

# JERUZALEM U RANOISLAMSKOJ TRADICIJI



## JERUSALEM IN EARLY ISLAMIC TRADITION

**Boris Havel**

Odsjek za komparativnu politiku / *Department of Comparative Politics*

Fakultet političkih znanosti, Sveučilište u Zagrebu / *Faculty of Political Science, University of Zagreb*

Lepušićeva 6

HR – 10000 Zagreb

boris.havel@fpzg.hr

UDK / UDC

94:297](569.4Jeruzalem)

DOI: 10.15291/misc.2748

Izvorni znanstveni rad / *Original scientific paper*

Primljeno / *Received*: 22. X. 2018.

### Abstract

U članku su opisane ključne ranoislamske tradicije prema kojima se Jeruzalem smatra trećim po važnosti svetim gradom u islamu. Iz perspektive vjerskih, međuvjerskih, političkih i povijesnih okolnosti analiziran je njihov sadržaj te su razmotreni mogući razlozi za nastanak tih tradicija. Pozornost je posvećena tekstualnim i materijalnim vrelima, razini njihove autentičnosti, datiranju, te njihovu tumačenju od strane uglednih orijentalista i povjesničara umjetnosti. U članku su obrađene pojedinačne teme, kao što je Jeruzalem u islamskim kanonskim tekstovima, Muhamedovo noćno putovanje u el-Aksu, legende o Omarovu osvajanju Jeruzalema, imena Jeruzalema u djelima ranoislamskih ljetopisaca, uloga Židova i židovskih obrćenika u nastanku ranoislamskih tradicija te izgradnja, ukrasi, inskripcije i simbolika Kupole nad Stijenom. Autor u zaključku razmatra pitanje u kolikoj je mjeri religijsko čašćenje Jeruzalema u islamu povezano s autohtonim ranoislamskim vjerskim tradicijama, a u kojoj s ranom muslimansko-židovskom interakcijom te političkim procesima, od unutarislamskoga raskola u vrijeme prelaska rašidunske vlasti na umajadsku i Abdul-Malikova sukoba s hidžaskim kalifom el-Zubeirom, preko Križarskih ratova, do današnjega arapsko-izraelskog sukoba.

**KLJUČNE RIJEČI:** Jeruzalem; islam; muslimani; Židovi; kalifat; el-Kuds; Brdo Hrama; *el-haram eš-šarif*; Kupola nad Stijenom; komparativna religija

### Abstract

The article describes major early Islamic traditions in which Jerusalem has been designated as the third holiest city in Islam. Their content has been analyzed based on the historical context and religious, inter-religious and political circumstances in which they were forged. Particular attention has been paid to textual and material sources, their authenticity, dating and their interpretation by prominent orientalist and art historians. The article addresses specific themes, such as Jerusalem in Islamic canonical texts, Muhammad's Night Journey to al-Aqṣā, the legends of Caliph 'Umar's conquest of Jerusalem, names for Jerusalem in Early Islamic chronicles, the influence of Jews and Jewish converts on early Islamic traditions, and the construction, symbolism, ornaments, and inscriptions of the Dome of the Rock. In the concluding remarks the author considers the question of to what degree attributing holiness to Jerusalem in Islam has been based on autochthonous early Islamic religious traditions, and to what degree on Muslim-Jewish interaction in Palestine, political processes, such as *fitnah* during early Umayyad rule, 'Abd al-Malik's struggle with Caliph Ibn al-Zubayr in the Hejaz, the Crusades, and the present-day Arab-Israeli conflict.

**KEYWORDS:** Jerusalem; Islam; Muslims; Jews; Caliphate; al-Quds; Temple Mount; al-Haram al-Sharif; Dome of the Rock; Comparative Religion

## 1. UVOD: JERUZALEM KAO OBJEKT ČEŽNJE I SUKOBA

Bogata i uzbudljiva povijest Jeruzalema tema je golemoga historiografskog opusa i predmet brojnih analiza, pa se lako stječe dojam kako o tome fascinantnom i intrigantnom gradu znamo sve što je relevantno.<sup>1</sup> Grad čiju svetost prepoznaju sve tri velike monoteističke religije nametnuo se kao česta tema sakralnih predaja, drevnih pripovijesti, ezoteričnih mitova i zagonetnih legendi, znanstvene polemike, duhovnih čežnja i religijskih nadmetanja, a u posljednjih pola stoljeća i sve žešćih političkih i vojnih sukoba te sigurnosnih izazova. Ipak, svetost Jeruzalema za islam i muslimane na Zapadu donedavno je uglavnom bila poznata samo kao suhi činjenični podatak; njegov su kontekst i sadržaj zapadnjacima bili skoro sasvim strani. Tek u posljednje vrijeme ta se svetost ozbiljnije i, barem naizgled, dublje prepoznaje u međunarodnim političkim kontekstima, ali i onima koji istupaju kao kulturni i povijesni. To je između ostaloga rezultiralo rezolucijama UNESCO-a od listopada 2015.,<sup>2</sup> travnja 2016.<sup>3</sup> te UNESCO-ova Odbora za svjetsku baštinu od srpnja 2017.<sup>4</sup> Iz tih se dokumenata iščitava sklonost da se Jeruzalem poglavito naglasi kao islamsko svetište: grad u kojem

<sup>1</sup> Ovaj je članak proširena inačica predavanja *Jeruzalem u ranoislamskoj tradiciji* održanog 10. studenoga 2017. na Odjelu za povijest Sveučilišta u Zadru.

Zahvalan sam M. Šaronu, profesoru Islamskih i bliskoistočnih studija s Hebrejskog sveučilišta u Jeruzalemu za dragocjene savjete o izvorima i tumačenju ranoislamskih tekstova koje sam primio tijekom pisanja ovoga članka, mnogih ranijih razgovora te Šaronovih predavanja kojima sam nazočio kao student. Odgovornost za interpretacije, zaključke i moguće pogreške isključivo je moja.

<sup>2</sup> <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002351/235180e.pdf> (pregledano 11. studenoga 2017.)

<sup>3</sup> <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002443/244378e.pdf> (pregledano 11. studenoga 2017.)

<sup>4</sup> <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2017/whc17-41com-18-en.pdf> (pregledano 11. studenoga 2017.) Zbog tih i sličnih odluka Država Izrael koncem 2017. odlučila je istupiti iz UNESCO-a.

## 1. INTRODUCTION: JERUSALEM AS AN OBJECT OF LONGING AND CONFLICT

The rich and exciting history of Jerusalem is the topic of an enormous historiographic opus and the object of numerous analyses. Consequently, one easily gets the impression that we know all that is relevant about that fascinating and intriguing city.<sup>1</sup> The city, whose holiness is recognized by all three great monotheistic religions, imposed itself as the frequent topic of sacred traditions, ancient narratives, esoteric myths and perplexing legends, academic polemics, spiritual longings and religious competitions. In the last fifty years or so it has become the stage of fierce political and military struggles, challenging the security of Israel and other Middle Eastern countries. However, the holiness of Jerusalem for Islam and Muslims has been, up until rather recently, known in the West only as a matter of factual information; its context and contents have been almost completely foreign to westerners. It is only recently that Jerusalem's holiness in Islam has been more seriously and, at least seemingly, more deeply recognized in international political contexts, as well as in those that are cultural and historical. That has, *inter alia*, resulted in the UNESCO resolutions of October 2015<sup>2</sup> and April 2016,<sup>3</sup> and the UNESCO World Heritage Committee resolution from July 2017.<sup>4</sup> From these documents one may detect tendencies to primarily identify Jerusalem as an Islamic sanctuary: the city in which the Al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf is found along

<sup>1</sup> This paper is an expanded version of the lecture *Jerusalem in Early Islamic Tradition* held on November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2017 at the Department of History of the University of Zadar.

I am thankful to Moshe Sharon, professor of Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, for his advice on the sources and interpretations of early Islamic texts, which I received both as his student, and in many later conversations and correspondences. The responsibility for the interpretations, conclusions and possible mistakes is entirely mine.

<sup>2</sup> <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002351/235180e.pdf>, accessed 11/11/2017.

<sup>3</sup> <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002443/244378e.pdf>, accessed 11/11/2017.

<sup>4</sup> <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2017/whc17-41com-18-en.pdf>, accessed 11/11/2017. Due to these and other, similar decisions, the State of Israel decided to drop out of UNESCO at the end of 2017.

se nalazi *el-haram eš-šarif* i uz njega zid *el-burak*.<sup>5</sup> Politička poruka koju ti dokumenti ipak prenose očita je i nije nova; ona je dosljedna sveukupnoj interakciji niza međunarodnih organizacija koje u posljednjih nekoliko desetljeća djeluju pod pokroviteljstvom UN-a s jedne strane te Države Izraela s druge. Ono što je novo jest upoznavanje neislamskog svijeta s islamskim narativom o Jeruzalemu, poglavito kroz uključivanje Jeruzalema u tu interakciju i u arapsko-izraelsku političku polemiku.

Zbog toga prostor koji se u kršćanskom svijetu tradicionalno povezivao gotovo isključivo sa židovskim Hramom, uključujući – dakako – novozavjetne priče o Isusu i njegovim učenicima koje su se zbile u Hramu i oko njega, danas više no ikad plijeni pozornost egzotičnim islamskim pripovijestima te veličanstvenim islamskim građevinama čiji pitoreskni ukrasi neke od tih pripovijesti prenose još od ranoga srednjeg vijeka. No, u srednjem je vijeku, pa i puno kasnije, sve do prije nekoliko desetljeća, malo tko na Zapadu znao kako izgleda Jeruzalem i njegov središnji dio, Brdo Hrama.<sup>6</sup> Isto je vrijedilo i za tradicije što ih je iznjedrio islam. Uz iznimku

<sup>5</sup> Arapski i hebrejski pojmovi objašnjeni su u tekstu. Prijevodi na hrvatski, uključujući i dijelove preuzete iz znanstvenih članaka i knjiga na engleskom jeziku, autorovi su. Nazivlje koje je transkribirano i transliterirano s hebrejskoga ili arapskog u ovome je članku pisano malim slovima jer u arapskom i hebrejskom jeziku nema malih i velikih slova. Transkribirane i transliterirane riječi pisane su kurzivom. Velika su slova ipak korištena ondje gdje se radi o poznatim ili citiranim djelima (*Sirat rasul Allah*, *Futuh el-Makdis*) te imenima (Jerušalajim, el-Kuds) koja u tom slučaju uglavnom nisu pisana kurzivom. Stoga su, ovisno o kontekstu, neke riječi pisane katkad malim početnim slovom, a katkad velikim. Transliteracija i transkripcija s hebrejskoga i arapskog na hrvatski rađena je izravno, a ne preko engleskog jezika, te je (s određenim iznimkama) u skladu s naputcima predloženima u B. HAVEL & M. KASAPOVIĆ, 2016: xvii-xxii.

<sup>6</sup> Iznimku su, naravno, činili Židovi, narod koji je Jeruzalem i učinio poznatim. Židovi su imali puno više znanja o Jeruzalemu kao središtu svoje vjere (primjerice u Psalmu 137:5 čitamo: „Nek’ se osuši desnica moja, Jeruzaleme, ako tebe zaboravim! Nek’ mi se jezik za nepce prilijepi ako spomen tvoj smetnem ja ikada, ako ne stavim Jeruzalem vrh svake radosti svoje!“), a potom i eshatoloških nadanja. Židovi diljem *galuta* tijekom čitave su povijesti održavali kakvu-takvu povezanost sa židovskim zajednicama iz Jeruzalema i Palestine.

with the wall of Al-Buraq.<sup>5</sup> The political message conveyed by those documents is overt and not new; it is consistent with interaction of many of the UN’s international organizations and the State of Israel for the past few decades. What is new is the introduction of the Islamic narrative about Jerusalem to the non-Islamic world, essentially by including Jerusalem in that interaction and in Arab-Israeli political polemics.

Thus has the place, linked in the Christian world traditionally almost exclusively to the Jewish Temple due to Biblical stories about Jesus and his disciples which occurred in and around the Temple became attractive as never before also because of exotic Muslim narratives, and magnificent Islamic buildings whose picturesque ornaments have transposed some of these narratives since the Early Middle Ages. Throughout history, up until just a few decades ago, few in the West knew what Jerusalem and its central part, the Temple Mount, looked like.<sup>6</sup> The same is true of the traditions about Jerusalem produced by Islam. With the exception of orientalist, archaeologist,<sup>7</sup> art historians and their

<sup>5</sup> Hebrew and Arabic terms are explained in the text. Translations to Croatian, including parts taken from academic papers and books in English, are those of the author. Most terms transliterated from Hebrew or Arabic are written with lowercase letters since there are no capital letters in Hebrew and Arabic. Transliterated words are written in italics. Capital letters are used where there are well-known or cited work (*Sirat Rasul Allah*, *Futuh al-Maqdis*) or names (Yerushalayim, al-Quds), which are not written in italics. For this reason, depending on the context, some words are written sometimes with a lowercase and sometimes with a capital letter. Transliteration and transcription from Hebrew and Arabic to Croatian has been done directly and not through English according to guidelines found in B. HAVEL & M. KASAPOVIĆ, 2016: xvii-xxii.

<sup>6</sup> Jews, the people who made Jerusalem famous, were obviously an exception. They had far more knowledge about Jerusalem as the center of their faith and eschatological hope. In the words of Psalmist: “If I forget you, Jerusalem, may my right hand forget its skill. May my tongue cling to the roof of my mouth if I do not remember you, if I do not consider Jerusalem my highest joy” (Psalm 137: 5-6, NIV). Jews in the *galut* (exile) maintained contacts with the Jewish communities in Jerusalem and Palestine throughout history.

<sup>7</sup> Academic research and excavations in Palestine were intensified from the mid-nineteenth century, mostly due to enterprises of British archaeologists. Texts from that era, and many translations of earlier texts, including primary sources, have been published by the Palestine Pilgrims’ Text Society. Many of their texts are available at the website <https://archive.org/search.php?query=creator%3A%22Palestine+Pilgrims%27+Text+Society%2C+London%22> (accessed 1/31/2018).

orijentalista, arheologa,<sup>7</sup> povjesničara umjetnosti i njihovih učenika, malo ih je tko poznao i malo su koga osobito zanimalo.<sup>8</sup> O Jeruzalemu je pisano mnogo, ali se – kako opaža Oleg Grabar, jedan od najvećih stručnjaka za islamsku arhitekturu Jeruzalema – većina tekstova odnosila na židovsku povijest grada od Davida do Heroda te razdoblje potkraj osmanske vladavine u 19. stoljeću.<sup>9</sup> Europski hodočasnici u Jeruzalem i oni koji su po njihovu povratku slušali o Svetom gradu činili su promil europske populacije, a hodočasničke priče prvenstveno su se odnosile na teme zanimljive kršćanima.<sup>10</sup> Pojavom masovnih medija šira je javnost postala vizualno upoznata s ljepotama Jeruzalema. Ipak, čestom temom Jeruzalem je postao tek nakon Šestodnevno rata, kad je ujedinjen pod izraelskom političkom vlašću, a islamski, ponajprije arapski svijet, pokrenuo niz kampanja kako bi pred međunarodnom

<sup>7</sup> Znanstvena istraživanja i iskapanja u Palestini intenzivirana su od sredine 19. stoljeća, u čemu su prednjačili britanski arheolozi. Korisne tekstove iz toga razdoblja kao i niz prijevoda ranijih tekstova, uključujući i primarne izvore, objavila je londonska organizacija Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society. Mnogi njihovi tekstovni dostupni su na stranici <https://archive.org/search.php?query=creator%3A%22Palestine+Pilgrims%27+Text+Society%2C+London%22> (pregledano 31. siječnja 2018.).

<sup>8</sup> Usp. J. LASSNER, 2017: 2.

<sup>9</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 15.

<sup>10</sup> Vidjeti primjerice M. MODRIĆ, 2016, gdje autor opisuje povijest franjevačke Kustodije Svete zemlje, a osobito putopis fra Vjenceslava Bilušića iz 1937. koji se u opsežnom opisu Jeruzalema uopće ne osvrće na temu muslimanskog štovanja Jeruzalema (M. MODRIĆ, 2016: 220-275). U kratkom poglavlju naslovljenom *Hramski trg* fra Vjenceslav ne stavlja pod upit da je tu bio židovski Hram te prenosi Isusovo proroštvo o njegovu uništenju iz Marka 13:1-2. O Kupoli nad stijenom, koju (netočno) naziva Omarovom džamijom piše samo ovo: „Omarova džamija diže se na mjestu gdje je bio Hram Salomonov. Sagrađena je u pravilnom osmerokutu. Taj spomenik pun je ljepote i veličanstvenosti; ipak kršćansko srce ne može tu naći nikakva zanosa ili ljepote“ (M. MODRIĆ, 2016: 272). Određenu iznimku predstavlja Twainovo djelo *The Innocents Abroad, or The New Pilgrims' Progress*, izvorno tiskano 1869. Twain opisuje i posjet „Omarovoj mošeji“ te navodi neke islamske tradicije koje je čuo od lokalnoga vodiča, no prenosi ih s cinizmom koji katkad prelazi u suptilnu podrugljivost (u dijelu u kojem opisuje vodičevo objašnjenje da svaki musliman ostavlja čuperak kose za koji ga Muhamed povuče u nebo i izbavi iz pakla što se nalazi ispod Omarove mošeje Twain zaključuje: „Većina onih koje sam vidio trebalo bi da tako i tako ostane s prokletima, bez obzira kako su ošišani“ (M. TWAIN, 1964: 191-194).

students, almost no one was aware of their existence, and almost no one was particularly interested in them.<sup>8</sup> Much has been written on Jerusalem but, as pointed by Oleg Grabar, one of the foremost experts on the Islamic architecture of Jerusalem, most texts dealt with the Jewish history of the city from David to Herod and the last decades of the Ottoman rule in Palestine.<sup>9</sup> European pilgrims to Jerusalem and those who heard their stories about the Holy City upon their return made up a small percentage of Europe's population. Even so pilgrims' stories primarily concerned topics of interest to Christians.<sup>10</sup> With the mass media advancement, a wider public became visually acquainted with beauties of Jerusalem. Yet the Holy City became a frequent topic of discussion only after the Six-Day War, when it was united under Israeli political rule. The Islamic, generally Arab world, initiated a series of campaigns in order to contest Israel's right to control Jerusalem, or at least over its eastern part with the Old City and the Temple Mount. As part of that political endeavor Muslims began to acquaint the Western world, as well as many uninformed co-religionists of theirs, with the traditions through which Islam attributes holiness to Jerusalem.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. J. LASSNER, 2017: 2.

<sup>9</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 15.

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, M. MODRIĆ, 2016, where the author describes history of the Franciscan Custody of the Holy Land, especially the travels of Franciscan Vjenceslav Bilušić from 1937 who, in a comprehensive description of Jerusalem, did not reflect on the city's importance for Muslims at all (M. MODRIĆ, 2016: 220-275). In a short chapter entitled *The Temple Square* Bilušić does not question that the Jewish Temple stood there and cites Jesus' prophecy from Mark 13: 1-2 about its destruction. On the Dome of the Rock, which he incorrectly calls 'Umar's mosque he writes only: "'Umar's mosque rises from the place where the Temple of Solomon stood. It is constructed as an octagon. That monument is full of beauty and majesty. Yet, the Christian heart cannot find any inspiration or beauty in it" (M. MODRIĆ, 2016: 272). Mark Twain's *The Innocents Abroad, or The New Pilgrims' Progress* originally published in 1869, is to a degree an exception to what is said above. Twain describes the visit to the "Mosque of 'Umar" and refers to some Islamic traditions which he heard from a local guide, but he retells them with cynicism which at times transposes into subtle mocking. He describes the guide's explanation that every Muslim leaves a lock of hair by which Muhammad pulls him into the Heaven and out of the Hell that is found under 'Umar's mosque, and concludes: "The most of them that I have seen ought to stay with the damned, any how, without reference to how they were barbed" (M. TWAIN, 1984: 462).

zajednicom Izraelcima pokušao osporiti pravo na vlast nad Jeruzalemom ili barem njegovim istočnim dijelom u kojemu se nalazi Stari grad i Brdo Hrama. Kao dio toga političkog nastojanja muslimani su zapadni svijet, ali i mnoge neupućene istovjerce, počeli upoznavati s tradicijama kojima islam Jeruzalemu atribuirira značajke svetosti.

Premda je Jeruzalem, kako ćemo vidjeti, od najranijega islamskog razdoblja na neki način bio prisutan u islamskim pripovijestima, povjesničaru je teško ne uočiti kako se golem dio muslimanskoga svijeta prisjetio važnosti Jeruzalema tek u kontekstu političkog nadmetanja sa Židovima, jer je Jeruzalem tijekom stoljeća pod islamskom vlašću uglavnom bio zapostavljen, gotovo zaboravljen grad. Muslimani, za razliku od kršćana i kasnije Židova, nisu pokazivali ni zanimanje za arheološka istraživanja svoje povijesti. Svrha opsežnih iskapanja i istraživanja oko Brda Hrama koja su proveli Charles Warren, Charles Wilson i drugi arheolozi sredinom 19. stoljeća bila je „izmjeriti, nacrtati i snimiti svaki dio Svetoga grada zanimljiv kršćanskim i židovskim vjernicima, ili staretnarima i povjesničarima u potrazi za ambijentom u kojem su se odvijala biblijska zbivanja.“<sup>11</sup> Grabar navodi kako je prvo značajnije djelo posvećeno islamskom Jeruzalemu objavljeno tek 1922. i 1927.<sup>12</sup> Muslimansko-židovski sukob oko Jeruzalema započeo je ranih 1920-ih muslimanskim nasiljem nad Židovima.<sup>13</sup> Tijekom izraelskog Rata za nezavisnost 1948.–1949. jordanske su postrojbe zauzele istočni dio Jeruzalema, a Židovi su protjerani iz Staroga grada. U njega su se vratili 1967., a gubitak Jeruzalema za muslimanski je svijet bio šok od kojeg se nikada nije oporavio. Sukob oko Jeruzalema, poglavito oko prostora Brda Hrama, danas je jedan od najintenzivnijih na svijetu, a izgledi za postizanje dogovora prihvatljiva objema stranama u trenutku pisanja ovoga članka gotovo su nikakvi.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 16.

<sup>12</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 16. Radi se o djelu švicarskog znanstvenika Maxa van Berchema *Matériaux pour un Corpus inscriptionum Arabicarum* koje je u tri sveska objavio Francuski institut u Kairu. Na stranici [archive.org](https://archive.org/djelo) djelo je dostupno u izdanju iz 1894. (<https://archive.org/stream/materiauxpourunc00berc#page/n7/mode/2up>, pregledano 5. travnja 2018.).

<sup>13</sup> Više o početnim sukobima v. B. HAVEL, 2013: 499-502.

<sup>14</sup> Više o ulozi Jeruzalema i osobito Brda Hrama u arapsko-izraelskom i muslimansko-židovskom sukobu v., primjerice, M. MA'OZ, 2014: 60-70.

Notwithstanding presence of Jerusalem in Muslim narratives from Islam's earliest era, a historian can hardly overlook the fact that vast parts of the Muslim world remember the importance of Jerusalem only in the context of its rather recent political contest with the Jews. During the previous centuries under Muslim rule, Jerusalem was mostly a neglected, almost forgotten city. Muslims, unlike Christians and later Jews, did not show much interest in the archaeological research of the city in pursuit of their own history. The intent of extensive excavation and research around the Temple Mount conducted by Charles Warren, Charles Wilson and other archaeologists in the mid-nineteenth century was “to measure, draw, and capture every part of the Holy City for Christian and Jewish believers or for antiquarians and historians in search of the setting for biblical events.”<sup>11</sup> Grabar points out that the first significant work dedicated to Islamic Jerusalem was not published until 1922 and 1927.<sup>12</sup> The Muslim-Jewish dispute over Jerusalem began in the early 1920s with Muslims' violent attacks against Jews.<sup>13</sup> During the Israeli War of Independence 1948–1949 Jordanian troops occupied the eastern part of Jerusalem and expelled Jews from the Old City. Israel returned to East Jerusalem in 1967, and Muslim loss of the city to Jews was a shock from which the Muslim world never recovered. The dispute over Jerusalem, primarily over the area of the Temple Mount, is one of the most intensive in the modern world, and the odds of coming to an agreement acceptable to both sides are virtually non-existent at this point.<sup>14</sup>

In his 1996 book *The Shape of the Holy*, Grabar wrote that “new concern for medieval, and more specifically early medieval, Jerusalem has arisen over the past fifteen to twenty years for reasons both political, in a broad and generally very favorable sense of the word, and scholarly.”<sup>15</sup> It should be pointed out that

<sup>11</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 16.

<sup>12</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 16. The French Institute in Cairo published the work of Swiss researcher Max van Berchem *Matériaux pour un Corpus inscriptionum Arabicarum* in three volumes. The 1894 edition of the work is available at [archive.org](https://archive.org/stream/materiauxpourunc00berc#page/n7/mode/2up) (<https://archive.org/stream/materiauxpourunc00berc#page/n7/mode/2up>, accessed 4/5/2018).

<sup>13</sup> For more on the initial conflicts see B. HAVEL, 2013: 499-502.

<sup>14</sup> For more on the role of Jerusalem and especially the Temple Mount in the Arab-Israeli and Muslim-Jewish conflict see, for example, M. MA'OZ, 2014: 60-70.

<sup>15</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 17.

Grabar u svojem glasovitom djelu *The Shape of the Holy* iz 1996. piše kako je zanimanje za Jeruzalem iz razdoblja ranoga srednjeg vijeka poraslo u posljednjih petnaest-dvadeset godina „iz razloga koji su kako politički, u širem i općenito veoma pozitivnom smislu te riječi, tako i znanstveni.“<sup>15</sup> Ja bih ipak upozorio kako u znanstvenom istraživanju ranoislamskoga<sup>16</sup> Jeruzalema i dalje prednjače kršćanski – Grabar, primjerice – te poglavito židovski arheolozi, povjesničari i arabisti – među ostalima Dan Bahat, S. D. Goitein, Michael Avi-Yonah, Moshe Gil, M. J. Kister, Myriam Rosen-Ayalon, Moshe Sharon i Jacob Lassner, čija nedavno objavljena monografija *Medieval Jerusalem: Forging an Islamic City in Spaces Sacred to Christians and Jews* predstavlja možda najbolju znanstvenu kompilaciju znanja o ranoislamskom Jeruzalemu do danas. Tek posljednjih desetljeća učestalije se javljaju muslimanski znanstvenici, a njihovi zapaženi radovi o temi ranoislamskog Jeruzalema mogu se, između ostaloga, pronaći u Brillovu godišnjaku *Muqarnas*<sup>17</sup> u kojemu je naglasak na temama iz islamske arhitekture i umjetnosti.

Politički sukob nije potaknuo samo znanstvena istraživanja, nego je iznjedrio i neke nove muslimanske tvrdnje, vezane kako za židovsku povijest, tako i za islamsku teologiju i tradiciju. Glede prvoga, posljednjih se desetljeća može čuti apsurdna tvrdnja kako u Jeruzalemu nikada nisu postojali nikakvi židovski hramovi.<sup>18</sup> Glede potonjega, Jeruzalem je, primjerice,

<sup>15</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 17.

<sup>16</sup> Pridjev *ranoislamski* u ovome tekstu odnosi se poglavito na razdoblje od nastanka islama do prve polovice drugoga hidžretskog stoljeća, odnosno do kraja umajadskog razdoblja. No, budući da je golema većina izvora nastala kasnije, kao i zbog niza nejasnoća po pitanju datiranja tekstualnih i materijalnih izvora, uključeni su i tekstovi i tradicije koji su nastali do konca 10. stoljeća. U kontekstu Križarskih ratova i kasnijih zbivanja javljaju se nove tradicije, koje nisu središnji predmet ove studije, premda sam se na nekim mjestima referirao i na njih.

<sup>17</sup> Više o časopisu i sadržaju pojedinih svezaka: <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/journals/22118993> (pregledano 6. travnja 2018.).

<sup>18</sup> Više o tome fenomenu v. D. GOLD, 2007: 11-18; D. BARNETT, 2011 i F. M. LOEWENBERG, 2013. Izgledno prvi islamski vjerski autoritet koji je, doduše ambigvitetno, doveo u pitanje postojanje Salomonova hrama bio je veliki jeruzalemski muftija iz 1920-ih i 1930-ih hadži Emin el-Huseini (H. E. EL-HUSEINI, 1943: 6-7). Zanimljivo je da je 1925. Vrhovno muslimansko vijeće pod hadži Eminovim predsjedavanjem objavilo traktat *Al-haram al-sharif* u kojem piše da je trg na kojem se nalazi Kupola nad

in academic research on early Islamic<sup>16</sup> Jerusalem, Christian (such as Oleg Grabar) and Jewish archaeologists, historians and Arabists are still prevalent. Among others we should mention Dan Bahat, S. D. Goitein, Michael Avi-Yonah, Moshe Gil, M. J. Kister, Myriam Rosen-Ayalon, Moshe Sharon and Jacob Lassner. Lassner's recently published monograph *Medieval Jerusalem: Forging an Islamic City in Spaces Sacred to Christians and Jews*, might well be the most comprehensive academic compilation of knowledge on early Islamic Jerusalem available today. It is only in the last few decades that many Muslim scholars of Jerusalem have emerged and produced fine, noted studies. Some of their works on early Islamic Jerusalem can be found in Brill's annual publication *Muqarnas*<sup>17</sup> in which the emphasis is on topics concerning Islamic architecture and art.

Political dispute has prompted not only academic research, but also novel Muslim claims related to Jewish history, and to Islamic theology and tradition. With regard to the former, we may mention the absurd claim that there have never been any Jewish temples in Jerusalem.<sup>18</sup> With regard to the latter, Jerusalem has been, for example, described as the city

<sup>16</sup> *Early Islamic* in this text refers mainly to the period from the birth of Islam until first half of the second century AH (after *hijra*), or until the end of the Umayyad period. As a majority of the sources originated later, as well as due to difficulties in the dating of textual and material sources, texts and traditions originating up to the end of the tenth century are included in this study. With the Crusades and subsequent events new Islamic traditions about Jerusalem appeared, which are not the topic of this study, although they are at times referred to.

<sup>17</sup> For more on the journal and the contents of different issues: <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/journals/22118993>, accessed 4/6/2018.

<sup>18</sup> For more on that phenomenon see D. GOLD, 2007: 11-18; D. BARNETT, 2011 and F. M. LOEWENBERG, 2013. Possibly the first Islamic religious authority who questioned the very existence of Solomon's temple – albeit ambiguously – was haj-Amin al-Husseini, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem during the 1920s and 1930s (H. E. EL-HUSEINI, 1943: 6-7). It is interesting that in 1925 the Supreme Muslim Council under the chairmanship of the same haj-Amin al-Husseini published a treatise entitled *Al-haram al-Sharif*, in which the author writes that the square on which Dome of the Rock and al-Aqṣā stand today is the location of the Solomon's Temple (AL-A'LÁ, 1925: 4). The majority of prominent Islamic historians and theologians do not question the former existence of Jewish temples on the Temple Mount; not even the radical sheik Yusuf al-Qaradawi (cf. Y. AL-QARADAWI, 2012).

opisan kao grad koji je Muhamed posjetio i *tek potom* odredio za *kiblu*.<sup>19</sup> Djelomice i zbog takvih neozbiljnih „neotradicija“ (ništa se slično ne može pronaći u ranoislamskim tekstovima) vrijedno je osvrnuti se na ozbiljne islamske tradicije u kojima se na Jeruzalem gleda kao na mjesto dostojno posebna pijeteta. U ovom ćemo članku pokušati razabrati tradicije koje sežu do vremena islamskih osvajanja Palestine i Jeruzalema, s naglaskom na one tradicije koje svetost Svetoga grada temelje na argumentima proisteklima iz islamskih kanonskih tekstova, unutar muslimanskih političkih procesa, islamskoga vjersko-estetskog nadmetanja s kršćanskim Bizantom, te na ideje koje su u islam donijeli Židovi i židovski obraćenici na Muhamedovu vjeru. Islamska je historiografija, teologija i mitologija njima iznimno bogata. Mnogi će kao kronološki prvu važnu tradiciju takve vrste prepoznati onu prema kojoj je Jeruzalem bio prvi grad u čijem se smjeru utemeljitelj islama, muslimanski prorok Muhamed, okretao u molitvama što ih je upućivao svojem božanstvu.

## 2. JERUZALEM U KONTEKSTU RANIH MUSLIMANSKO-ŽIDOVSKIH ODNOSA

Molitva je drugi od pet stupova islama. Muhamed je, islamska nam tradicija prenosi, na početku postojanja islama<sup>20</sup> Jeruzalem odredio kao *kiblu* i prema njemu se okretao tijekom prvoga mekanskog

---

stijenom i el-Aksa lokacija Salomonova hrama (AL-A'ĪLĀ, 1925: 4). Ipak, većina uglednih islamskih povjesničara i teologa ne stavlja pod upit postojanje židovskih hramova na jeruzalemskom Brdu hrama, pa ni radikalni šejk Jusuf el-Kardavi (v. Y. AL-QARADAWI, 2012).

<sup>19</sup> V. TALHAMI, 2000:114 gdje autorica piše: “Na vijest o [Muhamedovu noćnom] putovanju, muslimanima je naredeno da se tijekom molitve okrenu k Jeruzalemu.” Kako ćemo vidjeti kasnije u tekstu, ova tvrdnja nije u skladu ranoislamskom tradicijom i kanonom, budući da je Jeruzalem bio *kibla* i prije Prorokova tajanstvenoga noćnog putovanja, a Jeruzalem se do konca 7. stoljeća još nije povezivao s tim putovanjem. Autorica usto tvrdi i da je Meka postala *kibla* tek nakon “očišćenja tamošnjeg hrama 630.” što je netočno, jer je Meka postala *kibla* godinu i pol nakon hidžre 622., dakle dok je još bila središte mnogoboštva (IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 289, usp. El-Bekare 2: 142-144). *Kibla* je arapska riječ za smjer u kojem se muslimani okreću u molitvi, a to je danas Meka u Saudijskoj Arabiji.

<sup>20</sup> Muhamed je prve objave počeo primati u svojoj četrdesetoj godini, odnosno 610. Više o počecima islama v. IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 104-115.

that Muhammad visited and *only then* assigned for the *qiblah*.<sup>19</sup> In part due to such frivolous “neo-traditions” (no such claims can be found in early Islamic texts), it is advisable to consider serious Islamic traditions in which Jerusalem is regarded as a place worthy of special piety. In this article we will attempt to distinguish traditions which can be traced back to the period of the Islamic conquest of Palestine, with the emphasis on those in which holiness is attributed to Jerusalem based on arguments deriving from Islamic canonical texts, inter-Muslim political processes, Islamic religious and aesthetic competition with the Christian Byzantium, and on the ideas brought to Islam by Jews and Jewish converts to Muhammad’s religion. Indeed, Islamic historiography, theology, and mythology do abound with such traditions. Probably the earliest such tradition is the one according to which Jerusalem was the first city in whose direction Muhammad turned in prayers to the deity he worshiped.

## 2. JERUSALEM IN THE CONTEXT OF EARLY MUSLIM-JEWISH RELATIONS

Prayer is the second of the five pillars of Islam. According to Islamic tradition, Muhammad designated Jerusalem as *qiblah* at the very beginning of the existence of Islam,<sup>20</sup> and he faced towards it during the first period of Mecca (610–622). Even after the *hijra*<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> See TALHAMI, 2000: 114 where the author writes: “Following news of the [Muhammad’s night] journey, Muslims were ordered to face Jerusalem during the act of prayer.” As we shall see later, this statement is not consistent with early Islamic traditions and canon, inasmuch as Jerusalem was *qiblah* even before the Prophet’s secretive Night Journey, and Jerusalem was not linked to that journey until the end of the seventh century or later. The author further states that Mecca became *qiblah* only after “purification of its temple in 630” (p. 114), which is erroneous since Mecca became *qiblah* a year and a half after the *hijra* of 622 AD, while it was still a center of polytheist worship (IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 289; cf. Quran 2: 142-144). *Qiblah* is the Arabic word for the direction to which Muslims turn in prayer, and today that is the city of Mecca in Saudi Arabia.

<sup>20</sup> Muhammad received his first revelations when he was forty, in the year 610 ad. For more on the beginnings of Islam see IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 104-115.

<sup>21</sup> *Hijra* or *hegira* is Muhammad’s flight from Mecca (whose inhabitants did not accept his message and attempted to kill him) to Medina in June 622. That event marks the beginning of the Islamic calendar.

razdoblja (610.–622.). I nakon hidžre<sup>21</sup> 622. muslimani su se još punih šesnaest ili sedamnaest mjeseci u molitvi okretali prema Jeruzalemu, a tek od mjeseca šabana druge hidžretske godine počeli su se okretati prema Ka'bi<sup>22</sup> u Meki.<sup>23</sup> Izvori ne navode razloge za tu promjenu; štoviše, ranoislamski tekstovi ni ne spominju Jeruzalem ili uopće (Kur'an) ili ne pod tim imenom (Ibn Ishakova *Sira*). No, Muhamedovo uređivanje *ummeta* po dolasku u Medinu ne ostavlja puno prostora za stavljanje pod upit tradicije prema kojoj je prva *kibla* bio upravo Jeruzalem. Kur'an pak implicira da je Muhamedova istinska želja bila da se *kibla* usmjeri prema Ka'bi, što mu je potom objavom i dopušteno:

Vidimo Mi kako sa žudnjom bacaš pogled prema nebu, i Mi ćemo sigurno učiniti da se okrećeš prema strani koju ti želiš: okreni zato lice svoje prema Časnome hramu!<sup>24</sup>

Razlog Muhamedova odabira Jeruzalema kao prve *kible* u ranoislamskim tekstovima nije objašnjen. No, budući da se Muhamed okretao prema Jeruzalemu u molitvi već nakon prvih objava, može se oprezno pretpostaviti da je razlog taj što ga je smatrao simbolom monoteizma, a monoteizam je središnja tema Muhamedove poruke; Ka'ba je, pak, u to vrijeme bila središte arapskoga mnogoboštva.<sup>25</sup> Izvjesno je da je taj ritual preuzeo od Židova koji su se u molitvi okretali prema Jeruzalemu. Taj je odabir izgledno odražavao i Muhamedovo nastojanje

<sup>21</sup> Muhamedov bijeg iz Meke, čije se stanovništvo protivilo njegovim vjerskim porukama, u Medinu 622. naziva se hidžra ili hidžret.

<sup>22</sup> Islamsko je nazivlje u ovome članku uglavnom preuzeto iz arapskog, a ne iz turskog jezika, premda je u povijesnim hrvatskim zemljama izvođenje iz turskoga učestalije. Stoga Ka'ba umjesto Ćaba, *kafir* umjesto *ćafir*, hidžra umjesto hidžret itd. Nazivlje koje je već sasvim zaživjelo u hrvatskom jeziku usklađeno je sa službenim nazivljem koje koriste islamske zajednice u Hrvatskoj i BiH (ramazan umjesto ramadan, *ummet* umjesto *umma* itd.), dok su manje poznate riječi transkribirane izravno iz arapskoga (primjerice *fitna* umjesto *fitnet*).

<sup>23</sup> IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 289, El-Bekare 2: 142-144.

<sup>24</sup> El-Bekare 2: 144.

<sup>25</sup> *Kibla* je ipak preusmjerena prema Meki druge hidžretske godine, dok je Meka dakle još bila mnogobožačko svetište. Muslimani su Meku zauzeli tek 8. hidžretske godine (630.). Također, Ibn-Ishak nam prenosi da je Muhamed i tijekom prvoga mekanskog razdoblja kružio (*tauaf*) oko Ka'be, središnjega mnogobožačkog svetišta (IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 165).

in 622, Muslims faced Jerusalem while in prayer for a full sixteen or seventeen months, and it is only from the month Sha'bān in the year 2 AH that they began to face the Ka'ba<sup>22</sup> in Mecca instead.<sup>23</sup> Sources do not reveal the reasons for that change; in fact, early Islamic texts do not mention Jerusalem at all (Quran), or not by that name (Ibn Ishaq's *Sirah*). However, Muhammad's constitution of the Ummah upon his arrival in Medina does not leave much room for questioning the tradition according to which the first *qiblah* was actually Jerusalem. The Quran implies, though, that Muhammad's true desire from the beginning was that the *qiblah* should be changed to Ka'ba, which he was later allowed to do by a revelation:

We have seen the turning of thy face to heaven (for guidance, O Muhammad). And now verily We shall make thee turn (in prayer) toward a Qiblahh which is dear to thee. So turn thy face toward the Inviolable Place of Worship, and ye (O Muslims), wheresoever ye may be, turn your faces (when ye pray) toward it.<sup>24</sup>

The reason for Muhammad's choice of Jerusalem as the first *qiblah* was not explained in early Islamic texts. As Muhammad faced Jerusalem in prayer after the first revelations, one may cautiously assume that the reason may be that he regarded the city as a symbol of monotheism, and monotheism was the central theme of Muhammad's message. Ka'ba, on the other hand, was at that time the center of Arab polytheism.<sup>25</sup> We may take it as certain that he imitated the ritual of Jews who faced Jerusalem during their prayers. That choice also seems to reflect Muhammad's effort to approach Jews in the hope that they would accept him as the final Prophet in the line of prophets of the Hebrew Scripture. There is a similar example found in the celebration of Ashura, which derives from the Jewish Day of Atonement, Yom Kippur. According to

<sup>22</sup> Islamic terminology in Croatian version of this article has been taken from Arabic and not from Turkish language, even though in the historical Croatian lands a derivation of terminology from Turkish is more common. For this reason, we use Ka'ba instead of Ćaba, *kafir* instead of *ćafir*, etc.

<sup>23</sup> IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 289; Quran 2: 142-144.

<sup>24</sup> Quran 2: 144. All Quranic verses are from Pickthall's translation.

<sup>25</sup> The *qiblah* was redirected to Mecca during the second year AH, while Mecca was still a polytheistic sanctuary. Muslims only took over Mecca in the eighth year AH (630 AD). Also, Ibn Ishak transmits tradition that Muhammad performed circumambulation (*tawāf*) around the Ka'ba during the first Meccan period, that is while Mecca was still the center of polytheist worship (IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 165).



da se približi Židovima u nadi da će ga prihvatiti kao proroka, posljednjega u nizu Božjih poslanika o kojima govore židovska Sveta pisma. Sličan primjer postoji i kod svetkovanja blagdana Ašure, koji proizlazi iz židovskoga Dana pomirenja, Jom kipura. Muhamed je, prema tradiciji, taj blagdan uveo po dolasku u Medinu po uzoru na židovsko svetkovanje i post na Dan pomirenja, premda je sâm post kasnije premjestio na mjesec ramazan.<sup>26</sup> Uz to, Muhamed je s medinskim Židovima sklopio poseban ugovor kojim ih je svrstao unutar *ummeta*,<sup>27</sup> što je čast kakvu Muhamed ni prije ni poslije nije iskazao ni jednoj drugoj zajednici izvan muslimanske.<sup>28</sup> No, medinski Židovi, uz nekoliko iznimki, niti su prihvatili Muhamedovo poslanstvo, niti su prešli na islam. Dapače, izvirgavali su Proroka i njegove objave ruglu zbog anakronizama i anatopizama vezanih uz biblijske teme,<sup>29</sup> a kasnije su mu se usprotivili politički i vojno, svrstavanjem uz njegove mekanske neprijatelje. U sljedećih nekoliko godina Muhamed je uništio židovska plemena iz Medine i osvojio

tradition Muhammad introduced that celebration upon his arrival in Medina, modelling it after the Jewish fast and observation of the Day of Atonement, even though he later reassigned fasting to the month of Ramadan.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, Muhammad made a distinctive contract with the Jews of Medina by which he recognized them as part of the Ummah,<sup>27</sup> which is an honor the Muslim Prophet granted to no other non-Muslim community, neither before nor after that.<sup>28</sup> The Jews of Medina, however, with a few exceptions, did not accept Muhammad's message nor did they convert to Islam. In fact, they ridiculed the Prophet and his revelations because of Quranic anachronisms and anatopisms related to Biblical themes.<sup>29</sup> Later, they also opposed him politically and militarily by aligning themselves with his enemies from Mecca. In the next few years Muhammad destroyed the three Jewish tribes of Medina, and captured the Jewish town of Khaybar.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>26</sup> M. FIERRO, 1994: 193-208. Svetkovanje Ašure ovdje ne treba povezivati sa šijitskim blagdanom koji je nastao kasnije i kojim se obilježava mučeništvo imama Huseina.

