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Abstract
Islam as a doctrine has a unique relationship with culture. The uniqueness was emerging when Islam as a doctrine has to confront a tradition living in a community. This study discusses how the sculptors in Prumpung Magelang negotiate and compromise between the two of opposite entities in the community, that is (1) religious doctrines (sourced from authoritative texts) about the prohibition of crafting the image of living being, and (2) cultural and artistic practices of making living beings as perfect objects of artistic passion. This research attempts to explore and understand the creative reasoning model of some sculptors in the area of Prumpung Magelang when they have to appreciate their artistic passion in sculpture without having to confront the meaning of authoritative texts. Through a reception theory approach, this research concluded that the compromise and negotiation of two opposite entities which often creates polemics in the community can be accommodated in a work of art with objects of living things but still within the corridors and boundaries allowed by the text authority (hadith).
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Introduction
In the Islamic tradition, a doctrine on drawing imagery of objects in the form of living things (both in the form of paintings and sculptures) is affirmly prohibited (Hidayat 2017: 1) or qa'ān (قَانُ) in other words. It means that polemics among scholars toward the prohibition doesn’t exist (Aṣ-Ṣābūnī 1981: 405). Although the prohibition does not have a direct source from the text of al-Qur`an, (it is sourced from the hadith text) but the prohibition to save, collect, and make tamthil (imagery) in the form of living beings has undergone an orthodoxy process so that it becomes a doctrine. Resembling God’s creation and being used as an instrument of shirk (associating God with others) practice are two of reasons why the existence of images and sculptures of the form of living creatures are prohibited in Islam (Flood 2002: 643).

We can randomly refer to some of the literatures in the study of Quranic interpretations as proof that the doctrine of the prohibition of image and sculpture of living things is the “official decision” of the scholars, so that by acclamation the comments were given by the commentators on the verses of the Qur’an relating to tamthil always end in the prohibition (Kuiper 2010: 131). For example when interpreting Q.S. as-Saba’: 13, the verse explains the story of the prophet Sulaiman (Solomon) who was blessed by Allah with an ability (miracles) to conquer the jins, so that it can be mobilized and organized by the prophet Sulaiman to build whatever is desired by the prophet, both in the form of beautiful buildings and sculptures. Textually, this verse gives an impression that all forms of sculpture at the time of the prophet Sulaiman were permitted. But then, if we study to some interpreters on the
verse, it will usually end with a discussion of the prohibition of the statue in the treatise of the Prophet Muhammad (Aṣ-Ṣābūnī 1981: 391-422).

We can take an example, such as an explanation from the Shaykh Aṣ-Ṣābūnī in Tafsīr Akhām, when interpreting Q.S. as-Saba`a: 13. He placed it instead in the chapter discussing the law of statues and image (حكم التماثيل و الصور). In that chapter, Aṣ-Ṣābūnī discusses the propositions which in turn forbid the existence of images and statues (in the form of living things). Then he continued with the discussion about ‘illah (the causal factor) lying behind the forbidden images and statues for Muslims. Because it resembles or equals to the creation of God (المضاهة و المشابهة لخلق الله تعالى), as well as the entry of practices of associating God. The peoples practicing that are those who follow the belief system of paganism, originated from their habits to collect and to admire various images and sculptures (Aṣ-Ṣābūnī 1981: 391-422).

While the discussion about the statues in the time of prophet Sulaiman was relatively neglected, even it was discussed modestly such as in the interpretation of az-Zamakhsyarī which explains that the statues were in the form of angels, prophets and pious people, made of bronze and other expensive materials, and placed in the mosque so that the people at that time who worship at the mosque can imitate their piety and devotion (Az-Zamakhsyarī 1998: 111). Al-Qurṭubi also has a view that is not much different, that during the time of the prophet Sulaiman the existence of statues was permitted. But after the advent of the prophet Muhammad, they were replaced (Al-Qurṭubi 2006: 271). Because, in shari’a as risālah carried out by the prophet Muhammad PBUH, images and sculptures in the form of seemingly living things are officially declared as forbidden objects.

In many canonical books of hadith, we can easily find various forms of prohibitions on practices related to images or statues that resemble sentient beings (table 1). By using the hadith editorial search based on keywords, such as the word تروص and the word صورة, we can trace the hadith texts which prohibit Muslims from loading, collecting or even just storing all kinds of images or sculptures in the form of seemingly living creatures.

Table 1. The search results for the narrative of hadith using keywords صورة and تروص

| KITAB AL AHADITH | HADITH NUMBER |
|------------------|---------------|
| Sahih al-Bukhari  | 2225, 5963, 6109, 7042 |
| Sahih al-Muslim  | 5663 |
| Sahih Ibn Hibban | 5685, 5686, 5848 |
| Sunan Abū Dawud  | 5026, 9765, 9782, 9783, 9784 |
| Sunan Nasa'i      | 14346, 14349, 14352, 14356 |
| Sunan Al-Baihaqi  | 1866, 2162, 2213, 3272, 3383, 3394, 6326, 10556, 15296 |

Source: Maktabah Syumila NU 1.0

From the textual meaning of these traditions (hadith), it is not uncommon for Islam to be categorized as adherents of radical iconoclasm, while some of them correct that Islam is not a follower of iconoclasm but rather aniconism (Komaroff and Allen 1991: 2-4). This categorization is naturally reasonable and is seen as objective by considering that there are so many traces of tradition (sunnah derived from hadith texts). If we only understand them textually, it will give the impression that Islam rejects and prohibits all forms of artwork in the form of seemingly living things, both objects that in the form of paintings and sculptures (Flood 2002: 643).

