10.	*ǧ*	*g*	*y*	*gār/yār* "neighbour"
11.	CvCvCv(C)	CvCvCv(C)	CCvCv(C)	*raḳaba/rguba* "neck"
12.	imperfect verbs m. pl.	*-ū*	*-ūn*	*yikitbū/yikitbūn* "they write"
	f.s.	*-ī*	*-īn*	*tikitbī/tikitbīn* "you write"
13.	3rd m.s. suffix	*-uh*	*-ah*	*trisuh/trisah* "fill it!"
14.	prefix, hamzated verbs	*yō-*	*yā-*	*yōkil/yākil* "he eats"
15.	prefix, V and VI themes	*yit-/tit-/nit-*	*yti-/tti-/nti-*	*nit'allam/nti'allam* "we learn"
16.	question marker	*ə*	-	*fi l-bēt?* "in the house?"

The S dialects of the mountainous north (the group to which the dialect described by Reinhardt at the end of the last century belongs) bear a strong typological resemblance, at least in some major features of phonology and morphology, to those of other ancient sedentary groups living on the periphery of the peninsula (Ḥaḍramawt and Dathīna, as described by Landberg, the Shī'ī Baḥārna of eastern Arabia). The 'Umānī S reflexes of Classical *ḳ*, *k* and *ǧ* (= *ḳ*, *k*, *g*) probably represent the oldest dialectal development of the Old Arabic phonology. Broadly speaking, the 'Umānī B dialects have much in common with those of the central Arabian desert and the eastern Arabian groups which have emigrated from there to the coast over the last 200 years (most of the present-day Sunnī populations of Kuwait, Bahrain and the UAE). Thus the geographical distribution of dialect features probably reflects ancient patterns of settlement in Arabia overlaid by more recent population movements. In particular, the *-š* 2nd f.s. suffix (the *kashkasha* of the mediaeval grammarians), widespread throughout the southern half of Arabia, seems to be a very ancient feature which originated in Yemen, possibly originally as a common substrate feature of a number of ancient south Arabian languages (which now only survive with a few hundred speakers each), whence it was exported to Bahrain and 'Umān. The survival of feminine plural forms, internal passives and *tanwīn* in both the S and B dialects, rare outside Arabia, provides further evidence of the extreme linguistic conservatism of the 'Umānī dialects.

The occupational changes which have occurred since the change of régime in 1970 (especially the drift of the young male population away from the land to employment in industry, the service sector and the military); the effective reunification of the coast with the interior; and the increasingly close political and communication links with other Gulf states—all these factors have tended to blur the dialectal distinctions sketched above and led to the spread of a form of dialect based on the educated speech of the Capital Area, which itself had already long been a linguistic mélange formed out of diverse elements (including Indian languages and Swahili). This "national" dialect is an 'Umānī-influenced variety of the educated Gulf koinè now increasingly heard in the states of the Gulf Co-operation Council.

Bibliography: C. Reinhardt, *Ein arabischer Dialekt gesprochen in Oman und Zanzibar*, Stuttgart 1894, repr. Amsterdam 1972 (dialect of Banī Kharūṣ, northern sedentaries); N. Rhodokanakis, *Südarabische Expedition. Band VIII, Band X: Der vulgärarabische Dialekt im Ḍofar (Ẓfâr) I., II.* Vienna 1908, 1911 (southern 'Umānī dialects); A. Brockett, *The spoken Arabic of Khābūra*, Journal of Semitic Studies Monograph no. 7, Manchester 1985 (Bāṭina coastal dialect); C. Holes, *Towards a dialect geography of Oman*, in *BSOAS*, lii/3 (1989), 446-62; idem, *The Arabic dialects of south eastern Arabia in a socio-historical perspective*, in *ZAL*, xxxi (1996), 34-56. (C. HOLES)

'UMAR (I) B. AL-**KHAṬṬĀB**, the second caliph (*r.* 13/634-23/644), one of the great figures of early Islam, a driving force behind the early conquests and the creation of the early Islamic empire.

There is some contradiction among the historical and biographical traditions on 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, and many of these contain exaggerated or legendary details. However, a consistent character emerges out of this material: stern, strong-willed, prone to anger, devoted to Muḥammad, the Ḳur'ān and Islam, 'Umar seems to have had a coherent political programme during and even before his caliphate.

