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Abstract: This paper attempts to answer the exegetical polemic, regarding Uzayr, a figure found in the Qur’an 9:30. The interpretation of this figure is quite diverse and controversial. Generally, Muslim exegeses identify ‘Uzayr as Ezra. While there is a exegete who identifies ‘Uzayr as Eliezer like al-Biqā‘ī. Western sources, including Jewish scholars identified ‘Uzayr more variously, among them there were authors who identified ‘Uzayr as Uziel, and as Azariah, or Idris. By using descriptive analytic method, this literature research attempts to trace the differences of opinion above, through the identification of the figure of ‘Uzayr mentioned in the classical and modern exegesis. The study finds that ‘Uzayr was more inclined towards Ezra in the Jewish tradition, because through the comparison of the historical chronology of Ezra in Jewish literature and the story of ‘Uzayr in the exegeses both have many similarities. In addition, the two names have similar letter structure and also have similar meanings.

1 INTRODUCTION

The Qur’ān often mentions names such as names of known figures in certain traditions. There are figures whose identities are clearly identified, and there are also people whose identities are not clearly known, so that it becomes areas of differences among scholars. One reason for these various opinions is due to the rarity of the figure his or herself found in the Qur’ān or Hadith. This happens to a figure called ‘Uzayr. The Qur’ān only mentions it once, in Qur’ān 9:30 (‘Abd al-Baqi‘, 1364 H).

Hadith also mentions the figure rarely, it even does not explain the identity of ‘Uzayr at all. Among the hadiths which mention the name ‘Uzayr, there is nothing that clearly explains the identity of ‘Uzayr. Hadiths which mention his name is hadiths which are included in the theme of the ‘aqīdah (creed). There is no explanation as to who is ‘Uzayr, and what caused Israelites to respect him so much. These hadiths can be seen in the book Šaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: hadith no. 4581 and 7439 (al-Bukhārī, 1422 H), Šaḥīḥ Muslim: hadith no. 302 (Muslim), and Musnad Ḥamād: hadith no. 20694 (Hamad, 2001).

‘Uzayr’s figure has been extensively studied by many scholars from Jewish and Western scholars. Some Jewish literatures criticize the identification of ‘Uzayr as Ezra. Identification ‘Uzayr as Ezra is not found in the Qur’ān, but found in the work of Quranic interpretation. Some exegetes identify ‘Uzayr as Ezra, stating that ‘Uzayr was ‘Izrā‘ (יְזַרְא) as mentioned by al-Marāghi (al-Marāghi, 1946), Ibn Ṭūsī (Ibn Ṭūsī, 1984), and many others. There is also an exegete who does not mention the name Ezra, but the story of ‘Uzayr which is resemblance to the chronology of the story of Ezra narrated in Jewish literature, as explained by Ibn Kathīr (Ibn Kathīr, 1999). Therefore, it becomes a general view that ‘Uzayr is Ezra. Because the verse speaks of Jews, there are objections and criticisms from some Jewish and Western scholars. Before entering the discussion about these objections, here is a quote from the Qur’ān al-Tawbah verse 30: And the Jews say: Uzair is the son of Allah; and the Christians say: The Messiah is the Son of Allah. These are the words of their mouths. They imitate the saying of those who disbelieved before. May Allah destroy them. How they are turned away! (Shakir Translation, p. 333-334).

This verse states "The Jews say: "Uzayr is the son of Allah", and according to this verse we can mention that there are Jews who have said this. However, some Jewish scholars disprove the statement from the verse, because as adherents of Judaism they also believed in the concept of Monotheism like Islam. Disclaimers regarding this verse are expressed by Abraham Geiger and John Walker in his book.
Rabbi Abraham Geiger argues that the information in this verse has been understood differently and merely misunderstood, and for more details Geiger stated his argument like this:

We find more in the Quran about Ezra, if not about his history, yet about the way in which the Jews regarded him. According to the assertion of Muhammad the Jews held Ezra to be the Son of God. This is certainly a mere misunderstanding which arose from the great esteem in which Ezra was undoubtedly held. This esteem is expressed in the following passage (Sanhedrin 21:2): “Ezra would have been worthy to have made known the law if Moses had not come before him.” Truly Muhammad sought to cast suspicion on the Jews’ faith in the unity of God, and thought he had here found a good opportunity of so doing. (Geiger, 1898).

