animals: camels, cattle, sheep and goats; two types of grain: wheat and barley; and two types of produce: dried dates and raisins." This list is specific, and a number of jurists insist that offering is to be given on these items only. There are disagreements regarding items that are judged by analogy to be included in the requirement of offering or are excluded for practical purposes.

Among the items not agreed upon by the jurists are horses. Only Abū Ḥanīfah and his student Zufar require that offering be given on horses. The opinion is stated by al-Qudūrī: "When there are free-grazing horses, male and female, their owner has a choice. If he wants, he gives one dinar for every horse, or if he wants he appraises them and gives five dirhems for every one hundred dirhems [of their value]. There is no offering for male horses alone." According to Ibn Rushd, this position actually requires offering for the offspring of horses and is based upon the treatment of the horses as a commodity. That there is no offering for a person's mount is found in a hadith report cited by numerous authorities, but the Ḥanafis cite another hadith report, on the authority of Zayd b. Thābit, which says that a dinar or ten dirhems is the offering for every horse. To this, Ḥanafi authorities add the citation of a letter written from 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb to Abū 'Ubaydah b. al-Jarrāḥ requiring him to pay a dinar or ten dirhems for each free-grazing horse. According to later Ḥanafi authorities, this hadith report transmitted on the authority of Zayd specifies that the offering for horses is intended for horses used in war (fārs al-ghāzi).

There is no disagreement among the jurists regarding the requirement of giving offering on camels, cattle, and sheep and goats, but some ju-
rists specify that offering is required only for free-grazing animals of these types. It is possible that the Ḥanafi position on horses is based on an analogy with the requirement of offering for other free-grazing animals. Such an explanation is not offered by the Ḥanafis, who claim that the requirement for offering on horses is in analogy with offering on other salable commodities. This is further evident from the opinions of Abū Yūsuf and al-Shaybānī, who state that there is no offering for horses, mules, or donkeys unless they are used for commerce. Perhaps this is due to the recognition by the Ḥanafis that horses (along with mules and donkeys) are not regularly used, as are animals of the other three types, to provide food and clothing. Abū Yūsuf and al-Shaybānī support this logic by stating that there is no offering required for suckling camels (fuṣlān), lambs still carried by their mothers (ḥumlān), and calves under a year old (‘ajājil).

Jurists disagree on requiring offering for a number of different items of produce beyond the agreement that offering is required for wheat, barley, dried dates, and raisins. Some jurists, including Ibn Abī Laylā, Sufyān al-Thawrī, and Ibn al-Muẓārak hold that offering is required for only the four items agreed upon by all jurists. Malāk b. Anas and al-Shāfī‘i also require offering on other types of produce that is cut and stored. Abū Ḥanīfah requires offering on everything that is cultivated by people, whether edible or not, including grass, wood, and stalks. Despite these differences of detail, all of the jurists agree that offering is given only on products that are cultivated, just as offering is given only on domesticated animals. The qualification that offering is given only for cultivated produce may also explain the almost unanimous rejection of requiring offering on honey, since it is produced by bees, just as milk and wool are produced by animals and are not subject to offering. Abū Bakr b. Ḥalī al-Ḥaddād (d. 1398) limits Abū Ḥanīfah’s requirement of offering on nonedible produce to produce that is cultivated and excludes items such as palm fronds and cane, which grow wild. Similar questions are discussed regarding other items which may or may not be considered to be used as food, such as olive oil.

All of the jurists agree, however, that offering is not to be given on perishable produce. There is no offering for fresh fruits or leafy green vegetables. Many of the disagreements over what produce is subject to offering is due to differing interpretations of what constitutes perishable and non-perishable produce, such as onions and figs. Although some scholars have claimed that exempting perishable produce from offering is based upon practical considerations, it is remarkable that the categories used to determine which foods are subject to offering coincide with the foods pertaining to the garden of Eden and the fall of Adam and Eve. Foods subject to offering are cultivated foods. Wheat in particular is associated with the forbid-
den tree in the garden of Eden, the fall to earth, and the cause of impurities requiring ablution. Fruit is also specifically linked with the garden of Eden and the special conditions enjoyed by Adam and Eve there.55

The same applies to the other items subject to offering. There were no domesticated animals in the garden of Eden, nor were animals used to provide foodstuffs and clothing for Adam and Eve before their fall.66 Offering is also required on merchandise such as clothing, slaves, and other goods that were not present in the garden of Eden.67 There was also no gold or silver in the garden of Eden: “Ali b. ‘Abi Ṭālib: When God created the world he did not create in it any gold or silver. When he caused Adam and Eve to fall, he sent down with them gold and silver, that it would be passed down for use in buying and selling in the earth as an earthly benefit to their children after them. He established by this the dower [ṣadāq] of Eve, and it is thus necessary for everyone to give a dower when marrying.”68 Offering is also required on other precious minerals of the earth, and on money.69

The practice of getting rid of certain items allows for a partial experience of existence in the garden of Eden, just as fasting provides a temporary experience of the prefall state of Adam and Eve.

Muslim scholars compare fasting and offering as both relate to conditions in the garden of Eden. Both the fast and the offering are said to give admittance to the garden of Eden. In a number of hadith reports cited by al-Bukhārī, the prophet Muhammad states that the works required for entering the garden of Eden include the offering, fasting, and prayers.90 Ibn Mājah preserves a hadith report given on the authority of Abū Hurayrah in which the prophet Muhammad compares fasting and offering: “Abū Hurayrah said the apostle of God said: ‘For everything there is offering. The offering of the body is the fast.’”91 The breath of a person fasting is said to smell like the garden of Eden according to a number of hadith reports preserved in al-Bukhārī, Muslim, and al-Tirmidhī.92 Both fasting and offering are rituals oriented toward God, and are not to be performed or judged in terms of their actual natural and social effects.93 Offering is required to be paid by a person even after death, just as the fast is still incumbent on a person who dies without completing it, both the offering and fasting owed as debts.94 The offering and the fast are, like ablution and ritual washing, a means to subdue carnal connections, and the purification of one’s body and belongings are specifically linked to the forgiveness of sins.95

Pilgrimage

The pilgrimage is closely and explicitly linked to the garden of Eden. Adam is said to have instituted the rituals of the pilgrimage after his expulsion
from the garden of Eden and his repentance for the sin that led to his expulsion. Ibn Ishâq reports that when Adam fell to the earth he was sad because he missed the sights and smells of the garden of Eden, so God ordered him to go to Mecca. According to Ibn 'Abbâs, because of Adam's sin God commanded him to build the Ka'bah and circumambulate it, remembering God, just as the angels circumambulate the throne of God. In his commentary on Q 2:39, Ibn Kathîr remarks that Adam's repentance after his fall was tied to his receiving the commands of religion, and al-Zamakhshâri links Adam's repentance to his prophethood. The sanctuary at Mecca was to be an earthly substitute for the garden of Eden, made necessary by Adam's fall and allowed by Adam's repentance as part of that which was required for Adam and his descendants to return to the garden of Eden. Citing Ibn 'Abbâs, al-Ṭabarî reports that the establishment of the sanctuary and the pilgrimage were tied to God's acceptance of Adam's repentance, which included a fast of forty days and abstaining from sex with Eve for one hundred years. Adam is made the custodian of the sanctuary at Mecca and is responsible for establishing the pilgrimage there for his descendants, emphasizing that these descendants no longer were living in the garden of Eden.

The prohibitions established by Adam pertaining to the sanctuary at Mecca and the conduct of pilgrims correspond directly to conditions in the garden of Eden. An overview of the prohibitions is provided by al-Qudûrî: "He [a pilgrim] does not kill prey, nor does he motion toward it or point it out. He does not wear a shirt or trousers or a turban, tall hat [qalansûwah], or open garment [qaba']. He does not wear enclosed shoes unless he does not find sandals; then he cuts out the lower part of the heels. He does not cover his head or his face, nor does he wear perfume. He does not shave his head or the hair of his body. He does not trim his beard or cut his nails. He does not wear clothes dyed with turmeric, saffron, or safflower unless they can be washed without fading." In his description of the prohibitions connected to the pilgrim and the Meccan sanctuary, Ibn Qudâmah includes wearing a head covering, killing prey and pointing toward prey that is killed, eating prey, applying perfume, wearing dyed clothing, cutting the hair of the head and body, trimming the nails, eating certain foods, applying perfumed ointments, and applying kohl. Ibn Bâbûyâh lists wearing certain types of clothes, hunting prey, applying perfume or orificial ointments, applying kohl, and ejaculation caused by looking at a woman's legs or genitals. In addition, Ibn Rushd includes wearing enclosed shoes, certain clothes, coverings, and hats, applying perfume and marshmallow, hunting, marriage, cutting nails and hair, and various types of sexual relations.

The condition prescribed for the pilgrim when in a state of sacredization (ihrâm) and within the sanctuary (haram) at Mecca is not unlike the con-
ditions in which Adam and Eve lived in the garden of Eden. There, Adam and Eve lived a noncivilized existence, without the need of clothing, shelter, or cultivated foods. Pilgrims are not allowed to cut their hair or fingernails or to wear perfume. Ibn Mājah and al-Tirmidhi preserve reports on the authority of Ibn ‘Umar that the prophet Muhammad defined the state of the pilgrim as being unkempt and ill-smelling: ‘A man came to the Prophet and said: ‘Who is a pilgrim [hājj]?’ He said: ‘The unkempt [al-shā’ath] and ill-smelling [al-tifl].’ Another came up and said: ‘Which pilgrimage is better, Apostle of God?’ He said: ‘The crying [al-‘ajj] and bleeding [al-thajj].’ Another came up and said: ‘What is the way, Apostle of God?’ He said: ‘Provisions [al-zād] and luggage [al-raftilah].’”

Adam and Eve’s bodies are also said to have been covered with fingernail, hair, or feathers like the bodies of wild animals before the discovery of their genitals and their fall. The prohibition against the application of perfume by a pilgrim inside the sanctuary may be linked with the notion that all perfume originated from the plants of the garden of Eden and as such did not exist before the fall. Some jurists allow for the application of perfume before pilgrims enter their sacralized state (ihram), but once the pilgrim is inside the sanctuary, it may not be applied. On the basis of a hādith report, Mālik b. Anas requires that all perfume be washed from the pilgrim’s body before entering into the sanctuary. Some jurists likewise prohibit the application of marshmallow or other sweet-smelling items to the pilgrim’s hair, and the prohibition against cloth dyed with turmeric and other spices is also related to their odor. Ibn Qudāmah includes in this discussion the various positions on the prohibition against eating foods prepared with spices, such as saffron, or using scented creams.

Pilgrims are not allowed to wear sewn clothing. Ibn Qudāmah specifies that the pilgrim cannot wear a shirt (qamis), turban (‘imāmah), trousers (sarāwil), shoes (khifāf), hooded cloak (burūs), open garment (qabā’), covering (duwāj), long sleeves that cover the hands, or head covering. This is based on a hādith report, related by Ibn ‘Umar, in which certain items were prohibited to the pilgrim by the prophet Muhammad. Ibn Rushd discusses the prohibition of gloves (quffāz), veils (niqāb, khimār), and open-fronted garments (durra’ah) for women, also based on a hādith report cited by Mālik b. Anas. These prohibitions correspond to the conditions of Adam and Eve, who were naked in the garden of Eden. The origins of sewn clothing are specifically linked with Adam and Eve’s becoming aware of their genitals, their fall, and the necessity of clothing themselves while living on earth.

Pilgrims are not allowed to hunt wild prey or harvest wild plants growing in the sanctuary. Abū Yusuf reports the opinion of Abū Hanifah that it is reprehensible to graze animals on the grass of the sanctuary or to cut the
Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Ṭahāwī (d. 933) reports that it is not forbidden to hunt the prey of Medina or to cut down the trees there, as it is in the sanctuary around Mecca, although both Mālik b. Anas and al-Shāfi‘ī categorize doing these things in Medina as reprehensible. On the basis of a report from the prophet Muhammad, al-Shāfi‘ī also considers hunting and cutting down trees in the nearby city of al-Ṭā‘if to be reprehensible. Wild animals were not predatory in the garden of Eden, there were no domesticated animals, and Adam and Eve did not have a need to kill animals for food or clothing. The cultivation and harvesting of plants for food were not practiced in the garden of Eden, but were the punishment imposed upon Adam as a direct consequence of his fall to earth.

The penalties stipulated for the violation of the sanctuary or the pilgrim’s sacralized state are also associated with food. On the basis of the exegesis of Q 5:95, jurists stipulate three options for penalizing pilgrims who violate the rules of the pilgrimage or the area of the sanctuary, all of which involve food: fasting, feeding the poor, and animal sacrifice. Ibn Abī Zayd provides the standard list: “If a person kills prey then incumbent upon him is a penalty like that which he killed from among grazing herd animals [na‘am], determined by two just people from among the Muslims jurists. . . . He has the choice of this or expiation by feeding the poor [an amount of food equal to] the value of the prey determined as food and given as alms for it, or equal to this is to fast a day for each measure of food [mudd], and for each portion of a measure a complete day.” Fasting is going without food and, like fasting during the month of Ramaḍān, suggests the possibility of existence without eating, sustained by God alone. Feeding the poor creates conditions, like those in the garden of Eden, in which people are not required to work the land for their sustenance. The sacrifice of domesticated animals is the symbolic elimination of animal food and by-products, an act by which pilgrims, in imitation of Adam and Eve, can renounce their reliance on the eating of meat and the existence of domesticated animals. Similar penalties are stipulated for breaking the fast during Ramaḍān, further strengthening the connection between the two rituals and the garden of Eden.

Likewise, there is no sexual contact or marriage in the sanctuary, just as there was no sex in the garden of Eden, when Adam and Eve were ignorant of their genitals before their fall. Under this prohibition, Ibn Qudāmah includes marrying someone else, getting married, becoming engaged, sex both with and without ejaculation, sex with a vagina and with something other than a vagina whether ejaculating or not, kissing, and lustful looking. Menstruating women or women who are still within the legal period following parturition are restricted from circumambulating the Ka‘bah.
Hanafi authorities also specify lustful touching along with kissing, and they prohibit sex but do not further distinguish these actions or stipulate a distinction based on ejaculation. The prohibition on sexual contact is specifically addressed to married couples, with the implication that it is the sexual contact as a function and consequence of marriage that is being prohibited in this context. There are also a number of reports stating that a husband and wife performing the pilgrimage at the same time must separate for the period of the pilgrimage, suggesting that even a marriage already contracted is not valid for the period of the pilgrimage.

**RELATED PURITY LAWS**

Placing the restrictions on touching the penis in the context of these other rituals and the conditions of Eden allows for a more discerning interpretation of other unusual purity laws. According to Ibn Rushd, among the actions and conditions that are reported to require the performance of ablution are sleeping and unconsciousness, eating something touched by fire, and carrying a corpse. That sleeping and unconsciousness require ablution is generally agreed, according to al-Shāfi‘ī, Abū Hanifah, and Mālik b. Anas, although some jurists do not require ablution for sleep outright. In the *Kitāb al-umm*, it is stated that al-Shāfi‘ī requires ablution if a person sleeps lying down or otherwise loses consciousness or the ability to reason due to insanity or sickness, whether lying down or not. Drawing on the practice of different companions of the prophet Muhammad, al-Shāfi‘ī states that there is no ablution required for sleeping while sitting. But al-Shāfi‘ī is also reported to have required ablution for any deep sleep:

Equally for the rider on a boat, camel, riding animal, and riding while sitting on anything moving about the ground, sleeping standing or while prostrating, bowing, and lying down, ablution is required. When a person has doubt concerning whether he was asleep and he has the urge to urinate but does not know whether this urge was something he dreamed or related to himself awake, then he is not considered sleeping. If he is certain that he had the urge in a dream, but not certain he was asleep, then he is considered sleeping and ablution is incumbent upon him.

Abū Hanifah holds the same position with regard to the necessity of sleeping lying down, based on a report transmitted on the authority of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb that sleeping while lying down requires ablution. Mālik b. Anas also takes into consideration whether the sleep was heavy, the length of the sleep, and the position of the sleeper. In all three cases, despite the
differences of detail, the authorities agree that it is the loss of consciousness that invalidates ablution.

There are a number of hadith reports going back to the prophet Muhammad and his companions which state that eating something touched by fire requires ablution, although almost all later jurists hold that this practice has been dropped. "Zayd b. Thābit said: I heard the apostle of God saying: 'Ablution [is required] for that which fire touches.'" 134 This report and similar ones are transmitted on the authority of Abū Hurayrah, 'Ā'ishah, Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī, Anas b. Mālik, Ibn Abī Mālik, Abū Mūsā, Umm Sālamah, Ibn 'Umar, 'Abdallāh b. Zayd, Umm Ḥabībah, Ubayy b. Ka'b, Jābir b. 'Abdallāh, al-Ḥasan b. 'Ali, al-Ḥusayn b. 'Ali, and others. 135 To Mālik b. Anas and al-Shafi‘i are attributed opinions that they specifically rejected the idea that eating cooked food invalidated ablution. 136 According to Ibn Rushd, Jābir b. 'Abdallāh reported that the prophet Muhammad instructed his followers to cease observing the requirement of ablution for eating that which touched fire, thus abrogating his earlier practice. 137

Carrying a corpse also requires ablution according to hadith reports given on the authority of a number of companions of the prophet Muhammad, although some of the chains of transmission are considered weak. 138 The following is transmitted on the authority of Abū Hurayrah: "The Prophet said: 'For washing it [the corpse], ritual washing [is required]. For carrying it, ablution [is required].'" 139 Some of the opinions cited by al-Tirmidhī hold that ablution rather than ritual washing is required for the person who washes a corpse, but there is no further discussion of ablution's being required for the person who merely transports or handles the corpse. 140 Mālik b. Anas reports that Asmā' b. Umays washed the corpse of Abū Bakr and was told that she was not required to perform ritual washing. 141 That a corpse would cause impurity might also be implied by the special category of animals thought to eat carrion, including allowances to kill carrion-eating animals in the Meccan sanctuary and restrictions on eating their flesh. 142 The Ayāttallāh Khomeini includes among substances that require ablution the urine of birds whose flesh is not eaten along with the sweat of certain animals and people affected by physical impurities. 143 The requirement of ablution for touching a corpse may also be related to the listing of carrion and skins of carrion in the category of physical impurity (najāsah). 144

Although jurists proffer different accounts for these three cases individually, they do not provide a more general explanation encompassing how sleeping, cooked food, and corpse contact are related to other conditions that require ablution. Some scholars point to the fact that the impurity of cooked food may be due to the association of fire with the punishment of hell. 145 Ibn Qudāmah, though, cites a number of early Muslim authorities
who required ablution for that which was altered (ghayyara) by fire, referring to cooked foods in general. The notion that the requirement of ablution was intended to signify all food entering the body, by analogy to the impurity of food waste exiting the body through defecation and vomit, would not explain the hadith report specifying food cooked with fire. It seems, rather, that the hadith report refers to the eating of meat. Muslim records the following account transmitted on the authority of Jābir b. Samurah: “A man asked the apostle of God: ‘Should I perform ablution from the meat of sheep?’ He said: ‘If you want perform ablution and if you want, do not perform ablution.’ He [the man] said: ‘Should I perform ablution from the meat of camels?’ He [the Prophet] said: ‘Yes, perform ablution from the meat of camels.’”147 This hadith report is discussed at some length by Ibn Taymiyah, who argues that the references to the meat of sheep and camels should be understood as references to cooked food.148 The same point is made by Muhammad b. ’Ali al-Shawkānī (d. 1834), who cites an extensive list of authorities.149 Note also that the necessity of performing ablution after touching raw meat is specifically denied.150 Other jurists such as Ibn Rushd and Ibn Qudāmah also maintain that the requirement of ablution for eating food touched by fire should be understood to refer to the eating of the cooked meat of pigs.151

Food cooked with fire, and especially meat, is in the same category as touching the penis. Both are to be understood in relation to the existence of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden. Just as touching the penis requires ablution because it makes one conscious of having genitalia (in contrast to Adam and Eve before their fall from Eden), so eating cooked meat required ablution as a reminder of the absence of cooking and the eating of meat in the garden of Eden. Muslim exegesis of Q 2:34–39 mentions that Adam had to be taught how to cultivate and prepare food after his fall from Eden.152 The “oven” (tannūr) of Q 11:40 and 23:27 which God caused to boil forth the flood in the time of Noah is said to be this first oven which Adam and Eve used to cook their food.153 Likewise, there was no death, sickness, or unconsciousness in the garden of Eden. Although the reasons behind the requirement of ablution for these conditions was perhaps lost on later jurists, contact with the dead and unconsciousness or sleep represent circumstances unknown in the garden of Eden, and thus ablution was required, at least for a time, to remind people of the separation between Eden and their current existence in a fallen state on earth.

CONCLUSIONS: TABOO AND CONTAGION

In his essay “Taboo and Emotional Ambivalence,” Sigmund Freud discusses what he calls the primitive concept of taboo and contagion.154 He argues
not that the taboo itself is contagious, but rather that a person who violates the taboo without consequence will encourage others to violate the taboo, with the result that the taboo loses its symbolic value and function in society. Requiring ablution for touching the penis holds a place in Islamic purity laws analogous to the sense of “taboo” as employed by Freud. Impurity is not “contagious,” nor does the penis “transmit” impurity. Rather, the act of touching the penis is circumscribed to maintain the symbolic significance of ablution in its relationship with the loss of the garden of Eden and the necessity of religion and society.

Note also that purification and other rituals are symbolic acts. For example, the performance of ablution is not required before eating or after urination or defecation. It is necessary only before performing ritual practices and thus not for hygienic reasons. Certainly the ritual offering is not a realistic means for the redistribution of wealth, just as fasting forever and never again urinating or sleeping would be impossible. Numerous hadith reports and juristic definitions of ritual practices make it clear that people are not supposed to practice asceticism. The control of eating and sex during the fast signifies a temporary state of purity apart from human nature and can only be temporary without resulting in starvation or ceasing the continuation of human existence through procreation. Also indicative of the symbolic but nonrepresentational dimension of the rituals is the timing of the rituals, which are tied not to seasonal or historical occurrences, but to artificial divisions of time.

It is important to keep in mind that the prohibitions on touching the penis are discussed in texts most commonly used in pedagogical contexts, not necessarily “how-to” manuals of Islamic law or texts that purport to describe actual or even normative practices. In these pedagogical contexts, the legal category of “touching the penis” serves as an example (of things that cause impurity and require ablution) that points to the general principles and reasoning behind all laws of purification and ritual. The link maintained between touching the penis and the existence of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden can be extended to explain other laws of purification and the rituals made obligatory in Islamic law. Muslim definitions of purity and impurity emphasize the symbolic nature of ritual, that rituals are symbolic actions. The symbolism of the purity laws is not only that ritual purity is equivalent to living in the garden of Eden, but also that such purity is no longer natural or even possible for humans living in a fallen existence. Definition and performance of rituals emphasize the distinction between this world, in which religion and its upkeep by jurists is necessary, and the utopian existence of Eden.
Chapter 2 showed how Muslim legal definitions of purity and impurity can be understood as symbolic references to conditions in the garden of Eden. The impurity associated with natural bodily functions and sexual reproduction emphasizes the absolute difference between earthly existence and the utopia of Eden. The definition and performance of other rituals, such as the fast, offering, and pilgrimage, are also tied to conceptions of Eden. Rituals are practicable references to the fallen human condition that is described in narrative form by the exegetical accounts of Adam and Eve's fall.

Chapter 3 focuses on the relics of the prophet Muhammad, and the relics of certain pre-Islamic prophets and kings, as they relate to the conception of the sanctuary at Mecca and the origins of civilization. Section 1 examines the prophet Muhammad's physical (hair, nails, footprints) and artificial (clothing, hadith reports, various implements and artifacts) remains. The dispersal and collection of these remains represent different conceptions of territory based on a general model in which objects associated with the prophet Muhammad are transported by his followers from Mecca to the various outposts of Islamic civilization. Section 2 shows how Muslim exegesis links the relics of earlier prophets and kings to the origins of both Islamic and human civilization at the Meccan sanctuary established and visited as the earthly representation of the lost Eden. The state patronage of such relics, and the narrative description of their role in the development of civilization centered at Mecca, demonstrates the close connection between the mythological origins of civilization and an ideology which stipulates the existence of the state to administer religion required by the fallen state of humanity. Like ritual, relics serve to remind people of their fallen state by referring to the separation of earth and its civilization from existence in the garden of Eden.
In his history, al-Tabari preserves an unusual report concerning the dying instructions of the first Umayyad caliph, Mu‘awiyah b. Abi Sufyân. The report is transmitted on the authority of ‘Abd al-A‘lā b. Maymūn, on the authority of his father: “When he became sick with the illness from which he died, Mu‘awiyah said: ‘The apostle of God clothed me with a shirt [qamis], and I put it away. He pared his nails one day, and I took the parings and put them in a bottle. When I die, clothe me in that shirt, cut up and grind the parings, and scatter them on my eyes and mouth so that perhaps God might be merciful to me on account of the blessings [barakah] of these things.’” A similar account is mentioned by Nasīm al-Riyādī in his commentary on the Shīfa of al-Qāḍī ‘Iyād, but in this account Mu‘awiyah is buried in two of the prophet Muhammad’s cloaks (izar and ridā), and both the hair and the fingernails of the prophet Muhammad are stuffed in Mu‘awiyah’s mouth and nose in accordance with his bequest.