In the history, Islam apparently has got involved several times in a movement that is identical to the iconoclastic movement or at least the iconopobhia movement. This movement occurred during the reign of the Ummayyad dynasty, such as Abdul Azis bin Marwan (circa 67-70 H/686-689 AD) a Governor in Egypt who was also the brother of the Caliph Abdul Malik ordering the destruction of crosses both made of gold and silver. It continued in 86 AH/705 AD that Asbagh bin Abdul Azis protested strongly against the presence of the virgin Mary and Jesus in a procession of Christian rituals in the Hulwan region. Then there were also orders from
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the Caliph Umar bin Abdul Azis (who ruled from 99-101 H/717-720 AD) to eliminate all kinds of symbols of the cross in public areas by prohibiting the Christian community from showing the cross in their daily lives. And finally, it was Yazid II bin Abdul Malik’s political decision (101-105 H/720-724 AD) to damage various images and statues in the territory of the Banu Ummayyah especially images and statues found in several Christian communities (Flood 2002: 643). Iconoclastic activities still occurred in the following years even though it is incidental, such as an attack by a group of Muslim communities against Christian symbols in the form of images and statues (from 127 H/744 AD to 151 H/718 H).

Therefore, the iconoclastic movement that took place some time ago in Indonesia, although only sporadic-incidental and full of political scent, would find theologically ‘the red thread’ with similar events centuries ago, such as the destruction of the presence of the statue of Kongco Kwan Sing Tee Koen at the Kwan Sing Bio Tuban Temple in East Java, as well as several cases of arson destruction and destruction that occurred in Purwakarta. Unlike the rejection of the statue in Tuban, the burning of several statues in Purwakarta clearly uses religious issues. On a number of occasions, the party responsible for the arson stated that the statue was forbidden, so it had to be destroyed. At the same time, in other parts of the world, some naked iconoclastic actions have also been cruelly displayed by radical Islamic movements (Ma’arif 2010: 147) such as the Taliban who destroyed the ancient Bamiyan Buddhist statue in Afghanistan on 1 March. 2001, then ISIS destroying historic sites and archeological objects in Syria and Iraq from mid-2014 to March 2015 (Wilimantara 2016: 2).

However, the dynamics-dialectic cum compromise between doctrines and religious traditions vis a vis a culture (including art) does not always lead to conflict. In the context of Indonesia, in various regions of the archipelago, the dynamics of dialectics cum compromise brings harmony and gets a valuable culture, which in turn is able to unite between religion, art & culture. If in the past we could be proud of wayang, the architecture of the Jami’ mosque in Kudus, which greatly appreciated Hindu architecture, today we can still find the legacy of that pride from the sculptors in Prumpung Magelang. If in many places and various regions (such as in Purwakarta, as in the example above) the majority of Muslims are still antipathetic to the existence of statues, residents in Prumpung Magelang and its surrounding areas, have their reading models to compromise between their profession as sculpture makers with religious doctrine (Islam) which forbids its adherents from making images, statues and the like. Therefore, even though their profession as sculptors and most of them are Muslims, they can live side by side in harmony with other Muslims without having a polemic about the profession they have been doing for many years.

From the description, this article has an interest in revealing how the sculptor’s creative reasoning models when negotiated and compromised between the doctrines of the prohibition on making a sculpture in Islam vis a vis with their culture/profession as a sculptor?

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Some preliminary research discussing about the theme can be divided into four parts: (1) studies of Prumpung village and surrounding areas; (2) studies related to the prohibition of making images in Islam, both library research that focuses on the search for the true meaning of the text, as well as field research relating to the existence of the statue as well as its sculptor; (3) understanding of iconoclasm both that developed in the Islamic world and in Western-Europe; and (4) study of Islam and the culture of Javanese society.

The study of Prumpung itself actually examines Prumpung as a craft center, especially stone carving with sculpture as a dominant product that can be found in every corner of the Prumpung area. Prumpung is prepared as
a tourist destination because of its strategic location in the Yogyakarta-Borobudur tourism route (Kristiutami 2014), precisely about 3 km before the tourist area of Borobudur temple. However, a study of the culture of the local community is only slightly mentioned, especially about some of ‘kebatinan’s ritual’ which must be performed by a sculptor when making a sculpture object. Among those who discussed this matter was Prasetyo Wahyu when examining the profile of Dulkamit Joyoprono, a leader of the sculpture community in Prumpung (Wahyu 1992). The rest of the research that I found was more interested in studying the model of sculpture, its material and its marketing process as a result of a work of art (Lelono 2013). While the relationship between Islam embraced by the sculpture community, and their professions as sculptors has never been revealed.

