

involved with them had the same impression" (p. 81).

Cohen also describes strategies in "a key document" of the Zionist Elected Assembly aimed at "deepen[ing] fissures within Palestinian society by separating the Bedouin from the rest of the population and fomenting conflict between Christians and Muslims (and Druze)" (p. 18). To achieve this, Cohen tells us that the Zionist Executive financed the activities of Arab pro-Zionist organizations like the Muslim National Associations (MNA), which petitioned the Mandate authorities on behalf of the Zionists. In 1921, for example, Hasan Shukri, mayor of Haifa and president of the MNA, sent a telegram to London regarding an Arab Palestinian nationalist delegation sent to Britain to argue against the Balfour Declaration: "We strongly protest against the attitude of the said delegation. . . . We consider the Jews as a brotherly people . . . helping us in the construction of our common country" (p. 15). In 1924, Zionist-funded Palestinian "farmers' parties" appeared, further implementing these divisive strategies. Composed mainly of men belonging to "leading regional families or families with land in the village, and not to the fellah class," they were designed to "maintain and deepen the divide between Arab villagers and urban Arabs and weaken the Arab nationalist movement" (p. 20).

In the long run, Ragheb Nashashibi's National Defense Party (NDP)—composed mainly of mayors and administrations of larger cities, wealthy merchants, and some prominent rural families—became the chief beneficiary of Zionist support. Members of the NDP proclaimed themselves anti-Zionist, but zest for office led Nashashibi to replace Musa al-Husayni, a relative of the Mufti of Jerusalem, after the British dismissed him as mayor of Jerusalem in the wake of anti-British riots in 1920. Cohen is correct in noting that the behavior of nationalists like the Mufti only served to reinforce NDP loyalty to Britain. Indeed, when the Mufti became the dominant nationalist leader, Arabs who disagreed with him, and often their relatives, became "traitors" subject to assassination. In his fanatic rightist nationalism, the Mufti never developed a strategy to win over the significant Palestinian minority, rich and poor, who felt they had no choice, economically, but to collaborate directly with Britain and indirectly with Zionism.

For all its detailed description of collaboration, the book would have benefited

from additional contextual material. In one instance, Cohen examines elections for various offices where the vote was restricted to the propertied. However, no detail is provided on property regulations or the distribution of votes for the various parties. Similarly, he explores the topic of Bedouin collaboration without touching on what percentage of the total population Bedouins made up and what percentage of them collaborated with the Zionists. But such omissions, important as they are, do not significantly detract from the high scholarly quality of Cohen's work.

ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATIONS

The Dome of the Rock, by Oleg Grabar. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006. ix + 212 pages. Bibliography to p. 222. Index to p. 234. \$22.95 hard.

Reviewed by Finbarr Barry Flood

This short, engaging book represents half a century of reflection on what is at once the most familiar and enigmatic of Islamic monuments by its preeminent modern biographer. Combining formal analysis with epigraphic and textual exegesis, and drawing upon recent archaeological discoveries in and around Jerusalem, Oleg Grabar constructs a broad context for his diachronic account of the monument.

More than half of *The Dome of the Rock* dwells on the formative seventh century. The first chapter deals with Jerusalem and the Temple Mount before and after the Arab conquest of the city in the 630s, emphasizing a growing awareness that the late seventh-century Marwanid architectural project on the Haram al-Sharif may have been planned in embryonic form as early as the caliphate of Mu'awiyya (ruled 661–80 C.E.). The long second chapter discusses the

Finbarr Barry Flood, William R. Kenan Jr. professor of humanities in the Institute of Fine Arts and Department of Art History, New York University, is the author of *The Great Mosque of Damascus: Studies on the Makings of an Umayyad Visual Culture* (E. J. Brill, 2001), *Objects of Translation: Material Culture and Medieval "Hindu-Muslim" Encounter* (Princeton University Press, 2009), and the editor of *Piety and Politics in the Early Indian Mosque* (Oxford University Press, 2008).