Other reports indicate that the prophet Muhammad distributed his hair after shaving for the desacralization ritual (ihlāl) after his pilgrimage to Mecca, suggesting that the nails belonging to Mu‘awiyah might also be connected to the prophet Muhammad’s trimming of his nails at the conclusion of his pilgrimage and leaving his sacralized state as a pilgrim (iḥrām). Both al-Bukhari and Muslim cite a report in which it is said that the prophet Muhammad cut his hair upon completing the pilgrimage, instructed Abū Talhah to distribute one share of the hair to each of the male companions of the Prophet (ṣahābah), and instructed Abū Talhah’s wife Umm Sulaym to distribute two shares to the women. According to Ibn Ḥajar, it was this distribution which established the tradition of blessings (barakah) being associated with the hair of the Prophet. Al-Qaṣṭalānī comments that the prophet Muhammad made this distribution at the completion of his pilgrimage so that his followers could keep the objects as relics. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal records a report that there was no hair that fell from the prophet Muhammad’s head that was not collected by his followers.

The link between these relics and the pilgrimage to Mecca is highlighted further by the context of the other prohibitions for pilgrims entering the Meccan sanctuary as a pilgrim, in a state of ritual sacralization (iḥrām). Pilgrims are not allowed to wear sewn garments, dyed clothes, shoes with enclosed heels, cloaks, or hats, nor are they allowed to apply perfume and oils. These items appear to represent both social status and products of civilization. Kissing, lustful touching, sexual intercourse, and marriage are prohibited, apparently as a means of separating the Meccan sanctuary from the space of everyday life and the bases for the continuity of human society.
The area of the Meccan sanctuary itself is a preserve of wilderness in which people are restricted from hunting for food and harvesting trees, grass, or rocks. On the basis of a saying of the prophet Muhammad recorded in Ibn Mājah and al-Tirmidhī, legal scholars stress that these prohibitions, and especially the restrictions on cutting hair and nails, keep the pilgrim in a wild, animal-like state for the duration of the stay in the territory of the Meccan sanctuary.8

The transportation of hair by the companions of the prophet Muhammad and the farther distribution of this hair through conquest is evident from the records of burial, especially at sites of martyrdom or conquest. The Umayyad Khalid b. al-Walīd is reported to have been buried in Ḥims with a hair of the prophet Muhammad which he wore within or pinned to his hat when he conquered Damascus.9 Abū Zam‘ah al-Balawi, also known as ‘Ubayd b. Arqam and ‘Ubayd b. Adam, is reported to have been one of the companions present when the prophet Muhammad distributed his hair that was cut at the time of his desacralization (ihlāl) on the day of Mina.10 Al-Balawi is reported to have settled in Egypt but later traveled to Ifriqiyyah on a raid with Mu‘awiyah b. Hudayj, during which he was martyred and buried in Qayrawan at a place later identified as al-Balawiyah. In his history of Qayrawan, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad al-Dabbagh (d. 1300) describes how al-Balawī was buried with the hair of the prophet Muhammad: “He died in Qayrawan and was buried in a location known still today and called al-Balawiyah. He ordered them to cover over his grave and bury with him his tall hat [qalansūwah], in which was a hair from the Prophet.”11

In another report cited by al-Dabbagh, it is said that al-Balawi had three hairs of the prophet Muhammad, and he stated in his will that one should be placed on his tongue and one on each of his eyes.12 Abū al-Ghāni b. Ismā‘il al-Nabulisi (d. 1731) states that the hairs of the prophet Muhammad are numerous in India, and some claim that such hairs move, grow, and multiply on their own.13

The mention of a special location marked as the burial site of al-Balawī is also known from other traditions regarding the hairs of the prophet Muhammad. For example, Abū Sha‘rāh, who acquired some hairs of the prophet Muhammad, is said to have been buried in al-Zillaj in a spot marked with a dome around which was planted olive trees.14 Ibn Hajar reports that the burial site of ‘Alī b. Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Khalīfī, sometimes called “al-Rikābī” because of his possession of a stirrup (rikāb) and hair of the prophet Muhammad, is well known.15 Anas b. Mālik is said to have requested that he be buried with a hair of the prophet Muhammad under his tongue.16 Ja‘far b. Khinţāb, the vizier of the Ikhshidid Kāfūr, had three hairs of the prophet Muhammad, which he ordered to be placed in his mouth.
when he was buried in Medina.\textsuperscript{17} The Zengid ruler \textit{Nūr al-Din Māḥmūd} ordained that hairs of the prophet Muhammad be put on his eyes when he was buried in the madrasa he built in Damascus.\textsuperscript{18}

In other cases, hairs of the prophet Muhammad are used at the foundation of a public building, such as the madrasa of Ibn al-Zaman, which was named for Shams al-Din Muhammad b. ‘Umar b. Muhammad b. ‘Umar al-Zaman, who is said to have possessed a hair of the prophet Muhammad.\textsuperscript{19} In his work on this history of madrasas, ‘Abd al-Qādir b. Muḥammad al-Nu‘aymi mentions that the Naṣrid amir Sayf al-Din Manjak al-Yūsufī established the Madrasa al-Manjakīyah in Damascus with a hair from the prophet Muhammad.\textsuperscript{20} Ottomans are recorded to have donated hairs of the prophet Muhammad to the Ayyubid Mosque in Cairo.\textsuperscript{21} The public display and procession of hairs at mosques and madrasas, especially on the occasion of the birthday of the prophet Muhammad, is mentioned in a number of sources.\textsuperscript{22}

This use of the remains of the prophet Muhammad in the establishment of pious endowments is consistent with reports preserved by Ahmād b. ‘Alī al-Nasā’i (d. 915) and Ahmād b. Ḥanbal that the leftover water from the prophet Muhammad’s ablution and mouth rinsing was used to mark the place of a mosque: “He [the prophet Muhammad] called for water. He performed his ablution, rinsed his mouth, and then poured it in a bucket. He instructed us, saying: ‘Take this and when you come to your land, break your agreement, sprinkle this water in the place, and take it as a mosque.’ We said: ‘The city is far away and it is very hot. The water will dry up.’ He said: ‘Extend it with other water, for only the scent is necessary.’ So we went out until we reached our city. We broke the agreement, then sprinkled in its place, and took it as a mosque.’\textsuperscript{23} In this case, the saliva of the prophet Muhammad, like his hair, is transported to a distant location as an extension of his authority for the foundation of Islamic worship. Many other mosques, such as the Masjid al-Ḥusayn in Cairo and the Masjid al-Jazzār Pasha in Acre, are said to be endowed with and founded upon hairs of the prophet Muhammad, as are other institutions such as the Ribāṭ al-Naṣḥībādīyah in Cairo, the Mashhad al-Ḥusaynī in Damascus, and the Jami Mosque in Bahubal.\textsuperscript{24}

Abū ‘Abdallāḥ Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr al-Murshīdī, who was born in Mecca (1368) and died in Medina (1435), is reported to have had twenty-six hairs of the prophet Muhammad which he acquired from an upright man on one of his three visits to Jerusalem. The account is given in Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān’s (d. 1497) biography of al-Murshīdī: “[Al-Murshīdī] was pious and staid among people. He visited the Prophet for more than fifty years, walking on his own feet. He also visited Jerusalem three times.
where he met an upright man in whose possession were twenty-six hairs of the Prophet. He distributed them upon his death to six people in equal portions, and this one [al-Murshidi] was one of them." In the biography of al-Murshidi's son, 'Umar b. Muḥammad, al-Sakhāwī states that the hair was divided equally among three people, and that the hair brought blessings upon 'Umar for fifty-six years. Elsewhere in his work, al-Sakhāwī explains that the hairs were transferred from 'Umar to his son, al-Murshidi's grandson, Abū Ḥamīd. During his visit to Mecca in the sixteenth century, al-Qastallānī reported seeing the hair, then associated with al-Murshidi's grandson Abū Ḥamīd. These reports point to the importance of the transmission of prophetic relics, not unlike the transmission of hadith reports, among the pious and from father to son.

These hairs were acquired through travel away from Mecca and, in the case of al-Murshidi, travel in imitation of the prophet Muhammad's journey to Jerusalem. The transportation of the hair by al-Murshidi is an example of relic movement which facilitates the collection of the relics and their restoration to the place from which they were originally dispatched by the prophet Muhammad himself. The transfer of the hair to Mecca by al-Murshidi and his heirs represents a return of the prophet Muhammad's remains from their dispersal with his companions. It also establishes a chain of transmission not unlike that conceptualized in the dispersal and collection of hadith reports and other relics. The hair transported by al-Murshidi provides a physical manifestation of the otherwise intangible link between the prophet Muhammad and later generations of followers.

Hadīth Reports as Textual Remains

This dispatch of the relics with the companions and early followers of the prophet Muhammad, and the association of the relics with the establishment of civilizational centers in new territories, is also reflected in the distribution and collection of the Prophet's remains as text. The basic model of temporal succession and geographical distance is emphasized by the expansion of the companions (ṣaḥābāh) and Islam to the civilizational centers or "camps" (aṁsār) founded by the conquest, and by the necessity of travel among these civilizational centers in the search for knowledge of the prophet Muhammad. The Sunnah is represented by a textual record of the words and deeds of the prophet Muhammad as recorded by those of his followers who were in physical contact with him during his life. This textual corpus can be transmitted orally, in written form, or by the imitation of practices said to originate with the prophet Muhammad.

The dispersal of the Sunnah through four generations of scholarship.
from the prophet Muhammad to the scholars of the third Islamic century, is traced by Muslim scholars concerned with identifying the lines of transmission of hadith reports. The first generations of followers are described as spreading the textual reports of the prophet Muhammad from the sanctuaries at Mecca and Medina in the Hijāz to Iraq, Syria, Iran, and Khurasan. The fourth generation of transmitters is identified with the local authorities whose opinions became the basis for the classical Sunni schools of law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Companions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Practicable and textual record</td>
<td>Şahābah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Practicable and textual record</td>
<td>Tābi‘un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Practicable and textual record</td>
<td>Tābi‘i al-Tābi‘in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Practicable and textual record</td>
<td>al-A‘immah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|              | With each generation the practicable and textual record of the prophet Muhammad’s life was dispersed to a wider area and to greater numbers of people. According to ‘Abd al-Rahmān Ibn Abī Ḥātim (d. 938), the authority of the textual record transmitted is due to the fact that the original transmitters had been in physical contact with the prophet Muhammad: “They [transmitters] preserve from the Prophet what he received from God, and what the Prophet practiced, defined as practice, decided, judged, delegated, commanded, proscribed, forbade, and suggested they memorized and acquired.” Those first transmitters, who were in physical contact with the prophet Muhammad—his companions (şahābah)—acquired his textual remains and became living examples of his words and deeds, which they imitated in their own sayings and actions. The Prophet was a physical manifestation of the revelation while he stayed in Mecca and Medina for twenty-three years and established the distinguishing characteristics (ma‘ālim) of the religion. The practice of these first followers then became a physical manifestation of the prophet Muhammad’s example. With each generation, this example became the example of new people in new locations, generations of followers who became themselves the distinguishing characteristics of Islam.

A more detailed conception of the distribution of the example of the prophet Muhammad was mapped in later centuries. Abū Ishāq al-Shirāzi (1003–1083), for example, reconstructs the lines of transmission and the movement of the Sunnah from the Hijāz, where the prophet Muhammad lived, to the major civilizational centers in Iraq, Egypt, and Syria. The local authorities whose opinions became the basis for the classical schools of Sunni law are tied not to particular people but to specific locations to which knowledge of the prophet Muhammad had spread. Abū Ḥanīfah
and his followers were identified with the transmission of the Sunnah to Kufah, al-Awzā‘ī with the transmission to Syria, and Ahmad b. Hanbal with the transmission to Baghdad.

According to this map of al-Shirāzī, the classical Sunni law schools grew from the example of a single individual in the Hijāz and spread to the widespread locations conquered by the earliest followers of the prophet Muhammad. Those who had been in physical contact with the Prophet brought reports of his life to the next generation of followers in Medina, Basrah, Mecca, Syria, Kufah, Nahiyah, Ta‘if, and Egypt. The next generation, larger in number than the first, spread the textual accounts of the prophet Muhammad to an even wider area: Medina, Mecca, Yemen, Syria and Jazirah, Egypt, Kufah, Basrah, Baghdad, and Khurasan.

This dispersal of the successive generations of followers led to the necessity of traveling throughout these cities in order to collect the examples and reports of prophetic practice. The cities where the different scholars traveled and transmitted their knowledge of the Sunnah became depots for the textual record of the prophet Muhammad’s life. Scholars had to journey, often great distances and over periods of many years within the far-flung area encompassed by the area constituted by the early conquests and subsequent expansion of Islamic civilization. Traveling among the cities established by those who had been in physical contact with the Prophet allowed scholars to connect themselves to the transmission of the Sunnah. This travel also allowed scholars to collect in one location, in one text, a complete textual record of the prophet Muhammad’s life. This travel also entailed the creation of specific chains of transmission, allowing that only the select who made this travel, or later those who could trace their knowledge to these select few, were in a position of legal authority having a physical link to the textual corpus of the prophet Muhammad’s life.

With the culminating collection of the Sunnah into written texts and the concentration of knowledge of the prophet Muhammad in the cities of Islamic civilization, as centers of learning, the significance of the Prophet as text remained fundamental to the geographical model employed by Muslim hadith and legal scholarship. The reports of prophetic practice collected from their dispersal throughout Islamic civilization were compiled into the “six books” (al-kutub al-sirrah), representing a single corpus of the sayings and actions of the prophet Muhammad. This textualization allowed for a more detailed accounting of the chains of transmission and led to the development of the formal discipline of hadith criticism (al-jarh wa al-ta‘lil) to examine the reliability of the reports claimed by various authorities on the basis of their localities. Scholars began to compile biographical lists of the principle transmitters of this textual record which included the names
of the transmitters in the six books, but also lists in which were included only the names of either weak or trustworthy transmitters. Although the interpretation of written texts might displace the necessity of travel, temporal and spatial considerations, such as when and where a particular transmitter died, became the primary basis for the evaluation of knowledge and the establishment of authority.

PRESERVED FOOTPRINTS OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD

The link between the distribution and collection of the prophet Muhammad's knowledge and the demarcation of territorial and civilizational boundaries is also illustrated by the transmission of other remains of the Prophet, such as his footprints. A number of his footprints are reported to be preserved in stone, each called Qadam Rasūl Allāh or al-Qadam al-Sharif. These footprints preserved in stone are scattered throughout the area encompassed by the early conquests and places to which successive generations of the Prophet's followers traveled. Many of these footprints are still extant.

Some of these footprints are preserved in situ, where they were left by the prophet Muhammad. Perhaps the best known of these is the footprint in Jerusalem, preserved in the rock that is under the Dome of the Rock. This footprint is supposed to have been left by the prophet Muhammad when he visited Jerusalem during his Isrā' and Mi'raj. Other footprints are preserved in places that the prophet Muhammad is supposed to have visited during his life, such as the footprint in al-Ṭa'if on Mount Abū Zubaydah. Some sources report that the footprint is accompanied by the imprint left by a gazelle when the Jewish family that owned it converted to Islam. In the Masjid al-Qadam, just south of Damascus on the pilgrimage road, is a footprint said to have been left by the prophet Muhammad when, half alighted from his camel, he was asked by Gabriel to choose between this world and the next. Another report mentions the caliph al-Mahdi seeing a footprint of the prophet Muhammad upon his arrival in Medina.

Other footprints of the prophet Muhammad, like his hair and hadith reports, are distributed to areas farther afield than his actual footsteps. One of these footprints preserved in stone was brought to Constantinople by one of the first generation of the Prophet's followers, Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī, during the siege of the city, when he died, under the Umayyad caliph Yazid b. Mu‘awiyyah. As with the burial of the hair and nails of the prophet Muhammad, Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī left instructions that the footprint be buried with him. The practice of collecting the footprints of the prophet Muhammad and their association with burial sites also extends to the pre-
served footprints of his followers, especially those claiming descent from him. The footprint of Sidi Shaykh is reported to be preserved in Algeria, and the footprints of a marabout reportedly were seen when the first Muslims arrived in Senegal.

The footprints of the prophet Muhammad are also used in the foundations of buildings. The Mujahidiyah Madrasa in Damascus used to house a black stone on which was a footprint of the Prophet. In Tanta, another black stone, on which are preserved the prints of both the feet of the prophet Muhammad, is built into the foundation of the domed shrine of Sayyid Aḥmad al-Badawi. Other tombs contain footprints of the prophet Muhammad, such as that of Sultan Abī al-Nāṣr Qā'īt Bay in Cairo, that of Sultan 'Abd al-Ḥamīd I in Istanbul, and that of Fāṭḥ Khān, son of Fīrūz Shāh ῶajib, in the Qadam Sharif in Delhi. There are also a number of mosques that were built specially to house footprints of the prophet Muhammad, such as the Masjid Aḥār al-Nābi in Cairo and the Gawr Mosque. Other footprints are kept in special buildings for exhibition, such as the six held in the Topkapi Palace in Istanbul or the footprint in the Qadam Rasul Building in Lucknow.

Closely related to the footprints is the preserved shoe or "sandal" of the prophet Muhammad (naʿīl al-nabī). In his catalog of a private Medinan library, C. Landberg mentions a book containing hadith reports praising the preserved sandal of the Prophet. Other literary descriptions of the sandal are known, and the sandal is mentioned by al-Dhahabi, Qurb al-Oin al-Halabi, and Ibn Ḥajar. As are the other relics of the prophet Muhammad, his sandals and their dispersion are traced back to his earliest followers. One of his sandals is said to have originated with Umm Kulṭūm, the daughter of Abī Bakr. Another sandal is reported to have been preserved in the mosque in Khalil in the eleventh century. A Mālikī ṭariqa from Ahmad b. Yahyā al-Wansharīsī (d. 1508) in Fez on the veneration of the prophet Muhammad’s sandal demonstrates that the practice was known in the Maghrib. In his history of Egypt, Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Nuwayrī (d. 1333) records that a sandal of the Prophet was owned by an Egyptian named Ahmad b. 'Uthmān, who was descended from Sulaymān Abū al-Ḥadīd, the companion of the prophet Muhammad. Aḥmad b. 'Uthmān is reported to have put the sandal on his eyes and wanted it to be buried with him.

A number of accounts mention the sandal of the prophet Muhammad housed in the Ashrāfiyyah Madrasa. According to Mūsā b. Muhammad al-Yūnīnī (d. 1326), the fourteenth-century ruler al-Mālik al-Asḥraf wanted to visit a sandal he considered the sacred relic of the Prophet in the possession of Nizām al-Dīn b. Abī al-Ḥadīd. Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd used to take the sandal on visits to various local rulers who would pay him, so al-Mālik al-Asḥraf asked for a
small piece of the sandal so that it could be buried with him. According to Muhammad b. Shākir al-Kurubi (d. 1363), al-Mālik al-Ashraf wanted the sandal so that he could wear it around his neck like a talisman. After the death of Ibn Abi al-Hadid, the sandal was taken to Damascus by al-Mālik al-Ashraf, where it was housed in a special place for ḥadīth scholarship (dār al-ḥadīth) surrounded by books which contained scholarship devoted to the textual record of the prophet Muhammad’s life. According to ‘Uthmān b. Ahmad Ibn al-Hawrānī (d. 1705), the sandal was buried in the wall of the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafīyah. It was moved to Istanbul in the nineteenth century. Other sandals are reported to have been placed in the foundations of buildings, such as the right sandal of the prophet Muhammad housed in the Madrasah al-Dāmāghiyya, and another sandal in the mausoleum of the Sultan al-Ghūrī.

SYMBOLISM OF PROPHETIC RELICS

Despite the objections of scholars like Ibn Taymiyah, traditions relating to the footprints of the prophet Muhammad, like those related to his hair and hadith reports, do not appear to be understood primarily as a means to venerate the prophet Muhammad’s physical body. Different traditions do emphasize the miraculous physical character of the prophet Muhammad’s feet, such as the reports attributed to ‘Ali b. Abi Ṭalib that when the Prophet walked his footsteps were so matched that it appeared as if he were walking on air. There are also reports of other miraculous aspects of his body, such as that he cast no shadow, that fire could not burn his hair, and that his sweat and spit had curative powers. The footprints do not seem to be equated with the various traditions, especially in Sufism, of touching the feet of a venerable person as a sign of devotion and humility. By contrast, the prophet Muhammad’s relics and their distribution seem to reflect and stress his physical absence, and the concurrent spread of Islam to the widespread centers of civilization where these relics have been carried. Most of the footprints, even those made in situ by the prophet Muhammad in Jerusalem and Damascus, are outside the main area of his physical activity, as were the sites housing his hair and the far-flung civilizational centers which functioned as depots for the collection of hadith reports.

The footprints, hadith reports, and hair need to be seen as part of the larger context of all of the artifacts dispersed after the death of the prophet Muhammad. Most of these remains of the Prophet are artifacts lacking extraordinary attributes. There are items which were part of the prophet Muhammad’s everyday life, such as his cup, shoes, cloak, a fragment of his bowl, his kohl pencil, an awl for patching shoes, an instrument for extract-
ing thorns, his turban, his walking stick, and his bed. Some of the artifacts relate to the practice of religion, including the prophet Muhammad's prayer mat, his pulpit (minbar), and his copy of the Quran. Others were associated with the prophet Muhammad's role as a leader, such as his signet ring, his handwritten letters to certain families and other leaders, swords and bows, iron stirrup, armor, javelin, flags, and banners. Aside from the hair and fingernails, and his body, which is buried in Medina, however, there are no other physical remains of the prophet Muhammad reported to be kept elsewhere.

The relics of the prophet Muhammad are ordinary items the dispersal and collection of which, in his absence, reflect the spread of civilization and authority. Hair, footprints, and other artifacts of the Prophet are used in the foundation of buildings, such as mosques and madrasas, which are physical manifestations of the territorial distribution of Islam and of the preserved chain of transmission from him. These buildings are designated for the transmission of the example and textual record of the prophet Muhammad's life. The acquisition of hadith reports was necessitated by the dispersal of the Prophet's knowledge but also represents a means by which certain scholars and institutions gained authority. The civilizational centers were founded upon the example of the prophet Muhammad and became collection depots for his dispersed remains. Footprints and other artifacts marked the tombs of special individuals and classes which had authority in the area in which the prophet Muhammad's relics were spread, such as sultans, jurists, saints, and martyrs. As such, the Prophet's relics served to mark and signify the territorial boundaries of civilization and the law of the revelation.

2: RELICS AND CIVILIZATION

Closely related to the dispersal and collection of the prophet Muhammad's relics and their link to the spread of civilization is the interpretation of the transportation and possession of the relics of earlier prophets and kings. In their sack of Mecca in the eleventh century, the Qarmatians are reported to have taken from the Ka'bah a number of relics, including the rod of Moses, the horn of the ram sacrificed by Abraham, and a stone containing the footprint of Abraham (maqām Ibrāhīm). Other accounts, mentioned in chapter 1, detail the survival of artifacts associated with David (swords and armor) and Solomon (horses, mirror, throne, table, signet ring), many of which are traced back to Adam and originated as gifts from heaven for the establishment of civilization.
One collection of prophetic relics that receives much attention in Muslim exegesis and histories is that of Moses and Aaron, said to be contained in the Ark of the Covenant. Early Muslim exegesis of Q 2:248 provides a context in which to understand the significance of the prophet Muhammad’s relics, and in particular their link to the sanctuary at Mecca. ‘Ubaydallah b. Sulaymān, on the authority of al-Dāhī, claims that the “remains” (baqiyah) said to be in the Ark of the Covenant are a reference to “fighting for God” (jihād fi sabil allāh). In another report, on the authority of ‘Āṭah b. Abi Rabāḥ, it is said that the “remains” refer to knowledge of the Torah. As are the prophet Muhammad’s artifacts, the ark is here linked to the spread of civilization and knowledge of the revealed law. With its miraculous return, the ark is a sign of the authority of Ţālūt, David, and Solomon and the locating of a civilizational and political center in Jerusalem.

Although Q 2:248 uses the term “coffin” (tabūt) for the ark, and describes its contents as the “remains” of Moses and Aaron, Muslim exegesis is clear to point out that the relics of Moses and Aaron were not their physical remains:

Ibn ‘Abbās said: The rod of Moses and the fragments of the tablets. This is the same as what was said by Qatādah, al-Suddi, al-Rabī‘a b. Anas, and ’Ikrimah, but they added: The Torah. Abū Ṣāliḥ said this meant the rod of Moses, the rod of Aaron, the two tablets of the Torah, and the Manna. ‘Ātiyah b. Sa‘d said: The rod of Moses, the rod of Aaron, the garments of Moses, the garments of Aaron, and the fragments of the tablets.

‘Abd al-Razzāq said: I asked al-Thawrī about the verse, and he said: “There are those who say a measure of Manna and the fragments of the tablets, and others who say the rod and shoes.”

Various reports provide different accounts of the ark’s contents, but they all identify the remains, with the exception of the manna, with ordinary objects.

