

have been studied by A. Grabar,³⁵ who pointed out a possibly Oriental influence. In Islamic art this style, though not fully developed, appears already in the Umayyad period, not only in the mosaics of the *masjid al-jami'* in Damascus³⁶, but probably also in some fragments of the Khirbat al-Mafjar badiyah.³⁷ After a gap of five or six centuries, it reappears, fully developed, in the miniatures of the Baghdadi school.³⁸ It is not our aim to discuss the problem of the relationship between Islamic and Byzantine miniatures,³⁹ we think rather well that there was a common trend of aesthetic views in the Near and Middle East areas, involving Byzantine art, whose Oriental character was never disappointed.

Unfortunately we have not any evidence before the XIIth and XIIIth centuries A.D. The earliest examples show a complete disregard for architectural representation, and the "man" remains the protagonist of the miniature, following the tradition of Greco-

Roman art. Therefore, also from this point of view the slab of the 'Iraq Museum is of great interest, for we have not any contemporary architectural representation of such importance. But in some later miniatures we find, though in different subjects, many elements which belong to the same kind of perspective.

We must firstly emphasize the importance of the Hariri's *Maqamat*, especially, the miniatures providing us a view of a mosque, (fig. 5,6) such as "Abu Zayd before a qadi."⁴⁰ Here we find a picture, whose aim is not a true contact with the building, but rather to point out its most important items, as the *minbar*, its door, which is turned to be better seen, while the pointed arcade, in the first figure beyond the *minbar* could represent the *mihrab* or the *iwan* in which the latter was set, or perhaps both, together. The same principle is adopted in many other miniatures as for example, a scene from a Hariri (fig. 7) of the Suleimanye Library in

35 - See: A. Grabar, *Plotin et les origines de l'esthétique médiévale*, *Cahiers archéologiques*, I, 1945, pp. 15-34; V. Strika, *Note*, pp. 6-7.

36 - See: E. De Lorey, *Les mosaïques de la mosquée des Omayyades à Damas*, *Syria*, XII, 1931, p. 334; Marguerite van Brchem, *The Mosaics of the Dome of the Rock and of the Great Mosque of Damascus*, in K.A.C. Creswell, *Early Muslim Architecture*, I. Oxford 1932, p. 235; U. Monneret de Villard, *Introduzione allo studio dell'archeologia islamica*, Venezia 1966, p. 295.

37 - See: Oleg Grabar, in R.W. Hamilton, *Khirbat al-Mafjar, an Arabian Mansion*

in the Jordan Valley, Oxford 1959, pp. 306-308.

38 - See: 'Isà Salman, *The Characteristics of the Miniatures of the Mesopotamian School*, Sumer, 1967, p. 129; K. Holter, *Die islamischen Miniatureschriften vor 1350*, *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 1937, pp. 1-34; R. Ettinghausen, *Arab painting*, Lausanne 1962, pp. 97 foll.

39 - See: H. Buchta, *The painting of the Syrian Jacobites in its Relation to Byzantine and Islamic Art*, in *Syria*, 1939, 136-150.

40 - *Bibliothèque Nationale*, (Ms arabe 6094); *British Museum*, Add. 22. 114, fcl. 94 petra.

Anyway in both cases we have a piece belonging to the end of the fifth century A. H., i.e., to the period of the Atabegs, when Mossul reached the height of its cultural and economic development.

But the importance of the slab is due, as we said before, to its decoration and to the appearance of a Ka'bah representation in Islamic art, in such early a period. We can add too that the *naskhi* style by which the inscription is written, is very beautiful and belongs to the more refined examples of the kind. The origin of *naskhi*, as an ornamental scripture, goes back to the IXth century A. D.,²⁷ but its true development, as an independent monumental style, without intrusion of the kufi, is later. In this way the slab inscription can be considered among the older examples of fully developed *naskhi* in ornamental epigraphy.

On the other hand the *masjid al-haram* is depicted with a style which is completely different from the representations quoted by

Ettinghausen, Otto-Dorn and Erdmann²⁸, which mostly belong to the Ottoman art and are quite different, both for their style and some architectural details, which can be explained only by the existence of some new buildings, erected later on.

The origins of the perspective style on which we are concerned, was not an invention of Islamic art, but was a common trend in the Middle Ages, besides Islamic miniatures, both in Byzantine and Central-Asian painting.²⁹ Its roots can be found in Roman and Byzantine arts, as the Villa of Boscoreale³⁰ (fig. 2), as well some mosaics from Antioch³¹ in Syria, Madaba³², (fig. 3) Tabarka³³, (fig. 4) Appolinare Nuovo in Ravenna,³⁴ where in a similar perspective is represented the palace of Theodoric.

This style does not aim to represent the human figure and the building in a natural way, but rather to emphasise their spiritual values, therefore it has been linked to the philosophy of Plotin, whose aesthetic views

27 - See: V.A. Kratchkovskaya, *Ornamental naskhi inscriptions*, in *A Survey of Persian Art*, II, pp. 1771-75.

28 - See: R. Ettinghausen, *l.c.*, fig. 2, 4 etc. K. Erdmann, *l.c.*, fig. 1, 3 etc.

29 - See: Mehmet Aga-Oglu, *Remarks on the Character of Islamic Art*, *The Art Bulletin*, 36, 1954, 199; V. Strika, *Note introduttive a un'estetica islamica*, *Rendiconti (Accademia Lincei)*, fasc 5-6, 1973, pp. 2-7.

30 - See: F. Barnabei, *La villa pompeiana di P. Fannio Sinistore scoperta presso Boscoreale*, Roma 1901; A. Sambon, *Les frésques de Boscoreale*, Paris 1903.

31 - See: D.Levi, *Antioch Mosaic Pavements*,

II, London-Oxford 1947, pp. 120-26, 327-28, tav. XXII, LXXX.

32 - See: M. Gisler, *Jerusalem auf der Mosaikkarte von Madaba*, *Das heilige Land*, LVI, 1912, pp. 214 foll.; P. Thomsen, *Das Stadtbild Jerusalem auf des Mosaikkarte von Madaba*, *Z.P. Ver.*, LII, 1929, pp. 155 foll.; D.Levi, *l.c.*, pp. 614, 618-21.

33 - See: P. Gauckler, *Monuments Piot*, XIII, 1906, pp. 175 foll., tav. XIII.