'Umar reportedly began as an enemy of the cause which he later supported with all his might. Once, upon hearing his sister Fāṭima and her husband Sa'īd b. Zayd reciting verses of the Ḳur'ān, he fell (as often) into a rage, which was soon followed by his conversion to Islam. This sudden reversal, together with his later position in the history of Islam, has led to 'Umar's being known as "the St. Paul of Islam" (see Lazarus-Yafeh in *Bibl.* below), though the two seem actually to have had little in common other than their stubborn energy in championing the cause against which they had originally fought. 'Umar's conversion is often placed in his 26th year, four years before the *hiḏjra* [*q.v.*] in 1/622; the resulting figure of 30 for the beginning of the new age may have its own significance (Conrad, *Abraha and Muhammad*). As a member of the 'Adī b. Ka'b, a minor clan of Ḳuraysh [*q.v.*], and the son of a Makhzūmī mother, 'Umar could not assert much influence, though he may have tried to do so (Watt, *Muhammad at Mecca*, 7, 91-2). It was only after the migration to Yathrib/Medina that 'Umar emerged as a principal organiser of the new theocratic state. He played the part of counsellor more than that of soldier; although he took part in Badr, Uḥud [*q.vv.*] and later battles, little is recorded of his military exploits, unlike the cases of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib [*q.v.*] and other Companions. He is said to have claimed that at least three Ḳur'ānic verses were revealed at his request (II, 125; XXXIII, 53; and LXVI, 6), and everything indicates that he had the Prophet's ear. Despite the differences in their characters, harmony prevailed between 'Umar and Abū Bakr [*q.v.*] during this period. Even 'Umar's becoming, like Abū Bakr, father-in-law to the Prophet through the marriage of his daughter Ḥafṣa, provoked no jealousy between them. 'Umar was unquestionably the superior intellect in the circle around the Prophet, and he avoided the limelight both during Muḥam-

mad's lifetime and during the brief caliphate of Abū Bakr. However, Lammens' theory of a "triumvirate" of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and Abū ʿUbayda b. al-Djarrāḥ [*q.v.*] which would have dominated the Prophet and monopolised his authority, either directly or through his wives ʿĀʾisha bt. Abī Bakr and Ḥafṣa bt. ʿUmar [*q.vv.*], has not been generally accepted. Meanwhile, ʿUmar greatly extended his influence through strategic marriages (Lecker).

Upon the death of the Prophet in 11/632, ʿUmar played a central role in the events leading to the acclamation of Abū Bakr as caliph [see AL-SAḲĪFA]. During Abū Bakr's caliphate, ʿUmar remained close to the centre of power, advocating hard-line positions which the caliph did not always adopt. Upon Abū Bakr's death in 13/634 he achieved the caliphate in his own right. The question of whether or not the dying Abū Bakr designated ʿUmar as his successor has been much discussed by jurists and historians. Caetani (*Annali*, iii, 128) and Levi Della Vida (in the *EI*[1] version of this article) stated that ʿUmar easily assumed power *de facto* and immediately received the recognition of a majority of the Companions, in a manner similar to the nomination of a leader according to old Arab custom. Caetani also saw ʿUmar, both before and during his caliphate, as favouring the old Meccan aristocracy of Ḳuraysh (the Umayyads). Against this view, Madelung (*Succession*, 55) has pointed to resistance against ʿUmar's elevation to the caliphate on the part of members of Ḳuraysh, including field commanders such as Khālid b. al-Walīd [*q.v.*], upon whom Abū Bakr had depended; Abū Bakr would have had no choice but to designate ʿUmar in order to guarantee his succession.

