

ON THE HISTORY OF MUSLIM WORSHIP*

C.H. Becker

[374] THE MORE THOROUGHLY we study the beginnings of Islam the more clearly we see how unfinished Muḥammad's work was at the time of his death and how mistaken Islamic tradition is whenever it tries to trace back present-day ideas and practices as far as possible to the Prophet himself. This is particularly true in the field of public religious services, where so far only little research has been done. Everything appears so simple and clear that we could be tempted to believe that we are dealing with one instance of a tradition that really does date back to Muḥammad himself. It is true that Islam did not have a history of worship like that of Christianity, but Islamic worship has its own history. The Prophet's innovation had to undergo the fundamental influence of the existing environment in the field of worship as well. The actions and formula of the practice of divine worship are simple, and the implements used in the mosque are few. However, it is possible to use them as starting points for historical research that will help us to lift, if only slightly, the veil of tradition from the beginnings of Islam. Let us recall the definitive studies by Leone Caetani on the subject of the mosque in Medina¹ and by Henri Lammens on the *masjid*.² Furthermore, the present speaker has worked on the *minbar*,³ and Rhodokanakis has researched the origins of the *miḥrāb*.⁴ The following study is devoted to the history of the Friday service.

I

[375] The Friday service is one of only three occasions of community worship in the Islamic ecclesiastical year, the other two being, respectively, the feasts of fastbreaking and sacrifice. Muḥammad himself removed the feast of 'Ashūrā from its original meaning,⁵ and other festivals, such as the *mawlid* and *mi'rāj*, are not genuinely *sharī'a*-based festivals,⁶ but only asserted themselves in practice after long struggles and were accepted reluctantly by the *ijmā'*. The Friday celebration and the two feasts all have in common the combination of a sermon (*khuṭbā*) in two parts with one of the obligatory *ṣalāts*. Apart from this, however, the ritual is by no means similar. The main differences can be summarized in the following formula:

1. On Fridays the *khuṭbā* is linked to the midday prayer, on the feasts with the morning prayer.
2. On Fridays the *khuṭbā* takes place *before* the *ṣalāt*, on the feasts *after* the *ṣalāt*
3. On Fridays *adhān* and *iqāma* are linked to the service, whereas this is not so on the feasts, when there is a shortened *adhān*.
4. The Friday service is held in the mosque, the service on the feasts originally at least-outside on the *muṣalla*. All the implements of worship, such as the *minbar*, from which the Friday *khuṭbā* is delivered, are missing on the *muṣalla*.

If we take all these points together, it is obvious even without further historical proof that the ritual of the feast days is the primitive and true tradition, whereas the ritual of Friday celebration is no

*Lecture given at the Fourth International Congress on the History of Religion in Leiden, 9-12 September 1912.

¹ *Annali dell'Islam* (Milan, 1905-24), I, 432ff.

² Henry Lammens, *Ziād ibn Abihī, vice-roi de l'Iraq, lieutenant de Mo'āwia* (Rome, 1812), 88ff.; = *Rivista degli studi orientali* 4 (1911-12), 240ff., quoted as *Ziād*. See also his *Etudes sur le règne du calife omayyade Mo'āwia Ier* (Paris, London, and Leipzig, 1908.), 203ff.

³ "Die Kanzel im Kultus des alten Islam", in Carl Bezold, ed., *Orientalische Studien Theodor Noldeke zum siebzigsten Geburtstag (2 März 1906) gewidmet von Freunden und Nohillern* (Giesse, 1906), 331-51 (repr. in his *Islamstudien, Vom Werden und Wesen der islamischen Welt* (Leipzig, 1924-32), I, 450-71), quoted as "Kanzel".

⁴ N. Rhodokanakis, review of Josef Strzygowski, *Mschatta A*, in *WZKM* 19 (1905), 296-98; idem, "Zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft" (review of Theodor Noldeke, *Neue Hottrage zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, *WZKM* 25 (1911). 71-74; "Wort und Sachforschung im Arabien (Zu arab mihrab Gehetanische), *Warter und Sachen* 3 (1912).

⁵ A. J. Wensinck, *Mohammed en de joden le Medina* (Leiden, 1908) 123ff [trans. Wolfgang Behn, *Muḥammad and the Jews of Medina* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1975), 88ff.]

⁶ Ibn al-Hajj, *Al-Madkhal* (Cairo, AH 1320), I, 142ff.

primitive creation in any of its aspects. On the contrary, it betrays a tendency towards organised worship, which takes into account not only the needs of town-dwellers but also their experience in the field of worship, which took place in later centuries, replaces the *muṣalla* with the mosque in nearly all instances. Indeed, scholars nowadays prefer the mosque,⁷ although we can read clearly in the sources that Muḥammad used the *muṣalla*. Tradition shows clearly⁸ that the call to prayer developed out of a ritual need [376] in imitation of the Christian and Jewish example. Allegedly the Umayyads had already found that it is very impractical to conduct the prayer *before* the *khuṭbā*⁹ and Snouck Hurgronje has confirmed this from present practice in Mecca.¹⁰ Choosing midday rather than morning might be incidental, but is probably an expression of polemic against an existing cultic institution that remains to be determined.¹¹ Thus we may be permitted to state: the Friday ritual comprises experience of religious services and imitation as well as rejection of examples of other forms of worship, whereas the ritual on the feast days is ancient religious practice. This may be the reason why the development shows an unmistakable tendency to transfer the form of the Friday ritual onto that of the feasts as well. This is the only explanation for the well-known measures taken by the Umayyads. They are accused of having introduced the following ungodly innovations of feast-day worship:

1. As during the Friday service, they wanted to have the *khuṭbā* before the *ṣalāt*.¹²
2. They wanted to introduce their *minbar*,¹³ which they used in the mosque on Fridays.
3. They wanted to introduce the *adhān*, which was customary on Fridays.¹⁴

They failed in these three innovations. There must have been an established and old tradition against which even the all-mighty caliphate was powerless. Therefore these innovations were considered ungodly, while many other changes in worship that were certainly introduced by the Umayyads, such as the introduction of the *miḥrāb*, are silently overlooked because they have been received into the *ijmā'*. *It must, however, be emphasised that these three unsuccessful innovations are essential parts of the Friday service.*

In other cases, where traditional resistance must have been considerably less, the transfer of Friday practice was carried out more successfully. Moving the feast-day service into the mosque must be regarded as an instance of this tendency, as is the introduction of the double [377] *khuṭbā*. But, one may well ask, has the double *khuṭbā* necessarily been taken from the Friday service? Could the transfer not have been the other way round?¹⁵ We find the answer in the *fiqh* concept¹⁶ of all double sermons known to Islamic ritual: if a double sermon is preached by mistake as a single sermon, the legal action of which it is a part is not invalidated. A Friday service, however, is invalidated if only one sermon is preached instead of two. This proves that the practice of double sermons must of necessity have been transferred from the Friday service to all other acts of worship involving sermons. This point will prove to be very important for us later on.

The result of this introductory consideration is therefore: 1. As opposed to the feast-day ritual, the Friday ritual presents an advanced form of worship, which makes it unlikely that it dates back to Muḥammad; 2. The Friday ritual strongly influenced the feast-day ritual; 3. In very few, probably

⁷ T.W. Juynboll, *Handtruck des islamischen ??* (Leiden, 1910), 127.

⁸ Wensinck, *Mohammed en de Joden te Medina*, 118; [= *Muḥammad and the Jews of Medina*, 85.]

⁹ See the literature quoted in Juynboll, *Handbuch*, 89 u. 2.

¹⁰ c. Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka* (The Hague, 1888-89), A, 93; [trans J.H. Monahan, *Mekka in the Latter Part of the Nineteenth Century* (Leiden, 1931), 73].

¹¹ There are many traditions still to be studied on the subject of moving the Friday service into the time of the afternoon prayer ('asr); such as al-Muttaqī al-Hindī, *Kanz al-'ummāl* (Hyderabad, AH 1312-14), IV, 274 no. 5629, Sahnun, *Al-Mudawwana al-kubra* (Cairo, AH 1906-1907), I, 160; al-Kasani, *Bada'i' al-sana'i fi tartib al-shard'i* (Cairo, AH 1327-28), I, 269. According to Mālikī ritual the 'asr time is admissible, while Shāfi'īs and Ḥanafīs adhere to midday.