34 - See: A. Baumstark, *I mosaici di S. Apollinare Nuovo e l'antico anno liturgico ravennate*, *Rassegna gregoriana*, IX, 1-2, Roma 1910; G. Tura, *I restauri in corso al mosaico di S. Apollinare Nuovo*, *Felix Ravenna*, suppl. II, fasc. 2, 1916.

maqam at the times of Ibrahim al-Jarrahi.

The origins of the *maqam* are difficult to be explained. Anyway an inscription on window giving to the *marqad*, mentions the tomb of the *imam* Ibrahim ibn Ja'far as-Sadiq.¹⁶ This is also the view of al-'Umari,¹⁷ while on the contrary Ahmad Sufi¹⁸ concluded that the *imam* buried in was the second son of the *imam* Musà al-Kazim, whose tomb is found in the suburb of al-Kazimiyyah in Baghdad.¹⁹

As so our piece has nothing to do with the first erection of the *maqam*, for the second son of Musà al-Kazim lived some centuries before the probably date of the slab.

As a matter of fact the elegant *naskhi* inscription, mentions that the mosque was built by the Prince Ibrahim a-Jarrahi and that the neighbouring tomb belonged to Husnah Khatun bint al-Qarabali.²⁰ Both have

been identified by Ahmed Sufi,²¹ the first as the Emir Ibrahim ibn Quraysh al-Jarrahi, also known as Abu Salim al-'Uqayli,²² who was last ruler of the 'Uqaylid dynasty, whose rule on Mossul lasted from 381 to 486 A.H.²³ No records could be found on Husnah Khatun, but she has been identified as the daughter of a Qarabali, i.e., a Turkman tribe of great importance in the history of the region.²⁴ So the two names of the inscription indicate the end of the fifth century A.H. Can we establish more closely the date? We have not any similar piece, but Ahmed Sufi collecting the scanty historical data, mostly taken from Ibn al-Athir has proposed the year of Ibrahim al-Jarrahi death, i.e., 486 A.H.²⁵ Others, probably struck by the similarity of the *naskhi* inscription on the door of the same mausoleum, bearing the date of 498 A.H., have proposed the last year,²⁶ which seems to me less probably.

16 - *Ibid.*, p. 29; *al-Mutran Sulayman as-Saiygh, I.c.*, p. 163. The complete name of the *imam* is Ibrahim al-Mujab ibn Ja'far ibn Muhammad ibn Zayn al'Abidin.

17 - See: *Muhammad Amin ibn Khayr Allah al-Khatib al-'Umari, Manhal al-awliya'*, II, Mossul 1968, pp. 63-68.

18 - See: *Ahmad Sufi, I.c.*, p. 30. His views are mostly based on the *Kitab nur al-absar fi manaqib Al al-bayt al-mukhtar*, pp. 174-177, and on the *Sal-nameh* of the year 1310 A.H., p. 116.

19 - See: *Muhammad Hasan Al Yasin, Ta'rikh al-mashhad al-Kazimi*, Baghdad 1967.

20 - Here the inscription: *Bi-smi Allah ar-rahman ar-rahim. Innahu awwalu bayt wada'a lin-nasi ... wa hudà lil-'alamin. Fihi ayat baytani maqam Ibrahim.* In the upper side of the *ka'bah* and on the left

side of the *sahn* is found: *man dakhalahu aminan*, while on the lower part of the slab is written: *hadha 'l-masjid 'lladhi 'amarahu al-amir Ibrahim al-Jarrahi, 'wa hadhihi 't-turbah al-mujawirah lahu turbah Husnah Khatun bint al-Qarabali. Rahmat 'llahi 'alayha wa 'alà Ibrahim al-Jarrahi - 'Amala 'Abd Allah ibn Abi Hamzah.*

21 - See: *Ahmad Sufi, I.c.*, pp. 34-38.

22 - See: *al-Mutran Sulayman as-Saiygh, I.c.*, p. 164.

23 - See: *Ibn al-Athir, al-Kamil*, IX, pp. 241-243, X, p. 7, 91.

24 - *Ibid.*, X, p. 144.

25 - See: *Ahmad Sufi, I.c.*, p. 34.

26 - See: *Sa'id ad-Daywachi, I.c.*, p. 174; *Faraj Basmachi, I.c.*, p. 425. later on this date was also followed by Ahmed Sufi (*Khitat al-Mowsil*, p. 44).

on which is probably depicted the older representation of the *Masjid al-Haram* in Mecca (fig. 1). The piece is certainly datable between the 486 and 498 A.H. (1104 A.D.)⁶ As a matter of fact, R. Ettinghausen,⁷ K. Otto-Dorn⁸, and K. Erdmann⁹, to whom are due the most important researches in this field, did not find any *Ka'bah* representation in Islamic art before the beginning of the fourteenth century A. D.,¹⁰ when with the flourishing painting schools in Iran and elsewhere, the topic was more and more developed, especially in the Ottoman art of the next centuries.

It seems, indeed, that the Muslim were a little puzzled to represent their most important holy-place and that the rarity of the subject, before the miniature representations, was due to the general attitude of Islam against painting.¹¹ The prohibition was almost never fully followed, at least in Eastern Islamic lands, and the practice was

completely different from the theory explained by some extremist interpreters of the Law.¹² But it is almost assured that, though with some exceptions, the prohibition was fully observed in mosques,¹³ tombs and other religious buildings. Therefore, it is not astonishing if we do not find any *Ka'bah* representation during the first centuries A.H. Its appearance is probably due, on one side, to the more tolerant attitude inaugurated by the Seljuq towards painting and, on the other one, to the more and more decay of the 'Abbasid extremist trend.