<sup>27</sup> *Ummet* ili arapski *umma* (أمة) naziv je za sveukupni muslimanski svijet, slično riječi Crkva u kršćanstvu.

<sup>28</sup> Sporazum potječe iz ranoga medinskog razdoblja, prije Bitke kod Badra (M. GIL, 2004: 25), što potvrđuje i Ibn-Ishak u Siri. Tekst sporazuma u cijelosti se nalazi u IBN-ISHAQ, 2004: 231-233, a u njemu je osobito zanimljiva rečenica „Židovi [...] čine jednu zajednicu s vjernicima [muslimanima] (Židovi imaju svoju religiju a muslimani imaju svoju)“ (str. 233). Crone i Cook, kao i Wellhausen, taj aspekt Sporazuma s pravom smatraju zagonetnim (P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 7, 158, bilješka 41). Gil čitav „Medinski ustav“ smatra „jednim od najneobičnijih dokumenata iz ranoislamske povijesti“ te mu posvećuje studiju *The constitution of Medina: a reconsideration* (M. GIL, 1974: 44-76. Gilovo tumačenje toga dokumenta razlikuje se od tradicionalnog). Zanimljivo je da Balazuri samo spominje postojanje sporazuma (AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 33). V. još i N. A. STILLMAN, 1979: 115-118; A. HARUN & IBN-HIŠAM, 1998: 106-109; M. RODINSON, 2000: 190; F. M. DONNER, 2010: 72-73 id.).

<sup>29</sup> S. D. Goitein ukazuje na to da je Muhamed razvio neprijateljstvo prema Židovima zbog njihova ismijavanja njegovih „neizbježnih zabuna glede biblijskih priča i zakona“ te kao primjer takve zabune navodi suru El-Kasas (28): 38 prema kojoj faraon traži od Hamana, svojega vezira, da izgradi Babilonsku kulu (S. D. GOITEIN, 1955: 64).

<sup>26</sup> M. FIERRO, 1994: 193-208. This celebration of Ashura is not related to the Shia holiday in which the martyrdom of Imam Hussain is commemorated, which developed later.

<sup>27</sup> The Arabic word *Ummah* (أمة) is the term for the entire Muslim community, much like the word Church in Christianity.

<sup>28</sup> The agreement dates from the early period of Medina, before the battle of Badr (M. GIL, 2004: 25), which is confirmed by Ibn Ishak's *Sirah*. The text of the agreement is found in its entirety in IBN-ISHAQ, 2004: 231-233. Of particular interest is sentence "Jews [...] are one community with the believers [Muslims] (the Jews have their religion and the Muslims have theirs)" (p. 233). Crone and Cook, and also Wellhausen, consider this aspect of the agreement puzzling (P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 7, 158, note 41). Gil called the entire Constitution of Medina "one of the most remarkable documents in the history of early Islam" (p. 44) and he analyzed it in his article *The Constitution of Medina: A Reconsideration* (M. GIL, 1974: 44-76; Gil's conclusion about the Constitution differs, however, from traditional interpretations). It is interesting that Baladhuri only mentions the existence of the agreement (AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 33). See also N. A. STILLMAN, 1979: 115-118; A. HARUN & IBN-HIŠAM, 1998: 106-109; M. RODINSON, 2000: 190; F. M. DONNER, 2010: 72-7ff.).

<sup>29</sup> S. D. Goitein points to the fact that Muhammad developed an enmity towards the Jews due to their mocking of his "inevitable blunders in referring to the biblical narratives and laws" and as an example of such a mistake refers to Quran 28: 38 according to which "he [Muhammad] has Pharaoh ask his vizier Haman (!) to erect a "Tower of Babel"" (S. D. GOITEIN, 1955: 64).

<sup>30</sup> For more on the relations and conflicts between Muhammad and the Jews see B. HAVEL, 2013: 297 ff. On the destruction of the three Jewish tribes of Medina and Khaybar from primary sources see IBN-ISHAQ, 2004: 363 (Banu Qaynuqā), 437-445 (Banu al-Nadīr), 461-482 (Banu Qurayza), 510-523 (Khaybar), AL-TABARI, vol. VII: 27-41 (Banu Qurayza), 116-139 (Khaybar).

grad Hajber.<sup>30</sup> Time je između muslimanske zajednice i Židova u Hidžazu nastao politički i teološki jaz koji, kako će kasnija povijest pokazati, nije bio nepremostiv, ali Židovi su prestali biti dio *ummeta* i više nikad nisu bili ni blizu da to opet postanu. Muhamed je sasvim odustao od teološkog podilaženja Židovima pa oni, iz izvora se stječe dojam, osim kao sporadičan objekt izrugivanja, primjer nevjere i nevjernosti Allahu (premda prema tradiciji ostaju pouzdan izvor podataka o ličnostima iz povijesti koje se bez konteksta spominju u Kur'anu<sup>31</sup>), gube važnost u daljnjem razvoju islamske misli sve do muslimanskog osvajanja Sirije. Židovi su u islamskom kanonu ostali upisani kao najveći protivnici islama, koji su svoja Sveta pisma izmijenili kako bi iz njih maknuli proroštva o Muhamedovu poslanstvu. Ipak, u desetljećima koja su uslijedila, u nizu zemalja koje su padale pod islamsku vlast, kao što su Sirija, Irak, Egipat, Perzija i kasnije Španjolska, između novih muslimanskih vlasti i tamošnjih židovskih zajednica stvaraju se odnosi koji nisu bili uvjetovani sukobima iz vremena Muhamedova života ni islamskim kanoniziranim protužidovstvom, nego su, dapače, često bili obilježeni aktivnom židovskom kolaboracijom.<sup>32</sup> Mnoge su židovske zajednice u bizantskim pokrajinama arapske muslimanske osvajače dočekale kao izbavitelje, katkad im pružajući i pomoć u osvajanjima bizantskih utvrda, kao što

<sup>30</sup> Više o odnosima i sukobima između Muhameda i Židova v. u B. HAVEL, 2013: 297 i dalje. O uništenju triju medinskih židovskih plemena te Hajberu iz primarnog izvora v. IBN-ISHAQ, 2004: 363 (Banu Kajnuka), 437-445 (Banu el-Nadir), 461-482 (Banu Kurejza), 510-523 (Hajber); AL-TABARI, vol. VII: 27-41 (Banu Kurejza), 116-139 (Hajber).  
<sup>31</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1972: 215-239.

<sup>32</sup> Ovdje se, dakako, može postaviti pitanje koliko su o Muhamedovim stavovima o Židovima znali i sami muslimani, a pogotovo Židovi, budući da su mnogi krajevi (Sirija, Egipat, Irak, Perzija) osvojeni i prije nego što je Kur'an sabran u cjelovito djelo (prema tradiciji to se dogodilo u vrijeme trećega rašidunskog kalifa Usmana, ponajprije njegovom zaslugom), odnosno prije konca 7. stoljeća, budući da „ne postoji čvrst dokaz postojanja Kur'ana u bilo kakvu obliku prije posljednjega desetljeća sedmog stoljeća“ (P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 3). Što se tiče ostalih tekstova (Sira, hadisi), njihov nastanak velikim dijelom kronološki dolazi nakon osvajanja Španjolske. Goitein smatra i kako su židovske zajednice u Arabiji imale drukčiji usud od zajednica u ostalim dijelovima islamskog imperija (S. D. GOITEIN, 1955: 63).

A political and theological schism emerged between the Muslim community and the Jews of Hejaz which, as history would show, was not entirely unbridgeable, but Jews ceased to be part of the Ummah, and never came even close to become part of it again. Muhammad gave up on theological courting of Jews, and from the sources one gets the impression that, other than being a sporadic object of ridicule and an example of deceitfulness and unbelief (though according to some traditions they remained a reliable source of information about Biblical figures mentioned in the Quran<sup>31</sup>), they lost their importance for the further development of Islamic thought prior to the Muslim conquest of Syria. Jews were recorded in the Islamic canon as the greatest opponents of Islam, who corrupted their Holy Scriptures by removing prophecies of Muhammad's advent. In the decades that followed, however, in many lands that fell under Muslim rule, such as Persia, Iraq, Syria, Palestine and later Spain, somewhat unexpected relationship was forged between the new Muslim authorities and the local Jewish communities. They were not conditioned by Muslim-Jewish animosities during Muhammad's career in Medina, nor by Islamic anti-Jewish canonical texts. Instead, they were rather often marked by an active Jewish collaboration.<sup>32</sup> Many Jewish communities in Byzantine lands greeted Arab Muslim conquerors as deliverers, sometimes providing help in their conquest of Byzantine strongholds, as was the case in Hebron<sup>33</sup> and Caesarea,<sup>34</sup> and later even in

<sup>31</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1972: 215-239.

<sup>32</sup> We do not know how much the first Muslims, or Jews of Syria, Egypt, Iraq or Persia knew about Muhammad's and the Quranic attitude toward the Jews. Those regions were conquered before the Quran was collected and made available (according to tradition that happened during the era of the third Rashidun Caliph 'Uthmān), that is before the end of the seventh century or later. Crone and Cook point out that "There is no hard evidence for the existence of the Koran in any form before the last decade of the seventh century, and the tradition which places this rather opaque revelation in its historical context is not attested before the middle of the eight" (P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 3). With regard to the remaining texts (Sirah, ḥadīth) their origin postdates the Arab conquest of Spain. Goitein believes that fate of the Jewish communities in Arabia was different from Jewish communities in other lands conquered by Muslims (S. D. GOITEIN, 1955: 63).

<sup>33</sup> M. GIL, 1997: 57-58.

<sup>34</sup> Arabs, with the help of Jews, conquered Caesarea after a seven-year siege (M. GIL, 1997: 59; N. A. STILLMAN, 1979: 23; AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 217), and the conqueror was Mu'āwiyah ibn Abu Sufiyan, the future first Umayyad Caliph (AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 193).

je to bio slučaj u Hebronu,<sup>33</sup> Cezareji<sup>34</sup> i kasnije u Španjolskoj.<sup>35</sup> Muslimanski su pak osvajači prekinuli stoljetnu tradiciju izgnanstva Židova iz njihova najsvetijeg grada, Jeruzalema. Otkako je car Hadrijan 135. ugušio Bar Kohbin ustanak, Židovima sve do sedmoga stoljeća, uz nekoliko kratkotrajnih iznimki, nije bilo dopušteno naseliti se u Jeruzalemu, a često ni posjetiti ga ili približiti mu se. Nova je islamska vlast, na zgražanje kršćana, ukinula rimska i bizantska ograničenja. Po navodnoj zapovijedi kalifa Omara u Jeruzalem se iz Galileje doselilo sedamdeset židovskih obitelji,<sup>36</sup> čime je židovska prisutnost nakon više od pet stoljeća opet obnovljena u Davidovu gradu. Do križarskih osvajanja, uz iznimku kratkotrajne okrutnosti prema Židovima i kršćanima fatimidskog kalifa el-Hakima bi-Amr Allaha (996.–1021.), Židovi su u svojem najsvetijem gradu živjeli pod relativno blagonaklonom vlasti.<sup>37</sup>

Židovski su konvertiti na islam imali važnu ulogu u oblikovanju ranoislamskih tradicija o Jeruzalemu i Brdu Hrama, o čemu će biti riječi kasnije u tekstu. Ono što ostaje nejasno jest zašto epizode sukobljavanja između Muhameda i muslimana s jedne te arabijskih Židova s druge strane, koje su postale dijelom islamskoga kanona, nisu utjecale na oblikovanje muslimansko-židovskih odnosa u Siriji. Moguće je da tē priče sirijskim Židovima, a ni muslimanima, jer većina ih je islam prihvatila kasnije i nije potjecala iz Medine, nisu bile poznate. I nepostojanje tih tradicija u vrijeme islamskog osvajanja Sirije jedno je od mogućih objašnjenja. Orijentalisti, među kojima je najpoznatiji Wansbrough,

Spain.<sup>35</sup> Muslims, on the other hand, ended the centennial Jewish expulsion from their most holy city, Jerusalem. Ever since Emperor Hadrian crushed the Bar Kokhba revolt in 135 AD, Jews were banned from settling, indeed even approaching Jerusalem. To the outrage of Christians, the new Muslim authorities abolished those Roman and later Byzantine restrictions. Seventy Jewish families settled in Jerusalem from Galilee at the alleged behest of Caliph 'Umar,<sup>36</sup> and thus was a Jewish presence in the City of David restored after more than five centuries. With the exception of a brief but fierce persecution of Jews and Christians by the Fatimid Caliph al-Hākim bi-Amr Allah (996–1021), Jews lived under quite benevolent Muslim rule in their most holy city until the Crusades.<sup>37</sup>

Jewish converts to Islam had an important role in shaping early Islamic traditions about Jerusalem and the Temple Mount, which will be addressed later in this text. What remains unclear is why the episodes of conflict between Muhammad and the Muslims on one hand, and Arabian Jews on the other, did not influence the subsequent development of Muslim-Jewish relations in Syria and elsewhere. It is possible that persecution of Jews of Medina and Khaybar was not known to Syrian Jews, nor even to Muslims, since most Muslims who encountered Jews in Syria and Mesopotamia converted to Islam after those events, and possibly did not originate from the Hejaz. Another possible explanation is that by the time of the Muslim conquest of Syria those traditions were still not written down and canonized. Orientalists such as Wansbrough have already proposed dating of the Quranic text later than what is established by official Islamic chronology.<sup>38</sup> Even if we accept Islamic historiography, to which some orientalist refer as *Heilige Geschichte* because of its wanting or unverifiable historicity,<sup>39</sup> at the time of the Muslim

<sup>33</sup> M. GIL, 1997: 57-58.

<sup>34</sup> Arapi su uz pomoć Židovā osvojili Cezareju nakon sedmogodišnje opsade (M. GIL, 1997: 59; N. A. STILLMAN, 1979: 23; AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 217), a osvajač je bio Mu'aviya ibn Abu Sufian, budući prvi umajjidski kalif (AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 193).

<sup>35</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1955: 62-63

<sup>36</sup> N. A. STILLMAN, 1979: 154-155. Primarni izvor na koji se Stillman referira nepouzdan je i sadrži određene anakronizme (v. fusnotu 2), a i sama Omarova prisutnost u Jeruzalemu dio je kasnije tradicije, o čemu će više riječi biti kasnije u tekstu.

<sup>37</sup> Goitein o tome piše: „Premda se dogodio samo jedan incident progona nemuslimana koji je potaknula službena vlast, pohlepni emiri i neinteligentni šeići oštro su se odnosili prema stanovništvu u cjelini, a posebno prema onima pod njihovim patronatom.” (S. D. GOITEIN, 1981: 169).

<sup>35</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1955: 62-63

<sup>36</sup> N. A. STILLMAN, 1979: 154-155. The primary source to which Stillman refers is unreliable and contains certain anachronisms (see footnote 2), and the very presence of 'Umar in Jerusalem is part of later traditions, which shall be discussed later in the text.

<sup>37</sup> Goitein writes on the topic: “Although there was but one incident of officially-inspired persecution of non-Muslims, the avaricious emirs and unintelligent sheiks dealt stringently with the population as a whole, particularly with those under their patronage” (S. D. GOITEIN, 1981: 169).

<sup>38</sup> J. WANSBROUGH, 1977.

<sup>39</sup> M. SHARON, 2007: 316. For more on the origin of the use and meaning of “Salvation History”, which is also called *Heilsgeschichte*, see G. HAWTING, 2006: i-viii.

već su predložili datiranje kuranskog teksta kasnije nego što službeni islam naučava.<sup>38</sup> Ako i prihvatimo službenu islamsku historiografiju koju neki orijentalisti nazivaju *Heilige Geschichte*,<sup>39</sup> Kur'an u vrijeme osvajanja Sirije još nije bio prikupljen i kompiliran kao cjelovit tekst jer je to učinio tek treći rašidunski kalif, Usman (644.–656.), a osvajanja su uglavnom bila dovršena u vrijeme drugoga, Omara (634.–644.). S druge strane, Balazuri piše da je Omar Židove Hajbera protjerao u Siriju,<sup>40</sup> što bi značilo da su oni sa sobom donijeli priče o usudu arabijskih židovskih zajednica neovisno o muslimanskim tekstovima i tradicijama. Moguće je, ali ne i vjerojatno, da su sirijski Židovi mesijansku percepciju islamskih osvajanja pretpostavili zabrinutosti zbog usuda svojih arabijskih suvjeraca. I konačno, može se staviti pod upit opseg u kojem su arabijski i sirijski Židovi doista bili dio istoga nacionalnoga i vjerskoga korpusa. Moshe Sharon na temelju kuranske referencije o Uzejru smatra da u Medini zapravo nisu živjeli Židovi, nego kršćani.<sup>41</sup> Ni ta se tvrdnja ne može nekritički prihvatiti. Primjerice, Muhamed je na smrtnoj postelji zapovjedio da na Arabijskom poluotoku ne ostanu dvije religije,<sup>42</sup> što je kalif Omar razumio kao zapovijed da protjera preostale Židove iz Hajbera.<sup>43</sup> Treće vjere, kršćanske, prema ovome naputku, u Arabiji nije bilo.

conquest of Syria, the Quranic text had not yet been collected and compiled. Compilation of the Quran was completed by the third Rashidun Caliph 'Uthmān ibn Affān (644–656) and the conquests were mostly completed during the era of his predecessor, the second Caliph 'Umar (634–644). On the other hand, Baladhuri writes that 'Umar exiled the Jews of Khaybar to Syria,<sup>40</sup> which would mean that they brought with them the stories of the fate of the Arabian Jewish communities independently of Muslim texts and traditions. It is also possible, but not probable, that Syrian Jews preferred the messianic perception of Islamic conquest to their concern over the fate of their Arabian co-religionists. Finally, the extent to which Arabian and Syrian Jews were truly a part of the same national and religious corpus may be questioned. Moshe Sharon believes, on the basis of the Quranic reference to Uzair, that it was not Jews, but Christians, who lived in Medina.<sup>41</sup> Plausible as it is, that claim cannot be uncritically accepted either. For example, Muhammad on his deathbed ordered that two religions must not remain on the Arab Peninsula,<sup>42</sup> which Caliph 'Umar understood as a command to exile the remaining Jews from Khaybar.<sup>43</sup> The third faith, Christianity, according to this instruction, did not exist in Arabia.

<sup>38</sup> J. WANSBROUGH, 1977.

<sup>39</sup> M. SHARON, 2007: 316. Za više podataka o početku uporabe i značenju „sakralne povijesti“ (Salvation History) koja se nazivala i *Heilsgeschichte* v. G. HAWTING, 2006: i-viii.

<sup>40</sup> AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 46, 50.

<sup>41</sup> M. SHARON, 2007: 352-353. Sharon objašnjava: „Više-manje sve što se može reći o 'Muhamedovim Židovima' – određena skupina vjernika u Isusa koji su se razlikovali od ostalih 'mesijanskih' kršćana i nazivali se *Jehud*." U Kur'anu (9:30) piše kako Židovi vjeruju da je „Uzeir“ (vjerojatno Ezra) bog, što je netočno; nikada nije postojala nikakva židovska sljedba koja bi takvo što vjerovala. I Wansbrough napominje kako je „identitet [židovske medinske] zajednice nejasan...“ (J. WANSBROUGH, 2006: 109).

<sup>42</sup> IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 689; AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 48.

<sup>43</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. VIII: 130.

<sup>40</sup> AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 46, 50.

<sup>41</sup> See M. SHARON, 2007: 352-353 in which the author concludes that “more or less what he said about the ‘Jews of Muhammad’ – a certain group of believers in Jesus who were distinguished from the other ‘messianic’ Christians, and called *Yahūd*. Everything else consists of the stories of later authors who were very far from the time of the Prophet but met Rabbinical Jews in the conquered lands and projected whatever they saw among the Jews of their time to the past” (p. 353, Note 25). The Quranic verse 9: 30 opens with the statement: “And the Jews say: Ezra [i.e. Uzair, عَزَائِر] is the son of Allah”. However, there is no evidence of any Jewish sect in Arabia or elsewhere which adhered to such a belief. Wansbrough notes that “identity [of the Jewish community in Medina] is anything but clear and the polemic heavily stereotyped” (J. WANSBROUGH, 2006: 109).

<sup>42</sup> IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 689; AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 48.

<sup>43</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. VIII: 130.

### 3. MUHAMEDOVO NOĆNO PUTOVANJE U EL-AKSU

Godinu dana prije hidžre, 621., Muhamed je u tajanstvenu noćnom putovanju, jašući na mitskome biću el-Buraku, iz Meke došao do el-Akse, a potom se uzdignuo do celestijalnih prostranstava i ondje se susreo s Ibrahimom (Abrahamom), Musaom (Mojsijem) i Isaom (Isusom).<sup>44</sup> Noćno je putovanje poznato kao *isra*, a celestijalno kao *miradž*. Opisano je u prvom *ajetu*<sup>45</sup> sure El-Isrā (17), koji glasi:

Hvaljen neka je Onaj Koji je u jednom času noći preveo Svoga roba iz Hrama časnog u Hram daleki [el-Aksa], čiju smo okolinu blagoslovili kako bismo mu neka znamenja Naša pokazali. On, uistinu, sve čuje i sve vidi.

U Napomenama Korkutova prijevoda Kur'ana ovaj je *ajet* objašnjen sljedećim riječima:

Sveti Hram je Kaba u Mekki koju su sagradili Ibrahim i Ismail, a Daleki Hram je Hram u Jerusalemu koji su sagradili Davud [David] i Sulejman [Solomon]. U prvom *ajetu* se govori o Miradžu, Muhammedovom, a.s., putovanju u nebo.<sup>46</sup>

Pojam ovdje preveden kao „Daleki Hram“ na arapskom je *el-masdzid el-aksa* (المسجد الأقصى), a on se tradicionalno tumači sukladno Korkutovoj napomeni, kao Hram u Jeruzalemu. Profesor Abdallah El-Khatib u uglednom je časopisu *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* ustvrdio kako je ovo nedvojbeno kuranska referenca na Jeruzalem te se pozvao na tumačenja uvaženih muslimanskih egzegeta kako bi potkrijepio taj argument.<sup>47</sup> Razabiranje važnosti Jeruzalema u ranoislamskoj tradiciji za mnoge je današnje muslimane pitanje religijskog identiteta te kao takvo neupitno, što je i središnja poruka El-Khatibova članka. Muhamedovo noćno putovanje u el-Aksu i uspon u celestijalnu sferu ključni su dio te percepcije. Iz nje proistječe važnost džamije el-Akse na jeruzalemskom Brdu Hrama odnosno Plemenitom svetištu kako se uglavnom prevodi arapski naziv *el-haram eš-šarif* (الحرم الشريف), skraćeno Haram,

<sup>44</sup> IBN-ISHAQ, 2004: 182. Prema Ibn-Ishakovu izvješću oni su se nalazili u društvu nekih proroka, a Muhamed ih je sve skupa poveo u molitvu.

<sup>45</sup> *Ajet* je kuranski redak, stih.

<sup>46</sup> B. KORKUT, 2011: 616.

<sup>47</sup> EL-KHATIB, 2001: 34.

### 3. MUHAMMAD'S NIGHT JOURNEY TO AL-AQSĀ

A year before the *hijra*, in 621, Muhammad travelled from Mecca to al-Aqsā during his mysterious Night Journey, riding the mythical creature Al-Burāq, and then rising to the heavens where he met up with 'Ibrāhim (Abraham), Mūsā (Moses) and 'Īsā (Jesus).<sup>44</sup> The Night Journey is known as *isrā* and the Celestial Journey as *mi'rāj*. It is described in the first *āyah*<sup>45</sup> of the Surah Al-Isrā (17).

Glorified be He Who carried His servant by night from the Inviolable Place of Worship to the Far Distant Place of Worship the neighborhood whereof We have blessed, that We might show him of Our tokens!

In the Commentary of Korkut's translation of the Quran this verse is explained as follows:

The Holy Temple is the Ka'ba in Mecca, which was built by Ibrahim and Ismail, and the Far Distant Place of Worship is the Temple in Jerusalem, which was built by Dawud [David] and Suleiman [Solomon]. In the first verse is discussed the *mi'rāj*, Muhammad's a.s. journey to heaven.<sup>46</sup>

The term translated here as “the Far Distant Place of Worship” in Arabic is Al-Masjid al-Aqsā (المسجد الأقصى), and it is traditionally interpreted according to Korkut's commentary to translation as the Temple in Jerusalem. Abdallah El-Khatib explains that “All Muslim exegetes are unanimous about the reference of this verse to Jerusalem.”<sup>47</sup> Many contemporary Muslims view the importance of Jerusalem in early Islamic tradition as vital for their religious identity, which is the principal message of El-Khatib's article. Muhammad's Night Journey to al-Aqsā and his ascent into celestial realm are its key part. The importance of the al-Aqsā Mosque on the Temple Mount or the “Noble Sanctuary,” as the Arabic *Al-Ḥaram al-Sharif* (الحرم الشريف) is translated, and the Western Wall, to which the mythical creature al-Buraq was tied, derives from that legend.

The interpretation of this mythical episode from the Prophet's life, the only one which directly connects him to Jerusalem, is problematic from the perspective

<sup>44</sup> IBN-ISHAQ, 2004: 182. According to Ibn Ishak's report they found themselves in the company of some prophets, and Muhammad led them all in prayer.

<sup>45</sup> A line in the Quran, a verse.

<sup>46</sup> B. KORKUT, 2011: 616.

<sup>47</sup> EL-KHATIB, 2001: 34.

te Zapadnog zida uz koji je bilo privezano mitsko biće el-Burak dok je čekalo da Muhameda nakon *miradža* vrati u Meku.

Tumačenje ove mitske epizode iz Prorokova života, jedine koja ga izravno povezuje s Jeruzalemom, s aspekta je povijesnosti problematično već na prvi pogled, jer sadrži očit anakronizam: u Jeruzalemu u vrijeme Muhamedova noćnog putovanja nije bilo nikakva hrama, ponajmanje *masdžida el-akse*. Židovski hram u Jeruzalemu uništen je 70. godine, a prve islamske bogomolje na Haramu, čak i prema najoptimističnijim islamskim tradicijama, podignute su šest godina nakon Muhamedove smrti; *masdžid el-aksa* sagrađen je početkom 8. stoljeća. To je mogući razlog diskontinuiteta između prvih desetljeća postojanja islama i početka identificiranja Jeruzalema kao odredišta *isre*. Usprkos El-Khatibovu kreativnu interpretacijskom pothvatu u kojemu tvrdi suprotno, Jeruzalem se ne spominje u Kur'anu ni pod kakvim imenom, pa čak ni aluzijom.<sup>48</sup> Svi raspoloživi islamski izvori koji Muhamedovo noćno putovanje i *masdžid el-aksu* povezuju s Jeruzalemom nastali su dva stoljeća ili više nakon Muhamedove smrti. Od poznatijih izvora u kojima nalazimo tu tradiciju spomenimo *Siru* Ibn Ishaka (odnosno Ibn Hišama) te historiografska i zemljopisna djela at-Tabarija,<sup>49</sup> el-Balazurija i el-Mukaddasija. Egzegetski autoriteti na koje se El-Khatib poziva u svome članku, Fahr ad-Din Razi i Ibn Hadžar al-Askalani pisali su u 12./13. odnosno 14./15. stoljeću, što El-Khatib ne navodi.<sup>50</sup> Budući da je u vrijeme *isre* i *miradža* (621.) kibla još uvijek bila usmjerena prema Jeruzalemu – što se može smatrati neupitnim premda se, kako smo vidjeli, ime grada ni u tom kontekstu u izvorima izrijekom ne spominje – znakovito je da se u Kur'anu ne navodi ime

of history inasmuch as it contains an obvious anachronism: There were no sanctuaries in Jerusalem at the time of Muhammad's Night Journey, least of all the Masjid al-Aqṣā. The Jewish Temple of Jerusalem was destroyed in 70 AD, and the first Islamic shrines on the Ḥaram, according to even the most optimistic Islamic traditions, were built six years after Muhammad's death; the Masjid al-Aqṣā was built at the beginning of the eighth century. This is a possible reason for the discontinuity between the first decades of Islam and the earliest identification of Jerusalem as the destination of the *isrā*. Despite El-Khatib's creative attempt at interpretation in which he claims the opposite, Jerusalem is not mentioned in the Quran under any name whatsoever, not even as an insinuation.<sup>48</sup> All known Islamic sources which relate Muhammad's Night Journey and Masjid al-Aqṣā to Jerusalem were created two or more centuries after Muhammad's death. Among the well-known sources in which this tradition appears are Ibn Ishak's (or Ibn Hishām) *Sirah*, and the historiographic and geographic works of Al-Tabari,<sup>49</sup> Al-Baladhuri and Al-Muqaddasi. The exegetic authorities which El-Khatib cites, Muḥammad Fakhr al-Dīn b. 'Umar al-Rāzī and Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī wrote in the 12<sup>th</sup>/13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>/15<sup>th</sup> century AD respectively, which El-Khatib does not mention in his article.<sup>50</sup> Since at the time of *isrā* and *mi'rāj* (621) the *qiblah* was still directed towards Jerusalem – which may be considered undisputable even though, as we have seen, the name of the city was not explicitly mentioned in the sources – it is remarkable that the name of the destination of such an important and marvelous voyage is not specified, but substituted with a name of rather ambiguous meaning. Possibly the first early Islamic text in which Jerusalem is named as the destination of Muhammad's Night Journey is Ibn Ishaq's *Sirat Rasul Allah*: "Then the apostle was carried by night from the mosque at Mecca

<sup>48</sup> M. SHARON, 1992: 56.

<sup>49</sup> Neka su arapska imena u ovome članku transkribirana i/ili transliterirana različito u tekstu i u citatnicama i popisu literature. U popisu literature transliteracija je preuzeta iz engleskog jezika, onako kako je zadano u bibliografskoj jedinici. U samome tekstu, pak, imena su transkribirana fonetski, izravno s arapskoga na hrvatski, pa je tako Tabari u tekstu at-Tabari ili samo Tabari a u citatnicama i literaturi Al-Tabari (الطبري); također i el-Balazuri ili Balazuri odnosno Al-Baladhuri (البلاذري) u navedenim izvorima itd.

<sup>50</sup> Fahr ad-Din Razi (1149.–1209.), Ibn Hadžar el-Askalani (1372.–1449.).

<sup>48</sup> M. SHARON, 1992: 56.

<sup>49</sup> Some of the Arabic names in this paper have been transcribed and/or transliterated differently in the text and in the citations and bibliography. In the bibliography the transliteration is taken from the English language, in the same manner that it is given in the bibliographical unit. In the text itself, however, the names are transcribed phonetically, directly from Arabic to Croatian, so that Tabari in the text is at-Tabari or simply Tabari, but in the citations and literature is Al-Tabari (الطبري); the same principle is used for al-Balazuri or Balazuri, which is Al-Baladhuri (البلاذري) in cited sources, etc.

<sup>50</sup> Muḥammad Fakhr al-Dīn Razi (1149.–1209), Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī (1372.–1449).

odredišta tako važna i čudesna putovanja, nego se spominje ime koje je značenjem ambigvitetno. Moguće prvi ranoislamski tekst u kojem je Jeruzalem naveden kao odredište Muhamedova noćnog putovanja Ibn Ishakova je *Sira*: „Poslanik je noću prenesen iz džamije u Meki do džamije el-Akse, koja je hram u Aeliji...”<sup>51</sup> Njegova biografija muslimanskog proroka Muhameda *Sirat rasul Allah* napisana je sredinom 8. stoljeća, no to je djelo u izvornom obliku izgubljeno, a *Sira* koja je sačuvana priređena je i bilješkama dopunjena inačica Ibn Hišama s početka 9. stoljeća. To opet čini da je od izvora kojim danas raspoložemo i događaja opisanih u njemu proteklo dva stoljeća.<sup>52</sup> S vremenom je Jeruzalem, zbog *isre* i *miradža*, ali i niza drugih razloga muslimanima postao mjesto posebnog štovanja, što je iznjedrilo tekstove poznate kao *fada'il el-kuds* ili *fada'il beit el-mukaddas* (فضائل بيت المقدس), odnosno Vrline Jeruzalema, koje su dio literarnog opusa hadisa. Najstariji tekstovi toga žanra kojima danas raspoložemo potječu iz 11. stoljeća.<sup>53</sup> Oni se, pretpostavljivo je, temelje na ranijim tradicijama koje sežu do sedmog i osmog stoljeća,<sup>54</sup> poglavito iz razdoblja umajadskog kalifata.<sup>55</sup> Ključno pitanje na koje treba pokušati pronaći odgovor jest kada je islamska tradicija počela Jeruzalem prihvaćati kao odredište Muhamedova noćnog putovanja, odnosno kada je koncept svetosti Jeruzalema *zbog fenomena povezanih s islamom* zaživio među muslimanima, te

<sup>51</sup> IBN-ISHAQ, 2004: 181. Aelia (arapski Ilia ili Ilija) ime je kojim su ranoislamski povjesničari nazivali Jeruzalem, što je podrobnije objašnjeno dalje u tekstu.

<sup>52</sup> Ibn Ishak umro je oko 768. a Ibn Hišam oko 833. Ibn Ishakovo je djelo izgubljeno, a njegov je tekst ostao sačuvan samo u Ibn Hišamovoj doradi, kao i u at-Tabarijevoj *Povijesti*. Poznato je da je Ibn Hišam u određenoj mjeri izmijenio tekst, posebice u dijelovima u kojima su tada vladajući abasidski kalifi imali drukčije stavove od svojih umajadskih prethodnika. Više o *Siri* v. u *Uvodu* prevoditelja *Sire* na engleski Alfreda Guillaumea (IBN-ISHAQ, 2004: xiii-xxvii).

<sup>53</sup> J. LASSNER, 2006: 179. El-Khatib prvom knjigom toga žanra smatra djelo *Futuh Beit el-Makdis* iz godine 206. hidžretske odnosno 821. poslije Krista (EL-KHATIB, 2001: 27). Grabar pak navodi kako „*fada'il* ili religijski vodiči za hodočasnike kasnijeg doba donosi odgovore vezane za razdoblje nakon Križarskih ratova, ali je upitno jesu li sve složene tradicije vezane za Haram već bile sročene u vrijeme kad su Arapi osvojili to područje“ (O. GRABAR, 1959: 33).

<sup>54</sup> Usp. O. LIVNE-KAFRI, 2006: 382.

<sup>55</sup> O. LIVNE-KAFRI, 1998: 165.

to the Masjid al-Aqṣā, which is the temple of Aelia.”<sup>51</sup> His biography of the Muslim prophet Muhammad, *Sirah Rasul Allah*, was written in the middle of the eighth century, but the original form of the work is now lost, and the *Sirah* which has survived is the ninth century version by Ibn Hisham, edited and supplemented with commentaries. Thus, two centuries have elapsed between the sources that we have and the events described in those sources.<sup>52</sup> Due to *isrā* and *mi'rāj*, and some other events connected to the City, Jerusalem eventually became a place of special reverence for Muslims. Texts known as *fada'il al-Quds'* or *fada'il al-Bayt al-Muqaddas* (فضائل بيت المقدس), that is *Virtues of Jerusalem* were thus produced, and they form part of the literary opus of the ḥadīth. The oldest texts of that genre available today originate from the eleventh century.<sup>53</sup> We may assume that they have been based on earlier traditions which date as far back as the seventh and eighth century,<sup>54</sup> mainly from the era of the Umayyad Caliphate.<sup>55</sup> A key question to be addressed is following: When did Islamic tradition begin to identify Jerusalem as the destination of Muhammad's Night Journey? In other words, when did Muslims begin to attribute holiness to Jerusalem *because of events related to Islam*, and to venerate it as their third holiest city? This point is important because Islam both recognizes and appropriates Jewish patriarchs and

<sup>51</sup> IBN-ISHAQ, 2004: 181. Aelia (Ilia or Iliyā in Arabic) is that name used by early Islamic historians for Jerusalem, which is explained in more detail later in the text.

<sup>52</sup> Ibn Ishak died in 768 and Ibn Hisham around 833. Ibn Ishak's work has been lost and his text has only been preserved in Ibn Hisham's edition, and in al-Tabari's *History*. It is known that Ibn Hisham altered the text to some degree, especially in those parts in which the then-reigning Abbasid Caliphs held positions different from those of their Umayyad predecessors. For more on *Sirah* see the *Introduction* from the translator of the *Sirah* into English, Alfred Guillaume (IBN-ISHAQ, 2004: xiii-xxvii).

<sup>53</sup> J. LASSNER, 2006: 179. El-Khatib believes the first book of that genre to be the work entitled *Futūḥ Bayt al-Maqdis* from 206 AH/821 AD (EL-KHATIB, 2001: 27). Grabar, however, states that “The *fada'il* or religious guidebooks for pilgrims of later times provide us with an answer for the period which followed the Crusades, but it may be questioned whether all the complex traditions reported about the Ḥaram at that time had already been formulated when the area was taken over by the Arabs” (O. GRABAR, 1959: 33).

<sup>54</sup> Cf. O. LIVNE-KAFRI, 2006: 382.

<sup>55</sup> O. LIVNE-KAFRI, 1998: 165.

je on postao treći najsvetiji grad u islamu. Ovo potonje je važno budući da islam priznaje, ali i prisvaja židovske patrijarhe i proroke<sup>56</sup> (kao i novozavjetne ličnosti, no od njih se gotovo isključivo spominju samo Isus i Marija), pa je po toj logici svako mjesto koje je sveto Židovima, sveto i muslimanima.<sup>57</sup> U potrazi za odgovorom na pitanje kada su se događaji iz islamske tradicije počeli povezivati s Jeruzalemom, nužno je osvrnuti se na muslimansko osvajanje Palestine te na prve islamske građevine u Jeruzalemu.

#### 4. PALESTINA POD ISLAMSKOM UPRAVOM

Arapske su islamske čete zauzele Jeruzalem 638. tijekom vladavine drugoga – i prema sunitskoj tradiciji najvažnijega – rašidunskog kalifa Omara ibn el-Hataba (634.–644.). Jeruzalem je, prema najranijim islamskim izvorima, osvojio malo poznati vojskovođa Halid ibn Tabit el-Fahmi.<sup>58</sup> Golem imperij u nastajanju do

<sup>56</sup> Primjerice, u Ali Imran (3): 67 piše: „Ibrahim [Abraham] nije bio ni Židov ni kršćanin, nego je (*bio*) pravi musliman“ (prijevod Pandža i Čaušević, Zagreb, 2000; v. i IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 260). U Korkutovu prijevodu piše „Ibrahim nije bio ni jevrej ni kršćanin, već pravi vjernik...“; no taj je prijevod netočan budući da u arapskom izvorniku piše *musliman* (مسلم) odnosno u izvornom tekstu مُسْلِمًا, a ne *vjernik* (مؤمن). Korkut je ovu izmjenu vjerojatno napravio nastojeći izbjeći očit anakronizam, budući da je Abraham živio dva i pol tisućljeća prije nego što je nastao islam i pojam „musliman“.

<sup>57</sup> H. Busse svoj glasoviti članak *The Sanctity of Jerusalem in Islam* počinje rečenicom: „Obilježje svetosti Jeruzalema u islamu se, u biti, temelji na Muhamedovom shvaćanju sebe kao onoga tko je ispunio religiju Naroda knjige, Židova i kršćana“ (H. BUSSE, 1968: 441). Vidjeti i J. LASSNER, 2017: 191.

<sup>58</sup> *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 5: 323 (s.v. al-Ḳuds), M. SHARON, 2006: 24. Usp. AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 213-214 koji prenosi i tradiciju prema kojoj je Palestinu i Jeruzalem osvajao ‘Amr ibn el-‘As, poznat kao osvajač Egipta. Prema Tabariju, ‘Amr je u boj protiv stanovnika Jeruzalema poslao ‘Alkamah ibn Hakima i el-‘Akkija (AL-TABARI, vol. XII:186). Postoji i tradicija prema kojoj se osvajanje dijelova Palestine i posebice Jeruzalema pripisuje Abu Ubeidi. No, većina tradicija, neovisno o tomu tko se navodi kao zaslužan za zaposjedanje grada (Halid ibn Tabit el-Fahmi, ‘Amr ili Abu Ubeida), sam čin predaje Jeruzalema povezuje s Omarovim ulaskom u grad. O različitim tradicijama i izvorima v. H. BUSSE, 1986: 149-168, koji ipak napominje i kako su pojedini arapskoga osvajanja Palestine nepoznati, a islamska nam tradicija, načelno, prenosi četiri inačice priče o osvajanju Jeruzalema (H. BUSSE, 1968: 443-444). Omarova uloga u islamskom osvajanju Jeruzalema, pa i sam njegov

prophets<sup>56</sup> (as well as personalities from the New Testament, of which Jesus and Mary are practically the only ones mentioned), and consequently assumes that all places holy to Jews are also holy to Muslims by default.<sup>57</sup> In pursuit of an answer to the question of when these events from the Islamic tradition began to be linked to Jerusalem, it is essential to look back to the Muslim conquest of Palestine and the first Islamic constructions in Jerusalem.

#### 4. PALESTINE UNDER MUSLIM RULE

Arab-Muslim troops captured Jerusalem in 638, during the rule of the second, and according to Sunni tradition most important, Rashidun Caliph ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb (634–644). According to earliest Islamic sources Jerusalem was conquered by the little-known commander Khālid b. Thābit al-Fahmi.<sup>58</sup> By the end

<sup>56</sup> For example, in Quran 3: 67 is written that “Abraham was neither a Jew nor a Christian, but he was one inclining toward truth, a Muslim” (translation by Sahih International; see also IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 260). In Korkut’s translation “Ibrahim was neither Jew nor Christian, but a true believer ...”, but this translation is rather incorrect, since in the Arabic original we find the word *Muslim* (مسلم in the original text مُسْلِمًا) and not *believer* (مؤمن). Korkut likely made this change in order to avoid the obvious anachronism, seeing as Abraham lived two and a half millennia before Islam and term “Muslim” appeared. Similarly, Pickthall wrote: “Abraham was not a Jew, nor yet a Christian; but he was an upright man who had surrendered (to Allah).”

<sup>57</sup> H. Busse begins his famous article *The Sanctity of Jerusalem in Islam* with the sentence: “The sacred character of Jerusalem in Islam is, on the whole, based on Muhammad’s conception of himself as the one who fulfilled the religion of the People of the Book, Jews and Christians” (H. BUSSE, 1968: 441). See also J. LASSNER, 2017: 191.