In contrast to research that focuses on the search for the intrinsic meaning of the word صورة in the hadith text which is considered to be a source of reference forbidding statues in Muslim tradition, several books of sharia hadis such as the book of fath al-bārī by Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalānī, as well as Ibn Rajab’s works have discussed the meaning of the word in very detail when explaining the purpose of an editorial hadith which contains a prohibition on all forms of the likeness of living beings in the form of images. In the area of interpretation, Aṣ-Ṣābūnī, in his book Rawā‘il Bayān; Tafsīr Ayāt al-Ahkām min al-Qur‘ān, also discusses the meaning of the word صورة as well as an explanation of the Shari’a law. The three books above confirm that the extraction of meaning to the essence of the word صورة has been done for a long time and continuously. Therefore, the exploration of meaning is not the main objective in this study, although in the discussion of certain themes in this study, it will be still needed.

While in the Western scientific tradition, the discussion of the concept of idols (aṣnām in Arabic) which is realized in the form of sculpture can be traced from the research conducted by G.R. Hawting. According to him, in one of his research on the origin of the term “idols” pinned to statues which were used as objects of the Mecca jahiliyyah community, the embedding concept of idols (aṣnām) on the statue was actually not directly sourced from the Qur’an. But it was born from an intra monotheist polemic rather as an affirmation of Islam as a monotheistic religion, a religion that continues Ibrahim’s tawhid teachings. Furthermore, in his research Khalil Athamina (2004), explained the process of changing society around Mecca, from a community that had previously been a monotheist (the Ummah of the Prophet Ibrahim) turned into a follower of polytheism. In his search, there are two things that cause it, namely (1) the interests of the Meccan bourgeoisie in order to maintain its hegemony, both social and economic hegemony; and (2) trade interests that have been fostered between the tribes.

In this context, according to Hodgson (1999), Islam was born and developed in Mecca (and the surrounding area). Therefore according to Hodgson, the rejection of Islam against various forms of living creatures (statues and pictures) is caused by two factors, that is:

The first is relating to moral responsibility. The midle east region at that time was inhabited by so many communities (ethnic groups) that each has a very diverse system of beliefs and models of worship, such as the Hebrew traditions, the Zoroastrians, Isaiah (followers of the teachings of Jesus), Gnostics and Pagan. But among these various beliefs, only the Pagan (Mecca and its surroundings) used the statue/sculpture as a medium of worship in a series of ritual belief systems. Therefore, the rejection of the idolized statue concept, because it is considered to contaminate the belief system and worship, has been raised by communities that exist in the vicinity of Mecca (Hejaz), such as the rejection of both the Jewish and Isaiah communities. In this position, Islam shows its partiality towards the teachings of the previous celestial religion, Islam defines itself as a religion that continues the mission of tawhid religion (samawi) before, Islam also preaches itself as
the closing teachings of all the prophets sent on earth, therefore Islamic mission is a very universal mission. In fact, specifically, Islam, the group is termed the \textit{Millatu Ibrahima Hanifa} (Ibrahim’s right millah), a designation that shows al-Qur’an’s appreciation of a religious community that adheres strictly to the tradition of the \textit{tawhid} of the Prophet Ibrahim, in the midst of hegemony and intimidation of the Pagan community in Mecca.

The second is the populism movement, which is a prophetic mission in which the attention and partiality of the revelations (and the Prophet Muhammad \textit{PBUH}) are in the grass root group, ordinary people, marginalized and oppressed communities, both economically, socially and politically. In the context of early Islam, the statue is a luxurious property and was usually only owned by the elite, so the statue is often seen as a social status identity that is owned by someone, which distinguishes it from slaves, poor, laborers and with most sections of society in Mecca at that time who live under the tradition of the exploitation of the elite of the city of Mecca. And from these two events, understanding iconoclasm subsequently became part of the history of Islamic civilization.

Whereas the only field study that discusses the relationship between sculpture, sculptor and the religion which embraced, especially in Indonesia that the author managed to find, is Khafidhotus Soidah’s research entitled The Sculpture Carver Theology; Understanding the Theology of Sculpture Carvers About the Essence of God in Jatisumber Hamlet, Watesumpak Village, Trowulan District. In this research, she seeks to understand the phenomenon which she thinks is paradoxical, namely a community that normatively includes devout Muslims, but has a profession as a sculptor of stone. In her search, she found that they never considered their activities as sculpture carvers contrary to Islamic doctrine, what they have been doing is no more than an endeavor to fulfill economic needs only. It is a very interesting study, unfortunately this research does not specifically utilize social analysis in exploring the facts behind the phenomenon that is considered paradoxical so as to produce a clear mapping of the relationship between sculpture - sculptor-Islam. This emptiness will be completed in this study using a reception theory approach.

**Conceptual Framework**

This study does not look for the essence of the meaning from the hadith text that forbids Muslims to make statues, but rather it focuses on the response of the sculptors in Prumpung Magelang to the doctrine of the prohibition of making statues, as well as how they realize these responses in their sculpture. Therefore, this research is about the study of living text, a study that seeks to understand the behavior of a community inspired by the text (both al-Qur’an or hadith) by using social theories approach (Ali 2015: 151).