Let us now turn to our piece. As already said, it belongs to the shrine of Imam Ibrahim in Mossul. It is a marble slab, possibly granite,¹⁴ whose sizes are 15 × 33 cm and was fixed on the wall of the *hadrah*. According a picture taken by Ahmed Sufi¹⁵ it was not surrounded by any decoration and probably was merely a commemorative slab indicating the works carried out on the

-
- 6 - The piece has been transferred to Baghdad in 1939 to the *Dar al-Athar al-'arabiyyah* and now to the Iraq Museum. (ξ 1149).
- 7 - See: R. Ettinghausen, *Die bildliche Darstellung der Ka'ba im islamischen Kulturkreis*, Z.D.M.G., 12, 1934, pp. 111-137.
- 8 - See: K. Otto-Dorn, *Das islamische Iznik*, in *Istanbuler Forschungen*, 13, 1941, pp. 140-141.
- 9 - See: K. Erdmann, *Ka'bah-Fliesen*, *Ars Orientalis*, III, 1959, pp. 192-197.
- 10 - See: R. Ettinghausen, *l.c.*, p. 111. It is a representation of the *Ka'bah* from the *Jami' at-tawarikh* of the year 1306 A.D. (707 A.H.) (*l.c.*, p. 121 and Th.W. Arnold, *Islamic Painting*, Dover 1965, pl. XIX).
- 11 - On this subject see the researches of 'Isa Salman (*Islam and Figurative Art, Sumer*, 1969, pp. 59-96) and O. Bol'shakov (*Islam i izobrazitel'noe iskusstvo, Trudy gosudarstvennogo ermitazha*, 1969, pp. 142-156).
- 12 - Especially an-Nawawi (see: 'Isa Salman, *l.c.*, pp. 62-87).
- 13 - See: H. Stern, *L'aniconisme dans l'Islam Primitif, Actes du XXI^e Congrès des Orientalistes*, Paris 1948, pp. 335-336.
- 14 - See: Ahmad Sufi, *l.c.*, p. 34; Sa'id ad-Daywachi, *l.c.*, p. 74. But I think it is another kind of marble.
- 15 - See Ahmad Sufi, *l.c.*, the picture facing p. 34.

A KA'BAH PICTURE IN THE IRAQ MUSEUM

VINCENZO STRIKA¹

Although better known as the very center for studying the ancient Mesopotamian civilizations, the Iraq Museum of Baghdad can be also considered as one of the most exhaustive assemblages of Islamic art, which is represented with such important pieces

and monuments as the Khassaki *mihrab*², the most famous fragments of the three Samarra styles,³ the wooden *sarcophagi* of Musà al-Kazim and al-'Aquli⁴ etc. I will bear now the attention on a small marble slab belonging to the Maqam Ibrahim of Mossul⁵

- 1 - Much gratitude is due to General Director of Antiquities, Dr. Isà Salman and to Dr. Fawzi Rashid, Director of the 'Iraq Museum, who gave me the permission to study the piece and useful informations.
- 2 - The first researches on this famous *mihrab* were made by F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld (*Archäologische Reise im Euphrat und Tigris Gebiet*, II, Berlin 1920, pp. 139-45). See now: Bashir Fransis wa Nasir an-Naqshabandi, *al-Maharib al-qadimah fi mathaf al-qasr al-'abbasi bi-Baghdad*, *Sumer*, 2, 1951, pp. 211-13; V. Strika, *Caratteri e primi sviluppi della moschea irachena dalle origini al X secolo*, *Rendiconti* (Accademia Lincei), 1973, pp. 42-43.
- 3 - See: E. Herzfeld, *Der Wandschmuck der Bauten von Samarra und seine Or-*

namentik, Berlin 1923; 'Abd al-'Aziz Hamid, *The Origin and Characteristics of Samarra's bevelled style*, *Sumer*, 1966, pp. 83-99.

- 4 - See: Bashir Fransis wa Nasir an-Naqshabandi, *al-Athar al-Khashab fi dar al-athar al-'arabiyyah*, *Sumer*, V, 1949, pp. 55-56; 57.
- 5 - See: Ahmad Sufi, *al-Athar wa 'l-mabani al-'arabiyyah al-islamiyyah fi 'l-Mawsil*, 1940, pp. 34-36, al-Mutran Sulayman as-Saiygh, *Ta'rikh al-Mawsil*, (s.l.), 1956, pp. 163-164; Sa'id ad-Daywachi, *az-Zakharif ar-rukamiyyah fi 'l-Mawsil*, [lecture at the 4th Conference of the Arab Archaeologist] Cairo, p. 478, fig. II, *Ibid*, *Sumer*, 1964 p. 174; Faraj Basmachi, *Kunuz al-mathaf al-'iraqi*, Baghdad, 1972, p. 425.

exceeded their bounds he had to crush them to save himself and his dynasty. However they were not entirely destroyed. The rôle of those who remained can be traced in vital questions of that time.

On the other hand the Hashimiyya and Rawandiyya doctrine of the Abbasid Caliphate was one of the motive forces of the *da'wa*. Professor C. Cahen is very cautious in this respect, he says on Khidash and his ideas" being an early partisan would not imply in any way that the Abbasids approved of every thing he did". Professor cahen,²⁹ however, admists that Abu Muslim utilized diverse kind of people who held different ideas but he did not encourage

those ideas. Syncretic doctrines could have come into existence in the milieu of Abu Muslim but, as it seems, after rather than before his death.

At any rate, our sources clearly point to a connection of the Abbasids with extremism,³⁰ and we are inclined to say that a connection between the Abbasids and the extremist sect of the *Rawandiyya* is, therefore, more likely than one with the moderate Mu'tazila.

This is in no way in compatible with the political tribal nature of the Abbasid movement as the Abbasids endeavored to win every possible enemy of the Umayyads.



مرکز تحقیقات کامپیوتر علوم اسلامی

28- Ash'ari, *Moqalat..*, II, p. 451.- Watt, op cit,
54. Al-Bir Nadir, *Falsafat al-Mu'tazila- 2*
, vols. 1950/1951.

29- Cahen, *op-cit*, p. 326-328.

30- Lewis, *The Arabs in history*, London,
1950.-Idem, Abbasids (in the E.1.²).

those Amr was of course prominent. Amr's neutrality is confirmed by Baladhuri's *Ansab*, when he refused to accept an administrative office al-Mansur remarked: "By God, the man (Amr) is busy with what preoccupies him to look for what we have got

شغل والله الرجل بما هو فيه عما نحن فيه

V. On another occasion, when Amr was suspected by al-Mansur to have sworn allegiance to Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zkiyya Amr is said to have replied boldly

والله لو قلدتني الامه اختيار امام ما وجدته
"By God if the Umma gives me the task to chose its Imam I will not find (suitable) one ..."