circumstances of the monument's construction around 691–92, during the caliphate of 'Abd al-Malik (r. 685–705). Possibly intended as a victory monument, through its decoration, form, and setting, the shrine also engaged the destroyed Jewish Temple (in both its Solomonic and Herodian incarnations), the Holy Sepulchre, the Ka'ba in distant Mecca, and perhaps even eschatological and paradisiacal architecture associated with the End of Days. The third chapter considers the embellishment of the Haram al-Sharif in the post-Umayyad period, up to the advent of the Crusaders in 1099, arguing that it was during this period that the site received its final conceptual and material definition. The fourth and final chapter considers the fate of the monument under Crusader, Ayyubid, Mamluk, and Ottoman rule, tracing the meanings that accrued to it over this long span of time.

The book is full of observations with wide-ranging implications, from the empirical and historical (the possibility that differences in the quality of mosaic decoration on the soffits of arches provide insights into seventh-century workshop practices; p. 109) to the methodological (the startling suggestion that "certain forms seem to lend themselves to certain uses, and not just because they were previously used in a similar way"; p. 107). While there is much food for thought here, I would like to focus on a topic relevant to all four chapters.

Although the iconographic density of both monument and site makes for little consensus regarding its original meaning among modern scholars, there is almost universal agreement that 'Abd al-Malik's Dome of the Rock is unlikely to have commemorated what pious Muslims believe it does: the night journey (*isra'*) and ascension (*mi'raj*) of the Prophet Muhammad. Scholarly skepticism is rooted in complex exegetical problems, including when and where the farthest mosque (*masjid al-aqsa*) mentioned in Qur'an 17:1 was first identified with the Haram al-Sharif in Jerusalem. Textual analysis suggests that the association was made during the reign of al-Walid ibn 'Abd al-Malik (d. 715), who constructed, completed, or monumentalized al-Aqsa Mosque a decade or so after the completion of the Dome of the Rock. The first clear epigraphic indication of the identification is, however, found in a Fatimid mosaic of 1035 in al-Aqsa Mosque that cites the text of Qur'an 17:1 (p. 130). The absence of any analogous Umayyad inscriptions in the Dome of the Rock is taken here

(p. 176), as in most writings on the monument, to cast doubt on the association being made as early as the reign of 'Abd al-Malik.

However, although Qur'an 17: 1 is absent from the Umayyad inscriptions in the Dome of the Rock (which, in fact, may not be preserved in their entirety), the frequency with which they invoke the Prophet Muhammad is striking. The Prophet is alluded to or mentioned by name no fewer than eight times in the interior mosaic inscriptions and four more times on the Umayyad metal plaques covering the northern and eastern entrances (pp. 91–95). Further allusions to the Prophet may originally have included commemorative stone markers similar to those set in place by the Umayyads at other sites connected with his biography. Two of the Dome of the Rock inscriptions (including one on the eastern gate, facing the Mount of Olives, where the righteous will assemble) place an unusual emphasis on the Prophet's intercession (*shafa'a*) on behalf of his community (*ummahu*) on the day of resurrection (*yawm al-qiyama*), an event in which the Rock and its environs will play a central role. Grabar, however, suggests that the Prophet's intercessory role was only *later* connected with the events of the *isra'* and *mi'raj* (pp. 154–57), an association reinforced by the serendipity of Salah al-Din's capture of Jerusalem from the Franks in 1187 on the day that conventionally marks the *mi'raj* (p. 170). This seems to represent a shift away from an earlier position, put forward in *The Shape of the Holy: Early Islamic Jerusalem* (Princeton University Press, 1996), in which Grabar acknowledged that the association of both with the Haram al-Sharif (although not necessarily the Rock) may have been established by the late seventh century.