When ʿUmar became caliph, the movement of conquest was already well under way. The decade of his rule saw the extension of this movement over Syria, Egypt, ʿIrāḳ and al-Djazīra, and far into Persia and other countries. The Arabic sources tend to ascribe a greater degree of central control to the caliph than was technically and perhaps even politically feasible at the time (Caetani, v, 32; Noth, *Tradition*, 12, 55-7, *passim*; idem, *Früher Islam*, 80-100). ʿUmar was nonetheless a strategic and political genius. He showed his harsher side in demoting Khālid b. al-Walīd, as he had done previously during Abū Bakr's caliphate with Khālid b. Saʿīd b. al-ʿĀṣ [*q.v.*]. He appointed able commanders such as Abū ʿUbayd b. Masʿūd and Saʿd b. Abī Waḳḳāṣ [*q.v.*], whose relatively weak tribal and local affiliations made it impossible for them to set up as independent rulers in the new territories. In other instances, ʿUmar allowed members of the Meccan aristocracy to hold important positions, as when Muʿāwiya b. Abī Sufyān [*q.v.*] succeeded his own brother Yazīd as governor in Damascus in 18/639, and when ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ [*q.v.*] took the initiative in the conquest of Egypt. Here ʿUmar recognised the limits of his own power, a sign of political aptitude; and he also sent an old Companion, al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwwām [*q.v.*], to keep an eye on ʿAmr. But for the most part, ʿUmar did not appoint respected Companions to high commands but preferred to keep an eye on them from close by, while granting them the revenues from the conquered royal domains of ʿIrāḳ and Syria [see ḌAYʿA; IḲṬāʿ; ṬALḤA].

As the conquests proceeded, ʿUmar mostly remained in Medina. An exception to this was a journey to Syria, dated to various times between 15/636 and 17/638. There is much divergence in the sources regarding this journey (or journeys). ʿUmar apparently stopped at al-Djābiya [*q.v.*], where he consulted his commanders and then, according to some versions, received a delegation from Jerusalem, who would agree to a treaty with the Muslims only if ʿUmar guaranteed it; or else, according to other accounts, he went on to Jerusalem and there received the submission of the city. Busse has shown, however, that Jerusalem had probably surrendered at least a year before, and that divergent accounts of ʿUmar's stay in Jerusalem may be related to stages in the Islamisation of the city's holy places (see AL-ḲUDS). A text, existing in a number of versions, in which ʿUmar receives the submission of the inhabitants of Jerusalem to the Muslims and formally sets out the rights and obligations of both parties, became known as the Pact or Covenant of ʿUmar (*ʿahd ʿUmar*), a foundational text of the *dhimma* [*q.v.*]. Much of the Pact has been shown to have originated in later times; here, as elsewhere, developments extending over generations have been concentrated into idealised pictures associated with the revered figure of the second caliph. For indeed, ʿUmar's caliphate has traditionally been regarded as the time in which nearly all the major political institutions of Islam had their origin, which cannot have been so in every instance.

Yet the Muslim state and the lives of its inhabitants did undergo profound changes during ʿUmar's reign. As before, the conquerors adapted (often with little change) the existing administrative structures in the new territories, as well as coinage, personnel, languages of administration and so on. But now came the institution of a register (*dīwān* [*q.v.*]; Puin, *Der Dīwān*) containing the names of all those entitled to military pensions or stipends (*ʿaṭāʾ* [*q.v.*]; see also DAFTAR; DJAYSH). In drawing up the *dīwān* and dividing revenues among the Muslims the principle of *sābiḳa*, precedence in Islam (length of adherence to the cause) was observed, together with (and partly in contradiction to) tribal and family affiliations. The institution of the *dīwān* is almost universally ascribed to ʿUmar, as is a deliberate policy—for the Sawād of ʿIrāḳ but arguably elsewhere as well—of preventing the Muslim Arabs from dispersing and settling as a landed aristocracy in the newly-conquered regions. ʿUmar intended instead that they should cluster together in towns, remaining available for further military expeditions and retaining a distinct identity as Muslim warriors. Meanwhile, they would receive stipends (*ʿaṭāʾ*) from the proceeds of taxation on the conquered peoples. Thus, while the conquered peoples enjoyed protection in their persons and property, together with the right to practise their religions, the conquered lands as a whole became a kind of trust in perpetuity for the benefit of future generations of Muslims. The land-ownership theory behind all this is complex (see FAYʾ; Schmucker, *Untersuchungen*), but there is no reason to doubt that its original impetus came during ʿUmar's caliphate. ʿUmar is likewise given credit for founding the new garrison towns, the *amṣār* which quickly grew into flourishing urban centres [see AL-BAṢRA; AL-ḲŪFA; AL-FUSṬĀṬ; MIṢR. B]. Subsequent generations of jurists and administrators added to this complex but conceptually unified system of military service, taxation and land tenure, but they continued to view it as ʿUmar's creation.