Among the methods of social analysis used in this research is reception theory which is a study that focuses on people’s responses and acceptance of a text, and how they realize these responses in their daily lives. Etymologically, the word reception comes from the Latin language, \textit{recipere} which is interpreted as acceptance or greeting of the reader (Ratna 2015a: 165), or it can also be interpreted as the art of receiving something (an act of receiving something) (Rofiq 2014: 144). While the understanding of reception terminologically is a study of beauty based on the reader’s response to literary works (Pradopo 2007: 7). More broadly, reception is defined as text processing, ways of giving meaning to the text, so that it can respond to the text. The intended response is not done between the work and the real reader, but rather the reader as a historical process, the reader in a certain period known as the synchronic and diachronic model of historical approach (Ratna 2015a: 167).

In Iser’s reception concept, the intended reader is an implied reader, which is an idea (constructed) about the reader institution that is not identified sociologically or historically, it cannot be personified with any of the real readers, because it integrates with the structure
of the text itself (Iser 1987: 34). The "appearance" of the implied reader can be revealed when the structural aspects of the potential meaning of the text merge with the actual (real) reader of the potential meaning through the process of reading (Iser 1987: 34). Wolf Schmid, more operatively, portrays the implicit reader as the intended reader. Implied readers are counterparts of implied authors, in a more technical sense, implied readers are the author's imagination of readers who are fixed (fixed) and objectified in the text through certain signs (Schmid 2013:2-3). The implied reader seems to be a model, in which the real reader, through the medium of the implied reader, can determine his/her attitude in dealing with a particular text (Ratna 2015a: 171).

From the definition of reception theory above, it can be understood that reception is a theory in literary studies that examines the role of the reader in responding, reacting and appreciating a literary work (Fathurosyid 2015: 221). That is why this theory only focuses on the relationship between the text and the reader rather than with the author of the text (author), or in Jauss's language, that the reader is given a wider portion because he is seen as an active object capable of interpreting a literary work (Jauss 2005: 18-20). According to this reception theory, besides reflecting the aesthetic taste of the reader (the reader aesthetic taste), a literary work is a reflection of the readers' historical, social and cultural context (Shajrawi 2013: 2).

This is what Jauss later termed as the horizon of hope (erwartungshorizont). It is the reader's understanding of a literary work that was created from the results of previous "reading experiences" (Ratna 2015a: 109) or the past. Or in other terms, the horizon of hope is a creative-interactive process between the potential meaning contained in the text structure of a literary work with an interpretation system in a society that enjoys the literary work (T, Imran and Abdullah 2012: 146), in which the system of community interpretation is strongly influenced by culture and the structure of society in certain historical periods. The public are connoisseurs of literary works within the same cultural framework as the producers of literary texts. The reading of these communities of texts is probably still the same as text producers. Conversely, if members of the public are in different social positions (in this case it can be called differences in class, gender, age, etc.) from text producers, audiences will have the possibility of interpreting alternative or different texts (Ali 2015: 184-185).

Jauss's horizon paradigm is almost the same orientation as Iser's empty space concept. Through the concept of an implied reader, Iser brings up the idea of empty space, which is a space "provided" by the writer so that the reader can creatively fill it. Therefore, the subject in this study consists of (1) historical readers or also called explicit readers, namely the sculptors in the Prumpung Magelang region, also (2) implied readers, i.e., the reader institution that emerged from the dialectic between the structure of the text and the structure of act.

While the concept of empty space presupposes that the text is very open in nature, where the writer seems to only provide a global framework and invites readers to participate (Ratna 2015a: 171). Reader participation in expressing the meaning of literature is possible because in essence the condition of the literary text is not full (empty space; blank space) which is a place for readers to participate in the communication process. Therefore, the condition of such texts is what makes the text able to appear in various forms of reading (Soeratno 2012: 202). Reader participation to fill in the blank space requires the provision of knowledge that must be possessed by the reader, it can be obtained from previous readings. This is where the concept of Jauss's horizon is in line with Iser's empty space concept.

Another aspect as a key to reception theory is the interaction between literary structure (text) and the recipient (reader). This fact shows that in the study of literature, it should not only focus on the text, but also must pay attention to the actions (actions) of the reader who appears when responding to the literary work (Iser 1987: 20-21).
Therefore, what must be done then is to switch from text as an object to the act of reading as a process. The text that was created by the author and is still a schematic framework does neither (or does not yet) apply nor function before there is an effect for the reader, therefore the structure of the text must be concretized by the reader to give birth to a meaning that functions for him (Shi 2013: 983). For this reason, a literary work has two poles; the artistic pole and the aesthetic pole. The first pole refers to the text created by the author, while the second pole refers to the realization that has been achieved (accomplished) by the reader (Iser 1987: 21).