Further circumstantial (and potentially more controversial) evidence that a particular relationship between Prophet Muhammad and the Dome of the Rock already existed in the late seventh century might be sought in a series of glass pilgrim flasks produced for Christian, Jewish, and Muslim pilgrims to Jerusalem before and after the Arab conquest of the city. These are adorned with pictograms that can be divided into three general classes: eschatological motifs, ritual objects, and objects related to Jerusalemite sacred topography. An apparent exception is a standing figure depicted on flasks manufactured for Muslim pilgrims. In an important article published in *Oxford Studies in Islamic Art* in 1999, Julian Raby

identified this as the Umayyad caliph by virtue of its resemblance to a standing figure on the coinage issued by 'Abd al-Malik between 693 and 697. Recently, however, both Clive Foss and Robert Hoyland have questioned the latter identification, suggesting that the figure depicts not 'Abd al-Malik but the Prophet Muhammad. Supporting the challenge (although not necessarily the alternative identification) are differences between the Arab dress of the figure on the coin and the stucco sculptures of caliphs or princes recovered from the Umayyad palaces at Khirbat al-Mafjar near Jericho and Qasr al-Hayr al-Gharbi in northern Syria, which wear Byzantine or Sasanian garb.

In addition, the facial features of the standing figure on at least some of 'Abd al-Malik's figural coins are closely related to those of the bearded Christ depicted on coins struck by the Byzantine emperor Justinian II between 685 and 695. If, as seems likely, the latter provided the inspiration for the Umayyad figural coins, the appropriation might be read against the contrast between the past role of Jesus and future role of the Prophet as intercessor on behalf of the Muslim community that Grabar notes in the Dome of the Rock inscriptions (p. 117). This does not, of course, mean that the figure depicted on the Umayyad coins is in fact the Prophet, even if its traditional identification in modern scholarship is less secure than has been assumed. However, read against the epigraphic program of the Dome of the Rock, the depiction of the Prophet rather than the caliph on the pilgrim flasks would make more sense, given the suggestion that they were used by pilgrims to carry away *khuluq* (an unguent used to anoint the rock) from the Dome of the Rock, whose octagonal form they apparently echo in miniature.

Epigraphic and other materials thus suggest that a particular association between the Prophet Muhammad and the Dome of the Rock had been established at the time of the monument's construction, perhaps in the context of an evolving Marwanid caliphal ideology. It remains an open possibility that the nexus between the two was provided by accounts of the *mi'raj*. The canonization of this association in the eighth through eleventh centuries by the construction of satellite structures such as the Dome of the Ascension or the Dome of the Prophet, which marked particular moments in the unfolding of the *isra'* and *mi'raj*, or through the inscription

of Qur'an 17:1 in al-Aqsa Mosque, foregrounded one among the many original associations of the Umayyad Haram al-Sharif, rather than representing a radical post hoc interpretation.

This shift in emphasis resonates with Grabar's concluding remarks regarding the ability of forms that are visually powerful but iconographically weak to attract concatenated and overlapping meanings through time (pp. 207, 211). In the case of the Dome of the Rock, there are two corollaries. First, the dynamic shifts in meaning that marked the diachronic reception of the shrine were not necessarily reflected in alterations to its form (p. 159). Second, stability of form did not imply total material stability; the "Ottoman" tiles that replaced the original exterior mosaics in the sixteenth century and that define the appearance of the monument today are largely twentieth-century replacements for decayed originals (pp. 1-2). The former observation raises the interesting methodological problem of how, in the absence of "archival" interventions/traces upon their fabric, historians might access the social life of the monuments that they study. The latter provides a cautionary reminder for those of us who teach or write about the Dome of the Rock as if it were the pure product of late seventh-century caliphal patronage.

EXPROPRIATION LEGACIES

Land Expropriation in Israel: Law, Culture and Society, by Yifat Holzman-Gazit. Aldershot, UK, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007. viii + 173 pages. Bibliography to p. 196. Index to p. 204. \$99.95 cloth.

Reviewed by Jeremy Forman

Land Expropriation in Israel: Law, Culture and Society is one of the first monographs in a primarily article-based body of literature that examines the evolution of Israeli land law and its impact on Israeli society. Written by a leading Israeli legal historian and former independent academic advisor to the Israeli Interministerial Committee on Reform of Land Expropriation Law, the book is unique in that it does *not*

Jeremy Forman teaches and researches the historical, legal, and geographical dimensions of the Israeli land regime at Tel Aviv University and the University of Haifa.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.