<sup>58</sup> *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 5: 323 (s.v. al-Ḳuds); M. SHARON, 2006: 24. Cf. AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 213-214 who cites the tradition according to which Palestine and Jerusalem were conquered by ‘Amr ibn al-‘As, the famous conqueror of Egypt. According to Tabari ‘Amr sent ‘Alkamah ibn Ḥakīm and al-‘Akkī to the battle against the inhabitants of Jerusalem (AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 186). There is also a tradition according to which the conquest of parts of Palestine including Jerusalem is attributed to Abu Ubaydah. Most later traditions, though, regardless of who is merited with the conquest of the city (Khālid ibn Thābit al-Fahmi, ‘Amr, or Abu Ubaydah), linked the act of surrendering Jerusalem to ‘Umar’s arrival. On the various traditions and sources see H. BUSSE, 1986: 149-168. Busse points out that details about the Arab conquest of Palestine are not known, and that Islamic traditions offer four different versions of the narrative



konca desetogodišnje Omarove vladavine protezao se od Perzije do Egipta. Palestina je bila tek jedna od osvojenih bizantskih azijskih pokrajina, a Jeruzalem jedan u nizu gradova koji su iz bizantske uprave došli pod muslimansku. Radi upravljanja novoosvojenom pokrajinom bilo je nužno odrediti administrativno središte. Izbor je pao na Cezareju, palestinski grad koji su muslimani posljednji osvojili, a koji je bio lokalno administrativno središte i tijekom bizantske vladavine. Početkom 8. stoljeća muslimani su u Palestini izgradili novo administrativno središte Ramlu, utemeljenu između 705. i 714.<sup>59</sup> Ramla je ostala središte arapske muslimanske uprave u Palestini skoro do dolaska križara, točnije do potresa koji je 1068. razorio veći dio grada.<sup>60</sup>

Političko i upravno središte čitava toga šireg područja bio je Damask, glavni grad Umajada i prijestolnica islamskog imperija do dolaska Abasida (750.) koji su središte vlasti preselili u Irak. Damask je za Umajade bio važniji od Jeruzalema,<sup>61</sup> premda postoje neka alternativna mišljenja: ugledni izraelski povjesničar Amikam Elad – uz napomenu kako za to nema nikakvih „eksplicitnih pisanih svjedočanstava“ – smatra da je glavni grad Umajada bio

of ‘Umar’s ten-year rule, the Islamic empire extended from Persia to Egypt. Palestine was merely one of the conquered Byzantine regions in Asia, and Jerusalem one of many cities in which Muslim rule replaced Byzantine. In order to govern the newly occupied regions it was necessary to establish an administrative center. The choice fell on Caesarea, the last Palestinian city conquered by the Muslims, and the province’s administrative center also during Byzantine rule. At the beginning of the eighth century Muslims in Palestine built a new administrative center, the city of Ramla, founded between 705 and 714.<sup>59</sup> Ramla remained the capital city of Arab Muslim administration in Palestine until an earthquake in 1068 destroyed a greater part of the city.<sup>60</sup>

The political and administrative center of that wider region was Damascus, the capital of the Umayyad dynasty, and the capital of the Islamic empire until the Abbasids transferred the center of government to Iraq after the revolution of 750. Damascus was more important than Jerusalem to the Umayyads,<sup>61</sup> even though there are alternative opinions: Israeli historian Amikam Elad, along with the observation that there are no “explicit written testimonies” on the matter, wrote that the capital city of the Umayyads was

dolazak u Palestinu u bilo kojem kontekstu, može se staviti pod upit jer bi se za tako značajan događaj, ako se zbilo, očekivalo da bude zapisan u svim izvješćima i s puno više detalja (v. B. HAVEL, 2010: 432-433). Meka je od Palestine udaljena mjesec dana putovanja karavanom (IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 182-183), pa je teško pretpostaviti da bi kalif na tako dalek put išao bez ozbiljna razloga. Osvajanje Jeruzalema, ako je već tada bio percipiran kao sveti i eshatološki važan grad, predstavljalo bi takav razlog. Druga je mogućnost, kako impliciraju Crone i Cook, da je povezivanje Omara i Jeruzalema u kasnijoj tradiciji prikladno poslužilo za uzdizanje i sanktifikaciju i jednoga i drugoga (H. BUSSE, 1968: 447; P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 5).

<sup>59</sup> Ramlu je na pješćanim dinama utemeljio Sulejman ibn Abdul Malik dok je bio upravitelj Palestine, prije nego što je 715. postao kalif. O ranoj povijesti Ramle v. M. ROSENAYALON, 1996: 250-263.

<sup>60</sup> Primjerice, Mukaddasi na početku popisa gradova Palestine, koja je prema njegovoj podjeli činila jednu od šest sirijskih (aš-Šam) pokrajina, navodi da je njezin glavni grad al-Ramla (AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 123).

<sup>61</sup> Usp. H. BUSSE, 1986: 162.

of the conquest of Jerusalem (H. BUSSE, 1968: 443-444). ‘Umar’s role in the conquest of Jerusalem and his arrival in Palestine can be questioned in any context, for if such an important event had indeed occurred, one would expect that it would have been well documented and that far more detail would have been provided (see B. HAVEL, 2010: 432-433). Mecca lies at a distance of one-month travel by caravan from Palestine (IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 182-183), and it is hard to assume that the Caliph would undertake such a voyage without serious cause. The conquest of Jerusalem, if Jerusalem was at the time perceived as a holy and eschatologically important city, would represent such a cause. Or, as implied by Crone and Cook, the linking of ‘Umar and Jerusalem in later traditions properly served for the elevation and sanctification of both the Caliph and the City (H. BUSSE, 1968: 447; P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 5).

<sup>59</sup> Suleiman ibn ‘Abd al-Malik founded Ramla on sandy dunes while he was the governor of Palestine, before he became Caliph in 715. On the early history of Ramla see M. ROSENAYALON, 1996: 250-263.

<sup>60</sup> For example, Muqaddasi states at the beginning of the list of cities of Palestine, which according to his division makes up one of the six regions of Syria (al-Sham), that Palestine’s capital was al-Ramla (AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 123).

<sup>61</sup> Cf. H. BUSSE, 1986: 162.

Jeruzalem.<sup>62</sup> Upravitelj Damaska još od vremena rašidunskoga kalifata bio je Mu'āvija ibn Abu Sufjan (639.–661.). Nakon ubojstva trećega rašidunskoga kalifa, Mu'āvijina rođaka Usmana ibn Afana (656.), Mu'āvija je odbio prisegnuti na vjernost četvrtome kalifu Aliju ibn Abu Talibu (656.–661.). Sukobi koji su između njih dvojice uslijedili u ranoislamskoj su tradiciji ostali poznati kao razdoblje prve *fitne*, pri čemu se *fitna* (فتنة) u literaturi uglavnom prevodi kao *građanski rat*. Godine 661. kalifa Alija je u džamiji u Kufi ubio pripadnik radikalne muslimanske sljedbe haridžita, nakon čega je kalifska titula trebala pripasti njegovu najstarijem sinu Hasanu. No, Hasan se nagodio s Mu'āvijom kojemu je za pet milijuna dirhama prepustio vlast i vratio se u Medinu.<sup>63</sup> Iste se godine Mu'āvija proglasio kalifom, a njegovom dvadesetogodišnjom vladavinom (661.–680.) započinje razdoblje umajadskog kalifata.

<sup>62</sup> A. ELAD, 1999a: 300. Elad ovu pretpostavku gradi na opažanju kako su Umajadi u Jeruzalem uložili goleme materijalna i ljudska sredstva, što je samo djelomice točno i odnosi se na gradnju Kupole nad Stijenom. Ova je Eladova teza krajnje upitna, a on je, koliko je meni poznato, jedini ugledni stručnjak za ranoislamski Jeruzalem koji je zastupa. Lassner je u svojoj knjizi (J. LASSNER, 2017: xii, Poglavlje 4) posvetio značajan prostor opovrgavanju Eladovih tvrdnja. I raniji su autori uočili logiku u pretpostavci kako su Umajadi, zbog golemoga graditeljskog pothvata koji su poduzeli u Jeruzalemu, možda imali nakanu od njega učiniti svoj glavni grad, ali ne postoje nikakvi dokazi da su to i učinili. Malo je koji kalif prema raspoloživim dokazima uopće posjećivao Jeruzalem, a ni Abdul Malik u njemu se nije zadržavao (M. ROSEN-AYALON, 1989: 1). U prilog Eladovoj pretpostavci treba napomenuti i kako su posljednjih desetljeća obavljena arheološka iskanjanja na južnoj strani Harama koja su otkrila kompleks „sekularnih“ građevina iz umajadskog razdoblja, među kojima je i kuća iz koje se moglo izravno doći do džamije (el-Akse ili one koja je stajala na tome mjestu). Robert Hoyland predstavio je neke od neislamskih tekstova u kojima se spominje rana važnost Jeruzalema za muslimane. Hoyland je poznat kao jedan od najvećih poznavatelja neislamskih izvora o ranom islamu (ne i kao stručnjak za islamski Jeruzalem). On u kontekstu opisa Jeruzalema iz pera biskupa Arculfa (pisana 670-tih ili 680-tih) napominje i kako su između Jeruzalema i Damaska izgrađeni novi putovi a stari popravljani, pa i on smatra kako Jeruzalem za muslimane nije bio samo središte kulta, nego „isprva i glavni grad muslimanske Palestine“ (R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 223).

<sup>63</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XVIII: 4-5, 7-12.

Jerusalem.<sup>62</sup> The governor of Damascus was Mu'āwiyah ibn 'Abī Sufyān, who had ruled there since the Rashidun Caliphate. After the murder of the third Rashidun Caliph, Mu'āwiyah's cousin 'Uthmān ibn Affān (656), Mu'āwiyah refused to swear allegiance to the fourth Caliph, 'Alī ibn Abi Tālib (656–661). The disputes between the two of them became known in early Islamic tradition as the era of the first *fitnah* (فتنة) which is usually translated as Civil War. In 661 Caliph 'Alī was killed in a mosque in Kūfa by a member of the radical Muslim sect of Kharijites, after which the title of Caliph should have been inherited by his eldest son Hassan. Hassan, however, ceded power to Mu'āwiyah for the price of five million dirhams and returned to Medina.<sup>63</sup> The same year, Mu'āwiyah proclaimed himself Caliph and with his twenty-year rule (661–680) the period of the Umayyad Caliphate begins.

<sup>62</sup> A. ELAD, 1999: 300-314. Elad bases this assumption on the observation that the Umayyads invested an enormous amount of material and human resources into Jerusalem, but that is only partially true and is applicable only to the construction of the Dome of the Rock. This theory of Elad's is disputable and he is, as far as I know, the only prominent expert on early Islamic Jerusalem who adheres to this theory. Lassner in his book (J. LASSNER, 2017: xii, Chapter 4) dedicates much space to the refuting of Elad's statements. Even earlier authors noticed the logic in the assumption that the Umayyads, due to the enormous construction venture which they undertook in Jerusalem, perhaps had the intention of making it their capital city, but there is no evidence that they ever actually did it. Few Caliphs, according to the evidence available, even visited Jerusalem, and not even 'Abd al-Malik held up there (M. ROSEN-AYALON, 1989: 1). In support of Elad's theory it should be noted that in the past few decades there have been archaeological excavations on the south side of the Haram which have revealed a complex of "secular" buildings from the Umayyad era, among which a house from which one could directly approach the mosque (al-Aqsā or one that stood in that spot). Robert Hoyland presented some of the non-Islamic texts in which the early importance of Jerusalem for Muslims is mentioned. Hoyland is one of the most famous scholars of non-Islamic sources on early Islam (but not also as an expert on Islamic Jerusalem). In the context of a description of Jerusalem by Bishop Arculf (written in the 670s or 680s) he mentions that between Jerusalem and Damascus there were new paths built and the old repaired, and that he believes that Jerusalem was not only a cult center for Muslims, but also "initially the capital of Muslim Palestine" (R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 223).

<sup>63</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XVIII: 4-5, 7-12.

Mu'aviyina prijestolnica od vremena drugoga rašidunskoga kalifa koji ga je imenovao upraviteljem, a potom i kalifata koji je uspostavio, bio je Damask. No, kako at-Tabari prenosi, Mu'aviya se „okrunio“ za kalifa u Jeruzalemu.<sup>64</sup> Bez obrazloženja i u samo jednoj rečenici Tabari navodi da je „te godine Mu'aviya priznat za kalifa u Jeruzalemu“ a potom objašnjava kako su ga nakon Alijeve smrti također u Iraku, a ne više samo u Siriji, nazvali *amir ul-muminin*.<sup>65</sup> Raniji izvor, Ibn Sa'd (784.–845.) piše da je Mu'aviya 658. u Jeruzalemu sklopio savez s 'Amr ibn al-'Asom protiv Alija ibn Abu Taliba.<sup>66</sup> Do konca Mu'aviyine vladavine opisane u XVIII. svesku prijevoda Tabarijeve *Povijesti proroka i kraljeva* Jeruzalem se više ne spominje. Mu'aviya je umro 680. te je sahranjen u Damasku,<sup>67</sup> gradu u kojem je stolovao, koji je gradio,<sup>68</sup> i koji je tijekom stoljeća umajadske vladavine predstavljao „srce jednoga od najvećih imperija koje je svijet ikada upoznao“.<sup>69</sup> Uslijedio je niz kalifa Umajada – među kojima je i Abdul Malik ibn Marvan – dinastije koja je islamskim Orijentom vladala do sredine 8. stoljeća, a upravo u vrijeme Umajada nastaju brojne tradicije prema kojima se vjerska važnost pripisuje sirijskim zemljama, koje se na arapskom zovu *bilad aš-šam* (بلاد الشام), a uključuju i Palestinu.<sup>70</sup> U njima se Sirija svrstava uz bok Hidžazu, kolijevci islama. Nastojanja Umajada da steknu političko-vjerski legitimitet i nastojanja Muslimana da se Jeruzalemu pripiše

From the time of the second Rashidun Caliph 'Umar who appointed him governor, Mu'āwiyah's capital was Damascus. From the capital of the governor, Damascus proceeded to serve as the capital of the Caliphate founded by Mu'āwiyah. As stated by al-Tabari, however, Mu'āwiyah was “crowned” as Caliph in Jerusalem.<sup>64</sup> Without any explanation and in only one sentence Tabari states that “In this year Mu'āwiyah was rendered allegiance as Caliph in Jerusalem (Il-iyā)” and then explains that after 'Alī's death he was called *Amir al-Mu'minīn*<sup>65</sup> not only in Iraq, but in Syria as well. An earlier source, Ibn Sa'd (784–845), states that Mu'āwiyah made an alliance with 'Amr ibn al-'As in Jerusalem in 658 against 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.<sup>66</sup> Until the end of Mu'āwiyah's rule as described in the eighteenth volume of Tabari's *History of Prophets and Kings*, Jerusalem was no longer mentioned. Mu'āwiyah died in 680 and was buried in Damascus,<sup>67</sup> the city from which he ruled, which he built,<sup>68</sup> and which he – during the century of the Umayyad dynasty – turned into the “heart of one of the greatest empires that the world has ever known.”<sup>69</sup> A series of Umayyad Caliph's followed – 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan being one of the most successful – a dynasty which ruled the Islamic Orient until the mid-eighth century. During the Umayyad era numerous traditions appeared, according to which religious importance was attributed to the Syrian lands, in Arabic known as Bilād al-Sham (بلاد الشام), which also included Palestine.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>64</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XVIII: 6.

<sup>65</sup> Arap. „zapovjednik vjernika“, što je titula koja se pripisuje kalifu.

<sup>66</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 222. Mu'aviya je bio upravitelj Sirije, a 'Amr osvajač (640.) i upravitelj Egipta.

<sup>67</sup> O. GRABAR, 1966: 18.

<sup>68</sup> O Mu'avijinim nereligijskim građevinskim pothvatima zna se malo, no oni se po raskoši ne mogu mjeriti s Kupolom (O. GRABAR, 1959: 34).

<sup>69</sup> *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 2: 280 (s.v. Dimashk).

<sup>70</sup> Bilad aš-Šam ili samo aš-Šam označava područje znatno šire od današnje Sirije. Ono prema srednjovjekovnim muslimanskim zemljopiscima uključuje zemlje od Eufrata do sinajskog el-Ariša. Lassner opaža kako to odgovara području obećanu Abrahamu u Postanku 15:18, što upućuje na traženje zajedničke abrahamske tradicije triju monoteističkih religija (J. LASSNER, 2017: 5-6). V. Lassnerovo tumačenje moguće etimologije riječi *Šam*, područja koje prema islamskim izvorima ono obuhvaća, te religijsku simboliku na str. 2-7.

<sup>64</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XVIII: 6.

<sup>65</sup> Arabic for “Commander of the Faithful,” a title attributed to the Caliph.

<sup>66</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 222. Mu'āwiyah was the administrator of Syria, and 'Amr the conqueror (640) and the administrator of Egypt.

<sup>67</sup> O. GRABAR, 1966: 18.

<sup>68</sup> Grabar cautions though that “Little is known about Mu'āwiyah's secular constructions in Damascus, but it is not likely that they were done on a very lavish scale” (O. GRABAR, 1959: 34).

<sup>69</sup> *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 2: 280 (s.v. Dimashk).

<sup>70</sup> Bilād al-Sham or simply al-Sham denotes a region much wider than Syria today. According to medieval Muslim geographers it includes the lands from the Euphrates to al-Ariša of Sinai. Lassner notes that this corresponds to the region promised to Abraham in Genesis 15: 18, which points to the search for a common Abrahamic tradition for the three monotheistic religions (J. LASSNER, 2017: 5-6). See Lassner's interpretation of a possible etymology for the word *Sham*, the region which according to Islamic sources is enveloped by it, and the religious symbolism on pp. 2-7.

svetost „nerazdvojivo su povezana“.<sup>71</sup> Pojavljuju se hadisi kojima se muslimanima preporučuje posjet el-Halilu (Hebronu) i drugim sirijskim gradovima.<sup>72</sup> Nastaju i tradicije kojima se džamija u Damasku<sup>73</sup> uzdiže na razinu četvrte najvažnije u islamu, a molitve u njoj vrjednuju se kao trideset tisuća molitava drugdje.<sup>74</sup> Umajadi fabriciraju brojne hadise i tradicije o ovim temama, što je pak potaknulo proizvodnju hadisa sa suprotnim porukama, u kojima se negira važnost Sirije i sirijskih gradova, a naglašava neprikosnovena vrijednost Meke i, u manjoj mjeri, Medine, odnosno *haramajina*.<sup>75</sup>

Stariji su od islamskih kršćanski izvori u kojima je, najčešće u kratkim fragmentima, opisan Jeruzalem iz umajadskog razdoblja. Franački biskup Arculf izvor je „jedinoga vjerodostojnoga svjedočkog prikaza novoga muslimanskog Jeruzalema“.<sup>76</sup> Arculf je u Jeruzalemu boravio 670-ih te je po povratku u Europu ispričao kako „na mjestu gdje je nekoć stajao veličanstveno izgrađeni Hram, blizu istočnog zida, Saraceni sada pohode grubo izgrađeno pravokutno svetište [u koje] kako vele stane najmanje tri tisuće ljudi“.<sup>77</sup> U djelu što je napisao 680-ih ili 690-ih, redovnik Anastazije Sinajski, koji je tijekom višegodišnjeg putovanja dio vremena proveo i u Jeruzalemu,<sup>78</sup> svjedoči kako su 660. „demoni sudjelovali u poslu čišćenja koji su muslimani poduzimali na Brdu Hrama“.<sup>79</sup> Tu je i djelo *Pratum spirituale*

In these traditions, Syria is placed along with the Hejaz, the cradle of Islam. Thus “Umayyad claims to [religious and political] legitimacy and Muslim attempt to promote the sanctity of Jerusalem were inextricably linked.”<sup>71</sup> Hadith appeared which suggested a visit to al-Khalil (Hebron) and other Syrian cities to Muslims.<sup>72</sup> Traditions were also created by which the mosque of Damascus<sup>73</sup> was elevated to the fourth most important mosque in Islam, and prayers in it valued as thirty-thousand prayers elsewhere.<sup>74</sup> The Umayyads fabricated many ḥadīth and traditions containing such claims, which in turn prompted the invention of ḥadīth with opposite messages, in which the importance of Syria and Syrian cities was mitigated, and the unchallengeable importance of Mecca and, to a lesser degree, of Medina, that is *haramayn*, emphasized.<sup>75</sup>

Older than the Islamic are Christian sources in which, usually in short fragments, Jerusalem of the Umayyad era was described. The Frankish bishop Arculf is the source of “The only authentic eyewitness account of the new Muslim Jerusalem.”<sup>76</sup> Arculf lived in Jerusalem in the 670s and upon return to Europe stated that “In that famous place where once stood the magnificently constructed Temple, near the eastern wall, the Saracens now frequent a rectangular house of prayer which they have built in a crude manner, constructing it from raised planks and large beams over some remaining ruins. This house can, as it is said, accommodate at least 3000 people.”<sup>77</sup> In his work written in the 680s and 690s, the monk Anastasius of Sinai, who spent a period

<sup>71</sup> J. LASSNER, 2017: 17.

<sup>72</sup> I. GOLDZIHNER, 1971: 45.

<sup>73</sup> Veliku džamiju u Damasku počeo je graditi kalif el-Valid (705.–715.) godine 706. pošto je porušio Baziliku sv. Ivana Krstitelja, a gradnja je trajala skoro čitavo jedno desetljeće. El-Valid je istodobno izgradio i „prvu pravu džamiju“ u Medini, na mjestu gdje je stajala Muhamedova kuća, a moguće je i da je džamija el-Aksa u Jeruzalemu također građena u isto to vrijeme (R. GRAFMAN & M. ROSEN-AYALON, 1999: 7).

<sup>74</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 189.

<sup>75</sup> El-Haramajin (الحرمين) znači „dva svetišta“ i odnosi se na hidžaske gradove Meku i Medinu.

<sup>76</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 45.

<sup>77</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 221. Arculf je preživio brodolom kod otoka Ione u arhipelagu zapadne Škotske, a svoja je iskustva s putovanja u Svetu zemlju prepričao redovniku Adomnánu u samostanu u kojem se oporavljao. Adomnán ih je, uz dorade, opisao u djelu *O svetim mjestima (De locis sanctis)*.

<sup>78</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 92.

<sup>79</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 101.

<sup>71</sup> J. LASSNER, 2017: 17.

<sup>72</sup> I. GOLDZIHNER, 1971: 45.

<sup>73</sup> Caliph al-Walid (705–715) began the construction of the Great Mosque in Damascus in the year 706 after he destroyed the Church of John the Baptist, and the construction lasted almost one entire decade. Al-Walid, at the same time, constructed the “first real mosque” in Medina, at the place where Mohammed’s house stood, and it is possible that al-Aqsā mosque in Jerusalem was built at that time (R. GRAFMAN & M. ROSEN-AYALON, 1999: 7).

<sup>74</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 189.

<sup>75</sup> Al-Haramayn (الحرمين) means “two sanctuaries” and refers to the cities of Mecca and Medina in the Hejaz.

<sup>76</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 45.

<sup>77</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 221. Arculf survived a shipwreck near the island Iona in the west Scottish archipelago, and his experiences from his travels to the Holy Land were told to the monk Adomnán in the monastery in which he was recovering. Adomnán described them, with revisions, in his work *On Holy Places (De locis sanctis)*.

(Duhovna livada) Ivana Moska (Μόσχος), bizantskog redovnika i prijatelja jeruzalemskog patrijarha Sofronija, koje je doručeno nakon njegove smrti 619. ili 634., a prema nekim izvorima doručio ga je sam Sofronije.<sup>80</sup> Kratki dijelovi toga teksta posvećeni su počecima muslimanske gradnje na „Kaptolu“ što se tumači kao Brdo Hrama.<sup>81</sup> Prihvate li se ti doručeni dijelovi i tumačenja, muslimani su gradnju na Brdu Hrama započeli odmah po osvajanju Jeruzalema, dok je Sofronije još bio živ, odnosno 638. Hoyland objašnjava da je moguće kako su već tada podignuta neka zdanja, ali su srušena u potresu koji je pogodio Palestinu u lipnju 659., zbog čega je 660. prostor „čišćen“.<sup>82</sup> Zaključno, muslimanska gradnja u Jeruzalemu, koja izgledno implicira rano muslimansko pripisivanje važnosti, a možda i svetosti Jeruzalemu, može se smatrati neupitnom i prije podizanja Kupole nad Stijenom, najstarijega zdanja koje se daje datirati. Ipak, i ovdje treba biti oprezan u donošenju zaključaka. Sama gradnja *per se* nije dokaz pripisivanja svetosti gradu, jer su muslimanske bogomolje i druga zdanja s vremenom niknuli diljem islamskoga imperija, pa tako i u mjestima bez osobite religijske važnosti. U prilog ranog prepoznavanja svetosti govori odabir lokacije – Brdo Hrama. S druge strane, to je bilo i pogodno mjesto jer je pružalo širok prostor za gradnju bez potrebe za rušenjem starije građevine, kao što je u Damasku srušena Bazilika svetog Ivana Krstitelja radi gradnje Velike džamije.

<sup>80</sup> Ivan Mosko opisivao je događaje koje su on i Sofronije vidjeli i proživjeli, a pred smrt je Sofroniju povjerio da nastavi dopisivati u njegovu tekstu. Zbog toga je Ivan Damaščanski, koji je pisao 730-ih, smatrao da je Sofronije autor (R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 61).

<sup>81</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 63. Taj dio teksta glasi: „bezbožni Saraceni uđoše u grad Krista našega Gospodina, u Jeruzalem, uz Božje dopuštenje za kaznu zbog našega nemara, koji je popriličan, i odmah žurno nastaviše prema mjestu koje se zove Kaptol. Sa sobom povedoše ljude, neke silom a neke njihovom voljom, kako bi očistili to mjesto i izgradili tu prokletu stvar namijenjenu njihovim molitvama, koju oni nazivaju džamijom (*midzghitha*)“.

<sup>82</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 65. Za više podataka o tekstovima koji se pripisuju Ivanu Mosku i Sofroniju, a iz kojih se razabiru počeci muslimanske prisutnosti i gradnje u Jeruzalemu, v. R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 61-73.

of time in Jerusalem during his journey of many years,<sup>78</sup> “witnessed” in 660 “demons participating in the clearing work commissioned by the Muslims on the Temple Mount.”<sup>79</sup> Here is also the work entitled *Pratum spirituale* (The Spiritual Meadow) by John Moschus (Μόσχος), a Byzantine monk and friend of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Sophronius, which was revised after his death in 619 or 634, according to many sources by Sophronius himself.<sup>80</sup> Short portions of the texts are dedicated to early Muslim constructions on the “Capitol” which is interpreted as being the Temple Mount.<sup>81</sup> If these elaborated works and interpretations are accepted, Muslims began the construction of the Temple Mount immediately upon conquering Jerusalem, while Sophronius was still alive, that is, in 638. Hoyland explains that it is possible that already at that time some structures were built, but were destroyed in the earthquake which hit Palestine in June of 659, for which reason the space was “cleared” in 660.<sup>82</sup> In conclusion, Muslim construction in Jerusalem, which likely implies an early Muslim attribution of importance and perhaps holiness to Jerusalem, may be considered unquestionable even before erection of the Dome of the Rock, the oldest edifice that can be dated. However, even here one must be cautious in drawing conclusions. The construction *per se* is not evidence of the attribution of holiness to the city, as Muslim prayer-houses and other edifices with time came to be built around the Islamic empire, even in places without any particular religious importance. An early attribution of holiness to Jerusalem may be argued on the basis of choice of location

<sup>78</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 92.

<sup>79</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 101.

<sup>80</sup> John Moschus described events that he and Sophronius saw and experienced, and before his death he entrusted Sophronius to continue to add onto his text. John of Damascus, who wrote in the 730s, therefore believed Sophronius to be its author (R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 61).

<sup>81</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 63. That part of the text reads: “the godless Saracens entered the holy city of Christ our Lord, Jerusalem, with the permission of God and in punishment of our negligence, which is considerable, and immediately proceeded in haste to the place which is called the Capitol. They took with them men, some by force, others by their own will, in order to clean that place and to build that cursed thing, intended for their prayer and which they call a mosque (*midzghitha*)” (p. 63).

<sup>82</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 65. For more on the texts which are attributed to John Moschus and Sophronius, and from which the beginning of a Muslim presence and construction in Jerusalem can be seen, see R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 61-73.

## 5. RANOISLAMSKA IMENA JERUZALEMA

Od prvoga spomena Jeruzalema u Tabarijevoj *Povijesti proroka i kraljeva* zapažamo neočekivan toponim pod kojim se taj – do tada već sasvim nedvojbeno i odavno – sveti islamski grad pojavljuje u izvornomu arapskom tekstu. At-Tabari (839.–923.) Jeruzalem naziva „Ilija“ (إيلياء), odnosno *ilija madinat beit el-magdis*.<sup>83</sup> Značenje je ‘Aelia, grad Hrama’, pri čemu je *ilija* arabizirano latinsko ime Aelia, *medina* je arapska riječ za grad, a *beit el-magdis* (ili *makdis*) arabizirani je hebrejski naziv za židovski Hram u Jeruzalemu *beit ha-mikdash* (בית המקדש)<sup>84</sup>, što doslovno znači ‘sveti dom’ ili ‘svetište’. Prema Brilllovoj *Enciklopediji islama*, „u praksi se koristilo ime *Ilija* ili još češće *Beit el-makdis*“<sup>85</sup>, premda valja napomenuti kako najraniji islamski izvori spominju samo Iliju, ali ne i Beit el-magdis. Tako, primjerice, arheološki nalaz iz Negevske pustinje u današnjem Izraelu s modificiranim kuranskim tekstom, koji potječe s početka 8. stoljeća, ukazuje na ranu uporabu toponima Ilija, dok je ime Beit al-magdis još bilo nepoznato.<sup>86</sup> Isto nazivlje nalazimo i u drugih glasovitih islamskih povjesničara, od Ibn Ishaka koji također koristi toponim Ilija,<sup>87</sup> preko Ibn Sa‘da (784.–845.),<sup>88</sup> do Balazurija (?–892.) u kojega se češće javlja *el-beit el-mukaddas*, pa i kad piše o Jeruzalemu iz

– the Temple Mount. On the other hand, the Temple Mount was a convenient place because it offered a wide area for construction, with no need for the destruction of older buildings, such as the destruction of the Cathedral of John the Baptist in Damascus in order to build the Umayyad Mosque on its site.

## 5. THE EARLY ISLAMIC NAME FOR JERUSALEM

From the first mention of Jerusalem in Tabari’s *History of Prophets and Kings*, Tabari (839–923) uses a somewhat surprising toponym by which that city, by the tenth century AD already a long-time revered by Muslims as holy, is referred to. In the original Arabic text, Tabari calls Jerusalem “Iliyā” (إيلياء), or Iliyā madīnat bayt al-maqdis.<sup>83</sup> It means “Aelia, city of the Temple”, with Iliyā being the Arabicized Latin name Aelia, *madīnat* is the Arabic word for city, and *bayt al-maqdis* (or *maqdis*) is the Arabicized Hebrew term for the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem *bait ha-mikdash* (בית המקדש)<sup>84</sup> which means “the Holy House” or “the Temple”. According to Brill’s *Encyclopaedia of Islam* “In practice, Iliyā, or, more commonly, *bayt al-maqdis*, were used,”<sup>85</sup> although the earliest Islamic sources mention only Iliyā, and not Bayt al-maqdis. Thus, an early eighth century archaeological finding from the Negev Desert in modern Israel comprised of a modified Quranic text, indicates an early use of the toponym Iliyā, while the name Bayt al-maqdis was still unknown.<sup>86</sup> The same terms are used by other prominent Islamic chroniclers, such as Ibn Ishaq who also uses the toponym Iliyā,<sup>87</sup> Ibn Sa‘d (784–845),<sup>88</sup> and Baladhuri (?–892)

<sup>83</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 144. U transliteraciji na engleski „Iliya medinat bayt al-magdis“. U samome engleskom prijevodu piše „Jeruzalem“, a na isti su način prevedena i imena Meke, Bagdada, Damaska i Jemena, budući da se radi o „imenima dobro poznatih mjesta“, kako je obrazloženo u Predgovoru (AL-TABARI, vol. XII: viii), dok su imena manje poznatih mjesta transliterirana.

<sup>84</sup> Hebrejsko *ha* (ה) i arapsko *el* ili *al* (ال) predstavlja određeni član.

<sup>85</sup> Encyclopaedia of Islam, vol. 5: 322 (s.v. al-Ḳuds).

<sup>86</sup> M. SHARON, 2009: 298-299. Radi se o kamenoj gravuri retka 50:41 „I oslušuj! Dan kada će glasnik pozvati iz mjesta koje je blizu“, u kojem je dio „iz mjesta koje je blizu“ (من مَكَانٍ قَرِيبٍ) zamijenjen riječima „iz Ilije“ (إيلياء من).

<sup>87</sup> IBN-ISHAQ, 2004: 181.

<sup>88</sup> Ibn Sa‘d u svojoj glasovitoj kolekciji biografija *Kitāb tabaqat el-kubra* (4.2, 2) piše kako je Mu‘awiyah s ‘Amrom sklopio savez „bi bait el-makdis“, odnosno u Jeruzalemu (R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 222, fusnota 24).

<sup>83</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 144. In English transliteration “Iliyā madinat bayt al-maqdis”. In the English translation “Jerusalem” is written, and in the same way the names Mecca, Baghdad, Damascus and Yemen are translated, because they are considered “Well-known place names” as explained in the Foreword (ibid. viii), while the names of less-known places are transliterated.

<sup>84</sup> The Hebrew *ha* (ה) and Arabic *al* (ال) represent definite article.

<sup>85</sup> *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 5: 322 (s.v. al-Ḳuds).

<sup>86</sup> M. SHARON, 2009: 298-299. It is a stone inscription of verse 50: 41 “And listen on the day when the crier crieth from a near place” in which the part “from a near place” (من مَكَانٍ قَرِيبٍ) is replaced with the words “from Iliyā” (إيلياء من).

<sup>87</sup> IBN-ISHAQ, 2004: 181.

<sup>88</sup> Ibn Sa‘d in his famous biographical collection *Kitāb tabaqat al-kubra* (4.2, 2) writes that Mu‘awiyah made an alliance with ‘Amr “*bi-bayt al-maqdis*,” that is, in Jerusalem (R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 222, footnote 24).

vremena Prvoga hrama.<sup>89</sup> Današnje muslimansko ime Jeruzalema, el-Kuds, uopće se ne spominje, niti ono u to vrijeme postoji u literaturi. Autori natuknice „Al-Kuds“ u *EI* navode da je to ime „još uvijek nepoznato Ibn Sa‘du, Balazuriju, Tabariju, Ahganiju, Ikd al-Faridu i drugim klasicima 3./9. stoljeća”.<sup>90</sup> Moshe Sharon u opisu arapske inskripcije iz 785. pronađene blizu današnjega kibuca Sde Boker, napominje kako su Arapi do 10. stoljeća Jeruzalem poznavali pod imenom Ilija.<sup>91</sup> Ime el-Kuds učestalije koristi tek arapski povjesničar rodom iz Jeruzalema el-Mukaddasi ili el-Makdisi (المقدسي, 945.–991.) koji je pisao krajem 10. stoljeća. No, i on u svojem glasovitu zemljopisnom djelu *Ahsan el-takasim fi-marifat el-akalim* koristi i Beit al-makdis, primjerice na početku opisa palestinskih gradova te na početku opisa Jeruzalema.<sup>92</sup>

Neobičan je toponomastički i historiografski fenomen da ime grada koji se danas smatra trećim najsvetijim u islamu, muslimanskim povjesničarima koji pišu tijekom više od tri stoljeća od pojave islama, uopće nije poznato, kako u njegovu izvornome hebraiziranom obliku Jeruzalem odnosno Jerušalajim (ירושלים) tako ni u arapskoj inačici el-Kuds (القدس). Nedvojbeno je, naime, da se i Ilija i Beit el-makdis u djelima islamskih povjesničara odnosi na Jeruzalem. Pri tome je osobito znakovita uporaba imena Ilija, budući da je ono i prije islamskog osvajanja Palestine u religijskom kontekstu bilo neprihvatljivo Židovima, od kojih su muslimani preuzeli niz tradicija vezanih za taj grad, a potom, u određenoj mjeri, i kršćanima. Jeruzalem je u Aeliju Capitolinu preimenovao rimski car Hadrijan (117.–138.), pošto je uz goleme poteškoće 135. uspio ugušiti trogodišnju židovsku pobunu pod vodstvom Bar Kohbe. Židove koji su preživjeli pokolj protjerao je iz Jeruzalema i okolnih judejskih krajeva te im uz prijetnju smrću zabranio ulazak i približavanje gradu. Ta se zabrana odnosila i na kršćane

who used *al-Bayt al-Muqaddas* more often, even when he wrote about the Jerusalem of the First Temple period.<sup>89</sup> The current Muslim name for Jerusalem, al-Quds, is not mentioned at all, nor does it appear anywhere in literature of that time. The author of the entry “al-Ḳuds” in *EI* states that the name al-Ḳuds is “still unknown to Ibn Sa‘d, Baladhuri, Tabari, the *Agkani*, the *‘Ikd al-faridu* and other classics of the 3<sup>rd</sup>/9<sup>th</sup> century.”<sup>90</sup> Moshe Sharon, in the description of an Arabic inscription from 785 found near Kibbutz Sde Boker, explains that Iliyā was the name “by which the city was known to the Muslims until the 10th century.”<sup>91</sup> The name al-Quds’ is first used more frequently by an Arab historian born in Jerusalem, al-Muqaddasi or al-Makdisi (المقدسي, 945–991), who wrote at the end of the tenth century AD. In his famous geographical work, *Ahsan al-taqasim fi-ma’rifat al-aqalim*, however, he also uses the name Bayt al-Maqdis. It appears at the beginning of his account of Palestinian cities, and at the beginning of the description of Jerusalem.<sup>92</sup>

It is a rather unusual and unexpected toponymic and historiographic phenomenon that the name of a city today considered to be the third holiest in Islam was not known to Muslim chroniclers who wrote during the first three centuries of Islam, neither in its original Hebrew form Jerusalem or Yerushalayim (ירושלים) nor in its Arabic form al-Ḳuds (القدس). It is, however, beyond dispute that both “Iliyā” and “Bayt al-Maqdis” in the works of early Islamic historians refer to Jerusalem. The use of the name Iliyā is particularly indicative and perhaps unexpected inasmuch as “Aelia” has never been used by Jews in religious context, not even prior to the Muslim conquest of Palestine, and Muslims borrowed many traditions relating to the city from the Jews. To a certain extent that name was also improper for Christian, primarily religious use. Emperor Hadrian (117–38) renamed Jerusalem to Aelia Capitolina following his suppression of the Jewish revolt under Bar Kohba in 135 after three years of bitter struggle and much difficulty. The Jews who survived the Roman slaughter were exiled from Jerusalem and the surrounding Judaeen region, and were prohibited not only to enter but also to approach the city on pain of death. This ban applied to Christians of Jewish descent as well,

<sup>89</sup> AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 30; usp. AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 213 id.

<sup>90</sup> *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 5: 323 (s.v. al-Ḳuds). Stoljeća navedena u citatu odnose se na računanje vremena prema islamskom, odnosno prema kršćanskom kalendaru (3. stoljeće nakon *hidžre* odnosno 10. stoljeće poslije Krista).

<sup>91</sup> M. SHARON, 1992: 56.

<sup>92</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 132, 140.

<sup>89</sup> AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 30; cf. AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 213ff.

<sup>90</sup> *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 5: 323 (s.v. al-Ḳuds). The centuries cited in the citation are the Islamic way of denoting time, according to the Christian calendar (third century AH or tenth century AD).

<sup>91</sup> M. SHARON, 1992: 56.

<sup>92</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 132, 140.

židovskoga podrijetla, odnosno na sve obrezane.<sup>93</sup> Osim Jeruzalema, Hadrijan je preimenovao Judeju ili zemlju Izraelovu (ארץ ישראל) u Palestinu, radi zatiranja njezina židovskog identiteta.<sup>94</sup> Ime Palestina zaživjelo je i ostalo u uporabi do danas, dok se ime Jeruzalem polako vraćalo i s vremenom istisnulo ime Aelia Capitolina iz kršćanske uporabe. Među ključnim razlozima za to jest važnost Jeruzalema u kršćanskoj tradiciji kao mjesta Isusove muke i uskrsnuća, ali i grada što se u Bibliji spominje preko osam stotina puta.<sup>95</sup> Drugi je Hadrijanovo pretvaranje grada u „napadno rimsko naselje“ koje je uključivalo i poganska svetišta *ad hoc* podignuta radi zatomljenja židovske i kršćanske vjere. Samo ime Aelia Capitolina upućivalo je na vrhovništvo rimskoga boga Jupitera (*Iuppiter Capitolinus*) nad tim buntovnim gradom.<sup>96</sup> Konstantin (306.–337.) kasnije je porušio poganska rimska svetišta, a Jeruzalem je postao odredištem kršćanskih hodočasnika, posebice pošto je Konstantinova majka, sveta Helena, u Jeruzalemu pokrenula gradnju crkava na mjestima povezanim s epizodama iz Isusova života.<sup>97</sup> Tijekom čitava bizantskog razdoblja koje je, s iznimkom kratkotrajne perzijske vlasti početkom 7. stoljeća, trajalo sve do islamskog osvajanja, latinsko je ime Aelia ostalo u sporadičnoj uporabi u grčkomu ili u izvornomu latinskom obliku,<sup>98</sup>

that is, to all who were circumcised.<sup>93</sup> Along with Jerusalem Hadrian also renamed Judaea, or the Land of Israel (ארץ ישראל) to Palestine, in order to eradicate its Jewish identity.<sup>94</sup> The name Palestine took hold and has been in use to this very day, while the name Jerusalem slowly came back into use and eventually entirely ousted the name Aelia Capitolina from Christian use. Among the key reasons for this is the importance of Jerusalem in Christian tradition as the place of Jesus' Passion and Resurrection, as well its status as a city which is mentioned in the Bible more than eight hundred times.<sup>95</sup> Another reason was Hadrian's transformation of Jerusalem into a "conspicuously Roman colony" which included pagan sanctuaries constructed *ad hoc* in order to suppress the Jewish and Christian faith. The name Aelia Capitolina referred to the dominance of the chief deity of the Roman pantheon, Jupiter Capitolinus, over that rebellious city.<sup>96</sup> Under the rule of Emperor Constantine (306–337) pagan Roman sanctuaries were destroyed, and Jerusalem became a destination of Christian pilgrimage, particularly after Constantine's mother, Saint Helena, initiated construction of churches in places connected to events from Jesus' life in Jerusalem.<sup>97</sup> During the entire Byzantine period which, except for a brief period of Persian rule at the beginning of the seventh century, lasted until the Islamic conquest, the Latin name Aelia remained in sporadic use in its Greek or original Latin form,<sup>98</sup> even

<sup>93</sup> M. AVI-YONAH, 1960: 111.

<sup>94</sup> B. LEWIS, 1980: 1-12. Judeja i zemlja Izraelova u to su se vrijeme mogle smatrati sinonimima; v. primjerice Matej 2:19.

<sup>95</sup> „Ime *Jeruzalem* spominje se 660 puta u Starom zavjetu i 146 puta u Novom zavjetu; dodatne se reference na grad pojavljuju u obliku sinonima” (*Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology*: 392).

<sup>96</sup> Više o Hadrijanovu preimenovanju Jeruzalema v. u D. GOLAN, 1986: 226-239.

<sup>97</sup> Vidjeti C. DAUPHIN, 1997: 146-148.

<sup>98</sup> Hrvoje Gračanin, stručnjak za kasnoantičko i ranosrednjovjekovno povijesno spisateljstvo i povijest bizantske civilizacije s Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, poslao mi je niz primjera naziva Jeruzalema u djelima kršćanskih autora od 4. do 8. stoljeća. Sljedeći su citati preuzeti iz njegova dopisa od 23. siječnja 2018.:

„Euzebije (4. st.) u *Crkvenoj povijesti* 2.12.3: τῆς νῦν Αἰλίας, *sadašnje Elije*; 6.20.1: εἰς ἡμᾶς ... κατὰ Αἰλίαν, *do danas... u Eliji*. *Itinerarium Burdigalense* (333./334.) *Itineraria Romana*. Vol. 1: *Itineraria Antonini Augusti et Burdigalense*, ed. Otto Cuntz, Leipzig: Teubner, 1929, 86-102 isključivo se koristi ime Hierusalem (588,7-8; 589,4; 589,5; 589,7; 591,7; 594,5; 596,4; 598,4; 600,1). *Sanctae Silviae Peregrinatio* (kraj 4. st.)

<sup>93</sup> M. AVI-YONAH, 1960: 111.

<sup>94</sup> B. LEWIS, 1980: 1-12. Judaea and the land of Israel could have been considered synonyms at that time; see, for example Matthew 2: 19.

<sup>95</sup> “The name ‘Jerusalem’ occurs 806 times in the Bible, 660 times in the Old Testament and 146 times in the New Testament; additional references to the city occur as synonyms” (*Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology*: 392).