ʿUmar's other accomplishments are said to have included the creation of the office of *ḳāḍī* [*q.v.*], the new calendar which dated from the *hidjra* [see TAʾRĪḴH. I. 1. iii], and a great number of religious and civil ordinances regarding prayer, pilgrimage, fasting (see ḤADJDJ; RAMAḌĀN; ṢALĀT; ṢAWM; TARĀWĪḤ), penal law and indeed nearly every conceivable area. We cannot know how much of this is historically accurate,

but certainly 'Umar has always figured as an authority of the first rank. His role in the collection of the Ḳur'ān has been debated, but was certainly important. 'Umar also ordered the expulsion of the Christian and Jewish communities of Nadjrān and Khaybar [*q.vv.*], and forbade non-Muslims to reside in the Ḥidjāz for longer than three days.

Under 'Umar the office of caliph (see KHALĪFA) gained in solidity and prestige. Abū Bakr had styled himself *khalīfa* in the sense of successor to the Prophet (though see Crone-Hinds, 19-20, 111-12); this title remained, of course, but 'Umar also assumed the title *amīr al-mu'minīn* [*q.v.*] "Commander of the Faithful". On occasion, the sources convey a sense that 'Umar held more prestige and authority than a strict Islamic understanding of the matter would really have allowed; or to put it differently, at times his role seems less that of a St. Paul and more that of a St. John the Baptist, in danger of encroaching on the unique authority of the Founder. Uneasiness over such a role may possibly lie behind the *ḥadīth* "If God had wished for there to be another prophet after me, it would have been 'Umar" (Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad* i, 29, iv, 154; al-Muḥibb, *Manāḳib*, i, 259; cf. Lazarus-Yafeh, 7). Similarly, the epithet often associated with 'Umar, *al-Fārūḳ*, is generally understood to mean "the one who distinguishes truth from falsehood" or "the true faith from the false," but Sachau and Levi Della Vida (in *RSO*, iv, 1074-6) already detected an association between Arabic *fārūḳ* and Syriac *pārōḳā*, "saviour, redeemer" and related words in Semitic languages denoting a messianic element. Traditions on 'Umar as al-Fārūḳ are indeed connected with the *ahl al-kitāb*, especially the Jews, though the epithet is also said to have been given him by the Prophet; and some of the accounts of 'Umar's entry into Jerusalem have a messianic flavour (see Cook-Crone, 5-6; Bashear).

As caliph, 'Umar was only *primus inter pares*, and numerous anecdotes illustrate his accessibility. He nonetheless enjoyed a vast authority deriving from the respect and awe in which people held him. A stern, uncompromising character—in many anecdotes he chastises with a whip—he was no doubt more feared than loved. He was certainly famous for his temper, as in the story of his conversion, mentioned above, and in the episode of his throwing stones at the Muslim commanders at al-Djābiya when they appeared before him clad in silks and brocades (see Busse, *'Omar as conqueror*, 59, for a possible messianic aspect of some versions of this story). To the extent that 'Alī and others opposed him, they did so quietly.

Apparently, 'Umar gave little thought to the succession. He may have had Abū 'Ubayda in mind, but the latter died in any case of the plague in the year 18/639. 'Umar was assassinated, at the height of his powers (his age is given variously as 53, 55, 60, 61 and 63), on 26 Dhu 'l-Ḥidjdja 23/3 November 644, by Abū Lu'lu'a, a Christian slave of al-Mughīra b. Shu'ba [*q.v.*], then governor of Baṣra. The sources give as Abū Lu'lu'a's motive a tax against which he had appealed in vain to the caliph. Caetani (v, 40-51) thought that Abū Lu'lu'a was the instrument of a conspiracy of Companions which included 'Alī, Ṭalḥa and al-Zubayr. One of 'Umar's sons, 'Ubayd Allāh (who died at Ṣiffīn in 37), believed in such a conspiracy, but he seems to have gone insane, and Levi Della Vida and Madelung (*Succession*, 69-70) have shown that the suspicion was unfounded.