Many of these objects parallel those associated with the prophet Muhammad, and Muslim exegesis associates the contents of the Ark of the Covenant with the stories of Adam and his fall from the garden of Eden. Moses’s rod, for example, is said to have been brought by Adam when he was expelled from the garden of Eden. In the exegesis of the Moses narra-
rives in the Quran, the rod is portrayed as a symbol of Moses's authority as a king and a prophet. Moses used the rod to defeat the Egyptians, part the sea, bring water from the rock, and defeat the giant Og. In one report, the rod was with Adam until his death, when Gabriel took guardianship of it and then passed it on to Moses in Midian. Another report states that the rod was passed down through the prophets until it was passed from the prophet Shu'ayb to Moses in Midian, thus establishing a chain of transmission not unlike that found in the transmission of hadith reports.

Muslim exegesis also links the bringing of the rod from the garden of Eden with the origins of perfume and the arts of civilization. Adam is said to have taken the rod from one of the trees in the garden of Eden, sometimes identified with the Tree of Life, and taken with him pieces of the other trees when he fell to earth. Different reports of this are given by al-Ṭabarî in his exegesis of Q 7:22.

Abū al-ʿAlîyāh said: Adam left the Garden and took with him from there a rod from the trees of the garden. On his head was a crown or wreath from the trees of the garden. He fell to India, and from the crown came all the perfume in India . . .

It is also said that when Adam fell to earth he had a wreath on his head from the trees of the garden, when he reached the earth the wreath dried up and its leaves scattered, and from them grew the different types of perfume. Others say: This is what is meant when it is mentioned that Adam and Eve sewed leaves from the garden as clothes [Q 7:22]. When these leaves dried they scattered, and from them grew the types of perfume. Others say: When Adam learned that God was going to cast him to the earth, he began to pass by every tree in the garden and take branches from them. When he fell to the earth, these branches were with him, and when they dried up their leaves scattered. This is the origin of perfume.

In his history, al-Ṭabarî reports that the origins of the rod are connected to other implements and arts of civilization:

Adam caused some of the perfume of the garden to come down with him. He also brought down with him myrrh and incense, the black stone which used to be more white than snow, and the rod of Moses which was from the myrtle of the garden, ten cubits tall and equal to the height of Moses. After that, anvils, mallets, and tongs were sent down to him. When Adam fell upon the mountain, he looked and saw a rod of iron growing on the mountain. With the mallet, he began to break up the trees which had grown old and dry; then he heated the [iron] branch until it melted. The
One collection of prophetic relics that receives much attention in Muslim exegesis and histories is that of Moses and Aaron, said to be contained in the Ark of the Covenant. Early Muslim exegesis of Q 2:248 provides a context in which to understand the significance of the prophet Muhammad's relics, and in particular their link to the sanctuary at Mecca. 'Ubaydallah b. Sulaymān, on the authority of al-Dāhāk, claims that the "remains" (baqiyyah) said to be in the Ark of the Covenant are a reference to "fighting for God" (jihād fi sabil allāh). In another report, on the authority of 'Āṭā' b. Aṣ'ā b. Rabāḥ, it is said that the "remains" refer to knowledge of the Torah. As are the prophet Muhammad's artifacts, the ark is here linked to the spread of civilization and knowledge of the revealed law. In the broader context of the exegesis associated with Q 2:246–251, the ark itself is an artifact, linking its holder to the founding prophets and defining moments in the history of the Israelites. With its miraculous return, the ark is a sign of the authority of Ţālūt, David, and Solomon and the locating of a civilizational and political center in Jerusalem.

Although Q 2:248 uses the term "coffin" (tābūt) for the ark, and describes its contents as the "remains" of Moses and Aaron, Muslim exegesis is clear to point out that the relics of Moses and Aaron were not their physical remains:

Ibn 'Abbās said: The rod of Moses and the fragments of the tablets. This is the same as what was said by Qatādah, al-Suddi, al-Rābi‘a b. Anas, and 'Ikrimah, but they added: The Torah. Abū Śālih said this meant the rod of Moses, the rod of Aaron, the two tablets of the Torah, and the Manna. 'Āṭiyah b. Sa'd said: The rod of Moses, the rod of Aaron, the garments of Moses, the garments of Aaron, and the fragments of the tablets.

'Abd al-Razzāq said: I asked al-Thawrī about the verse, and he said: "There are those who say a measure of Manna and the fragments of the tablets, and others who say the rod and shoes." Various reports provide different accounts of the ark's contents, but they all identify the remains, with the exception of the manna, with ordinary objects.

Many of these objects parallel those associated with the prophet Muhammad, and Muslim exegesis associates the contents of the Ark of the Covenant with the stories of Adam and his fall from the garden of Eden. Moses's rod, for example, is said to have been brought by Adam when he was expelled from the garden of Eden. In the exegesis of the Moses narr
in the Quran, the rod is portrayed as a symbol of Moses's authority as a king and a prophet. Moses used the rod to defeat the Egyptians, part the sea, bring water from the rock, and defeat the giant Og. In one report, the rod was with Adam until his death, when Gabriel took guardianship of it and then passed it on to Moses in Midian. Another report states that the rod was passed down through the prophets until it was passed from the prophet Shu'ayb to Moses in Midian, thus establishing a chain of transmission not unlike that found in the transmission of hadith reports.

Muslim exegesis also links the bringing of the rod from the garden of Eden with the origins of perfume and the arts of civilization. Adam is said to have taken the rod from one of the trees in the garden of Eden, sometimes identified with the Tree of Life, and taken with him pieces of the other trees when he fell to earth. Different reports of this are given by al-Tabari in his exegesis of Q 7:22.

Abū al-ʿĀliyah said: Adam left the Garden and took with him from there a rod from the trees of the garden. On his head was a crown or wreath from the trees of the garden. He fell to India, and from the crown came all the perfume in India.

It is also said that when Adam fell to earth he had a wreath on his head from the trees of the garden, when he reached the earth the wreath dried up and its leaves scattered, and from them grew the different types of perfume. Others say: This is what is meant when it is mentioned that Adam and Eve sewed leaves from the garden as clothes [Q 7:22]. When these leaves dried they scattered, and from them grew the types of perfume. Others say: When Adam learned that God was going to cast him to the earth, he began to pass by every tree in the garden and take branches from them. When he fell to the earth, these branches were with him, and when they dried up their leaves scattered. This is the origin of perfume.

In his history, al-Tabari reports that the origins of the rod are connected to other implements and arts of civilization:

Adam caused some of the perfume of the garden to come down with him. He also brought down with him myrrh and incense, the black stone which used to be more white than snow, and the rod of Moses which was from the myrtle of the garden, ten cubits tall and equal to the height of Moses. After that, anvils, mallets, and tongs were sent down to him. When Adam fell upon the mountain, he looked and saw a rod of iron growing on the mountain. With the mallet, he began to break up the trees which had grown old and dry; then he heated the [iron] branch until it melted. The
first thing he pounded out was a knife with which he used to work. Then he pounded out an oven, the one which Noah inherited.\textsuperscript{89}

In this account, Adam is supplied with the tools and raw materials necessary for working with iron, which he subsequently uses to create a knife and oven, implements used primarily for the preparation of food.

The manna is also supposed to have descended from heaven and is closely associated with the food eaten in the garden of Eden. On the authority of Ibn 'Atiyah, al-Jawhari, Mujahid, and al-Zajjaj, Ibn Kathir reports that the manna was like honey, the honey that flows in the garden of Eden.\textsuperscript{90} There are numerous reports, based on the exegesis of Q 47:15, which associate honey with the garden of Eden.\textsuperscript{91} Ibn Kathir also reports, on the authority of 'Ikrimah, that the quail given to the Israelites in the wilderness of wandering were like the birds of the garden of Eden.\textsuperscript{92} Consumption of the manna was not supposed to cause defecation, not unlike the food eaten by Adam and Eve before they ate from the Tree of Life.\textsuperscript{93} The manna represents food provided by God, food that requires no cultivation and harvesting, food for which the people did not have to work. This is in contrast with the punishment imposed on Adam: after his fall he was required to work the land for his food.\textsuperscript{94}

Similarly, the clothing of Moses and Aaron is linked to the accounts of the garden of Eden and the fall of Adam and Eve. Ibn Kathir reports, in his exegesis of Q 7:159, on the authority of al-Suddi, Ibn 'Abbâs, and others, that God provided special clothing to the Israelites in the wilderness: “[The Israelites asked]: ‘Where are the clothes?’ Their clothes used to grow with them, just as children grow. The clothes did not tear or wear.”\textsuperscript{95} These were clothes that did not need to be taken from animals, sheared, spun and woven, and sewn, like the coverings of Adam and Eve in the garden before the fall from Eden.\textsuperscript{96} On the basis of the exegesis of Q 7:26, Muhammad b. Qays reports that Adam and Eve were originally covered with feathers, like angels.\textsuperscript{97} Wahb b. Munabbih claims that Adam and Eve’s clothing was light which covered their genitals.\textsuperscript{98} Others, on the basis of Q 7:22, report that it was Adam and Eve’s fingernails that covered their “secret parts,” and that after they ate of the tree, the fingernails fell off and they sewed together leaves as their clothing.\textsuperscript{99}

The connection between the loss of Adam and Eve’s coverings and the exposure of their genitals is related to the tradition that there was no sex in the garden of Eden. Gabriel’s instructions in sex and reproduction are related to his other instruction of Adam in the arts of civilization such as farming and metal-working. Just as Adam’s punishment was having to work the land for food, Eve’s punishment was menstruation and the bear-
MECCAN ORIGINS OF CIVILIZATION

It is in Mecca that Adam and Eve first meet after the fall and begin procreation and the issue of the human race. And it is from Mecca that civilization first develops and spreads, the location where Adam receives instruction in the arts of civilization along with the implements required to practice these arts. According to al-Tha'labi, Adam was the first person to coin dinars and dirhems, creating the money necessary for commerce. Exegesis on Q 57:25 discusses the origins of iron and specifically the smithing of tools for agriculture and war, making the substances and the technical skills divine gifts to Adam as the first smith. Adam is also credited with having invented the different languages of the world. According to 'Ali b. Burhān al-Dīn al-Halabi (d. 1635), Adam knew the twelve different types of writing systems used in the world, and al-Kisā'i claims that Adam spoke seven hundred languages.

Much of the exegesis related to the establishment of the Meccan sanctuary and the pilgrimage to it portray Mecca as the center of the world and the location from which religion originated. In some exegesis, the Meccan sanctuary is associated with all the prophets. It is reported that when Adam arrived in Mecca, the Ka'bah was already in place, a jewel from the garden of Eden that was later raised up into heaven as the Bayt al-Ma'mur before the flood in the time of Noah. In other accounts, Adam set up the first Ka'bah as a tent ('arish) similar to the tabernacle that would later be built by the Israelites under Moses in the wilderness. Several exegetes mention the account in which Adam builds the Ka'bah when he arrives in Mecca out of five mountains: Mount Sinai, the Mount of Olives, Lebanon, al-Jūdī, and al-Hira'. Each of these mountains is associated with future prophets: Moses, Jesus, Solomon, Noah, and Muhammad.

Adam's role in instituting the rituals of the pilgrimage, and in particular the boundaries of the sanctuary, establishes a link between Mecca and the lineage of prophets. The observance of the pilgrimage rites and prohibitions of the sanctuary by the prophets reiterates the association of Mecca and Eden. The prohibition against the application of perfume in the sanctuary is related to the idea that perfume originated from the plants of the garden of Eden and thus would naturally provide a sweet smell to visitors. There is no sexual contact or marriage in the sanctuary, just as there was no sex in the garden of Eden, where Adam and Eve were ignorant of their genitals. Similarly, no sewn clothing is allowed for the pilgrim, just as Adam and Eve were naked in Eden and learned how to sew clothes only...
after their fall. Wild animals were not predatory in the garden of Eden, nor did Adam and Eve need to kill them for food or clothing. The cultivation and harvesting of plants for food was not practiced in the garden of Eden; they are tied directly to Adam’s fall and the necessary origins of human food production.

The association of different prophetic relics with the fall from Eden is tied directly to the territory of the Meccan sanctuary as an earthly counterpart of the garden of Eden. Muslim exegesis states that the sanctuary was established by Adam in imitation of the garden of Eden. According to different reports, when Adam first fell to the earth he was tall enough that, standing on Mount Budh, or “Nod,” in India, his head reached into heaven, where he enjoyed the sweet perfume of the garden and could see and hear the angels crowding around God’s throne.106 After the angels complained to God, Adam was reduced in size, but he was still large enough that his step was said to cover the distance it would take a normal-sized man to travel in three days.107 Because he could no longer hear and smell the garden of Eden, God instructed Adam to make a pilgrimage to Mecca and establish the sanctuary there as a substitute for the garden of Eden. As Adam made his way to Mecca from India, his footsteps demarcated wild from civilized territory: “Adam went on the pilgrimage to Mecca from India. Every place his foot stepped became a city [qurâ] and the territory between his steps became barren desert until he arrived at the House and circumambulated it.”108 In this account, Adam’s footsteps mark out the future cities of the world, ending at the metropolis or “mother city” (umm al-qurâ) of Mecca.109

Each of the gifts and actions of Adam relate directly to different aspects of civilization, and to the various prophets and kings who succeed him. Adam is cast as the first smith, who is taught the divine secrets of alchemy and metallurgy to create the implements of civilization, including tools, weapons, and money. He is portrayed as the first king, who demarcates the boundaries of cities and settled lands and who establishes language and commerce. Drawing upon all of these aspects, Adam is made to be the first prophet, who establishes the sanctuary at Mecca and performs the pilgrimage which is to be repeated by all successive prophets, culminating in the prophet Muhammad.

A similar link between relics and the Meccan sanctuary is made in many Muslim eschatological traditions. For example, the sword of the prophets is supposed to return to the earth in the hand of Jesus to defeat the Dajjal. The Ka’bah will be destroyed and the sanctuary devastated as knowledge of the Quran and Islamic law disappears. The old landscape of the earth will be replaced with a new one, such as that envisioned with the appearance of
the prophet Muhammad's pool. Judgment will be on the basis of the laws of the fallen earth, but paradise will be different, governed by a set of rules between those of the earth and heaven.  

**STATE PATRONAGE OF RELICS**

That these narratives about the origins of civilization and the artifacts that accompanied them had religious and political significance in later Muslim societies is evident from the collection of relics and sanction of rituals directed at their recognition, transportation, display, and preservation. Many of these relics were associated with the pilgrimage to Mecca from the major cities throughout the Middle East and North Africa. Local leaders provided accommodation and protection for pilgrims and maintained shrines, tombs, and other religious sites along the pilgrimage routes that passed through the areas within their jurisdiction. As seen from the examples above, states also patronized Islamic legal scholarship, often by establishing special buildings which housed the various relics of the prophet Muhammad.

Some of the earliest Muslim rulers, such as Mu'āwiya b. Abī Sufyān, kept and used artifacts and relics associated with the prophet Muhammad. The Fatimids appear to be the first state to collect and display relics associated with Shi'i or 'Alid figures. According to an inscription on a pulpit from the mashhad in 'Asqalān, the head of Husayn b. 'Alī b. Abī Tālib was discovered by Badr al-Jamāli in the twelfth century. The head is said to have been kept originally in Syria by the Umayyad caliph Yazīd until its disappearance. After its discovery in 'Asqalān, the head was cleaned up, perfumed, and transported to Cairo in a basket to be housed in the Husayn Mosque.

In Fatimid Cairo a number of mausoleums were established to contain the bodies of Fatimid predecessors from North Africa, including 'Ubaydallāh al-Mahdī, al-Qā'īnā, the grandfather, and al-Manṣūr, the father of al-Mu'izz. A special building was built over the site of the rediscovered burial site of the head of Zayd b. 'Alī Zayn al-'Ābidīn b. al-Husayn in the thirteenth century. These shrines and mosques, all dating from the last period of Fatimid rule, seem to be part of an attempt to provide physical evidence of the Fatimid claim of descent from the prophet Muhammad through Husayn b. 'Alī. Other sites in Cairo included the mausoleum of the brothers of Joseph, on the site of what is said to have been a Jewish cemetery containing the relics of Moses. The origins of special rituals designated for the visitation of relics can also be found in relation to some of these early buildings.
Roughly concurrent with this work of the Fatimids was the attempt by the twelfth-century Zengid ruler Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd and the later Ayyubids to create centers of prophetic authority in Syria. Unlike the Fatimids, the Zengids and Ayyubids focused on the textual artifacts of the prophet Muhammad and the building of madrasas for ḥadith and law scholarship and shrines for figures prominent in the transmission and study of these textual artifacts. In Aleppo, Nūr al-Dīn built three madrasas, several caravansaries, a hospital, a number of mosques, a Dār al-ʿAdl, a Dār al-Ḥadith, a shrine for the Hanbalis and a shrine for the Mālikīs. In Damascus, he built another hospital, a Dār al-ʿAdl, seven madrasas, the Dār al-Ḥadith al-Nūriya, the Ribāṭ of Aḥū al-Bayān, and a number of mosques, and he worked on the great mosque of the Umayyads. Nūr al-Dīn also built a Shafiʿi madrasa in Hama and a Shafiʿi madrasa in Baʿalbek. The breadth of his patronage and claim to territory are evidenced by his having built a pulpit for the al-Aqṣā Mosque in Jerusalem and his commissioning of projects in Daraya, Hama, Mecca, Medina, and Mosul. By laying emphasis upon the textual artifacts of the prophet Muhammad, Zengid buildings could counter the threat of the Shiʿi Fatimid ideology and of the Crusader states.

Under the Ayyubids and Mamluks certain cities became significant centers for the display of relics associated with the prophets and the origins and spread of Islam. Once established as sites for the collection and display of relics, cities such as Hama and Damascus continued to develop new pilgrimage sites, including those associated with artifacts, locations of special events, and bodies of important people. Ibn al-Ḥawrānī cites traditions according to which there are said to be 500 or 1,700 tombs of prophets in Damascus, including the tomb of Moses. Compilations of ḥadīth reports and traditions concerning the virtues (faḍḥāʾīl) and wonders (ʿajāʿīb) of Damascus and its surroundings emphasize the importance of the area as a center for pilgrimage. This patronage included a major building program on the Haram al-Sharif in Jerusalem as one of the pilgrimage sites in Syria.

Among the locations and items catalogued in medieval guides as pilgrimage sites in and around Damascus are the following: the cave at Mount Qasiyūn where Abel was killed by Cain, the site of the birth of Abraham and the place where he observed the celestial phenomena, the tomb of Moses, the footprint of Moses in the al-Qadam Mosque, the rock struck by Moses in the wilderness of wandering, the place where Jesus and Mary took refuge, the minaret upon which Jesus will descend at the end of time, the head of John the Baptist, the throne of Bilqis the Queen of Sheba, the tomb of Hūd, the place where Khīḍr prayed, the tomb of the mother of Mary, the foot-

In and around Hama are attested a number of small shrines (mazārāt) connected with saints and prophetic figures: the maqām of Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, the maqām of Jaʿfar al-Ṭayyār, the tomb of Jonah in the Ḥasanayn Mosque, the tomb of Ham the son of Noah, the maqām of David, the tomb of the Emīr Sārīm al-Dīn al-Nābulṣī, the tomb of soldiers who fought with Salāḥ al-Dīn (Shaykh Muḥammad Nahār and Shaykh Suweyd), the tombs of famous Muslim scholars (Abū al-Layth al-Samarqandi, Shaykh ʿAlwān Abū Muḥammad ʿAlī b. ʿAṭiya, al-Shīrāzī, Shaykh Khallūf, al-Birmāwī, al-Sālūsī, al-Muẓaffar, Shaykh Maʿrūf, Umayy al-Qarāṇī, Shaykh ʿAmbar, Abū al-Wafā al-Hawrānī, Shaykh ʿAbash, Sayyida Nafīsah, Shaykh Abū al-ʿAdīmīnār, Shaykh Ḥasan, Shaykh Masʿūd, Shaykh Maknūn, and Shaykh Bashīr), the mazar of al-Ḥusayn, and the maqām of ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Kīlānī.130

The existence of conflicting traditions concerning the location of some relics demonstrates that acknowledging the authenticity of the relics and accuracy of the site was less important than being able to claim patronage of the relics and the site. The rivalry over the location of the tomb of Moses resulted in the identification and patronage of three different sites.131 In other cases, such as the complex of sites at Khalīl or Hebron, the competition among different groups included exegetical and physical claims.132 Other sites and relics were destroyed rather than allowed to fall into the hands of a competing patron, as was not uncommonly practiced by the Crusaders around Jerusalem.133 The different tombs of Ezra in Iraq and Syria were recognized and visited by both Jews and Muslims.134 And a number of Buddhist relics were transformed into relics of ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Kīlānī by Muslims in India.135

In other cases, relics and sites seem to have been produced without an attempt to trace their history. According to ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Jabarti (d. 1825), a number of relics including hairs, shoes, and a handwriting sample
from the prophet Muhammad were discovered suddenly in the mausoleum of Sultan al-Ghūrī. 134 Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Ibn Khallikān (d. 1282) reports that Tāj al-Dīn b. Ḥinna constructed the Ribāṭ Dayr al-Ṭīn near Cairo for a cache of relics he had purchased from the family of the Banū Ibrāhīm for one hundred thousand dirhems. 135 Others claim that the Ribāṭ of relics is said to have contained only a piece of wood and a piece of iron. 136 Shams al-Dīn b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī Ibn Ṭūlūn (d. 1546) reports that prophetic relics were taken in procession from Jerusalem to Damascus, including a cup (qadāḥ) and walking stick (ʿukkāz) of the prophet Muḥammad. 137 Ibn Ṭūlūn doubts the authenticity of these relics but recognizes the significance of their acquisition and transport to Damascus by local authorities. 138 The identification of the tomb of Noah near Baʿalbek also appears to have been anticipated. 139 Nur al-Dīn is reported to have taken a piece of the special saw of Shaykh Arslān Nūr al-Dīn and stipulated that it be placed in his burial shroud. 140

The symbolic character of such relics is illustrated by a fatwā included in the collection of al-Wansharisī. In response to a question about the permissibility of visiting a shrine which housed a shoe of the prophet Muḥammad (naʿl karīmah), the author of the fatwā states that there is no sensible reason to venerate a shoe: “If this relic [al-āthār] is considered great and sacred, it is not because it has any particular form nor any particular smell, but because a person considers it great on account of his [the prophet Muḥammad’s] sacred character, from its connection to his noble house.” 141 After this, the fatwā goes on to cite a number of hadith reports concerning the veneration of objects. Permission for people to wear, touch, and wipe the shoe relic is based upon this veneration, a veneration that is supposed to focus the mind of the visitor on the prophet Muḥammad and the sacred places where he walked. It is about bringing to mind the temporal and physical distance separating the visitor from the Prophet when he wore the shoe.

More important than the relics themselves was the relationship represented by the patronage of relics by the state. The Ottoman treasury housed one of the greatest collections of prophetic artifacts, now kept in the Topkapi Palace in Istanbul. Perhaps this collection, like the collection of relics by earlier local states, was intended to demonstrate the legitimacy of the Turkish state among the largely non-Turkish Arab population of the Middle East. In addition to the swords of the prophet Muḥammad and his followers, the Topkapi includes the cloak (burdah) and hairs of the prophet Muḥammad, a number of footprints, the silver keys of the Kaʿbah, 142 the cover (mahfazah) for the black stone, an inscribed signet ring of the prophet Muḥammad, and a letter from the prophet Muḥammad to Muqawqas written on the cover of a Coptic Gospel. 143
A large number of relics were brought to Samarqand by Timur from his conquests in the Middle East and were later transferred to Mughal India. These included a copy of the 'Uthmān Qurʾān, taken from Baghdad and stained with the blood of 'Uthmān,\(^1\) the body or just the hand of the prophet Daniel,\(^2\) and a large number of Arabic and Persian manuscripts. The Pādishāhi Mosque in Lahore is reported to contain twenty-eight different relics of the prophet Muhammad, 'Ali b. Abī Tālib, Fātimah al-Mu'awwādah, and Shawth al-Aʿzam 'Abd al-Qādir Ginānī and miscellaneous items, including a tooth of Uways al-Qurānī. This cache is said to have been taken from Damascus by Timur and later brought to India and held by Babur until it was transferred by the British to the mosque at Lahore.\(^3\)

The link between the patronage of relics and the legitimacy of the state is not limited to Islamic examples. In Ptolemaic Egypt, the Hellenistic rulers were able to assert their authority vis-à-vis local identity through a sort of pilgrimage to different cities in which were said to be interred the dismembered body parts of Osiris.\(^4\) The modern state of Israel has attempted to lay claim to certain parts of historical Palestine on the basis of the identification of archaeological remains with the biblical narrative of the ancient Israelites.\(^5\) The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan has invested millions of dinars and many years of work in the renovation of the tombs and shrines attributed to prophets, companions of the prophet Muhammad, and other sites of religious significance among Muslims and Christians. This patronage and renovation has also included the upgrading of roads and other local infrastructure to facilitate the visits of pilgrims and tourism.

A map of the holy sites of Jordan, produced in conjunction with the Ministry of Religious Endowments and the Ministry of Tourism, lists fifty-three holy sites.