¹² Al-Qastallani, *Ishad al-sari ila sharh Sahih al-Bukhari* (Cairo, AH 1285), A, 209-10, Sahnun, *Mudawwana*, I, 168pu.

¹³ Collection of instances in "Kanzel", 15 (345) n. 4.

¹⁴ Al Shāfi'ī, *Kitab al-umm* (Cairo, AH 1321-26), I, 208,16.

¹⁵ This is what I used to believe, when I could see the connections without, however, being able to explain them: see "Kanzel", 14 (344).

¹⁶ According to alShāfi'ī, *Kitab al-umm*, I, 211, 18ff.

ancient, institutions, the Feast ritual withstood all attempts at harmonization. These results shall now be confirmed by a critical assessment of historical tradition.

II

The most urgent question is now: which is the most ancient, though still historically tangible form of the Friday service? Of no interest whatsoever are all those traditions according to which the Prophet celebrates the Friday service adhering exactly to the ritual *as* it is in use nowadays. Much more important. are those reports that deviate from the customary form, and we have an invaluable source of legal-historical criticism in the *ikhtilāf* literature [concerned with differences of doctrine between early Muslim jurists]. While in the standard traditions Muḥammad always preaches a double sermon before the *ṣalāt*, a few deviating reports show that the *ṣalāt*, took place before the sermon during the Friday service as well, if we can assume that there was a sermon at all in the very early days. The *ikhtilāf* literature shows clearly that the two-part nature of the sermon was not customary in the earliest times. Let us now look at evidence for both these statements.

The *ṣalāt*, rather than the *khuṭbā*, is the central act of worship of the Friday service, an observation that will be very important for us later. This is obvious from the name of the Friday service, *ṣalāt al-jumu'a*. Furthermore, someone who only enters the mosque after the *khuṭbā* and only takes part in the *ṣalāt* is still considered to have completed a valid Friday service. [378] He does not have to pray the four *rak'as* of the midday prayer later, as long as he has prayed the two *rak'as* of the *ṣalāt* after the *khuṭbā*.¹⁷ While the sermon makes up for two *rak'as* and is considered obligatory,¹⁸ it is really only the prelude to the main act of worship on Friday, which is then introduced solemnly again by the *iqāma*.

The Friday prayer was introduced by Sūrat al-Jumu'a (62), v. 9, and does consequently date back to Muḥammad, unless the verse is an interpolation. "Believers, when you are called to the Friday *ṣalāt*, hasten to the remembrance of God (*dhikr Allāh*) and cease your trading. This is better for you, if you understand. And when the *ṣalāt* is ended, disperse all over the country " No *khuṭbā* is mentioned here, though exegesis has tried to locate it in the *dhikr Allāh* (al-Baydawi). The *ṣalāt* is the central act of worship.

The most recent scholar to research the genesis of this institution is A.J. Wensinck in his excellent doctoral thesis *Mohammed en de Joden te Medina*.¹⁹ He also adduces the various traditions that name not the Prophet, but rather either As'ad ibn Zurara or Muṣ'ab ibn 'Umayr, as the first to have organised a Friday service. These two are alleged to have held the *jumu 'a* at the Prophet's request even before his arrival in Medina. Unfortunately there are very specific tendencies connected with these two names. Muṣ'ab was a Medinan [read "Meccan"] and a disciple of Muḥammad's, while As'ad was one of the Anṣār. Thus Meccans and Medinans were arguing about the honour of having produced the first celebrant of Friday service, and consequently the situation is not quite clear. Unfortunately there is another tendency hidden in both traditions. They are testimony for the smallest number of participants needed for a valid Friday *ṣalāt*. The As'ad tradition suggests the number 40, which has been accepted by Shāfi'ī *fiqh*,²⁰ and the Muṣ'ab tradition mentions 12 and is therefore the chief witness for Mālikī and Ḥanafī *fiqh*.²¹ [379] If any one of these traditions were historical at all, it would be the Muṣ'ab version, as it possesses a greater inner probability. In the most detailed. version, which is found in Ibn Sa'd,²² we read:

¹⁷ In fact, it is only necessary to take part in one rak'a and pray a second one later; see al-Shāfi'ī, *Kitab al-umm*, I, 182 (wa-man adraka rak'atan min al-jum'a bana alayhd rak'atan ukhra wa-ajza'athu al-jum'a); Sahnun, *Musawwana*, I, 147.

¹⁸ Al-Kasani, *Bada'i' al ??*, I, 262.

¹⁹ Wensinck, *Mohammed en de Joden te Medina*, 111ff.; [= Muḥammad and the Jews of Medina, 80ff.]

²⁰ Al Shāfi'ī, *Kitab al-umm*, I, 169; al-Ghazali, *Al-Wajiz* (Cairo, AH 1317), I, 61, 65.

²¹ Neither adheres to the number 40, but both - which is more original - allow the *salat al-jumu'a* only in a misr of larger community. See al-Kasani, *Bada'i' al-sana'i*, I, 268; Muḥammad 'Ulaysh, *Fath al-'ali al-malik fi l-fatwa 'ala madhhab al-imam Malik* (Cairo, AH 1319), I, 122:21, 130:17; Ibn Abi Zayd al-Qayrawani, *Risala, Bab fi salat al-jumu'a*; [ed. and trans. Leon Bercher, 2nd ed. (Algiers, 1948), 94-95]

²² Ibn Sa'd, *Kitab al-tabaqat al-kabir*, ed. Eduard Sachau et al. (Leiden, 1904-40), AI.2, 23ff. [This reference is incorrect. Ibn Sa'd's biography of Muṣ'ab is at AI.1, 81ff. The quoted passage occurs at AI.1, 83.]

Muṣ'ab wrote to the Prophet and asked for his permission to hold a community service for the Medinans. Muḥammad gave him permission and wrote to him: "Choose the day on which the Jews prepare their Sabbath.²³ Once the sun has passed its zenith on this day, turn to God with two *rak'as* and preach among them (*ukhtub fihim*)". So Muṣ'ab held the community service in the house of Sa'd ibn Khaythama. Twelve men were present, and he only slaughtered one sheep on that day. He was the first to hold Friday service in the time of Islam.

Wensinck stresses this tradition particularly because it shows clearly that Friday service was dependent on the institution of the Sabbath. In the present context it is even more interesting that the two *rak'as* appear first, and then the *khuṭbā*, and that a sacrifice appears to have been part of the ritual, while the only sacrifice modern worship knows of is during the Great Feast. We should probably assume that the Muṣ'ab version is an invention as well, but it dates from a time when the later regulation of Friday worship had not yet taken place. The As'ad version, on the other hand, bears all the signs of having been invented later to suit a certain tendency, and it lacks ancient features.

Qur'ān and tradition show features missing from the later Friday service. If we read objectively the verse from the Qur'ān and the aforementioned traditions in their numerous versions, we cannot but get the impression that the *ṣalāt al-jumu'a* is nothing but the expression of the *ṣalāt jamā'atan* in a fixed form. In that case it is not important whether it really dates back to Muḥammad or whether it was only instituted after his death. In the context of the present train of thought it is more important to state that it is *not* possible to derive a *fixed ritual* from these earliest reports.

Now that the historical material has failed to provide an answer, perhaps the *ijmā'* and *ikhtilāf* of the schools of *fiqh* can give us a clue. All the rites follow the same practice in their main points, constituting a solemn celebration with a very skilful liturgical structure. After a first *adhān* has called the community together, there is a second *adhān* during which the preacher is already on the *minbar*. [380] When the call is over, the preacher rises and preaches the *khuṭbā*, after which he sits down again. After a short solemn silence, he rises again and preaches a second *khuṭbā*. He then leaves the *minbar*, while the *mu'adhdhin* sounds the final call to prayer, the *iqāma*. Meanwhile the congregation have formed rows for prayer and the celebration culminates in a communal act of worship, a *ṣalāt* consisting of two *rak'as*.