VI. It is true that the Mu'tazilites played a prominent part in the defence of Islam against its enemies. They challenged the Jahamites as well as the dualists who had become active again in the Abbasid period.²⁵ This policy suits the Abbasids, but, at the same time, Mu'tazilite attitude towards authority was negative.²⁶ During the Umayyad period the Mu'tazila sympathized with *Ahl al-Bayt* ingeneral and not with the Abbasids in particular. Thier connections with Alidswas equal to if not stronger than their connection with the Abbasids before al-Ma'mun.

These Mu'tazilites who were close Alid sympathisers, approved of armed operations against authority when they were likely to be

successful.²⁷ This justifies their participation in Ibrahim's rising in Basra (145 A.H.).

VII. One of the center of the Abbasid propoganda was Kufa, the residence of Abu Salama. It served as avital link between Khurasan the scene of Abbasid subversive activities and Humayma where the Imam resided. Contrary to the traditional Mu'tazilite centre al-Basra, Kufa embraced the revolt even before the arrival of Khurasani troops. Basra was not at all enthusiastic about Abbasid victory. Its Umayyad governor resisted the new regime for many months until he voluntarily left for the Hijaz. In fact, many incidents occured in Basra during the early Abbasid period reflect its hostile or neutral taaitude.

Conclusion :

Scattered information does not enable us to form a clear picture of the religious policy of the early Abbasids. However, we do know that the Abbasids were not Mu'tazilites when they became Caliphs. Al-Mansur, the chief exponent of Abbasid religious policy, was broad-minded. He played with many doctrines without committing himself. The main feature of his policy was to establish "Orthodoxy" based on the Quran and the *Sunna*. He approached several traditionists and won them in great numbers. Meanwhile the Caliph was prepared to leave the extremist *Rawandiyya* sect free to act, but within reasonable limits but when they

25- Baladhuri, *Ansab*, fols, 543-547.

26- See *Kitab al-Intisar* by al-Khayyat (introduction by Neberg). see also the introduction of the *Tabaqat al-Mu'tazila*.- Ibn al-Nadim, *Firhist*, the list of wasils books.- (*Tabaqat al-Mu'tazila*, pp. 44, 46, 47, 54, 55.- *al-Intisar* pp. 17, 22, 30, 40, 155, 171,

104.- It does not seem that the Mu'tazila had a real condidate to the Imamate. Perhaps they sympathiesed at various times with.. one or another bue without identify.

27- Ibn al-Murtada, p. 47.

realized that his suspicion had no foundation. Though certain historians exaggerate the importance of al-Mansur's friendship with Amr b. Ubayd, the later attitude towards the regime can not be described as friendly or even compromising. He upheld Justice and condemned injustice and never participated in the administration. This is hardly the attitude of a Mu'tazilite partisan towards a Mu'tazilite regime. However, the personal affection between Amr b. Ubayd and al-Mansur continued and in the words of Ibn Khalikan al-Mansur grieved by the death of Amr b. Ubayd and he was the first Caliph to recite an elogy to his inferior in status.¹⁹

* * *

Besides scattered accounts found in the sources are clearly incompatible with Nyberg's hypothesis: I- According to Tabari, a number of people in the Caliphate of al-Mahdi were arrested in Madina under the accusation of discussing Qadarism and brought to Baghdad. The very fact that they were arrested by the governor of Madina indicates that Qadarism was considered reprehensive by the Abbasid authorities. Secondly an Abbasid Caliph al-Mahdi, explicitly dissociated himself from the Mu'tazilite idea of free will and denied that his father al-Mansur had anything to do with it. Al-Khatib al-Baghdadi²⁰ adds that though al-Mahdi was accused of being a Qadrite because they (Qadrite prisoners) asked for his protection:

"I have been told by whom I trust that he never spoke of it (Qadar)".

II Al-Kindis account²¹ that 'Ali b. Sulayman the Abbasid was accused of Qadrite tendencies because he freed two Qadrites from prison, also indicates that Abbasid authority persecuted the Qadrites as late as the reign of al-Hadi. Even later, in the reign of al-Rashid, men were executed or threatened with execution because of their ideas on the created Quran.²² All this proves that none of the early Abbasid Caliphs sympathized or even condoned Mu'tazilite or rather Qadrite ideas.

III. The prohibition of *Jadal* by al-Rashid and the imprisonment of *Mu'takallimin*²³ were measures directed against Mu'tazilites as well as other anti-Abbasid sectarian. An example of the same tendency is the cutting off of the hands of the pious Mutakallim Isa b. al-Tabari by Muhammad b. Sulayman.

IV. Al-Baladhuri²⁴ who devotes four pages to Amr's relations with al-Mansur never mentions a doctrinal connection between the two. On the contrary, he gives the impression that the Caliph looked upon Amr b. Ubayd as a religious figure not interested in politics. It was the general policy of the early Abbasids to favour all traditionists even the pro-Alid and pro-Umayyad ones in order to win them over but it is obvious that they must have favoured the neutral, non-partisan traditionists most of all. Among

op. cit, vol 12 p. 166-169. al-Tanukhi, al-Mustajad., p. 189.- see also.

19- Ibn al-Mustada, op. cit, p. 40.- Ibn Khallikan, Wafayat., (Amr b. Ubayd).- Yaqut, Mujam., vol. 4, 479.

20- Tab, III, p. 534, citing Umar b. shabba.

21- Khatib, op. cit, vol. 2, 301.

22- Kindi, Wulat, p. 131.

23- Khatib, op. cit, vol. 7, p. 56.- Ibn Khthini, Bidayam vol. 10, p. 215.- Suyuti, Tarikh ..., p. 188.

24- Ibn al-Murtada. op. cit, pp. 54, 56, 52, 64.

of the support given to Ibrahim "by the followers of Amr b. Ubayd" and not of the Mu'tazila.

The Abbasids showed no sign of Mu'tazilite leanings after their accession to power. It is true that Abu Ja'far (al-Mansur) led, during his formative years,¹² a very active life, and frequented religious circles at the mosques of several cities especially Basra. He made friends among the traditionists and he himself was known for his knowledge of Hadith and theology. According to one account¹³, al-Mansur is said to have expressed some Qadrite views when returning one day from Basra to alsham where his father used to live. When his father Muhammad b. Ali heard that, he rebuked him and forbade him to mention the subject again. If this tradition is authentic, one can hardly assume that the Abbasids ever entertained the idea of adopting Mu'tazilite doctrines as their own, if the originator of the 'Abbasid *da'wa*, Muhammad, felt so strongly on this subject.