<sup>96</sup> For more on Hadrian's renaming of Jerusalem see D. GOLAN, 1986: 226-239.

<sup>97</sup> See C. DAUPHIN, 1997: 146-148.

<sup>98</sup> Hrvoje Gračanin, an expert from the University of Zagreb's Faculty of Philosophy on historical writing from late antiquity and the early Middle Ages, as well as on the history of Byzantine civilization, sent me a series of examples of the name for Jerusalem in the works of Christian authors from the 4th to the 8th century. The following citations are from his letter dated January 23rd, 2018:

Eusebius (4th century) in *Church History* 2.12.3: τῆς νῦν Αἰλίας, *of the Aelia of today*; 6.20.1: εἰς ἡμᾶς ... κατὰ Αἰλίαν, *until today... in Aelia*.

*Itinerarium Burdigalense* (333/334) *Itineraria Romana*. Vol. 1: *Itineraria Antonini Augusti et Burdigalense*, ed. Otto Cuntz, Leipzig: Teubner, 1929, 86-102 only the name Hierusalem was used (588,7-8; 589,4; 589,5; 589,7; 591,7; 594,5; 596,4;



premda su kršćani u „pisanim izvorima načelno grad nazivali ‘Hierosolym’”.<sup>99</sup> Ime Aelia dočekalo je muslimanske osvajače koji su ga prihvatili, arabizirali i koristili još stoljećima. Muslimanima je podrijetlo imena Aelia odnosno Ilija bilo nepoznato, pa su ga tumačili na različite načine, između ostalog povezujući ga s biblijskim prorokom Ilijom, hebrejski Elijahu (אֵלִיָּהוּ), koji se u Kur'anu (6:85; 37:130) naziva Ilijas (إلياس).<sup>100</sup> U većini prijevoda ranoislamskih arapskih tekstova na engleski ime Aelia (Ilija) naprosto je prevedeno kao Jeruzalem, uz eventualnu kratku napomenu da se radi o usklađivanju nazivlja, kakva se nalazi u predgovorima više svezaka prijevoda Tabarijeve *Povijesti*. Postoje, dakako, iznimke. Orijeentalist Guy Le Strange (1854.–1933.) objasnio je imena Jeruzalema koja

*Itinera Hierosolymitana*, ed. Paul Geyer 9.7: in Helia, id est in Ierusalimam.

Euherije iz Lugduna, *De situ Hierusolimitanae urbis atque ipsius Iudaeae epistola ad Faustum presbyterum* (5. st.) *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, ed. Paul Geyer, str. 127,7: Hierusalem ab Aelio Adriano Aelia uocitatur, str. 128,4: Aelia.

Akta halkedonskog koncila (451.) *Concilium Universale Chalcedonense*, u: *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* t. II, vol. I: *Acta Graeca*, Pars III: *Actiones VIII-XVII. 18-31*, ed. Eduard Schwartz, Berlin-Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1965. Actio XVI, 16: *biskupu Elije, to jest Jeruzalema*.

Komes Marcelin, *Kronika* (6. st.) a. 419.3 ... Montem oliveti Hierosolymae vicinum ... (...Maslinskom gorom blizu Jeruzalema). A. 439.2 Hierosolymis; a. 444.4 Aeliam urbem i Aeliam civitatem; a. 453.1 Hierosolymam; a. 516.2 Hierosolymitanae urbis.

Adomnan iz Ione, *De locis sanctis libri tres* (7./8. st.) *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, ed. Paul Geyer. Učestalije se koristi ime Hierusalem, ali u 1.20: Helia (dvaput) i 2.7: Helia.

Beda, *Liber de locis sanctis* (7./8. st.) *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, ed. Paul Geyer

učestalije se koristi ime Hierusalem; cap. 1: sed ab Helio Adriano Caesare, a quo etiam nunc Helia uocatur; Helia i u cap. 3,7,8,9 i 15.“

Ovim putem zahvaljujem Hrvoju Gračaninu na ljubaznosti i trudu koji je uložio u prikupljanje gore navedenih primjera.

<sup>99</sup> J. LASSNER, 2006: 165, fusnota 2. Žilavost imena Aelia i tijekom pretežitog kršćanskoga Bizantskog Carstva doima se neobičnim, uzme li se u obzir da je već postojao kanoniziran tekst Novoga zavjeta u kojem se spominje Jeruzalem, ali ne i Aelia, budući da je to ime nastalo nekoliko desetljeća nakon pisanja i posljednjega novozavjetnog teksta. Nadalje, car Julijan Apostata (361.–363.) svoj je protukršćanski nazor iskazivao podržavanjem Židova u njihovu nastojanju da obnove Hram u Jeruzalemu, a ne u Aeliji, a Židovi svoj sveti grad sigurno nisu nazivali Aelijom.

<sup>100</sup> *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 5: 322-323 (s.v. al-Ḳuds).

though “In written sources, Christians generally referred to the city as ‘Hierosolym.’”<sup>99</sup> The name Aelia was thus adopted by Muslim conquerors. They arabicized it and continued to use it for centuries. The origins of the name Aelia, or Iliyā, was unknown to Muslims, and they interpreted it in different ways, relating it *inter alia* to the Biblical prophet Elijah, in Hebrew Eliyahu (אֵלִיָּהוּ) who is called Iliyās (إلياس) in the Quran (6:85; 37:130).<sup>100</sup> In most translations of early Arabic texts into English, the name Aelia (Iliyā) was simply translated as “Jerusalem”, sometimes with a short translators’ note explaining that it was done in order to coordinate the terms, as in the foreword of several volumes of Tabari’s *Histories*. There are, of course, exceptions. Orijeentalist Guy Le Strange (1854–1933) offered an explanation for the names for Jerusalem

598,4; 600,1). *Sanctae Siluiae Peregrinatio* (end of the 4th century) *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, ed. Paul Geyer 9.7: in Helia, id est in Ierusalimam.

Euherius of Lyon, *De situ Hierusolimitanae urbis atque ipsius Iudaeae epistola ad Faustum presbyterum* (5th century) *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, ed. Paul Geyer, p. 127,7: Hierusalem ab Aelio Adriano Aelia uocitatur, p. 128,4: Aelia.

*Acts of the Chalcedonian Council* (451) *Concilium Universale Chalcedonense*, in: *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* t. II, vol. I: *Acta Graeca*, Pars III: *Actiones VIII-XVII. 18-31*, ed. Eduard Schwartz, Berlin-Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1965. Actio XVI, 16: *to the bishop of Aelia, that is, Jerusalem*.

Marcellinus Comes, *Chronicles* (6th century) a. 419.3 ... Montem oliveti Hierosolymae vicinum (... *over the Mount of Olives near Jerusalem*). A. 439.2 Hierosolymis; a. 444.4 Aeliam urbem and Aeliam civitatem; a. 453.1 Hierosolymam; a. 516.2 Hierosolymitanae urbis.

Adomnán from Iona, *De locis sanctis libri tres* (7th/8th century) *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, ed. Paul Geyer. The name Hierusalem is used more often, but in 1.20: Helia (twice) and 2.7: Helia.

Venerable Bede, *Liber de locis sanctis* (7th/8th century) *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, ed. Paul Geyer, the name Hierusalem is used more often; cap. 1: sed ab Helio Adriano Caesare, a quo etiam nunc Helia uocatur; Helia also in 3,7,8,9 and 15.

I am thankful to Hrvoje Gračanin for the effort that he put into collecting the examples mentioned above.

<sup>99</sup> J. LASSNER, 2006: 165, footnote 2. The tenacity of the name Aelia even during the mostly Christian Byzantine Empire seems unusual when taking into consideration that there already existed the canonized text of the New Testament in which Jerusalem, and not Aelia, is mentioned, seeing as the name originated several decades after the writing of the text of the New Testament. Furthermore, the emperor Julian the Apostate (361-363) expressed his anti-Christian point of view through his support of the Jews in their attempt to renew the Temple in Jerusalem, not in Aelia, and the Jews certainly did not call their holy city Aelia.

<sup>100</sup> *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 5: 322-323 (s.v. al-Ḳuds).

su muslimani koristili prvih stoljeća vladavine nad Palestinom, pa tako i ime Ilija.<sup>101</sup> Jacob Lassner ukazuje na poteškoću da se razumije pod kojim je okolnostima arapski toponim Ilija kasnije zamijenjen imenima koja ukazuju na pridavanje svetosti gradu, a to su Beit el-makdis i el-Kuds.<sup>102</sup> Ovaj fenomen do sada nije privlačio osobito veliku pozornost povjesničara ranog islama i orijentalista.<sup>103</sup>

## 6. OMAR IBN EL-HATAB KAO OSVAJAČ JERUZALEMA

Islamski su izvori u nesuglasju glede godine muslimanskog osvajanja Jeruzalema. At-Tabari na jednom mjestu kao godinu osvajanja navodi 14.,<sup>104</sup> a na drugome 15. hidžretsku godinu<sup>105</sup> (636. odnosno 637.), dok Balazuri navodi 17. hidžretsku godinu<sup>106</sup> (638.), što je u skladu i s nekim neislamskim izvorima, poglavito onima koji se odnose na jeruzalemskog patrijarha Sofronija,<sup>107</sup> pa se 638. najčešće koristi kao godina pada Jeruzalema pod islamsku vlast. Kako smo vidjeli, prema najranijim izvorima Jeruzalem je osvojio malo poznat zapovjednik Halid ibn Tabit el-Fahmi.<sup>108</sup> Kasnije

used by Muslims in the first centuries of rule in Palestine, including the name Iliyā.<sup>101</sup> Jacob Lassner points to the difficulties in understanding under which circumstances the Arabic toponym Iliyā is later substituted with names which reveal attribution of holiness to the city, Bayt al-Maqdis and al-Quds.<sup>102</sup> Generally, this phenomenon has not attracted much attention from historians of Early Islam and orientalis.<sup>103</sup>

## 6. 'UMAR IBN AL-KHATTĀB AS THE CONQUEROR OF JERUSALEM

Islamic sources are not in agreement regarding the year of the Muslim conquest of Jerusalem. Al-Tabari as the year of the conquest lists both year 14<sup>104</sup>, and year 15 AH<sup>105</sup> (636 and 637 AD), while Baladhuri lists the year 17 AH<sup>106</sup> (638 AD), which corresponds to some non-Islamic sources, in particular those which refer to the patriarch of Jerusalem, Sophronius.<sup>107</sup> The year 638 AD has been generally accepted as the year of the fall of Jerusalem under Muslim rule. As we have seen, according to the earliest sources Jerusalem was conquered by an almost anonymous commander, Khālid b. Thābit al-Fahmi.<sup>108</sup> Later traditions, however, according to

<sup>101</sup> G. LE STRANGE, 1890: 83 i dalje.

<sup>102</sup> J. LASSNER, 2006: 165.

<sup>103</sup> Uz već spomenute iznimke kao što su Le Strange, Moshe Sharon i Jacob Lassner, valja napomenuti kako je 2017. objavljena Lassnerova knjiga *Medieval Jerusalem* u kojoj je ova tema podrobnije obrađena.

<sup>104</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 144.

<sup>105</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 186. U Tabarijevoj *Povijesti* katkad nalazimo na očite pogreške, pa je taj inače iznimno dragocjen izvor potrebno uzimati s oprezom i nastojati ga usporediti s drugim izvorima kad god je to moguće. Primjer takve pogreške je Tabarijev opis bizantske obrane grada Ramle od muslimanske opsade istovremeno kad i Jeruzalema, o čemu je 'Amr izvijestio kalifa Omara (AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 185). No, grad Ramlu osnovao je, a ne osvojio, Sulejman ibn Abdul Malik početkom 8. stoljeća, desetljećima pošto je bizantska vlast potpuno izgubila sva sirijska i palestinska područja (v. i fusnotu 691 na str. 185).

<sup>106</sup> AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 214. Gil kao godine osvajanja Jeruzalema koje Tabari navodi spominje 15. i 16. hidžretsku godinu (M. GIL, 1997: 51), no ovdje treba imati na umu kako se godine hidžretskoga i julijanskoga kalendara ne podudaraju u potpunosti.

<sup>107</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 45.

<sup>108</sup> V. *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 5: 323 (s.v. al-Kuds); AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 213-214; M. GIL, 1997: 52, M. SHARON, 2009: 283 itd.

<sup>101</sup> G. LE STRANGE, 1890: 83 ff.

<sup>102</sup> J. LASSNER, 2006: 165.

<sup>103</sup> Along with the aforementioned works by Le Strange, Moshe Sharon, Jacob Lassner and some other Arabists we ought to mention that this topic has been covered in greater detail in Lassner's recent book *Medieval Jerusalem: Forging an Islamic City in Spaces Sacred to Christians and Jews* published in 2017.

<sup>104</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 144.

<sup>105</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 186. In Tabari's *Histories* we sometimes find obvious errors; thus, that otherwise extremely valuable source should be taken with caution and compared to other sources whenever possible. An example of such an error is Tabari's description of the Byzantine defense of the city of Ramla from a Muslim siege at the same time as Jerusalem, a matter which 'Amr reported to the Caliph 'Umar (AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 185). The city Ramla, however, was founded by Suleiman ibn 'Abd al-Malik at the beginning of the eighth century, that is, decades after the Byzantine Empire lost the entire Syrian and Palestinian region (see also 691 on p. 185).

<sup>106</sup> AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 214. Gil mentions the years 15 and 16 ah as the years of the conquest of Jerusalem, which Tabari cites (M. GIL, 1997: 51); one must keep in mind, however, that the Hijri and Julian calendar do not completely correspond.

<sup>107</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 45.

<sup>108</sup> See *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 5: 323 (s.v. al-Kuds); AL-BALADHURI, 1916: 213-214; M. GIL, 1997: 52; M. SHARON, 2009: 283 etc.

se javljaju tradicije prema kojima se osvajanje Jeruzalema pripisuje kalifu Omaru, i te su tradicije s vremenom postale općeprihvaćene.

Tijek Omarova osvajanja Jeruzalema u različitim je izvorima opisan različito. Heribert Busse, koji je veći dio istraživanja ranoislamske povijesti posvetio legendama o Omarovu ulasku u Jeruzalem, objašnjava kako u islamskoj tradiciji postoje četiri različite tradicije o osvajanju Jeruzalema.<sup>109</sup> U svakoj od njih Omar je taj koji osvaja grad, a razlika je između načina i razloga njegova dolaska u Siriju/Palestinu. Dominantna je tradicija ona prema kojoj se Omaru pripisuju mesijanski atributi. Prema njoj, stanovnici opsjednutoga Jeruzalema poručili su da će grad predati samo osvajaču čiji je dolazak najavljen u proroštvima. Budući da je Omar u to vrijeme bio u Hidžazu, udaljenu mjesec dana putovanja karavanom od Palestine,<sup>110</sup> muslimanski su osvajači pokušali izigrati branitelje grada predstavljajući im zapovjednika Halida ibn Valida kao kalifa, no pronicljivi i upućeni u proroštva znali su da to nije on te je naposljetku Omar bio prisiljen osobno doputovati i preuzeti grad. Legende o Omarovu osvajanju Jeruzalema ispunjene su mesijanskim i eshatološkim crtama, velikim dijelom preuzetima iz židovske i kršćanske predaje. Prema njima, Omar je u Jeruzalem došao preko Maslinske gore, u dotrajaloj odjeći koja je simbolizirala poniznost, jašući na devu.<sup>111</sup> Omar je potom prošao gradom, pomolio se u Davidovu *mihrabu*<sup>112</sup> te potražio mjesto gdje je nekoć stajao Hram. Kršćani, koje je predvodio patrijarh Sofronije i koji su u destrukciji Hrama vidjeli ispunjenje Isusovih proroštava<sup>113</sup> i

which the conquest of Jerusalem is attributed to Caliph ‘Umar appear, and those traditions are eventually generally accepted.

The course of ‘Umar’s conquest of Jerusalem is described differently in different sources. Heribert Busse, who dedicated much of his research on early Islamic history to legends of ‘Umar’s entry into Jerusalem, points out that in Islamic tradition there are four different accounts on the conquest of Jerusalem.<sup>109</sup> In each of these it is ‘Umar who conquers the city and the difference lies in the way and purpose for his arrival to Syria/Palestine. A dominant account is the one in which messianic attributes were bestowed upon ‘Umar. According to this, the inhabitants of a besieged Jerusalem announced that they would surrender the city only to the conqueror whose coming was prophesized in the Scripture. As ‘Umar was in the Hejaz at that time, at a one-month caravan-travel distance from Palestine,<sup>110</sup> the Muslim conquerors attempted to deceive the defenders by introducing general Khālid ibn al-Walīd as the Caliph, but they, being well-informed about the prophecy, knew that it was not him. As a result, ‘Umar was compelled to undertake the long journey to Palestine. Legends of ‘Umar’s entry into Jerusalem abound with messianic and eschatological features taken from Jewish and Christian traditions. According to them, ‘Umar approached Jerusalem from the East, over the Mount of Olives, dressed in worn-out clothes symbolizing humility, and riding on a camel.<sup>111</sup> ‘Umar then went through the city, prayed in David’s *mihrab*,<sup>112</sup> and searched for the place where the Temple stood. The Christians, led by the patriarch Sophronius, who saw in the destruction of the Temple the fulfilment of Jesus’ prophecies<sup>113</sup> and the triumph of Christianity over a despised Judaism for which reason they also turned the Temple Square into the city

<sup>109</sup> H. BUSSE, 1968: 443-444; v. i H. BUSSE, 1986: 156-158.

<sup>110</sup> IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 182-183. Jahač je isti put mogao prijeći brže. Grabar navodi kako je dvojici hodočasnika iz 1047. za putovanje od Jeruzalema do Meke trebalo oko petnaest dana (O. GRABAR, 1996: 137).

<sup>111</sup> Također postoji tradicija prema kojoj je Omar jahao na kljusetu (nerasnu konju), a koju prenosi Tabari (AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 193), te tradicija prema kojoj je jahao na magarcu. Mukaddasi navodi kako je Omar na Maslinskoj gori nekoliko dana čekao predaju grada (AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 144).

<sup>112</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 193-194. *Mihrab* u ovom kontekstu znači *odaja*.

<sup>113</sup> V. Luka 21: 6.

<sup>109</sup> H. BUSSE, 1968: 443-444; see also H. BUSSE, 1986: 156-158.

<sup>110</sup> IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 182-183. A rider could make the same trip more quickly. Grabar cites that two pilgrims in 1047 took 15 days to travel from Jerusalem to Mecca (O. GRABAR, 1996: 137).

<sup>111</sup> There also exists a tradition according to which ‘Umar rode an old horse, which is told by Tabari, and a donkey (AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 193). Muqaddasi states that ‘Umar waited for the surrender of the city for several days on the Mount of Olives (AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 144).

<sup>112</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 193-194. *Mihrab* in this context means *chamber*.

<sup>113</sup> See Luke 21: 6.

trijumf kršćanstva nad prezrenim židovstvom, zbog čega su Hramski trg pretvorili u gradsko smetlište<sup>114</sup>, pokušali su mu pokazati neko drugo mjesto, ali Omar je shvatio da ga zavaravaju. Na Brdo Hrama poveo ga je Židov Ka'b el-Ahbar, koji je mjerenjima izvedenima iz Mišne<sup>115</sup> otkrio i točnu lokaciju Hrama. Omar je zapovjedio da se taj prostor raščisti te je ondje poveo vjerne u molitvu. Utvrdio je mjesto na koje je Muhamed došao u noćnom putovanju, kao i polazišnu točku njegova celestijalnog uznesenja.<sup>116</sup>

Tradicija Omarova osvajanja Jeruzalema izvor je nekoliko različitih, ali povezanih ideja. Njome se utvrđuje mesijansko ozračje oko Omarove ličnosti. Kalif koji prema nekim sunitskim tradicijama ima prednost čak i pred samim Prorokom, poznat pod naslovom el-Faruk, što prema etimologiji iz aramejskog (ne i arapskog) jezika znači 'spasitelj',<sup>117</sup> mesijanstvo pokazuje upravo svečanim ulaskom u Jeruzalem i obnavljanjem Hrama.<sup>118</sup> Islam utvrđuje svoj teološki postulat prema kojem je Muhamedova objava zamijenila prethodne objave – židovsku i kršćansku – te donijela konačnu Božju poruku čovječanstvu. Gradnja islamskog svetišta na Brdu Hrama dokazuje primat islama nad kršćanstvom, upravo kao što je razaranje židovskog svetišta na istome mjestu dokazalo kršćanski primat nad židovstvom. Islam se nadograđuje na biblijske ličnosti, od kojih su Abraham (Ibrahim), David (Davud), Salomon (Sulejman) i Isus (Isa) među najvažnijima, a islamizacija judeokršćanske povijesti kroz islamizaciju ozemlja, u ovome slučaju grada, iz islamske perspektive to nedvojbeno dokazuje. Jeruzalem je prema islamskim tradicijama koje ćemo kasnije navesti mjesto od jedinstvene eshatološke važnosti jer će

garbage dump,<sup>114</sup> attempted to mislead the Caliph to some other place, but 'Umar saw through their trick. A Jewish convert to Islam, Ka'b al-Ahbar, brought him to the Temple Mount, and he also determined the exact location of the Temple through measurements derived from Mishna.<sup>115</sup> 'Umar commanded that the space be cleared, and led the faithful to prayer. Then he identified the place to which Muhammad arrived during his Night Journey, as well as the starting point of his celestial trek.<sup>116</sup>

The tradition of 'Umar's conquest of Jerusalem is the source of several differing but related ideas by which a messianic aura around 'Umar's character is established. Caliph 'Umar, also known by the title al-Faruq, which according to Aramaic (but not Arabic) etymology means "savior,"<sup>117</sup> exhibits his messianic mission through his festive entry into Jerusalem and the renewal of the Temple.<sup>118</sup> Islam established its theological postulate according to which Muhammad's revelation replaced the former revelations – Jewish and Christian – and brought God's ultimate message to humanity. The construction of the Islamic sanctuary on the Temple Mount is proof of the primacy of Islam over Christianity, just as the destruction of the Jewish sanctuary in the same place was proof of Christian primacy over Judaism. Islam builds up upon Biblical characters, of which Abraham (Ibrāhīm), David (Dāwūd), Solomon (Suleimān) and Jesus (ʿĪsā) are among the most important, and the Islamization of Judeo-Christian history through the Islamization of their territory, in this case the city of Jerusalem, from the perspective of Islam demonstrates that metaphysical truth. According to Islamic traditions which we will address later, Jerusalem is a place of unique eschatological importance because the Resurrection and Judgement Day will take place

<sup>114</sup> H. BUSSE, 1986: 167. Hramski trg zapravo je ravna površina Brda Hrama na kojoj su nekoć stajali hramovi, a danas se na njemu nalaze Kupola nad Stijenom, džamija el-Aksa i druga manja islamska svetišta. Za razliku od Brda Hrama, Hramski trg ne uključuje i prostor Zapadnoga zida.

<sup>115</sup> Mišna je dio rabinske literature ili „usmene Tore“ i glavni tekst Talmuda.

<sup>116</sup> H. BUSSE, 1986: 167-168.

<sup>117</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 5.

<sup>118</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 5. Busse opaža kako „osim činjenice da je svrha legende Omaru pripisati osvajanje Jeruzalema te tako podići statusa grada, ona također služi i za podizanje stature Omara“ (H. BUSSE, 1968: 446-447).

<sup>114</sup> H. BUSSE, 1986: 167. The Temple Square is actually a flat surface on the Temple Mount on which Temples used to be, and today the Dome of the Rock, al-Aqṣā mosque and other smaller Islamic sanctuaries are found there. Unlike the Temple Mount, the Temple Square does not include the Western Wall.

<sup>115</sup> Mishna is part of rabbinic literature, or the "oral Torah", and the main text of the Talmud.

<sup>116</sup> H. BUSSE, 1986: 167-168.

<sup>117</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 5.

<sup>118</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 5. Busse notes that "Apart from the fact that the legend has the purpose to credit the Caliph 'Umar with the conquest of Jerusalem and thereby to increase the status of the city, it also serves to increase the status of 'Umar" (H. BUSSE, 1968: 447).

se ondje dogoditi uskrsnuće i Sudnji dan. Štoviše, ključna razlika između Jeruzalema i islamskih svetišta u Hidžazu je u tome što se u Meki nalazi Ka'ba, Medina je središte Muhamedove političko-vjerske karijere, a Jeruzalem je središnje mjesto zbivanja Posljednjih vremena.<sup>119</sup> Takvu važnost Jeruzalema potvrđuje i Mukaddasi,<sup>120</sup> rođeni Jeruzalemac koji je uz sjajne pohvale rodnome gradu ipak pazio da se ne prijeđe granica pretjeranog atribuiranja vjerske važnosti Svetoj zemlji.<sup>121</sup> Zbog toga je Jeruzalem već tijekom ranoga umajadskog razdoblja postao i određeno *hadža* prema poznatom hadisu u kojemu Muhamed određuje tri džamije kao određena hodočašća.<sup>122</sup> Prema drugom hadisu molitva u džamiji el-Aksi u Jeruzalemu petsto je puta vrijednija od molitava upućenih s drugih mjesta, s iznimkom Meke i Medine.<sup>123</sup>

Problem s tradicijama o Omarovu osvajanju Jeruzalema poglavito leži u tome što potječu iz kasnijih izvora, kao što su Balazuri i Tabari. Najraniji dostupni izvori potječu iz „ljetopisa prikupljenih dva stoljeća ili više nakon muslimanskih osvajanja”.<sup>124</sup> Oni se referiraju na ranije izvore čije se postojanje ili vjerodostojnost ne mogu nekritički odbaciti, no ti su izvori danas izgubljeni. Tradicije o osvajanju Jeruzalema nalaze se i u nekim hadisima, premda Busse ukazuje na to da „praktično ne postoji hadis koji ne sadrži anakronistične elemente različitih etapa razvoja [događaja vezanih za osvajanje Jeruzalema]”.<sup>125</sup> Slično kao i kod tradicije o Muhamedovu noćnom putovanju, tradicija o Omarovu osvajanju Jeruzalema s vremenom

in it. A key difference between Jerusalem and the two Islamic sanctuaries in the Hejaz is that Mecca is home of Ka'ba, Medina is center of Muhammad's political-religious career, and Jerusalem is the scene of the Last-Days events.<sup>119</sup> Muqaddasī, a true-born Jerusalemite, also confirms the eschatological importance of Jerusalem<sup>120</sup> even though, while praising his native city, he was cautious not to overemphasize religious significance of the Holy Land at the expense of *haramayn*.<sup>121</sup> But Jerusalem's importance was established and it already became a destination for *hajj* according to a famous *ḥadīth* in which Muhammad assigns three mosques as the destinations for pilgrimage during the early Umayyad period<sup>122</sup> According to another *ḥadīth*, prayer in the al Aqsa mosque in Jerusalem is five hundred times more valuable than prayer in other places, with the exception of Mecca and Medina.<sup>123</sup>

Traditions about 'Umar's conquest of Jerusalem derive from later sources, such as Baladhuri and Tabari, which is their main historiographic problem. The earliest available sources derive from "chronicles first assembled two centuries and more after the Muslim conquest."<sup>124</sup> They refer to earlier sources whose existence or reliability cannot be simply dismissed, but those sources are today lost. Traditions about the conquest of Jerusalem are also found in some *ḥadīth*, although Busse points out that "there is practically no *hadith* that does not contain in a rather anachronistic manner elements from different stages [of events related to the conquest of Jerusalem]."<sup>125</sup> Similar to traditions concerning Muhammad's Night Journey, traditions about 'Umar's conquest of Jerusalem gradually gained more acceptance, and were eventually deemed unquestionable, and they also grew more

<sup>119</sup> J. LASSNER, 2006: 179.

<sup>120</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 141; J. LASSNER, 2017: 182.

<sup>121</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 140-144; više o Mukaddasijevu opisu Jeruzalema bit će riječi kasnije u tekstu.

<sup>122</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 173-196; I. GOLDZIHHER, 1971: 45. Više o ovom hadisu bit će riječi u poglavlju o Kupoli nad Stijenom.

<sup>123</sup> EL-KHATIB, 2001: 29. Prema hadisu koji El-Khatib ovdje navodi, molitve izgovorene u džamiji u Meki vrijede kao 100.000 molitava izrečenih drugdje, a molitve u prorokovoj džamiji Medini vrijede kao tisuću molitava na nekome drugom mjestu. Kister pak prenosi hadis prema kojemu molitva u el-Aksi vrijedi kao deset tisuća molitava drugdje, i deset puta više nego molitva u Prorokovoj džamiji u Medini (M. J. KISTER, 1969: 185).

<sup>124</sup> J. LASSNER, 2006: 165.

<sup>125</sup> H. BUSSE, 1986: 161.

<sup>119</sup> J. LASSNER, 2006: 179.

<sup>120</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 141; J. LASSNER, 2017: 182.

<sup>121</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 140-144; more on Muqaddasī's description of Jerusalem will be discussed further in the text.

<sup>122</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 173-196; I. GOLDZIHHER, 1971: 45. More on this *ḥadīth* will be discussed in the chapter on the Dome of the Rock.

<sup>123</sup> EL-KHATIB, 2001: 29. According to the *ḥadīth* cited here by El-Khatib, prayers said in the mosque in Mecca have the same value as 100,000 prayers said elsewhere, and prayers said in the Prophet's mosque in Medina have the value of 1000 prayers said elsewhere. Kister cites the *ḥadīth* according to which a prayer in al-Aqsā is valued at 10,000 prayers said elsewhere, and 10 times more than a prayer in the mosque of the Prophet in Medina (M. J. KISTER, 1969: 185).

<sup>124</sup> J. LASSNER, 2006: 165.

<sup>125</sup> H. BUSSE, 1986: 161.

je bivala sve prihvaćenija, te je na koncu postala neupitna, ali uz to i sve kićenija. Uspoređujući djela ranoislamskih autora s tekstem iz 1350., Le Strange opaža:

Priča o Omarovu osvajanju i posjetu, te o Abdul Malikovoj izgradnji Kupole nad Stijenom, koje nalazimo u [djelima] muslimanskih ljetopisaca od Tabarija do Ibn al-Atira ograničena je na jednostavno priopćavanje činjenica i potpuno je lišena podrobnosti kojima ovaj tekst obiluje.<sup>126</sup>

Nedosljednosti i dvojbe vezane za različite tradicije o Omarovu osvajanju Jeruzalema prikazao je Oleg Grabar, uz prijedlog vlastite „spekulativne priče“. U njoj navodi kako je Omar „sam, ili pod Sofronijevim vodstvom, ili nadahnut židovskim obraćenicima ili s nekim drugim pratiteljima“<sup>127</sup> obišao grad, te stigao i na Brdo Hrama. Inačice priče nalaze se u kasnijim dorađenim tekstovima u kojima je opisano i Omarovo čišćenje zapuštena Hramskog trga te pronalazak Stijene koju je otkrio sam, ili uz Sofronijevu pomoć, ili uz pomoć Židova; počistivši ostatke i krhotine ranijih građevina, na njoj se pomolio. Ali, ni jedan izvor ne navodi kakvo je značenje za Omara imala Stijena, ni prostor na kojemu su nekoć stajali židovski hramovi.<sup>128</sup>

Grabar diskretno, u popratnoj bilješci na kraju knjige, izražava sumnju da je Omar ikad bio u Jeruzalemu:

Je li Omar doista došao [u Jeruzalem] ne može se zapravo utvrditi. Sve u svemu, argumenti koji govore protiv toga da je pošao na tako dugačko putovanje radi prihvaćanja predaje Jeruzalema meni se čine snažnijima od onih koji govore tomu u prilog, poglavito radi toga što svi izvještaji, bez i jedne jedine iznimke, sadrže anakronizme ili pristranosti koji narušavaju njihovu vjerodostojnost.<sup>129</sup>

Goitein navodi kako je arapsko zauzimanje Jeruzalema „uljepšano legendama i izmišljenim pričama prema kojima su samo najuzvišenije vojničke ličnosti sudjelovale u različitim etapama osvajanja. [...] U stvarnosti, zbog minimalne strateške i

flamboyant. Comparing the works of early Islamic authors with a text from 1350, Le Strange notes:

The story of Omar's conquest and visit, and 'Abd al Malik's building of the Dome of the Rock, as given by the Muslim Annalists, from Tabari down to Ibn al Athir, is confined to a simple statement of the facts, and is devoid of all the details which abound in the present text.<sup>126</sup>

Inconsistencies and dilemmas related to different traditions on 'Umar's conquest of Jerusalem were demonstrated by Oleg Grabar, along with the proposition of his own "speculative story." According to it, "Umar [...] on his own, led by Sophronius, or inspired by Jewish converts or by other companions"<sup>127</sup> went through Jerusalem and arrived at the Temple Mount. Different versions of the narrative are found in later expanded texts. They describe how 'Umar cleaned a desolate Temple Square, found the Rock – by himself or with the help of Sophronius, or with the help of Jews – cleaned the debris and remains of earlier structures, and prayed there. Not one source, however, mentions of what importance the Rock was for 'Umar, nor the space where Jewish Temples once stood.<sup>128</sup>

Somewhat discretely, in the endnotes of his book, Grabar expresses doubt that 'Umar ever visited Jerusalem:

Whether Umar really came cannot in fact be established, and on the whole, the argument against his undertaking such a long voyage for the purpose of accepting the surrender of Jerusalem seem stronger to me than those in favor, mostly because all the accounts, without a single exception, contain anachronisms or biases that weaken their credibility.<sup>129</sup>

Goitein explains that the Arab conquest of Jerusalem was "embellished [...] with legends and imaginary stories, according to which only the most illustrious military figures had been engaged in the various stages of the conquest. [...] In reality, due to the minimal strategic and administrative importance of the city, very little reliable information has remained about the course of the conquest and the first centuries of Jerusalem under Muslim rule." Goitein also calls that process "historiographic tendency, that increased in later generations."<sup>130</sup>

<sup>126</sup> G. LE STRANGE, 1887: 251.

<sup>127</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 47. Grabarov opis muslimanskog osvajanja nalazi se na str. 46-50.

<sup>128</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 47.

<sup>129</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 198, bilješka 63.

<sup>126</sup> G. LE STRANGE, 1887: 251.

<sup>127</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 47. Grabar's description of the Muslim conquest is found on pp. 46-50.

<sup>128</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 47.

<sup>129</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 198, note 63.

<sup>130</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1981: 169.

administrativne važnosti grada, ostalo je vrlo malo pouzdanih podataka o samome tijeku osvajanja i prvim stoljećima Jeruzalema pod muslimanskom vlašću“, te taj proces naziva „historiografskim tendencijama koje su se pojačavale u kasnijim naraštajima”.<sup>130</sup>

Tekstualna vrela u kojima je opisana važnost Jeruzalema za muslimane u vrijeme rašidunskoga i umajadskoga kalifata daleko više predstavljaju odraz kasnijih percepcija nego opise onovremenih zbivanja. Ali, razumijevanje problematike povijesnosti u tim tekstovima ne znači *per se* stavljanje pod upit važnosti Jeruzalema tijekom čitava ranoislamskog razdoblja. Dapače, ono poziva na pokušaj razlučivanja između supstancijalne, iskonske važnosti grada s jedne strane te narativa o zbivanjima, ličnostima i procesima koji su naknadno ispleteni upravo radi tih važnosti s druge strane, odnosno između uzroka i posljedice fabriciranja povijesti. U tom je kontekstu od neprocjenjive vrijednosti vrela koje je – budući da se ne radi o tekstu nego o zdanju – u gotovo neizmijenjenu obliku sačuvano od nastanka oko 72. hidžretske godine (692. po. Kr.) pa sve do danas: jeruzalemska Kupola nad Stijenom.

## 7. POVIJEST, ZNAČAJ I ZNAČENJE KUPOLE NAD STIJENOM

Među najvrjednije izvore o ranoislamskom viđenju i važnosti Jeruzalema spada Kupola nad Stijenom ili arapski *kubat as-sahra* (قبة الصخرة). Prekrasna, kićena, osmokatna građevina na Brdu Hrama odnosno *el-haram eš-šarifu* „nije samo najraniji sačuvani spomenik islama, nego je najvjerojatnije i najranija značajna građevina koju su podignuli novi gospodari Bliskog istoka”.<sup>131</sup> Od historiografskih vrela koje je moguće datirati, ona je i najstarije na kojemu se pojavljuje riječ „muslimani”.<sup>132</sup> Dovršena je 72. hidžretske godine (691./692.), za vladavine petoga umajadskoga kalifa Abdul Malika ibn Marvana (685.–705.). Prema nekim izvorima gradnja Kupole nad Stijenom te godine nije završena nego

Islamic textual sources, in which importance of Jerusalem for Muslims during the Rashidun and Umayyad Caliphates was described, reflect later perceptions far more than they contain contemporary descriptions. However, an understanding of the problem of the historicity of these texts does not mean *per se* that the importance of Jerusalem during the entire early Islamic period should be questioned. Quite on the contrary, it pleads for an attempt to distinguish between the substantial, original importance of the city on one hand, and the narrative of events, personalities and processes which were additionally woven into it precisely due to its importance on the other hand, that is between the cause and effect of the fabrication of history. For that purpose, there is a source of great importance, which is not a text but a structure, and it has been preserved in an almost unaltered form from its inception around 72 AH/692 AD to this day: The Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem.

## 7. HISTORY, IMPORTANCE AND MEANING OF THE DOME OF THE ROCK

Among the most valuable sources on the early Islamic perception and importance of Jerusalem is the Dome of the Rock, or *Qubbat al-Sakhrah* (قبة الصخرة) in Arabic. The magnificent, ornamented, octagonal building on the Temple Mount, or Al-Ḥaram al-Sharīf, is “not only the earliest remaining monument of Islam, but, in all likelihood, the earliest major construction built by the new masters of the Near East.”<sup>131</sup> Of all historical sources that can be dated it is the oldest on which the word “Muslims” is found.<sup>132</sup> It was completed in 72 AH (691/692), during the reign of the fifth Umayyad Caliph ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwan (685–705). According to some sources, construction of the Dome of the Rock was not completed but inaugurated that year.<sup>133</sup> Most historians, however, do not consider those accounts to be authentic.

Probably the greatest enigma related to the Dome pertains to its purpose. There is no agreement among scholars about it, and it is still a debated issue.<sup>134</sup> The Dome of the Rock is not a mosque, nor was it built like mosque. There has long existed the

<sup>130</sup> S. D. GOITEIN: *Jerusalem in the Arab Period (638-1099)* u L. I. LEVINE, 1981: 169.

<sup>131</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 33.

<sup>132</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 8.

<sup>131</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 33.

<sup>132</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 8.

<sup>133</sup> See S. BLAIR, 1992: 59-87.

<sup>134</sup> EL-KHATIB, 2001: 31.

je započeta,<sup>133</sup> ali većina povjesničara te izvore ne smatra autentičnima.

Vjerojatno najveća nepoznanica vezana uz tu građevinu odnosi se na njezinu svrhu, o čemu se i danas vode polemike, a među znanstvenicima vlada nesuglasje.<sup>134</sup> Kupola nad Stijenom, naime, nije džamija, niti je građena kao džamija. Odavno postoji danas već sasvim uvriježeno mišljenje kako se radi o mjestu koje obilježava Muhamedovu *isru* i *miradž*,<sup>135</sup> no ono, kako ćemo vidjeti, nije dokazivo iz podataka dostupnih na samoj građevini. Oblik zdanja vrlo je neuobičajen za islamsku arhitekturu, što se tumači kao pokušaj oponašanja i nadmašivanja u ljepoti bizantske arhitekture, budući da se u neposrednoj blizini nalazi Bazilika Svetog groba natkrivena sličnom kupolom. Taj je argument solidno utemeljen u povijesnim okolnostima s konca 7. stoljeća, a izrijeком ga iznosi i Mukaddasi, pa se načelno može smatrati neupitnim.<sup>136</sup> No, to nije jedini razlog gradnje i arhitektonskog rješenja, a gotovo je sigurno da nije ni najvažniji.

Glasoviti orijentalist Ignaz Goldziher (1850.–1921.) gradnju, oblik i svrhu Kupole nad Stijenom u potpunosti tumači u kontekstu sukoba koji je u vrijeme Abdul Malikove vladavine postojao između damašćanske umajadske kalifske dinastije i mekanskoga kalifa Abdulaha ibn el-Zubeira (683.–692.). I Abdul Malik i Zubeir za sebe su tvrdili da su legitimni kalifi, a da je onaj drugi prisvojitelj časti koja mu ne pripada. Zubeirova prednost bila je ta što je vladao u Meki, u Hidžazu, izvornome središtu i kolijevci muslimanske vjere i države.<sup>137</sup> Zubeir

<sup>133</sup> Vidjeti S. BLAIR, 1992: 59-87.

<sup>134</sup> EL-KHATIB, 2001: 31.

<sup>135</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 36.

<sup>136</sup> „Kupola nad Stijenom prvo je [...] muslimansko zdanje kojim se otvoreno oponaša bizantska praksa [gradnje kupole]“ (R. GRAFMAN & M. ROSEN-AYALON, 1999: 10). U nedavno objavljeni članku, Levy-Rubin zagovara tezu kako je izgradnja Kupole nad Stijenom odraz muslimanskog natjecanja s Konstantinopolom i njegovim sakralnim objektima, a osobito Crkvom Svete mudrosti (M. LEVY-RUBIN, 2017: 441-464).

<sup>137</sup> El-Zubeir se prema nekim tradicijama smatra šestim rašidunskim kalifom, premda se uglavnom uzima da su postojala samo četiri rašidunska kalifa, Abu Bakir, Omar, Usman i Ali ibn abu Talib. S druge strane, način na koji su umajadski kalifi uspostavili dinastiju predstavljao je odstupanje od rašidunskog prenošenja vlasti koje se temeljilo

now well-established perception that it is the place which marks Muhammad's *isrā* and *mi'rāj*,<sup>135</sup> but that, as we shall see, cannot be substantiated from evidence available on the structure. The shape of the Dome is rather unusual for Islamic architecture, which has been explained as an attempt to imitate and surpass the beauty of Byzantine architecture, as it is in close proximity to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, covered with a similar dome. This argument has been based on historical circumstances from the late seventh century and an explanation by Muqaddasī, and is generally accepted by scholars.<sup>136</sup> However, it is certainly not the only, and probably not even the most important, reason for the Dome's construction and architectural design.

Ignaz Goldziher (1850–1921), the famous orientalist, explained the construction, shape and purpose of the Dome of the Rock entirely in the context of struggle between the Umayyad dynasty of Damascus and 'Abdallah ibn al-Zubayr of Mecca (683–692) during the reign of 'Abd al-Malik. Both 'Abd al-Malik and al-Zubayr claimed the title of Caliph and accused the other of being a usurper. Al-Zubayr's advantage was that he ruled in Mecca in the Hejaz, the original center and cradle of the Muslim faith and state.<sup>137</sup> In addition, Al-Zubayr had a special reputation as the first child born to Muslims after the *hijra*, and his mother Asma was daughter of the first Rashidun Caliph Abu Bakr and a half-sister of Muhammad's dearest wife 'Aisha.<sup>138</sup> 'Abd al-Malik, on the other hand, ruled in Damascus, far

<sup>135</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 36.

<sup>136</sup> “The Dome of the Rock is the earliest [...] Muslim structure that openly emulates the Byzantine practice [of constructing a dome]” (R. GRAFMAN & M. ROSEN-AYALON, 1999: 10). Levy-Rubin, however, suggests that a key reason for building the Dome of the Rock was Islamic competition with the Constantinople and its sacred buildings, particularly the Basilica of the Hagia Sophia (Levy-Rubin, 2017: 441-464).

<sup>137</sup> Al-Zubayr is, according to some traditions, regarded as the sixth Rashidun Caliph, although it is generally agreed upon that there were only four Rashidun Caliphs: Abu Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān and 'Alī ibn Abī Tālib. On the other hand, the manner in which the Umayyad Caliphs established their dynasty represented a departure from the Rashidun transfer of power which was based on, or perhaps more precisely called upon, a consensus of the Ummah (*ijmā al-ummah*). For this reason, an attempt to contest Umayyad rule and a return to Rashidun principles is not an unexpected process, especially in the Hejaz. For more on this see B. HAVEL, 2015a: 27-35.