While this is general practice, the individual actions are valued in different ways. Let me give just one characteristic example. According to Shāfi'ī law, the two *khuṭbās* and their division by the act of sitting down on the part of the preacher are a religious duty (*farīda*) and consequently an indispensable part of the service.²⁴ According to Ḥanafī law, however, they are only customary practice (*sunna*), because the Qur'ānic instance on which they are based mentions neither the preacher sitting down nor the number of the sermons.²⁵ A well-known Ḥanafī work gives an explanation for the development of the double sermon, namely that the Prophet had at first preached one sermon only, but that, as he got older, he had sat down during the sermon.²⁶ Thus the preacher was to rest while sitting down. The position of Ibadī *fiqh* on this question is quite similar. The *Kitāb al-nīl* states:

As to whether the preacher should sit for a little while between the two *khuṭbās*, although that cannot be traced back to Abū Bakr or 'Umar, or not, and whether he should sit down at

²³ Ibn Sa'd, *Al-I*, 83:24, has *yaiharu*, which is difficult to understand, while al-Kasani, *Bada'i al-sana'i*, I, 69:22, offers the much more probable *yatajahhasu*.

²⁴ Abū Shuja' and later his commentator Ibn Qasim; cf. al-Bajuri's *Hashiyā 'ala Fath al-qadir* (Cairo, AH 1289), I, 235-36.

²⁵ Al-Kasani, *Bada'i al-sana'i*, I, 263:4; *Fatawa Alemgiri* (Calcutta, 1828), I, 206; the *khuṭba*, however, is spoiled if the preacher does not sit down. Al-Kasani, *Bada'i al-sana'i*, I, 262:22, shows the contrast between Abū Yusuf, Abū hanifa's pupil, and al-Shāfi'ī in such a way that it becomes obvious that the Ḥanafī school originally intended to allow one *khuṭba* only. The Shāfi'ī interpretation is accepted later in the form of the *sunna*. Cf. also al-Zarqani's *Sharh al-Muwatta'* (Cairo, AH 1279-80), I, 209 bottom.

²⁶ Al-Kasani, *Bada'i al-sana'i*, I, 263:14; the same thought can be detected in the *mustarah* of one tradition in the *Kitāb al-umm*, I, 177:23; al-Bajuri, I, 235:31.

all, there are two opinions. The practice was introduced by Mu'āwiya, according to others by 'Uthman when he grew old.²⁷

Consequently the two-part sermon is a question of *ikhtilāf*. While nowadays it is admitted by *fiqh* everywhere, it is still seen as an innovation of post-Prophetic times. Thus we can see that the Friday ritual was not fixed even at a comparatively late date.

All of the schools of *fiqh* are of the opinion that the *ṣalāt* must take place *after* the *khuṭbā* on Fridays. Even the Ḥanafī school recognises this [381] as *farīda*,²⁸ although it is not stated in the Qur'ān. This is, however, just the point in which the oldest tradition diverges, which is why it is generally assumed that originally the *ṣalāt* took place before the *khuṭbā*.²⁹ The change originated with the Banū Umayya. This may be true, although tradition only mentions this Umayyad practice for the *muṣalla*.³⁰ Still, the Umayyads introduced other innovations into the practice of worship, such as the third *adhān*,³¹ the *miḥrāb*, the minaret and others, of which we will speak later. Considering how uncertain tradition is, how can we explain the fact that the Friday ritual, as it finally asserts itself, is a well-structured whole, whose meaning we do not quite comprehend as yet, but whose example was so vigorous that even the ancient feast-day rite was to be modeled on it, and indeed was modeled on it in numerous points? Why this insistence on the sermon *before* the *ṣalāt*? Tradition has it that the later generations would have run off after the end of the *ṣalāt*, while the Umayyads were still preaching.³² Is it possible to imagine a sillier explanation? Nobody would run off while the caliph was speaking, as this would have had dire consequences indeed. Still, why was the *ṣalāt* moved to the end of the service to such effect? This might be explained by suggesting that the *ṣalāt* had always been the central act of worship on Fridays and that the sermon should be interpreted as a prelude to the *ṣalāt*. However, there would still be the complete mystery of why *two* sermons were introduced. According to all *fiqh* books, the sermons should be short, so why have two? Is not the Prophet's weariness a reason as equally silly as the suggestion that the congregation might run off during the caliph's sermon? Indeed, every rite of this kind has much deeper reasons. We will find the solution of the whole complicated problem quite easily once we have come to the bottom of the question of why there were two *khuṭbās*.

III

So why were there two *khuṭbās*? Perhaps because the two *khuṭbās* took the place of two *rak'as*, which, together with the two *rak'as* of the *ṣalāt al-jumu'a*, would make up the number of four *rak'as* which are otherwise obligatory for the midday *ṣalāt*? [382] Some remarks hint that these thoughts may have played a part.³³

In order to comprehend the real reason it is advisable to study the conditions or pillars of the *khuṭbā*: that is, the obligatory rules for preaching it during one of the main rites. I shall choose the Shāfi'ī school because it includes a most lively discussion of the questions of particular interest to us, which is why I would like to assume that these circles have had a most lasting influence on the development of worship. The whole Shāfi'ī school from al-Ghazali³⁴ downwards - I have

²⁷ Kitāb al-nīl (Cairo, AH 1305), I, 82 bottom.

²⁸ Fatawa Alemgiri, I, 204.

²⁹ Juynboll, Handbuck, 89.

³⁰ Cf. the instances quoted in Ignaz Goldziher, Muhammedanische Studien (Halle, 1888-90), A, 43 [ed. and trans. S.M.Stern and C.R.Barber, Muslim Studies (London, 1967-71), A, 51]; also al-Bukhari in al-Qastallani, Irshad, A, 209, al-Shāfi'ī, Kitāb al-umm I, 208 bottom, Sahnun, Mudawwana, I, 168 bottom.

³¹ Al Shāfi'ī, Kitāb al-umm, I, 208:16.

³² See the instances given above in n. 30.

³³ Al-Kasani, Bada'i' al-sana'i, I, 262; al-Bajuri, I, 238 bottom.

³⁴ Wajiz, I, 63 bottom.

compared al-Nawawi,³⁵ Ibn Hajar,³⁶ al-Ramli,³⁷ al-Shirazi,³⁸ Ibn Qasim³⁹ and al-Bajuri⁴⁰ - knows five *arkan al-khuṭbā*:

- 1) The hamd Allāh
- 2) the *ṣalāt 'ala l-nabi*
- 3) the exhortation to piety (*al-wasiya bi-l-taqwa*)
- 4) the prayer for the believers (*al-du'a li-l-mu'minin*)
- 5) recitation from the Qur'ān (*al-qira'a*)

How are these pillars distributed among the two sermons? Nos. 1 to 3, namely praise of God, prayer for the Prophet and exhortation should occur in *both* sermons. The *du'a*, no. 4, should only occur in the *second* sermon. Al-Ghazali says clearly: "It only belongs in the second sermon" (*la tajib illa fi l-thaniya*).⁴¹ *The position of the du'a is thus absolutely determined.*

As we know, the *du'a* ends the second *khuṭbā* even today. The *qira'a* (no. 5) is different. Its position is a question of internal *ikhtilāf* among the Shāfi'īs. Al-Ghazali says about it in this very place: "According to one view, it belongs specifically in the *first khuṭbā*". According to Ibn Hajar⁴² and al-Bajuri,⁴³ it ought to be incorporated in the first *khuṭbā* because there it corresponds to the *du'a* in the second. Al-Shirazi explains: "In the first sermon, something from the Qur'ān should be recited, and it is also said that reciting from the Qur'ān is obligatory in both sermons".⁴⁴ Al-Nawawi says: "The fourth pillar is recitation of a verse from the Qur'ān in one of the two [383] sermons, and it is also said - i.e. views that are less well attested - in the first, or in both, or it is not a duty at all".⁴⁵ Al-Ramli adds here: "but a *sunna*, and those who hold this view are silent on when the recitation should be".⁴⁶ Ibn Hajar al-Haytami himself, however, is of the opinion that recitation during the first *khuṭbā* is a *sunna*.⁴⁷ Al-Bajuri concludes thus: it is sufficient to hold the *qira'a* during the first or the second sermon, but it is better to have it in the first one (*fa-l-ula awla*).⁴⁸

There is discussion about the *length* of the *qira'a* as well as its position, and I do not think it necessary for me to go into greater detail about that. According to the reigning opinion nowadays, one verse is sufficient.⁴⁹ The oldest Shāfi'ī law book known to us, the invaluable *Kitabb al-umm* of the master himself, however, informs us that in old times the Qur'ān recitation was *extensive*.⁵⁰ Thus the Prophet is said to have recited Sūrat Qaf, i.e. the fiftieth Sura, on a regular basis. (I am assuming that the reason for this can be found in the last verse, in which the Prophet is called upon to exhort

the congregation through the Qur'ān.) Al-Shāfi'ī himself also reflects on the position of the *qira'a*. He says:

I should like the preacher to hold the address (*kalam*) first and recite the Qur'ān afterwards, because this is how it was handed down to us. If, however, he puts the recitation first and then holds the address: that is not terrible either. I should like his recitation to take place as described (i.e. in an extensive form) during the first *khuṭbā*, and then he should recite one or more verses during the

³⁵ Minhaj al-talibiyyin (Cairo, AH 1325), 19.