**PROPHETS:**

1. Maqām of Noah in Karak
2. Maqām of Hud near Jerash
3. Maqām of Lot in Ghur al-Safi
4. Maqām of Khidr in Karak, 'Ajlun, Mahis, and Bayt Ras
5. Tomb of Shu'ayb near al-Salt
6. Tomb of Aaron near Petra
7. Maqām of Moses on Mount Nebo
8. Tomb of Joshua b. Nun near al-Salt
9. Maqām of David in al-Mazar al-Shamali
10. Maqām of Solomon in Sirfa
11. Maqām of Job near al-Salt

\(^1\) A large number of relics were brought to Samarqand by Timur from his conquests in the Middle East and were later transferred to Mughal India. These included a copy of the 'Uthmān Qurʾān, taken from Baghdad and stained with the blood of 'Uthmān, the body or just the hand of the prophet Daniel, and a large number of Arabic and Persian manuscripts. The Pādishāhi Mosque in Lahore is reported to contain twenty-eight different relics of the prophet Muhammad, 'Ali b. Abī Tālib, Fātimah al-Mu'awwādah, and Shawth al-Aʿzam 'Abd al-Qādir Ginānī and miscellaneous items, including a tooth of Uways al-Qurānī. This cache is said to have been taken from Damascus by Timur and later brought to India and held by Babur until it was transferred by the British to the mosque at Lahore.

\(^2\) The link between the patronage of relics and the legitimacy of the state is not limited to Islamic examples. In Ptolemaic Egypt, the Hellenistic rulers were able to assert their authority vis-à-vis local identity through a sort of pilgrimage to different cities in which were said to be interred the dismembered body parts of Osiris. The modern state of Israel has attempted to lay claim to certain parts of historical Palestine on the basis of the identification of archaeological remains with the biblical narrative of the ancient Israelites. The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan has invested millions of dinars and many years of work in the renovation of the tombs and shrines attributed to prophets, companions of the prophet Muhammad, and other sites of religious significance among Muslims and Christians. This patronage and renovation has also included the upgrading of roads and other local infrastructure to facilitate the visits of pilgrims and tourism.

\(^3\) A map of the holy sites of Jordan, produced in conjunction with the Ministry of Religious Endowments and the Ministry of Tourism, lists fifty-three holy sites.

**PROPHETS:**

1. Maqām of Noah in Karak
2. Maqām of Hud near Jerash
3. Maqām of Lot in Ghur al-Safi
4. Maqām of Khidr in Karak, 'Ajlun, Mahis, and Bayt Ras
5. Tomb of Shu'ayb near al-Salt
6. Tomb of Aaron near Petra
7. Maqām of Moses on Mount Nebo
8. Tomb of Joshua b. Nun near al-Salt
9. Maqām of David in al-Mazar al-Shamali
10. Maqām of Solomon in Sirfa
11. Maqām of Job near al-Salt
(12) Maqâm of John in Mukawir
(13) Maqâm of Jesus at Jordan River
(14) Maqâm of Muhammad near al-Safawi

ṢAḤĀBAH:
(15) Tomb of Ja'far b. Abî Tâlib
(16) Tomb of Zayd b. Ḥârîtha
(17) Tomb of 'Abdallâh b. Rawâḥa
(18) Tomb of Abû 'Ubaydah 'Āmir b. al-Jarrâh
(19) Tomb of Mu'âdh b. Jabal
(20) Tomb of Shurhâbil b. Ḥasna
(21) Tomb of 'Āmir b. Abî Waqqâs
(22) Tomb of Ḥîrâr b. al-Aqwar
(23) Tomb of al-Ḥârith b. 'Umayr al-Azdi
(24) Tomb of Abû Dharr al-Ghîffârî
(25) Tomb of Abû al-Darda'
(26) Maqâm of Bilâl b. Rabâh
(27) Tomb of Maysara b. Masrûq
(28) Tomb of 'Ikrimah b. Abî Jahl
(29) Maqâm of Abû Mûsâ al-Ash'ârî
(30) Tomb of Farwa b. 'Umayr al-Judhamî
(31) Maqâm of 'Abd al-Râhîm b. 'Awf
(32) Tomb of Jâbir b. 'Abdallâh

OTHER RELIGIOUS FIGURES AND SITES:
(33) Cave of Seven Sleepers near Amman
(34) Maqâm of Zayd b. 'Ali in Karak
(35) Maqâm of Seth in Tafilah
(36) Site associated with Jadûr (biblical Gad) in al-Salt
(37) Khirbat Hazzîr in al-Salt
(38) Springs of Moses
(39) Baths of Moses

ISLAMIC HISTORICAL SITES:
(40) Site of battle of Mu'tah
(41) Site of battle of Fahl (Pella)
(42) Site of battle of Yarmouk
(43) Mount al-Taḥkîm (where 'Ali and Mu'âwiyyah met)
(44) Mosque of 'Uthmân
(45) al-Ḥumaymah
CHRISTIAN SITES:
(46) Place of baptism of Jesus
(47) Place of beheading of John
(48) Pella
(49) Copper mines of Feinan
(50) Cave of Lot
(51) Steps of Mu'ab (Livia's)
(52) Sanctuary of Wine
(53) Umm al-Rasas (Mayfa'ah)

Some of the sites are listed more than one time (13 and 46, 12 and 47, 41 and 48, 3 and 50) as Islamic and Christian sites. and the map includes a separate list of six places designated by the Vatican as pilgrimage sites.

It is important to note that the historical and mythological significance attributed to the relics patronized by Islamic states seems to differ from the significance of the sort of oddities displayed in so-called curiosity shops. The oddities of curiosity shops are not symbols that refer to sovereignty, but are instead designed to encourage commerce. Marsh's Free Museum lists among its contents freaks of nature (Jake the alligator man, a two-headed baby, a one-eyed lamb, an eight-legged lamb), artificially produced oddities (a shrunken head, Morris the freeze-dried cat, a bowl made of human skin), and merchandise (antiques, souvenirs, candy, fudge, resort wear, fresh saltwater taffy, collectibles, glass floats, black lights; see fig. 1). Like the shrines and other structures built upon or housing relics, the curiosity shop does attract tourists with exhibits that cannot be missed—“You gotta see Jake the alligator man”—without fear of having missed something integral to the visit. And both the oddities and the relics provide the reason for a visit to the place. Both the curiosity shop and relic shrine give the opportunity to take home a “souvenir” of the place visited.

The designation of the souvenir store as a curiosity shop or a “free museum” is intended perhaps to mask the real reason for the exhibits, just as relics provide an alternate and indirect explanation for the existence of the state that collects and displays them. Viewing the exhibition of oddities becomes an excuse for buying merchandise, just as visiting a relic is an implicit recognition of the legitimacy of the state patronage that identifies it as a relic. But relics are significant because they are defined in a way that links them to a recognized figure or event in the past, whereas the “relics” of curiosity shops do not appear to have an existence independent of the curiosity shop in which they are displayed. Jake the alligator man does not have a history, but relics provide a tangible link to the development of civilization and past prophets who established religion. As such, relics are a reminder...
of the fall from Eden, and the patronage of the relic is an attempt to assert a claim to what the relic represents, the need for the state to administer religion to humanity in its fallen condition.

CONCLUSIONS: RELICS AND PORTABLE TERRITORY

It is possible that the prohibitions of cutting fingernails and hair in the context of the pilgrimage are related to the wild state of the pilgrim in the
Meccan sanctuary. These prohibitions appear to stress the connection of the Meccan sanctuary to life beyond or before civilization, in the wilderness of wandering and the garden of Eden. Pilgrims are required to let their hair grow all over their bodies, and to let their nails become long. There are numerous traditions associating a pilgrimage and religious retreat with a return to a wild or beastlike state of existence. These traditions stress the distinctions separating civilization with its temptations and regulations from the Edenic state lacking the concomitant society and sin. In the garden of Eden, Adam and Eve were said to be covered with fingernail. The loss of the fingernail coincided with their fall from Eden, the recognition of sex, and the origins of civilization. Marking movement from one type of area to another, the prohibitions and practices of the pilgrimage to Mecca signify the transition from one type of existence to another. It is this transition that is highlighted by the treatment of the prophet Muhammad’s hair, nails, and other relics.

Within the context of Muslim scholarship, the link between the prophet Muhammad’s remains and civilization is of cultural rather than natural significance. The cutting of nails and hair at the conclusion of the pilgrimage is a sign of not being in the garden of Eden, of having to leave a location that allowed for only the temporary experience of what was lost with the fall of Adam and Eve. Similarly, the contents of the Ark of the Covenant signify the break between the wilderness and the Holy Land, the wilderness being like an Eden, flowing with milk and honey, whereas the Holy Land was to be a place of conquest, laws, building, farming, and social hierarchy. The relics of the prophet Muhammad are symbolic references to the fall and the separation of the utopian existence in the garden of Eden from the social realities of civilized life on earth.

The hair, nails, footprints, and hadith reports are portable symbols linked to the Meccan sanctuary and the pilgrimage instituted by the prophets. By patronizing the collection and display of prophetic relics, states and local authorities could lay claim to a tangible link between their state and the origins of Islamic civilization. Just as obligatory Muslim rituals symbolize an acknowledgment of the break between Eden and earth, relics serve to remind people of the necessity of religion and its administration by the state in a postfall world.

In some cases, pieces of the territory itself might serve as the relics do, as souvenirs of the place. Shi‘i pilgrims in Iraq and Syria purchase tablets of soil from the tomb of Husayn and are given torn pieces of the shroud covering the tombs visited. The transportation of water from Zamzam and earth from the Meccan sanctuary by pilgrims is also reported. In his pilgrim guide, ‘Ali b. Abi Bakr al-Harawi (d. 1215) mentions the use of soil to cure a scor-
According to Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Muqaddasi (d. 964), women in Syria were known to wear the shavings of a disinterred coffin dug up and identified as the coffin of the prophet Joseph. Visitors to tombs of the Ahl al-Bayt in Damascus are given small pieces of the cloths covering the tombs. Yahyā Ḥaqqī (d. 1992) describes how people would put in their eyes kerosene from the lamps at the tomb of Sayyidna Zaynab in Cairo. Pilgrims from other sites in the ancient world apparently took home scrapings from the temples and shrines they visited. The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan has advertised for companies to bid for a contract to bottle, market, and distribute holy water from the site of the baptism of Jesus at the Jordan River. This notion of territory made portable by pilgrims visiting the location is analogous to the conception of relics as reminders of a place and time now absent. The analogy between portable territory and relics must also take into account that the acquisition of relics is usually limited to officials, perhaps because it is some sort of official patronage that signifies the object as a relic and testifies to its connection with the place of its origins.

Certain Indian notions relating to the distribution of the remains of the Buddha and the notion of the multiple Buddha bodies parallel, in some respects, the concept of the pieces of the prophet Muhammad associated with the Meccan sanctuary and the origins of civilization. In a manner similar to that in which the dispersal of hadith reports is linked to the early conquests and the establishment of Muslim centers of civilization, the Buddha's textual and physical remains are distributed to every large city throughout the earth. The distribution of the Buddha's remains is a reconstruction of the physical body of the Buddha (rupa-kaya) and the legal body of the Buddha (dharma-kaya), just as the hair and nails of the prophet Muhammad are accompanied by his textual remains in their distribution and collection. The stupas built atop the distributed remains of the Buddha are physical monuments to the dharma (dharmarājikā) and mark the boundaries of the civilized Buddha-world within which the dharma applies. Madrasas and mosques are built upon and contain the physical remains of the prophet Muhammad, functioning as centers for the collection and study of his textual remains in the formulation of the Sunnah and Islamic law.

The distribution of the pieces of the Buddha and the prophet Muhammad emphasize that which separates civilization from utopia: the absence of the Buddha and the loss of Eden.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nibbana</th>
<th>Eden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buddha (relics)</td>
<td>Prophet Muhammad (relics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civilization</td>
<td>civilization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The utopian Nibbana and Eden are mediated in civilization through the relics of the Buddha and the prophet Muhammad. Asoka's distribution of the Buddha's body asserts the relationship of his kingdom and the dharma of the Buddha. The spread of the prophet Muhammad's relics affirms the legitimacy of the state, which preserves the relics and administers religious law. Asoka disperses the relics of the Buddha and performs a pilgrimage identifying himself and the civilization which he administers with the physical body and dharma teachings of the Buddha. Just as the physical body of the Buddha parallels his dharma body, so the physical relics and artifacts of the prophet Muhammad are equivalent to his textual remains, the hadith reports that are instrumental in the formation of the Sunnah and Islamic law. The dispersal of the bodies is what provides for the establishment of the state, a dispersal made necessary because of the fallen state of humanity.

It is important to note that the assertion that the Muslim state is necessary is not based upon the absence of the prophet Muhammad, as the analogy with Buddhism might suggest. It is, rather, an indirect assertion. The Muslim state is necessary because of the loss of Eden. The prophet Muhammad's distribution of his hair and nails at the boundaries of the Meccan sanctuary and the completion of his pilgrimage underlines the link between Mecca and the origins of civilization. Mecca works as a symbol of the origins of civilization because, as the earthly substitute for the lost garden of Eden, it represents what was made necessary by the fall of Adam and Eve. In this respect, the Islamic example might be comparable to the Iroquois conception of wampum as a symbol of the disjunction of creation and humanity. The wampum belt is integral to the Iroquois social structure, providing authority to speak in the longhouse and title to its bearer as a link to an ancestral past. As the first object discovered on earth by Haiawatha at the time of creation, the wampum marked the beginning of civilization, a prototype of the objects required for social governance and an economy of exchange. The relics of the prophet Muhammad also reflect back to the break between heaven and earth, and the need for the first objects of civilization.

In substance, the relics of the prophet are no different from the raw materials of the wampum. Pieces of hair, wood, metal, and ceramics and ordinary objects such as shoes, clothing, and a bed can be as arbitrary and common as a given seashell or the actions which might be labeled ritual walking, standing, and speaking. Indeed, the symbolic nature of certain actions and objects is heightened by the fact that they are employed in a manner unlike what would be expected. The Islamic legal definition of impurity, for example, marks bodily functions which are shared by all
human beings on a daily basis. What makes a given object, action, or condition special is the attention paid to it. As a given text is canonized by its interpretation, objects are rendered sacred by their use as symbols to demonstrate the authority of the patron. Performing a given action as a "ritual" or visiting a given object as a "relic" is an acknowledgement, or at least a tacit recognition, of the authority that designates the actions and objects as rituals and relics. In this sense, relics and ritual are not best understood as a supernatural link to the presence of the prophet Muhammad, but rather as reminders that the existence of the Prophet and the law he brought was made necessary by the loss of Eden.

In the Islamic context, relics mark the land with mosques and madrasas, as reminders of the loss of Eden and the necessity of rituals and the law. Collection and possession of the prophet Muhammad's relics were a means to demonstrate authority in the social organization of the postfall world. Likewise, burial with the prophet Muhammad's relics was a statement of the recognition of the break between the utopia of Eden and this life. Use of the relics was a recognition of the necessity of the state in providing the means for fallen humanity to follow the example of the prophet Muhammad and reenter paradise at the end of time.
CHAPTER FOUR

Tombs of Giant Prophets

Chapter 3 focused on the relics associated with the prophet Muhammad and the territorial spread of Islamic civilization. The Prophet's hair and nails refer to the symbolism of the Meccan sanctuary as the earthly substitute for the garden of Eden and the origins of Islamic civilization. The spread of these physical remains, as well as hadith reports and other artifacts such as the prophet Muhammad's footprints, clothing and weapons, delineate the boundaries of Islamic civilization. Relics were carried by the early conquests and their successor states to outposts and cities which then served as centers for the study and implementation of Islamic law. Official collection and preservation of these relics allowed local states to assert their legitimacy as patrons of the religious law necessary for the development of civilization in a postfall world.

Chapter 4 examines the locations and objects associated with the tombs of prophets mentioned in the Quran and Muslim exegesis. The identification and development of these tomb sites epitomize the sort of state patronage associated with the collection and preservation of prophetic relics. Particular attention is given to those tombs which are of extraordinary length, up to 175 yards long. Little has been written on these long tombs despite their frequent mention in both Islamic and European sources, and despite the many references to the giant size of early prophets in Muslim exegetical and historical accounts. European scholars have noted the existence of the so-called “nine-yard” (nau-gaz) long tombs in South and Southeast Asia, usually associated with the Muslim warriors (ghāzi) involved in the earliest conquests of India and identified primarily in northwest India and Pakistan but also as far east as Bengal and Java.

The following pages suggest that the extraordinary size of the nau-gaz tombs and the tombs of prophets is linked with the larger Muslim concep-
tion of the origins and development of civilization as outlined in previous chapters. Section 1 provides an overview of some of the nau-gaz and long tombs of prophets from archaeological evidence and travelers' accounts. These sources show that the phenomenon of long tombs is widespread throughout Asia but appears to be specific to Islamic conceptions of tomb symbolism. Section 2 shows how this symbolism is connected to the existence of giants in Muslim accounts of the earliest civilizations after the flood and before the Israelite conquest of the Holy Land. Various sources provide accounts in which a direct correlation is made between the technological development of civilization and a physical reduction in human size. Comparisons of Muslim and other ancient accounts concerning giants and the recovery of their remains indicate that the long tombs, like other prophetic relics, are understood as physical reminders of the fall from Eden and the progress of civilization toward the prophet Muhammad and Islam.

1: LONG TOMBS

In the description of his travels in southern Arabia, Theodore Bent (1832-1897) makes a remarkable observation concerning the tomb of the Arab prophet Salih:

A short ride of two hours brought us nearly to the head of the Wadi Khonab, and there, situated just under the cliff, in an open wilderness, is the celebrated tomb. It consists simply of a long uncovered pile of stones, somewhat resembling a potato-pie, with a headstone at either end, and a collection of fossils from the neighbouring mountains arranged along the top... The tomb is from 20 to 40 feet in length, and one of the legends concerning it is that it never is the same length, sometimes being a few feet shorter, sometimes a few feet longer. The Bedouin have endless legends concerning this prophet. He was a huge giant, they said, the father of the prophet Houd, or Eber; he created camels out of the rock, and hence is especially dear to the wandering Bedou; and he still works miracles, for if even unwittingly anyone removes a stone from this grave, it exhibits symptoms of life, and gives the possessor much discomfort until it is returned. Once a domed building was erected over the tomb, but the prophet manifested his dislike of being thus enclosed and it was removed.³

Of particular significance in Bent's description is the claim that the extraordinary length of the tomb was due to the gigantic size of the prophet Salih. Some forty years later, W.H. Ingrams (d. 1897) visited this same tomb of Salih and reported that it was sixty-four feet long and was contained in a
long, low building. Ingram also mentions visiting the nearby tomb of the prophet Hud which he estimated measured some ninety feet long, stretching up the side of the hill behind the dome which housed the cleft in the rock into which Hud is supposed to have disappeared when pursued by his people. Other travelers likewise mention the ninety-foot length of Hud's tomb and describe the annual Muslim pilgrimage to it. Tombs of other prophets in the area are also reported to be of enormous length, said to house the bodies of giants; these include the tomb of al-Galsad in the Hadramawt, another near the tomb of Hud, and a giant tomb near Shabwah.

**Tombs of the Prophets**

Various structures at Islamic sanctuaries and shrines are associated with burials and tombs. According to Muqatil b. Sulayman, there are seven prophets, including Hud, Salih, and Ishmael, buried in the sanctuary of Mecca. In his commentary on Q 2:125, al-Suyuti relates that along with Hud, Salih, and Ishmael, the prophets Noah and Shu‘ayb are also said to be buried in the sanctuary of Mecca. In his biography of the prophet Muhammad, al-Halabi relates a report that three hundred prophets were buried around the Ka‘bah. The Ka‘bah itself and the well and the pit associated with the Ka‘bah are interpreted as structures associated with and marking the sanctuary of Mecca not unlike how stelae, pillars, and cairns mark sacred areas in pre-Islamic Arab contexts. Many of the rites associated with the pilgrimage to Mecca and visitation of other shrines parallel funerary and mourning practices attested in other contexts, such as circumambulation of the tomb, the wearing of certain sorts of clothing, and restrictions on certain types of behavior.

Many of the long tombs found throughout the Middle East include pillars and resemble cairns, and the tombs themselves could represent the sorts of structures associated with the various terms used to designate shrines and places of burial. In the middle of the shrine dedicated to the prophet Hud in the Hadramawt is a structure like the base of a thick pillar built upon the rock into which Hud is supposed to have disappeared. The long tombs on the Swahili coast of Kenya feature prominent pillars, and the local mosque there is sometimes called the “mosque of the pillar” because of this architectural feature. Central Asian tombs often include rock structures built atop the main tomb resembling small cairns or pyramid-like pillars. The tombs of Salih and Hud are described as cairnlike mounds of rocks, and the large area designated as the “tomb” of Seth is regarded by some to designate a larger sanctuary within which the body is buried.

Muslim pilgrims and European travelers report on the existence of a num-
ber of other long tombs associated with prophets from the Quran and its exegesis. General Alexander Cunningham (d. 1893), in his published reports on the various northwest provinces of India, mentions the tombs of the prophets Seth and Job, called Ayub Paigambar and Sis Paigambar by local tradition, at Ajudhya. He also refers to a nau-gaz tomb in Lamghān, beyond the Indus, which is ascribed to Lamek Paigambar, or the prophet Lamech, the father of Noah. W. Crooke (d. 1923), honorary director of the ethnographic survey of the northwest provinces and Oudh, also refers to the tombs of Seth and Job at Ajudhya, giving their measurements as seventeen and twelve feet long, respectively. In his book on the early Arab conquests, Ahmad b. Yahyā al-Balādhūrī (d. 892) reports an account of the people of Sind venerating an image of the prophet Job: “The temple [budd] of Multan received rich presents and offering, and the people of Sind considered it a place of pilgrimage. They circumambulated it and shaved their heads and beards. They conceived that the image there was that of the prophet Job.” Other tombs of the prophet Job can be found in Central Asia, including one in Bukhāra and the Mazar of Hazrett Ayyub Paigambar near Jalabad in Turkestan, the guardians of which claim descent from Job. Both of these shrines in Central Asia include water sources said to be related to what is mentioned in Q 38:42.

The shrine of the prophet Daniel, or the Mazar of Saint Daniel, in Samarqand also contains an extralong tomb. Joseph Castagné measures the tomb of Daniel as twenty meters in length. Some local tradition claims that what is buried in this tomb is the remains of the prophet Daniel brought to Samarqand by Timur from the city of Sus, or Shūsh, the ancient Susa in Iran. According to some accounts, the tomb holds only the hand of Daniel, since the rest of the parts of Daniel’s body had been plundered from his tomb in Sus by the time of Timur’s visit. Others claim that it is not the tomb of Daniel the prophet but Daniel, or Dānār, who was one of the followers of Qussām b. ‘Abbās, the prominent companion of the prophet Muhammad who is also buried in Samarqand, in the Shah-i-Zindah necropolis.

Daniel, Job, and Seth also have tombs associated with them in the Middle East. There is a tomb of Job in Palestine near Ayn Silwan in Jerusalem, and another tomb of Job near Jabal Qara in Dhofar, Oman. Neither the tombs of Job or Daniel in the Middle East are of extraordinary length. The tomb of Job in Dhofar is about five meters in length, but the tomb of Seth in the Baq’a Valley of Lebanon is one the longest on record. According to ‘Abd al-Ghani al-Nabulsi, the tomb is forty meters in length. “Then we visited the tomb of the prophet of God Seth. . . . I saw that the tomb was very large, majestic and wondrous. The length of the tomb was about
forty meters and its width was about two meters. We stopped there and prayed to God. In the account of his travels, Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Jubayr (1134–1217) mentions the tombs of the prophets Seth and Noah in the Baq‘a‘a Valley, but he did not visit them in person. The tomb of Noah is described to Ibn Jubayr as being thirty meters in length, and the tomb of Seth as being forty meters in length. According to an anonymous medieval Hebrew travel account, the tomb of Noah was twenty-four cubits long, and the British traveler Lord Curzon (d. 1925) reports that when he visited the tomb of Noah it measured forty yards in length.

In the same vicinity as the tombs of Seth and Noah is the long tomb of Abel, the son of Adam, on a mountaintop along the same range of the Anti-Lebanon Mountains as the tomb of Seth, just on the Syrian side of the border near the town of Suq Wadi Barādah. The tomb is roughly nine to ten meters in length. This tomb is not mentioned in classical Muslim pilgrimage guides but is mentioned along with the tomb of Cain in the anonymous Hebrew travel account entitled Eleh ha-Massā‘ot. Ibn al-Hawrānī and al-Harawi both describe the Cave of Blood (maghārat al-dam) on the slope of the nearby Mount Qāsiyūn, where Cain is supposed to have killed Abel. According to a Greek legend cited in Stephanus Byzantinus and reflected in Jerome’s account of Cain and Abel, it was at this location that Hermes killed the giant Askos at the founding of the city of Damascus, possibly linking the status of Abel as a giant with the founding myth of the city.

Further south, in the hills above the Jordan Valley, are the long tombs of Joshua and Aaron. The tomb of Joshua is located in the city of Zaw, near the city of al-Salṭ in Jordan. This tomb is described by John Lewis Burckhardt (d. 1817), who identifies the tomb as that of the prophet Hosea in his travels through Syria:

The Mezar Osha is supposed to contain the tomb of Neby Osho, or the prophet Hosea, equally revered by Turks and Christians, and to whom the followers of both religions are in the habit of offering prayers and sacrifices. . . . [T]he tomb is covered by a vaulted building, one end of which serves as a mosque; the tomb itself, in the form of a coffin, is thirty-six feet long, three feet broad, and three feet and a half in height, being thus constructed in conformity with the notion of the Turks, who suppose that all our forefathers were giants, and especially the prophets before Mohammed. The tomb of Noah in the valley of Coelo-Syria is still longer. The coffin of Osha is covered with silk stuffs of different colours, which have been presented to him as votive offerings.
Still further south is the tomb of the prophet Aaron on the top of Jabal Hārūn, just to the southwest of the Nabataean site of Petra. Burckhardt did not visit the tomb when he was in Petra but had it described to him as being “a large coffin, like that of Osha in the vicinity of Szalt.”