On his deathbed, 'Umar called for a council or *shūrā* [*q.v.*] to choose a successor, though this too has been disputed, as has the question of whether he actually proposed 'Uthmān b. 'Affān [*q.v.*], the council's eventual choice. At any rate, it is consistent with all that we know regarding 'Umar that he would have insisted on the principle of *shūrā*, together with that of *sābiḳa*, already mentioned. Throughout his caliphate 'Umar adhered to these two principles (Madelung, 58-9, 76-7), and yet there was contradiction between them. Thus we find 'Umar advocating the equality of all believers before God (*fī dhāt Allāh*, al-Ṭabarī, i, 2217), while at the same time favouring particular groups in the allocation of offices and revenues.

'Umar did much to provide—if not as completely as is sometimes thought—a social and political framework for the religious edifice which had begun to rise in the days of Muḥammad. But the rapid expansion of Islam which occurred during 'Umar's caliphate put that same framework at risk. Major questions remained unresolved, including that of relations between the early converts and the first Helpers (*Anṣār* [*q.v.*]) on the one hand, and the ambitious Meccan aristocracy on the other; emerging jealousies between the first Arab conquerors in the newly-conquered lands and the waves of immigrants who came after them; and the general question of whether the Arab forces scattered throughout the immense territories would accept subordination to the central authority in Medina. Modern discussions of these questions see the ruling élite as largely unified and concerned with maintaining its power over the tribesmen (Donner), or else as deeply divided (Madelung). Either way, severe tensions remained for which 'Umar's successor, 'Uthmān, would later pay the price.

Shī'ī tradition has never concealed its antipathy to 'Umar for having thwarted the claims of 'Alī and the House of the Prophet. Sunnī tradition, however, reveres 'Umar not only as a great ruler but also as one of the supreme models for all the Islamic virtues. He appears often in Sunnī *ḥadīth*, both transmitting from the Prophet and as an authority on his own, and sometimes in association with his son 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar [*q.v.*], a great jurist in his own right. In many *ḥadīth*s and in the speeches and sermons attributed to 'Umar in biographies and chronicles, he expresses concern with intention, *niyya* [*q.v.*]—a theological topic much discussed in later ages, and perhaps an instance of later retrojection upon 'Umar—and in general with what we might call the internalisation of norms. Probably less anachronistic on the whole are 'Umar's exhortations to his fellow-Muslims to follow the simple, rough style of living which he himself practised (*shiddat al-'aysh*, Ibn Sa'd, iii/1, 199-200). This stopped short of self-deprivation: himself an active and vigorous man, 'Umar is said to have denounced extreme ascetics and *mutawakkilūn* (another likely anachronism) for their weakness and dependence, and he was quoted as saying that he preferred to die while travelling in search of legitimate gain (*abtaghī min fadli 'llāhi*, cf. Ḳur'ān, II, 198, LXII, 10, LXXIII, 20), rather than in the *djihād* (al-Shaybānī, *Iktisāb*, Cairo 1938, 14, 37; *Kasb*, Damascus 1980, 40-1, 61; on 'Umar's engaging in commerce while caliph, see Ibn Sa'd, iii/1, 199, ll. 19-20). A distinctive type of symbolic poverty may be associated with 'Umar, different from that of other Islamic rulers, including the other Rāshidūn (I. Mattson) [see AL-KHULAFĀ' AL-RĀSHIDŪN, in Suppl.].

Always the paradigmatic just ruler for Sunnīs, 'Umar appears in some 20th-century works as a model for democratic leadership and other modern values. Thus in greatly different circumstances, this austere, majestic figure continues to inspire respect and awe in the community of believers.