³⁶ Tuhfa, on the margin of the glosses by al-Shirwani and Ibn Qasim (Cairo, AH 1315), A, 445ff.

³⁷ Nihaya al-muhtaj (Cairo, AH 1303), A, 49ff.

³⁸ Abū Ishaq al-Shirazi, Al-Tanbih fi l-fiqh, ed. Th. W. Juynboll (Leiden, 1879), 40.

³⁹ In the margin of al-Bajuri, I, 236-37.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Al-Ghazali, Wajiz, I, 64:3.

⁴² Tuhfa, A, 447.

⁴³ Hashiya, I, 237:32.

⁴⁴ Al-Shirazi, Tanbih, 40:6.

⁴⁵ Al-Nawawi, Minhaj, 19.

⁴⁶ Nihaya, A, 52.

⁴⁷ See his Al-Fatawa al-kubra (Cairo, AH 1308), I, 261:1. Should the qira'a have been forgotten during the first khutba, it is possible to insert it later in the second one without necessitating a second julus to repeat the whole ceremony (ibid., I, 260).

⁴⁸ Hashiya, I, 237:32.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Al-Shāfi'ī, Kitāb al-umm, I, 178.

second *khuṭbā*. Then he shall say: "I am asking God's forgiveness for you and for myself " And wherever the preacher shall recite the Qur'ān during the first or the second *khuṭbā*, whether he starts with the qira'a or with the *khuṭbā* or whether he has the qira'a in the middle of the *khuṭbā* or at its end, as long as he does a qira'a at all, God will reward him.⁵¹

Thus the question held interest even in al-Shāfi'ī's time. Still, why was there such a lively *ikhtilāf* concerning such an indifferent subject as the correct place for Qur'ān recitation during a sermon, and why was this recitation reduced to one verse? Is there a polemic intention hidden here? Is something being veiled?

[384] Al-Shāfi'ī himself suggests⁵² the structure of a sermon, which obviously shows the practice of his time and clearly shows the example on which the ritual has been modeled. He says:

In order for something to deserve the name of a sermon during the two-part sermon ritual, the preacher at least has to recite during the first sermon: 1) the praise of God, 2) the *ṣalāt al-nabi* and 3) a piece of the Qur'ān. During the second sermon he has to recite: 1) the praise of God, 2) the *ṣalāt al-nabi* 3) the exhortation to fear God and 4) the *du'a*.

We can see here in complete clarity the structure of the Christian service. The first *khuṭbā* corresponds to the reading of scripture, the second to the Christian sermon. This idea behind the whole structure has been lost quite early on in Islamic times, or perhaps it was intentionally blurred. Without the precondition that the first *khuṭbā* corresponds to the reading of scripture, the whole discussion concerning the position of the qira'a is incomprehensible. The need to put scripture at the beginning, which is obligatory in the Christian church, was obliterated by polemical tendencies, but the notion of *summa*, that which is recommended, contains to this day an historical reminiscence of the original idea behind the first *khuṭbā*.

This, however, does not exhaust the parallels. We will see that the framework of the Christian service is present in all its main features. Consequently, we have to start by reconstructing this framework for the seventh and eighth centuries.

It is not easy to picture the Christian service at the time of the Arab expansion.⁵³ Also, we of course do not know which particular mass ritual influenced Muslim worship. It is probable that the influence of sectarian churches was stronger than that of the Byzantine church, as the Muslim government everywhere played off the sects against the orthodox central church. On the other hand, we must not imagine that one particular rite was adopted in all its details. Considering the difference of the dogma and the non-sacramental nature of Muslim service, this would have been completely out of the question. However, the basic structure-the general framework of the Sunday service-was used as a model, and this structure was more or less the same in all churches, as it had developed from the same roots. Anton Baumstark has shown [385] the oriental Mass in its historical structures in his little book *Die Messe im Morgenlande* (Kempten and Munich, 1906).. There the pre-eucharist part of the Mass is divided in 1) the pre-Mass (ἐναρξίς), 2) reading from scripture, 3) the sermon and 4) the general prayer of the congregation. Then follows, as the actual act of worship, the Mass itself. Muslim worship is completely similar to this schema. The first *khuṭbā* is, as we have seen, equivalent to the reading from scripture, and, as proof for our theory, the communal prayer appears in the same place in Christian and Muslim worship. It is the Islamic *du'a that, as we know*, until today the place to pray for the community of Muslims and then in particular for the authorities and possibly the caliph. In Christian liturgy the prayer for the community of the believers and the authorities is in exactly the same place, i.e. at the end of the sermon.⁵⁴ In the Christian church, too, it is a communal prayer for all believers, and it is only later that a ruler is

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid., I, 178:3.

⁵³ See for instance C.A. Swainson, *The Greek Liturgies* (Cambridge, 1884).

⁵⁴ Baumstark, *Die Messe in Morgenlande*, 99.

mentioned as well.⁵⁵ In Islam it is also supposed to be a general prayer for the mu'minin and the *mu'minat*, and mentioning a particular ruler is considered to be an Abūse. Ibn Hajar⁵⁶ and al-Ramli⁵⁷ have expressed themselves in detail on this subject. Mentioning the prince is a very old custom and is undoubtedly connected with the genesis of the whole institution. In the present context this parallel is the decisive piece of proof that our train of thought was correct. In addition, the Christian congregation used to remember heretics and persecutors of the Church.⁵⁸ Similarly, the *du 'a* against the 'Alids appears at the time of the Umayyads. This *du 'a* took place on the *minbar*⁵⁹ and, in particular, at the end of the *khuṭbā*,⁶⁰ and was consequently an act of worship. Its place in the liturgical structure was more or less that which is occupied by the *du 'a* today. This whole episode, which has frequently been discussed,⁶¹ appears in a different light and therefore further supports our theory.

[386] The equivalent of the Mass itself in Islam is the *ṣalāt*, the central position of which in Friday worship we have stressed above. Just by looking for Friday service in a *fiqh* or hadith work one will recognise that the importance of the *ṣalāt* is far higher than that of the sermon, i.e. that the relation of the *khuṭbās* to the *ṣalāt* is similar to that of the pre-eucharistic part of the Christian Sunday service to the Eucharist. The service of reading and sermon has withered away in Islam as in Christianity,⁶² and is nowadays only a fixed ritual with little variation. The only reason it has not achieved the structural importance of the Mass is that Islam decides these questions by means of an independent *ijmā'*, which is often ambiguous and changeable, whereas Christianity has an authoritative ecclesiastical administration to deal with them.

IV

To complete the parallel, the pre-Mass, which precedes the reading from Scripture, can be found in Islamic worship as well, albeit in an understandably rudimentary form. Some of its parts survive in the obligatory and non-obligatory practices of the Friday service.

The external form of the pre-Mass is a rite of response between the officiating priest and the deacon. The latter invites the congregation to pray.⁶³ At least in the early days of Islam, the *khuṭbā* was preceded by a rite of response. *This rite of response is the adhān*. The *khatib* corresponds to the officiating priest, and the *mu'adhdhin* to the deacon. This statement is so contrary to the accepted idea of *adhān* that detailed reasons have to be given for it.

There are two terms for the call to prayer used in *hadith*, which are randomly interchangeable. In the commentaries, the one not used in the text is invariably used to explain the one used in the text: *adhān* and *nida'*. The *mu'adhdhin* is contrasted with the *munadi*. Two words for the same thing are always suspicious. [387] Originally they denoted two different things. The Qur'ān does not use the terms *adhān* and *mu'adhdhin* with the meaning "call to prayer", but rather only to mean "exhortation". The call to prayer is always described by the third form of the verb *nada*: *idha nudiya li-l-ṣalāt min yawm al-jumu 'a*, "when the *nida'*, the call to Friday prayer sounds", we read in Sūrat al-Jumu'a (62), v. 9. *Nada* has another, purely secular meaning, and is used in the historical sources as well as the Qur'ān to mean "to call" in general. I do not think that, after the Qur'ānic

⁵⁵ Ibid., 102. From the position of this prayer we can conclude that the Egyptian ritual could not have been the model in any case; however, it has always been more probable that the borrowing took place in Syria, in which case the position is exactly correct.