Wasil b. Ata the so called founder of the Mu'tazila, was a student of Abu Hasim Abdallah b. Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya¹⁴ According to Ibn al-Murtada, he sent missionaries to several parts of the empire to propagate for Islam and defy heresy. However, their names by no means correspond with

the names of the well-known Abbasid propagandists of Khurasan. As Wasil b. Ata died in 131 A. H. i. e. before the advent of the Abbasids to power, it is only Amr b. Ubayd (d. 144) whose attitude towards the new regime can be subject to examination.

Al-Mansur never considered Amr b. 'Ubayd the head of the MU'tazila movement, but respected him highly due to his personal qualities and friendship of long standing. Amr seems to have had no worldly ambitions, and never capitalized on his old friendship with the Caliph. On the contrary he bluntly refused to participate in the administration at the wish of the Caliph, and merely admonishing him to apply justice.¹⁶

Al-Mansur, in fact, wanted to enlist his services as part of his plan to win over the men of religion for his regime, and not because of a particular politico religious idea. Amr's remarks on the Abbasid conduct of state was rather antagonistic than friendly. He used to give the Caliph hard words of advice. Once Amr called the Abbasid officials thieves and even reproached Abu Ayyub al-Muryani saying: "enough evil is done to a nation if you the conductor of its affairs."¹⁷ At his critical year 145 A.H. the Caliph, however, did suspect Amr of Alid tendencies,¹⁸ but he soon

12- Isfahani, Maqatil, pp. 256-260.

13- Mas'udi, Muruj, vol. VI, p. 207.- Qaziwini, Athar al-Bilad., II, p. 207.

14- Maqrizi, Muntakhab al-tadhkira, Ms. B.N. paris.

15- Ibn al-Murtada, Tabaqat al-Mu'tazila, p. 7.- shahristani, op. cit, p. 34.

16- See for example: Baladhuri, Ansab, Ms. fol. 543-547.- Ibn Qutayba, 'Uyun., vol. 1, 56, 209.-

حين شاهد عمرو بن عبيد رجلا من الشرطة
(ممثل السلطة) يقطع يد سارق علق على ذلك قائلا
(سارق السر يقطعه سارق العلانيه)

Tab, III, 208.- Masudi, Muruj, VI, 207.- al-Khatib, Tarikh Baghdad, 12, p. 166.- Shahristani, op. cit. p. 17.

17- Jahshiyari, al-Wuzara., p. 116.

18- Ibn Qutayba, Uyun al-Akhbar, vol. 1, p. 209.- Ma'arif, p. 93 Dinawari, al-Akhbar al-tiwal, p. 380.-19d, vol. S, p. 85. Khatib,

wan al-Ansari which was said in praise of wasil b. 'Ata' and that the latter has dispatched his missionaries to the borders of china as well as the province of North Africa. Professor Sourdel⁶ says that the verses of Safwan and Wasil's activities would be connected with movements of Alid inspirations, especially if we recall their cordial relations with Abdallah al-Mahd in Madina. It would not be a miss if we may add that Shahrستاني⁷ states that a small number of wasiliyya were to be found in the land of Idris b. Abdallah the Hasanid in Magrib. Professor C. Cahen⁸ is inclined to reject both professor Nyberg and professor Lewis theories and sees in the Abbasid revolution "a more profound will to Islamization and ... The fall of the conception of an Islam tied to the domination of one race." Although there were according to Cahen, extremists in the Abbasid movement, it was not their doctrines that furnished "the motive force of the action" at least not the majority of the revolutionaries.

However, while there is no doubt that the Hashimiyya sect was the nucleus of the Abbasid propoganda in Khurasan where the partisans were first organised into *Naqibs*, chief *Da'is* and *Da'is*, it is not at all certain whether the Mu'tazila were already at the begining of the 2nd centary A.H./8. A.D. organised as well-defined sect. Professor M. Watt⁹ has mentioned that the Mu'tazila did

not coalesce into a clearly difined body until 800 or 850 A.D. The impression derived from the heresiographers is only the result of the attempt at a projection of later Mu'tazilite conceptions to earlier conditions in an effort to distingwish and disassociate their doctrines from that of Jahm b. Safwan.¹⁰ Those termed by heresiographers as "thefounders of Mu'tazila sect" such as Wasil and Amr were in fact only members of a large group of traditionists اصحاب الحديث or Fuqaha'. As Nallino states in his excellent article, their name goes back not be their secession from the *Ahl al-Sunna* or their dismissal from the circle of al-Hasan al-Basri but to the doctrine of *manzila bayna al-manzilatayn* which implies a state of intermediate between belief and unbelief. They claimed that the *Fasik* who committed a great sin was neither Mu'min nor Kafir but in between. The name Mu'tazila impies a neutral political attitude between the conflicting parties rather than secession from *Ahl al-Sunna*.

The name Mu'tazila was, in fact, applied to different groups and figures who kept a loof from the political strife. Though Wasil and Amr are given the appellation "Mu'tazilites" in historical accounts, they must not be regarded as members of a definite sect of Mu'tazila as it existed in later times. Referring in one of his accounts to the rising of Ibrahim al-Hasani in Basra, Isfahani¹¹ speaks

6- Sourdel, Baghdad capital., in *Baghdad, volume special*, 1962.

7- Shahrستاني, *Milal*, p. 31.

8- Cahen, point du Vue Sur., *R.H*, 1963, p. 336.

9- Watt, *op. cit*, p. 54.

10- See Khalidal Asali *Jahm b. Safwan*, Baghdad. 1965. 161 ff.

11- Nallino, sul origin de Nome die Mu'tazilite R.S.O., 1916-18 He supports his point of view by referring to historical texts which show that the term "Mu'tazila" was used to denote those people who did pay homage to Ali, bue were not partisans of Uthman.

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE MU'TAZILITES AND THE ABBASIDS BEFORE AL-MA'MUN

Dr. F. Omar

Once the 'Abbasids had siezed power, they were faced with the necessity of adopting an official doctrine for their regime. It is worth reemphasazing that despite the political nature of the Abbasid revolution and the importance of the tribal confederations in Khurasan, the Abbasid propoganda started with subversive activities organized by a sect or a party called al-Hashimiyya.