In addition, John Walker explains that this information is understood differently and falls into an accusation. The following is a quote from the walker statement regarding the verse:

The Jews Say Ezra is the son of God.” The only known occurrence of this statement is to be found here in the Koran. If the idea did not originate in Mohammed’s own mind, it is obviously a slanderous accusation against the Jews, made by enemies, perhaps the Samaritans, who hated Ezra most bitterly because he changed the sacred law and its script (Walker, 1931).

In these quotations, they translated ‘Uzayr as Ezra. Then, is it true that Uzayr is Ezra? Did Prophet Muhammad ever identify ‘Uzayr as Ezra? And from where origins Uzayr identified as Ezra?

Although the verse says the negative side of the Jews, the Qur’anic view does not generalize to Ahl al-Kitāb; from Jews or Christians. Because among of them there are people who still cling to the original teachings brought by the prophet Previously. As mentioned in Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān verses 113-114: [113] They are not all alike. Of the followers of the Book there is an upright party; they recite Allah’s communications in the night time and they adore (Him). [114] They believe in Allah and the last day, and they enjoin what is right and forbid the wrong, and they strive with one another in hastening to good deeds, and those are among the good. (Shakir Translation, p. 112 - 113).

It clearly state that Ahl al-Kitāb, is not as alleged by Geiger and Walker, or others, it actually states that there are Ahl al-Kitāb who really do the right teaching, and even so we cannot deny that there are those who deviate as described in Qur’an 9:30.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Among the Muslim scholars (other than the Mafassir or Exegete) who first discussed ‘Uzayr in their writings were ‘Alī bin Ḥazm al-Zāhirī (d. 456 H / 1064 AD) in al-Faṣḥu Milal wa al-Ahwā’ wa al-Nihāl, Abū Mansur al-Jawāliqi (d. 540 H / 1144 AD) in al-Mu’arrab min al-Kalām al-A’jamī, and al-Samau’al al-Maghribī (d. 572 H / 1180 AD), in Iḥām al-Yahūd.

Based on the references from the work of these authors ‘Uzayr figure is not explained in detail, and in it they only allude to ‘Uzayr in a concise manner. Ibn Ḥazm in al-Faṣḥu Milal wa al-Ahwā’ wa al-Nihāl, which discusses various groups, like religions and sects, and in this book related to Jewish discussion, there is a brief discussion about ‘Uzayr. Whereas al-Jawāliqi in the book al-Mu’arrab min al-Kalām al-A’jamī, discusses the foreign vocabulary found in the al-Qur’ān, one of which includes the name ‘Uzayr. al-Samau’al al-Maghribi in Iḥām al-Yahūd, discusses the criticisms of Jews relating to issues that arise between them.

Whereas among Western scholars discussing ‘Uzayr in their writing, Abraham Geiger in Judaism and Islam, John Walker in Bible Characters in the Koran, Arthur Jeffery in The Foreign Vocabulary of The Qur’an in the letter ‘Ayn: ‘Uzayr, Hava Lazarus-Yafeh in Intertwined Worlds Medieval Islam and Bible Criticism, Mikhail Piotrovsky, in Historical Legends of the Quran: Word and Image, Lisbeth S. Fried, in Ezra and the Law in History and Tradition. The writings of Abraham Geiger, John Walker, and Mikhail Piotrovsky use a similar theme, namely writing Jewish figures found in the Qur’an, these writings discuss the figures accompanied by various criticisms. Then, the writings of Arthur Jeffery lead more to the entry of foreign vocabulary in the Qur’an, this is because he was inspired by the writings of al-Jawāliqi and al-Suyūṭī who had discussed this before, and Hava Lazarus-Yafeh discusses medieval Muslim writings, including the discussion of Uzayr which is discussed in its own Sub-theme. Among the weaknesses of the discussion contained in the books mentioned above, is due to the less detailed explanation of ‘Uzayr.