**Research Method**

This research is a combination of field research as well as library research. Field data needed in this study were obtained by observation, interview and documentation (Arikunto 1993: 117). Through observation and documentation techniques, the researcher has observed in the behaviors and actions of stone carvers in Prumpung Magelang in the reception of hadith which prohibits the making of statues. While interview techniques are used to find out the reasons and answers why they choose to produce certain forms in their stone carving work in order to compromise between the passion of art with Islamic doctrines and traditions about sculpture. It uses a qualitative analysis method. Qualitative understanding itself is research in which data sources are in the form of words and not a series of numbers. They are arranged in an expanded text.

The subjects in this study were all members of the stone carving community in the village of Prumpung Magelang, which consisted of the owner of the studio (skipper) and the carvers (workers). While technique used for sampling respondents is snowball sampling technique i.e., extracting data through in-depth interviews from one respondent to another respondent and so on, to the point that researchers do not find new information anymore (Fathurrosyid 2015: 224). The technique is carried out by determining the key figures first, namely key figures who know much about the history of stone carving in the village of Prumpung following the choice of sculpture that avoids the perfect shape of the living creatures. This phase is then followed by data retrieval on other research subjects, so it is expected that the information and data collected will be total and comprehensive.

In practice, this research only interviewed certain informants who were considered capable of communicating and having enough information needed to this study. So, this research began by interviewing sculptors who were historical actors and pioneers in the emergence of the sculpture industry in Prumpung Magelang, namely Mr. Joyoprono and Mr. Kasrin. Interview material for both of them is emphasized on philosophical aspects related to the existence of sculpture as a work of art and religious views related to the prohibition of making sculptures. Then, the interview was continued to other informants namely the next generation of carvers: Mr. Tari and Mr. Bagong, to complete the technical aspects related to the sculpture carving industry which were not explored during the interviews with Mr. Joyoprono and Mr. Kasrin, especially in the relationship between skippers and workers. While the last informant was Haji Anis Fuadi, a santri who graduated from Pesantren 'Tambak Beras Jombang' and chose to engage in the stone carving industry. Because of his background as a santri, the materials of discussion were related to the compromises between his knowledge of texts that forbids to make the sculptures and his passion as a person who engaged in the stone carving industry.

While the notion of analysis is a post-data collection activity consisting of three channels, namely (1) data reduction, the process of selecting, focusing on simplification, abstracting and transforming "rough" data that arise from written records in the field. The next activity is (2) data presentation, which is a collection of organized information that gives the possibility of drawing conclusions and taking action. While the last
activity is (3) drawing conclusions/verification, is only a part of the activities of one complete configuration. Conclusions and verification do not have to be at the end of the activity, but often the three activities are intertwined at the time before, during and after data collection in parallel to build a general insight called ‘analysis’ (Huberman 1992: 15).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Overview of Geographical Conditions of Prumpung and Its Surrounding Villages

Prumpung is a hamlet on the side of the Jogja-Semarang highway, 11km from the Borobudur temple tourism complex, precisely in Tamanagung Village, Muntilan District, and Magelang Regency, Central of Java (Wahyu 1992: 18). Its strategic location, namely on the main route of Borobudur temple tourism makes Prumpung always traversed by tourists, both domestic and foreign tourists, especially tourists who depart from Yogyakarta. The Prumpung is a term for a hamlet called Sidoarjo, but other sources say that Prumpung covers an area which ranges three hamlets namely Tejowarno, Ngadiretno and Sidoharjo. For the benefit of this research, operationally, ‘the Prumpung’ was positioned as a word that has connotative meaning, an area which is the center of stone sculpture. So, the sculptors who do not inhabit in the Prumpung but they have ‘sanad’ connecting chain from the Prumpung sculpture artist, they have been categorized as the sculptor from ‘Prumpung’.

Compared to other villages, this village is special, because of its position as a center of stone craft as well as a transit destination for both domestic and foreign tourists who want to travel to the Borobudur temple. The tourists who transit will be spoiled by a variety of handicraft products that are very varied, ranging from mortar, trap floor, mortar (stone tools to pound rice), ornaments that are installed as interior or exterior, as well as statues/sculptures, both animal and human statues of various sizes.

In this village, long before it was known as a center for stone statue crafts, around before the 1950s, the majority of the residents of Prumpung hamlet were farming (around 80%), while the rest (20%) were stone carvers, then known as jlogro, not as sculptors/statues, because at that time the results of stone handicraft production was limited to gravestones, umpak (stones designed as wooden bases for houses), cowek (stones for grind spices) and stone trap (square stones which are usually used as a temple court floor). Stone carving to be used as a sculpture/statue began around 1958, with its inaugural sculpture product in the form of a Buddha's head. This statue was bought by antique traders from Jogja, precisely on Malioboro street in front of the Garuda hotel. Starting with the sale of the Buddha head statue, the sculpture industry/statue in Prumpung became increasingly large, both from the number of industrial business actors and from the aspect of production variants. From the number of stone handicraft business actors, no less than 500 stone sculpture workers depend on the economy through this well-known andhesitic craft. Even the stone handicraft industry has grown outside the Pumpung area, almost evenly around the Muntilan sub-district.