<sup>138</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. VII: 9.



je zauzimao poseban ugled kao prvo dijete koje se muslimanima rodilo nakon *hidžre*, a njegova je mati Esmā bila kći prvoga rašidunskoga kalifa Abu Bakira i polusestra Muhamedove najdraže žene Ajše.<sup>138</sup> Abdul Malik stolovao je pak u Damasku, daleko od *haramajina*, potjecao je od obitelji koja se na islam obratila tek nakon Muhamedova osvajanja Meke,<sup>139</sup> a do kalifске je titule došao po dinastijskoj liniji, što su tradicionalisti od početka zamjerali Umajjadima. Zubeir je tijekom određenog razdoblja sukoba upravljao većim dijelom muslimanskog Orijenta,<sup>140</sup> dok se Abdul Malik pouzdavao u sirijske čete koje su mu na koncu i donijele pobjedu. Potrebu za svetim mjestom na području Sirije, kojim bi se osnažio vjersko-politički autoritet damaščanskoga kalifa, prvi je prepoznao Mu'āvija, koji se nije bez razloga okrunio u Jeruzalemu. Abdul Malik je, prema Goldziherovu mišljenju, pokrenuo izgradnju Kupole nad Stijenom kako bi Jeruzalem – koji se u svim onovremenim arapskim dokumentima svejednako naziva Ilijom – pretvorio u alternativno odredište *hadža*. Cilj mu je navodno bio zaustaviti hodočašća Sirijaca u Meku kako ondje ne bi prisegnuli na vjernost njegovu suparniku.<sup>141</sup> Prihvatimo li taj argument, razumljiv postaje i oblik građevine, jer ona kao osmokutno svetište podignuto posred širega praznog prostora Harama jest prikladna za *tauaf*.<sup>142</sup>

Goldziher u tom kontekstu tumači i nastanak hadisa prema kojemu Muhamed dopušta hodočašće u Medinu i Jeruzalem, uz uobičajeni *hadž* i *'umru* u Meku. Radi se o poznatomu, kanonskom hadisu koji glasi: „Sedla neka se ne pričvršćuju za jahanje [radi odlaska na hodočašće] osim za tri džamije: *mesdžid el-harami* (u Meki), *mesdžid*

away from the *haramayn*. He came from a family that converted to Islam only after Muhammad's conquest of Mecca,<sup>139</sup> and received his title of Caliph through a dynastic hereditary succession, which traditionalists held against the Umayyads from the beginning of their rule. Zubayr had ruled over most of the Muslim East during a certain period of the conflict.<sup>140</sup> 'Abd al-Malik relied on his Syrian troops, and they eventually brought him victory. Mu'āwiyah was first Umayyad Caliph to recognize a need for a holy place, by which Syria would claim religious and political relevance. That was the reason for his coronation in Jerusalem. 'Abd al-Malik took this a step further. According to Goldziher, he initiated the construction of the Dome of the Rock so that Jerusalem – all the while called Iliyā by the Arabs – could be converted into an alternative destination of *hajj*. His apparent goal was to redirect Syrian pilgrims from Mecca to Jerusalem so that they would not pledge allegiance to the Meccan ruler, his rival Zubayr.<sup>141</sup> If we are to accept this argument, the shape and position of the Dome – an octagonal structure built in the middle of a wider empty space of the Haram – becomes logical, since as such it is suitable for *ṭawāf*.<sup>142</sup>

Goldziher explained in that context the creation of the *ḥadīth* by which Muhammad, along with the regular *hajj* and *'umra* to Mecca, also allowed pilgrimages to Medina and Jerusalem. It is a well-known, canonic *ḥadīth* which reads: “The saddles (of the riding beasts) shall not be fastened (for setting out for pilgrimage) except for three mosques: The Sacred Mosque (in Mecca), my mosque (in Medina) and al-Aqsā mosque (in Jerusalem).”<sup>143</sup> M. J. Kister believes that at the beginning of the second century AH (first half of the eighth century AD) there was probably a consensus among Muslims about the special importance of those three mosques. Before that, the importance of Jerusalem was disputed, even through *ḥadīth*. Tradition transmits several *ḥadīth* of equal content, save for the fact that Muslims were instructed to make pilgrimage to only two mosques: the one in Mecca

na konsenzusu *ummata* (*idžma el-umma*) ili je, možda točnije, na nj pozivalo. Zato pokušaj osporavanja umajjadske vlasti i povratka na rašidunska načela nije neočekivan proces, poglavito u Hidžazu. Više o tome v. B. HAVEL, 2015: 27-35.

<sup>138</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. VII: 9.

<sup>139</sup> Mu'āvija je na islam prešao one godine kad je Meka osvojena, nakon čega je služio kao Muhamedov pisar (v. AL-BALADHURI, 1924: 273).

<sup>140</sup> M. SHARON, 1983: 15.

<sup>141</sup> I. GOLDZIHHER, 1971: 44.

<sup>142</sup> *Tauaf* (طواف) znači 'obilazjenje' te predstavlja dio hodočasničkog rituala hoda oko Ka'be u Meki.

<sup>139</sup> Mu'āwiyah converted to Islam the year that Mecca was conquered, after which he served as Muhammad's scribe (see AL-BALADHURI, 1924: 273).

<sup>140</sup> M. SHARON, 1983: 15.

<sup>141</sup> I. GOLDZIHHER, 1971: 44.

<sup>142</sup> *Ṭawāf* (طواف) means "circumambulation", or pilgrims' ritual walk around the Ka'ba.

<sup>143</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 173. First part of the *ḥadīth* has been taken from footnote one, since it corresponds with the original Arabic.

*el-hadha* (u Medini) i *mesdžid el-aksa* (u Jeruzalemu).<sup>143</sup> Premda Kister smatra kako je izgledno da je početkom drugoga hidžretskog stoljeća (prva polovica 8. stoljeća) među muslimanima postojala suglasnost o posebnoj važnosti te tri džamije, važnost Jeruzalema bila je prije toga osporavana, pa i putem hadisa. Tradicija prenosi nekoliko hadisa gotovo jednaka sadržaja, osim što se muslimanima nalaže hodočašće u samo dvije džamije: onu u Meki i onu u Medini.<sup>144</sup> Čini se kako je važnost Jeruzalema nastajala djelomice upravo u kontekstu suparništva između tih dvaju gradova i njihovih dviju džamija.<sup>145</sup> Činjenica da se različita mišljenja o važnosti Jeruzalema, bilo da ga se promiče bilo da ga se opovrgava, temelje na hadisima nije neobična, osobito prihvati li se pretpostavka kako se radi o sporu koji je ponajprije politički, a tek potom i u okviru toga, doktrinarni. O političkoj i doktrinarnoj argumentaciji utemeljenoj na hadisima Goldziher objašnjava:

...među kontroverznim pitanjima o kojima se u islamu žučno polemiziralo, bila ona politička ili doktrinarna, nema ni jednoga za koje pobornici različitih pogleda nisu u stanju navesti određeni broj tradicija, odreda opremljenih dojmljivim isnadima.<sup>146</sup>

Važnost, dakle, Jeruzalema, ne može se jednoznačno povezati s tradicijama koje pronalazimo u hadisima. Goldziherovo tumačenje Kupole nad Stijenom kao mjesta na koje je Abdul Malik želio preusmjeriti *hadž* temelji se poglavito na pisanju el-Jakubija (اليقوبي), povjesničara iz 9. stoljeća.<sup>147</sup> Slične tvrdnje kasnije su pronađene i u drugih autora, ali od onih iz ranoislamskog razdoblja tu je još samo Eutih Aleksandrijski (877.–940.), kršćanski

and the one in Medina.<sup>144</sup> It seems that the importance of Jerusalem evolved partly due to the rivalry between those two cities and their mosques.<sup>145</sup> The fact that different beliefs on the importance of Jerusalem, either promoting or refuting it, have been based on *ḥadīth*, is not something unexpected, particularly if we recognize that the dispute was primarily political, and only then and within that context also doctrinal. On the political and doctrinal argumentation based on *ḥadīth* Goldziher explains:

...among the hotly debated controversial issues of Islam, whether political or doctrinal, there is none in which the champions of the various views are unable to cite a number of traditions, all equipped with imposing *isnāds*.<sup>146</sup>

The importance of Jerusalem, therefore, cannot be unequivocally related to the traditions which we find in the *ḥadīth*. Goldziher's interpretation of the Dome of the Rock as the place to which 'Abd al-Malik wanted to redirect *hajj* is mainly based on the writings of a historian from the ninth century, al-Ya'qūbī (اليقوبي).<sup>147</sup> Similar claims are found in the works of other, later authors, but of those from the early Islamic period there is only one more, Eutychius of Alexandria (877–940), a Christian chronicler who wrote in Arabic.<sup>148</sup> Ya'qūbī was a pro-Shiite Abbasid historian, biased against the Umayyads. It is therefore hard to base an understanding of this topic on his allegation of the Umayyad Caliphs' apostasy by the abolition of Quranic regulations and the introduction of innovations. Most historians today dismiss his charges against 'Abd al-Malik as implausible.<sup>149</sup> Eutychius was Melkite patriarch of Alexandria, of whom Goitein notes that, much like Ya'qūbī, "connect[s] with this allegation other statements which by

<sup>143</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 173. U prijevodu na hrvatski uzео sam u obzir i izvorni tekst hadisa, koji se nalazi u Kisterovoj fusnoti 1.

<sup>144</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 178-179.

<sup>145</sup> Usp. M. J. KISTER, 1969: 188.

<sup>146</sup> I. GOLDZIHHER, 1971: 44. Ovdje valja napomenuti kako je Goldziher bio jedan od najvećih svjetskih poznavatelja i autoriteta za tumačenje hadisa. *Isnad* je slijed osoba preko kojih je prenesena određena tradicija.

<sup>147</sup> J. LASSNER, 2017: 131. El-Jakubi u svojem tekstu također spominje i tradiciju prema kojoj je Muhamed, prije uzlaska u celestialna prostranstva, nogom stao na stijenu na Haramu (O. GRABAR, 1959: 37).

<sup>144</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 178-179.

<sup>145</sup> Cf. M. J. KISTER, 1969: 188.

<sup>146</sup> I. GOLDZIHHER, 1971: 44. It should be mentioned here that Goldziher was one of the greatest authorities for the interpretation of the *ḥadīth* in the world. *Isnād* is the chain of transmitters through which a certain tradition is transferred.

<sup>147</sup> J. LASSNER, 2017: 131. Al-Ya'qūbī in his text also mentioned the tradition according to which Muhammad, before his trek to celestial realm, stepped on the Rock on al-Haram (O. GRABAR, 1959: 37).

<sup>148</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1950: 104; O. GRABAR, 1973: 49-50.

<sup>149</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1950: 104; N. N. N. KHOURY, 1993: 58.

ljetopisac koji je pisao na arapskom jeziku.<sup>148</sup> Jakubi je kao prošijitski abasidski povjesničar bio pristran protivnik Umajada, pa je na njegovim optužbama o apostaziji umajadskih kalifa kroz dokidanje kuranskih propisa i uvođenje inovacija teško temeljiti razumijevanje ove teme. Današnji povjesničari njegove optužbe na račun Abdul Malika uglavnom smatraju nevjerodostojnima.<sup>149</sup> Eutih je pak bio melkitski patrijarh u Aleksandriji, za kojega Goitein opaža da, kao i Jakubi „s tom optužbom povezuje druge izjave koje ju svojom očitom neistinom obezvrjeđuju”.<sup>150</sup> Jakubijevu i Eutihovu optužbu ponavljaju i neki kasniji islamski autori, među kojima i glasoviti Ibn Katir (14. stoljeće). No, ona se ne pojavljuje u ranijih uglednih povjesničara – Tabarija i Balazurija, primjerice – koji također nisu pisali s pozicije naklonosti prema Umajadima. Umajadski kalifat u djelima kasnijih povjesničara, a gotovo svi islamski historiografski tekstovi koji su nam poznati nastali su nakon umajadske vladavine, promatran je iz perspektive uvođenja dinastije umjesto konsenzusa (*idžma*) *ummeta* kakav je, načelno, postojao kod imenovanja predumajadskih rašidunskih kalifa. Premda se u vrijeme Umajada islam nastavio širiti, pa je tijekom njihove vladavine za Muhamedovu vjeru osvojena Španjolska, a nakratko i Francuska do Poitiersa, kasniji islamski povjesničari nisu im oprostili uvođenje nasljednoga kalifata. Vrhovno liderstvo nad *ummetom* tim je činom postalo pitanje obiteljskih ambicija i spletki te dvorskoga unutarinastijskog nasilja.<sup>151</sup> Ovakav je stav postojao i među sunitskim i među šijitskim autorima. Suniti su s čežnjom pisali o rašidunskim vremenima, što se vidi iz mesijanskog nazivlja kojim su počastili svakoga rašidunskoga kalifa

their obvious untruth invalidate it.”<sup>150</sup> Ya‘qūbī’s and Eutychius’ allegations were repeated by some later Islamic authors, including the great fourteenth century historian Ibn Kathir. But it cannot be found in chronicles of early historians, such as Tabari and Baladhuri, who also did not favor the Umayyads. Almost all Islamic texts about the Umayyad Caliphate known to us today were created after their reign. Umayyads were viewed from the perspective of their introduction of a dynastic rule instead of the consensus (*ijmā*) of the Ummah which was, basically, how pre-Umayyad Rashidun Caliphs were appointed. Even though the Muslim empire continued to expand during the time of the Umayyads so that Spain and, for a short while, France up to Poitiers were conquered for Islam, later Islamic historians did not forgive their introduction of a hereditary Caliphate. Because of it, the supreme leadership of the Ummah became an issue of family ambitions, intrigues, and inter-dynastic court violence.<sup>151</sup> Resentment towards Umayyads existed both among Sunni and Shia authors. Sunnis were longing for the Rashidun era, as demonstrated by messianic names they gave to each Rashidun Caliph and to all four together.<sup>152</sup> Shiites, on the other hand, believed that leadership of the Ummah does belong to a dynasty, but that of the Prophet, that is *ahl al-bayt* made up of ‘Alī, his sons by Muhammad’s daughter Fāṭima and their descendants. It is hard to overestimate the Umayyad crime of altering the way of obtaining and transferring the title of Caliph, which has not been forgotten to this day.<sup>153</sup> If the Umayyads had had the ambition and attempted to change the destination of *hajj*, Tabari, Baladhuri, Muqaddasī and other historians would

<sup>148</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1950: 104; O. GRABAR, 1973: 49-50.

<sup>149</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1950: 104; N. N. N. KHOURY, 1993: 58.

<sup>150</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1950: 104. Vidjeti i opsežniju analizu moguće vjerodostojnosti Jakubijeva i Eutihova navoda o Abdul Malikovoj možebitnoj ambiciji preusmjeravanja *hadža* u Jeruzalem, kao i tumačenja koja nude Goldziher i kasniji orijentalisti u J. LASSNER, 2017: 131-149.

<sup>151</sup> Kalif Omar ibn Abdul Aziz (Omar II.) je otrovan (AL-TABARI, vol. XXIV: 78) te ga je naslijedio Jazid II., a al-Valid ibn Jazid (Valid II.) je ubijen (AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 126-180).

<sup>150</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1950: 104. See also the comprehensive analysis of the possible credibility of Ya‘qūbī and Eutychius’ citations on ‘Abd al-Malik’s possible ambition of directing the *hajj* to Jerusalem, as well as the interpretation which Goldziher and later orientologists offer in J. LASSNER, 2017: 131-149.

<sup>151</sup> Caliph ‘Umar ibn Abdul Aziz (‘Umar II) was poisoned (AL-TABARI, vol. XXIV: 78) and his inheritor was Yazid II, and al-Walid ibn Yazid (Walid II) was killed (AL-TABARI, vol. XXVI: 126-180).

<sup>152</sup> For more on that topic see P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977. Al-Rashidun means *rightly guiding*, while some of the titles of the Rashidun Caliphs are al-Siddik (Abu Bakr) and al-Fārūk (‘Umar).

<sup>153</sup> These issues are re-actualized in the context of the origin and self-promotion of the Islamic State (former ISIS) on which topic see B. HAVEL, 2017: 215-233.

ponaosob te svu četvoricu zajedno.<sup>152</sup> Šijiti su pak smatrali kako pravo na predvođenje *ummeta* uistinu pripada dinastiji, ali Prorokovoj dinastiji, odnosno *ahl-ul-beitu*, koju čini Ali i njegovo potomstvo po Muhamedovoj kćeri Fatimi. Teško je precijeniti težinu umajadskoga krimena preuređivanja načina stjecanja i prenošenja kalifске titule, koji do danas nije zaboravljen.<sup>153</sup> Tabari, Balazuri, Mukaddisi i drugi povjesničari, gotovo je izvjesno, umajadsku bi ambiciju promjene odredišta *hadža*, da im je bila poznata, odnosno da je takva ambicija postojala, unijeli u svoje ljetopise.<sup>154</sup>

U tom kontekstu valja promatrati činjenicu da Goldziherovo tumačenje gradnje Kupole nad Stijenom kao alternativnog odredišta hodočašća prikladna za *tauaf* kasniji orijentalisti, koji su imali uvid u više izvora nego Goldziher, stavljaju pod upit.<sup>155</sup> Goitein tako ukazuje na činjenicu da povjesničari koji su opisali sukob Abdul Malika i Zubeira „nijednom ni u tragovima ne navještavaju navodnu Abdul Malikovu nakanu da Jeruzalem, umjesto Meke, učini središtem islama”.<sup>156</sup> Dapače, Tabari navodi da su Abdul Malikovi vojnici sudjelovali na hodočašću u Meku koje je 692. predvodio zapovjednik Abdul Malikove vojske, el-Hadžadž.<sup>157</sup> Te je godine Abdul Malikova vojska osvojila grad, a Zubeir je ubijen. Lassner pak navodi kako bi mijenjanje odredišta *hadža* iz Meke u Jeruzalem predstavljalo čin otpada od vjere koji bi, da se zbio, „ugledni ljetopisci [vremenski] najbliži događajima, potaknuti [historiografskom] temeljitošću i protuumajadskom pristranošću jamačno spomenuli.”<sup>158</sup>

<sup>152</sup> Za više podataka o toj temi v. P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977. Ar-Rašidun znači *oni koji ispravno vode*, dok su neke od titula rašidunskih kalifa as-Siddik (Abu Bakir) i el-Faruk (Omar).

<sup>153</sup> Ova je problematika reaktualizirana u kontekstu nastanka i samopromocije Islamske države o čemu v. B. HAVEL, 2017: 215-233.

<sup>154</sup> Usp. J. LASSNER, 2017: 132; O. GRABAR, 1959: 35.

<sup>155</sup> I ovdje je iznimka Amikam Elad (A. ELAD, 1999a: 303) koji smatra da su Goldziherovi izvori vjerodostojni te zanemaruje argumente znanstvenika poput Goiteina i kasnije Lassnera koji su ovu tvrdnju argumentirano opovrgnuli (v. dalje u tekstu).

<sup>156</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1950: 104.

<sup>157</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XXI: 208.

<sup>158</sup> J. LASSNER, 2017: 132.

have been only too pleased to register it in their chronicles.<sup>154</sup>

In that context one ought to note that Goldziher's interpretation of the construction of the Dome of the Rock as an alternate destination for pilgrimage suitable for *ṭawāf* was challenged by later orientalisists, who had insight into more sources than Goldziher.<sup>155</sup> Thus, Goitein points to the fact that historians who wrote about the conflict between 'Abd al-Malik and Zubayr "never made the slightest allusion to 'Abd al-Malik's alleged intention of making Jerusalem instead of Mecca the center of Islam."<sup>156</sup> On the contrary, Tabari explained that 'Abd al-Malik's soldiers participated in the pilgrimage to Mecca which 'Abd al-Malik's army commander al-Hajjaj lead in 692.<sup>157</sup> That same year, 'Abd al-Malik's army conquered the city, and Zubayr was killed. Lassner explains that a change in the destination of *hajj* from Mecca to Jerusalem would be an act of apostasy and, if it had indeed happened, "with their customary thoroughness and anti-Umayyad bias [...] the great chroniclers who were closest to the event would surely have mentioned it."<sup>158</sup>

Goitein, Lassner, and other authors believe, therefore, that it is not likely that the Dome of the Rock was built as a destination of pilgrimage. Even a powerful ruler such as 'Abd al-Malik could not afford a political act by which apostasy would be implied and which would make him a *murtadd*<sup>159</sup> in the eyes of many orthodox Muslims who would not have to submit to him any longer because of it. This, however, does not mean that the endeavors of the Umayyads to elevate Syria and Jerusalem to a level of holiness by which their political domain would gain some form of metaphysical value, in part competitive with the *ḥaramayn*, would be by default illegitimate. That they had such a political-religious ambition, in fact, remains unquestionable, but it is

<sup>154</sup> Cf. J. LASSNER, 2017: 132; O. GRABAR, 1959: 35.

<sup>155</sup> Elad is also here an exception (A. ELAD, 1999: 300-314), since he believes that Goldziher's sources are reliable, and ignores the arguments of researchers such as Goitein, and later Lassner (see further in the text).

<sup>156</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1950: 104.

<sup>157</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XXI: 208.

<sup>158</sup> J. LASSNER, 2017: 132.

<sup>159</sup> Arabic: someone who abandons the faith, an apostate. Goitein uses the word *Kāfir*, or "unbeliever" here, (S. D. GOITEIN, 1950: 105; S. D. GOITEIN, 2010: 138) and so does Grabar (O. GRABAR, 1959: 36).

Goitein, Lassner i drugi autori smatraju, dakle, da nije izgledno da je Kupola nad Stijenom građena kao alternativno odredište hodočašća. Čak ni moćan vladar poput Abdul Malika nije si mogao priuštiti politički čin kojim bi implicirao apostaziju i koji bi ga u očima mnogih pravovjernih muslimana učinio *murtaddom*<sup>159</sup> kojemu se više ne bi morali pokoravati. Ipak, to ne isključuje nastojanje Umajada da Siriju i Jeruzalem uzdignu na razinu svetosti koja će njihovoj političkoj domeni pridodati i metafizičku vrijednost, djelomice kompetitivnu *haramajinu*. Takva političko-vjerska ambicija, dapače, ostaje neupitna, ali je gotovo podjednako neupitno i da njihov cilj nije bio utemeljiti novo središte islama nauštrb izvornoga.<sup>160</sup> *Kubat as-sahra* tako, usprkos primamljivu, ali neodrživu Goldziherovu tumačenju, ostaje nepoznanica.

Jedan od najuglednijih znanstvenika za tumačenje Kupole nad Stijenom, poglavito u njezinu arhitektonskom i umjetničkom aspektu, francusko-američki je orijentalist, arheolog i povjesničar islamske umjetnosti Oleg Grabar (1929.–2011.). Grabar je svetišta na Haramu istraživao sredinom prošlog stoljeća kao jedan od rijetkih nemuslimana i znanstvenika koji je imao neograničen pristup Kupoli nad Stijenom, pa se na njegova istraživanja, tumačenja i prijevode arapskih inskripcija znanstvenici referiraju i danas.<sup>161</sup> Grabar smatra kako se najviše podataka o razlogu gradnje najpoznatijega jeruzalemskoga muslimanskog svetišta i njegovoj svrsi može izvući iz samoga svetišta: iz njegova lokaliteta, arhitekture, ukrasa te inskripcija, kojima obiluje.<sup>162</sup> Kupola nad Stijenom podignuta je na mjestu na kojem

<sup>159</sup> Arap. otpadnik od vjere, apostat. Goitein ovdje koristi riječ *kafir* odnosno „nevjernik“ (S. D. GOITEIN, 1950: 105; S. D. GOITEIN, 2010: 138), što je preuzeo i Grabar (O. GRABAR, 1959: 36).

<sup>160</sup> O tome Grabar piše: „... stoga se može pretpostaviti da je Abdul Malik, islamizirajući židovsko sveto mjesto, također uspostavljao i određenu premoć Palestine i Jeruzalema nad Mekom, ne kao zamjenu za Ka'bu, nego prije kao simbol njegova protivljenja staromodnoj mekanskoj aristokraciji koju je predstavljao Ibn el-Zubeir“ (O. GRABAR, 1959: 45).

<sup>161</sup> Primjerice J. LASSNER, 2017.

<sup>162</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 46. Grabarov glasoviti članak *The Umayyad Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem* objavljen je 1959. i na njega se referira većina autora koji su kasnije pisali o Kupoli nad Stijenom. Ta je Grabarova studija kasnije proširena i 1996. objavljena kao monografija *The Shape of the Holy: Early Islamic Jerusalem*.

almost equally unquestionable that their aim was not to found a new center of Islam at the expense of the original.<sup>160</sup> The *Qubbat al-Sakhrah*, thus, despite the tempting but unsustainable interpretation by Goldziher, remains unknown.

One of the most influential scholars and interpreters of the Dome of the Rock, especially with respect to its architectural and artistic aspect, is Oleg Grabar (1929–2011), a French-American orientalist, archaeologist and historian of Islamic art. Grabar researched the sanctuaries on the Haram in the middle of the last century as one of the rare non-Muslim researchers who had unlimited access to the Dome of the Rock. Even today scholars frequently refer to his research, interpretations, and translations of Arabic inscriptions on the Dome.<sup>161</sup> Grabar believed that most of the information on the motive for the construction of the Dome and its purpose can be extracted from the sanctuary itself: its locality, architecture, decoration and inscriptions, in which it abounds.<sup>162</sup> The Dome of the Rock was built on the place where Jewish temples once stood, but it was neglected until the Muslim conquest of the city. Caliph 'Umar, according to legend, had wisely concluded that in the choice of that spot Islam would claim that it was founded on earlier revelations, but without the unnecessary destruction of Christian holy places. In the immediate vicinity of the Haram the Church of the Holy Sepulcher is located, which 'Abd al-Malik, just like 'Umar before him, did not want to seize and turn into a mosque.<sup>163</sup> During 'Abd al-Malik's rule Byzantium posed a serious threat to the Muslim State, and Damascus evaded war with the powerful Christian empire by paying a costly tribute. In addition,

<sup>160</sup> On that Grabar writes that “...it may be suggested that 'Abd al-Malik, while 'islamizing' the Jewish holy place, was also asserting a certain preeminence of Palestine and Jerusalem over Mekkah, not actually as a replacement of the Ka'bah, but rather as a symbol of his opposition to the old-fashioned Mekkan aristocracy represented by Ibn al-Zubayr” (O. GRABAR, 1959: 45).

<sup>161</sup> E.g. J. LASSNER, 2017.

<sup>162</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 46. Grabar's article *The Umayyad Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem* was published in 1959 and is referred to by most authors who later wrote about the Dome of the Rock. That study of Grabar's was later expanded, and in 1996 published as the monograph *The Shape of the Holy: Early Islamic Jerusalem*.

<sup>163</sup> According to the tradition described by Eutychius of Alexandria, the patriarch Sophronius offered to 'Umar to pray in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, but the Caliph refused so that Muslims would not later convert that Christian sanctuary into a mosque.

su nekoć stajali židovski Hramovi, ali koje je u vrijeme muslimanskog zauzimanja grada bilo zapušteno. Kalif Omar je – prema legendi – mudro zaključio kako izborom toga mjesta islam obilježava da se temelji na ranijim objavama, ali bez nepotrebnog uništavanja kršćanskih bogomolja. U neposrednoj blizini Harama nalazi se Bazilika Svetog groba, koju Abdul Malik, kao ni prije njega Omar, nije želio preoteti i pretvoriti u džamiju.<sup>163</sup> Tijekom Abdul Malikove vladavine Bizant je predstavljao ozbiljnu prijetnju muslimanskoj vlasti, a Damask je plaćanjem visokog danka izbjegavao rat s moćnim kršćanskim imperijem. Abdul Malik k tome je godinama ratovao i s muslimanima iz Arabije te Iraka, u kojem su šijiti nastojali svrgnuti umajadsku vlast i ustoličiti Alijeve i Huseinove potomke. Uništavanje Bazilike, da je kalif takvo što i priželjkivao (što je također upitno s obzirom na referentni stav snošljivosti koji je prema jeruzalemskim kršćanskim svetištima, ali ne i drugim kršćanskim svetištima u Siriji,<sup>164</sup> navodno zadao Omar), predstavljalo bi čin provokacije mogućega muslimansko-bizantskog sukoba širih razmjera,<sup>165</sup> što si umajadski vladari nisu mogli priuštiti. Balansiranje snaga općenito je bilo nužno budući da je „tijekom srednjega vijeka nadmoć rijetko bila potpuna.“<sup>166</sup> S druge strane, trebalo je stvoriti nešto upečatljivo i dojmljivo što će pokazati sjaj islama ne samo muslimanima nego i samim kršćanima.<sup>167</sup> *Kubat as-sahra* bila je izgrađena kako bi impresionirala, a trošak njezine dojmljivosti

<sup>163</sup> Prema tradiciji koju prenosi Eutih Aleksandrijski, patrijarh Sofronije Omaru je ponudio da se pomoli u Bazilici, no kalif je to odbio kako muslimani kasnije ne bi to kršćansko svetište pretvorili u džamiju.

<sup>164</sup> Primjerice, velika džamija u Damasku podignuta je na mjestu na kojemu je stajala crkva Ivana Krstitelja koju su muslimani uništili (O. GRABAR, 1964: 73). Jeruzalemski biskup Sofronije (umro 369.) zabilježio je između ostaloga i sljedeće: „Saraceni [...] pljačkaju gradove, pustoše polja, pale sela, potpaljuju svete crkve, ruše svete samostane...“ (R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 72-73).

<sup>165</sup> Upravo je uništenje Bazilike Svetoga groba u vrijeme fatimidskoga kalifa el-Kamila (poznat i kao Ludi kalif) početkom 11. stoljeća potaknulo europske kršćane na planiranje vojne kojom bi se kršćanska Sveta zemlja oslobodila od islamskih osvajača. Koncem istoga stoljeća pokrenuti su Križarski ratovi.

<sup>166</sup> O. GRABAR, 2001: 681.

<sup>167</sup> Grabarovim riječima, muslimani su „iz političkih, povijesnih i poglavito ideoloških razloga, dodijelili novu svetost najdrevnijoj svetoj točki Svetoga grada“ (O. GRABAR, 1964: 73).

‘Abd al-Malik warred for years with Muslims from Arabia, and also from Iraq, from where Shiites struggled to depose Umayyad rulers and place ‘Ali’s and Hussein’s descendants on their throne. The destruction of the Basilica, had the Caliph desired it (which is also questionable considering the referential attitude of tolerance which ‘Umar allegedly showed towards Christian sanctuaries in Jerusalem, but not towards other Christian sanctuaries in Syria<sup>164</sup>), would probably provoke a wide-scale Muslim-Byzantine conflict,<sup>165</sup> which Umayyad rulers could not afford. A balance of powers was necessary in general since “Domination was rarely total in medieval times.”<sup>166</sup> On the other hand, it was necessary to create something striking and impressive which would show the splendor of Islam not only to Muslims, but to the Christians, too.<sup>167</sup> *Qubbat al-Sakhrāh* was built to be impressive, and the price of its grandeur was enormous: ‘Abd al-Malik paid for it “seven years of revenue from Egypt, his richest province.”<sup>168</sup>

The oldest known Islamic building in the Middle East was built in the Byzantine and Persian style, not in the Arab style, because on the one hand “from its Arabian past the new Muslim art could draw almost nothing”<sup>169</sup> (the first minarets built in Syria were modelled on already existing Roman turrets and church towers<sup>170</sup>), and on the other hand Mediterranean artistic expression was, to use a modern term, popular. Signs of a visual and aesthetic competition

<sup>164</sup> For example, the great mosque in Damascus was built on the spot where the church of John the Baptist formerly stood, which Muslims destroyed (O. GRABAR, 1964: 73). The Bishop of Jerusalem, Sophronius (d. 369), noted, among other things, the following: “Saracens [...] plunder cities, devastate fields, burn down villages, set on fire the holy churches, overturn the sacred monasteries...” (R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 72-73).

<sup>165</sup> It was the destruction of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher during the reign of the Fatimid Caliph al-Kamil (also known as the Mad Caliph) at the beginning of the eleventh century that provoked Christians to plan a re-conquest of the Holy Land. At the end of the same century the First Crusade began.

<sup>166</sup> O. GRABAR, 2001: 681.

<sup>167</sup> In the words of Grabar, Muslims “for political and historical, but especially for ideological, reasons, gave a new holiness to the most ancient sacred spot in the Holy City” (O. GRABAR, 1964: 73).

<sup>168</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1950: 106.

<sup>169</sup> O. GRABAR, 1964: 79.

<sup>170</sup> O. GRABAR, 1964: 74. Grabar points out here the lack of studies on the origin of the minaret and refers to the famous work by K. A. C. Creswell, *Early Muslim Architecture* (K. A. C. CRESWELL, 1969: 38-40).

bio je golem: Abdul Malik ju je platio „sedmogodišnjim приходima svoje najbogatije pokrajine, Egipta“.<sup>168</sup>

Najstarija poznata islamska građevina na Bliskom istoku izgrađena je u bizantskom i perzijskom, a ne u arabijskom stilu, jer s jedne strane „muslimanska umjetnost skoro ništa nije mogla preuzeti iz svoje arabijske prošlosti“<sup>169</sup> (prvi minareti izgrađeni su tek u Siriji po uzoru na postojeće rimske kule i crkvene tornjeve<sup>170</sup>), a s druge je mediteranski umjetnički izričaj bio, današnjim rječnikom rečeno, popularan. Znakovi vizualnog i estetskog natjecanja s bizantskim religijskim oblicima, prema Grabaru, uočljivi su u kompoziciji ukrasa unutrašnjosti Kupole. Ona je pokrivena mozaicima površine čak 1280 četvornih metara, što je bez premca u odnosu na sva ostala mozaička zdanja ranoga srednjeg vijeka.<sup>171</sup> Protkana je oblicima koji ne krše islamsku prohibiciju prikazivanja likova te ocrtavaju oblike i ukrase koji se ne mogu smatrati predmetom štovanja i ne predstavljaju ljude ili životinje.<sup>172</sup> To su najvećim dijelom biljke sa stabljikama, pupoljcima, listovima, krošnjama i grozdovima. Zamjećuju se lukovice te primog ili tratork (lat. *acanthus*),<sup>173</sup> mediteranska biljka prema čijim su se rebrastim listovima često oblikovali grčki, rimski i bizantski ornamenti. Dio ukrasa čine simetrični geometrijski oblici, ukrasni predmeti i imperijalni ornamenti poput kruna i nakita u bizantskomu i (rjeđe) perzijskom stilu te ukrasi i raskošni nakit bizantske sakralne umjetnosti kakvi se nalaze uz prikaze Krista, Marije i svetaca, dakako, bez samih likova.<sup>174</sup> Među oblicima se uočava skladan, simetričan splet stabljika s pupoljcima, amfora iznad koje su kružni kićeni ukrasi i na vrhu par raširenih krila izrađenih

with Byzantine religious forms, according to Grabar, may be seen in the composition of decorations on the inner side of the Dome. A space of 1280 square meters was covered in mosaics, which is unprecedented in comparison to all other edifices with mosaics from the Early Middle Ages.<sup>171</sup> It is inwrought with forms which do not violate the Islamic prohibition of image portrayal. There are shapes, patterns, and decorations which cannot be considered to be objects of veneration as they do not depict humans or animals.<sup>172</sup> They are, for the most part, plants with stems, buds, leaves, treetops and bunches. Bulbs are noticeable, as well as the *acanthus*,<sup>173</sup> a Mediterranean plant whose ribbed leaves were frequently used as pattern for Greek, Roman and Byzantine ornaments. A part of the decorations is made up of symmetrical geometric objects, decorative items and imperial ornaments such as crowns and jewelry in the Byzantine and occasional Persian style, and decorations and luxurious jewelry of Byzantine sacred art such as is found in pictures of Christ, Mary and the Saints, without the images themselves, of course.<sup>174</sup> Ornaments also consist of well-proportioned, symmetrical plexus of stems with buds, amphorae beneath circular ornate decorations, and a pair of spread wings fashioned in the Sassanid Persian style.<sup>175</sup> Despite the eclectic style of the decoration, it is unquestionable that the entire structure, “both architecture and decoration show remarkable clarity and consistency consonant with a single [architectural-artistic] campaign.”<sup>176</sup> The Sassanid royal symbols, according to Grabar, proclaim the triumph

<sup>168</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1950: 106.

<sup>169</sup> O. GRABAR, 1964: 79.

<sup>170</sup> O. GRABAR, 1964: 74. Grabar ovdje ukazuje na nedostatak studija o porijeklu minareta te se referira na poznato djelo K. A. C. Creswell, *Early Muslim Architecture* (K. A. C. CRESWELL, 1969: 38-40).

<sup>171</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 71.

<sup>172</sup> O. GRABAR, 1973: 93.

<sup>173</sup> S. BLAIR, 1992: 84.

<sup>174</sup> Usp. O. GRABAR, 1959: 48-50. Sheila Blair opaža da su na unutrašnjosti Kupole nad Stijenom možda radili umjetnici koji su desetljeće ranije radili na betlehenskoj Bazilici Kristova rođenja (S. BLAIR, 1992: 85).

<sup>171</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 71.

<sup>172</sup> O. GRABAR, 1973: 93.

<sup>173</sup> S. BLAIR, 1992: 84.

<sup>174</sup> Cf. O. GRABAR, 1959: 48-50. Sheila Blair observes that artists who had worked a decade before on the Basilica of the Nativity in Bethlehem might have worked on the inside of the Dome of the Rock (S. BLAIR, 1992: 85).

<sup>175</sup> Superb photographs of the decorations of the Dome of the Rock were made and published by Saïd Nuseibeh (Nuseibeh and Grabar, 1996; for photographs of the interior octagon see O. GRABAR, 1996: 92-99). Saïd Nuseibeh is the first photographer to have received approval to photograph the mosaic of the Dome of the Rock in colour with the assistance of professional equipment, which included setting up scaffolding and lights (O. GRABAR, 1996: xiii).

<sup>176</sup> S. BLAIR, 1992: 62. The author offers this observation in the context of proving that the construction of the Dome of the Rock did not take decades and was not undertaken during the era of Mu'āwiyah, twenty years earlier, as was assumed by F. E. Peters (F. E. PETERS, 1983: 119-138).

u sasanidskom perzijskom stilu.<sup>175</sup> Usprkos određenoj eklektičnosti ukrasā, nedvojbeno je da čitavo zdanje, „i arhitektura i dekoracija pokazuju izuzetnu jasnoću i dosljednost koje proizlaze iz jednoga [građevno-umjetničkog] projekta.“<sup>176</sup> Sasanidski kraljevski simboli, prema Grabaru, proglašavaju pobjedu islama nad nevjernicima.<sup>177</sup> Ukrasi preuzeti iz kršćanske sakralne umjetnosti ukazuju na umjetničko natjecanje, budući da je kršćanski Bizant kroz veličanstvena umjetnička djela i estetiku predstavljao ozbiljna vjerskoga konkurenta islamu. Upravo te razloge za gradnju Kupole nad Stijenom navodi Mukaddasi u sljedećem ulomku:

Jednom sam prigodom, u razgovoru s očevim bratom rekao: „O, striče, zacijelo nije umjesno to što el-Valid troši sredstva muslimana na džamiju u Damasku. Bilo bi prikladnije, a i njemu više na čast, da ih je utrošio u gradnju putova ili spremnika za vodu, ili za popravak utvrda.“ On mi odgovori: „Ti, sine dragi, naprosto ne razumiješ. El-Valid je u potpunosti u pravu; otvorila mu se mogućnost da stvori vrijedno djelo. Ta vidio je da je Sirija zemlja napućena kršćanima, i primijetio je ondje njihove crkve, tako lijepe s čarobnim ukrasima, nadaleko glasovite, kao što je Bazilika Svetog groba,<sup>178</sup> i crkve u Lidi i el-Ruhi. Stoga je muslimane potaknuo na gradnju džamije koja će njihovu pozornost preusmjeriti s crkvi, i koja će biti jedno od svjetskih čuda. Ne shvaćaš li da je Abdul Malik, vidjevši veličinu

<sup>175</sup> Sjajne fotografije ukrasa Kupole nad Stijenom napravio je i objavio Saïd Nuseibeh (S. NUSEIBEH & O. GRABAR, 1996; fotografije unutarnjeg osmerokuta v. u O. GRABAR, 1996: 92-99). Saïd Nuseibeh prvi je fotograf koji je dobio dopuštenje da u boji fotografira mozaik Kupole nad Stijenom uz korištenje profesionalne opreme, koja je uključivala postavljanje skele i osvjtljenja (O. GRABAR, 1996: xiii).

<sup>176</sup> S. BLAIR, 1992: 62. *Autorica ovo opažanje iznosi u kontekstu dokazivanja kako izgradnja Kupole nad Stijenom nije trajala desetljećima i nije započeta u vrijeme Mu'avije, dvadeset godina ranije, kako je pretpostavljao F. E. Peters (F. E. PETERS, 1983: 119-138).*

<sup>177</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 52. Perzijanci su u vrijeme islamskih osvajanja – osobito elita na vlasti – bili sljedbenici zoroastrijanstva koje su, zbog dualizma, muslimani smatrali mnogobožičkom religijom.

<sup>178</sup> Bazilika Svetog groba u Mukaddasijevu se tekstu naziva *kumama* (قمامة), što na arapskom znači 'smeće', ali zvuči slično stvarnom arapskom nazivu tē crkve – *kijama* (قيامة), odnosno *kanisat ul-kijama* (كنيسة القيامة), odnosno Crkva uskrsnuća. Vidjeti i O. GRABAR, 1996: 53.

of Islam over unbelievers.<sup>177</sup> The decorations taken from Christian sacred art point to an artistic competition, inasmuch as Christian Byzantium, through its magnificent art and aesthetics, stood as a serious religious contestant to Islam. Muqaddasi explicitly names this competition as a reason for the construction of the Dome of the Rock:

Now, talking to my father's brother one day said I: "O my uncle, surely it was not fitting for al-Walid to expend the resources of the Muslims on the mosque at Damascus. Had he expended as much in building roads, or the water tanks, or in repairing the fortresses, it would have been more proper and more to his credit." Said he: "You simply do not understand, my dear son. Al-Walid was absolutely right, and it was open to him to do a worthy work. For he saw that Syria was a country settled by the Christians, and he noted there their churches so handsome with their enchanting decorations, renowned far and wide, such as are the Qumāma,<sup>178</sup> and the churches of Ludd (Lydda) and al-Ruhā. So he undertook for the Muslims the building of a mosque that would divert their attention from the churches, and make it one of the wonders of the world. Do you not realize how 'Abd al-Malik, seeing the greatness of the dome of the Qumāma and its splendour, fearing lest it should beguile the hearts of the Muslims, hence erected, above the Rock, the dome you now see there?"<sup>179</sup>

Grabar in his commentary on the quoted text from Muqaddasi asks to what extent modern historians can accept the perception of reasons for the Dome's construction as explained in the tenth century to understand

<sup>177</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 52. Persians during the era of Islamic conquest – especially the elite who were in power – were followers of Zoroastrianism which Muslims considered to be a polytheistic religion due to dualism.

<sup>178</sup> The Church of the Holy Sepulcher is called *qumama* (قمامة) in Muqaddasi's text, which in Arabic means "garbage", but which sounds similar to the actual Arab name for the Church *qiyama* (قيامة) or *kanisat al-qiyama* (كنيسة القيامة), that is, the Church of the Resurrection. See also O. GRABAR, 1996: 53.

<sup>179</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 135-136. Earlier in the text Muqaddasi cites that al-Walid hired artisans from Persia, Indian, West Africa and Byzantium for the construction of the mosque in Damascus. The expenses for the construction amounted to the seven-year revenue of Syria, and eighteen ships which brought gold and silver and materials for the creation of the mosaic from Cyprus, which were sent by the Byzantine emperor (p. 134).