⁵⁶ Tuhfa, A, 449; it is felt to be makruh, but one is allowed to do it (la ba'sa fihi) as long as one keeps aloof of exaggeration.

⁵⁷ Nihaya, A, 52, and similarly al-Bajuri and others.

⁵⁸ Baumstark, Die Messe im Morgenlande, 102.

⁵⁹ M.J. de Goeje and P. de Jong, eds., Fragmenta historicum arabicorum (Leiden, 1871), I, 62.

⁶⁰ Ibn al-Athir, al-Kamil fi l-ta'rikh, ed. G.J.Tornberg (Leiden, 1867-76), V, 31:3.

⁶¹ Most recently by Lammens, Mo'awiya, 180ff. In my opinion it cannot have been introduced before Marwanid times and has then, understandably, been transferred to Mu'awiya. Lammens suspects something similar, the Fragmenta, I, 62, mention the Marwanids explicitly.

⁶² Baumstark, Die Messe im Morgenlande, 79, says about the reading and prayer service that preceded the Mass without forming a part of it: "It might be said that progressive withering is an essential characteristic of similar structures".

⁶³ Swainson, Greek Liturgies, 2, 3; Baumstark, Die Messe in Morgenlande, 84.

instance given, there can be any doubt that the call to prayer, as introduced by Muḥammad, was also called *nida'*. Bilal was the Prophet's *munadi*.

In post-Qur'ānic times the words *adhān* and *mu'adhhdhin*, all of a sudden, replace *nida'* and *munadi* in-and this is important-a *technical* sense as opposed to Qur'ānic usage. What did the ritual now denoted by *adhān* originally look like?

Firstly, *when* should the *adhān* take place? The main *adhān*, which was originally the only one, takes place when the *imam* enters the mosque and takes his seat on the *minbar*. It is consequently *not* a call to prayer, but in a way the beginning of the service. Al-Shāfi'ī does, however, state quite clearly that the *adhān* is not a part of the *ṣalāt*.⁶⁴ In addition, we have an Abundance of tendentious traditions, according to which even the conversations among the congregation continue even though the *khatib* has taken his seat and the *mu'adhhdhin* sounds the call to prayer. Only when the *mu'adhhdhin* is silent does the congregation turn towards the preacher and the conversation ends.⁶⁵ An opinion on the question of whether the *adhān* is a part of worship or just the call to prayer is obviously hidden in this practice, which, incidentally, is not uniform, as the Mālikī s forbid talking during the *adhān*. On the other hand, it is clear that in later times it corresponds to the *nida'* of the Prophet's time and thus is just a call to prayer. However, it is perfectly obvious in al-Bukhari and other collections of traditions that the original form of the *adhān* was a rite of response and therefore most likely modeled on a Christian example. To give a few instances: al-Bukhari in al-Qastallani has the following tradition: "When you hear the call to prayer (*nida'*), you should repeat the [388] words of the *mu'adhhdhin*".⁶⁶ 'Isa ibn Talha heard one day how Mu'āwiya repeated the *mu'adhhdhin's* words until the phrase: "I testify that Muḥammad is God's messenger". The following tradition adds: "To the *mu'adhhdhin's* words: *havy 'ala l-ṣalāt*, 'Come to prayer', Mu'āwiya replied: *la hawla wa-la quwata illa bi-llah*, ['There is no capacity or power save through God']. Then he added: "This is how we saw your Prophet do it". The same Mu'āwiya tradition is varied slightly in a version in which it is reported with particular reference to the Friday ritual.⁶⁷ Standing on the *minbar*, Mu'āwiya repeats only the *takbir*, while he replies to the *shahada*, *wa-ana*, "and I".⁶⁸ Al-Shafi'ī's attitude concerning these traditions can be found in the *Kitab al-umm*:

It is the duty of every individual who is not in the course of performing the *ṣalāt*, whether he recite the Qur'ān, call God's name, be contemplating silently or reporting tradition, to repeat the words of the *mu'adhhdhin*. To the formula *havy 'ala l-ṣalāt*, *havy 'ala l-falah*, he should reply: *la hawla wa-la quwata illa bi-llah*. However, I would prefer that those who are praying a *ṣalāt*, either because they have been ordered or because they wish to do so, should continue⁶⁹

It will have to be admitted that a memory of the Christian response ritual may live on in the traditions and customs quoted.⁷⁰ Suggesting an atmosphere of polemic, we find that it is forbidden to sing the *adhān*.⁷¹ In any case, the *mu'adhhdhin* appears as the *imam's* assistant. Further proof that the *adhān* is part of the ritual is found in the fact that the *mu'adhhdhin* has to face the direction of the *qibla* and should fulfill the requirement of ritual purity for prayer.⁷² The order of the formulae of the *adhān* is also considered to be obligatory.⁷³ The entire content of the *adhān*, the numerous *takbirs*, the solemn *shahada* and the fact that *the actual call to prayer completely lacks prominence* [389]

⁶⁴ Al-Shāfi'ī, *Kitab al-umm*, I, 173:10: *wa-laysa fi l-adhan shay' yafsudu al-salat li-anna l-adhan laysa min al-salat innama huwa du'a ilahya*.

⁶⁵ Sahnun, *Mudawwana*, I, 148-49, al-Shāfi'ī, *Kitab al-umm*, I, 180; al-Muttaqī al-Hindi, *Kans al-umm*, IV, 274, nos. 5033-34.

⁶⁶ Al-Qastallani, *Irshad*, II, 7ff.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 178.

⁶⁸ Further variations can be found in al-Muttaqī al-Hindi, *Kanz al-umm*, IV, 272 and elsewhere. A *du'a* for the Prophet is recommended after the *adhan* (Al-Qastallani, *Irshad*, II, 8; al-Muttaqī al-Hindi, *Kanz al-umm*, IV, 150).

⁶⁹ Al-Shafi'ī, *Kitab al-umm*, I, 76.

⁷⁰ In a discussion of this theory during the congress in Leiden, Martin Hartmann referred to Sura al-Rahman (55), assuming an ancient Christian rite of response in it as well. In that case, Christian worship must have exerted some kind of influence in Medina even at the Prophet's time. Though I have devoted a great deal of thought to H's theory, I cannot subscribe to it. Sura 55 is not a rite of response, but a question repeated frequently in the way of a chorus, a rhetoric formula that, after all, occurs frequently in poetry. The rite of response I am assuming in the case of the *adhan* is in any case something essentially different. It is not so much the character of the rite, but its position within the whole liturgy, that is the decisive parallel.

⁷¹ Al-Safi'ī, *Kitab al-umm*, I, 76:6.

⁷² *Ibid.*, I, 74.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, I, 72:20.

show that the *adhān* was originally a part of the liturgy and not a replacement for wooden clappers or trumpet. In the course of the early development, it did, however, become one.

It is difficult to reconstruct this development, but I imagine it to have occurred as follows. The call to prayer originated with the Prophet and was originally called *nida'*. Separate from this, the liturgical act of *adhān* with its response character was an essential part of the Friday service and possibly or even probably connected with the development of the *ṣalāt* ritual, which is likely to have developed under Christian influence. *Nida'* and *adhān* were then used beside one another, their ranges of meaning were assimilated, and finally the two terms were used indiscriminately. This is all the more understandable as the Christian deacon begins the liturgy with the invitation to prayer. Nowadays the Prophet's ancient call to prayer survives as the first *adhān*, the liturgical act as the second (the *iqāma*). One reminder of this is the strange difference between *iqāma* and *adhān*, namely that the *adhān* is called from the minaret, while the *iqāma* is spoken in the mosque even today.⁷⁴ While we do not have any decisive proof for this early development, there is an important analogy in the introduction of the so-called third - i.e. in this order: the first *adhān* in the Friday service. This third *adhān*, which is said to have been introduced by 'Uthman or Mu'āwiya "when people became numerous",⁷⁵ is in my view nothing but putting the call to prayer as introduced by Muḥammad before the structure of the Friday service.