There are a number of long tombs also found and reported in the Arabian Peninsula ascribed to prophets. Of those known from Oman is the tomb of the prophet ‘Umrān, located in the Dhofar region, in Salalah, measuring thirty meters in length. ‘Alī al-Shahīrī has cataloged other tombs of this type found in the monsoon mountains, the coastal area, and Salalah, some of which may be pre-Islamic and resemble other prehistoric tombs in the area (see fig. 2). It is possible that the ‘Umrān of Salalah is ‘Imrān, mentioned in the Quran as the father of Mary the mother of Jesus (Q 3:33–35) and also identified in Muslim exegesis as the father of Moses. According to al-Shahīrī, ‘Umrān is a local Arab prophet like the prophet Raḍwān mentioned in connection with al-Jabal al-Akhdār near Muscat. Perhaps the longest tomb of all reported is that of Eve, the wife of Adam, located in Jedda, on the Red Sea coast of the Ḥijāz. Charles Doughty (d. 1926) gives a rousing description of the tomb.
There are graves, set out in many places, in the Arabian wilderness, more than twenty feet in length; and such are said to be of the R. Helil. In like sort, we may see the graves of certain biblical patriarchs and prophets in Palestine, now in the custody of the Moslem, that are drawn out to a demesurate length, after their higher age and dignities. Some sixty, some a hundred feet long. Eve's grave is sought our (for is she not called mother of mankind?) to almost as many paces at Jidda: to the oratory upon our great mother's navel, being more than the height of a tall cedar.—her babes, at the birth (saving her reverence) should be greater than elephants. If thus were the first woman, what should Adam be?

According to Lord Curzon, the tomb of Eve measured 173 yards in length, and D. Van der Meulen reports that the tomb, located near the entrance to Wadi Mäder, was 175 yards long.

There are various Islamic traditions regarding the location of the tombs of Adam and Eve. According to Ibn Kathir, different accounts claim that Adam is buried on the mountain to which he fell in India, that he is buried in Mount Abū Qubays in Mecca, or that Noah took the bodies of Adam and Eve on the ark and reburied them in Jerusalem. 'Ali b. Abū Muḥammad al-Hasan Ibn 'Asākir (d. 1176) says that the head of Adam is at the Mosque of Abraham in Khalil and his legs at the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem. In his history, al-Ṭabarī reports that Noah took Adam and Eve with him on the ark but then returned them both to the cave on Mount Abū Qubays, also called the Cave of the Treasure, in which they had originally been buried. Although the actual tomb of Adam is not described, his great size is mentioned in a number of different sources, including a hadith report related by Ubayy b. Ka' b on the authority of the prophet Muhammad: "Your father Adam was as tall as a very tall palm, that is, sixty cubits. He had much hair, and his private parts were concealed. . . . When Adam was dead, the angels washed him separately with lotus and water and dressed him in separate layers of shrouds. then they prepared a grave and buried him. They said: 'This will be the custom of the children of Adam after him.' Both Qatādah and Ibn 'Abbās also report that, after his fall from the garden of Eden, Adam was reduced in size to sixty cubits—about thirty meters—before he made his first pilgrimage to Mecca.

The extraordinary lengths of the tombs of these prophets is largely a matter of speculation to most of the observers whose opinions are preserved. The local guardian of the shrine at the tomb of Noah reports that some think the length of the tomb is due to its holding an example of the "missing link" in the evolution of human beings. Other travelers attribute
the size of the tombs to pre-Islamic traditions, perhaps related to nature and fertility cults, as Ingrams does in describing the grave of the giant Nebi Mola Matar, from whom the mountain takes its name:

This was the first of the many giants' tombs we saw in the Hadhramaut. High up on the face of the opposite mountain is a weather-worn rock which our Badawin said represented their prophet's camel. The spot is sacred to the Badawin who hold there an annual fair, and I wondered whether the place was not a relic of one of the old sanctuaries of the pre-Islamic nature gods, particularly as the name [matar] means rain. To try and make this prophet more orthodox, a somewhat apologetic effort was later taken to identify him with 'Ali, the son-in-law of the Prophet Muhammad.

Ingrams also reports that one of the giant tombs was situated near a lone sumar tree, perhaps representing a connection between the planting of trees and the shrines of certain prophets. Bent postulates that the tombs associated with prophets were originally "heathen sites of veneration, which have, under Moslem influence, been endowed with orthodox names."

Others attribute the length of the tombs to a mistaken identification of an earlier structure. One modern guidebook states that the long tomb of Noah in the Baqâ'a Valley is probably just the remains of a Roman aqueduct: "Au centre du village, ancienne mosquée que les habitants prétendent être le tombeau de Noé (Nouh) et qui n'est qu'un fragment d'aqueduc antique." A local source in the town of Nebi Shith claims that the length of Seth's tomb is due to the fact that because the exact location of Seth's body was not known a large area was declared the "tomb" to protect the sanctity of the actual spot. The local imam of the tomb of Joshua says that although the tomb is ten meters in length, Joshua was only four or five meters tall, but it is unknown which part of the tomb contains the body. It is not uncommon for tombs to be enlarged by later patrons, and for the form of the architecture to produce a tomb that is larger than the body it is supposed to contain.

NAU-GAZ TOMBS

In addition to the large tombs located in the Arabian Peninsula, a number of different sources refer to the nau-gaz tombs located in South, Central, and Southeast Asia. Some of the earliest references to these tombs in South Asia are recorded in the archaeological surveys commissioned by the British in the middle and late nineteenth century. Cunningham lists the locations
and measurements of a number of them. In Multan, he mentions eighteen such tombs, including those of well-known saints and their relatives, a converted Hindu, ghazis known by name and anonymous, and unidentified people. The tombs range in size from twenty-one feet to fifty-four feet in length and are clustered around the gates of the old fort and city, though many were buried under the ruins of the fort before Cunningham's arrival in 1853. Five were near the fort:

1. Near the Sikki gate, tomb of Lal Husen Bairagi, a converted Hindu.
2. Near the De gate, tomb of Miran King Shamar, 4 gaj in length.
3. Near the Rehri gate, tomb of Sabz Ghazi, 3½ gaj in length.
4. Near the De gate, outside, tomb of unknown Ghazi.
5. Near the Jamia Masjid, tomb of Kazi Kutb Khusani. There was no trace of this in 1854.58

The other tombs were near the gates of the city:

6. Near the Bor gate and inside the city, tomb of Pir Adham.
7. Near the Bor gate and outside the city, tomb of Pir Din dar, 54½ feet long.
8. Above Husen Gai, in the Nandh Mohalla, tomb of Pir Ramzan Ghazi. 21 feet 3 inches long.
9. Outside the Delhi gate, 450 feet distant, tomb of Pir Gor Sultan. This tomb is 35½ feet in length.
10 and 11. near Sagar, two tombs, each 3½ gaj in length. Names not known.
12 and 13. At Shadana Shabid, tombs of the Shadana himself, and of some unknown martyr, each 3½ gaj in length.
15. In Mangar-ka-Mahalla, unknown tomb.61

Cunningham also records the forty-six-foot-long tomb of Nur Shah in Harapa,62 the thirty-two-foot-long tomb of Muhammad Shah in Bawanni,63 and seven tombs in the Punjab measuring from twenty-nine feet to thirty-eight feet in length.62 Nau-gaz tombs are also reported in Rajputana and Ahmadabad. In Ahmadabad there are nine nau-gaz tombs to the south of the Hindu Nara

ryoan temple, near the Rauza to the northwest of the city. There is no record of their exact measurements, and they are not identified with particular people.64 Crooke records one nau-gaz tomb at Nagaur, in Rajputana, and makes reference to the tombs listed by Cunningham in the Punjab.65
Crooke does not elaborate on the size of this tomb in Rajputana but describes the nau-gaz tombs as "where the giants of olden time rest." Cunningham similarly does not provide any details on the gigantic size of the tombs and does not question the local traditions that the nau-gaz tombs date back to the earliest Muslim invasions of the area, although he identifies a number of them with later saints. He reports that the tomb of Far Sultan in Multan is 1,300 years old, as is the tomb of Muhammad Shah in Bavanni, both belonging to warriors who fell under the command of the Arab general Muhammad b. al-Qāsim al-Thaqafi in 711 CE.

Long tombs associated with the introduction of Islam to Southeast Asia have also been recorded in Java. Hasan Muarif Ambary describes four "long tombs" (makam panjang) in the village of Leran in Java, all roughly equivalent in length to the nau-gaz tombs found in South Asia, measuring 8.77, 9.25, 9.28, and 9.61 meters in length. Local tradition identifies three of the tombs with known followers of Raja Cermin, the brother of Malik Ibrahim, who came to Java in 1385 and died in 1419 according to his grave marker. The earliest Muslim burials on the island are recorded in the eleventh century on grave markers imported from further west, such as the tomb of Fatimah bint Maimūn near the four long tombs in Leran.

It is not possible to verify that the long tombs in Java or the nau-gaz tombs in South Asia—either the location or the structures themselves—date back as far as local tradition maintains. One of the earliest dated Muslim tombs from Sādan, near Muzaffargarh, has an inscription which states that the saint died in 674 AH, or 1275 CE. This dates the tomb to the period of the Mongol attacks in the area, and local tradition claims that the tomb is that of a descendant of a companion of the prophet Muhammad who came to Multan with the army of Muhammad b. al-Qāsim in the eighth century. The tomb is constructed of baked bricks and is identical in design to other nau-gaz tombs but is roughly square (twenty-one feet by twenty-nine feet), and the casket itself is just over ten feet long. A number of tombs, both dated and undated, in Central Asia and China are associated with companions of the prophet Muhammad and are not reported to be of extraordinary length.

In addition to the indeterminacy of the tombs' dates, there is scant information regarding the length of the tombs beyond the scattered reports of their measurements and undocumented comments concerning local claims of the giant size of those buried in the tombs. Several observers do remark on the possibility that the length of the tombs might be influenced by local, non-Islamic traditions. Cunningham makes indirect comparisons between the nau-gaz tombs and the large stupas in Ajudhya, and Crooke discusses possible Buddhist influences on the nau-gaz tombs. Henry Cousens, who
made a number of surveys of the antiquities of the Sind and western India, directly relates the architecture and materials used in the construction of Muslim tombs to those used in Buddhist and Hindu monuments in the same area.75

Of particular note is the fact that all the nau-gaz tombs are constructed of special baked bricks characteristic of stupas and Hindu temples. The use of the baked mud brick in Muslim tombs may represent more than practical concerns, as Cousens notes in relation to the building of mosques: "The Muhammadan, on the other hand, looks upon every stone of his mosque, even when the latter is totally ruined, as having been consecrated to God's use, and it is a desecration to use it in any other way." 76 Cousens appears to be describing a notion shared with other traditions in the region regarding the individual stones or bricks each as representing the building as a whole in the construction of which they are employed. The bricks are thus said to signify or take on the substance of the structure in which they are employed and individually represent the significance of the building as a whole.78

This connection between the individual bricks and the body contained in the tomb is expressed in a number of ways. Buddhist stupas are built over the distributed remains of the Buddha’s body, so that each stupa and each brick in the stupa represent the larger rupa-kaya, or physical body, of the absent Buddha.79 In the case of the Hindu temple, the building is a physical manifestation of the deity to whom the temple is dedicated, an embodiment of the otherwise absent god or goddess.80 Stella Kramrisch explains how the Hindu temple is a representation of the fire altar, in which the bricks represent the different pieces of the body of the sacrifice (vajranu).81 The foundation bricks of the temple are laid with mantras imbuing them with the symbolism of the body of the deity, so that the bricks become the limbs of Agni.82 The installation of the bricks (istaka-nyasa) is the main foundation rite of the temple. In its design, the temple is the likeness of Purusa, the primal being whose body is dismembered for the creation of the cosmos and society.83 The temple plan represents Purusa and Agni to the extent that the temple is regarded as the stone body of these beings.84

Muslim practices also connect the physical character of the tomb with the body of the deceased. For example, in both South and Central Asia stones are placed on the top of tombs in the shape of a pyramid, with the top stone supposed to represent a miniature version of the tomb or an image representing the body of the person in the tomb.85 This is similar to the practice of the Turkic peoples of Siberia and the steppes of Central Asia, who erect figurines representing the dead person at the site of the tomb.86 Certainly, the extraordinary length of the nau-gaz tombs is supposed to
represent the gigantic size of the ghazi or saint encased in the brick structure of the tomb. The concept of the dismembered and buried body parts of the deity marked by the building of a temple is not unlike the example of shrines built over the distributed body parts of Horus in Egypt or the distribution and housing of the remains of the prophet Muhammad in mosques, mausoleums, madrasas, and other buildings associated with the transmission of hadith reports and the study of Islamic law. Insofar as the Hindu temple and the stupa represent the bodies over which they are built, it is possible that the bricks of the Muslim tomb also embody and signify the fallen ghazi or saint who is entombed within it. 87

2: GIANTS

Consistent throughout the accounts of the nau-gaz tombs and the long tombs of the prophets is the claim that the extraordinary length of the tombs is due to the gigantic size of the bodies buried in them. A number of travelers report that local Bedouin told them that the people buried in the long tombs were from the giants responsible for building the huge monuments now in ruins around the Arabian Peninsula: "Stories of antiquity tell of the people of ‘Ad and Thamūd. They were giants to whom the beduin to-day attribute the buildings and monuments of which they see the ruins that consist of huge blocks of stone. Only giants, people much taller and stronger than living mankind, could have put such colossal stones on top of each other."88 The city of San‘a is also reported to have been built by the giant people of ‘Ad to whom Hud was sent as a prophet.89 In his geography, Ibn al-Faqih (fl. 903) reports on the authority of Ibrahim b. Abi al-Mahajir that the city of Mecca, originally called “Bakkah,” as recorded in Q 3:96, used to be in the possession of the giants (jabābirah).90 Doughty also reports that giants are said to be responsible for the wells, water pits, and large standing stones and mentions a number of long tombs supposed to belong to the tribe of the Banū Hilāl, who are associated with heroic feats.91

RECOVERY OF GIANT REMAINS IN GREEK AND ROMAN SOURCES

That the people of long ago, especially the prophets and heroes, were giants is a motif known from other religious traditions and cultures. Numerous examples of the discovery of the bones of giants exist in Greek and Roman sources.92 Solinus reports that massive bones washed ashore by streams at Pallene, site of a battle between the gods and giants, were found and collected.93 Pausanias mentions the giant-sized bones at Megalopolis in the sanctuary of Asklepios, said to be from one of the giants called upon by
Hopladamos to defend Rhea: “Under this hill there is another sanctuary of Asclepius. His image is upright and about a cubit in height, that of Apollo is seated on a throne and is not less than six feet high. Here are also kept bones, too big for those of a human being, about which the story ran that they were those of one of the giants mustered by Hopladamos to fight for Rhea, as my story will relate hereafter.” In his work on the cult of Protesilaus, Philostratus mentions corpses from different locations attributed to giants such as Hyllus of the Aloadai brothers Otos and Ephialtes in Thessaly, Alkyoneus at Phlegra, and other giants buried by Vesuvius at Pallene.95

Plutarch narrates how the Athenian soldier Cimon brought back to Athens a giant body found beside bronze weapons at Skiros, said to be the bones of Theseus, son of Poseidon.96 According to Plutarch and Strabo, the burial mound of the giant Antaios, the son of Poseidon and Gea, was dug up at Tingis (Tangier) by Sertorius, who found a body sixty cubits in length.97 The body of Asterios, son of the giant Anax, who was the son of Gea, was reported to be at least ten meters in length when his tomb was opened.98 A coffin eleven cubits in length containing a giant body was found in the Orontes River, and according to Philostratus,99 a body dug from the Orontes River was the giant Aryades, measuring thirty cubits in length.100 Phlegon reports that digging on an island near Athens uncovered a coffin one hundred cubits in length bearing an inscription identifying the giant body as that of Makroseiris.101

Greek and Roman sources also report on the large bones and tombs of heroes.102 According to Diodorus and Pausanius, when the tomb of Ajax was unearthed at Troy near Thoiteion, his kneecaps were found to be as large as the discuses used by athletes.103 The body of Ajax discovered in the tomb was sixteen feet in length, and the Iliad portrays him as being of enormous size.104 The body of Orestes, recovered by the Spartans, was found at Tegea in a coffin seven cubits long.105 Pausanius describes the retrieval of the bone of Pelops:

When the war of the Greeks against Troy was prolonged, the soothsayers prophesied to them that they would not take the city until they had fetched the bow and arrows of Heracles and a bone of Pelops. So it is said that they sent for Philoctetes to the camp, and from Pisa was brought to them a bone of Pelops—a shoulder-blade. As they were returning home, the ship carrying the bone of Pelops was wrecked off Euboea in the storm. Many years later than the capture of Troy, Damarmenus, a fisherman from Eretria, cast a net into the sea and drew up the bone. Marveling at its size he kept it hidden in the sand. At last he went to Delphi to inquire.
whose the bone was, and what he ought to do with it. It happened that
by providence of Heaven there was then at Delphi an Elean embassy pray-
ing for the deliverance from a pestilence. So the Pythian priestess ordered
the Eleans to recover the bones of Pelops, and Damarmenus to give back
to the Eleans what he had found. He did so, and the Eleans repaid him
by appointing him and his descendants to be guardians of the bone. The
shoulder-blade of Pelops had disappeared by my time, because, I suppose,
it had been hidden in the depths so long, and besides its age it was greatly
decayed through the salt water.106

Phlegon also reports the discovery of a broken jar containing three skulls
and two jawbones, identified as the remains of Idas, the strongest man on
earth.107 The great size of Heracles is referred to numerous times, including
the mention of a huge bone identified with the finger of Heracles bit off
by the Nemean lion.108

The bones and bodies of giants are also found in other European con-
texts. In Egil’s saga, the leg bone of Egil is described as being so large that it
required several men to carry it. The first time a dinosaur bone was discov-
ered in Oxfordshire, some said the bone was from a giant.109 Giant bones
were also identified with monsters and giants in other parts of Britain, such
as the giant “Dun Cow” slain by Sir Guy of Warwick whose relics are kept
in the Warwick Castle.110 Saint Stephen’s cathedral in Vienna contains a
“Giant’s Door” (Riesenror), so named on account of a giant bone found
during the building of the church in the thirteenth century and displayed
as the remains of a giant killed during the flood of Noah’s time.111 Trolls and
giants are also common in European folklore.112 In the Don Valley is the
city of Kostienki, meaning “bone village,” where large bones were uncov-
ered and attributed to a giant named Inder in Russian folklore.113

GIANTS AND THEIR REMAINS IN THE QURAN AND BIBLE

The accounts concerning giants in the Quran and Bible parallel and may
be related to these Greek and Roman motifs but are more specific in how
giant size is related to the origins and end of civilization. This specificity
is reflected in the Muslim exegesis that attributes gigantic size to certain
prophets mentioned in the Quran. According to al-Qurtubi, the reference
in Q 7:69 to God’s increasing the stature of the people of ‘Ad is to the
physical height of the people: “The ‘Ad were tall in stature and great in
body size. Ibn ‘Abbās says their height was one hundred cubits and then
God shortened them to sixty cubits. This was the extra [size] which he
added to the natural size of their forefathers. It is also said that this verse
means they were increased in size over the people of Noah. A report given on the authority of Wahb b. Munabbih states that the heads of the people of 'Ad were so large that they were like great domes, and their eyes were so large that they could scare away predatory animals. Others report that the people of 'Ad ranged from sixty to one hundred cubits in height. The city of Iram dhāt al-‘Imād, in which the 'Ad lived, is also described as being gigantic:

It is said that Iram was a city unlike any other ever created. It was situated in Yemen between the Hadramawt and San‘a. In it were castles of gold and silver and dwelling places under which flowed rivers. It is also said that the people gathered all the gold, silver, pearls, gems, and precious stones in the world and brought them to one place, and from these things were built the city of Iram. The length and the width of the city was twelve parasangs on each side. In it were three hundred thousand castles all made of jewels. After the people of 'Ad were destroyed, the city disappeared and no person has ever entered it except for one man during the days of Mu‘āwiyyah whose name was 'Abdallāh b. Qilābah.

Exegesis on the building of signs on every “high place” and “artifices” mentioned in Q 26:128–129 explains that the people of 'Ad had great castles and tall towers, more magnificent than the ruins of ancient Egypt that reached into the sky.

The long tomb of Salih in the Hadramawt is also attributed to the gigantic size of the prophet and his people. Muslim genealogists state that Salih, like Hud, was a descendant of Shem the son of Noah but several generations removed from that of Hud. Though it appears to contradict the sequence of the Quran in which Salih comes after Hud, local tradition of the Hadramawt claims that Salih was the father of Hud, perhaps identifying Hud with the biblical “Eber” and Salih with the biblical “Shelah” the father of Eber in Genesis 10:22–24 and Luke 3:35. Muslim exegetes also explain that Hud and Salih were the first two in a series of “Arab” prophets which also includes Shu‘ayb and the prophet Muhammad: “The prophet Muhammad said to me: ‘Abū Dharr, four [prophets] were Syrian: Adam, Seth, Noah, and Idris. He was the first to write with a pen. God revealed to Idris thirty scriptures. Four [prophets] were Arab: Hud, Salih, Shu‘ayb, and your prophet.”

The close relationship between the antediluvian “Syrian” prophets and the “Arab” prophets is also highlighted by the direct succession of the accounts of Noah, Hud, and Salih in Q 11. and 26. Muslim exegesis on Q 19:57 states that Idris did not die, but tall stature and long tombs are attested for the other three antediluvian prophets.
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Exegesis on the building of signs on every “high place” and “artifices” mentioned in Q 26:128–129 explains that the people of 'Ad had great castles and tall towers, more magnificent than the ruins of ancient Egypt, that reached into the sky.

The long tomb of Salih in the Hadramawt is also attributed to the gigantic size of the prophet and his people. Muslim genealogists state that Salih, like Hud, was a descendant of Shem the son of Noah but several generations removed from that of Hud. Though it appears to contradict the sequence of the Quran in which Salih comes after Hud, local tradition of the Hadramawt claims that Salih was the father of Hud, perhaps identifying Hud with the biblical “Eber” and Salih with the biblical “Shelah” the father of Eber in Genesis 10:22–24 and Luke 3:35. Muslim exegetes also explain that Hud and Salih were the first two in a series of “Arab” prophets which also includes Shu‘ayb and the prophet Muhammad: “The prophet Muhammad said to me: 'Abū Dharr, four [prophets] were Syrian: Adam, Seth, Noah, and Idris. He was the first to write with a pen. God revealed to Idris thirty scriptures. Four [prophets] were Arab: Hud, Salih, Shu‘ayb, and your prophet.” The close relationship between the antediluvian “Syrian” prophets and the “Arab” prophets is also highlighted by the direct succession of the accounts of Noah, Hud, and Salih in Q 7, 11, and 26. Muslim exegesis on Q 19:57 states that Idris did not die, but tall stature and long tombs are attested for the other three antediluvian prophets.
The link between Hud and Salih, and the attestation of long tombs for both of these prophets, may be related to their special status as the original Arabs. Of the four Arab prophets, only Hud and Salih are considered to be from the “original Arabs” (al-‘arab al-‘aribah), also called the “extinct” or “long-ago Arabs” (al-‘arab al-ba‘idah), while Shu‘ayb and the prophet Muhammad are from the “arabicized Arabs” (al-‘arab al-musta‘ribah).¹²¹

Aram b. Shem b. Noah begat Uz b. Aram, Gether b. Aram, and Hul b. Aram. Then Uz b. Aram begat Gether b. Uz, ‘Ād b. Uz, and ‘Ubayl b. Uz. Gether b. Aram begat Thamūd b. Gether and Judays b. Gether. They were an Arab people speaking the Muḍarī language. The Arabs called these nations the “original Arabs” because Arabic was their original language, but they called the descendants of Ishmael b. Abraham the “arabicized Arabs” because they spoke the language of these people after they had settled among them. The ‘Ād, Thamūd, Amalekites, Umaym, Jāsim, Judays, and the Ṭasm are the original Arabs.¹²²

Ibn Kathīr records a number of reports that associate the origins of the Arabic language with Hud, his father, Noah, or Adam.¹²³ The Arabic language of Ishmael (al-‘arabīyah al-fuṣḥā) and his descendants, who formed the tribes from which the prophet Muhammad descended, is said to have been learned from the original Arabs with whom Ishmael settled in Mecca: the Jurhum, the Amalekites, the people of Yemen, and the Arab peoples who preceded Abraham.¹²⁴

In Muslim exegesis, the gigantic size attributed to certain figures appears to be limited to the early prophetic figures, the Syrian prophets, and the Arab prophets of the original Arabs.¹²⁵ The size of these early peoples might also be related to the notion that the life span of human beings was reduced after the great flood, which marked a division between the mythical era of primeval times and the origins of human civilization in historical time.¹²⁶ Genesis 5 lists the ten generations from Adam to Noah, attributing extraordinary long lives to the patriarchs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enosh</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenan</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahalalel</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoch</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methuselah</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lamech (777 years)  
Noah (950 years)

After the flood, the life spans decrease drastically:

Shem (Gen 11:10, 600 years)  
Arpachshad (Gen 11:12, 438 years)  
Shelah (Gen 11:14, 433 years)  
Eber (Gen 11:16, 464 years)  
Peleg (Gen 11:18, 239 years)  
Reu (Gen 11:20, 239 years)  
Serug (Gen 11:22, 230 years)  
Nahor (Gen 11:24, 138 years)  
Terah (Gen 11:31, 205 years)  
Abraham (Gen 25:7, 175 years)

A similar pattern exists in the Sumerian King List, in which the reigns of the antediluvian kings (tens of thousands of years in length) are replaced after the flood by reigns lasting no more than 1,500 years. Flood stories from the ancient Near East, Greece, and India also portray the flood as a measure to control population, and the immortality of the heroes is contrasted with the shortened lives of postdiluvian humanity.