Bazilike Svetog groba i njezin sjaj, a strahujući da bi mogla zavesti srca muslimana, iznad Stijene podignuo Kupolu koju danas ondje vidiš?<sup>179</sup>

Grabar u komentaru na navedeni Mukaddasijev tekst postavlja pitanje u kojoj mjeri današnji povjesničari mogu prihvatiti percepciju razloga podizanja Kupole iz 10. stoljeća kako bi razumjeli stvarne razloge gradnje koji su postojali u vrijeme kad je nastajala,<sup>180</sup> odnosno je li Mukaddasijevo objašnjenje anakronistično. Drugih arapskih izvora koji bi Mukaddasijevu tvrdnju potvrdili ili opovrgnuli nema. No, prema nekim tumačenjima ranih izvora, argumentirano se može staviti pod upit koliko su u vrijeme izgradnje Kupole muslimani kršćane<sup>181</sup> i Židove smatrali pripadnicima odvojenih religija, a koliko su sebe smatrali dijelom judeokršćanske tradicije koju su posljednjom, konačnom i u cijelosti pravovjernom objavom trebali odvratiti od krivoštovlja, što je, prema islamu, vjerovanje u inkarnaciju i Trojstvo.<sup>182</sup>

Upravo tim porukama obiluje i za teologe i povjesničare možda najkorisniji dio ukrasa Kupole nad Stijenom: najkorisniji kako za tumačenje svrhe same građevine, tako i za tumačenje percepcije važnosti Jeruzalema u najranijim tradicijama, onima iz prvoga hidžretskog stoljeća. Radi se o pisanim tekstovima, mahom kuranskih

the motives for its building that existed while it was being built,<sup>180</sup> that is, whether or not Muqaddasi's explanation is anachronistic. There are no other Arabic sources which would confirm or refute Muqaddasi's statement. According to some interpretations of early sources one may also ask yet another question: to what extent did Muslims, during the period of the construction of the Dome, view Christians<sup>181</sup> and Jews as members of different religions, and to what extent they viewed themselves as part of the Judeo-Christian tradition which they had a mission to divert from heresies (such as belief in the Incarnation and the Trinity) through Muhammad's ultimate and final revelation.<sup>182</sup>

The part of the Dome's decoration that is historically and theologically perhaps most valuable abounds in precisely those messages: the most valuable, that is, both for the interpretation of the structure's purpose, and for the interpretation of the perception of Jerusalem's importance during the earliest decades of Islam. Those decorations consist of written texts, mostly verses from the Quran, in which *Qubbat al-Sakhrah* is very rich. Most of the texts date from the Umayyad period. The length of inscriptions inside the Dome is 240 meters,<sup>183</sup> and all of them originate from the same period as the building, save for the text on which the name 'Abd al-Malik was replaced by the name of al-Ma'mūn, the Abbasid Caliph who ruled from 813–833.<sup>184</sup>

We cannot here describe in detail their contents, nor are their nuances and linguistic details relevant

<sup>179</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 135-136. Ranije u tekstu Mukaddasi navodi da je el-Valid za gradnju džamije u Damasku unajmio umjetnike iz Perzije, Indije, zapadne Afrike i Bizanta. Trošak gradnje bio je sedmogodišnji prihod Sirije te osamnaest brodova koji su s Cipra dopremili zlato i srebro te materijale za izradu mozaika koje je poslao bizantski car (str. 134).

<sup>180</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 54.

<sup>181</sup> Poglavito one koji nisu prihvaćali doktrinu o Trojstvu, premda je upitno koliko bi ortodoksni kršćani pripadnike takvih sljedbi uopće smatrali kršćanima.

<sup>182</sup> Za opsežnije razmatranje o ovoj temi v. potpoglavlje *Ecumenism* u F. M. DONNER, 2010: 68-74. Donner, jedan od najuglednijih arabista i stručnjaka za rani islam, ovdje nudi tumačenje ranoislamske „konfesionalne otvorenosti“ i „ekumenizma“ koje se temelji na neortodoksnu, ali uvjerljivu tumačenju ranoislamske povijesti i kuranskih poruka. I o ovoj temi, a Donner to i napominje, islamski su izvori nepotpuni, često nejasni i višeznačni. No to se odnosi i na njihovo „neekumensko“ tumačenje, ono prema kojemu se iz tih poruka kasnije razvila tradicija prema kojoj su „kur'anske riječi *islam* i *musliman* naknadno stekle restriktivnije, konfesionalno značenje nove vjere različite od kršćanstva i židovstva“ (str. 72).

<sup>180</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 54.

<sup>181</sup> Mostly those who did not accept the doctrine on the Trinity, although it is debatable to what extent orthodox Christians would consider followers of such sects to be Christians.

<sup>182</sup> For a more extensive examination of this topic see the subchapter *Ecumenism* in F. M. DONNER, 2010: 68-74. Donner, one of the most respected Arabists and experts on early Islam, offers here an explanation of early Islamic “confessional openness” and “ecumenism” which is based on an unorthodox yet persuasive interpretation of early Islamic history and the messages of the Quran. On this topic as well, Donner reminds us, Islamic sources are incomplete, often unclear and multifaceted. This also has to do with their “non-ecumenical” interpretations, according to which traditions developed from the messages according to which “Qur'anic words, *islam* and *muslim*, could subsequently have acquired their more restrictive, confessional meanings as a new faith distinct from Christianity and Judaism” (p. 72).

<sup>183</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 52.

<sup>184</sup> O. GRABAR, 1973: 61-62.

*ajeta*. *Kubat as-sahra* njima je veoma bogata, a većina ih je iz umajadskog razdoblja. U unutrašnjosti Kupole nalaze se takve inskripcije duljine 240 metara<sup>183</sup> i sve potječu iz istoga razdoblja kao i građevina, osim teksta na kojemu je ime Abdul Malika zamijenjeno imenom Ma'muna, abasidskoga kalifa koji je vladao 813.–833.<sup>184</sup>

Ovdje ne možemo detaljno opisati sav njihov sadržaj, koji za temu ovoga članka nije ni bitan u svim svojim jezičnim i sadržajnim nijansama i pojedinostima.<sup>185</sup> No, tema koja izrazito prevladava u inskripcijama jest polemika s kršćanskim kristološkim naukom kako su ga shvaćali autori inskripcija. Grabar predlaže da se inskripcije unutarnjeg dijela Kupole podijele u šest dijelova različite duljine, a prvi prenosi suru *El-Ihlas* (112.) u cijelosti: „Reci: ‘On je Allah – Jedan! Allah je Utočište svakom! Nije rodio i rođen nije, i niko Mu ravan nije!’“<sup>186</sup> Poruka ove sure predstavlja opovrgavanje kršćanskog shvaćanja Trojstva i utjelovljenja kakvo, primjerice, nalazimo u Nicejsko-carigradskom vjerovanju: „Vjerujem u jednoga Boga, Oca svemogućega, Stvoritelja neba i zemlje, svega vidljivoga i nevidljivoga. I u jednoga Gospodina Isusa Krista, jedinorođenoga Sina Božjega. Rođenog od Oca prije svih vjekova. Boga od Boga, svjetlo od svjetla, pravoga Boga od pravoga Boga. Rođena, ne stvorena, istobitna s Ocem...“<sup>187</sup> Velik dio ostalih inskripcija prenosi poruku na tragu sure 112: *ajeti* 3:16-17, 4:169-171, 9:33, 2:130 itd. Gotovo svi tekstovi religijskog su sadržaja i referiraju se na ranije objave (židovsku i kršćansku) kao prethodnice islamske, uz stanoviti otvoreni ili latentni prikaz islama ne kao nove vjere nego kao vjere koja je usavršila ranije objave i ispravila zablude koje su se u njima razvile. U natpisima se imenom ne spominje ni jedan starozavjetni prorok, nego je naglasak na Isusu i Mariji.<sup>188</sup> Za temu ovoga članka znakovita je inskripcija s tekstem iz sure *El-Isrā* (17.), ali to nije

for the topic of this paper.<sup>185</sup> The theme that noticeably prevails in the inscriptions is the polemic with Christian Christological doctrine as understood by the authors of the inscriptions. Grabar suggests that the inscriptions from the inner part of the Dome be divided into six portions of varying length, with the first transposing Surah 112 in its entirety: “Say: He is God, the One; God the Eternal; He has not begotten nor was He begotten; and there is none comparable to Him.”<sup>186</sup> The message of this Surah represents the refutation of the Christian understanding of the Trinity and the Embodiment as, for example, is found in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed: “We believe in one God, the Father, the Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all that is, seen and unseen. We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, eternally begotten of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, one in Being with the Father.”<sup>187</sup> Many of the remaining inscriptions convey a message similar to the Surah 112. Those are Quranic verses 3:16-17, 4:169-171, 9:33, 2:130 etc. Almost all of the texts are of religious content and refer to earlier revelations (Jewish and Christian) as predecessors to the Islamic revelation, with a certain open or latent representation of Islam not as a new faith, but as a faith that perfected earlier revelations and rectified errors which developed in them. Not one Old Testament prophet is mentioned by name in the inscriptions; the accent is on Jesus and Mary.<sup>188</sup> The inscription with a text from Surah 17 is significant for the topic of this paper. However, it is not the Surah’s first verse in which Muhammad’s Night Journey is mentioned, but verse 111, which is again a polemic with the Christian doctrine.<sup>189</sup> The Dome of the Rock does not contain any references to *isrā* or *mi’rāj*, which points to the fact that Muhammad’s Night Journey and *al-Aqsā* were not linked to Jerusalem before the end of the seventh century. Had they been, it would be hard to believe

<sup>183</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 52.

<sup>184</sup> O. GRABAR, 1973: 61-62.

<sup>185</sup> Cjelovitiji sadržaj natpisa može se naći u O. GRABAR, 1959: 52-62 i O. GRABAR, 1996: 59-61; arapski tekst natpisa u O. GRABAR, 1996: 184-186.

<sup>186</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 53.

<sup>187</sup> *Katekizam Katoličke Crkve: Kompendij*, 2005: 27-28.

<sup>188</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 54.

<sup>185</sup> More complete contents of the inscription may be found in O. GRABAR, 1959: 52-62 and O. GRABAR, 1996: 59-61; the Arabic text of the inscription in O. GRABAR, 1996: 184-186.

<sup>186</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 53.

<sup>187</sup> [http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc\\_css/archive/catechism/credo.htm](http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc_css/archive/catechism/credo.htm) (The Nicene Creed; accessed 10/12/2018).

<sup>188</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 54.

<sup>189</sup> Surah 17: 111 states “And say: Praise be to Allah, Who hath not taken unto Himself a son, and Who hath no partner in the Sovereignty, nor hath He any protecting friend through dependence. And magnify Him with all magnificence.”

ajet 1. u kojemu se spominje Muhamedovo noćno putovanje, nego ajet 111. u kojemu se opet polemizira s kršćanskim naukom.<sup>189</sup> Sama Kupola nad Stijenom ne sadrži nikakve reference na *isru* i *miradž*, što ukazuje na to da se Muhamedovo noćno putovanje i el-Aksa do konca 7. stoljeća nisu povezivali s Jeruzalemom. Da jesu, teško je pojmljivo da se tako važnome događaju ne bi posvetio natpis na mjestu povezanu s njime. Na Haramu, pokraj *kubat as-sahre*, danas stoji memorijal Noćnom putovanju u obliku nevelika osmokutnog podnožja okružena s osam stupova nadsvođenih kupolom. To je *kubat an-nabi*, Prorokova kupola, poznata i pod nazivom *kubat džibril*, kojom je obilježen Prorokov posjet Jeruzalemu. Zdanje je puno kasnijega, osmanskog podrijetla. U blizini se nalazi i *kubat el-miradž*, spomen na Prorokovo celestijalno putovanje, izgrađen u vrijeme križara, vjerojatno kao krstionica, a doraden u vrijeme Ajubida. No, poznato je da su te kupole u nekom obliku postojale i ranije. Mukaddasi osim *kubat as-sahre* imenom spominje još tri kupole na Haramu (*kubat es-silsilah*, *kubat an-nabi* i *kubat el-miradž*).<sup>190</sup> *Kubat an-nabi* i *kubat el-miradž*, na temelju izvora u kojima se prvi put pojavljuju, vjerojatno potječu iz umajadskog razdoblja.<sup>191</sup> Da je Kupola nad Stijenom izvorno zamišljena kao memorijal *isre* i *miradža* ili da je Stijena povezivana s mjestom s kojega se Muhamed vinuo u nebesa, ne bi postojala potreba za gradnjom ovih dviju kupola. Ipak, rekonstrukciju tijekom gradnje kupola na Haramu, iz koje bi se moglo zaključiti više o njihovoj korelaciji, znatno otežava to što su sve, s iznimkom *kubat es-silsilaha*, ponovo izgrađene nakon križarskog razdoblja.<sup>192</sup>

*Kubat es-silsilah*, odnosno Kupola lanca, smještena je istočno od *kubat as-sahre* i tik do nje. To je treća po veličini građevina na Haramu i nije povezana s legendama o *isri* i *miradžu*, nego s lancem Sudnjega dana koji će na putu u raj propustiti dobre, a zaustaviti zle. Od manjih kupola ona je jedina koja u današnjem obliku potječe iz umajadskog razdoblja,

that such an important event would not warrant an inscription at the place related to it. At the Ḥaram, near the *Qubbat al-Sakhrah*, there stands today a memorial to the Night Journey in the form of a small, octagonal pedestal surrounded by eight columns with a vaulted dome. This is the *Qubbat al-Nabi*, the Prophet's Dome, known also as the *Qubbat Jibril*, by which the Prophet's journey to Jerusalem is marked. The structure is of a much later, Ottoman origin. Nearby is the *Qubbat al-mi'rāj*, a memorial to the Prophet's celestial journey, built during the Crusades, likely as a baptismal font, and ornamented during the Ayyubid dynasty. It is known, however, that those domes existed in some form even earlier. Other than the *Qubbat al-Sakhrah*, Muqaddasi mentioned three more domes on the Ḥaram by name (*Qubbat al-Silsilah*, *Qubbat al-Nabi* and *Qubbat al-mi'rāj*).<sup>190</sup> Based on sources in which they were first mentioned we may conclude that *Qubbat al-Nabi* and *Qubbat al-mi'rāj* likely originate from the Umayyad period.<sup>191</sup> There would not be a need to construct these two domes were the Dome of the Rock originally intended to be a memorial to the *isrā* and *mi'rāj*, or were the Rock related to the place from whence Muhammad ascended to heavens. A reconstruction of the course of the building of the Domes on the Ḥaram, however, from which more conclusions about their correlation might be reached, is made considerably more difficult because, with the exception of the *Qubbat al-Silsilah*, they were all reconstructed after the Crusade period.<sup>192</sup>

*Qubbat al-Silsilah*, or the Dome of the Chain, is located east of the *Qubbat al-Sakhrah*, right next to it. It is the third largest building on the Ḥaram and it is not related to legends of the *isrā* and *mi'rāj*, but rather to the Chain of Judgement Day which will let the good through on their path to heaven and block the evil. Of the smaller domes it is the only one which dates from the Umayyad period in its current form, likely from the time of the Caliphate of 'Abd al-Malik. The purpose of the construction of the dome with such an unusual shape is also unknown; Grabar even suggests the possibility that it was built from construction material left over after the completion of other edifices on the Ḥaram.<sup>193</sup> He, in his description of the Dome of the Chain, cites the observation

<sup>189</sup> Sura 17:111 glasi „i reci: 'Hvaljen neka je Allah, Koji Sebi nije uzeo djeteta i Koji u vlasti nema ortaka, i Kome ne treba zaštitnik zbog nemoći – i hvaleći Ga veličaj!'“

<sup>190</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 142.

<sup>191</sup> A. ELAD, 1999: 48-50.

<sup>192</sup> G. NEPICOĞLU, 2008: 24-27.

<sup>190</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 142.

<sup>191</sup> A. ELAD, 1999: 48-50.

<sup>192</sup> G. NEPICOĞLU, 2008: 24-27.

<sup>193</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 132.

izgledno iz vremena Abdul Malikova kalifata. No, svrha gradnje te kupole neobična oblika također je nepoznata; Grabar čak predlaže mogućnost da je podignuta od građevinskog materijala preostalog nakon završetka drugih zdanja na Haramu.<sup>193</sup> On u svojem opisu Kupole lanca navodi i opažanje Myriam Rosen-Ayalon kako se ona nalazi točno na sredini Harama te je k tomu i jedina građevina na Haramu koja se nalazi na sredini bilo čega. Grabar to opažanje naziva „možda korisnijim od svih ranijih“.<sup>194</sup> No ni ono ne pridonosi razumijevanju razloga gradnje i namjene Kupole nad Stijenom. Naprotiv, njime se broj nepoznanica o ranoislamskim građevinskim pothvatima u Jeruzalemu i na Haramu samo povećava.

Vjerojatno najlogičniji zaključak do kojeg nas dovodi analiza arhitekture, ukrasa i inskripcija *kubat as-sahre*, jest da je glavna svrha građevina s jedne strane zapriječiti da muslimane privuku atraktivna kršćanska religijska gradnja i ornamentura kojima je Jeruzalem obilovao i koje su imale i nezanemarljivu misionarsku svrhu, a s druge strane „opremanje [muslimanskih] vjernika argumentima koje će moći koristiti protiv kršćanskih [doktrinarnih] stajališta.“<sup>195</sup> Tomu se može pridodati i muslimanska ambicija da impresionira kršćansku populaciju pokazujući ne samo uvjerljivost svojih vjerskih argumenata nego i sposobnost da ih uobliči u estetskoj formi koja ljepotom ne zaostaje za kršćanskom, pa time *kubat as-sahra* biva i „misionarski monument čija je svrha impresionirati i uvjeriti [...]“.<sup>196</sup>

Materijalni dokazi prikupljeni iz Kupole time u određenoj mjeri potvrđuju hadise i tradicije iz umajjadskog razdoblja. Između Jeruzalema i Meke, odnosno Harama i Ka'be, postojalo je političko-religijsko suparništvo koje valja prepoznati, ali ne bi ga trebalo prenamaglasiti. Isto vrijedi i za suparništvo između kršćanskih i islamskih struktura – što uključuje arhitekturu, lokaciju, teologiju, estetiku i prestiž – unutar istoga grada. Usprkos obilju materijala koji pruža solidan uvid u Abdul Malikove neimarske motive i težnje, temeljno pitanje biti i svrhe *kubat as-sahre* ostaje neriješeno. Ustrajna i nesavladiva zagonetnost

of Myriam Rosen-Ayalon that it has been built exactly in the middle of the Ḥaram, and is, furthermore, the only building on the Ḥaram that is found in the center of anything. Grabar suggests that her observation “may be more fruitful than all the earliest ones.”<sup>194</sup> Even that does not contribute much to the understanding of the motive of the construction and the purpose of the Dome of the Rock. Rather the opposite, it only added to enigmas concerning the early Islamic construction ventures in Jerusalem and on the Ḥaram.

Probably the most logical conclusion to which an analysis of the architecture, decorations and inscriptions of the *Qubbat al-Sakhrah* brings us is that the main purpose of the building is, on the one hand, to deter the attractive Christian religious buildings and ornaments which were bountiful in Jerusalem and which had a not insignificant missionary purpose, from attracting Muslims, and on the other providing “the [Muslim] faithful with arguments to be used against Christian [doctrinal] positions.”<sup>195</sup> To this can be added the Muslim ambition to impress the Christian population by showing not only the convincingness of their religious arguments, but also the ability to shape them into an aesthetic form which does not lag behind the Christian aesthetic enterprises. Thus, *Qubbat al-Sakhrah* becomes also “a missionary monument that is meant to impress and convince [...]”.<sup>196</sup>

Material evidence collected from the Dome confirm, to a certain degree, the ḥadīth and traditions from the Umayyad period. Between Jerusalem and Mecca, or Ḥaram and the Ka'ba, there was a political-religious rivalry, which should be recognized, but should not be over-emphasized. The same is true of the rivalry between Christian and Islamic structures – which include architecture, location, theology, aesthetics and prestige – within the same city. Despite the richness of material that offers a solid look into 'Abd al-Malik's aspirations and motives for construction, the basic question of the essence and purpose of the *Qubbat al-Sakhrah* remains unanswered. The persistent and unanswerable mystery of that great building calls for caution when being interpreted by researchers. It calls the believer to something else entirely: offering him an almost endless space for historic, textual and eschatological interpretation it

<sup>193</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 132.

<sup>194</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 131.

<sup>195</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 56.

<sup>196</sup> N. N. N. KHOURY, 1993: 59.

<sup>194</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 131.

<sup>195</sup> O. GRABAR, 1959: 56.

<sup>196</sup> N. N. N. KHOURY, 1993: 59.

toga velebnog zdanja poziva znanstvenika na oprez kod tumačenja, no vjernika poziva na nešto sasvim drugo: pružajući mu gotovo beskrajn prostor za povijesna, tekstualna i eshatološka tumačenja, poziva ga, izaziva i mami da zdanju pristupi s pozicije sudjelovanja u aktualnim procesima unutar vječite borbe dobra i zla. A Jeruzalem je od pradavnih vremena – i to ne čitav Jeruzalem nego Brdo Hrama, hebrejski *har ha-bait* (הר הבית), kasnije arapski *el-haram eš-šarif* – predstavljao glavno bojište i vrhovnu vrednotu do koje se uopće može doći na *dunjaluku*.<sup>197</sup> Polemične i poučne kuranske poruke koje zahvaljujući Abdul Malikovu životnom projektu dominiraju tim mjestom, u očima muslimanskih vjernika simboliziraju duhovnu dominaciju islama nad židovstvom i kršćanstvom, a to je u biti i temeljna poruka islama kao svjetonazora. Opustošenje židovskoga svetog mjesta među kršćanima je simboliziralo napuštanje Staroga saveza i prelazak na Novi savez te potvrdu teologije supstitucije.<sup>198</sup> Implicitna islamska polemika s kršćanstvom, koja je eksplicitno iznesena u inskripcijama *kubat as-sahre*, vidljiva je u obliku muslimanskog prihvaćanja tradicije gradnje Hrama; gradnje, a ne opustošenja, kako su se prema prostoru židovskog Hrama i hramskog trga odnosili kršćani. Grabar stoga s razlogom napominje kako Kupolu nad Stijenom uvijek valja promatrati u okviru jeruzalemskog miljea u kojemu je podignuta, što ne pridonosi jednostavnosti njezina tumačenja: „Stvari usložnjava to što se radi o zdanju sa skoro 1300 godina neprekidne povijesti u gradu s emocionalnim, pijetističkim i političkim asocijacijama koje su brojnije i kontradiktornije nego u bilo kojoj drugoj urbanoj sredini na svijetu.“<sup>199</sup>

## 8. ULOGA ŽIDOVSKIH OBRAĆENIKA NA STVARANJE RANOISLAMSKIH TRADICIJA O JERUZALEMU

U razmatranjima o razvoju ranoislamske misli i teologije, osobito u kontekstu uzdizanja Jeruzalema na razinu islamskoga svetog grada s eshatološkim značajem, neminovno je promotriti ulogu židovskih, te u manjoj ili zanemarivoj mjeri, kršćanskih konvertita

appeals, challenges, and attracts him to approach the structure from the position of participation in the current processes of the eternal battle between good and evil. Jerusalem has from time immemorial – and not all of Jerusalem, but primarily the Temple Mount, the Hebrew *har ha-bayit* (הר הבית) and later the Arabic *Al-Haram al-Sharif* – represented the main battleground and supreme value to which one may arrive in the *dunyā*.<sup>197</sup> The polemic and instructive messages from the Quran which, thanks to the life project of ‘Abd al-Malik, dominate on that spot, symbolize in the eyes of Muslim believers the spiritual domination of Islam over Judaism and Christianity, and that is in principle a key message of Islam as a worldview. The devastation of the Jewish holy place symbolized to the Christians the abandonment of the Old and a shift to the New Covenant, and a confirmation of the Replacement Theology.<sup>198</sup> The implicit Islamic polemic with Christianity – which is explicitly stated in the inscriptions of the *Qubbat al-Sakhrah* – is seen in the Muslim adoption of the tradition of the construction of the Temple; construction, and not devastation, as the Christians treated the space of the Jewish Temples and the Temple Square. Thus, Grabar correctly perceives that the Dome of the Rock should always be viewed in the context of the Jerusalem milieu in which it was built. By no means does it facilitate its interpretation: “What complicates matters is that it is a building with a continuous history of nearly 1300 years in a city with more numerous and more contradictory emotional, pietistic, and political associations than any other urban entity in the world.”<sup>199</sup>

## 8. THE ROLE OF JEWISH CONVERTS IN CREATION OF EARLY ISLAMIC TRADITIONS ABOUT JERUSALEM

In considering the development of early Islamic thought and theology, especially in the context of elevating Jerusalem to the level of an Islamic holy city with eschatological significance, it is necessary to regard the role of Jewish and, to a lesser if not negligible degree Christian converts to the new faith. Islam, as it arrived from Arabia, was a simple religion, with only a few key theological themes of which the most

<sup>197</sup> Ovaj svijet, od arapskoga *dunja* (دُنْيَا).

<sup>198</sup> Usp. M. SHARON, 1992.

<sup>199</sup> O. GRABAR, 1973: 49.

<sup>197</sup> Arabic “this world” (دُنْيَا).

<sup>198</sup> Cf. M. SHARON, 1992.

<sup>199</sup> O. GRABAR, 1973: 49.

na novu vjeru. Islam koji je stigao iz Arabije bio je jednostavna vjera, s tek nekoliko ključnih teoloških tema, od kojih je najvažnija sadržana u *šahadetu*<sup>200</sup>, a to je jednobojstvo; u prvim se izvorima čak ne spominje Muhamedovo poslanstvo, nego samo to da „nema boga osim Boga“, katkad uz dodatak da on „nema sudruga“,<sup>201</sup> što je Židovima u cijelosti prihvatljivo. Od ostalih tema tu je vjera u Sudnji dan, uskrsnuće mrtvih, raj i pakao te u anđele i demone. Nikakvih sofisticiranih teoloških teorija nije bilo u tim vrlo uopćenim dogmama. U islamu s konca 7. stoljeća nije postojalo ništa usporedivo sa složenim dogmama kakve nalazimo u kršćanstvu, pa čak ni u – doktrinarno gledano – puno jednostavnijem židovstvu. Prihvatimo li tradicionalni islamski narativ, tekst koji su muslimani imali sa sobom dolazeći u sjeverne pokrajine bili su zapravo fragmenti Kur’ana,<sup>202</sup> a iz njih se nije moglo puno toga zaključiti ni o čemu, pa ni o životu njegova autora, nastanku islamske objave ili gore spomenutim dogmama. Petersovim riječima, „Islamska je sveta knjiga tekst bez konteksta, pa je taj primarni dokument, koji snažno zagovara svoju autentičnost, neupotrebljiv za rekonstruiranje događaja iz Muhamedova života.“<sup>203</sup> Prve raspoložive tradicije koje stavljaju Kur’an u povijesni kontekst potječu iz sredine osmog stoljeća.<sup>204</sup>

Na razvoj ranoislamske misli, poglavito kad se radi o Jeruzalemu, od goleme je važnosti bilo osvajanje Sirije nešto više od desetljeća nakon hidžre i dodir s tamošnjim drevnim tradicijama. Islamska se vlast u Siriji relativno brzo konsolidirala i utvrdila, uz mnoštva Židova i kršćana koji su se priključili novim vladarima, kako u njihovoj vjeri, tako i u administraciji.<sup>205</sup> Upravo su njihove biblijske i izvanbiblijske tradicije bile ključne za oblikovanje islamskoga viđenja Jeruzalema kao svetoga grada, a pri tome poglavito kao grada od posebne eshatološke važnosti.<sup>206</sup> Prema

important was comprised of the *shahada*.<sup>200</sup> That was monotheism. The first sources do not even mention Muhammad’s mission, only that “there is no god other than God”, sometimes with the addition “and he does not have a companion,”<sup>201</sup> which is acceptable to Jews in its entirety. Of the remaining themes there are also the belief in Judgement Day, the resurrection of the dead, heaven and hell, and angels and demons. There were no sophisticated theological theories and doctrinal nuances in these much-generalized dogmata. In Islam at the end of the seventh century there was nothing comparable with the complicated creeds found in Christianity, nor even in Judaism which was (from the point of view of doctrine) much simpler religion compared to Christianity. If we accept the traditional Islamic narrative, the text that Muslims had with them when they arrived at the Byzantine lands in the north was made up of fragments of the Quran,<sup>202</sup> and not much could be concluded about anything on the basis of them, including the life of its author, the origin of the Islamic revelation, or the aforementioned dogmata. In the words of F. E. Peters, “The Holy Book of Islam is text without context, and so this prime document, which has a very claim to be authentic, is of almost no use for reconstructing the events of the life of Muhammad.”<sup>203</sup> The first available traditions which place the Quran in a historic context derive from the mid-eighth century.<sup>204</sup>

The conquest of Syria a bit more than a decade after the *Hijra* and the contact with ancient Syrian traditions were of enormous importance to the development of early Islamic thought, especially with regard to Jerusalem. Islamic rule in Syria consolidated rather quickly, and the multitude of Jews and Christians joined with the new rulers both in their faith and in their administration.<sup>205</sup> Their Biblical and non-Biblical traditions were key in the formation of an Islamic view of Jerusalem as the holy city, and thereby mainly as a city of particular eschatological importance.<sup>206</sup> According to

<sup>200</sup> Muslimanska ispovijed vjere koja glasi „nema boga osim Allaha a Muhamed je njegov poslanik“.

<sup>201</sup> F. M. DONNER, 2010: 112.

<sup>202</sup> Crone i Cook upozoravaju kako „ne postoji čvrst dokaz postojanja Kur’ana u bilo kakvu obliku prije posljednjega desetljeća sedmog stoljeća“ (P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 3).

<sup>203</sup> F. E. PETERS, 1991: 300.

<sup>204</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 3.

<sup>205</sup> M. SHARON, 1992: 56-68.

<sup>206</sup> O. LIVNE-KAFRI, 2006: 382; A. MEDDEB & B. STORA, 2013: 108.

<sup>200</sup> The Muslim confession of faith which states, “there is no god but Allah and Muhammad is his messenger.”

<sup>201</sup> F. M. DONNER, 2010: 112.

<sup>202</sup> Crone and Cook warn that “There is no hard evidence for the existence of the Koran in any form before the last decade of the seventh century” (P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 3).

<sup>203</sup> F. E. PETERS, 1991: 300.

<sup>204</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 3.

<sup>205</sup> M. SHARON, 1992: 56-68.

<sup>206</sup> O. LIVNE-KAFRI, 2006: 382; A. MEDDEB & B. STORA, 2013: 108.

židovskim tradicijama Jeruzalem će biti mjesto uskrsnuća mrtvih na Sudnji dan. Ništa slično ne nalazimo u islamu prije osvajanja Sirije, premda je islam od samoga nastanka zaokupljen eshatološkim temama. Na tragu židovske, kršćanske i zoroastrijske mesijanske eshatologije razvijala se islamska eshatološka misao, pa je tako tako nastao i koncept Mahdija<sup>207</sup> koji će „svijet ispuniti pravdom i jednakošću kao što je sada ispunjen tiranijom i ugnjetavanjem“.<sup>208</sup>

Među ranoislamskim eshatološkim tradicijama znakovita je ona koju nalazimo u Mukaddasijevu zemljopisnom djelu. Mukaddasi na početku opisa Jeruzalema najprije navodi kako klima grada „točno odgovara [onakvoj kakva se nalazi u] opisu Raja“.<sup>209</sup> Potom navodi poznatu tradiciju prema kojoj će Jeruzalem biti mjesto uskrsnuća, mjesto kamo će na Dan suda doći uskrsnuli mrtvi, te nastavlja:

Istina je da su Meka i Medina nadmoćni zbog Ka'be i Proroka – sallallahu alejhi ve selam – ali uistinu na Dan uskrsnuća oba će [ta grada] požuriti u Jeruzalem te će izvrsnost sviju njih ondje biti zajedno obuhvaćena.<sup>210</sup>

Zanimljivost Mukaddasijeva opisa leži i u podatku da većinu stanovnika Jeruzalema čine kršćani i Židovi, dok su „džamije [prazne i] bez vjerničkoga zbora“.<sup>211</sup> Jeruzalem od islamskih osvajanja do konca 10. stoljeća ne samo da nije imao muslimansku većinu, nego su muslimani bili značajno brojčano nadmašeni. Time se i prelazak tradicija većinskih zajednica, židovske i kršćanske, na manjinsku, muslimansku, uz ostale navedene čimbenike, doima prirodnim i logičnim procesom.

Eshatološka očekivanja Židova početkom sedmoga stoljeća u Palestini doživjela su višestoljetni vrhunac pošto je Perzija to područje nakratko osvojila od Bizanta. Perzijanci su osvojili Jeruzalem 614., a Židovi su, djelomice zbog lošeg položaja koji su imali pod kršćanskim Bizantom, a djelomice zbog usporedivih povijesnih okolnosti koje su se zbile prije više od tisuću godina, i koje

Jewish traditions, Jerusalem will be the place of the resurrection of the dead on Judgement Day. We find nothing similar in Islam before the conquest of Syria, even though Islam was preoccupied with eschatological topics from its very founding. Islamic eschatological thought developed on the trail of Jewish, Christian and Zoroastrian messianic eschatology. Thus, the concept of Mahdi<sup>207</sup> which will “fill the earth with justice and equity as it is now filled with tyranny and oppression”<sup>208</sup> appeared in Islam.

Among early Islamic eschatological traditions, the one found in Muqaddasi's geographical work is of particular importance. At the beginning of his description of Jerusalem, Muqaddasi states that the climate of the city is “the very description of Paradise.”<sup>209</sup> He then cites the well-known tradition according to which Jerusalem will be the place of resurrection, the place to which the resurrected dead will arrive on Judgement Day, and continues:

Now it is true that Makka and al-Madina are in the ascendant with the Ka'ba and the Prophet – God's peace and blessing be upon him – but truly, on the Day of Resurrection, they will both hasten to Jerusalem, and the excellence of all of them will be encompassed there together.<sup>210</sup>

Another curiosity found in the Muqaddasi's description is his statement that majority of the inhabitants of Jerusalem was made up of Christians and Jews, while Jerusalem's “mosques [are] devoid of congregations and assemblies.”<sup>211</sup> Not only was there no Muslim majority in Jerusalem by the end of the tenth century AD, but the Muslims there were far surpassed in numbers. Thus, the transmission of traditions from the communities which made up a majority, that is, the Christians and Jews, to the Muslim minority seems to be a natural and logical process, particularly when the other earlier mentioned factors are considered.

The eschatological expectations of the Jews at the beginning of the seventh century in Syria reached a centennial peak after Persia captured Palestine from Byzantium for a short period of time. The Persians took over Jerusalem in 614 and the Jews, partly be-

<sup>207</sup> Mahdi je islamska mesijanska figura s čijim se dolaskom, odnosno povratkom, povezuje kraj svijeta i dolazak Sudnjega dana. Danas je iščekivanje Mahdija daleko više prisutno u šijitskoj nego u sunitskoj zajednici.

<sup>208</sup> B. LEWIS, 1950: 308.

<sup>209</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 140.

<sup>210</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 141.

<sup>211</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 141.

<sup>207</sup> Mahdi is an Islamic messianic figure whose arrival, or departure, is connected to the end of the world and the arrival of Judgement Day. Today, the anticipation of Mahdi is much more present in the Shia rather than the Sunni community.

<sup>208</sup> B. LEWIS, 1950: 308.

<sup>209</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 140.

<sup>210</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 141.

<sup>211</sup> AL-MUQADDASI, 2001: 141.

su zabilježene u Bibliji,<sup>212</sup> zdušno podržali perzijsku invaziju. Naime, koncem 6. stoljeća prije Krista Perzija je osvojila babilonske zemlje, među kojima je bila i Judeja. Babilonci, odnosno Kaldejci, 586. pr. Kr. uništili su Hram u Jeruzalemu, a Židove protjerali iz Judeje u babilonsko sužanjstvo.<sup>213</sup> Sedamdeset godina kasnije perzijski je kralj Kir dopustio prognanim Židovima povratak u Judeju i Jeruzalem i obnovu Hrama<sup>214</sup> koja je počela u vrijeme Ezre te jeruzalemskih zidina koje je uz kraljevo dopuštenje i financiranje izgradio Nehemija. Perzijska invazija bizantskih zemalja početkom 7. stoljeća poslije Krista među Židovima je potaknula slična očekivanja, uključujući i ono o obnovi Hrama, zbog sličnih povijesnih okolnosti. Poraz Perzijanaca i povratak bizantske vlasti koncem 620-ih ta su nadanja raspršili. Car Heraklije (610.–641.) u svečanosti je povorci 21. ožujka 630. pobjedonosno ušao u Jeruzalem, noseći Kristov križ, koji su Bizantinci povratili od Perzijanaca.<sup>215</sup> Bizantske su vlasti po povratku u Jeruzalem Židove izvrnule još žešćem progonu zbog kolaboracije s Perzijancima. Židovi su prisilno pokrštavani, zabranjeno im je naseljavanje u Jeruzalemu, a oni među njima koji su bili optuženi za zlostavljanje kršćana tijekom perzijske uprave pogubljeni su.<sup>216</sup>

Arapska osvajanja bizantskih zemalja, koja su uslijedila samo nekoliko godina kasnije, u mnogim su Židovima opet raspirila mesijansku i eshatološku nadu. Činilo se da su se židovske čežnje za povratkom na Cion počele ostvarivati, jer su muslimani odmah po osvajanju Jeruzalema, usprkos kršćanskom protivljenju, dopustili Židovima da se ponovo nastane u svojem svetoj gradu. Štoviše, prema jednom armenskom izvoru, za upravitelja Jeruzalema neposredno nakon islamskih osvajanja postavljen je Židov.<sup>217</sup> Percepcija arapske invazije kao božanske intervencije neko je vrijeme, izgledno je, među sirijskim židovskim zajednicama bila dominantna.

cause of their low status in Christian Byzantium, and partly due to comparable historical circumstances which happened more than a thousand years earlier, and which are registered in the Bible,<sup>212</sup> wholeheartedly supported the Persian invasion. Namely, at the end of the sixth century BC Persia conquered the Babylonian lands, among which was Judaea. The Babylonians, or Chaldeans, destroyed the Temple in Jerusalem in 586 BC and exiled the Jews from Judaea to Babylon.<sup>213</sup> Seventy years later the Persian king Cyrus allowed for the exiled Jews to return to Jerusalem and to restore the Temple.<sup>214</sup> Restoration of the Temple worship began in the time of Ezra, and the walls of Jerusalem were built by Nehemiah, with the permission and financing of the Persian king Artaxerxes I. Due to similar historical circumstances, the Persian invasion of the Byzantine lands at the beginning of the seventh century AD prompted similar expectations among the Jews, including those concerning the rebuilding of the Temple. The defeat of the Persians and the return of Byzantine rule at the end of the 620s ruined that hope. The Emperor Heraclius (610–641) triumphantly entered Jerusalem in a ceremonial procession on March 21<sup>st</sup>, 630, carrying the cross of Christ which the Byzantines recaptured from the Persians.<sup>215</sup> Upon their return to Jerusalem, the Byzantine rulers exposed Jews to an even harsher persecution due to their collaboration with the Persians. Jews were baptized by force, their settlement in Jerusalem was prohibited again, and those among Jews who were accused of abusing Christians during Persian rule were put to death.<sup>216</sup>

The Arab conquest of Byzantine lands which followed only a few years later rekindled messianic and eschatological expectations among the Jews. It seemed that the Jewish longing for the return to Zion was about to be fulfilled, since Muslims immediately upon conquering Jerusalem, despite the opposition of the Christians, allowed Jews to again settle in Jerusalem, the Jewish holy city. What is more, according to one Armenian source, immediately following the Islamic conquest a Jew was

<sup>212</sup> Vidjeti, primjerice, Knjigu Ezrinu i Knjigu Nehemijinu, osobito njihov uvodni dio.

<sup>213</sup> 2. Kraljevi 24:10-25:21.

<sup>214</sup> Ezra 1:1-4.

<sup>215</sup> A. LOUTH, 2008: 227-228.

<sup>216</sup> M. AVI-YONAH, 2006: 34.

<sup>217</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 6, 156, bilješka 30.

<sup>212</sup> See, for example, the Book of Ezra and the Book of Nehemiah, especially its introduction.

<sup>213</sup> 2. Kings 24: 10-25: 21.

<sup>214</sup> Ezra 1: 1-4.

<sup>215</sup> A. LOUTH, 2008: 227-228.

<sup>216</sup> M. AVI-YONAH, 2006: 34.



Židovski nam tekstovi nastali u vrijeme arapskih osvajanja Sirije pružaju uvid u opseg i prirodu tê percepcije. U pseudoepigrafskom djelu *Nistarot shel raban Šimon ben Johai* (Tajne rabina Šimuna ben Johaija, dalje u tekstu *Nistarot*<sup>218</sup>) autor opisuje dolazak Išmaelova<sup>219</sup> kraljevstva, koje će uništiti kraljevstvo zla, Edom (koji simbolizira Bizant<sup>220</sup>), te obnoviti Izrael. Autor *Nistarota* piše i kako će „drugi kralj koji dođe od Išmaela“ biti ljubitelj Izraela te će na brdu Moriji (Brdu Hrama) obnoviti hram na hramskoj stijeni.<sup>221</sup> Ovo se proroštvo, poglavito u kasnijim tumačenjima, lako moglo pripisati Omaru. Od ostalih židovskih tekstova u kojima se islamska osvajanja tumače u eshatološkom smislu, uz reference na biblijska proroštva i obećanja te očekivanje obnove Izraela, tu su još *Poglavlja rabina Eliezera*, *Židovska apokalipsa o Umajadima*, *Mesijini znakovi* te apokaliptična pjesma *U onaj dan*.<sup>222</sup> Grabar prenosi i srednjovjekovni midraš prema kojemu će „Abdul Malik izgraditi dom Boga Izraelova“.<sup>223</sup> Židovska

appointed the administrator of Jerusalem.<sup>217</sup> The perception of the Arab invasion as divine intervention was, it is certain, dominant in Syrian Jewish communities for some time.

Jewish texts originating during the period of the Arab conquest of Syria offer a look into the extent and nature of that perception. In the pseudographic work *Nistarot shel rabban Shimon ben Yohay* (Secrets of Rabbi Simon ben Yohay, henceforth referred to as *Nistarot*<sup>218</sup>) the author describes the arrival of Ismael's<sup>219</sup> kingdom which will destroy the kingdom of Evil, Eda (which symbolizes Byzantium<sup>220</sup>), and renew Israel. The author of the *Nistarot* writes that “The second king who arises from Ishmael will be a lover of Israel” and he will build a “mosque” on the Temple rock on Mount Moriah, that is the Temple Mount.<sup>221</sup> This prophecy could easily be interpreted as referring to ‘Umar, especially in later accounts. Of the remaining Jewish texts in which the Islamic conquests were interpreted in eschatological terms, with references to Biblical prophecies and promises and the expectations of the restoration of Israel, there are also *The Chapters of Rabbi Eliezer*, the *Jewish Apocalypse on the Umayyads*, the *Signs of the Messiah*

<sup>218</sup> Šimon ben Johai je rabin iz 2. stoljeća, dok je tekst *Nistarota* (odnosno njegov izvorna inačica) nastao u vrijeme arapskih osvajanja. Tekst je kasnije doradivan, pa se u njemu nalaze dijelovi koji se odnose na kraj umajadskog kalifata i dolazak Abasida. Iz njega je u vrijeme Križarskih ratova nastao tekst *Tfila shel Šimon ben Johai* (Molitva Šimona ben Johaija). Analizu i cjelovit prijevod *Nistarota* v. u B. LEWIS, 1950: 173-196, a ulomke koji su relevantni za temu ovoga članka, također s popratnim komentarima, u R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 308-312. Vidjeti i P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 35-38.