Al-Maqrizi has quite an interesting history of the *adhān* in Egypt,⁷⁶ from which it is obvious how much the actual call to prayer has varied. He also quotes some traditions from al-Waqidi and al-Baladhuri that convey the impression that in old times the call to prayer was mainly an invitation to the Prophet or the caliph to start the prayer now; thus it would have been an announcement of prayer rather than a call to prayer. In a different place we hear that 'Uthman performed the *adhān* in front of the Prophet (*bayna yaday rasal Allāh*) near the *minbar*.⁷⁷ According to this tradition the *mu'adhdhin's* position is surprisingly [390] similar to that of the deacon. In any case, this *adhān* is different from the call that replaces the ringing of bells.

There are several other small features that refer to the pre-Mass. Taken individually these do not carry much weight, but together with everything else they heighten the probability of connections between Christian and Muslim liturgies. There is, for instance, the *khatib's salam* before the service begins, which has given rise to many a discussion in the tradition and *fiqh*⁷⁸ and is likely to correspond to the greeting of peace of the officiating priest.⁷⁹ Also there are the praise of God and the *ṣalāt 'ala l-nabi* that, as we have seen, immediately precede the *khuṭbā* and appear to be essentially self-explanatory. These are likely to correspond to the praise of God and the prayer to Jesus in the pre-Mass,⁸⁰ as we know exactly that *khuṭbās* during Umayyad times were frequently preached without any of these forms that are now obligatory. There is even a technical term for these: *khuṭbā batra*.⁸¹

These were most likely purely secular addresses. In any case, we can see that the hamd *Allāh* and the *ṣalāt 'ala l-nabi* only made their appearance once the *khuṭbā* became part of the act of worship. They are already characterized as independent parts of the *khuṭbā* by the fact that hadith recommends an *amma ba'du* following them.⁸² This allows us to conclude that the position of this formula within the service gave rise to discussion. The asking of God's forgiveness for preacher and congregation at the end of the *khuṭbā*, which is recommended or even obligatory,⁸³ could remind us of the *κυριε ἐλέησον* [Kyrie Elieson]. There may well be a Christian archetype for the *imam's* raising his hands during the *du'a*.⁸⁴ The *tasliya*,⁸⁵ which is expected of the congregation at any

⁷⁴ References for this can be found, for example, in al-Muttaqi al-Hindi, *Kanz al-'ummāl*, IV, 267 no. 5499.

⁷⁵ Al-Shāfi'ī, *Kitāb al-umm*, I, 173:5, and elsewhere.

⁷⁶ Al-Maqrizi, *Khitat* (Cairo, AH 1270), II, 269.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 270:4.

⁷⁸ Al-Muttaqi al-Hindi, *Kanz al-'ummāl*, IV, 275 nos 5646, 5650-51; Al-Shāfi'ī, *Kitāb al-umm*, I, 211:14.

⁷⁹ Baumstark, *Die Messe in Morgenlande*, 81.

⁸⁰ Swainson, *Greek Liturgies*, *passim*.

⁸¹ Lammens, *Ziād*, 36 (36); *idem*, *Mu'awia*, 297 n.4; also al-Ya'qubi, *Ta'rikh*, ed. M.T. Houtsma (Leiden, 1888), II, 341:7.

⁸² Al-Qastallani, *Irshad*, II, 183.

⁸³ Sahnun, *Mudawwana*, I, 150.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 188; al-Muttaqi al-Hindi, *Kanz al-'ummāl*, IV, 275 nos 5645; Ibn Hajar, *Fatawa*, I, 252.

mention of the Prophet's name during the sermon, could correspond to a Christian hallelujah. So far it has not been possible to determine whether there is also a Christian ritual hidden in the greeting to the mosque in the *rak'a li-tahiyat al- masjid* after the *khuṭbā*⁸⁶ has started. Another instance that seems to me to be suspect is the insistent admonition to the *imam* to face the congregation during the *khuṭbā*. While this appears to be a matter of course at first sight, it is also possible that it is a warning to the *imam* not to turn his back on the congregation as the officiating priest does.

[391] As we have seen, it is possible to find quite a number of features that lead us to assume that not only the overall structure of Christian Sunday service was transferred, but possibly also - at least from the point of view of the question - several little individual features. Furthermore, a comparison between *tajwid* and the rules for the medieval litany should produce astonishing results. However, this would require detailed knowledge of the technicalities of music, which I do not possess. In the future it will be necessary to devote much study to all the problems. In particular the rite of prayer itself will have to be examined in all possible detail. The genesis of the mosque is inseparably bound up with the history of worship, and this will prove to be an important link in our chain of evidence.

V

Among the most valuable results of Caetani's *Annali* is the destruction of the myth of the Prophet's mosque in Medina. Muḥammad's place for prayer and receiving was the open courtyard in front of his house. A projecting roof on one side of this courtyard formed an open arcade, which was shady and safe from rain. This seems to have been the type of reception courtyards of distinguished houses. In these courtyards, the family and tribal life of the Arab community took place. A specific room for worship is not mentioned at all, even though it is obvious that it was here that the communal *ṣalāt* was held after Muḥammad's appearance. This room may even have been used for ritual purposes during pagan times.⁸⁷ In a very important study, Henri Lammens⁸⁸ researched the nature of these community courtyards, these *majalis* or - as they were called apparently even before, and certainly after Muḥammad - *masajid*, and has found them to be widespread in the early years of the Umayyad era. Early mosques within and without Arabia are furnished after the manner of these *masajid*. I am not thinking of art-historical relations here, but of the spreading of the idea of a separated room where the tribe and the community would meet for religious as well as secular meetings, which did not possess any architectural indication that it was a place of worship. The mosque is not so much built as rather staked off, and only later was it surrounded with walls. Building mosques and places of worship only begins with 'Abd al-Malik and al-Walid. To my mind the most typical [392] contrast between the architecture of the patriarchal period on the one hand and the Marwanids on the other is expressed in a legend preserved by al-Samhudi. Al-Walid inspects the construction of the Prophet's mosque in Medina commissioned by him. The Prophet's primitive reception courtyard had already been expanded by his early successors, in particular 'Uthman. Al-Walid meets one of 'Uthman's sons and says to him: "See how superior our architecture is to yours!" And 'Uthman's heir replies: "Most certainly, but then our buildings were in the style of (ancient Arabian) *masajid*; yours, however, in the style of Christian churches".⁸⁹ And what were the innovations that al-Walid's style introduced? The *miḥrāb*, the minaret and maybe the *maqṣara*.

In the context of the institution of the *miḥrāb* we have to *distinguish clearly between two things*: the history of the term *miḥrāb* on the one hand, and the history of the role of the prayer niche in worship. The history or the word can only be dealt with briefly in the

⁸⁵ Unfortunately I have lost the evidence for this. [There are several traditions recommending that the Muslims recite the phrase *salla Allāhu 'alayhi wa-sallama* ("God's blessing and peace be upon him") when the Prophet's name is mentioned. But I have been unable to find any that specify the *khuṭba* in this connection].

⁸⁶ Al-Ghazali, *Wajiz*, I, 64; al-Kasani, *Bada'i al-sana'i*, I, 201 bottom; al-Shirazi, *Tanbih*, 41.

⁸⁷ Cf. Martin Hartmann n "Qusajj", *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 27 (1912), 46; Lammens, *Ziād*, 90 (242) ff.

⁸⁸ *Ziād*, 88 (240).

⁸⁹ Al-Samhudi, *Khulasat al-wafa* (Mecca, AH 1316), 131:30.

present context, but much more information will be found in the valuable and convincing studies of Rhodokanakis.⁹⁰ The *miḥrāb* must have been the raised place, usually in the shape of a niche, occupied by the prince on the occasion of formal receptions. The name is likely to be a *nomen loci* and is associated with the spear that was carried before the prince, as it was later before the Prophet and the caliphs (southern Arabian and Ethiopian culture group, possibly also Persian). The name of this niche was then transferred onto the whole palace. The original idea of this niche must still have been alive in Umayyad days, as it could not have been transferred onto the niche in the mosque. After all, in the beginning the mosque was the meeting hall for affairs of state as well. The caliph appeared on his throne, the *minbar*. In pre-Islamic times this throne was situated on the dais reserved for the prince, the *miḥrāb*.