Then, the author also found writing whose core research was specifically about Ezra, like the book written by Lisbeth S. Fried. In the book Lisbeth discusses Ezra with a fairly extensive discussion, from the discussion of history, the laws brought by Ezra, geographical location, and the issues found in several religions that pertain to Ezra, such as Samaritan, Christian, and Islam.
3 METHOD

Using a descriptive-analytic method, this study discusses the exegetical polemic of 'Uzayr identity found in the works of Qur'anic interpretation in the classical period such as Fātiḥah al-Bayān fī Tāwil al-Qur'ān by Abū Ja'far al-Ṭabarī, and the exegesis of Naẓm al-Durar fī Tanāsib al-Āyāt wa al-Suwár by al-Biqā‘ī, and modern one such as Tafsīr al-Maraghi by Ahmad bin Muṣṭafā al-Maraghi, Tahrîr al-Ma‘nā al-Sadid wa Tanwîr al-‘Aqīl al-Jadid min Tafsīr al-Kitāb al-Majid by Ibn ʿĀshūr al-Ṭūnisī. Another sources were also consulted, i.e. Jewish literature. The secondary relevant sources were also used such as books and journals.

3.1 Exegesis View of ‘Uzayr

Identity 'Uzayr is often not clearly explained in the works of tafsīr, particularly on the narration of the cause ‘Uzayr was called the son of God by the Jews. al-Ṭabarī brings two narrations originally quoted from ibn ʿAbbas and al-Sudd as with a slight different chronology of stories. However, both of these narrations still have several important points in common. Like the disappearance of the Torah on the side of Israelites, ‘Uzayr prayed to God to give the Torah back to the side of Israelites, the Torah was rewritten through ‘Uzayr, and ‘Uzayr called as the son of God by the Jews (al-Ṭabarī, 2000).

The above narrations do mention the two narrations, those points do refer to the story of Ezra mentioned in Jewish literature, one of them rewriting the Torah which used Assyrian language by Ezra, as mentioned in the Talmud in the passage of Sanhedrin 21b (William Davidson Talmud).

Then other exegetes like al-Biqā‘ī, in contrast to al-Ṭabarī who did not identify ‘Uzayr in one particular figure found in Jewish literature, al-Biqā‘ī in his exegesis identified ‘Uzayr with a figure named al-‘Azar/Eliazar (al-Biqā‘ī). al-Biqā‘ī opinions was derived from the opinion of a ex-Jewish Rabbi Sama‘ūl al-Maghribī, who also stated that ‘Uzayr was not Ezra because he thought Ezra was only a Rabbi (al-Maghribī, 1964).

Furthermore, among modern exegeces such as al-Maraghi’s exegesis and Ibn ʿĀshūr’s exegesis. Regarding the explanation of the interpretation of who ‘Uzayr was meant in the verse, both had the same interpretation because both referred Uzayr to the figure of Ezra known in the Jewish tradition, and both also stated that the words of “the Jews” used meant not all Jews said that, but only a part of them. However, both provide different explanations for the general use of the word “Jew”, while the verse goes down only to respond to statements from some of them.

al-Maraghi explained that the general use of the word Jews in the verse has a meaning like the statement in Surah al-Anfal verse 25, which explains to keep oneself from torment that not only afflicts the wrongdoers in particular, and then he likens that it is the same as an epidemic that infects a people caused by filth, which not only attacks dirty people, but clean people are also afflicted by the plague (al-Maraghi, 1946).