Bibliography: Materials relating to ʿUmar were collected and analysed by Caetani, *Annali*, iii-v, index in vol. vi. These include Ibn Saʿd, iii/1, 190-274; the section of Ṭabarī's chronicle covering ʿUmar's caliphate is now translated in *The history of al-Ṭabarī*, xi, tr. Kh.Y. Blankinship, Albany 1993; xii, tr. Y. Friedmann, Albany 1992; xiii, tr. G.H.A. Juynboll, Albany 1989; xiv, tr. G.R. Smith, Albany 1994. In addition, see Ibn Shabba, *Taʾrīkh al-Madīna al-Munawwara*, Mecca 1979, esp. ii, 654-948; Shaybānī, *Iktisāb/Kasb*, Cairo 1938 and Damascus 1980; relevant sections of Balādhurī's *Ansāb*, repr. in I.Ṣ. al-ʿAmad, *al-Shaykhān Abū Bakr wa-ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb wa-wulduhumā*, Kuwait 1989; Ibn al-Djawzī, *Manāḳib Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb*, Beirut 1980; al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī, *al-Riyāḍ al-naḍira fī manāḳib al-ʿashara*, Ṭanṭā 1372/1953; Ibn ʿAsākir, *Taʾrīkh Dimashḳ*, i, Damascus n.d.; Ibn Ḥadjar, *Iṣāba*, Cairo 1970, iv, 588-91. See also I. Goldziher, *Spottnamen der ersten Chalifen bei den Schiʿiten*, in *WZKM*, xv (1901), 321-34; E. Sachau, *Über den zweiten Chalifen Omar. Ein Charakterbild*, in *SBBayer. Ak.* (1902); H. Lammens, *Le "triumvirat" Aboû Bakr, ʿOmar et Aboû ʿObaida*, in *MFOB*, iv (1910), 113-44; G. Levi Della Vida, rev. of Caetani, *Annali*, v, in *RSO*, iv (1912), 1057-79; W.M. Watt, *Muhammad at Mecca*, Oxford 1953; S. al-Ṭamāwī, *ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb wa-uṣūl al-siyāsa wa 'l-idāra al-ḥadīṯha*, Cairo 1969; G. Puin, *Der Dīwān von ʿUmar ibn al-Ḫaṭṭāb. Ein Beitrag zur frühislamischen Verwaltungsgeschichte*, Bonn 1970; W. Schmucker, *Untersuchungen zu einigen wichtigen bodenrechtlichen Konsequenzen der islamischen Eroberungsbewegung*, Bonn 1972; M. Cook and P. Crone, *Hagarism*, Cambridge 1977; Gh.ʿA. al-Ḳurashī, *Awwaliyyāt al-Fārūḳ al-siyāsiyya*, Riyāḍ 1401/1981; H. Lazarus-Yafeh, *ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb—Paul of Islam?* in eadem, *Some religious aspects of Islam*, Leiden 1981, 1-16; F. Donner, *The early Islamic conquests*, Princeton 1981; H. Busse, *ʿOmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb in Jerusalem*, in *JSAI*, v (1984), 73-119; idem, *ʿOmar's image as the conqueror of Jerusalem*, in *JSAI*, viii (1986), 149-68; P. Crone and M. Hinds, *God's Caliph*, Cambridge 1986; L. Conrad, *Abraha and Muhammad: some observations apropos of chronology and literary topoi*, in *BSOAS*, l (1987), 225-40; S. Bashear, *The title* Fārūq *and its association with ʿUmar I*, in *St. Isl.*, lxxii (1990), 47-70; A. Noth, *Früher Islam*, in U. Haarmann (ed.), *Geschichte der arabischen Welt*, Munich 1987, 11-100; idem, *The early Arabic historical tradition: a source-critical study*, Princeton 1994; W. Madelung, *The succession to Muhammad*, Cambridge 1997; M. Lecker, *The Medinan wives of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb and his brother Zayd*, in *Isl.*, forthcoming; work in progress by I. Mattson (symbolic poverty) and R. Fulton (ʿUmar as messianic figure).

(G. LEVI DELLA VIDA-[M. BONNER])

ʿUMAR (II) B. ʿABD AL-ʿAZĪZ b. Marwān b. al-Ḥakam, Abū Ḥafṣ al-Ashadjdj, fifth caliph of the Marwānid branch of the Umayyad dynasty [*q.v.*], reigned 99/717 to 101/720.