In the same time, terms of product variants that are produced also numerous. The list of orders that have been done by Dulkamit Jayaprana alone from 1957-2000 are countless, but of the many results of his work can be divided into three types, namely (1) the form of statues, (2) the miniature form of the temple, and (3) the gate (one of his works is the monument or the border gate between Jogja-Magelang located to the west of the Krasak bridge). In terms of outreach, stone handicraft products in this region have also entered many foreign markets, as well as for souvenirs or for spiritual needs, such as making miniature temples in Thailand, Laos and Vietnam. What is interesting then, in its development, is that the sculptors in the village of Prumpung and its surroundings are generally divided into two; (1) a community of sculptors who carve stones to be used as sculptures with various forms, ranging from animal, human forms
to living creatures that are of a nature imaginative (such as the form of Gupala statue, etc.), while the other group of sculptors (2) is a community of sculptors who carve stones to become craft forms other than living forms.

In this study, however, given the limited time and space to explore in this research, we only limit the study and research to the second group of sculptors; those who choose not to carve stones in the form of sculptures (three-dimensional) living things, but in other forms such as plant forms, or living things, but only two-dimensional shapes.

Hadith about the Prohibition of Images and Statues

In this study, the hadith that will be approached with the reception theory is a hadith about the prohibition of making statues. Among the texts that show the prohibition of painting and (moreover) making statues sourced from the hadith of the Prophet Muhammad, narrated by Imam Bukhari:

حدثنا سعيد قال: سمعت النضر بن أنس بن مالك يقول قتادة: كنت عند أبي عباس ولا يدكر النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم. ثم سأل فقال: سمعت النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول من صور صورة في الدنيا كلف يوم الْقِيَامَةِ أن ينفُخَ فِيهَا الرُّوْحَ وَلَيْسَ بِنَافِخٍ.

Translation:
Sa’id told us, he said: I heard that an-Nadlr bin Anas bin Malik told Qatadah, he said: I was beside Ibn Abbas and they asked him (Ibn Abbas), then he replied: I have heard the Prophet Muhammad said: "Whoever draws a picture (living creature) in the world, then on the Day of Judgment he will be burdened by Allah to blow the spirit inside it (a picture of a living creature), even though he won’t be able to (do it)."

There are other hadiths which have the same theme related to the prohibition of drawing/painting and making something that resembles a living creature numbering in the hundreds, even if you use the keyword صورة alone, then the hadiths that appear numbered in tens (close to one hundred) pieces of Hadith, as it can be seen on table 2:

| KITAB AL-AHADITH | HADITH NUMBER |
|-------------------|---------------|
| 1 Sunan Kubro Li-an-Nasa-i | 257, 2158, 4787, 4794, 4793, 9761, 9762, 9763, 9764, 9765, 9766, 9768, 9769, 9770, 9771, 9772, 9782, 9783, 9784 |
| 2 Al-Mustadrak li al-Hakim | 611, 4092 |
| 3 Sunan Ibn Majjah | 3649, 3651 |
| 4 Sunan Abu Dawud | 227, 4154, 4157, 4158, 4159, 5026 |
| 5 Sunan al-Baihaqi al-Kubra | 920, 1084, 1120, 4044, 9520, 14334, 14339, 14340, 14342, 14346, 14349, 14356, 14360, 14361, 14362 |
| 6 Sunan at-Turmuudy | 1751, 2804, 2805 |
| 7 Sunan ad-Darimy | 2663 |
| 8 Shahih Ibn Hibban | 1205, 5649, 5685, 5686, 5845, 5848, 5849, 5850, 5855, 5856, 5857, 5858 |
| 9 Shahih Ibn Huzaimah | 229 |
| 10 Shahih Muslim | 5633, 5635, 5636, 5637, 5639, 5640, 5647, 5662, 5663 |
| 11 Musnad Ibn al-Ja’d | 2455, 2880 |
| 12 Musnad Abi Ya’la | 313, 506, 563, 626, 1414, 1430, 1440, 2459, 2577, 2589, 4508, 5580, 7093 |
| 13 Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal | 672, 647, 657, 815, 845, 1170, 1172, 1269, 1289, 1866, 2162, 2213, 2508, 2811, 3272, 3383, 3394, 6241, 6326, 9051, 10196, 10556, 14363, 14654, 15149, 16400, 16416, 24607, 25143, 25572 |
| 14 Musnad al-Bazzar | 879, 883, 2589, 3786 |
| 15 Musnad al-Khumaidi | 431, 531 |
| 16 Musnad asy-Syaamiyyin | 149, 1086, 1091 |
| 17 Musnad ath-Thayaalisiy | 961, 110, 1220 |
| 18 Shahih al-Bukhariy | 2225, 3224, 3225, 3226, 3227, 3235, 3232, 3351, 4002, 5958, 5960, 5963, 7042 |

Source: Maktabah Syumila NU 1.0
From the narations of the hadith (table 2), we can divide them into five major themes, namely:

a. The threat of doom on the Day of Judgment against painters and artists (sculptors) who make works in the form of living creatures.

b. Angels do not want to enter a house in which there is a picture (a creature that can live) and a dog.

c. In the case of fathu Mecca, the Messenger of Allah did not want to enter the Kaaba because in it there were still many pictures and statues. Then he ordered Umar’s companions to clean up the images and idols, then he was willing to enter the Kaaba.

d. In Aisha’s house there is a picture curtain (a living creature), then Rasulullah PBUH telling her to cut the curtain to make something else.

e. The order of the Messenger of Allah in the funeral procession of a corpse, to destroy the statue, damage the image and flatten the tomb (grave).