Consequently it is perfectly understandable that with the transition from *minbar* the throne to *minbar* the pulpit the niche next to the *minbar* would be called *miḥrāb*, not with a secular meaning, but referring its use in worship.

In its use in worship the *miḥrāb* does not, however, emerge from ancient Arab tradition but out of Christian practice. As we have seen, its earliest introduction was accompanied by the idea that a building to which a *miḥrāb* is added is characterized as a Christian church. In addition there is the information produced by Henri Lammens⁹¹ showing the *miḥrāb* clearly as an imitation from Christianity [393] that was established with difficulties and only during the second century AH. The purpose of the prayer niche is one of worship only. The development of this transfer of a Christian form is exactly the same as in all other similar cases. The item or form is transferred, but at the same time there is polemic against its specifically Christian use.⁹² As we know, the apse was the most important part of a church; about the *miḥrāb*, however, tradition says that it is the least holy place in the whole mosque.⁹³ Furthermore, the *imam* is warned most urgently against standing in the *miḥrāb*.⁹⁴ Thus we can see that transferring the *miḥrāb* was not restricted to a neutral architectural form, but included the *cultic institution*. Consequently people have to be warned lest they transfer this in its entirety.

Recently there has also been some discussion of the introduction and origins of the *minaret*.⁹⁵ Again, as in the case of the *miḥrāb*, we have to distinguish between discussion from the point of view of art history and that of history of worship. Only after the introduction of prayer towers⁹⁶ did the announcer of prayer become a caller to prayer who replaced the bells.

Wherever in art history we may look for the predecessors of the minaret, its model in worship is the Christian bell tower, which, as I hear from Herzfeld, is attested as early as the fourth and fifth centuries.

The prototype of the maqsura are the imperial lodges of the Byzantine church. Justinian's lodge survives in the Hagia Sofia until this day.⁹⁷ And in conclusion a brief word concerning the *minbar*. When the mosque developed into a place for religious meetings only, the *minbar*, the throne of the ruler in a theocracy, developed into the pulpit.⁹⁸ The seat above two steps, whose existence in Ethiopia Littmann established,⁹⁹ and which was used by the early caliphs,¹⁰⁰ developed into the pulpit at the top of several steps,¹⁰¹ as it was in use in Christian churches at the

⁹⁰ See the literature quoted above, 374 n. 3.

⁹¹ Ziād, 94 (246) n. 1.

⁹² The same method is attested elsewhere; cf. Ignaz Goldziher, "Die Sabbathinstitution im Islam", in M. Brann, ed., Gedenkbuch zur Erinnerung an David Kaufmann (Breslau, 1900), 86-105 [Chapter 3 in this volume].

⁹³ Ibn al-Hajj, Madkhal, II, 76ult.: akhaff min baqi l- *masjid*.

⁹⁴ Ibid., II, 76.

⁹⁵ Hermann Tieruch, Pharos, Antike, Islam und Occident (Leipzig, 1909); Richard J.H. Gottheil, "The Orgn and History of the Minaret", Journal of the American Oriental Society 30,2 (1910), 132ff.

⁹⁶ Concerning the introduction in Egypt, cf. al-Maqifal, Khifaf, II, 270-20.

⁹⁷ Information received from E. Herzfeld.

⁹⁸ "Kanzel", 345.

⁹⁹ E. Littmann and D. Krencker, Vorbericht der Deutschen Aksumexpedition (Berlin, 1906), 22.

¹⁰⁰ "Kanzel", 335.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., passim.

time. Indeed, information that [394] Abū l-Mahasin probably found in an older source states that in Egypt, for example, the *minbar* was taken directly from a Christian church.¹⁰² Thus the history of the implements of worship in the mosques confirms our thesis of a Christian model for Muslim worship as such.

VI

Proving a certain dependence in the field of liturgy does not make a history of worship, for such a history will require much more research. However in conclusion of the preceding thoughts it may still be advisable to attempt a sketch of the outlines of the development as it appears from Lammens' research as well as from my own studies. The borrowings and relations described will thus be arranged, albeit hypothetically, in a unified picture of the historical development, and consequently their chronological and factual probability will increase.

It is safe to assume that the history of Muslim worship developed in four phases:

FIRST PHASE: The primitive state of the patriarchal period. The community life of the Arab tribes takes place in the reception courtyards (*majalis*) of the leaders. Muḥammad takes over this role with his position in his congregation. The courtyard of his house is the scene of the community life of the *ummat al-muslimin*. As he lays more emphasis on religion than earlier leaders did, his counsel meetings are begun with a communal *ṣalāt*. The *munadi*, a caller or announcer, who may represent an ancient Arab institution, calls people to this prayer. At any rate the *majlis* is also called *nadi* and, according to Lammens, even *masjid*. An invitation to the communal service is issued whenever there is a need of taking counsel. The times of the later five prayers do not appear to be fixed at this stage. The first step towards organised worship is the decision to make Friday the main day for meetings. This practice was probably developed after a Jewish example. We can assume that, as in all meetings of this kind, the prayer preceded the address and business dealings. This primitive period is likely to have lasted until the reign of 'Uthman.

SECOND PHASE: Building of major mosques in great army camps based on primarily political motives. The practice as it was in Medina is naturally transferred to the conquered provinces. The meeting place for the whole army camp is linked to the governor's tent, and later his rooms.¹⁰³ [395] It was here that the negotiations, often difficult, between the commander-in-chief and the Arab tribes would take place; here that the nominal confessors of Islam, who had no religious discipline whatsoever, became accustomed to taking part in religious practice before the negotiations. Individual tribes would have their own *masajid* just like the tribes in Medina. Hence the question in *fiqh* whether it is permissible to speak of the *masjid* of a particular tribe, *masjid bani fulan*.¹⁰⁴ The whole period is characterized by the struggle between the *masjid al-jama'a*, which served the centralist interests of the Umayyads on the one hand, and the *masajid al-qaba'il*, which were inspired with the particularistic spirit of the Arab tribes, on the other. Lammens collected remarkable instances of this from the time of Ziyad.¹⁰⁵ Some of the issues debated so heatedly in the later *fiqh*, and resolved differently by different *madhahib*, date from this time: whether the valid Friday *ṣalāt*, being a major communal prayer, could only be held in one mosque in an army camp, whether a second service would be against the law, and whether the presence of the imam or his deputy would be obligatory.¹⁰⁶

This is also the period when the Umayyads and their governors endeavoured to appear at these meetings with all the regalia of their office. The ancient Arab *minbar* is adapted to resemble a princely throne, which the caliph takes with him on his travels.¹⁰⁷ The use of the *ṣalāt* to furnish

¹⁰² Abū l-Mahasin Ibn Taghribirdi, *Al-Nujum al-zahira (Annales)* ed. T.W.Juynboll and B.F. Mathes (Leiden, 1852-61), I, 78:11. Cf. also 'Ali Mubarak, *Al-Khitat'al-tawfichyja al-jadida* (Cairo, AH 1305-1306), IV, 3.

¹⁰³ This can still be seen clearly from the map of al-Fustat; see the map in the article "Cairo" in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* [1st edition].

¹⁰⁴ Al-Qastallani, *Irshad*, I, 423.

¹⁰⁵ Lammens, *Ziād*, 97 (249) ff. Cf. also al-Muttaqi al-Hindi, *Kanz al-ummal*, IV, 259 no. 5391.

¹⁰⁶ Al-Shāfi'ī, *Kitab al-umm*, I, 171; al-Kasani, *Bada'i al-sana'i*, I, 261. Later it was permitted under certain circumstances. Ibn Hajar, *Fatawa*, I, 250; Muḥammad Amin Ibn al'Abidin, *Al Futawa al-hamidiya* (Cairo, AH 1300), I, 7pg.

¹⁰⁷ "Kanzel", 338.

these meetings with a religious guise, which Muḥammad inaugurated, is continued and possibly regulated slightly. As the prayer is only an introductory act while the lecture, in which the caliph discusses current politics, is the main part of the meeting, it is only natural that the prince in person should lead the whole proceedings. The *khutbā* was at that time still a debate with the leaders of the most powerful tribal groups. It is understandable that at this time there was no such thing as formal worship or fixed liturgy. This second phase is approximately contemporary with the era of the Sufyanids.