<sup>219</sup> Išmaelci se u židovskoj i arapskoj tradiciji odnosi na Arape. Ideja da su Arapi potomci Abrahamova sina Išmaela, sina Hagarina, u židovskim se tekstovima javlja u vrijeme Drugoga hrama, a od Židova su ju preuzeli i sami Arapi. S nastankom islama ona postaje ključna identitetska odrednica muslimana, pa tako u Kur'anu (2:125-127) nalazimo da su Abraham i Išmael očistili Hram (Ka'bu) u Meki (S. D. GOITEIN, 1955: 22).

<sup>220</sup> U rabinskoj literaturi (Talmud, Midraš) ime Edom, što je drugo ime Izakova sina Ezava, Jakovljeva brata blizanca, uobičajeno je ime za Rim, a kasnije za Bizant, kada ih se spominje kao Izraelove neprijatelje (v. H. SIVAN, 2002: 277-306).

<sup>221</sup> B. LEWIS, 1950: 324-325; R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 311. Hoyland napominje kako je riječ prevedena kao “džamija” (mosque) u izvorniku “*hishtahawāyā*”.

<sup>222</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 312-320.

<sup>223</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 54-55. Midraš je vrsta rabinske literature kojom se tumači neki dio Biblije, najčešće Tore, ili usmene predaje. Grabar napominje kako je ovaj srednjovjekovni midraš „kao i obično gotovo nemoguće datirati“ (str. 54).

<sup>217</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 6, 156, note 30.

<sup>218</sup> Simon ben Yohay is a rabbi from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, while the text of the *Nistarot*, or rather his original version, originated during the era of the Arab conquests. The text was later revised, and there are parts of it which relate to the end of the Umayyad Caliphate and the arrival of the Abbasids. During the time of the Crusades he wrote the text *Tfila shel Simon ben Yohay* (The Prayer of Simon ben Yohay). For an analysis and entire translation of the *Nistarot* see B. LEWIS, 1950: 173-196, and for fragments which are relevant to the topic of this paper, also with an added commentary, see R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 308-312. See also P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 35-38.

<sup>219</sup> In Jewish and Arab tradition, the Ishmaelites are Arabs. The idea that Arabs are the descendants of Abraham's son Ismael, the son of Hagar, appears in Jewish texts during the era of the Second Temple, a tradition which was received from the Jews by the Arabs themselves. With the founding of Islam, it becomes a key element of Muslim identity, so that in the Quran (2: 125-127) we find that Abraham and Israel cleaned the Temple (Ka'ba) in Mecca (S. D. GOITEIN, 1955: 22).

<sup>220</sup> In rabbinic literature (The Talmud, Midrash) the name Edom, which is the second name of Isaac's son Ezav, Jacob's twin brother, is the customary name for Rome, and later for Byzantium, when they are mentioned as Israel's enemies (see H. SIVAN, 2002: 277-306).

<sup>221</sup> B. LEWIS, 1950: 324-325; R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 311. Hoyland specifies that the word translated as “mosque” is “*hishtahawāyā*”

mesijanska nadanja zapisana su i u onovremenim kršćanskim tekstovima. Među najranijima je protužidovski tekst *Doctrina Jacobi* iz 634. u kojem se spominju Židovi koji se raduju „proroku koji se pojavio među Saracenima te najavljuje dolazak pomazanika, Krista koji ima doći“. Njima se protiv Židov obraćen na kršćanstvo koji odbacuje takvu percepciju Muhameda uz objašnjenje da je on „lažni [prorok], jer proroci ne dolaze naoružani mačem.“<sup>224</sup> Sv. Maksim Ispovjednik u pismu pisano između 634. i 640. govori o Židovima koji su „[više od svih drugih] lišeni vjere na ovome svijetu pa stoga najspremniji iskazati dobrodošlicu neprijateljskim silama“.<sup>225</sup>

S eshatološkim su očekivanjima pristigli i osvajači iz Arabije. Arapi muslimani bili su fascinirani civilizacijom u koju su došli te su s njome uspostavili aktivnu interakciju koja je uključivala preuzimanja ideja i oponašanja, pa se kao takva iz današnje perspektive doima gotovo nepojmljivo. Tu „međureligijsku“ interakciju nalazimo u islamskim tekstovima, a ona se, na što Lazarus-Yafeh ukazuje, zacijelo barem djelomice temelji na brojnim osobnim kontaktima u kojima su razmjenjivane ideje.<sup>226</sup> Kuranski navodi iz *kubat as-sahre* upućuju na rano razumijevanje neprihvatljivosti temeljne kršćanske dogme o Trojstvu, no sa Židovima je bilo drukčije. Muslimani i Židovi dijelili su slično stajalište glede striktnog jednobojstva, a povezivao ih je i niz obrednih sličnosti, religija koja počiva na objavljenom zakonu te simbolički važno obrezanje. Goitein, štoviše, smatra neobičnim to što većina Židova iz Arabije nije prihvatila Muhameda kao proroka nežidovima, budući da „prije nego što su poganski obredi hodočašća u Meku ušli u islam, u Muhamedovu propovijedanju nije bilo ničega odbojna židovskoj vjeri.“<sup>227</sup> Dio je Židova prigrlilo islam, ali u to rano vrijeme nije postojala potreba za zanemarivanjem niza židovskih vjerskih načela, vjerovanja i eshatoloških očekivanja, jer alternativnih – a osobito suprotnih – u islamu nije ni bilo. Obnova Hrama u Jeruzalemu predstavlja primjer toga. Prema skoro svim

and the apocalyptic song *On That Day* and others.<sup>222</sup> Grabar also cites a medieval Midrash according to which ‘Abd al-Malik “shall build the house of the God of Israel.”<sup>223</sup> Jewish messianic hopes were also recorded in Christian texts of the time. Perhaps the earliest such record is the anti-Jewish text *Doctrina Jacobi* from 634, in which Jews were described as celebrating the “prophet [who] had appeared, coming with the Saracens, and [...] proclaiming the advent of the anointed one, the Christ who was to come.” A Jewish convert to Christianity opposed them and rejected such a perception of Muhammad, explaining that he is “false [prophet], for the prophets do not come armed with a sword.”<sup>224</sup> St. Maximus the Confessor in a letter composed between 634 and 640 writes that Jews are “[more than any other] deprived of faith in the world and are so the most ready to welcome hostile forces.”<sup>225</sup>

The Muslim conquerors from Arabia also arrived with eschatological expectations. Arab Muslims were fascinated by the civilization to which they came. They established an active interaction with it, which included the Muslim imitation and adoption of ideas to a degree almost inconceivable from a modern perspective. This interfaith interaction is found in Islamic texts and, as pointed out by Lazarus-Yafeh, it was at least partially based on numerous personal contacts by which ideas were exchanged.<sup>226</sup> The Quranic verses on the *Qubbat al-Sakhr* point to an early understanding of the unacceptability of basic Christian dogma concerning the Trinity, but it was different with Jews. Muslims and Jews shared similar points of view regarding strict monotheism, and were connected by some ritual resemblances, a religion based on the revealed law, and the symbolically important circumcision. Goitein, thus, believed it to be unusual that most Jews from Arabia did not accept Muhammad as the prophet of the non-Jews inasmuch as “before the pagan rites of the pilgrimage to Mecca were incorporated into Islam, there was nothing repugnant to the Jewish religion in Muhammad’s preaching.”<sup>227</sup>

<sup>222</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 312-320.

<sup>223</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 54-55. Midrash is a type of rabbinic literature through which some part of the Bible is interpreted, most often the Torah, or an oral narrative. Grabar mentions that this medieval Midrash is “as usual almost impossible to date” (p. 54).

<sup>224</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 57.

<sup>225</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 78.

<sup>226</sup> H. LAZARUS-YAFEH, 1992: 133.

<sup>227</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1955: 63.

<sup>224</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 57.

<sup>225</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 78.

<sup>226</sup> H. LAZARUS-YAFEH, 1992: 133.

<sup>227</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1955: 63.

muslimanskim izvorima upravo je židovski obraćenik na islam Ka'b el-Ahbar bio taj koji je kalifu Omaru pokazao gdje je stajao židovski Hram te ga je, prema donekle nejasnu Tabarijevu opisu, pokušao nagovoriti da to mjesto učini *kiblom*.<sup>228</sup> Ka'b el-Ahbar Omara je obavijestio o proročanstvu starom petsto godina, prema kojem će on, el-Faruk, očistiti opustošeni prostor nekadašnjeg Hrama, a Bog će kazniti Bizantince jer su uništili Dom Božji.<sup>229</sup> Muslimansku gradnju svetišta na tome mjestu mnogi su Židovi, i to ne samo obraćenici na islam, doživjeli kao početak obnove hramskog bogoštovlja i ispunjenja biblijskih proroštava. Židovski su obraćenici na islam predstavljali „iznimno važan čimbenik u stvaranju muslimanskih apokaliptičnih tradicija, uključujući one koje se odnose na Jeruzalem“.<sup>230</sup>

Za ovu temu možda najzanimljiviji aspekt muslimansko-židovske interakcije u Palestini jest pitanje muslimanske otvorenosti za ideje iz židovstva. Židovi, za razliku od kršćana i muslimana, nisu nastojali privući konvertite. Židovske ideje nisu ulazile u islam zbog židovske prozelitske ambicije, nego zbog muslimanske radoznalosti, ali i vjerske pragmatičnosti: novu je vjeru trebalo opremiti vjerovanjima gdje god su postojale nedorečenosti i praznine. „Konverzija mnogih Židova i kršćana na islam [...] stvorila je izravan i legitiman kanal kroz koji su biblijske i izvanbiblijske tradicije uvedene u islam.“<sup>231</sup> Tijekom prvih hidžretskih desetljeća islam ne samo da se još uvijek razvijao; prema Crone i Cooku tek

Some Jews did embrace Islam, but in that early period they could maintain many Jewish religious principles, beliefs, and eschatological expectations, since alternative, especially opposite expectations, did not exist in Islam. Anticipation of the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem is an example of that. According to almost all Muslim sources, it was a Jewish convert to Islam, Ka'b al-Aḥbār, who showed Caliph 'Umar where the Jewish Temple stood and, according to the somewhat unclear description of Tabari, attempted to persuade him to shift *qiblah* towards it.<sup>228</sup> Ka'b al-Aḥbār informed 'Umar about the five-hundred years old prophecy according to which he, al-Fārūk, would clear the space where the Temple once stood, and God would smite the Byzantines for destroying the House of God.<sup>229</sup> Many Jews, and not only converts to Islam, perceived the Muslim construction of sanctuaries on the Temple Mount as the beginning of the renewal of Temple worship and the fulfilment of Biblical prophecies. Thus, Jewish converts to Islam represented an “extremely important factor in the creation of the Muslim apocalyptic traditions, including those on Jerusalem.”<sup>230</sup>

Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of Muslim-Jewish interactions in Palestine is the question of Muslim openness to ideas from Judaism. Jews, unlike Christians and Muslims, did not attempt to attract converts. Jewish ideas did not enter into Islam due to Jewish proselytizing ambitions, but rather due to Muslim curiosity and religious pragmatism: the new religion needed to be equipped with beliefs wherever there was lack of theory and vacuum. As Moshe Sharon puts it, “The conversion of many Jews and Christians to Islam [...] created a direct, and legitimate channel through

<sup>228</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 194-195; H. BUSSE, 1986: 167-168. Više o toj epizodi v. dalje u tekstu, u dijelu o protujeruzalemskim tradicijama.

<sup>229</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 196. Ovaj ulomak sadrži niz zanimljivih detalja. Židovski konvertit priznaje da drevne proročke knjige sadrže proročanstva vezana uz advent islama, što je jedna od ključnih polemičkih tema između Muhameda i međinskih Židova. Potom Omara naziva Farukom, što je mesijanski naziv i može značiti *izbavitelj* (P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 5). Tu je i anakronizam, ne neuobičajen za ranoislamske tekstove, prema kojemu izvjesni prorok odlazi u Konstantinopol i prijeti Bizantincima zbog onoga što je „tvoj narod učinio Mome Domu“. U vrijeme razaranja Hrama, 70. po. Kr., Bizantinci nisu postojali, kao ni Konstantinopol – autor ih je zamijenio za Rimljane i Rim.

<sup>230</sup> O. LIVNE-KAFRI, 2006: 383.

<sup>231</sup> M. SHARON, 1992: 56.

<sup>228</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 194-195; H. BUSSE, 1986: 167-168. More on that episode further in the text, in the portion on anti-Jerusalem traditions.

<sup>229</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 196. This fragment has a series of interesting details. A Jewish convert admits that ancient books of prophecy contain prophecies connected to the advent of Islam, which is one of the key polemic topics between Muhammad and the Jews of Medina. Thereupon he calls 'Umar by the name Farūk, which is a Messianic name and could mean *deliverer* (P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 5). There is also the anachronism, not unusual in early Islamic texts, according to which the aforementioned prophet goes to Constantinople and threatens the Byzantines for that which “your people did to My Home.” In the time of the destruction of the Temple in 70 AD Byzantium still did not exist, nor did Constantinople, which the author used as a substitute for the Romans and Rome.

<sup>230</sup> O. LIVNE-KAFRI, 2006: 383.

je bio u povojima.<sup>232</sup> No čak i da je postojala razvijena religijska misao, malo je muslimanskih osvajača Sirije o njoj moglo imati ikakvo dublje znanje, a ono se u najboljem slučaju svodilo na poznavanje određenoga broja kuranskih *ajeta* i tradicija (hadisa). Sve što su znali naučili su nakon konverzije na novu vjeru, a ta je konverzija bila više ili manje nedavna. Ovdje je lako previdjeti kako muslimanski osvajači Sirije, za razliku od pripadnika drugih vjera ili kasnijih naraštaja muslimana, nisu imali prigodu o vjeri učiti od predaka, obitelji i unutar zajednice u kojoj su odrastali. Dapače, svoje su izvorne vjerske nazore stečene u *džahiliji* morali potisnuti i zamijeniti onima koje su (ako jesu) ciljano učili od početka.<sup>233</sup> Pridoda li se tome opća nepismenost<sup>234</sup> i neukost Arapa,<sup>235</sup> slika postaje još turobnija. Čak i oni muslimani koji su znali *ajete* i tradicije o Ibrahimu (Abrahamu), Ishaku (Izaku), Jusufu (Josipu), Musi (Mojsiju), Harunu (Aronu), Davudu (Davidu), Sulejmanu (Salomonu) ili Uzeiru (Ezri) bez uvida u židovske i

which Biblical and extra-Biblical traditions were introduced into Islam.”<sup>231</sup> During the first decades after *hijra* not only was Islam still developing; according to Crone and Cook, it was still in the process of creation.<sup>232</sup> Even if there existed a more developed religious thought, few of the Muslim conquerors of Syria could have had any deeper knowledge of it. Their understanding of Islam was in the best case limited to a certain number of Quranic verses and some *ḥadīth*. All that they knew they learned after converting to the new religion, and that was more-or-less recently. It is easy to overlook that the Muslim conquerors of Syria, unlike the members of other faiths or later generations of Muslims, did not have the opportunity to learn about their religion from their ancestors, family, or inside the community in which they grew up. In fact, they had to repress their original religious views gained in the *jahiliyyah* and exchange them for ones that they had to learn from scratch.<sup>233</sup> If we add to that the general illiteracy<sup>234</sup> and lack of education among Arabs<sup>235</sup> the picture becomes

<sup>232</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 3-9.

<sup>233</sup> Arapi u Hidžazu su, prema islamskim izvorima, prije adventa islama štovali različita božanstva, a sva njihova predislamska bogoštovlja i tradicije u islamu su se smatrala *džahilijom* (neznanjem) i kao takva su se u potpunosti odbacivala. Prelazak na islam značio je radikalan prekid sa svakom vrstom ranijega religijskog izričaja i identiteta.

<sup>234</sup> Pismenost je u vrijeme adventa islama bila rijetka, pa Balazuri poimence navodi svih sedamnaest muškaraca iz kurejšitskog plemena koji su u vrijeme adventa islama bili pismeni (među njima su svi rašidunski kalifi osim Abu Bakira) te imena nekoliko pismenih žena. Muhamed je bio nepismen te je za zapisivanje objava i drugih tekstova koristio pisare, čija imena Balazuri također navodi (AL-BALADHURI, 1924: 272-273). Balazuri piše i da je „pismenost među [arapskim plemenima] Aus i Hazradž [također] bila rijetka“ te navodi da su neki Židovi naučili pisati arapski. Autor daje popis nekoliko ljudi koji su uz pisanje još znali i gađati i plivati, a te tri vještine činile su da ih se oslovljava s *kamil* (savršeni). Na koncu navodi i da je Zaid ibn Tabit, jedan od Muhamedovih pisara podrijetlom iz Medine, po Prorokovu napatku naučio pisati hebrejski (AL-BALADHURI, 1924: 274).

<sup>235</sup> Donner opaža kako su čete arabijskih plemena koje su se u *džihadu* priključile „vjernicima“ (muslimanima) tijekom Ratova protiv apostazije (u vrijeme prvoga rašidunskoga kalifa Abu Bakira, 632.–634.) bile krajnje rudimentarno upućene u islam: „njihovo je znanje o doktrinama [islamskog] pokreta vjerojatno bilo ograničeno na ideju da je Bog jedan, te uglavnom obuhvaćeno ushićenim krilaticama poput one ‘Bog je velik’ (*alahu ekber*), koju su koristili kao bojni poklič“ (F. M. DONNER, 2010: 116).

<sup>231</sup> M. SHARON, 1992: 56.

<sup>232</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 3-9.

<sup>233</sup> The Arabs in the Hejaz, according to Islamic sources, worshiped various divinities before the advent of Islam, and all of their pre-Islamic cults and traditions were regarded as *jahiliyyah* (ignorance) in Islam, and thus rejected. Conversion to Islam meant a radical discontinuity of all earlier religious expressions and identity.

<sup>234</sup> Literacy was rare in the time of the advent of Islam, such that Baladhuri names all seventeen men from the Quraysh tribe who were literate at the time of the advent of Islam (among which were all of the Rashidun Caliphs except Abu Bakr), and the names of a few literate women. Muhammad was illiterate and used scribes in writing down the revelations and other text, scribes whose names are also mentioned by Baladhuri (AL-BALADHURI, 1924: 272-273). Baladhuri writes also that “Writing in Arabic was rare among the [Arab tribes] Aus and the Khazraj” and mentions that some Jews learned to write Arabic. The author lists those who, along with writing, also knew how to shoot and swim, and the possession of those three skills meant that they were addressed as *kāmil*, that is “perfect”. Finally, he also mentions that Zaid ibn Thābit, one of Muhammad’s scribes originally from Medina, learned to write in Hebrew at the behest of the Prophet (AL-BALADHURI, 1924: 274).

<sup>235</sup> Donner observes that the troops of Arab tribes which joined the “believers” (Muslims) in the *Jihad* during the War against apostasy (in the time of the first Rashidun Caliph Abu Bakr, 632-634) were extremely rudimentarily informed on Islam: “Their knowledge of the doctrines of the [Islamic] movement, then, was probably limited to the idea that God was one and enshrined mainly in enthusiastic slogans such as “God is Great!” (*alahu akbar*), which they used as a battle cry” (F. M. DONNER, 2010: 116).

kršćanske kanonske tekstove, apokriife i knjige pseudoepigrafe ili u tekstove različitih judeokršćanskih sljedbi kojima je Sirija obilovala, nisu mogli znati gotovo ništa.<sup>236</sup> Logično je da se pojavila dvojba treba li, odnosno je li vjerski dopustivo, preuzimati sadržaj vlastite vjere (islama) od sljedbenika druge vjere (židovstva). To pitanje, naravno, nije bilo postavljeno na ovakav način. Kako smo već vidjeli, islam je sebe percipirao ne kao novu vjeru, nego kao nadogradnju prethodnih. Iz tako uokvirena stajališta, ne postoji ništa sporno u preuzimanju tradicija *ahl ul-kitaba* (naroda knjige), poglavito Židova. Tako se pojavio poznat i često korišten hadis *had-disu 'an bani isra'ila va-la haradža*, prema kojemu Muhamed potiče svoje sljedbenike da preuzimaju židovske tradicije.<sup>237</sup> Muslimanski su mislioci bili svjesni da bez upoznavanja *Tevrata* (Tore) i drugih židovskih knjiga malo toga iz Kur'ana može biti kontekstualizirano.<sup>238</sup> Tomu treba pridodati i pitanje utjecaja spomenutih židovskih mesijanskih percepcija islamskih osvajanja te pripisivanja božanske misije „Išmaelcima“ i njihovu proroku u kontekstu osvajanja bizantskih zemalja. Takva laskava priznanja od strane najuglednije monoteističke zajednice ranoga srednjeg vijeka i njihov „filoarapski sentiment“<sup>239</sup> zacijelo su pridonosili spremnu, možda pokatkad i nekritičkom otvaranju islama za ideje židovstva. Rani kršćanski izvori govore i o „sarcenskom spaljivanju crkvi, uništavanju samostana, skrnavljenju križeva i užasnom huljenju na Krista i crkvu“, kao i o pozivu „išmaelskog vladara“ bizantskome caru da se odrekne „toga Isusa kojega ti nazivaš Kristom, a koji ni samoga sebe nije mogao spasiti od Židova“.<sup>240</sup> Crone i Cook zaključuju kako „ovdje nema ničega što bi potvrđivalo islamsku sliku [o sebi kao o] pokretu koji je još prije osvajanja

even more gloomy. Even knowledge of those Muslims who were familiar with Quranic verses and Islamic traditions about Ibrahim (Abraham), Ishak (Isaac), Yusuf (Joseph), Musa (Moses), Harun (Aaron), Dawud (David), Suleiman (Solomon) or Uzair (Ezra) was, without acquaintance with Jewish and Christian Scripture, books of apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, or texts of various Judeo-Christian sects which abounded in Syria, very limited.<sup>236</sup> It is logical that a dilemma arose about whether or not it is religiously legitimate for Muslims to acquire information about their religion from the followers of other faiths, primarily Judaism. That question, of course, was not posed in this manner. As we have already seen, Islam perceived itself not as a new faith, but rather as an annex to already existing faiths. From such a framed point of view there is nothing debatable in the assumption of the traditions of the *ahl al-kitāb* (people of the book), mostly Jews. Thus the well-known and often referred-to ḥadīth *ḥaddithū 'an banī isrā'ila wa-lā harāja* appeared, according to which Muhammad encouraged his followers to assume Jewish traditions.<sup>237</sup> Muslim thinkers were aware of the fact that without knowledge of the Tawrah (Torah) and other Jewish books few things from the Quran could be contextualized.<sup>238</sup> To that we must add the question of the influence of the aforementioned Jewish messianic perceptions of Islamic conquest and the attribution of a divine mission to the “Ishmaelites” and their message in the context of the conquest of Byzantine lands. Such flattering acknowledgement from the most respected monotheistic community of the Early Middle Ages and their “philo-Arab sentiments”<sup>239</sup> must have contributed to the ready, willing and perhaps sometimes uncritical openness of Islam to the ideas of Judaism. Early Christian sources speak of a “burning of churches, the destruction of monasteries, the profanation of crosses, and horrific blasphemies against Christ and the church,” as well as of the invitation of the “Ishmaelite ruler” to

<sup>236</sup> Djelomice je iznimka Jusuf (Josip) čiji je život opisan u 12. kuranskoj suri, Surat Jusuf. To je ujedno i jedina od 114 sura koja je sačinjena od kronološki posložene priče.

<sup>237</sup> Opsežnu studiju navedenog hadisa v. u M. J. KISTER, 1972: 215-239.

<sup>238</sup> U ovome se članku polazi od pretpostavke da je Kur'an nastao onako kako nam to prenosi islamska tradicija, no znanstvenici su te tradicije stavili pod upit (J. WANSBROUGH, 1977; P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977).

<sup>239</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 6.

<sup>240</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 6; usp. R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 219.

<sup>236</sup> A partial exception to this was Yusuf (Joseph) whose life was described in the twelfth *surah* of the Quran, Surat Yusuf. This is also the only one of the 114 surah which is made up of a chronologically arranged narrative.

<sup>237</sup> For a comprehensive study on the mentioned ḥadīth see M. J. KISTER, 1972: 215-239.

<sup>238</sup> Official Islamic tradition on dating the composition of the Quran was maintained for the purpose of writing this article, even though researchers have brought that tradition into question (J. WANSBROUGH, 1977; P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977).

<sup>239</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 6.

[Sirije] raskinuo sa Židovima i koji je na židovstvo i na kršćanstvo gledao s istim spojem snošljivosti i suzdržanosti“.<sup>241</sup>

Toga su, logično je pretpostaviti, u određenoj mjeri bili svjesni i Židovi. Narod koji je u vrijeme islamskih osvajanja već preko pola tisućljeća bio politički i vojno sasvim impotentan, ali je čuvao bogatu monoteističku baštinu, i narod politički i vojno najpotentniji na Orijentu, ali bez ikakve vjerske tradicije, na jeruzalemskom su se Brdu Hrama našli u, gotovo bi se moglo reći, prirodnoj vjersko-političkoj simbiozi. Sharon objašnjava:

Abdul Malik želio je ponovno izgraditi Salomonov hram. Na taj je način uspostavio izravnu poveznicu između sebe i Salomona, kur'ansko-ga kralja-proroka, izostavljajući kršćane [iz toga slijeda]. Njemu su svesrdno pomagali Židovi Sirije i Palestine, koji su na islamska osvajanja i zamjenu bizantsko-kršćanske vlasti arapskom gledali kao na početak Izraelova otkupljenja. Štoviše, postoje jasni dokazi da su Židovi gradnju Kupole nad Stijenom smatrali, barem simbolički, obnovom Hrama.<sup>242</sup>

Ovo potonje vidljivo je iz nekih rituala povezanih s Kupolom nad Stijenom koji su židovskog podrijetla, a koji su postojali najmanje do 16. stoljeća, poput pomazivanja uljem stijene (*sahre*) ponedjeljkom i četvrtkom, danima nebitnima u islamu, ali bitnima u židovstvu. „Židovi su bili djelatno uključeni u službu u Kupoli nad Stijenom: bili su zaduženi za paljenje svijeća, pripremu fitilja za uljane svjetiljke i čišćenje svetišta.“<sup>243</sup> Tu je i nazivanje *kubat as-sahre* hebrejskim arabiziranim imenom *heikal* (היכל) odnosno arapski (هيكل) koje u Bibliji označava Dom Božji ili hramsku odaju.<sup>244</sup>

<sup>241</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 6. Hagarism je teško čitljiv, na dijelove jedva prohodan tekst, namijenjen čitateljima koji su već dobro upoznati s tradicijama i uvriježenim tumačenjima ranoislamske povijesti. Autori se na ovom mjestu referiraju na „raskidanje sa Židovima“ kakvo se dogodilo u Medini, pošto je Muhamed odbacio sporazum kojim su Židovi prihvaćeni kao dio *ummata* te njihova plemena protjerao ili porobio i pogubio. Podrobnije o tim odnosima, zbivanjima i izvorima v. u B. HAVEL, 2013: 297-376.

<sup>242</sup> M. SHARON, 1992: 63.

<sup>243</sup> M. SHARON, 1992: 65. Sharon napominje kako su ove tradicije očuvane do vremena Mudžir ad-Dina (1456.–1522.), jeruzalemskoga kadije i ljetopisca.

<sup>244</sup> M. SHARON, 1992: 65; Izaija 6:1; 44:28; 66:6 Ezra 3:6, Nehemija 6:10, Ezekiel 8:16 itd.

the Emperor of Byzantium to renounce “that Jesus whom you call Christ and who could not even save himself from the Jews.”<sup>240</sup> Crone and Cook conclude that as “There is nothing here to bear out the Islamic picture of a movement which had already broken with the Jews before the conquest [of Syria], and regarded Judaism and Christianity with the same combination of tolerance and reserve.”<sup>241</sup>

It is logical to assume that Jews were also aware of the situation. The nation which at the time of the Islamic conquests had been without any political and military power for over half a millennium, but with a rich monotheistic heritage, and the nation which was the most powerful politically and militarily in the Orient, but almost without any religious traditions, met at the Temple Mount in Jerusalem in, one could almost say, a natural religious-political symbiosis. Sharon explains:

‘Abd al-Malik wished to rebuild the Temple of Solomon. In so doing he created a direct link between himself and Solomon, the Qur’anic king-prophet, leaving Christianity out. He was wholeheartedly assisted by the Jews of Syria and Palestine, who regarded the Islamic conquest and the replacement of the Byzantine-Christian rule by Arab rule, as the beginning of the redemption of Israel. Moreover, there is clear evidence that the Jews regarded the building of the Dome of the Rock as the renewal, at least in a symbolic way, of the Temple.<sup>242</sup>

The former is evident from some rituals related to the Dome of the Rock which are of Jewish origin, and which existed at least until the sixteenth century, such as the anointing of the Rock (*Sakhrāh*) with oil on Mondays and Thursdays, days which are not important in Islam but are in Judaism. “Jews were actively involved with the service in the Dome of the Rock: they were in charge of lighting the candles, preparing the wicks for the oil lamps and cleaning the

<sup>240</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 6; cf. R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 219.

<sup>241</sup> P. CRONE & M. COOK, 1977: 6. Hagarism is difficult to read, at parts barely legible, aimed at readers who are already well versed in the traditions and interpretations of early Islamic history. The authors refer to this spot as a “separation from the Jews” such as the one which happened in Medina after Muhammad rejected the treaty by which Jews would be accepted as part of the Ummah and expelled or enslaved and killed their tribes. More in depth on these relations, events and sources in B. HAVEL, 2013: 297-376.

<sup>242</sup> M. SHARON, 1992: 63.

U kontekstu islamske gradnje na Brdu Hrama pod utjecajem Židova, kratak i neobičan opis nalazi se u armenskome tekstu pisanu 660-ih kojemu nije poznat autor, ali katkad se pripisuje biskupu Sabeju Bagratidskom. Ovo je prvi poznati kršćanski tekst u kojemu je kod opisa islama u obzir uzeta muslimanska samopercepcija, a opisani su i rani unutarislamski sukobi, odnosno *fitne*.<sup>245</sup> Sabej piše da su Židovi pronašli mjesto Svetinje nad svetinjama,<sup>246</sup> na njemu izgradili temelj i nadgrađe te se ondje skupljali na molitvu, no potom su ih „zavidni Išmaelci“ otjerali s toga mjesta te su njihovo zdanje nazvali svojim mjestom molitve.<sup>247</sup> Ova se tradicija kosi s islamskima, prema kojima su muslimani od samoga početka bili graditelji na Haramu, a Židovi tek njihovi savjetnici.

## 9. RANOISLAMSKA PROTUJERUZALEMSKE TRADICIJE

Tema Jeruzalema u ranoislamskoj tradiciji ne bi bila potpuna bez osvrta na još jedan fenomen istoga žanra, a to su protujeruzalemski islamski stavovi koji se u različitim omjerima i oblicima također nalaze unutar istoga tekstovnog korpusa u kojem nalazimo i *fada'il el-kuds*.<sup>248</sup> Izravno protivljenje uzdizanju Jeruzalema na pijedestal islamskoga svetoga grada, ili pak poruke opreza kako se u pohvalama Kudsa ne bi pretjeralo, nalazimo u hadisima te u djelima islamskih povjesničara i ljetopisaca (Kur'an je, naravno, nijem o toj temi). Već smo spomenuli hadis kojim se muslimanima nalaže hodočašće u samo dvije džamije, one u Meki i u Medini, što implicira da je hodočašće u Jeruzalem neprihvatljivo.<sup>249</sup>

<sup>245</sup> Više o ovome tekstu v. u R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 124-132.

<sup>246</sup> Svetinja nad svetinjama, hebrejski *kodesh hakodashim* (קֹדֶשׁ הַקֹּדָשִׁים) središnje je i najsvetije mjesto Salomonova hrama (1 Kraljevi 6:16) u kojemu je bio smješten Kovčeg saveza Jahvina (1 Kraljevi 8:6).

<sup>247</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 127.

<sup>248</sup> Velikim dijelom sam zahvaljujući Lassnerovoj studiji zaključio kako je za dublje razumijevanje imidža Jeruzalema u ranoislamskoj tradiciji nužno osvrnuti se, barem letimice, i na ovaj žanr. Više o ovoj temi v. u J. LASSNER, 2017: 184-201.

<sup>249</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 178-179. Zanimljivo je da se jedan

sanctuary.<sup>243</sup> There is also the naming of the *Qubbat al-Sakhrāh* by the Arabicized Hebrew name *Heykal* (Hebrew הֵיכָל, Arabic هَيْكَل), which in the Bible refers to the Temple, Sanctuary, and the like.<sup>244</sup>

A short and puzzling description of Islamic construction on the Temple Mount under the influence of Jews is found in an Aramaic text written in the 660s whose author is unknown but is often attributed to Bishop Sebeos of Bagratunis. This is the first known Christian text in which the self-perception of Muslims is taken into consideration in the description of Islam, and the early inter-Islamic dispute, or *fitnah*, is described.<sup>245</sup> Sabeos writes that the Jews found the place of the Holy of Holies,<sup>246</sup> built a foundation and superstructure there, and gathered for prayer. The “jealous Ishmaelites,” however, drove Jews away, and called Jewish structures Muslim place of prayer.<sup>247</sup> This tradition does not align with the Islamic tradition, according to which the Muslims were from the very beginning the builders on the Haram, and Jews were only their advisers.

## 9. EARLY MUSLIM ANTI-JERUSALEM TRADITIONS

The topic of Jerusalem in early Islamic tradition would not be complete without a reference to yet another phenomenon of the same genre, and that is anti-Jerusalem Islamic traditions which in varying scope and form are also found in the same textual corpus in which we find the *faḍā'il al-Quds*.<sup>248</sup> Direct opposition to the elevation of Jerusalem on the pedestal of Islamic holy city and the messages of caution against excess in the praises of al-Quds is found in the ḥadīth and in the words of Islamic historians and chroniclers. The Quran is, of course, silent

<sup>243</sup> M. SHARON, 1992: 65. Sharon mentions that these traditions were preserved until the era of Mujir ad-Dīn (1456–1522), a qadi and chronicler from Jerusalem.

<sup>244</sup> M. SHARON, 1992: 65; Cf. Isaiah 6: 1; 44: 28; 66: 6 Ezra 3: 6, Nehemiah 6: 10, Ezekiel 8: 16 etc.

<sup>245</sup> See more on this text in R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 124-132.

<sup>246</sup> The Holy of Holies, the Hebrew *kodesh hakodashim* (קֹדֶשׁ הַקֹּדָשִׁים) is the central and most holy place in Solomon's temple (1 Kings 6: 16) in which the Arc of the Covenant of God was kept (1 Kings 8: 6).

<sup>247</sup> R. G. HOYLAND, 1997: 127.

<sup>248</sup> It is very much due to Lassner's study that I have concluded that this genre needs to be addressed for a comprehensive understanding of the image of Jerusalem in Early Islamic Tradition. For more on anti-Jerusalem texts and Muslim dilemmas, see J. LASSNER, 2017: 184-201.

Kister prenosi niz hadisa prema kojima je „među islamskim teolozima iz prve polovice drugoga [hidžretskog] stoljeća postojala određena nespremnost da trećoj džamiji u potpunosti priznaju svetost, te da Jeruzalemu dodijele položaj istovjetan onome koji su imala dva islamska sveta grada, Meka i Medina.“<sup>250</sup> Prema tim hadisima Muhamed je obeshrabrivao zavjetna hodočašća u Jeruzalem, premda ih nije izrijekom zabranjivao. Isto je učinila i jedna od njegovih žena, koja je nekoj ženi što se zavjetovala da će otići na hodočašće u Jeruzalem ozdravi li, te je nakon ozdravljenja onamo i krenula, savjetovala da ne ide u Jeruzalem, već da se pomoli u Prorokovoj džamiji u Medini.

Isti autor prenosi i hadis iz zbirke Abdul Razika ibn Hamama, prema kojem je kalif Omar, dok se nalazio u ograđenom prostoru s devama, ugledao dvojicu prolaznika. Na njegovo pitanje gdje su bili, odgovorili su mu: „U Jeruzalemu.“ Omar ih je na to počeo udarati bičem, misleći da su u Jeruzalem išli na *hadž* kao što se ide u Meku. Prestao je tek na njihovo objašnjenje kako su kroz Jeruzalem prolazili usput te su se ondje samo pomolili.<sup>251</sup>

Neobičnu tradiciju o Omaru, *sahri* i Haramu prenosi i Tabari. Omar je, ušavši u Jeruzalem, židovskog obraćenika Ka'ba el-Ahbara pitao gdje bi trebalo podignuti mjesto molitve.

Ka'b je rekao: „Prema Stijeni.“ Omar reče: „O, Ka'be, ti oponašaš vjeru Židova! Vidio sam te kako si izuo cipele.“ Ka'b odgovori: „Želio sam stopalima dotaknuti tlo.“ Omar će na to: „Vidio sam te. Ne, kiblu ćemo postaviti ispred toga. I Poslanik je Božji prednji dio naših džamija učinio kiblom. Brini se za svoj posao; nama nije zapovjedbena da štuju Stijenu [u Jeruzalemu] nego nam je zapovjedbena da štuju Ka'bu [u Meki].“<sup>252</sup>

Usprkos postojanju brojnih tradicija prema kojima se važnost i svetost Jeruzalema umanjuje ili u

on the topic. We have already mentioned the ḥadīth in which Muslims make pilgrimage to only two mosques, those in Mecca and Medina, which implies that pilgrimage to Jerusalem is unacceptable.<sup>249</sup>

Kister cites a series of ḥadīth according to which it is “among scholars of Islam in the first half of the second century AH there was some reluctance to give full recognition of sanctity to the third mosque and to grant Jerusalem an equal position with the two holy cities of Islam, Mecca and Medina.”<sup>250</sup> According to these ḥadīth Muhammad discouraged votive pilgrimages to Jerusalem, although he did not prohibit them outright. One of his wives did the same when she suggested to a woman who had vowed to go on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem if she were to be cured, and after being healed, headed there, that she should rather pray in the mosque of the Prophet in Medina, than go to Jerusalem.

The same author cites also a ḥadīth from the collection of ‘Abd al-Raziq ibn Hammam, according to which the Caliph ‘Umar, while attending to camels, saw two men passing by. When asked where they had been, they replied: “In Jerusalem”. ‘Umar began to beat them with a whip, believing that they had gone to Jerusalem on a *hajj*, as pilgrims go to Mecca. He stopped only when they had explained to him that they had only passed through Jerusalem, and that they had only stopped briefly to pray.<sup>251</sup>

An unusual tradition about ‘Umar, *Sakhrāh* and the Haram is recorded by Tabari. ‘Umar, having entered Jerusalem, asked the Jewish convert Ka'b al-Aḥbār where a place for prayer should be constructed.

Ka'b said: “Toward the Rock.” ‘Umar said: “O Ka'b, you are imitating the Jewish religion! I have seen you taking off your shoes.” Ka'b said: “I wanted to touch this ground with my feet.” ‘Umar said: “I have seen you. Nay, we shall place the qiblah in the front of it; the Messenger of God likewise made the front part of our mosques the qiblah. Take care of your own affairs; we were not commanded to venerate the Rock, but we were commanded to venerate the Ka'ba [in Mecca].”<sup>252</sup>

od takvih hadisa temelji na predaji (*isnad*) koja potječe od Ajše.

<sup>250</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 180.

<sup>251</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 181.

<sup>252</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 194-195. Vidjeti i fusnote na str. 195 gdje prevoditelj razmatra što je Omar pitao, a što je Ka'b odgovorio, budući da iz razgovora proizlazi da je tema *kibla*. U hrvatskoj je transliteraciji lako pobrkati imena židovskog konvertita Ka'ba i mekanskog svetišta Ka'be, koja nisu povezana.

<sup>249</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 178-179. It is interesting to note that one of such ḥadīth has been transmitted (*isnād*) by Aisha.

<sup>250</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 180.

<sup>251</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 181.

<sup>252</sup> AL-TABARI, vol. XII: 194-195. See also the footnote on p. 195 where the translator considers what ‘Umar asked and what Ka'b answered, seeing as the topic of the *qiblah* came up in conversation. In transliterating into Croatian, it is easy to mix up the name of the Jewish convert Ka'ba and the sanctuary in Mecca, Ka'ba, which are not related.



cijelosti poriče, ni jedan se hadis s tom porukom na koncu nije našao u kanoniziranim zbirka hadisa.<sup>253</sup> Gotovo je sasvim izvjesno da su takvi hadisi nastali tijekom unutar-muslimanskih sukoba, poglavito sukoba između vladara i štovatelja u Hidžazu te Umajada u Siriji. Nakon završetka tih sukoba hadis o legitimnosti triju džamija kao odredišta *hadža* postao je „općeprihvaćen među ortodoksnim teolozima“.<sup>254</sup>

S obzirom na gotovo nedvojbenu političku pozadinu hadisa kojima se Jeruzalemu poriče svetost, logično je postaviti pitanje i političke pozadine hadisa kojima se Jeruzalemu ista ta svetost pripisuje. Ipak, ovdje treba biti oprezan u zaključivanju. Premda se misao o recipročnosti nastanka dviju oprječnih tradicija nameće po logici i u skladu je s ranije navedenim Goldziherovim opažanjem o političkim hadisima,<sup>255</sup> u njoj, gotovo je izvjesno, ne leži cjelovito objašnjenje nastanka projeruzalemskih hadisa i tradicija. Ranoislamski imperij promatran iz Hidžaza i *haramajna* jednostavniji je, a težište promišljanja prirodno leži na unutar-muslimanskim odnosima, ponajprije suparništvu Arabije s jedne i Sirije s druge strane. Logično je da establišment u Hidžazu nikada nije u potpunosti prihvatio to što je prijestolnica islamskog imperija izmještena u udaljenu sjevernu pokrajinu, dok je izvorište vjere, odnosno Prorokov zavičaj, ostalo zapostavljeno te izgubilo društveni značaj, političku vlast i prihode od poreza. Logična je bila i bojazan da se promjena sjedišta političke vlasti ne odrazi i na promjenu središta religijske vlasti. Svijet promatran iz Sirije bio je znatno složeniji. Uz unutar-muslimanske sporove, tu su bili i odnosi s lokalnim kršćanima, Bizantskim carstvom, Perzijom, sljedbenicima zoroastrijanstva i nizom drugih neislamskih aktera. Umajadima je bio potreban sveti grad, ali ne poglavito kao sredstvo političke borbe s arabijskim muslimanskim suparnicima – jer tu su borbu zahvaljujući glasovitom i beskrupuloznom vojskovođi Hadždadžu ibn Jusufu svakako riješili u svoju korist – nego kao sredstvo propagandnog nadmetanja s protivnikom kojega su

Despite the existence of many traditions according to which the importance and holiness of Jerusalem is diminished or entirely denied, not one ḥadīth with such a message has been found in the canonical collections of the ḥadīth.<sup>253</sup> It is almost certain that such ḥadīth originated during inter-Muslim disputes, especially the dispute between the rulers and worshipers in the Hejaz on the one hand, and the Umayyads in Syria on the other. After the end of these disputes a ḥadīth on the legitimacy of three mosques as the destinations of *hajj* “was granted consensus of the orthodox scholars.”<sup>254</sup>

Inasmuch as political background of the ḥadīth in which the holiness of Jerusalem is denied is almost certain, it is logical to posit the question of the political background in which the same holiness is attributed to Jerusalem. One must be careful, however, when making any conclusions. Although the idea of the reciprocity of the origin of the two diametrically opposed traditions is logical and consistent with earlier-mentioned observation of Goldziher on the political ḥadīth,<sup>255</sup> the origin of the pro-Jerusalem ḥadīth and traditions certainly cannot be fully explained by it. The early Islamic empire viewed from the Hejaz and *haramayn* was simpler and the brunt of deliberation was naturally borne by inter-Muslim relationships, mainly on the rivalry between Arabia, on the one hand, and Syria, on the other. It is logical that the political establishment in the Hejaz never fully accepted that the seat of the Islamic empire was relocated to the remote northern region, while the center of the faith, that is, the native land of the Prophet, remained neglected and lost its social importance, political power and tax revenue. Logical also was the fear that the change of the center of political power might be reflected in the change in the religious center as well. The world as viewed from Syria was much more complicated. Along with inter-Muslim conflict there were also relations with local Christians, the Byzantine Empire, Persia, the followers of Zoroastrianism and other non-Islamic protagonists. The Umayyads needed a holy city, but not primarily as a center for political battles with Arab Muslim rivals – as this battle was certainly won in their favor thanks to the notorious commander al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf – but as the

<sup>253</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 193.