Whereas Ibn ʿĀshūr explained the reason for the Qur'ān attributing it to the Jews as a whole, even though only a few of them said it, it was because of their silence against the heretical words that emerged from some of them, even they agreed to let that (Ibn ʿĀshūr, 1984).

3.2 Scholars View over the Figure of ‘Uzayr

In spite of the dominant view which sees ‘Uzayr as Ezra in the discourse of Quranic hermeneutics, some scholars identify him as another figure whom he might also be traced in the source of Jewish literature. Their efforts in identifying ‘Uzayr have several different reasons. One of them is like Cassanova who views ‘Uzayr is one of the fallen Angels named Uziel or Azazel, because the figure is often called the son of God in Jewish literature (Jeffery, 1938; Wassersom, 1995).

Another opinion came from Gordon Newby. He suspected that in pre-Islamic times some Arab Jews equated ‘Uzayr with Enoch. They said that because Enoch was assumed into heaven, stripped of his humanity and transformed into heavenly creature called Metatron. This creature is often regarded as a b’ně ‘elōhîm or son of God in Jewish literature (Newby, 2004).

Furthermore C. C. Torrey assumes that Uzayr is Idris, because he thinks the name Idris is a form of the Arabic name Esdras. While Esdras is the Latin form of the name Ezra. Thus Torrey had assumed that Ezra, Uzayr, and Idris were the same person (Torrey, 1933).

Then, Viviane Comerro assumed that Uzayr was Azaryah, he assumed that there was still confusion from Muslim traditionalists themselves, regarding the difference from the two Hebrew names between Ezra and Azaryah, because the two names came from the same root. Comerro also stated that in the Arab Christian tradition Ezra was called Azra like...
pronunciation in Syriac, while difference between Azra and Azaryah because there was a lowercase letter ‘yod’ in the composition of his words. So he thought it is not possible if Uzayr mentioned in the Qur’an referred to Azaryah figure (Comerro, 2005).

In other side, there are some scholars who assumed that ‘Uzayr appeared because of an error. Like Finkel’s opinion which states there was an error in reading the text, he assumed the reading of the text supposed to be Aziz not ‘Uzayr (Jeffery, 1938). Bellamy also stated that there was a misinformation regarding ‘Uzayr as the son of God, because the mentioned name is not directed at Ezra as found in the Apocrypha 2 Esdras 2: 42-48 (Bellamy, 2001).

Instead it was aimed at a handsome young man whom Ezra had seen in the hills of Zion, and in the Christian tradition the young man was often interpreted as Jesus (The New Oxford Annotated Bible; New Revised Standard Version With The Apocrypha, 2010). Then Bellamy also said that there had been a writing error during the codification process, which supposed to be ‘Azrāhu changed to ‘Uzayrun ibnu (Bellamy, 2001). In addition to Western scholars view, there are other opinions that arise from Muslim scholars. Like the opinion of Dr. Salah ed-Dine Kechrid, he assumed that ‘Uzayr was ‘Uzziyah (Kechrid, 1990). Then the view of ex-Rabbi Sama’u’āl al-Maghribi who assumes ‘Uzayr as Eliazar (al-Maghribi, 1964).

3 DISCUSSION

Having visited several sources regarding the figure of Uzayr, we find that each of them has an argument to prove their opinion. Finkel and Bellamy, who found that there had been an error in writing and reading the text in the Qur’an. This view does not have a strong basis because many of the companions of the Prophet memorized the Qur’an, and the Qur’an has been collected into one Mushaf before the Prophet died (al-Ghifārī, 2010). While the codification effort carried out by ‘Uthman was only to make one qirā’ah (Quranic Recitation Method) in one manuscript. Because the difference qirā’ah spread at that time, caused Muslims to accuse each other of infidelity (al-Ghifārī, 2010).