Vague, complex and undefined religious policy of the early Abbasids before al-Ma'mun has given rise to speculations. H.S. Nyberge¹ hypothesis is that the Abbasids used the Mu'tazilites as their propogandists in the late Umayyad period, so that Mu'tazilite doctrines became the official doctrine of the Abbasid movement. While H. Gibb² reverses Nyberg's argument maintaining that it was the Mu'tazilites that utilized the Abbasids for their own purposes. He states

"That a close connection between the early Abbasids and the Mu'tazilite wing seem very probably and adds: "(although I am inclined to invert Nyberg's argument, and to ragard the Mu'tazila as prior and independent, and only subsequently associated with the Abbasid Caliphate)". According to professor B. Lewis,³ the Abbasid propagandists were extremists by nature and belonged to the Rawandiyya sect. Professor M. Watt⁴ notices the weakness in Nyberg's hypothesis, but states without committing himself: "They (the Mu'tazila) probably favoured the Abbasid movement when they came to know of it, though it seems unlikely that they were propagandists for the new dynasty, as H. S. Nyberg has maintained, in view of the differences from Abu Muslim". Professor ch. Pellat⁵ expresses difficalty of elucidating a definite information from the verses of Saf-

1- E.1.¹ (Mu'tazila)

2- Gibb, government and Islam ..., *Elaboration De l'Islam*, paris 1961.

3- E.1.² ('Abbasids), (Hashimiyya).

4- Watt, The political attitude ..., J.R.A.S., 1960, p. 54.- Idem, *Islamic survey*, I, pp. 61 ff.

5- ch. pellat, *Le Milieu Basrien* ..., Paris 1953, (Arabic traus.)

immer wieder vor, daß archaische Tontafeln, überwiegend solche der Schriftstufe IIIb, aufwärts in die historischen Schichten gelangt sind. So wurden auch in dieser Gra-

bungssaison frühsumerische Texte im Füllschutt der Häuser geborgen. Daneben gab es einige wenige Fragmente spätbabylonischer Tafeln, deren Bearbeitung noch aussteht.

Abbildungsverzeichnis :

- Fig. 1: Eanna, Wohnhäuser aus dem 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. in den Planquadraten Oa XV 3,4 und Ob XV 3.
- Fig. 2: Eanna, Wohnhäuser aus dem 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. in Oa, b XV 3. Im Vordergrund Reste des sog. "Kellers".
- Fig. 3: Eanna, Wohnhäuser aus dem 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. Wirtschaftsraum in einem fragmentarisch erhaltenen Haus.
- Fig. 4: Eanna, Ob XV 3, sogn. "Keller" mit Treppe.
- Fig. 5: Beispiele von Terrakotten des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.
- Fig. 6: Eanna, Grabung in den Wohnhäusern des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr. Ziegenkopf aus Terrakotta.
- Fig. 7: Eanna, Tempel F der Periode Archaisch IVb. Ausschnitt mit nischengegliederter Wand in Ne XVI 2,3.
- Fig. 8: Eanna, Stratigraphie der archaischen Schichten in Ne XVI 3. Bei den oberen Schichten mit Riemchenmerk handelt es sich um die Perioden IV a, IVb und IVc, die darunter befindlichen großformatigen Ziegel gehören der Periode V an.
- Fig. 9: Figur eines Löwen aus Kalkstein. Fundort: Hajji Mohammed.
- Fig. 10: Eanna, Grundriß der Wohnhäuser aus dem 1. vorchristl. Jahrtausend.
- Fig. 11: Eanna, Tempel F der Schicht Archaisch IVb.

Die zweite Grabungsstelle an der Anu-Zikkurrat konnte aus den oben geschilderten Umständen nicht in dem gewünschten Maße zum Erfolg geführt werden. Um das Feld südlich der Obēd-Tempel für eine spätere Untersuchung vorzubereiten, sind die an jener Stelle verbliebenen Reste der seleukidischen Anu-Zikkurrat freigelegt und aufgenommen worden. Es handelt sich um die untersten Teile der ersten Zikkurratstufe und um Teile des Abfang und Fundamentstreifens.

Während der Grabung sind bei den Grabungsbegehungen vor allem Ergebnisse zu nennen, die die unmittelbare Umgebung Warkas in der Spätzeit der altorientalischen Geschichte betreffen. Es handelt sich um kleinere Ansiedlungen entlang des Shatt an-Nil aus sasanidischer Zeit und um ein großes, geschlossenes Stadtgebiet im Südosten Uruks, das im Verlauf der Kampagne als Sasanidenstadt Uruk identifiziert werden konnte. Es liegt an derjenigen Stelle, wo der von Norden kommende Fluß in mehreren Schleifen nach Osten abbiegt. Die sehr ausgedehnte, aber flache Ruine läßt auf einen nicht allzulangen Okkupationszeitraum schließen, beweist aber gleichzeitig, daß Uruk hier vor den Toren der alten Stadt in sasanidischer Zeit als geschlossenes Ganzes weiterlebte.

Auch im Norden Uruks, zwischen Stadtmauer und Nufaiji entstanden zur Zeit der Sasaniden kleine Siedlungen. Diese Art der offenen Siedlungsweise zieht sich entlang des alten Flußbettes und hat noch in frühislamischer Zeit floriert. In der näheren Umgebung Uruks zeigt sich, daß auf parthischen Ruinen meist sasanidische Relikte zu finden sind.

Dies bedeutet, daß die Kultur um Uruk noch nicht erloschen war, wenngleich möglicherweise gegenüber der Partherzeit zurückgegangen. Unseren im Anfangsstadium befindlichen Untersuchungen zufolge scheint die früheste, unmittelbar auf die Partherzeit folgende Sasanidenära in Uruk selbst zu finden zu sein, während später das Gebiet innerhalb der Stadtmauer völlig ausgespart wird, nachdem das neue, sasanidische Uruk außerhalb gegründet ist⁷.