That the people who lived before the flood were of gigantic size is a common motif indicated in a variety of sources. A number of verses in the Quran use the term "giant" (jabbâr, pl. jabâbirah, jabbârin) as an accusation against people who put their own importance over God. References to particular giants are found in Muslim exegesis on the various Quran passages mentioning the flood.

Some exegetes allege that Og ['Awj] b. 'Anâq, also called Ibn 'Anâq, was alive from before the time of Noah to the time of Moses. They say he was an unbeliever, a giant, and a tyrant. They say he was not rightly guided but he was the offspring of his mother, a daughter of Adam, out of wedlock. On account of his height he used to take fish from the depths of the sea and fry them on the face of the sun. He used to say to Noah while he was on the ark: "What is that large bowl you have there?" It is mentioned that he was 3,333 ⅓ cubits in height.

This same giant is again mentioned by Muslim exegetes as being present at the time when the Israelites arrived in the Holy Land (al-ard al-muqaddisah) (Q 5:20–26). According to al-Tabari, the giant Og captured
the twelve chiefs sent out by Moses to reconnoitre the land. A report given on the authority of Nawf b. Fadalah claims that Moses defeated the giant Og: “The height of Og was eight hundred cubits. The height of Moses was ten cubits, and his rod was ten cubits. Moses jumped into the air ten cubits and hit Og, hitting his anklebone, and Og fell down dead. His body was a bridge for the people to cross.” Ibn Kathir reports that there was another giant who called on Moses, named Balaam b. Beor (Ba’awra), who is said to have been the tallest of the giants encountered in the Holy Land.

Muslim exegesis also connects the giants in the Holy Land with the original Arab peoples related to Hud and Salih. Ibn al-Jawzi and others explain that the giants inhabiting the Holy Land in the time of Moses were the Amalekites, and the giant Goliath whom David defeated in Q 2:251 was from the Amalekites who had conquered Gaza and Ashkelon. In Numbers 13:27–33, the twelve representatives sent by Moses into the land report back concerning the giants inhabiting the land:

27. They told him saying: We came to the land to which you sent us. It flows with milk and honey, and this is its fruit. 28. Nevertheless, the people who are settled in the land are great and the cities are walled and very big. Also, the descendents of ‘Anaq we saw there. 29. The Amalekites have settled in the land of the Negev. The Hittites, Jebusites, and Amorites have settled in the mountains. The Canaanites have settled by the sea and by the side of the Jordan. 30. Caleb quieted the people before Moses and said: Let us go up now so that we might take it, for we are able to do it. 31. But the people who had gone up with him said: We are not able to go up against the people because they are stronger than we. 32. So they brought a bad report of the land which they had spied to the Israelites, saying: The land through which we have crossed to spy is a land that eats its seeders, and all the people that we saw in it were people of great stature. 33. There we saw the Nephilim, the descendents of ‘Anaq who are from the Nephilim. In our own eyes we were as grasshoppers, and likewise we were in their eyes.

The inhabitants of Moab are called the Emim (Deut 2:10) and the territory of Ammon was known as the land of the Rephaim, who were also called the Zamzummim by the Ammonites (Deut 2:20–21). Both of these peoples are described as being giants, like the descendents of ‘Anaq, the Anakim. In 2 Samuel 21:16–20 and 1 Chronicles 20:4–8 there are references to the Rephaim (ha-rápā) as “giants,” and several passages mention Og of Bashan as one of the last of the Rephaim. The Nephilim mentioned in Numbers
13:33 as being descendants of `Anaq, like the Anakim, are also mentioned in Genesis 6:1–4 as the offspring of the sons of God (ha-ēlōhīm) and daughters of Adam—a description similar to that of Og b. `Anāq in Muslim exegetis.\textsuperscript{137}

Such traditions regarding giants were current in later periods and were identified with particular locations visited by pilgrims in late antiquity. Josephus mentions a place near Hebron where the Israelites are said to have destroyed a race of giants: “So they [the Israelites] moved their camp to Hebron, took that town and massacred all those in it. There remained yet a race of giants who, by reason of their huge frames and figures were in no way like the rest of humanity, and were an amazing sight and a tale of terror to be heard. Their bones are shown to this day, bearing no resemblance to any that have been known to people.”\textsuperscript{138} In his account of Christian pilgrimage sites, Jerome identifies a number of Palestinian cities with giants, including Ashdod, Hebron, and Gaza.\textsuperscript{139} Eucherius also mentions that Hebron was once a city of giants, as does Adomnan.\textsuperscript{140} Theodosius mentions the city of Paran, near Mount Sinai, where Moses is supposed to have fought with Amalek.\textsuperscript{141} In the account of his pilgrimage to the Holy Land, Bernard the Monk mentions on the Plain of Tanis the bodies of people who fell in the time of Moses, which look like three walls.\textsuperscript{142}

The gigantic size of certain prophets may also be related to a larger soteriological history beginning with the garden of Eden and culminating in the Day of Judgment. According to a report given on the authority of Ibn `Abbās and Qatādah, Adam was reduced in height to thirty cubits when he fell from the garden of Eden.\textsuperscript{143} This corresponds to the reduction in size and life span of people after the flood. The tombs of Adam and Eve are reported to be the longest, followed by those of the antediluvian and Arab prophets, and then by the tombs of later prophets and the nau-gaz tombs of the ghazis and saints. Local tradition holds that the body of Daniel, in the tomb in Samarkand, continues to grow, and that the tomb is enlarged to accommodate this growth.\textsuperscript{144} It is possible that the growth of Daniel’s corpse relates to his special role in eschatological traditions—that the growth of his body is his gradual restoration to the original size of humanity in its prefall, Edenic state.\textsuperscript{145} From this perspective, the body of Daniel can be expected to reach its full primordial size just before the Day of Resurrection. According to a hadith report given on the authority of Anas b. Mālik, the bodies of all the people who enter Eden are given the height of Adam, sixty cubits.\textsuperscript{146} The giant size of other eschatological figures, such as the Dajjal, the Dabbat al-Ard, and Jesus, is also mentioned in traditions about the end of time.\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{137} The gigantic size of certain prophets may also be related to a larger soteriological history beginning with the garden of Eden and culminating in the Day of Judgment. According to a report given on the authority of Ibn `Abbās and Qatādah, Adam was reduced in height to thirty cubits when he fell from the garden of Eden.\textsuperscript{143} This corresponds to the reduction in size and life span of people after the flood. The tombs of Adam and Eve are reported to be the longest, followed by those of the antediluvian and Arab prophets, and then by the tombs of later prophets and the nau-gaz tombs of the ghazis and saints. Local tradition holds that the body of Daniel, in the tomb in Samarkand, continues to grow, and that the tomb is enlarged to accommodate this growth.\textsuperscript{144} It is possible that the growth of Daniel’s corpse relates to his special role in eschatological traditions—that the growth of his body is his gradual restoration to the original size of humanity in its prefall, Edenic state.\textsuperscript{145} From this perspective, the body of Daniel can be expected to reach its full primordial size just before the Day of Resurrection. According to a hadith report given on the authority of Anas b. Mālik, the bodies of all the people who enter Eden are given the height of Adam, sixty cubits.\textsuperscript{146} The giant size of other eschatological figures, such as the Dajjal, the Dabbat al-Ard, and Jesus, is also mentioned in traditions about the end of time.\textsuperscript{147}
SIZE AND SOCIAL STATUS

Several of the long tombs, such as those ascribed to Salih and Hud in the Ḥadramawt, are described as mounds of rocks resembling cairns. Cairns and burial mounds are well attested in the Near East, especially the ancient burial mounds on Bahrain and in the Gulf, and the cairns with Safaitic inscriptions from the basalt desert region of eastern Jordan. According to Edward Westermarck, the cairnlike appearance of some tombs may be due to pilgrims’ throwing stones at a roadside shrine when passing it in lieu of a personal visit. The tomb of the prophet Muhammad in Medina is described by Richard Burton (d. 1890) as an oblong mound of earth covered with small stones laid by pilgrims visiting the site. The domelike structure of the cairn is considered to be a more primitive form of the later dome (qubbah) that covers many enclosed tombs. Both the dome and the cairn, as the pyramids or the tholoi—the beehive-shaped tombs of the Mycenaean Greeks—are thought to represent artificial mountains, the construction of an artificial cave in which the body may be interred. Many tombs, including the long tombs of prophets, contain or are endowed with objects of value and thus resemble artificial versions of caves associated with the burial of treasure. Some of these objects are buried with the body, often under the mound or cairn, and other times the objects are depicted on the tombs themselves. Castagné mentions a host of objects which accumulate at the tombs of saints and prophets, including horns of goats and rams, skulls of horses, lamps, swords, mosaic fragments, written prayers, Quran codices, rugs, and metal balls sometimes as large as cannonballs. Burckhardt describes the treasures reported to have been kept in the tomb of the prophet Muhammad in Medina, including jewelry and an original copy of the 'Uthmān Quran. The more important the person buried, the more numerous and valuable the items left at the tomb. Jewelry buried in the tombs, portrayed on them, or left at the tomb by visitors is also used to indicate the importance of the deceased. Cunningham reports on giant-size jewelry up to two feet in diameter, said to be the thumb rings linked to a nearby nau-gaz tomb, at Multan. Weapons are also linked with tombs, often signifying the heroic stature of the deceased though not necessarily associated only with warriors.

The status of the deceased can also be displayed through the construction of elaborate tombs and necropolises. Such necropolises are often built and patronized by the state for the burial of ruling family members and appear to serve as monuments to the greatness of the dynasty. Towers, pillars, and other accoutrements are added to tombs to indicate status, in-
cluding huge piles of stones, perhaps associated with cairns, for the burial of nobles and royal figures. Also demonstrating the continued importance of the tombs is how the size of many of the nau-gaz and other long tombs appear to increase over time with additions from pilgrims and local patronage. The nau-gaz tomb of Nūr Shah is recorded to have grown from eighteen to forty-six feet in length. Cunningham and Crooke describe the tombs of Seth and Job at Ajudhya as growing from ten and a half to seventeen and nine to twelve feet in length “through the frequent repairs of pious Musulmans.”

Such examples suggest that much tomb architecture and size results not from the physical requirements of the corpse but rather from the attempt to express the historical and social significance of the interred person. The relative lengths of the long tombs in the Arabian Peninsula are described as reflecting a hierarchy among the prophetic figures: “We soon passed some tombs arranged around a larger one that is believed to be the last resting-place of the Prophet Handala and is twenty-five yards long. The longer the tomb the greater the importance attached to the person believed to have been buried in it. The tomb of Hūd the Prophet of Allah, six days' travel by camel to the east, is tens of yards longer than that of Handala. In Jidda, the Red Sea port of Mecca, the tomb of our Mother Eve is 175 yards in length.” One of the most striking tombs in India is the Dargah of Shah Amin al-Din A‘la (d. 1675) which bears the shahādah, numerous hadith reports, names of the twelve imams, and a ghazal of fifteen couplets culminating in the saint's being identified with God. Often, the relative importance of the dead is expressed in the relative position and size of their tombs. In the Deccan, tombs were rebuilt by later adherents to ensure that the tombs of certain Sufi saints and the founders of orders were larger than those of later followers. Crooke mentions the tomb of a disciple of Sayyad Mahmud at Jhanjhana, in Muzaffarnagar, whose tomb is said to continuously sink below the earth so that it is lower than the tomb of his master. Tomb construction also reflects ordinary social and gender distinctions, such as the custom of burying religious leaders near mosques, burying women deeper than men, or using separate areas in cemeteries for children and non-Muslims.

The special status signified by the size of tombs is also found associated with other large remains, including the relics of prophets. The preserved footprints of the prophet Muhammad discussed in chapter 3, for example, are relatively large, roughly eighteen to twenty-four inches in length. Large footprints are also attributed to other prophetic figures, such as the enormous footprint of Adam in Sri Lanka. According to al-Nābulṣī, the tomb
of Job in a village near Nawi has a running spring and a footprint of the prophet. There are numerous Greek examples of large footprints attributed to Perseus (two cubits long), Dionysius (one hundred feet long), and Heracles (just shorter than the footprint of Dionysius). Extra-large footprints of the Buddha and giant-size teeth attributed to the Buddha are attested. These large remains, like the long tombs, appear to represent the special status of the figure with which they are connected rather than an attempt to display a more literal interpretation of giant body size.

It is the association of such locations and objects with the prophets and their followers, and thus their definition as sacred, that is accomplished by the state's authorization of their veneration through both narrative and visual discourse. The building of mosques, madrasas, and tombs demonstrates the state's support for religious learning, the scholars, and the institutions that develop from the prophet Muhammad. By using the ruins of earlier tombs and monuments in its own constructions, the state can show its building upon and supercession of earlier regimes. The identification and patronage of tombs, in particular, coincides with territorial claims. Duplication of tomb locations and the use of shrines (maqāmāt) illustrate state and local competition for claims of identity and sovereignty. The patronage of prophetic relics and tombs has the effect of grafting the current regime into the continuity of authority stemming from the prophet Muhammad and the line of prophets that stretches back to Adam.

CONCLUSIONS: TECHNOLOGY AND HUMAN SIZE

The state patronage of certain objects and locations as relics and tombs of the prophets helps provide legitimacy to the current social order by reminding people of the fall from the garden of Eden and the necessity of civilization. Tombs serve to signify the break between this world and the utopian existence of Eden, in part by reference to the physical remains of those no longer present. The association of tombs and relics with miracles relating especially to sickness and infertility can signify the disjunction between current human existence and how it was in Eden. To tombs and relics are also attributed cosmogonic significance, such as the tomb as a representation of the world mountain which once linked heaven and earth, and the tombs of prophets and saints are closely tied to the establishment of sanctuaries built in imitation of Eden.

The attribution of long tombs to the antediluvian and Arab prophets is understood as a direct reference to the origins of Islamic civilization in
Mecca. Muslim exegetes explain that the sanctuary in Mecca was established by Adam as an earthly substitute for the garden of Eden, and it is from Mecca that the civilization established by the prophet Muhammad spreads. The antediluvian Syrian prophets and the successive Arab prophets are the direct successors to Adam and the direct predecessors to the prophet Muhammad. The complicated history of the multiple prophets sent to the Israelites is in stark contrast to the stories of Noah, Hud, Salih, and Shu'ayb, which illustrate a basic pattern of the prophet sent from God with a simple message that is rejected by the people, who are then destroyed. 177

Size matters in the symbolism of the long tombs and their relation to the progress of civilization. That the giant bodies said to be housed in the long tombs are much larger than regular people evinces the size reduction of later humanity. Ahmad b. Hanbal preserves a hadith report, given on the authority of Abû Hurayrah, that God gradually decreased the size of humans from the original sixty-cubit height of Adam. 178 This reflects an inverse relationship between the technological advances accompanying the progress of civilization and the size of people. The size of grain is said to have shrunk from giant size in the time of Adam to the size of an ostrich egg in the time of Idris, a hen's egg in the time of Elijah, a hazelnut in the time of Jeremiah, a pea in the time of Ezra, and its current small size in the time of Jesus. 179 As farming and agricultural technology advanced, the size of grain diminished, just as giant people were reduced when advances in medicine, housing, and weapons made such great stature and strength unnecessary to human survival.

Along with advances in technology comes increased social interaction and the need for more laws that address the regulation of an increasingly populous society in its many aspects. The reduction of Adam's size corresponds to his fall from Eden and receiving of the many tools and arts of civilization, including language, agriculture, clothes production, weapons, and religion. Likewise, the elimination of the giants from the Holy Land is accompanied by God's revelation of the Torah, with its complex of laws to be applied in the land, for the Israelites. The simple message given to Hud, that his people acknowledge the oneness of God, is addressed to an age far removed from the more developed society to which are addressed the Quran and the example of the prophet Muhammad.

After the fall from Eden, human beings were compelled to develop agriculture, harvesting, kneading, baking, and other techniques in order to eat, just as they needed to develop artificial cover and weapons to compensate for their unprotected bodies. Perhaps the early people on the earth required gigantic size in order to build, travel, and protect themselves before the development of adequate technology and the full realization of
human civilization. Human civilization and religion culminate in the stage of civilization initiated by the prophet Muhammad, the last in a series of ages preceding the Day of Resurrection and a return to Eden. The long tombs thus appear to be symbols of a bygone age reminding people of the prophets, religion, and civilization made necessary by the fall of humanity from the garden of Eden.
CONCLUSION

The Pure, the Sacred, and Civilization

The preceding chapters outlined the symbolic significance of rituals, relics, and territory as understood in certain Muslim contexts. Chapter 4 related the long tombs of prophets to the giant size associated with the earliest development of civilization. Chapter 3 showed how the distribution and collection of prophetic relics is connected to the origins and spread of Islamic civilization from the Meccan sanctuary. Chapter 2 focused on how legal definitions of impurity and other obligatory rituals make reference to the lost conditions of the garden of Eden. Chapter 1 examined the accounts of the treasure of the Ka'bah as an example of the narrative motif linking Islamic civilization with the founding of the Meccan sanctuary by Adam after his fall from Eden.

The examples in these chapters illustrate how sacred status is attributed to selected objects, actions, and places which refer to the mythological origins of human and Islamic civilization. Muslim exegetical and historical sources articulate in narrative form the mythology which is represented in practicable and physical form by ritual and relics. In its various forms, this mythology expresses an ideology that makes necessary the existence of the state as the means to administer religion to humanity in its fallen condition. Official patronage of the scholarship and facilities designed to promote this mythology allows local states to assert their legitimacy as the guardians of Islamic civilization.

By way of conclusion, the following pages detail how Muslim definitions of ritual, relics, and territory delineate the authority and structure of a social order based upon two complementary systems of difference. The conception of these two systems provides more generic significance to the mythological symbolism exemplified by specific Muslim rituals and relics. Section 1 outlines how Muslim scholarship defines these two systems of
difference. On the one hand, the Muslim scholars propose the opposition between the pure and impure, marking the absolute distinction between existence in Eden and humanity in its fallen state. On the other hand, Muslim jurists construct an opposition between the sacred and profane, delineating the relative distinctions at work in human civilization made necessary by the fact of humanity's fallen state.

Section 2 emphasizes the particular conception of agency characteristic of the specific Muslim examples of ritual and relics examined in the previous chapters. Mary Douglas's study of the Lele pangolin cult highlights the importance of society's recognition of the symbolism of the objects and actions it categorizes as sacred. Muslim definitions of ritual and relics evince a conscious attempt to demonstrate the conventional character of the sacred. This conventional character of ritual is illustrated further in contrast to the popular conception of surfing and its relationship to society. Unlike surfing, ritual is typified by its attitude of futility: that the break between Eden and earth is absolute and beyond human agency. These comparisons help to clarify the integral link between the sacred and a lost utopia.

1: STATUS AND POWER

The use of oppositions to generate and authorize hierarchical structures is evident in other cultural contexts. Providing a close reading of Louis Dumont's magisterial work on the caste system of India, J. Z. Smith distinguishes status from power, each constructed by separate sets of systemic oppositions:

Status is founded on the absolute dichotomy of the pure and the impure, and is expressed as a relative hierarchy of degrees of purity and impurity, with the priest at its summit. It is, essentially, a sacerdotal system. Power is dominance—a hierarchy of degrees of legitimate force, with the king at its summit. It is, essentially, a juridical system. The two systems exhibit a necessary complementarity. The king will always be impure with respect to the priest (largely, though not exclusively, due to corpse pollution); but the priest will be inferior to the king with respect to authority. The priest legitimates the power of the king; the king supports, protects, and preserves the power of the priests.1

Smith concludes that Dumont's opposition between pure and impure is associated with the "hierarchy of status and priestly function," while the distinction between sacred and profane is defined as a "hierarchy of power associated with the royal function."2
Muslim definitions of certain obligatory rituals employ a similar distinction between the absolute opposition of the pure and impure, and the relative degrees separating the sacred and profane. This is evident from the stark contrast between the laws of purity and the laws relating to other rituals, such as prayer (ṣalāt).

Muslim legal definitions of impurity refer to the complete separation of earth and Eden, caused by the fall, and thus do not recognize distinctions within earthly existence. Certain differences that are taken into account affect the actual performance of the purification rites. It is not necessary for an injured person to remove a splint in order to perform purification, nor are pregnant and nursing women or old and sick people required to fast. Menstruation affects only women, and women are allowed practical considerations, such as exemptions for long hair and dress when performing purification rituals. Jurists also exempt persons without sufficient reasoning capacity, such as children and the insane, from ritual purification. Such mentally immature and infirm persons are excluded not because they are incapable of performing the rituals, but precisely because the value of the ritual is to remind people, through their activity, of their current separation from existence in Eden.

Similarly, Muslim purity law does not allow for relative states of purity, but only different types of impurity and the attendant rituals for purification relative to the basic cause of the impurity. A person cannot transmit impurity, nor is impurity contagious in a physical sense. Menstruating women, for example, do not infect other people or objects with which they come into contact. The ablation (wuḍū') relates to the natural bodily state and functions of individual human beings, and the ritual washing (ghusl) relates to the natural continuation of human society through sexual reproduction. Impurities arising from sexual reproduction require ritual washing, and those arising from everyday bodily functions, such as sleep, eating, and drinking, require ablation. Other impurities related to contact with physical substances are also assigned their place in this system. Physical impurities (najāsah, anjās) include semen, blood, urine, and corpses. Such impurities do not involve a lack of bodily control; rather, as substances and conditions unknown in Eden, they are markers and reminders of the fall and the perpetual state of human impurity.

In sharp contrast to the laws of purity are the many earthly distinctions recognized and required in the definition of other ritual practices. Certain restrictions emphasize social distinctions, such as those that distinguish men and women. Women are not to attend the group prayer (jumʿah) on Fridays and are not allowed to pray in mixed groups with men, and virgins according to some, are not allowed to perform any prayers or fast during
the month of Ramadān. The qualifications of the prayer leader delineate a social standing according to age, piety, and learning: "The best person for leading the prayer is the most learned of the people praying in customary practice. If they [candidates] are equal in learning, then the best reader among them [is chosen]. If they are equal, then the most pious of them [is chosen]. If they are equal, then the oldest of them [is chosen]. It is reprehensible to put forward a slave, a nomad, a sinner, a blind person, or a child of fornication, but if they are put forward it is permitted." These criteria set up oppositions between the free person and slave, city dweller and nomad, pious person and sinner, the healthy and the handicapped, and heir and bastard. Similar distinctions are made in describing the standing order for a group prayer: "The pure person does not pray following a person who has incontinence of urine, nor does a pure woman pray following a woman with an irregular discharge, nor a literate person following an illiterate person, nor a clothed person following the naked person. It is permitted for the person purified by purification without water to lead in prayer people purified by ablution, and the person who has wiped his slippers [to lead in prayer] the people purified by washing." In these examples, the absolute and nonrelative rules for purification demarcate social differences, as do markers of social status, such as clothing and education. Other rituals are restricted to certain segments of society. Offering (zakāt) is required only of people possessing wealth over and above that required for their regular upkeep, just as the pilgrimage to Mecca and fighting in defense of the community (jihād) are not required for a people who do not have the means to both perform the duty and provide for their families during their absence.

Spatial and temporal distinctions are also demarcated through ritual. For example, when traveling outside a civilizational center (miṣr), people are not allowed to perform the congregational prayer. Nor is purification without water (tayammum) allowed within the confines of a civilizational center. People traveling more than three days distance from their home are required to pray only three daily prayers. Parallel commercial and criminal laws, such as the prohibition against a city dweller's selling goods for a desert dweller and the stipulation that a bailed defendant be deposited in a market (sūq) but not in open country, also illustrate such social and geographical differentiation. The rules pertaining to fighting in defense of the community (jihād, siyār) that apply outside the boundaries of Islamic civilization—such as killing, looting, and setting free slaves—are serious crimes inside Muslim society. These territorial distinctions establish a kind of social mapping of Islamic society (see fig. 3). This can be extended to take into account the position of Mecca and its relation to the garden of Eden. The mosque refers to Mecca and Mecca to Eden, just as
Muslim jurists define two realms, that of Eden and that of the earth. The earth is the realm of civilization, the laws of which are determined by the jurists and enforced by the state. As in the Indian case, where the king is separated from the priests through purity laws, the Muslim state does not have access to the legislative process of the jurists. In the realm of civilization, the state ensures that people have the facilities to fulfill the ritual obligations of the law (‘ibādāt) and are bound by the social obligations of the law (mu‘āmalāt). According to Abū al-Hasan ‘Ali al-Māwardi (d. 1058), the head of the state is intended as a representative of the prophets in upholding the faith and managing the affairs of the world. Citing Q 4:59 and a hadith report transmitted on the authority of Abū Hurayrah, al-Māwardi states that Muslims are to obey those in authority over them, even if the authorities themselves are impious, as long as the authorities uphold that which is according to the law (wāfiq al-haqq).