ʿUmar was probably born in Medina, around 60/680, although some sources say that he was born in Egypt. He spent his early years in both places, especially in Ḥulwān in Egypt, where his father resided as governor in the years 65-86/686-705. Nevertheless, it was in Medina that ʿUmar was educated, and it was there that he allegedly first associated with prominent pious figures and *muḥaddiṯūn*. After ʿUmar's father died, his uncle, the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik [*q.v.*], summoned ʿUmar to Damascus to confirm a marriage between ʿUmar and the caliph's daughter Fāṭima. Shortly thereafter, ʿAbd al-Malik's son and successor al-Walīd I [*q.v.*] named ʿUmar as governor of Medina. Both of these acts may be seen as propitiatory gestures designed to soften relations between two rival branches of the Marwānid family.

ʿUmar arrived at his new post in Medina in Rabīʿ I 87/February-March 706; his jurisdiction later included Mecca and Ṭāʾif as well. Little is known of his activities as governor, but it is said that he immediately set out to govern in close association with the *fuḳahāʾ* of the Prophet's city. Most accounts depict ʿUmar as a just governor, often leading the pilgrimage, and being especially reverent to pious figures like Saʿīd b. al-Musayyab [see FUḲAHĀʾ AL-MADĪNA AL-SABʿA. VI, in Suppl.], although others describe the young ʿUmar as worldly and over-indulgent. In 88/707, ʿUmar oversaw the expansion of the Mosque of the Prophet at al-Walīd's request. However, Umar's lenient government in the Ḥidjāz may well have been his undoing there. It was to the Ḥidjāz that some ʿIrāḳīs fled to avoid the harsher treatment of al-Ḥadjdjādj b. Yūsuf [*q.v.*], the powerful and irascible governor of ʿIrāḳ, and it was under pressure from al-Ḥadjdjādj that ʿUmar was recalled from his post in Shaʿbān 93/May-June 712.

ʿUmar appears to have spent the next years of his life attached to the Umayyad court in Damascus, where, with the influential Radjāʾ b. Ḥaywa al-Kindī [*q.v.* in Suppl.], he was an unofficial counsellor to the caliph Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik [*q.v.*]. In 97/716, for example, he accompanied Sulaymān on his pilgrimage to Mecca, stopping in Jerusalem on their return. When Sulaymān became ill at Dābiḳ [*q.v.*] in northern Syria while on campaign in 98/716, Radjāʾ was able to persuade him to name ʿUmar as his successor with Yazīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik [*q.v.*] to follow, in contradiction to ʿAbd al-Malik's earlier wish that the succession remain solely among his own descendants. Although this sudden change evoked some opposition from the line of ʿAbd al-Malik, the oath of allegiance to ʿUmar was secured, and ʿUmar was proclaimed caliph on 10 Ṣafar 99/22 September 717.

During his short reign as caliph, ʿUmar's activities involved both military matters and domestic concerns. ʿUmar has often been portrayed as a pacifist caliph, but it was more likely his concern over the dwindling caliphal treasury that dictated his stance on military affairs. Thus, in 99/717, ʿUmar did order the armies engaged in the costly and probably fruitless siege of Constantinople to be lifted, and the frontier with Byzantium to be withdrawn to the region of Malaṭya. However, he was still willing to send troops in that same year against the Turks, who had launched destructive attacks into Ādharbāydjān, and the traditional summer raids continued unabated. Similarly, in 100/718, he ordered first an ʿIrāḳī and then a Syrian army to be sent against Khawāridj rebels under Shawdhab (or Bisṭām) al-Yashkurī in ʿIrāḳ, although some sources relate that the rebels were placated through diplomatic means.

ʿUmar was also active in the internal affairs of the caliphate. Like other caliphs, he appointed and removed provincial governors as he saw fit. The most famous example is ʿUmar's removal and imprisonment of the Azdī notable Yazīd b. al-Muhallab [see MUHALLABIDS], who had evidently reneged on promises of revenues that he had raised as Sulaymān's governor of ʿIrāḳ and the East. But ʿUmar is best known for his fiscal policies, although these policies still remain unclear. His famous "fiscal rescript" is not a document, but a text preserved in Ibn ʿAbd al Ḥakam's