Unter den Kleinfunden der 32. Kampagne sind neben Keramik und Terrakotten besonders zwei Stücke hervorzuheben: erstens das Fragment eines Kudurru der Isin II-Zeit. Es wurde in sekundärer Lage in einer Stein- und Scherbenauffüllung in Eanna gefunden, die zum ersten Besiedelungshorizont der Wohnhäuser gehört. Der zweite Fund stammt nicht aus Warka selbst, sondern wurde uns von einem Bewohner der Ortschaft Hajji Mohammed übergeben. Es ist eine kleine Rundplastik aus Kalkstein, einen sitzenden Löwen darstellend. Im Rumpf ist die Figur schräg nach oben durchbohrt, so daß im Falle der Aufpflückung eine aufrechte Sitzhaltung entsteht. Nach Aussagen des Mannes aus Hajji Mohammed hat er das Stück am unteren Rand des Euphratsteilufer gefunden, mit anderen Worten in oder an der prähistorischen Siedlung, die in jedem Jahr erneut vom Flußwasser freigelegt und ausgewaschen wird. Dem Fundort nach zu urteilen müßte das Stück also obedzeitlich oder älter sein. (Fig. 9).

Durch die besondere Lage der Wohnhäuser im 1. vorchristlichen Jahrtausend, direkt auf den Mauern des großen Stampflehmgebäudes der frühdynastischen Zeit, kommt es

7) B. Finster-J. Schmidt, a. O.

chaft des Darius zerstört wurde⁵. Hingegen sprechen die Reste der neuassyrisch-neubabylonischen Wohnhäuser dafür, daß die Fortsetzung des Südwestzingels nicht in gradliniger Verlängerung zu suchen ist sondern möglicherweise als einfacher Mauerzug und nicht als Raumtrakt in den bisher noch unausgegrabenen Teilen Eannas, d. h. abgewinkelt und auf irgendeine Weise mit dem nachgewiesenen Flügel in Ne, Oa XIV 2,3 verbunden.

Eine Nebenaufgabe in Eanna bestand darin, die Anschlußbauten des 1965/66 ausgegrabenen Tempels F der Schicht Archaisch IVb zu untersuchen⁶. Tempel F ist ein für die Schicht IVb charakteristischer dreischiffiger Bau vom Uruk-Typ und besitzt einen zweifach gegliederten Kopfbau (Planquadrat Nd, XVI 1,2).

Bei den damaligen Untersuchungen hatte sich gezeigt, daß der äußere der beiden quergelagerten Räume am Kopfteil des Tempels in zwei unverbundene Raumabschnitte (9 und 11) unterteilt ist. Von Kammer 11 aus führt eine Tür nach 12 und von dort nach 13 und in zwei weitere, mit dem Kultbau eng verbundene Räume. (Fig. 11). Die nordwestliche Längsmauer konnte bei der ersten Grabung nur an der Innenseite beobachtet werden, auch die Festlegung des weiteren Mauerverlaufs ist damals unterblieben.

In nachfolgenden Grabungen hatte sich immer wieder gezeigt, daß die dreischiffigen Kultbauten der Periode Archaisch IVb außerordentlich verbreitet gewesen zu sein scheinen und daß sie, die allgemeine Orientierung der Bauten im Heiligen Bezirk einhaltend, meist gegeneinander um 90° gedreht sind.

Dazwischen liegen Freiräume oder Höfe, die im kultischen Geschehen ebenfalls eine bestimmte Funktion erfüllt haben müssen, wie teilweise die in ihnen liegenden Feuerstellen verdeutlichen. Auch bei den jetzt erfolgten Sondagen hat sich dieses Bild im Prinzip bestätigt. Es stellte sich nicht nur heraus, daß die Bauten mit rechtwinklig zueinander stehenden Hauptachsen um Höfe gruppiert sind, sondern daß die architektonische Gestaltung der Höfe mit dem Baukörper aufs engste verbunden ist. Die Begrenzungswände der Höfe bilden fast immer das Pfeiler-Nischen-Motiv der Tempelfassaden auf und bilden mit diesen eine optisch in sich geschlossene, systematisch durchgliederte Einheit. Form- und stilgeschichtlich ergeben sich daraus Konsequenzen, auf die jedoch hier nicht eingegangen werden soll. (Fig. 7).

Die Schicht Uruk IVb bricht schließlich im Planquadrat NcXVI 3 ab, weil hier die Außenmauer des Großen Hofes der Schicht IVa so tief angelegt wurde, daß das IVb-Terrain vollkommen abgegraben ist.

Eine im gleichen Grabungsfeld gelegene Grube, bei der es sich um eine Neubabylonische, tief in die archaischen Schichten reichende Störung handelt, wurde zum Anlaß genommen, die Schichtabfolge durch Ausräumen des Füllschuttes hier bis auf das Niveau Uruk V zu untersuchen. Die Stratigraphie zeigte, daß auch in den älteren archaischen Schichten in erheblicher Entfernung von der Zikkurrat Monumentalarchitektur vorhanden ist, wobei bemerkt werden muß, daß wir bis heute nichts über die Lage des Zentrums des Heiligtums in den früharchaischen Schichten wissen. (Fig. 8).

5) UVB XXIII, 23.

6) UVB XXIII, 30 ff.

behaltung des gleichen städtebaulichen Prinzips und nur geringfügige Veränderungen. Auf bautypologischem Gebiet haben wir fremde Einflüsse und ein leichtes Abweichen von der babylonischen Tradition bemerkt.

Hinsichtlich der Kleinfunde ist die Trennlinie weniger scharf zu ziehen. Im wesentlichen bleiben Keramik- und Terrakottagattungen erhalten. Bei diesen aber handelt es sich in erster Linie um die am Ort verbliebenen Stücke. In der zweiten Periode der Besiedelung finden wir jedoch erstmalig auch andere Formen auf, stilistisch und thematisch von der ersten Gruppe unterschieden. Ausschließlich an diese Periode gebunden und früher nicht bekannt sind verschiedene Typen von Reiterdarstellungen. Außer dem tradierten Material tauchen bei der Keramik neue Formen auf und eine stärkere Verbreitung von Glasuren.

Allem Anschein nach haben wir mit diesem Horizont, der auch topographisch über den Schichten der Neubabylonischen Zeit liegt, die Zeit der Achämenidenherrschaft erfaßt.