Although each of the five points above has different emphases, it is entirely connected to one another by the main theme, which is the prohibition of the Messenger of Allah towards all kinds of activities related to painting and sculpture when the object is a living creature.

**Iconoclasm in Islam**

In the Islamic tradition, the prohibition of various images of living things (animals and humans) in the form of images and sculptures can be traced through two sources, namely (1) from various narrative texts that chained the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) and (2) from the historical events of Fathu Mecca in August 630 AD, during which the Prophet Muhammad ordered the Companions to destroy all the idols (statues) in the Kaaba and its surroundings, including his assignment some sahabat to sweep every resident's house in Mecca to confiscate every idol, both large and small (King 2016: 268), and then destroyed.

Formally the two sources have different motives for the prohibition; (1) the prohibition of all forms of likeness to living creatures, accompanied by the threat that the artists-sculptors will be held accountable on the Day of Resurrection to turn on the life sculptures that they have made. As long as in the world, if you cannot fulfill it, you will get painful torture. As well as (2) the historical-logical prohibition, that the prohibition was born because of the Apostle’s concern over the existence of a picture or a statue would again plunge people into shirk practice.

Even so, the prohibition of depictions of living things (both 2-dimensional or 3-dimensional) originating from the two sources above has the same goal, namely to avoid oneself that can plunge Muslims into the practice of polytheism in the form of worship idols and its kind. In accordance with the opinion expressed by al-Khatththabi, as quoted from al-‘Asqalani, that in fact torture for the makers of drawings (mushawwir) is very hard, because in the past images were worshiped as a match for Allah. Likewise, looking at pictures (especially statues) is feared to cause defamation because some souls will be attracted by it. Al-Khatththabi, as mentioned by al-‘Asqalani in Fathul Bārī, he explained that the purpose of the picture here is a statue of a living creature that has a soul (Al-Asqalany 2008: 888-889).

In line with al-Khatththabi’s view, Hodgson (Hodgson 2016: 227-228) conclude that Islam’s rejection of various forms of living things (statues and pictures) was caused by two factors, (1) it was associated with a certain moralism, and (2) it was associated with a certain rejection of the exploiting, privileged classes. The first, this factor is relevant to religious deviation in the Middle East and surrounding areas that have made idols as a belief system. The second, pictures and sculptures at that time were symbols of certain social status in the community. Therefore, the rejection of images and sculptures was closely related to the injustice and exploitation that was often executed by the society’s elite against the weak community. So the rejection of images and statues is identical to rejection of all forms of exploitation and injustice committed by the elite community.
The iconoclasm that has emerged in Islam, if we only examine based on the two sources of prohibition above, then we will immediately conclude that this understanding was born from the Islamic tradition. However, if we look at the historical aspects, we will find some interesting phenomena. In an article, G.R.D King explained that the understanding of iconoclasm in Islam has a very strong relationship with the same understanding among Christians (Byzantine Orthodox Christians). In his study, King explained that the evidence of iconoclasticism can be found abundantly, both from Islamic and Byzantine Christian sources (King 1985: 67). But he refused if iconoclasm was considered as a pure understanding born from the Islam, according to him precisely in the Christian tradition, this iconoclasm had very strong roots, more than the iconoclastic movement that had ever existed in Islam. In his opinion, iconoclasm in Islam only appeared to emerge during the Umayyad dynasty, especially when Yazid II was in power, during which during his reign, he often ordered his troops to attack several Church communities in which there were sacred statues (King 1985: 268).

Furthermore, in King's view (compare with Marshal G Hodgson), the rejection (of Muslims) of images (especially statues) of living things is closely related to the basic principles of Muslim theology, i.e., tawhid. That is, the antipathy attitude of Islam to all kinds of depictions and manifestations of living things is not the substance or existence of the image or statue itself, but the role or status held by the pagans against the image or statue, which is considered to be an embodiment of the God they worship (King 1985: 269).

**Sculptor's Reception toward the Doctrine of Images and Statues Prohibition**

In this study, the disclosure of the sculptor's response in Prumpung Magelang to the prohibition doctrine of images and sculptures is done through the application of the concept of blank space, concretization and implicit reader which are the core concepts in Iser’s receptor theory, namely:

**a. Blank Space**

The concept of blank space in the structure of the text prohibiting images (and sculptures) can actually be traced through a number of passages (or rather comments) from the Companions (Shahāba). The concept of blank space in the structure of the hadith text which forbids all forms of images (and sculptures) of living things can be traced through (at least) five themes as reviewed in the previous section.