The area of Islamic civilization, the Dār al-İslām, is the realm of caliphs.
judges, laws, mosques, and prophets. It is defined and constituted by a hierarchy of ranks—marks of status that represent the spectrum of human existence in the real, post fall world. The state is responsible for upholding a law which is outside its purview. The law is the responsibility of the jurists, whose authority depends upon their showing that the law they ask the state to uphold originates with the revelation and example of the prophet Muhammad. Patronage of the jurists and the learning associated with the transmission of prophetic knowledge ensures that the state is granted legitimacy. The jurists provide a law that provides for the existence of the state.

2: SYMBOL AND AGENCY

In her well-known study of the relationship between impurity and social order, Mary Douglas contributes to the central question of how certain rituals, and the myths with which they are associated, relate to the structure and maintenance of social order. Douglas's insistence on distinguishing the impure from the sacred allows her to recognize that people are conscious of the symbolic character of their rituals: "[The Lele pangolin cult epitomizes] cults which invite their initiates to turn round and confront the categories on which their whole surrounding culture has been built up and to recognize them for the fictive, man-made, arbitrary creations that they are." According to Douglas, ritual directs attention to the conventional character of religious definitions, such as the pure and impure, culminating in an activity that confirms the necessary shared nature of these conventions: "Then comes the inner cult of all their ritual life, in which the initiates of the pangolin, immune to dangers that would kill uninitiated men, approach, hold, kill and eat the animal which in its own existence combines all the elements which Lele culture keeps apart." Echoing the camel sacrifice described by Robertson Smith and the Intichiuma described by Durkheim, Douglas uses the Lele initiation rite to underline that the social significance of these rituals and rules is to be found in the recognition of their symbolic value. What matters is not the particular animals that are prohibited or the particular actions prescribed. What matters is the fact that certain animals and actions are recognized by society as having symbolic value, and that this symbolic value is recognized as having been attributed to these animals and actions by society. It is this recognition that allows for the animals and actions related to natural phenomena to communicate a message that is of a social character. Douglas contends that this message, communicated also by other definitions of impurity, is the disjunction between the ideal cosmic order and the actual state of the world.

Such a conception of the disjunction between society and the natural
world is also found in Islamic rituals and the treatment of relics. Except for the extraordinary attention given to them, relics are natural objects and artifacts coming from everyday life. Rituals are actions from everyday life given symbolic value. Just as the Lele pangolin cult uses definitions of impurity to highlight the symbolism of the sacred, so Islamic definitions of purity and impurity provide a conceptual contrast against which to perceive the symbolic value of other rituals.

The contrast between status and power displayed in the undifferentiation of purification rituals and the highly differentiated structure of other rituals (e.g., șalāt) illustrates this point. People performing the ritual prayer are defined on one level as humans, reminded of their fallen state, while on another level they are defined as males or females, city dwellers or nomads, learned or illiterate, healthy or infirm. These two axes are also evident in the symbolism of the rituals themselves. Facing Mecca during the group prayer, people direct their attention toward Mecca and its symbolism as a substitute for the lost Eden, while standing in rows and thus delineating their social and economic standing in the society of the postfall world.

Like the Lele pangolin cult, Muslim rituals also display a conscious attempt to demonstrate the conventional character of the rules by which they are governed. The close parallels between Muslim rituals and other rites of mourning and celebration in contemporary and neighboring cultures indicates that Muslim rituals are an assertion of a new identity based on social convention rather than shared history or seasonal patterns. The timing of the rituals is specifically nonnatural. Although prayer times are set according to the position of the sun, legal discussion of prayer times makes clear that the use of the sun’s position is only to create convention, and the prayers are not to be performed in such a fashion as to link them organically with natural phenomena.

Likewise, the Muslim calendar, based on the lunar cycle without intercalation, is not based upon seasonal patterns. Despite the original link of fasting, offering, and pilgrimage to seasonal festivals, as in Judaism, Christianity, and other ancient Near Eastern contexts, these Muslim rituals are not fixed according to the natural cycle of fertility. The nonhistorical character of Muslim rituals is also striking. Although all of the rituals are said to have been performed by earlier prophets, only the seclusion during Ramadān (i’tikāf) and the pilgrimage partly correspond to concrete historical events.23

Douglas emphasizes the need to pay attention to the agency of the rituals and rules. The “danger” of impurity is not the superstitious beliefs of individual harm coming from the violation of a rule. To the contrary, as Douglas observes, much of so-called purity law concerns what people must do when they become impure. Impurity is a natural consequence of every-
day life, and as such is not dangerous, but failure to recognize the conventional rules of society concerning what is pure and impure is dangerous. Such a failure is dangerous because it threatens the common conception of the society. The execution of the apostate is an example of this principle, protecting society from the contagion of the individual who, in theory, would repudiate all social conventions. Impurity as defined by Islamic law is a result of the fall from Eden, and as a result all people are de facto impure. The purpose of purification rituals is not to eliminate impurity or its causes. This could be accomplished only by an actual, physical return to the conditions of Eden. The obligation of all people to perform regular purification rituals serves to "protect" society from the lack of attention to its fallen existence, and thus to confirm its need for organization and rule.24

In this sense, the relationship of ritual to the social order, as described by Douglas, is not unlike the relationship between surfing and society. Like ritual, surfing creates a social group through initiation rites, technical language, special clothing, and certain repeated actions.25 Surfing is performed in designated areas, following in the footsteps of earlier surfers, and the act of surfing itself is performed in imitation of kings in a mythic setting.26 The use of specialized objects—including boards and wax—based on mythic archetypes also parallels the use of sacred objects in ritual contexts.27

Surfing resembles the bear ritual described by J. Z. Smith: the activity of surfing and the culture accompanying it are based on a consciousness that life is not what it should or could be. Surfing epitomizes the notion that the everyday world of work, school, and cold weather is discontinuous from the idealized world of an endless summer of cranking waves.28 Surfing is a temporary condition in the sense that most surfers eventually have to return to work, the summer ends, the waves are not always big, and you get old and die (and can't surf anymore). But whereas the bear ritual is utopian, surfing is unrealistic. The bear ritual is utopian because the real hunt can never take place as it is enacted in ritual, but it is not impossible to surf on the same beach as King Kealoha in Hawaii. As attested in movies and by professional surfers, it is possible, however unrealistic for most surfers, to surf continuously, following the summer around the world, never going back to work or school.29

Surfing differs from ritual in another significant way. The recognition of the disjunction between the ideal world of surfing and the real world of work and school does not serve to legitimate the status quo, as ritual does. On the one hand, the artifacts and body parts that are recognized as relics, and the actions that are stipulated as ritual, are officially sanctioned and supported by the state. Surfing may be a popular fad, but it is an activity that creates a subculture distinct from the larger social setting in which it
The culture of surfing can be an outlaw, punk culture. On the other hand, although surfing makes a distinction similar to that made by ritual between the ideal and real world, ritual makes this distinction to authorize and underline the need for society and the state. The activity of surfing does not recall a primordial utopia whose loss requires the existence of society. There is a futility to ritual, a "helpless" attitude not shared by surfing: the attitude that regardless of the ritual performed there is really nothing that can be done by human beings to change the fundamental condition of their existence.

This helpless attitude of ritual is captured, in part, by Lévi-Strauss's insistence that the utopian existence described in myth and displayed in ritual cannot be recovered by society. The participants in both surfing and ritual realize that their actions do not magically transport them to a place and time that does not exist, but only in ritual are the participants reminded of a utopia to which they cannot return through their own activity. Ritual legitimizes the existence of the state because it is designed to emphasize the ineffectiveness of human activity in overcoming humanity's fallen condition. Surfing is imitative, and surfers can actually accomplish the feats of Hawaiian kings and ancestral heroes, but ritual purification does not stop the need for sleep or defecation. Ritual and relics are about absence.

This futile attitude, contained in the notion that the break between Eden and earth is absolute and beyond the realm of human agency, is found in the Islamic context. The futility of ritual is that the actions performed do not actually accomplish physical change. Only God can return humanity to its prefallen state, and this will happen only if people follow the rules God has established in the postfall world. Rituals communicate this basic message using symbols that turn attention toward the sharp discontinuity between the actual and the ideal human condition. Surfing is escapist and is not unlike certain soteriological traditions in Buddhism, so-called gnosticism, and the beliefs and practices of groups like the Branch Davidians of Waco that treat the break between a utopia and the real world as a problem from which it is possible to escape through secret knowledge, initiatory experiences, or physical transport. This escapist view makes the sharpest break between the ideal and the real, abandoning the real to the extent that it is the real world that becomes the no-place, a demiurgic creation, or product of false consciousness.

At the opposite extreme is the apocalyptic ideology associated with so-called fundamentalism and religious activism. The apocalyptic view is one in which the break between heaven and earth is seen as a problem that can be fixed through human action or initiative. Various "fundamentalist" religious groups urge people to actions that are said to lead to immediate and
real change in the world so that it might become like the utopia. Such an apocalyptic view mistakes the utopian ideal as a literal goal, something that can be achieved through human agency. There is no "utopia" (no-place) that justifies the way things are in a fallen world, but rather a "eutopia" (good-place) into which this world must be changed.

For the apocalyptic view, the sacred is not a symbol or a social convention but rather an attribute of objects and locations that are an intermediate stage in the transformation of this world into the next. Rituals are seen not as symbolic acts but as utilitarian activities designed to transform or correct the here and now into the then and there. Whereas the sufferer opts to escape temporarily from the world, the fundamentalist seeks to restore the world to its "utopian" state, thus erasing, ultimately, the distinction between the ideal and the real. Both the apocalyptic and escapist ideologies represent radical critiques of what might be called the civilizational view that relies upon the conception of an unattainable utopia to legitimate the status quo of existing religious and state institutions.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

'Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad Ibn Khaldūn (d. 1382) writes that civilization is the necessary condition of humanity after the fall from Eden: "God created and fashioned humanity in a form that can live and subsist only with the help of food. He guided humanity to a natural desire for food and instilled in it the power than enables humanity to obtain food." Human beings must develop agriculture, harvesting, kneading, baking, and other techniques in order to survive. God also did not provide humans with natural defenses, great strength, or tough hides, long nails, and sharp teeth. This means that human beings must organize themselves socially: "Social organization is necessary to the human species. Without it, the existence of human beings would be incomplete. God's desire to settle the world with human beings and leave them as his representatives on earth would not materialize."

God designed human beings, in their fall from Eden, to require social organization, the use of tools, and the governance of religion. Civilization is, for Ibn Khaldūn, God's soteriology for humanity. It is not that civilization leads to salvation, but rather that living in the conditions of this world reminds people of the way things were and can be again at some point in the future.

The conception of Islamic rituals and relics examined in this book fits a model of religion in which an absolute distinction is made between heaven and earth. The examples from Islamic contexts exemplify what appears to be the general motif of reflecting upon the break between a utopia and the real world. Muslim jurists and exegetes think about this break from what might
be called a civilizational perspective, in which the utopia serves not as a realistic goal to be achieved through human agency, but as a concept invoked to remind people of the fall and of the need for the necessities of this world: religion and its administration by the state. This conception is eschatological in the sense that the utopia is to be realized at some point in the future and can be realized only through changes of radical and divine nature. Human beings are able to think about the break only in such a way as to justify waiting for God to heal it while living in the conditions of this world.

Muslim scholars define rituals and relics as symbols reminding people that their salvation depends upon adherence to a state whose legitimacy depends upon its patronage and administration of a religious law derived by Muslim scholars from revelation and the example of the prophet Muhammad. Certain actions, objects, and places are accorded sacred status because of their function as symbols referring to the loss of utopia and the need for civilization. These sacred things are physical manifestations of a mythology that is expressed in historical, legal, and exegetical discourses. Patronage of the textual and physical expression of this mythology allows the state and the religious elite to assert indirectly their own legitimacy as the necessary custodians of a postfall civilization.

It is certainly the case that this assertion by the state and religious elite, whether the claim to sovereignty or the particular justification of its existence, is not always accepted by those who might not appear to reject this ideology openly. Historical and ethnographic research demonstrates that people visit relics, follow the restrictions of sanctuaries, and perform rituals for a wide variety of reasons. The use of conceptual oppositions (pure and impure, sacred and profane) to explain the need for religion and the state represents a strategy to assert authority, a strategy that exists in dynamic tension with the people who are governed by the social structure in which the assertion is made.

The reliance upon notions of absence and loss in Islamic conceptions of the significance of ritual, relics, and territory suggests a more generic understanding of how assigning categories of the pure and the sacred to specific actions and objects is related to the organization and maintenance of social order. In this sense, religion is a type of social theory, providing not only the means but also the reason for the organization of society and its governance. Jurists maintain a theory of civilization that authorizes their own position and the rule of the state on a model of absolute opposition between this world and the next, a model that requires sheer obedience. The rituals and relics that make up religion are about this utopia of the next world whose absence legitimizes the existence of society by insisting upon its necessity.
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47. For an example, see the basalt stela, from second-century-CE Kharaba, in the Hawran portraying Allāt with armor, a shield, and a spear. This stela is in the Louvre, AO 11215. See Hoyland, Arabia and the Arabs, 187. On the warrior image of deities, see the comparative material in S. M. Kang, Divine War in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East (Berlin, 1987); H. Fredrickson, Jahwe als Krieger (Lund, 1945); and P. D. Miller, The Divine Warrior in Early Israel (Cambridge, Mass., 1973).
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49. For the Aramaic inscription, see Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum (Paris, 1881–), 2:157. For the Sabaean inscription, see A. Jamme, Sabaean Inscriptions from Mahram Bilqis (Baltimore, 1962), 745. These inscriptions are also mentioned in Hoyland, Arabia and the Arabs, 186.


Rubin, “The Ka’ba,” 116–117, contends that the wild animal as a votive offering is related to the Arabian sanctuary as a refuge for wild animals. He also contends that the burial of the offerings is a sign of the treatment of the sanctuary as a burial site of prophets including Hud, Salih, and Ishmael. Hoyland, Arabia and the Arabs, esp. 188–189, remarks that the burial of offerings for the dead usually did include arms and armor but not gazelles or other animal offerings.


54. See the examples cited by Serjeant, South Arabian Hunt, 69–74.

55. On the gifts of golden crescent moons or horns, and the ram horns, see al-Azraqi, Akhbar Makkah, 156. Also see the brief comment in Rubin, “The Ka’ba,” 117–118. In relation to this, see al-Jähiz, who mentions the two gazelles of Mecca connected with the sacrifices brought to the Ka’bah in his Kitāb al-hayawān, ed. ‘Abd al-Salām Muhammad Hārūn (Beirut, 1992), 3:192–195.

56. See Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Birūnī, Kitāb al-jawāhir fi mā‘rifat al-jawāhir (Hyderabad, 1355), 66.


60. See al-Azraqi, Akhbār Makkah, 124; and al-Qaddūmī, Book of Gifts and Rarities, no. 175.

61. See al-Qaddūmī, Book of Gifts and Rarities, no. 1.


63. For the Gudea cylinder, statue, and mace-head inscriptions, see Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, 268–269. For the original, see E. de Sarzec and L. Heuzey, Découvertes en Chaldée (Paris, 1884), pls. 16, 33–35. For another recent translation, see G. A. Barton, The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad (New Haven, 1929), 181–261. The "Statue B" text states that when Gudea was building the temple of Ningirsu he gave two weapons to the king, the "SAR.UR" and the "SAR.GAZ." The "Macehead A" inscription states that Enlil fashioned the mace-head for king Ningirsu. On Gudea, see A. Falkenstein, Die Inschriften Gudeas von Lagash (Rome, 1966); and related materials in E. Sollberger, "The Temple in Babylonia," in Le temple et le culte (Leiden, 1975). 31–34.


65. For the account of Samuillum, see Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, 271. This is contained in the British Museum.


On the possible relation of Mecca to the Macoraba of Ptolemy (Geography, vi, 7), which may be the equivalent of the South Arabian and Ethiopic mikrāb, meaning “temple,” see E. Glaser, *Skizze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Propheten Muhammad* (Berlin, 1890), 2235. Also see the discussion of these associations in Patricia Crone, *Meccan Trade and the Rise of Islam* (Princeton, 1987), esp. 134–136 on Ptolemy’s Macoraba as Makka Rabba or Mikrāb or Moka (a town in Arabia Petraea also cited in the *Geography* of Ptolemy).


72. For the measurements of the sanctuary at Mecca, see al-Azraqi, *Akhbār Makka*, 1:288–293.

73. On the Kiswā, see ibid., 1:249–257. For the vessels and other items placed inside the Ka'bah, see ibid., 1:223–243, immediately preceding the section on the pit (jubb) of the Ka'bah in 1:244–248.


75. On the general significance of the temple’s measurements and construction, see H. Nissen, *Das Tempel: Antiquarische Untersuchungen* (Berlin, 1869).


86. For China and a general overview of the significance linking the rituals establishing capital and its territory, see Paul Wheatley, *The Pivot of the Four Quarters: A Preliminary Enquiry into the Origins and Character of the Ancient Chinese City* (Chicago, 1971), esp. 465–476.


On Egypt, and the pharaoh’s ritual performance of the circuit of the wall as Menes had performed the circuit of the wall when he first laid out the sacred

NOTES TO PAGE 29


According to al-Azraqi, *Akhbār Makkah*, 1:111, there was a “handle” on the Ka’bah to which fugitives sometimes clung to declare their use of the sanctuary as a place of refuge. Sacrifices were performed at Mina so as to avoid the spilling of blood in the sanctuary at Mecca. See Wensinck and Jomier, “Ka’ba”; and Wensinck, “The Ideas of the Western Semites Concerning the Navel of the Earth,” passim.


This is the interpretation put forward in Brannon Wheeler, *Mores in the Quran and Islamic Exegesis*, 90–91.


See al-Birūnī, *Kitāb al-jawāhir fi ma‘rifat al-jawāhir*, 248. For an overview of Indian metallurgical terminology, see Richard Garbe, *Die indischen Mineralien ihre Namen und die ihnen zugeschriebenen Kräfte* (Hildesheim, 1974). For some examples of Indian weapons close to the areas mentioned here, see G. N. Pant, *A Catalogue of Arms and Armour in Bharat Kala Bhavan* (Delhi, 1995), esp. 14–33 on examples of swords.


Zaki claims that the “Indian” blades mentioned by al-Kindi were made of Narmahen iron, noted for brightness, an iron which was also called “mandali.” He cites al-Qazwini as identifying Mandal as a city in India where “al-nad” is found in large quantities, also called “al-mandali” or Indian Kameroni. See A. R. Zaki, “Islamic Swords in Middle Ages,” 365–397; and Zakariya b. Muhammad al-Qazwini, Athār al-biltīd wa akhbār al-‘ibād, ed. Ferdinand Wüstenfeld (Göttingen, 1848; reprint, Beirut, 1960–1961), s.v. “Mandāl.” Also see Yaqūt, Mu‘jam al-buldān, s.v. “Mandali.” Yaqūt also says that Mandal is a city in India and relates it to the adjective Mandali used in Arab poetry. On Indian steel in sword-making technology, see M. Faraday, “An Analysis of Wootz, or Indian Steel,” Quarterly Journal of Science, Literature and the Arts 7 (1819): 288–290.


102. See Pliny, Historia Naturalis, 30.14. Also see the discussion of Chinese mines in Zaki, “Centres of Islamic Sword Making in Middle Ages,” 289–290. Richard F. Burton, The Book of the Sword (London, 1884; reprint, New York, 1987), 54 and 77–79, attempts to identify the “Cassiterids” (Oestrymniades) with a number of different locations in Europe on the basis of Herodotus (3.119), Strabo (3.5.11), and Diodorus Siculus (5.21–22).


105. See Burton, The Book of the Sword, 74-85.

106. Muhammad b. Ismā'il al-Bukhārī, Sahīh (Damascus, 1981), 57:4; this text is also found in Ahmad b. ʿAli Ibn Hājar, Fath al-bārī bi-iṣṭilāḥ Sahīh al-Bukhārī (Cairo, 1301; reprint, Beirut, 1408), 6:160-163.

107. See Muhammad b. ʿIsā al-Tirmidhī, al-jāmiʿ al-saḥīḥ (Delhi, 1937), 21:16.


111. See the text as printed in Muhammad Hasan Muḥammad al-Tihāmī, Suyūf al-rasūl wa ʿuddah barbi-hi (Cairo, 1992), 26; and ʿUmar b. Rasālān al-Bulqīnī, Maḥāsin al-iṣṭilāḥ wa tadmin kitāb Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, in Muqaddimat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ wa Maḥāsin al-iṣṭilāḥ (Cairo, 1974). For another tradition mentioning nine swords, see al-Bukhārī, Sahīh, 64:44.

112. See Ahmad b. Saʿd, al-Tābaqāt al-kubrā (Beirut, 1990), 1:376-378. A number of the names given to the swords of the prophet Muḥammad are mentioned as generic "types" of swords in other sources such as Ibn Salām, Kītāb al-iṣṭilāḥ, 17-18, in his section on swords and their descriptions.


116. See al-Dhahābī, Siyar al-lām al-nubalāʾ, 2:428n. Also see Yusūf b. ʿAbd al-
Rahmān al-Mizzi, *Tahdhib al-kamāl* (Damascus, n.d.), 1:212. Many of the names given to these swords are also adjectives commonly applied to swords, such as Bātār and Qaḍīb, which mean “cutting” or “sharp” referring to the blades of the swords. See, for example, Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisan al-ʿArab*; and Muhammad Murādā al-Zabidi, *Tāj al-ʿarūs min jawāhir al-qāmūs* (Kuwait, 1965), s.v. “B-T-R,” “Q-D-B,” and “-D-B.”


120. For an overview of these items, see al-Tihāmī, *Suyūf al-rasūl wa ʿuddah harbi-hi*, 26, and 55–108 for the list of items used and acquired as booty in the different campaigns of the prophet Muhammad. Ibn Shahrāshūb, *Manāqib Al Abi Tālib* (Najaf, 1956), 1:83, cites al-Waqīdī in a listing of four hundred suits of armor, four hundred lances, and five hundred swords.


124. This sword is commonly referred to simply as al-Maʾthūr. The term al-Fījār refers to the “sacred” war during which the sword was used. The Quraysh and the Kinānah fought against the tribe of Qay ʿAylān, and the war is said to have taken place when the prophet Muhammad was twenty years old (ca. 590 CE), although other sources give his age as anywhere from fourteen to twenty-eight years old. See the references in Ibn Hīshām, *al-Sirah al-nabawīyah*, 3:324–327; Guillaume, *The Life of Muhammad*, 82/119; al-Ṭabarī, *Tarikh al-rasul wa al-mulik*, 1130, 1255; Watt and McDonald, *The History of al-Ṭabarī: Muhammad at Mecca*, 49–50, 161; and H. Lammens, “La Mecque à la veille de l’Hégire,” *Mêlanges de l’Université Saint-Joseph* 9 (1924): 97–439, esp. 326.

126. See the reference to this in al-Tihāmi, Suyūf al-rasūl wa 'uddah harbi-hi, 113–114. On the accounts of the marriage of Fātimah and 'Ali, see 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Nasā'i, Sunan (Beirut, n.d.), 26:81; Ibn Majah, Sunan, 9:24; Ibn Rustam al-Ṭabarî, Dalā'il al-imāmah (Najaf, 1949), 1–58; Husayn 'Abd al-Wāhhab, 'Uyūn al-mu'jizāt (Najaf, 1950), 46–51; and Ibn Shahrashūb, Manāqib Al Abi Ṭalib, 3:101–140. Also see Ibn Hishām, al-Siraḥ al-nabawiyyah, 389/58, where it is reported that the prophet Muhammad handed his sword to Fātimah, asking her to wash the blood from it, and then 'Ali handed her his sword, asking her to wash the blood from it too.


128. For pictures and a general description of this sword, see Yücel, Islamic Swords and Swordsmiths, 15–16; and al-Tihāmi, Suyūf al-rasūl wa 'uddah harbi-hi, 113–117.


131. See Muslim, Sahīh, 52:33–34. Ibn Shahrashūb lists six suits of armor and eight swords as having been used in the raid of Badr. See Ibn Shahrashūb, Manāqib Al Abi Ṭalib, 1:162.

132. See Ibn Kathīr, Tafsir al-Qur'ān al-ʻazīm, on Q 8:41; and al-Tirmidhi, al-jami' al-sahīh, 21:14. Ibn Kathīr refers to the sword and the larger question of the distribution of spoils at the beginning of his exegesis of Surah al-Anfāl, "the Spoils." In his exegesis of Q 8:1, Ibn Kathīr cites a report transmitted on the authority of Sa'd b. Abī Waqqās that the sword in question belonged to Sa'id b. al-ʻĀṣ and was called Dāu al-Katīfah. Another report mentioned by Ibn Ishāq states that the sword was the one taken by Mālik b. Rabī'ah from Ibn 'Ā'idh and was called al-Marzabān.