<sup>254</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 196.

<sup>255</sup> I. GOLDZIHHER, 1971: 44. Ovdje valja napomenuti kako je Goldziher bio jedan od najvećih svjetskih poznavatelja i autoriteta za tumačenje hadisa.

<sup>253</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 193.

<sup>254</sup> M. J. KISTER, 1969: 196.

<sup>255</sup> I. GOLDZIHHER, 1971: 44. It must be mentioned here that Goldziher was one of the greatest experts and authorities in the world for the interpretation of the ḥadīth.

također porazili vojno, ali ne i kulturološki; njegovi su kultura, arhitektura i umjetnost nastavili prijetiti islamu tako što su kroz estetiku i ljepotu pronosili vjersku i političku poruku protivnu umajadskoj viziji svijeta. U tom kontekstu treba shvatiti i Abdul Malikove druge reforme, poput uvođenja kovanica na kojima je isprva čak bio kalifov lik (na bizantskim je kovanicama, koje su se do tada koristile i na umajadskim područjima, bio Kristov lik s natpisom *Kralj kraljeva*) ili istiskivanja grčkog jezika iz administrativnog sustava imperija i uvođenja arapskog jezika. Jeruzalem kao islamski sveti grad, s Kupolom nad Stijenom, a kasnije i džamijom el-Aksom, podignutima na mjestu čiju su drevnu vjersku važnost prepoznavali i Židovi i kršćani, dugoročno je u tome kompleksnom nadmetanju postao važniji za dokazivanje muslimanskih tvrdnja nemuslimanima nego umajadskih tvrdnja postrašidunima. No, i pored toga nadmetanja, „muslimani su shvaćali da je [Jeruzalem] grad svet ponajprije Židovima i kršćanima“.<sup>256</sup>

U osporavanju štovanja jeruzalemskih svetišta osobito je oštar bio Ibn Tajmija (1262.–1328.), koji je teologiju i islamski zakon studirao u Damasku. On je ustrajavao na tome da se u Jeruzalemu mogu upućivati molitve, kao što je to učinio Prorok na Noćnom putovanju. No Kupola nad Stijenom, tvrdio je, nema nikakvu osobitu važnost, na stijeni nema Muhamedova otiska stopala,<sup>257</sup> kalif Omar nije ondje molio, a čitav su Haram izgradili Umajadi kako bi onamo preusmjerili *hadž*. Prema njemu na svijetu postoje tri harama, ali ni jedan nije u Jeruzalemu.<sup>258</sup> Štovanje svetišta čija se važnost temelji na židovstvu, kao i drugih sličnih svetišta uključujući i Prorokov grob, prema njemu znak je otpadništva od islamske vjere koje je kažnjivo smrću.<sup>259</sup>

center of competitive propaganda with the Christian rival whom they defeated militarily, but not culturally; Christian culture, architecture and art continued to be a menace to Islam, since through aesthetics and beauty Christianity carried a religious and political message inconsistent with the Umayyad vision of the world. ‘Abd al-Malik’s other reforms should be understood in that context, like the introduction of coins on which at first there was the image of the Caliph (on Byzantine coins, which were until then used even in the regions of the Umayyads, there was Christ’s image and the inscription *King of kings*), or the extrusion of the Greek language from the administrative system of the empire and the introduction of Arabic. Jerusalem as an Islamic holy city, with the Dome of the Rock and later the al-Aqṣā mosque, built on the place whose ancient religious importance was recognized by both Jews and Christians, in the long term became more important in that complex competition for asserting Muslim claims to non-Muslims than the Umayyad claims to the post-Rashidun rulers of the Hejaz. Even with that competition “Muslims realized that [Jerusalem] was a holy city primarily for Jews and Christians.”<sup>256</sup>

Ibn Taymiyyah (1262–1328), who studied theology and Islamic law in Damascus, fiercely opposed Muslim veneration of sanctuaries in Jerusalem. He approved of Muslims prayers in Jerusalem, much as the Prophet did on his Night Journey. The Dome of the Rock, however, had no particular importance according to him, Muhammad’s footprints were not found on the rock,<sup>257</sup> Caliph ‘Umar did not pray there, and the entire Ḥaram was built by Umayyads so that they could redirect the *hajj* there. According to him, there are three Ḥarams in the world, but not one of them in Jerusalem.<sup>258</sup> The veneration of the sanctuary whose importance was based on Judaism, much like other, similar sanctuaries, including the grave of the Prophet, was according to Ibn Taymiyyah a sign of apostasy from the Islamic faith, which is punishable by death.<sup>259</sup>

<sup>256</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1981: 169.

<sup>257</sup> Prema tradiciji koju prenosi el-Jakubi, Muhamed je prije uzlaska na nebo nogom stao na stijenu na Haramu (O. GRABAR, 1959: 37), što dokazuje otisak njegova stopala koji je, prema nekim legendama, još uvijek vidljiv.

<sup>258</sup> To su Meka, Medina i mjesto u blizini Ta’ifa, također u Hidžazu.

<sup>259</sup> C. D. MATTHEWS, 1936: 2-6.

<sup>256</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1981: 169.

<sup>257</sup> According to the tradition transmitted by al-Ya’qūbi, Muhammad stood with his foot on the Rock on the Ḥaram before ascending to heavens (O. GRABAR, 1959: 37), and his footprint which is, according to some legends, still visible, proves it.

<sup>258</sup> These are Mecca, Medina and a nearby place, Taif, also in the Hejaz.

<sup>259</sup> C. D. MATTHEWS, 1936: 2-6.

## 10. ZAKLJUČAK: PROŠLOST I BUDUĆNOST ISLAMSKOG JERUZALEMA

Važnost Jeruzalema za razvoj islamske misli i identiteta dijela muslimanskog svijeta od najranijih godina nastanka nove religije može se smatrati neupitnom. Podjednako neupitna činjenica kako je percepcija važnosti Jeruzalema uvelike bila određena političkim okolnostima, te nastojanjima umajadskih kalifa da područje Sirije uzdignu na religijsku vrijednosnu razinu prema uzoru na Hidžaz, tu važnost ne umanjuje. Isto vrijedi i za teološko, arhitektonsko, mozaično i estetsko nadmetanje s kršćanskom Bizantom, koje je vidljivo poglavito u oblikovanju svetišta *kubat as-sahre*. Različiti dijelovi *ummata* tijekom različitih razdoblja različito su tumačili koncept svetosti Jeruzalema za islam. Njima treba pridodati i onaj dio ranoislamske tradicije koja je u pripisivanju meritornosti Jeruzalemu prepoznavala religijsku inovaciju (*bid'a*, što je u islamu drugi najveći grijeh, odmah nakon *širka*<sup>260</sup>) te političku i religijsku konkurenciju Meki i Medini, koju je nastojala suniti.

Među rijetkim je izvorno islamskim i s političkim zbivanjima nepovezanim tradicijama pridavanja svetosti Jeruzalemu ona o prvoj *kibli*. No, ta je *kibla* napuštena, a fokus molitve postala je, i do danas ostala, Meka. Grabar stoga s pravom upozorava kako je „psihološki krajnje malo vjerojatno da bi se točka izvorne [napuštene] *kible* obilježavala [kroz pridavanje svetosti]“ te u nastavku objašnjava kako razloge treba tražiti u tradicijama povezanim s kalifom Omarom i *isrom*<sup>261</sup>, što nas opet vraća na kasnija događanja, obilježena političkim motivima i eshatološkim nadanjima.

Kao i kod istraživanja drugih tema iz ranoislamske povijesti, istraživanja ranoislamskoga Jeruzalema otežava i ograničava oskudnost onodobnih izvora.<sup>262</sup> Islamski izvori koji su nam danas poznati nastali su dva stoljeća ili više nakon događaja koje

## 10. CONCLUSION: PAST AND FUTURE OF ISLAMIC JERUSALEM

The importance of Jerusalem in the development of the Islamic thought, and of identity of parts of the Muslim world from the earliest years of the new religion, may be considered undisputable. Equally undisputable fact that Muslim perception of the importance of Jerusalem was to a great extent determined by political circumstances, and the effort of the Umayyad Caliphs to elevate the region of Syria to religious importance in the likeness of the Hejaz, does not diminish that importance. The same is true of the theological, architectural, mosaic and aesthetic competition with Christian Byzantium, which is primarily seen in the construction of the *Qubbat al-Sakhrah* sanctuary. Different parts of the Ummah during different periods interpreted the concept of the holiness of Jerusalem for Islam differently. To these should be added the early Islamic traditions according to which the attribution of merits to Jerusalem was perceived as a religious innovation (*bid'ah*, which in Islam is a grave sin, second only to *shirk*<sup>260</sup>), and a reprehensible political and religious competition with Mecca.

Among the rare originally Islamic traditions of attributing holiness to Jerusalem not connected to political events is the one concerning the first *qiblah*. That *qiblah*, however, was abandoned, and the focus of the prayer became, and has remained ever since, Mecca. For this reason, Grabar correctly cautions that it is “psychologically most unlikely that the spot of the original [abandoned] *qiblah* would have been commemorated [by attributing holiness to it].” He proceeds to explain that the reasons for attributing holiness to Jerusalem should be looked for in traditions connected to Caliph ‘Umar and the *isrā*<sup>261</sup> which brings us back to later events permeated with political motives and eschatological expectations.

Much like in the research of other topics from early Islamic history, research on early Islamic Jerusalem has been made difficult and limited by the lack of contemporary sources.<sup>262</sup> Islamic sources known today were produced two or more centuries after the events which they describe. The early Islamic narrative is in

<sup>260</sup> Arap. idolatrija, krivoštovlje.

<sup>261</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 47-48.

<sup>262</sup> Odličan, kategoriziran i kritički pregled izvora za znanstveno izučavanje Jeruzalema u ranoislamskom razdoblju nalazi se u O. GRABAR, 1996: 8-20.

<sup>260</sup> Arabic: idolatry.

<sup>261</sup> O. GRABAR, 1996: 47-48.

<sup>262</sup> An excellent, categorized, and critical review of the sources for the academic study of Jerusalem in the early Islamic period is found in O. GRABAR, 1996: 8-20.

opisuju. U njima se ranoislamski narativ isprepliće s umajadskim ili, rjeđe, abasidskim političkim interpretacijama prošlosti, često do razine na kojoj je teško ili nemoguće razlučiti izvornu religijsku tradiciju od proračunate, službene vladarske promidžbe politički pogodnih vjerovanja koja su se potom i sama preobražavala u „uvjerljive tradicije opremljene *isnadima*“<sup>263</sup> i u kojima se povijest predstavlja „ne onakvom kakva je bila, nego kakva je trebala biti“.<sup>264</sup> Zato su za istraživanje percepcije Jeruzalema u ranoislamskoj tradiciji od goleme važnosti s jedne strane arheološki i materijalni izvori, poglavito *kubat as-sahra* i Haram, a s druge strane židovski i kršćanski tekstovi u kojima se spominje Jeruzalem nakon islamskog osvajanja. Nastanak ovih potonjih vrela teško se može pripisati unutar-muslimanskim političkim procesima, a eshatološka prizma kroz koju su neki od njih pisani nije razlog za odbacivanje povijesnosti dijela sadržaja u kojemu su opisana zbivanja ili navedeni podatci. Veći je problem to što su i neislamski izvori čiji se nastanak može datirati bliže razdoblju i događajima koje opisuju rijetki, nepotpuni i uglavnom naknadno doručeni.

Nejasnoće i nesuglasja vezani za ranoislamsko pripisivanje svetosti Jeruzalemu danas nisu razlog za stavljanje pod upit važnosti Jeruzalema za muslimane, odnosno njegova uzvišena položaja trećega najsvetijega grada u islamu. Dapače, one kao da grad pokrivaju nekom maglovitom, otajstvenom čari iz koje se nazire nadolazeće mesijansko buđenje i eshatološka kulminacija povijesti. Ako je vjerska važnost Jeruzalema za islam bila povezana s političkim procesima – a da je tako dade se uočiti i nakon razdoblja obrađenih u ovome članku, primjerice neposredno prije<sup>265</sup> i tijekom Križarskih ratova<sup>266</sup> – onda ne treba čuditi što Jeruzalem posljednjih godina postaje predmetom vjerskih čežnja i gorljivosti muslimana diljem svijeta, i to puno više nego ikada prije

those sources intertwined with the Umayyad or, more rarely, with the Abbasid political interpretations of the past, often to such an extent that it is difficult or impossible to distinguish the original religious tradition from a calculated, official government's promotion of politically suitable beliefs which were then themselves transformed into traditions “equipped with imposing *isnāds*,”<sup>263</sup> and in which history is presented “not as it was, but rather as it should have been.”<sup>264</sup> In pursuit of the perception of Jerusalem in early Islamic tradition, therefore, archaeological and material sources, especially the *Qubbat al-Sakhrah* and the Haram on the one hand, and Jewish and Christian texts which mention Jerusalem and were produced after the Islamic conquest on the other, are of the utmost importance. The origin of the later sources can hardly be attributed to inter-Muslim political processes, and the eschatological prism through which some of them were written is not reason enough to reject the historiographical part of the content in which events or objects are described. A more serious problem is that even non-Islamic sources whose origin can be dated nearer to the period and events which they describe are rare, incomplete, and were usually later revised.

Perplexity, ambiguity and dissensus related to the early Islamic perception of Jerusalem are not a reason to problematize or question present-day importance of Jerusalem for the Muslims, or its exalted position as the third most holy city in Islam. In fact, it is as though they cover the city with a hazy, mysterious enchantment from which the messianic sensation is emerging and eschatological culmination of history can be anticipated. If the religious importance of Jerusalem for Islam was related to political processes – that it is so can be perceived even after the periods covered in this article, for example before<sup>265</sup> and during the Crusades<sup>266</sup> – then it should not come as a surprise that in recent years Jerusalem has become the object of religious zeal and longing for Muslims around the world, much more than ever before in the history of the city. Earlier inter-Muslim conflicts, and the conflicts between Muslims and Christians over

<sup>263</sup> Usp. I. GOLDZIHNER, 1971: 44.

<sup>264</sup> M. SHARON, 1988: 225. Vidjeti i članak Francis Edwarda Petersa *Quest of the Historical Muhammad* (F. E. PETERS, 1991: 291-315).

<sup>265</sup> Goitein navodi kako su muslimani stratešku važnost grada prepoznali tek trideset godina prije dolaska križara (S. D. GOITEIN, 1981: 169).

<sup>266</sup> Usp. C. D. MATTHEWS, 1936: 1.

<sup>263</sup> Cf. I. GOLDZIHNER, 1971: 44.

<sup>264</sup> M. SHARON, 1988: 225, *The Birth of Islam in the Holy Land*. See also the article by Francis Edward Peters, *Quest of the Historical Muhammad* (F. E. PETERS, 1991: 291-315).

<sup>265</sup> Goitein cites that the Muslims only recognized the strategic importance of the city thirty years before the arrival of the Crusaders (S. D. GOITEIN, 1981: 169).

<sup>266</sup> Cf. C. D. MATTHEWS, 1936: 1.

u povijesti grada. Prijašnji unutarmuslimanski sukobi, kao i sukobi muslimana s kršćanima oko Jeruzalema, grad su činili poželjnim posjedom, ali ushit koji je donosilo njegovo posjedovanje uglavnom nije bio rigidan i neobuzdan; prostor za pragmatičnost i politički kompromis uvijek je postojao. Prisjetimo se samo dogovorne predaje Jeruzalema Fridriku II. od strane ajubidskog vladara el-Kamila, što je na neko vrijeme u Palestinu donijelo mir. K tome, opet je korisno ukazati na to da nikada u povijesti nijedna islamska vlast Jeruzalem nije učinila svojim glavnim gradom, dok je u razdoblju prije Križarskih ratova on za muslimane kulturno bio „provincijski grad bez osobite važnosti“.<sup>267</sup>

Aspekt srednjovjekovne teološke interakcije i nadmetanja islama sa židovstvom i kršćanstvom u kontekstu Jeruzalema zavrjeđuje posebnu pozornost jer danas ima političke implikacije koje su se izvorno možda nazirale, ali nisu bile eksplicitne. Muslimani po osvajanju grada, pa ni nakon gradnje na Brdu Hrama, Jeruzalem nisu u potpunosti prisvojili, nego su svoju prisutnost u njemu vidjeli više kao nadogradnju na ranijim tradicijama. Židovi su i kršćani u okviru *zimijskog*<sup>268</sup> statusa pod islamskom vlašću relativno mirno njegovali svoje tradicije, dok su muslimani tijekom 461 godine, koliko je proteklo između islamskoga i križarskog osvajanja grada, u njemu ostali manjina.<sup>269</sup> U islamskim je tradicijama koje su se razvijale uloga židovskih konvertita na islam bila golema, a u nekim aspektima, kao što je pripisivanje eshatoloških značajki Jeruzalemu, vjerojatno i presudna. To je svakako bio proces, jer islamska teološka misao u prvom hidžretskom stoljeću u nizu ključnih pitanja još nije bila oblikovana, ali je bila otvorena, znatiželjna i heterogena. Prihvatimo li pak službeni islamski nauk o datiranju kuranskog teksta,

Jerusalem, have transformed the city into a desirable property, but the thrill that came with possessing it was generally not rigid and unrestrained; prospect for pragmatism and political compromise had always existed. The negotiated surrender of Jerusalem to Frederick II by the Ayyubid ruler al-Kamil, which brought peace for some time to Palestine, is but one example. In addition, we may recollect that no Islamic state in history made Jerusalem its capital, while in the period before the Crusades, Muslims perceived it as a “provincial city of no special importance.”<sup>267</sup>

An aspect of the medieval theological interaction and competition of Islam with Judaism and Christianity in the context of Jerusalem is worth of particular attention because today it has political implications which originally could have been discerned but were not explicit. Upon conquering the city, and even after building sanctuaries on the Temple Mount, Muslims never completely appropriated Jerusalem, but rather viewed their presence in it as a superstructure founded upon the earlier traditions. Jews and Christians, protected by *dhimmi*<sup>268</sup> status, lived according to their own traditions fairly peacefully under Islamic rule, while Muslims during the 461 years that had passed between the Islamic and Crusader conquest of the city, remained a minority in it.<sup>269</sup> The influence of Jewish converts to Islam on the development of Islamic traditions was substantial, and in some aspects, such as the attribution of eschatological merits to Jerusalem, it was probably crucial. At any rate, it was a process, for Islamic theological thought during the first century AH was not yet formed with regard to many key questions, but it was open, curious and heterogeneous. If we accept, however, the official Islamic dating of the Quranic text, then one of the theological aspects was defined and articulated rather early, and that is the Islamic view on what we call today Comparative Religion. Islam is, according to self-perception, the bearer of the final revelation, whereas the previous revelations (Judaism and Christianity) were

<sup>267</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1981: 169.

<sup>268</sup> *Zimije* ili *ahl ul-zimma* (أهل الذمة) su Židovi i kršćani koji pod uvjetom pokornosti i plaćanja posebnog poreza nametnuta samo nemuslimanima, žive na područjima pod islamskom političkom vlašću.

<sup>269</sup> Najveću zajednicu činili su kršćani, često pripadnici različitih monofizitskih sljedbi. O broju jeruzalemskih Židova, kao i njihovim naseobinama u gradu i mjestu otkud su se doselili, ne zna se puno (usp. O. GRABAR, 1996: 132-133).

<sup>267</sup> S. D. GOITEIN, 1981: 169.

<sup>268</sup> *Dhimmis*, or *ahl al-dhimma* (أهل الذمة) are Jews and Christians who live in areas under Islamic political rule under conditions of obedience and with the payment of a special tax collected from non-Muslims.

<sup>269</sup> Christians made up the largest community, often members of differing monophysite denominations. On the number of Jews in Jerusalem, as well as their settlements in the city and the place from whence they came, not much is known (cf. O. GRABAR, 1996: 132-133).

jedan je teološki aspekt bio definiran i artikuliran, a to je islamsko viđenje onoga što danas nazivamo komparativnom religijom. Islam je, prema tome viđenju, nositelj konačne i završne objave, dok su prethodne objave (židovstvo i kršćanstvo) praktički, premda ne i *de jure*, dokinute kroz svojevrsni *nash* (نسخ).<sup>270</sup> Lassnerovim riječima, „arabizacija monoteizma ključ je islamske debate sa Židovima i kršćanima”,<sup>271</sup> za što su inskripcije *kubat as-sahre* među najstarijim i najboljim primjerima. Islamizacija i arabizacija biblijskih koncepta i ličnosti tijekom niza povijesnih razdoblja Židovima je i kršćanima omogućavala da ih tumače kao pronalaznje zajedničkoga monoteističkog izričaja, ali njihovo tumačenje nije potpuno točno. Ne odbacujući i moguće postojanje zajedničkoga monoteističkog izričaja, glavni je učinak islamizacije i arabizacije biblijskih koncepta i ličnosti to da je njima židovska i kršćanska povijest islamizirana. Islamizacija povijesti učinila je islamizaciju ozemlja prirodnom i logičnom posljedicom,<sup>272</sup> a ona je vidljiva od izvorne medinske islamske države utemeljene prve hidžretske godine pa sve do danas. No, taj korak često nije značio gaženje i zatiranje prethodnih monoteističkih tradicija, nego nametanje interakcije s njima pod uvjetima koje je diktirao islam i koji su se, ovisno o političkim okolnostima, mijenjali. Jeruzalem je, slobodno se može reći, ogledni primjer te interakcije.

Muslimanski sukob sa Židovima oko Jeruzalema, koji počinje u vrijeme jeruzalemskoga velikog muftije hadži-Emina el-Huseinija (1897.–1974.), u islamsku je percepciju svetosti grada unio čimbenik determinirane, fanatične i agresivne posesivnosti,<sup>273</sup> koja je bez

practically, even though not *de iure*, abrogated through a peculiar application of *naskh* (نسخ).<sup>270</sup> In the words of Lassner “The Arabization of monotheism was key to Islam’s debate with Jews and Christians,”<sup>271</sup> and the *Qubbat al-Sakhr* inscriptions are among the oldest and best examples of it. Jews and Christians interpreted Islamization and Arabization of Biblical concepts and personalities as a way to pursue a common monotheistic expression, but their interpretation was not entirely correct. Without necessarily rejecting possible presence of a common monotheistic expression, the primary effect of those processes was Islamization of Jewish and Christian history. The Islamization of Jewish and Christian history made the Islamization of Jewish and Christian territory a natural and logical consequence,<sup>272</sup> as has been evident from the first Islamic state founded in Medina in the first year of the *hijra* up to this day. That project, however, often did not necessarily imply the treading on and suppression of previous monotheistic traditions, but rather an enforcement of interaction with them under conditions dictated by Islam; an interaction refashioned in accordance to prevalent political circumstances. Contest over Jerusalem has been a typical example of that interaction.

Muslim conflict with the Jews over Jerusalem, which began during the time of the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem Hajj-Amin al-Husseini (1897–1974), brought a determined, fanatic and aggressive possessiveness in the Islamic perception of the holiness of the city,<sup>273</sup> which has been without precedence in the former historical interaction of Islam with Jerusalem and Jerusalem’s Jews. What is more, such possessiveness contradicts some principles of their historical interaction. It transforms early Islamic traditions according

<sup>270</sup> Koncept *an-nasih va-l-mansuh* koristi se u kuranskoj egzezezi i odnosi se na tumačenje koje su poruke ukinute (*nasih*) i zamijenjene (*mansuh*) kronološki novijima. Koncept se prvi put javlja u kontekstu takozvanih „sotonskih stihova“ (IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 165-167; Kur’an 53:1-20) ali njegova je primjena s vremenom postala vrlo široka. U smislu nadomještanja biblijske objave islamom tu riječ tumači i Wansbrough (J. WANSBROUGH, 2006: 109-114).

<sup>271</sup> J. LASSNER, 2017: 191.

<sup>272</sup> Za razumijevanje ovoga aspekta zahvalan sam profesoru M. Sharonu, koji mi je ukazao na njega u jednome od razgovora.

<sup>273</sup> Za više podataka o el-Huseinijevoj ulozi u raspirivanju vjerskog sukoba između muslimana i Židova v. B. HAVEL, 2014 i B. HAVEL, 2015.

<sup>270</sup> Arabic: “abrogation”. The concept *al-nāsikh wal-mansūkh* is used in Quranic exegesis and refers to the interpretation of which messages are abrogated (*nāsikh*) and replaced (*mansūkh*) by chronologically newer messages. The concept is found for the first time in the context of the so-called “Satanic verses” (IBN-ISHAK, 2004: 165-167; Quran 53: 1-20) but its application became wider with time. Wansbrough interprets this word in the meaning of the replacement of the Biblical revelation with the Islamic (J. WANSBROUGH, 2006: 109-114).

<sup>271</sup> J. LASSNER, 2017: 191.

<sup>272</sup> I am indebted to Professor Moshe Sharon for bringing my attention to this in one of our conversations.

<sup>273</sup> For more on al-Husseini’s role in the incitement of a religious conflict between Muslims and Jews see B. HAVEL, 2014 and B. HAVEL, 2015.

prevedana u dotadašnjoj povijesti interakcije islama s Jeruzalemom i jeruzalemskim Židovima. Štoviše, u nekim mu je aspektima i oprječan. On ranoislamsku tradiciju preobličuje potrebama političkog trenutka, i to sve oštrije. Daljnje retroaktivno učitavanje važnosti Jeruzalema za islam te jeruzalemcetrična tumačenja povijesnih zbivanja i islamskih mitova, koja su nerijetko anakronistična, a koja postaju prihvatljiva čak i ozbiljnim znanstvenicima,<sup>274</sup> usprkos eventualnoj kratkoročnoj političkoj koristi za islam, bacaju sjenu na sjaj i nanose štetu ranoislamskim pripovijestima, tradicijama i historiografiji. Ipak, politički će dobitak, sudeći po sveukupnomu dosadašnjemu povijesnom iskustvu, jamačno prevagnuti. Pitanje Jeruzalema u ranoislamskoj tradiciji stoga je jednim dijelom tema historiografskoga i teološkog istraživanja, a drugim je dijelom političko-vjerski proces koji nije dovršen, niti mu se nazire kraj.

to the political need of the moment, more and more severely as time goes on. Further retroactive assignment of the importance of Jerusalem for Islam and the Jerusalem-centric interpretation of past events and Islamic myths, which are at times anachronistic and yet acceptable even to serious scholars,<sup>274</sup> despite the possible short-term political benefit, overshadows the splendor, and impair early Islamic narratives, traditions and historiography. Yet, judging by the entirety of historical experience up until now, the political benefit will most certainly gain the upper hand. For that reason, the question of Jerusalem in early Islamic tradition is partly the theme of historiographic and theological research, and partly a political-religious process which has not yet been completed, nor is its end on the horizon.

<sup>274</sup> Primjer su historiografske analize važnosti Jeruzalema u islamu, utemeljene na tradicijama prema kojima Muhamed na Jeruzalem gleda kao na mjesto na kojemu je već izgrađena džamija, odnosno *masdžid*, što osim džamije može označavati i drugu bogomolju. Jasno je da u vrijeme legendarne *isre* i *miradža* na Brdu Hrama nije bilo nikakve bogomolje, a poglavito ne džamije, čije spominjanje u Jeruzalemu prije islamskih osvajanja predstavlja apsurdan anakronizam.

<sup>274</sup> An example of this are the historiographic analyses of the importance of Jerusalem in Islam founded on traditions according to which Muhammad viewed Jerusalem as the place in which a mosque (that is a *masjid*, which other than mosque might indicate another place of prayer) had already been built. It is clear that in the time of the legendary *isrā* and *mi'rāj* there were no places of prayer on the Temple Mount, let alone a mosque, the mention of which in Jerusalem before the Islamic conquest of Palestine is but an absurd anachronism.

BIBLIOGRAFIJA / BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AL-A'LÁ 1925 – Majlis al-Shar'ī al-Islāmī al-A'lá, *A Brief Guide to Al-Haram Al-Sharif*, Jerusalem, 1925.
- AL-BALADHURI 1916 – al-Baladhuri, *The Origins of the Islamic State Part I (Kitab Futuh al-Buldan)* translated by Philip Hitti, New York, 1916.
- AL-BALADHURI 1924 – al-Baladhuri, *The Origins of the Islamic State Part II (Kitab Futuh al-Buldan)* translated by Francis Clark Murgotten, New York, 1924.
- AL-MUQADDASI 2001 – al-Muqaddasi, *The Best Divisions for Knowledge of the Regions*, Reading, 2001.
- Y. AL-QARADAWI 2012 – Yusuf al-Qaradawi, *Jerusalem: The Concern of Every Muslim*, 2012.
- AL-TABARI – al-Tabari, *The History of al-Tabari (Ta'rikh al-rusul wa'l-muluk)*, New York, 1987-1997.
- M. AVI-YONAH 1960 - Michael Avi-Yonah, *Jerusalem*, Jerusalem: The Israeli Publishing Institute Ltd, 1960.
- M. AVI-YONAH 2006 - Michael Avi-Yonah, *The Historical Background*, u / in: *Jerusalem: the Saga of the Holy City*, eds. M. Avi-Yonah, D. H. K. Amiran, J. Jotham Rothschild et al., Delray Beach: Levens Press, 2006, 7-42.
- D. BARNETT 2011 - David Barnett, *The Mounting Problem of Temple Denial*, *The Middle East Review of International Affairs*, 15/2, 2011, 1-10.
- S. BLAIR 1992 - Sheila Blair, *What is the Date of the Dome of the Rock?*, u / in: *Bayt al-Maqdis: 'Abd al-Malik's Jerusalem*, eds. J. Raby & J. Johns, *Oxford Studies in Islamic Art* 9, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992, 59-88.
- H. BUSSE 1968 - Heribert Busse, *The Sanctity of Jerusalem in Islam*, *Judaism*, 17/4, 1968, 441-468
- H. BUSSE 1986 - Heribert Busse, *Omar's Image as the Conqueror of Jerusalem*, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 8, 1986, 149-168.
- K. A. C. CRESWELL 1969 – *Early Muslim Architecture: Umayyads A.D. 622-750*. Oxford: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1969.
- P. CRONE & M. COOK 1977 - Patricia Crone & Michael Cook, *Hagarism: The Making of the Islamic World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- C. DAUPHIN 1997 - Claudine Dauphin, *On the Pilgrim's Way to the Holy City of Jerusalem. The Basilica of Dor in Israel*, u / in: *Archaeology and Biblical Interpretation*, ed. J. R. Bartlett, London: Routledge, 1997, 145-165.
- F. M. DONNER 2010 - Fred M. Donner, *Muhammad and the Believers: At the Origins of Islam*, Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010.
- H. E. EL-HUSEINI 1943 - Hadži Emin El-Huseini, *Govor njegove preuzvišenosti velikog muftije palestinskog prigo-dom rođendana Božjeg poslanika Muhameda*, Zagreb: Islamski središnji zavod u Berlinu, 1943.
- A. EL-KHATIB 2001 - Abdallah El-Khatib, *Jerusalem in the Qur'an*, *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 28/1, 2001, 25-53.
- A. ELAD 1999 - Amikam Elad, *Medieval Jerusalem and Islamic Worship: Holy Places, Ceremonies, Pilgrimage*, Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- A. ELAD 1999a - Amikam Elad, *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Jerusalem during the Early Muslim Period*, u / in: *Jerusalem: its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, ed. Lee I. Levine, New York: The Continuum Publishing Company, 1999, 300-314.
- Encyclopaedia of Islam - Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986-2004.
- Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology - Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell, Grand Rapids, 2000.
- M. FIERRO 1994 - Maribel Fierro, *The celebration of "Ashura" in Sunni Islam*, u / in: *Proceedings of the 14th Congress of the Union européenne des arabisants et islamisants*, ed. A. Fodor, Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University, 1994.
- M. GIL 1974 - Moshe Gil, *The Constitution of Medina: A Reconsideration*, *Israel Oriental Studies*, 4, 1974, 44-76.
- M. GIL 1997 - Moshe Gil, *A History of Palestine, 634-1099*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- M. GIL 2004 - Moshe Gil, *Jews in Islamic Countries in the Middle Ages*, Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- S. D. GOITEIN 1950 - Shelomo Dov Goitein, *The Historical Background of the Erection of the Dome of the Rock*, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 70/2, 1950, 104-108.
- S. D. GOITEIN 1955 - Shelomo Dov Goitein, *Jews and Arabs: Their Contacts Through The Ages*, New York: Schocken Books, 1955.
- S. D. GOITEIN 1981 - Shelomo Dov Goitein, *Jerusalem in the Arab Period (638-1099)*, u / in: *Jerusalem Cathedral: Studies in the History, Archaeology, Geography & Ethnography of the Land of Israel*, 1, ed. L. I. Levine, Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi Institute, 1981, 168-196.



- S. D. GOITEIN 2010 - Shelomo Dov Goitein, *Studies in Islamic History and Institutions*, Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- D. GOLAN 1986 - David Golan, Hadrian's Decision to supplant "Jerusalem" by "Aelia Capitolina", *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 35/2, 1986, 226-239.
- D. GOLD 2007 - Dore Gold, *The Fight for Jerusalem: Radical Islam, the West, and the Future of the Holy City*, Washington: Regnery Publishing, 2007.
- I. GOLDZIHHER 1971 - Ignaz Goldziher, *Muslim Studies (Muhammedanische Studien)*, Translated by C. R. Barber and S. M. Stern, Volume Two, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1971.
- O. GRABAR 1959 - Oleg Grabar, The Umayyad Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, *Ars Orientalis*, 3, 1959, 33-62.
- O. GRABAR 1964 - Oleg Grabar, Islamic Art and Byzantium, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 18, 1964, 67-88.
- O. GRABAR 1966 - Oleg Grabar, The Earliest Islamic Commemorative Structures, Notes and Documents, *Ars Orientalis*, 6/1, 1966, 7-46.
- O. GRABAR 1973 - Oleg Grabar, *Formation of Islamic Art*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973.
- O. GRABAR 1996 - Oleg Grabar, *The Shape of the Holy: Early Islamic Jerusalem*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- O. GRABAR 2001 - Oleg Grabar, Space and Holiness in Medieval Jerusalem, *Islamic Studies*, 40/3-4, 2001, 681-692.
- R. GRAFMAN & M. ROSEN-AYALON 1999 - Rafi Grafman - Myriam Rosen-Ayalon, The Two Great Syrian Umayyad Mosques: Jerusalem and Damascus, *Muqarnas: An Annual on the Visual Culture of the Islamic World*, 16, 1998, 1-15.
- A. HARUN & IBN-HIŠAM 1998 - Abdusselam Harun & Ibn-Hišam, *Poslanikov životopis*, Sarajevo: Bemust, 1998.
- B. HAVEL 2010 - Boris Havel, Zapadna orijentalistika: povijest i teologija s političkom misijom: uvod u kritičku analizu suvremene srednjestrujaške zapadne orijentalistike, *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu*, 42, 2010, 425-443.
- B. HAVEL 2013 - Boris Havel, *Arapsko-izraelski sukob: religija, politika i povijest Svete zemlje*, Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak, 2013.
- B. HAVEL 2014 - Boris Havel, Haj Amin al-Husseini: Herald of Religious Anti-Judaism in the Contemporary Islamic World, *The Journal of the Middle East and Africa*, 5/3, 2014, 221-243.
- B. HAVEL 2015 - Boris Havel, Hajj Amin Husseini's Anti-Semitic Legacy, *The Middle East Quarterly*, 22/3, 2015, 1-11.
- B. HAVEL 2015a - Boris Havel, Islamska država nije samo "takozvana": političko-vjerska propaganda i pitanje autentičnosti kalifata, *Političke analize: časopis Fakulteta političkih znanosti u Zagrebu*, 6(22), 2015, 27-35.
- B. HAVEL 2017 - Boris Havel, Komunikacijska kampanja Islamske države: *Dabiq*, 2014.-2015, *Anali hrvatskoga politološkog društva*, 14, 2017, 215-233.
- B. HAVEL & M. KASAPOVIĆ, 2016 - Boris Havel & Mirjana Kasapović, Napomene o transkripciji i transliteraciji, u / in: *Bliski istok: politika i povijest*, ed. M. Kasapović, Zagreb, 2016, xvii-xxii.
- G. HAWTING 2006 - Gerald Hawting, Foreword, u / in: John Wansbrough, *The Sectarian Milieu: Content and Composition of Islamic Salvation History*, Amherst: Prometheus Books, 2006, i-viii.
- R. G. HOYLAND 1997 - Robert G. Hoyland, *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It: A Survey and Evaluation of Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian Writings on Early Islam*, New Jersey: Darwin Press, 1997.
- IBN-ISHAK 2004 - Ibn-Ishak, *The Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Ishaq's "Sirat Rasul Allah" by A. Guillaume*, Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Katekizam Katoličke Crkve: Kompendij* - Split: Biskupska konferencija Bosne i Hercegovine, Verbum, Crkva u svijetu, 2005.
- N. N. N. KHOURY 1993 - Nuha N. N. Khoury, The Dome of the Rock, the Ka'ba, and Ghumdan: Arab Myths and Umayyad Monuments, *Muqarnas*, 10, 1993, 57-65.
- M. J. KISTER 1969 - Meir Jacob Kister, 'You Shall Only Set out for Three Mosques', A Study of an Early Tradition, *Le Muséon*, 82, 1969, 173-196.
- M. J. KISTER 1972 - Meir Jacob Kister, Haddithu 'an bani isra'ila wa-la haraja: A Study on an Early Tradition, *Israel Oriental Studies*, 2, 1972, 215-239.
- B. KORKUT 2011 - Besim Korkut, *Prijevod Kur'ana*, Novi Pazar: El-Kalimeh, 2011.
- J. LASSNER 2006 - Jacob Lassner, Muslims on the Sanctity of Jerusalem: Preliminary Thoughts on the Search for a Conceptual Framework, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 31, 2006, 164-195.
- J. LASSNER 2017 - Jacob Lassner, *Medieval Jerusalem: Forging an Islamic City in Spaces Sacred to Christians and Jews*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017.

- H. LAZARUS-YAFEH 1992 - Hava Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds: Medieval Islam and Bible Criticism*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- G. LE STRANGE 1887 - Guy Le Strange, Description of the Noble Sanctuary at Jerusalem in 1470 A.D., by Kamāl (or Shams) ad Dīnas Suyūṭī, *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, New Series*, 19/2, 1887, 247-305.
- G. LE STRANGE 1890 - Guy Le Strange, *Palestine Under the Moslems: A Description of Syria and the Holy Land From a.d. 650 to 1500*, London: Alexander P. Watt for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, 1890.
- M. LEVY-RUBIN 2017 – Milka Levy-Rubin, Why was the Dome of the Rock built? A new perspective on a long-discussed question, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 80/3, 2017, 441-464.
- B. LEWIS 1950 - Bernard Lewis, An Apocalyptic Vision of Islamic History, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 13/2, 1950, 308-338.
- B. LEWIS 1980 - Bernard Lewis, Palestine: On the History and Geography of a Name, *The International History Review*, 2/1, 1980, 1-12.
- O. LIVNE-KAFRI 1998 - Ofer Livne-Kafri, The Muslim Traditions “In Praise of Jerusalem” (“fada’il al-Quds”): Diversity and Complexity, *Annali Istituto Universitario Orientale*, 58/1-2, 1998, 165-192.
- O. LIVNE-KAFRI 2006 - Ofer Livne-Kafri, Jerusalem in Early Islam: The Eschatological Aspect, *Arabica*, 53/3, 2006, 382-403.
- F. M. LOEWENBERG 2013 - F. M. Loewenberg, Did Jews Abandon the Temple Mount?, *Middle East Quarterly*, 20/3, 2013, 37-48.
- A. LOUTH 2008 - Andrew Louth, Byzantium Transforming (600-700), u / in: *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire c. 500–1492*, ed. J. Shepard, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, 221-248.
- M. MA’OZ 2014 - Moshe Ma’oz, The Role of the Temple Mount / Al-Haram Al-Sharif in the Deterioration of Muslim–Jewish Relations, *Approaching Religion*, 4/2, 2014, 60-70.
- C. D. MATTHEWS 1936 - Charles D. Matthews, A Muslim Iconoclast (Ibn Taymiyyeh) on the ‘Merits’ of Jerusalem and Palestine, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 56, 1936, 1-21.
- M. MODRIĆ 2016 - fra Miroslav Modrić, *Fra Vjenceslav Bilušić i Kustodija Svete Zemlje*, Sinj: Zbornik Kačić, 2016.
- G. NECIPOĞLU 2008 - Gülru Nepicoğlu, The Dome of the Rock as Palimpsest: ‘Abd al-Malik’s Grand Narrative and Sultan Süleyman’s Glosses, *Muqarnas: Frontiers of Islamic Art and Architecture: Essays in Celebration of Oleg Grabar’s Eightieth Birthday*, 25, 2008, 17-105.
- S. NUSEIBEH & O. GRABAR 1996 - Said Nuseibeh & Oleg Grabar, *The Dome of the Rock*, New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 1996.
- F. E. PETERS 1983 - Francis Edward Peters, Who Built the Dome of the Rock? *Graeco-Arabica*, 2, 1983, 119-138.
- F. E. PETERS 1991 - Francis Edward Peters, The Quest of the Historical Muhammad, *Journal of Middle East Studies*, 23, 1991, 291-315.
- M. RODINSON 2000 - Maxime Rodinson, *Muhammed*, Zagreb: MISL, 2000.
- M. ROSEN-AYALON 1989 - Myriam Rosen-Ayalon, The Early Islamic Monuments of al-Ḥaram al-Sharif: An Iconographic Study, *Qedem: Monographs of the Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem*, 28, 1989, 1-73.
- M. ROSEN-AYALON 1996 - Myriam Rosen-Ayalon, The first century of Ramla, *Arabica*, 43/1, 1996, 250-263.
- M. SHARON 1983 - Moshe Sharon, *Black Banners from the East: The Establishment of the ‘Abbāsid State : Incubation of a Revolt*, Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, E. J. Brill, 1983.
- M. SHARON 1988 - Moshe Sharon, The birth of Islam in the Holy Land, u / in: *Pillars of Smoke and Fire: The Holy Land in History and Thought*, ed. M. Sharon, Johannesburg: Southern Book Publishers, 1988, 225-235.
- M. SHARON 1992 - Moshe Sharon, Praises of Jerusalem as a Source for the Early History of Islam, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, 49/1-2, 1992, 56-68.
- M. SHARON 2006 - Moshe Sharon, Islam on the Temple Mount, *Biblical Archaeology Review*, 32/4, 2006, 24–36.
- M. SHARON 2007 - Moshe Sharon, The Decisive Battles in the Arab Conquest of Syria, *Studia Orientalia*, 101/1, 2007, 297-357.
- M. SHARON 2009 - Moshe Sharon, Shape of the Holy, *Studia Orientalia*, 107, 2009, 283-310.

H. SIVAN 2002 - Hagith Sivan, From Byzantine to Persian Jerusalem: Jewish Perspectives and Jewish/Christian Polemics, *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, 41, 2002, 277-306.

N. A. STILLMAN 1979 - Norman A. Stillman, *The Jews of Arab Lands: a History and Source Book*, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society in America, 1979.

G. H. TALHAMI 2000 - Ghada Hashem Talhami, The Modern History of Islamic Jerusalem: Academic Myths and Propaganda, *Middle East Policy*, 7/2, 2000, 113-129.

M. TWAIN 1964 - Mark Twain, *Naivčine na putovanju*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1964.

M. TWAIN 1984 - Mark Twain, *The Innocents Abroad, or The New Pilgrims' Progress*, New York: The Library of America, 1984.

J. WANSBROUGH 1977 - John Wansbrough, *Quranic studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

J. WANSBROUGH 2006 - John Wansbrough, *The Sectarian Milieu: Content and Composition of Islamic Salvation History*, Amherst: Prometheus Books, 2006.