THIRD PHASE: The beginning of conscious structures of worship. We would not be doing justice to the Umayyad era if we [396] believed the government of that time to have been purely secular. The Umayyads most certainly considered themselves to be religious rulers, too; at least they knew full well what an instrument of power the religious idea meant for them. There were no politics, no political or economic life without the religious cloak.¹⁰⁸ It must have been a matter of course for the later Umayyads to surround their public appearances with all the impressive ceremony or religious functions. What did they have to match the splendor of Christian places of worship, the imposing structure of Christian services in Syria?¹⁰⁹

There were Sasanid models in Iraq, but the style of the caliph's residence would of course have been decisive.¹¹⁰ It was the inspiration for building work in the provinces, as we have seen in the case of the mosque in Medina. Al-Walid's time marked the introduction of the *miḥrāb*, the *minbar* and, probably only as late as this, the *maqsura*. Adopting Christian ideas in the field of religious buildings could not remain without consequence for the form of the worship itself. The introduction of a *maqsura*, a "royal box", appears to exclude the caliph from officiating at the service. In later years the Umayyads and in particular the 'Abbasids followed the example of the Khusraws and the Caesars in that they became increasingly invisible and removed themselves from everyday life. Once the empire was stable, the need to influence tribal chieftains with personal lectures of religious interest vanished completely. In the long run, the state was governed by the bureaucracy. The social function of the mosque gave way to the religious one. Officiating at the Friday service was at that time still an honorary office from which the provincial governors withdrew only gradually. It is difficult to put an exact date on this process of "clericalisation" of the Friday service, but it is completed at the beginning of the 'Abbasid era. In the year AH 132 *minbars* first appeared in the provincial towns in Egypt.¹¹¹ This is certain proof that they were places of worship that celebrated a Friday service, because political negotiations did not take place in provincial towns. However, the custom of announcing political decrees, appointments, etc., [397] in provincial towns on the occasion of the Friday service survived for a while longer, until the Fatimid era and possibly even later.¹¹² In fact, there is a similar custom in Christian ritual. The political mosque is part of the Umayyad era. Of course its existence was only justified in the capital cities, the *amsar*. There is a reminder of this age in the *fiqh* where the *ṣalāt al-jumu'a* is repeatedly prefixed with the condition that it must only be held in *amsar*.¹¹³ Under pressure of reality, this condition then referred to the town in general. In a small village, where no 40 praying men can be found, the celebration is inadmissible according to Shāfi'ī law. There does not seem to be any reason why there should be this restriction when it refers to a matter of worship pure and simple. It recalls the practice of the Umayyad era, which is not understood by later masters of *fiqh*. Hence the otherwise nonsensical speculation concerning the smallest number of attendees that renders a *ṣalāt al-jumu'a* legal.¹¹⁴ This example gives us a deep insight into the development and the nature of *fiqh*. Thus in the later part of the Umayyad era we find a strong tendency towards formalizing worship. It is probable that this tendency did not originate exclusively with the rulers but, as we have hinted above, that it also came

¹⁰⁸ We only need to remember the tone of the papyri.

¹⁰⁹ In the discussion of this lecture Wensinck pointed out that during public appearances the Umayyads even imitated the garb of Christian bishops.

¹¹⁰ The mosque in al-Kufa is built after a Christian model; see Lammens, *Ziād*, 95 (247).

¹¹¹ "Kanzel", 345.

¹¹² Al-Sayrafī, *Qanunn diwan al-rasa'il*, ed. 'Ali Bek Bahjat (CAiro, 1905), 119:2.

¹¹³ Al-Qastallani, *Irshad*, II, 166-67; Sahnun, *Mudawwana*, I, 152-153; al-Shāfi'ī, *Kitab al-umm*, I, 169; al-Kasani, *Bada'i al-sana'i*, I, 259.

¹¹⁴ Al-Kasani, *Bada'i al-sana'i*, I, 268; al-Shāfi'ī, *Kitab al-umm*, I, 169 and all the *fiqh* books. It must also be taken into consideration that it was a question whether the permission of the government was necessary; al-Qastallani, *Irshad*, II, 168-69.

from the circles of unworldly orthodoxy, which was composed in the longer term more and more of previously Christian *mawali*. These circles originated the polemic against sitting on the *minbar*;¹¹⁵ workmen should only be allowed there for prayer,¹¹⁶ and all the other traditions that criticize any use of the mosque that is not worship. I would also locate the transfer of the structure of the Christian Mass liturgy in this period of transition, which coincides mainly with the era of the Marwanids.

FOURTH PHASE: The definite fixing of the form of worship, the mosque as exclusively the house of God. The tendency to structure worship achieves dominance with the 'Abbasids. The *miḥrāb* and the *minbar* are tried and proved, they have been adapted to the forms of worship and are now a matter of course. The *min bar* is the pulpit and no other meaning is understood.

A professional preacher officiates in the place of the caliph and his representatives. [398] Only on very special occasions, in particular the two holidays, which are now slowly moved to the mosque, does the caliph still officiate as *imam*.¹¹⁷ In the case of Egypt we know the exact year - 242/856 – when the *amir* led the Friday prayer for the last time.¹¹⁸ Of course, this development will have to be studied in more detail. The form of worship itself is fixed. During the time of the founders of the great schools of law there are still debates on whether there should be two *khuṭbās* or one, whether sitting before and between these is obligatory or just recommended, but this *ikhtilāf* is the only reminder of a time when these questions were still problems. The *ijmā'* had come to a consensus concerning the major issues. It is already unthinkable in al-Shāfi'ī's day that a mosque could have any other purpose aside from serving as a place of worship. Now religious reasons are put forward to justify the practice. Those who are reluctant to exert themselves simply call on the Prophet to authenticate the practice in use in their time. More scrupulous speculators attempt to harmonise the strangely different information of the old days with the practice of the present. In cases where that is not successful - well, then the godless Umayyads are to blame for the practice, and they may now be cursed to everyone's heart's content. If it should be that the *ijmā'* accepted an Umayyad practice against the practice of patriarchal times, it is glossed over, or else 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz receives a further laurel wreath. Thus the traditions about the history of worship appear after the development of the structures of worship is complete.

While it is possible that the four phases described may have to undergo revisions on particular points, it is fairly certain that the development as such did place along these lines. The decisive influences occurred in Umayyad times, and are therefore Christian. In the Prophet's lifetime the main influence came from Judaism, under the Umayyads out of Christianity and under the 'Abbasids out of the domain of Sasanid culture. This is perfectly obvious from the geographical circumstances. The Christian influence on Muslim worship is all the less wondrous as the dependence of Islam on Christianity is apparent even in dogma,¹¹⁹ to say nothing of the secular sphere. Even in later times the strong influence of Christianity caused innovations in Muslim worship – I have in mind here the celebrations of Muḥammad's birthday, which are [399] obviously modeled on celebrations of Jesus' birthday - and influenced ancient institutions. Thus the later practice regarding the Prophet's birthday in Egypt shows clearly that the *m'adhdhin's* solemn invitation to the *imam* and a candlelight procession are attempts to take into consideration popular sentiments, which were accustomed to Christian practice of worship.¹²⁰ Thus we can see that Christian influences do not end with the formalization of the Friday ritual.

After all· from where else could the Friday ritual have been taken? *Fixed liturgy is not simply invented*. This is proved by the history of Christian liturgy, which grew from pagan and Jewish models; indeed, it is proved by the history of all liturgy.

¹¹⁵ "Kanzel", 346-47.

¹¹⁶ Al-Muttaqi al-Hindi, Kanz al-'ummal, IV, 260 no. 5406 [jannibu *masjidakum sunna'ukum*], cf. Lammens, Ziād, 30-31 (30-31).

¹¹⁷ On the subject of the Fatimid era, see al-Musabbih in my Beitrage zur Geschichte Agyptens unter dem Islam (Strassburg, 1902-1903), I, 72:2, and al-Qalqashandy in al-Sairafi, Qanun, 47, concerning the custom described there cf. Ibn al-Hajj, Madkhal, II, 84:2.

¹¹⁸ Al-Maqrizi, Khifaf, I, 312:27.

¹¹⁹ Cf. J. Morgenstern, "Biblical Theophanies", Zeitschrift für Assyriologie 26 (1911), 175ff.

¹²⁰ Ibn al-Hajj, Madkhal, II, 83:10.