133. See Ibn Majāh, Sunan, 24:18; and al-Bayhaqī, Dalā'il al-nabawiyyah, 1:136.

134. See Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Qaṣṭallānī, Irshād al-sāri` li-sharh Sahīh al-Bukhārī (Cairo, 1304), 5:200–201. There may be a reference to this in the account of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭalib's giving his sword to Fātimah. See al-Ṭabarī, Tārikh al-rasul
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136. Ibn Hishām lists al-ʿĀs b. Munabbih b. al-Ḥajjāj as one of five people from the Banū Sahm b. ʿAmr who were killed at the battle of Badr. See Ibn Hishām, al-Sirah al-nabawiyah, 2:269; Guillaume, The Life of Muhammad, 338/510. Guillaume’s translation does not specify that it was ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭalib who killed al-ʿĀs b. Munabbih.


140. See ʿAbd al-Qurṭubi, Musnad (Cairo, 1895), 1:271; Ibn Mājah, Sunan, 24:18; and Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidayah wa al-nihayah fi al-tārīkh (Cairo, 1351–1358), 6:5. Also see the ḥadīth reports stating that the prophet Muḥammad took as spoils the sword of Abū Jahl, whom he killed on the day of Badr, in al-Ḍarīmī, Sunan, 16:139; and Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad, 3:497.

141. See al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh al-rusul wa al-mulūk, 1359; and McDonald and Watt, The History of al-Ṭabarī: The Foundation of the Community, 84.

142. al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh al-rusul wa al-mulūk, 1402; and McDonald and Watt, The History of al-Ṭabarī: The Foundation of the Community, 119–120.

The phrase spoken by the voice, and variants of it, are commonly inscribed on sword blades. See, for example H. J. Braunholtz and A. S. Fulton, “An Inscribed Turkish Sword,” British Museum Quarterly 1 (1927): 106–107. For specific examples from collections, see David Alexander, The Arts of War: The Nasser D. Khalili Collection of Islamic Art (Oxford, 1992); Bernd Augustin, “Arms,” in Oriental Splendour: Islamic Art from German Private Collections, ed. Claus-Peter Haase and others (Hamburg, 1993), 182–224; Robert Elgood, Arms and Armour of Arabia in the 18th, 19th, and 20th Centuries (London, 1994); and idem, ed.,
Islamic Arms and Armour (London, 1979). For a general overview of the decoration of swords and other weapons, see George Cameron Stone, A Glossary of the Construction, Decoration and Use of Arms and Armor in All Countries and in All Times (New York, 1934). Similar inscriptions became popular on firearms. See, for example, the North African, Balkan, and Indian guns cataloged in Robert Elgood, Firearms of the Islamic World in the Tareq Rajab Museum, Kuwait (London, 1995), esp. guns 44, 67, and 114.


144. See Ibn Shahrāshūb, Manāqib Al-Abī Ṭālib, 3:82. Ibn Shahrāshūb cites a number of reports, on the authority of `Ikrimah and others, saying that it was an angel who called this phrase from the sky.

145. For the use of the sword by the Fatimids, see Heinz Halm, The Empire of the Mahdi: The Rise of the Fatimids, trans. Michael Bonner (Leiden, 1996), esp. 313–355. On the general significance of Dhū al-Faqār in its association with `Āli and in Shi'i contexts, see S. M. Swemer, “The Sword of Mohammed and Ali,” Moslem World 21, no. 2 (1931): 109–121. Swemer (111–112) cites a Chinese depiction of Dhū al-Faqār with the phrase “There is no companion like `Ali and no sword like Dhū al-Faqār.” A Chinese text describes how the sword was passed to `Ali from the prophet Muhammad, who had received it from the angel Gabriel.


147. See al-Dhahabi, Siyar a‘lām al-nubalā‘, 2:429.
150. This raid is mentioned in Ibn Ḥishām, al-Sirah al-nabawiyyah, 6:54; Guillermou, The Life of Muhammad, 916/1000; and in Ibn al-Kalbi, Kitāb al-‘asām, 15–16, 61–62. See the English translation in The Book of Idols: Being a Translation from the Arabic of the Kitāb al-‘asām by Ḥishām Ibn al-Kalbi, trans. Nabih Amin (Princeton, 1952), 13–14, 52–53. The two swords are mentioned in a line of

151. Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqīdī, Kitāb al-maghāzī, ed. Marsden Jones (Oxford, 1966), 3:988. He states that the first two swords were given to the prophet Muḥammad but the third sword was kept by ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib.

152. See Ibn Shahrāshūb, Manāqib Al Abī Ṭālib, 3:82.


155. See Yucel, Islamic Swords and Swordsmiths, 38–39, who attributes this sword to Ja’far al-Ṭayyār; and al-Tihāmī, Suyūf al-rasūl wa‘uddah barbi-hi, 193–195.


157. See Yucel, Islamic Swords and Swordsmiths, 34, who attributes the sword to Zayn al-‘Abidīn on the basis of the inscription; and al-Tihāmī, Suyūf al-rasūl wa‘uddah barbi-hi, 197–199.

158. See Muḥammad al-Majlīsī, Bihār al-Anwār (Tehran, 1887), 7:448.


161. See al-Tihāmī, Suyūf al-rasūl wa‘uddah barbi-hi, 125–127. For references to the acquisition of this sword by the prophet Muḥammad, see Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad (from Anas); Muṣlim, Saḥīh; and Sulaymān b. Āḥmad al-Ṭabarānī, Mu‘jam al-kafr (Baghdad, 1978) (from ʿIbādah al-Nu‘mān). It is thought that, since Dhū al-Faqār was given to ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib at Uhud, the prophet Muḥammad used al-ʿAdh at that battle, although it was sent to him before Badr by Sā’d b. Ṣādiq al-Anṣārī.


164. See al-Bukhārī, Saḥīh, 57:1, 64:12. Also see Arent Jan Wensinck and R. Paret, “Kaynukā,” in Encyclopaedia of Islam, 4:824. On relations between the prophet Muḥammad and the Jews of Medina, see Arent Jan Wensinck, Mohammed en de Joden te Medina (Leiden, 1908), esp. 39, 146–151; R. Leszynsky, Die Juden in Arabien zur Zeit Mohammeds (Berlin, 1910), esp. 60–63; H. Z. Hirschberg, Yir‘ēl be-ʿArav (Tel Aviv, 1946); William Montgomery Watt, Muhammad at Medina (Oxford, 1956); Moshe Gil, “The Medinan Opposition to the


172. See, for example, the reports that David cut off the head of Goliath with the sword in al-Ṭabarī, *Jāmi‘ al-bayān fi taṣfiṣ al-Qur‘ān*, on Q 2:251. Also see al-Suyūṭī, *Al-Durr al-manthūr*, on Q 2:251.

174. See 'Ali b. İbrāhīm al-Qummi, *Tafsir al-Qummi* (Beirut, 1991); and also Muḥsin al-Malaqqab al-Ghayd Khalṣānī, *Tafsir al-sāfi* (Tehran, n.d.), on Q 2:251. Al-Samarqandi states that one of the stones David used was the stone of Moses. Al-Tabari, *Jāmi‘ al-bayān fi tafsir al-Quṣṭ an*, on Q 2:251, cites a number of reports that the stones David used were named after Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the Israelites. Al-Suyūtī, *al-Durr al-manthīr*, on Q 2:241, cites a report in which one of the stones was the stone of the Israelites. Al-Qummi claims that David was a Levite; but al-Qurtūbī, *al-Jāmi‘ li-ahkām al-Quṣṭ an*, on Q 2:251, states that David was from the tribe of Judah and that Goliath was the leader of the Amalekites. Al-Zamakhshārī, *al-Kashf‘ān /:Jaqii‘iq ghawamir/ al-tanzil wa ‘uyūn al-aqawil fi wujūh al-tawil*, on Q 2:251, explains that Goliath was one of the Amalekites and was a descendant of the people of ‘Ād.

175. See Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Tha‘labī, *Qiṣṣas al-anbiya‘* (Cairo, n.d.), 274. 176. See al-Tha‘labī, *Qiṣṣas al-anbiya‘*, 274. The fight is also to be compared with 'Ali b. Abī Ta‘līb’s defeat of the Jewish giant at Badr which resulted in the capture of the sword Dhū al-Faqār. See Burton’s citation of 'Ali b. Abī Ta‘līb’s killing a Jewish giant with Dhū al-Faqār. For the role of the sword in biblical narrative, see Isser, *The Sword of Goliath*, 34–51.


178. See al-Zamakhshārī, *al-Kashf‘ān /:Jaqii‘iq ghawamid al-tanzil wa ‘uyūn al-aqawil fi wujūh al-tawil*, on Q 21:79–80, who states that David sold each suit for four thousand dinar. Al-Suyūtī, *al-Durr al-manthīr*, on Q 21:79–80, cites a report on the authority of Qatādah that David did not have to use fire or a hammer to make the armor, and that he used the armor of David to protect the Israelites from their enemies.

to slay the Dajjal with his hand, and he shows the people the blood of the Dajjal on his sword. See Ibn Majah, Sunan, 36:11. See al-Tirmidhi, Jami' al-sahih, on Gog and Magog (31:23), the sword used (31:33), Jesus returning (31:54), breaking crosses and killing pigs (31:54), the Dajjal (31:55–62), and Jesus killing the Dajjal (31:1, 62).

180. See 'Ali b. Burhan al-Din al-Halabi, al-Sirah al-Halabiyah (Cairo, 1900), 2:303–309; and Muslim, Sahih, 44.

181. See Yücel, Islamic Swords and Swordsmiths, 21; and al-Tihami, Suyuf al-rasul wa 'uddah harbi-hi, 207–213.


184. See Yücel, Islamic Swords and Swordsmiths, 27–32; and al-Tihami, Suyuf al-rasul wa 'uddah harbi-hi, 219–223.

185. See Yücel, Islamic Swords and Swordsmiths, 40–47; and al-Tihami, Suyuf al-rasul wa 'uddah harbi-hi, 225–235.

186. See Yücel, Islamic Swords and Swordsmiths, 49–50; and al-Tihami, Suyuf al-rasul wa 'uddah harbi-hi, 237–247.


189. See al-Qaddumi, Book of Gifts and Rarities, 211–212. On these and other relics of Solomon, see al-Suyuṭi, al-Durr al-Manthur, on Q 21:78–82.


191. See al-Qaddumi, Book of Gifts and Rarities, 227.


195. See al-Qaddumi, Book of Gifts and Rarities, 186; al-Mas'üdi, Muruj al-dhahab, 1:399; and Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Khawarizmi, Majasib al-'ulam, 69.

(Beirut, 1999), 84; and Muhammad Murtada al-Zabidi, Tāj al-ʿarūs, 6:220, s.v. It is reported that the Umayyad Khalid b. Saʿīd b. al-ʿĀṣ, one of the companions of the prophet Muhammad, acquired the sword after routing Amr in battle, but it is also said the Amr gave it to the caliph ʿUmar, who passed it to his nephew, who then lost it defending the caliph ʿUthmān. The sword is later reported to have been found by a Bedouin tribe and is said to have existed in the later ʿAbbasid period. See Ibn al-Kalbi’s remark in al-Baladhuri, Futūḥ al-buldān, 119–120; and in a poem in Ahmad b. Muhammad Ibn Khallikan, Wafayāt al-ayān, ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbas (Beirut, 1968–1972). 5:329.


199. Al-Qaddūmī, Book of Gifts and Rarities, 221. Also see 222 for a report of the discovery of swords by Khālid b. Barmak during his conquest of Tabaristān and Dinawand.

200. See al-Qaddūmī, Book of Gifts and Rarities, 240, on the Indian spearheads, Tibetan armor, and Tārkhuṇiyyah plate mail. See also 196 for the treasure of Nihāwān, which had belonged to one of Khusraw’s companions. On this, also see al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrikh al-rusul wa al-mulūk, 197–198. Ṭabarī also reports that Ahmad b. Tūlūn is said to have discovered a million dinars in the desert identified as the “treasure of bygone [al-awaʿil] peoples” (369).


On ancient examples of sword as rod, see Burton, The Book of the Sword, esp. 199–208.


On the role of the sword in establishing territorial boundaries and civi-


The connection between smithing and cosmogony is particularly pronounced in Indian contexts, for which see the excellent work of R. Elgood, "A Study of the Origin, Evolution and Role in Society of a Group of Chiselled Steel Hindu Arms and Armour from Southern India, c. 1400–1865 A.D." Also see Alf Hiltebeitel, The Ritual of Battle (Ithaca, 1976); and Heather Elgood, Hinduism and the Religious Arts (London: Cassells, 1998). On smiths and their position in South and Southeast Asian contexts, see Stella Kramrisch, "The Rgvedic Myth of the


213. See al-Ṭabarî, Majma‘, on Q 57:25.
215. The scholarship on this myth is extensive. For an overview and references to further sources, see G. Farber-Flügge, “Inanna und Enki,” in Der Mythos “Inanna und Enki” unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Liste der Me, ed. G. Farber-Flügge, Studia Pohl 10 (Rome, 1973), 16–65; and W. R. Sladek, “Inanna’s Descent to the Netherworld” (PhD dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1974). There is a brief overview of the myth in S. H. Hooke, Middle Eastern Mythology: From the Assyrians to the Hebrews (New York, 1963), 23–29.

CHAPTER TWO

2. See ibid., 1:42–43.
3. Ibid., 1:42. Among the six authoritative collections of ḥadith, this report is also cited in Abū Dā‘ūd, Sunan, 1:69; al-Tirmidhī, al-Jāmi‘ al-sahīh, 1:61; al-Nasā‘ī, Sunan, 1:118; and Ibn Mājah, Sunan, 1:63. The report is also cited in al-Shāfi‘ī, Kitāb al-umm, 1:33–34.


8. Ibn Rushd, Bidāyat al-mujṭahid, 1:491. For reports used to support the Shāfīʿī position, see Shāfīʿī, Kitāb al-umm, 1:29–30.
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23. This account is repeated by pilgrims visiting the shrine and other locals, including the matriarch of the family responsible for providing the cloth covering for the tomb itself. On Timur’s policy of legitimation, see Beatrice Forbes Manz, “Tamerlane and the Symbolism of Sovereignty,” Iranian Studies 21 (1987): 105–122. On Timur’s campaigns in Iran, Iraq, and Syria, see, idem, The Rise and Rule of Tamerlane (Cambridge, 1989), 71–73.
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30. See ibid., 253. Ibn Jubayr also claims that the tomb of Noah's son is adjacent to the tomb of Noah, though he provides no specifics and this is not mentioned in other accounts. For the tomb, or maqām, of the prophet Noah in Kerak in Jordan, see Ghazi Bin Mohammed, *Maqāmāt al-Urdūn: Holy Sites of Jordan*, 26–27.
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35. On this tomb, sometimes associated with the prophet Hosea, see Selah Merrill, East of the Jordan: A Record of Travel and Observation in the Countries of Moab, Gilead, and Bashan (London, 1881; reprint, London, 1986), 306; and Ghazi Bin Mohammed, Maqamat al-Urdun: Holy Sites of Jordan, 40–41.
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98. See Pausanias, Description of Greece, 1:35.5. On the giant Asterios or Aster.

100. See Philostratus, *Heroicus*, 8.3.
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129. See, for example, Ibn Kathîr, *Tafsîr al- Qur’ân al’azîm*, on Q 28:19 and Q 40:35. Also see the account, attributed to Ibn ‘Abbâs, of the prophet Muhammad’s night journey, during which he sees in hell the giants who do not believe in the Day of Reckoning. See ibid., on Q 17:1.

130. Ibid., on Q 5:20-26. Also see Ibn Kathîr, *Qîsas al-anbiyâ’* (Beirut, 1992), 71. Al-Thâ’labi, *Qîsas al-anbiyâ’*, 75, gives an account on the authority of Ja’far al-Ṣâqî that ‘Anâq was the name of the first daughter born to Adam and Eve after the fall from Eden, and the first person to fornicate.
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138. Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, 5.ii.3 (pp. 58–59).


144. See Castagné, “Le culte des lieux saints de l’Islam au Turkestan,” 83–86. For another possible example of this growth of the body in the tomb, see Castagné’s (63–64) description of the Mazar Khorkhout-Ara venerated by the Kazakhs and Kirghiz. He reports that pilgrims discovered the feet of the saint sticking out of the tomb because of his great stature. Also see V. Veliaminov-Zernov, Bulletins de la Section Orientale des Archives Russes, vol. 9:272.


147. On Jesus and the Dajjal, see Q 18:94–99. Al-Bukhārī, Sahih, gives an overview of events (92:76–77) and describes how Jesus uses a sword (92:88–89) and the Dajjal is killed by Jesus (92:93); al-Tirmidhī, al-jāmi’ al-sahīh describes Jesus coming as morning prayer is called to slay the Dajjal with his hand and showing the people the sword of the Dajjal on his sword (31:10), Gog and Magog (31:23), the sword used (31:33), Jesus returning (31:54), the Dajjāl (31:55–62), and Jesus killing the Dajjāl (31:62); see also Ibn Mājah, Sunan, 36:11.

On the Dubbat al-Ard, al-Firuzabādī, Qāmūs al-nubūt, s.v. “Dabb” records that the Dabbat al-Ard appears at the end of time, appearing to make a pilgrimage to Mecca. In its possession is the rod of Moses and the ring of Solomon with which he strikes each believer.
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150. See Zajadacz-Hastenrath, Chaukhandi Tombs: Funerary Art in Sind and Baluchistan (Karachi, 2003); citing Richard F. Burton, Sindh and the Races That Inhabit the Valley of the Indus, with Notices of the Topography and History of the Province (London, 1851; reprint, Karachi, 1973), 415n31, on the folklore that stones are thought to intercede for the deceased on the Day of Judgment, and that extra stones may be placed on the tomb by visitors.

151. On the mountain symbolism of the burial mounds and cairnlike tombs, see Tamara M. Green, “Tombs,” in Encyclopedia of Religion, esp. 14: 553. Goldziher, Muslim Studies, 254, claims that the dome structure developed out of the less permanent tent which was pitched over the dead body. In some places in the Arabian Peninsula and Jordan desert, the cairn or dome is simply represented by a ring of stones (rawdah) or low-walled enclosure (hawtah) with or without a roof (56).


155. For a striking example of this, consider the different types of jewelry reported to have been placed on the stone from Golgotha in Jerusalem by Christian pilgrims: armlets, bracelets, necklaces, rings, tiaras, girdles, crowns, belts. See Paul Geyer, ed., *Itineraria Hierosolimitana saeculi IV–VIII*, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 39 (Vindobonae, 1898), 175, 171; and Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades*, 83. Also see P. Geyer, *Kritische und sprachliche Erläuterungen zu Observatiom sur le Vocabulaire du Pelerinage chez Egérie et chez Antonin de Plaisance* (Nijmegen, 1965).

156. See Cunningham, *Report for the Year 1872–1873*, 106, pl. 33, figs. 6–8, and the other travelers' accounts he cites.


The lance that pierced the side of Jesus is reported to have been hung in the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. See Adomnan, The First Book on the Holy Places, 235; and Wilkinson, Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades, 97.


159. On the stone piles for noble and royal burials, see V. I. Abaev, Skifoeuropejskie izoglossy na styke vostoka i zapada (Moscow, 1965), esp. 136–139; also on the big burial mounds in Central Asia, perhaps related to Bronze Age catacomb tombs, some with up to fifty thousand cubic meters of earth and stone. On pillared and tower tombs in the Red Sea hills, see A. Paul, “Ancient Tombs in Kassala Province,” Sudan Notes and Records 33 (1952): 54–57, describing tower tombs at Maman from the fifteenth century; and J. W. Crowfoot, Sudan Notes and Records 5 (1922): 87, describing tombs resembling pyramid-like towers. Thomas H. Wilson, “Swahili Funerary Architecture of the North Kenya Coast,” in Swa-
Hili Houses and Tombs of the Coast of Kenya, by James de Vere Allen and Thomas H. Wilson, Art and Archaeology Research Papers (London, 1979), 34, argues that pillared "tombs therefore functioned as symbols of hereditary succession and supernatural authority, the fountainheads upon which rested, to use Tringham's observation, the leadership systems of the coastal communities."


161. Cunningham, Four Reports Made during the Years 1862–63–64–65, 323. And see Crooke, An Introduction to the Popular Religion and Folklore of Northern India, 140–141. The smaller size is reported by Abul Fazl, as recorded in Francis Gladwin, Ayeen Akbery; or, The Institutes of the Emperor Akber (London, 1800; reprint, London, 2000), 2:33.

162. van der Meulen, Aden to the Hadhramaut, 194–195.

163. See Eaton and Qadiri, Sahifat-i Ahl-i Huda, 88; and Richard Eaton, Sufis of Bijapur, 1300–1700, fig. 11, p. 140.

164. See Elizabeth Merklinger, Indian Islamic Architecture: The Deccan, 1347–1686 (Warminster, 1981); and idem, "Seven tombs at Holkonda: A Preliminary Survey," Kunst des Orients 10 (1975): 187–197. Henry Cousens, A List of Antiquarian Remains in His Highness the Nizam's Territories, Archeological Survey of India 31 (Calcutta, 1900), 187–196, also surveys the seven tombs at Holkonda and states that they were rebuilt so that those of the saints were larger than the tombs of others, including royalty.

165. See Cousens, A List of Antiquarian Remains in His Highness the Nizam's Territories, 141. Flags, poles, and other tall structures are often used to designate the tomb of a particularly important person. See, for example, Burton-Page, "Makbara"; and idem, "Muslim Graves of the 'Lesser Tradition': Gilgit, Punjal, Swât, Yusufzai," in which are described the tombs of pirs marked by a white flag, or a green flag in the case of a descendant of the prophet Muhammad. Tombs in Central Asia often feature tall poles of wood or metal topped with representations of hands.


On cemetery organization, see John Simpson, "Death and Burial in the Late Islamic Near East," 244. Separate areas for children and infants are reported in


169. On the footprint of Perseus at Chemmis in Egypt, see Herodotus, *Historiae*, 2.91. On the footprint of Heracles in Scythia, see ibid., 4.82. For the footprint of Dionysius and Heracles in the far west, see Lucianus of Samosata, *Adversus Indoctum: Verae Historiae*, 1.7. Other remains associated with the gigantic size of Heracles include the lake he made at Agyrion (Sicily) and some footprints located near there. See Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica*, 4.24.3–4; and Aristotle, *De Mirabilibus Auscultationibus*, ed. and trans. W. D. Ross (Oxford, 1908–1952), 97.


CONCLUSION


Stanley Tambiah, *World Conqueror and World Renouncer: A Study of Buddhism and Polity in Thailand against a Historical Background* (Cambridge, 1976), whom Smith also cites (*To Take Place*, 151n42), maintains that a clearer distinction between the two systems is to be understood as a conscious and ironic redefinition of the Vedic structure on the part of Buddhist theorists. See esp. 19–22. A similar argument is made for linking the performance of certain rituals to the endurance of the Moroccan state in M. E. Combs-Schilling, *Sacred Performances: Islam, Sexuality, and Sacrifice* (New York, 1989).


Majah, Sunan, 5:54; al-Darimi, Sunan, 2:52; and Ibn Hanbal, Musnad, 6:301, 371.


10. Al-Qudūrī, Mukhtāsr fi al-fiqh, 36. Also see see al-Bukhari, Sahih, 8:2, 10, 12, 77:20; Muslim, Sahih, 4:275; Abū Dā'ūd, Sunan, 2:77; al-Nasā’i, Sunan, 9:18; al-Darimi, Sunan, 2:100; Ibn al-Humām, Sharh fath al-qadir, 1:274–321; and Ibn Rushd, Bidayat al-mujtahid, 2:300–322.


18. See al-Mawardi, al-Ahkām al-sultāniyyah, 6; idem, The Ordinances of Gov-
For this concept of authority and its definition in al-Māwardi, also see Hanna Mikhail, Politics and Revelation: Māwardi and After (Edinburgh, 1995).


22. Douglas's remarks, which seem to interpret this disjunction as something the Lele seek to overcome through their rituals (as a means of atonement), is misleading given her emphasis upon the persistence of rituals and rules acknowledged to be arbitrary and fictive. See Douglas, Impurity and Danger, 209. For other such interpretations, see Evans-Pritchard, Nuer Religions; and Eliade, The Sacred and the Profane.


24. Also see Douglas, Natural Symbols, esp. 1–19.


28. See Kampion and Brown, Stoked, 23–53.

29. See the statement of Bear in the film Big Wednesday (Warner Bros., 1978): “Nobody surfs forever. One day the big swell will come and wipe away everything that came before it.” This is illustrated at other points in the film: when Matt Johnson gives Bear’s log to a younger surfer after wiping out on the big swell; when Bear is asked if he is a surfer and he replies that he is just a trashman.

In the movie In God’s Hands (Tri-Star Pictures, 1998), the narrator asks: “How good do you want to be? How far are you willing to go?” The ultimate limit is the last scene in the film, where the Mexican swell is surfed all alone. Other surfers in the film, such as Bob, cannot achieve this, as is illustrated by his death when trying to surf the fifty-foot waves in Hawaii without being pulled in by a motorized craft.
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