Die dritte Phase des Stadtviertels ist im Grabungsabschnitt nur geringfügig zu belegen, da das allgemeine Niveau dieser Schicht weit über dem normalen Terrain Eannas liegt. So konnten wir die dazu gehörigen Hinterlassenschaften nur an den allerhöchsten Stellen als Fußbodenpflasterung o. ä. nachweisen. Eine Ausnahme bildet eine in die älteren Schichten weit hinabgetiefte "Kelleranlage" aus Backsteinen. Auf einer Ziegelschritttreppe gelangt man in diese, bisher noch nicht vollständig ausgegrabene Baulichkeit hinunter. Formal handelt es sich um einen engen Rechteckraum, an dessen Außenseite sich die Treppe lehnt. Gegenüber liegt eine symmetrisch angeordnete, ziemlich breite Tür, die in die weiteren, noch bedeckten

Teile der Anlage führt. Raumform und Lage der Tür verleihen diesem "Keller" etwas Cellaartiges. (Fig. 4)

In Verbindung mit dieser Architektur steht eine Keramikgattung, die mit der der älteren Schichten nichts zu tun hat. In Ton, Ritzmusterverzierung und Gefäßform liegt hier etwas weitgehend Unbekanntes vor, das erst nach eingehender typologischer Einordnung genauer bestimmt werden kann.

Außerhalb im vorliegenden Grabungsabschnitt Eannas ist die hohe Zahl an Bestattungen, die unter den Fußböden der Häuser zu finden waren. Es sind durchweg Doppeltopfgräber, in denen die Toten beigesetzt wurden, und diese Sitte scheint sich durch die ganzen hier infrage kommenden drei Jahrhunderte nicht geändert zu haben. Aber trotz der vielen Gräber auf relativ engem Raum bleibt die allgemeine Frage der Totenbestattung insgesamt gesehen nach wie vor ungelöst, da die auf die einzelnen Wohneinheiten entfallende Zahl der Bestattungen in keinem Verhältnis zur Zahl der Bewohner und vor allem zum Besiedelungszeitraum steht.

Die Grabung in Eanna hat dazu beigetragen, die allgemeine Situation des Heiligen Bezirks im 1. vorchristlichen Jahrtausend weiter zu verdeutlichen, besonders hinsichtlich der Zingelanlagen, die in historischer Zeit um die Zikkurat angelegt worden waren. Von dem neuassyrischen Außenzingel Sargon II., dessen Verlängerung in Oa XV 5 und Ne XV 4 hätte erscheinen können, fand sich wiederum keine Spur. Wir wissen, daß unter Darius das Heiligtum zerstört worden ist. Die Tatsache, daß in den fraglichen Gebieten achämenidische Hausruinen anzutreffen sind, ließe zunächst die Vermutung zu, daß auch hier die Einschließung Eannas unter der Herr-

die nur wenige Wohnräume umfaßten, ganz auf einen zentralen Hof verzichtet zu haben und begnügte sich mit einem unüberdeckten Verschlag.

Zu beobachten ist eine neue, nicht babylonische Hausform, die aufzukommen scheint mit der Besiedelung Eannas in nachbabylonischer Zeit. Wieder handelt es sich prinzipiell um die Hofhausform, doch machen sich im Unterschied zum rein babylonischen Haus im Grundriß Ansatzpunkte bemerkbar, die auf eine andere Tradition und mitunter sogar auf einen anderen Geist schließen lassen. Diese "Neuheiten" bestehen z. B. darin, daß der Grundriß einer spürbar axialen Organisation unterworfen ist und daß es einen betonten, am Hof liegenden Hauptraum des Hauses gibt, der durch das Vorhandensein von zwei symmetrisch sitzenden Türen ausgezeichnet wird, ein Merkmal, für das es keine praktische Erklärung gibt.

Mit den Beobachtungen auf bautypologischem Gebiet sind die neugewonnenen Erkenntnisse bei der stragraphischen Untersuchung verknüpft: abgesehen von vielen, für ein derartiges Wohngebiet stets charakteristischen Veränderungen, Umbauten, Erneuerungen etc. lassen sich im ausgegrabenen Gebiet drei Hauptperioden voneinander trennen.

Die älteste Phase liegt direkt auf den Schichten der fröhdynastischen Zeit, die hier durch das aus früheren Jahren bekannte große Stampflehmgebäude vertreten ist³. Mit Hilfe der Keramik und der Terrakotten läßt sich der erste Abschnitt in der Besiedelung des 1. vorchristlichen Jahrtausends der neuassyrisch-neubabylo-

nischen Zeit zuschreiben. Die Keramik gleicht in Form, Typen und gelegentlich auftretenden Verzierungen ganz demjenigen Material, das bisher aus dieser Epoche vorliegt.

Bei den Kleinfunden sind es fast ausnahmslos Terrakotten, die die Datierung ermöglichen. Auch dabei sind - bis auf ganz geringe Varianten - alle Typen bereits bekannt und aus älteren Grabungen Warkas belegt⁴. Bringt das Material formgeschichtlich nicht wesentlich Neues, so ist doch die überaus große Zahl an Terrakotten bemerkenswert. Da fast jeder Typ, ob Tierfigur oder Menschendarstellung zu hunderten vorkommt, möchte man annehmen, daß sich in dieser Gegend eine Produktionswerkstätte befand. Neben dem quantitativen Vergleich war es aber auch möglich, Qualitätsunterschiede festzustellen, und zwar derart, daß regelrecht von Güteklassen gesprochen werden kann. Ein und derselbe Terrakottatyp, d. h. mehrere aus derselben Form stammende Beispiele, weisen erhebliche Unterschiede in Tonqualität und Oberflächenbehandlung auf. In besonderen Fällen erhält die Figur einen veredelnden Überzug oder sogar eine Glasur. Außerordentlich verbreitet sind Flaschenhalter, nackte Frauen, Mutter mit Kind-Figuren, bärtige Männer mit Emblemen sowie Kamele und Hunde. (Fig. 5, 6).

Auf die neuassyrisch-neubabylonische Ära geht schließlich die Anlage des ganzen Wohnquartiers, d. h. die primäre Aufteilung des Siedlungsverbandes zurück und die erste Bebauungslage mit den babylonischen Merkmalen.

Die zweite Etappe bringt die städtebauliche Fortsetzung des Vorhandenen, d. h. die Bei-

3) zuletzt UVB XXIII, 24 ff.
UVB XXIV, 11 f.

4) Vgl. L. Ziegler, Die Terrakotten von War-

ka, Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka, Bd. 6, 1962.