From this, we can begin to find pieces of clues that lead us to the blankspace zone. To reconstruct the zone, the table 3 was used as a tool:

**Table 3. Tools to describe the area of blank space**

| PROHIBITION | PERMISSIBLE |
|-------------|-------------|
| Drawing a creature that (can) live, whether there is no shadow (2D) or that has a shadow (3D/ sculpture) | Drawing 2-dimensional or 3-dimensional objects in the form of: |
| 1. Makhluq that do not (can) live (animals or humans, but not the whole body ex. Only the head, animal or human, but formed unnaturally like human or animal forms, ex. Leather puppets). | 1. Lifeless creatures such as mountains, plants, moon, stars. |
| 2. live dolls, both human and animal shaped | 2. Live dolls, both human and animal shaped |

This creative reasoning is used by stone carvers in the Prumpung and surrounding areas to fulfill their artistic passion without "confronting" the Islamic religious doctrine they believe in, especially the prohibition on depicting three-dimensional living creatures (making sculptures). In other words, carvers are forbidden to make a statue of a creature that is alive, whether human or animal. Conversely, portrayals other than living creatures, ex. trees, animal heads, human heads, half body of humans, etc. are allowed.

Some of the photos (figures 1-6) are manifestations (concretization) of the creative reasoning:
If we look briefly, from the six results of the production of stone carving, some of which are shaped like animals and humans as carved in Prumpung, but let’s look at the figure 1, figure 2 and figure 6 carefully. The three images are more like pictures of two dimensions but made “arise”. Whereas in figure 5, it is in the form of a statue (three dimensions) but there are irregularities in the form of a human being who wants to be realized in the statue. Next, try to note the head shape of the statue which has a size of half of its body, also with the size of the abdomen that is completely disproportionate to the height. The strangeness of the shape of the statue, as far as the search from the author, is a deliberate concept created by the sculptors there, so as not to enter into the Prophet’s prohibition critiques about depicting living creatures.

The purpose referred to here is an intent that arises from the collective awareness of some of the carvers in Prumpung about the prohibition
of making statues in Islam. On the other hand, the skills and expertise in carving andesite stone are skills that have been handed down from the previous generation in addition to being a means of their daily work. In this phase there is a very intense dialogue between the individual "piety" of the carver vis a vis and the passion of art that has become ingrained. The dialectics between the two aspects that are united in the carver is what in Iser's theory is called the reading process, a creative process that is carried out intensely and for a long time, years and maybe even centuries. It is a process that is absolutely carried out by a community entity, when receiving a sacred text (sacred text), but slowly carried out internal compromises so that harmony between religious texts and the cultural reasoning of the community concerned is realized.

a. Implied Reader

Phenomenologically, the results of the thought of stone carvers in the Prumpung and surrounding areas are "appearances" of the implied reader, a concept of the reader (ideal) imagined by Iser. Indeed, according to Iser, an implied reader is not a real reader, but an idea (constructed) of a reader institution that is not identified sociologically or historically, and cannot be personified with any of the real readers, because it integrates with the structure of the text itself (Iser 1987: 34). However, Iser further stated, that this implicit reading institution can do an "appearance" when aspects of the structure of the potential meaning of the text merge with the actualization of the reader (real) of the potential meaning through the process of reading (Iser 1987: xii). If it is written schematically, the implied reader appearance formula can be written as follows:

\[
\text{Implied reader sightings} = \text{(1) structure of the potential meanings of the text} + \text{(2) reader actualization} + \text{(3) reading process}
\]

(1) The creative reasoning of the sculptors reflected in scattered puzzles summarized in blank space is a potential meaning structure contained in the hadith text about the prohibition of drawing/sculpting living things, while (2) the embodiment of the puzzles in various kinds of andesite stone carvings, which in Iser terms are called concritization phases, are a form of actual (real) reader reading. These two aspects were born as a result of (3) the reading process of the text. When these three aspects fuse in the same momentum, there is a true appearance of the implicit reader institution.

**Conclusion**

Stone sculptors in Prumpung Magelang and its surroundings basically have the ability to accommodate two different entities in their subconscious, namely cultural entities (the ability to carve andesite stones obtained from generation to generation) and religious entities (Islamic religious doctrines especially doctrines about the prohibition of sculpting objects of living creatures); the two entities that are more often now face to face and contrasted than to be aligned to find harmony and harmony. In the case of stone sculptors (non-sculptures) in Prumpung and its surroundings, the struggle between artistic instincts and spiritual emotions in chisers can be examined chronologically through the approach of Wolfgang Iser's receptor theory.

Through reception theories, the religious doctrine which originated from a text utterance about the prohibition of carving a statue of a living creature, leaves empty spaces immediately filled with the passion of the sculptors' passion. In this process we can see that the passion of the sculptors' art can still be streamed to the fullest without having conflict with the basic Islamic doctrine on the prohibition of sculpture carving. If the doctrine is presumed with a winding iron mold, then the passion of art flows through the bends and hollows of the mold without passing the boundaries in the mold. This process does not damage the mold while maintaining the water flowing through the mold. As a result, the concretization of this process is the
birth of a very beautiful living sculptural work. Nevertheless, its existence is not a form of sculpture that is prohibited in Islamic religious doctrine, as examples of sculptures that have been shown.
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