Then Newby’s opinion assumes ‘Uzayr as Enoch or Metraton, and Torrey assumes that ‘Uzayr as Idris. This argument seems also weak, because ‘Uzayr was called a Jew, whereas Idris or Enoch were not Jews, and they lived long before Jews formed as an ethnic community. Thus the confusion was also directed to Finkel’s assumption of Uziel or Azazel, because based on the story Azazel was an angel who was expelled into earth and became a Devil, which in the Islamic tradition was known as Iblīs.

The same thing also found on Sama’u’āl’s opinion about Eliazar, because Eliazar was living in the time of prophet Ibrahim and also known as his slave. Whereas the prophet Ibrahim was not a Jew, because Jewish term used as an ethnic group name after his grandson period; Ya’qub/Jacob. As for Kechrid’s assumptions about ‘Uzayr as Uzziyā, he just stated it without giving convincing arguments. His opinion might refer to Azaryah, because the name Azaryah appears instead of Uzziyā’s name, which is according to Driscoll opinions probably due to a抄ist’s error (Driscoll, 1911). Comerro’s statement about Azaryah also did not provide a more convincing argument.

Then, when Uzayr was connected to Ezra there seemed to be more compatibility and similarity. By language the name ‘Uzayr is a diminutive form (tağıh) from the word ‘azr (عزر) which one of its meanings is help (Ibn Manzur). Likewise the name Ezra comes from the word ‘azr (عزر) which also has the meaning of help (Jackson, 1909; Smith, 2002; Lee, 1840; Klein, 1987; Tal, 2000). In addition the two names also have a word form that only consists of one word, unlike the names Eliazar and Azaryah which are names derived from two words; El + Azar and Azar + Yah. El and Yah means God. Therefore, the name Eliazar means “God is my helper” and Azaryah means “God has helped.” (McGough, 2006).

Regarding the name, Ibn ‘Ashūr also stated that the name of ‘Uzayr was from the Jews of Medina who called his as Ezra, they called his name in diminutive form and called him so because they liked calling so (Ibn ‘Ashūr, 1984).

The following is a table about the forms of those names:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Origin Word</th>
<th>Meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>عزر</td>
<td>‘Azr</td>
<td>Help, assist, aid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>عزر (‘Uzayr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>צור (Ezra)</td>
<td>צור (‘Azr)</td>
<td>Help, assist, aid, helper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>צור (Ezra)</td>
<td>צר (‘Azr)</td>
<td>Help, assist, aid, helper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>אליאצא (Elazar)</td>
<td>אליאצא (‘Azr)</td>
<td>God is my Helper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>אליאצא (Elazar)</td>
<td>אליאצא (‘Azr)</td>
<td>God is my Helper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>עזריה (‘Azaryah)</td>
<td>עזריה (‘Azr + Yah)</td>
<td>God has helped.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Then, if we look at some derivative names of the name Ezra, there are some names that are indeed close to the name ‘Uzayr in the naming tradition of Jewish names. There are personal names and Jewish surnames that are pronounced close to the pronunciation of the name ‘Uzayr, the name is Ozer or Oyzer, which also has the meaning “helper” and is also referred to as another mention of the name Ezra. (Hanks, 2003).

Seeing the form of the name Ozer with the name ‘Uzayr both have close forms, although there are slight differences in terms of pronunciation, this can also be a clue that maybe the name ‘Uzayr was born among Arab Jews because of the closeness of its form to the name Ozer, which was then intended to call Ezra and the pronunciation changed to ‘Uzayr in the Arabic dialect.

Related to that, al-Tawbah verse 30 which states that ‘Uzayr was a son of God by the Jews, and in that verse in the text clearly uses the name ‘Uzayr and not the name ‘Azrā (عزرا). It might also be to show that the perpetrators who had called Ezra the son of God were Arab Jews, or certain Jewish sects that existed in Arabia.

Although there are some western scholars who doubt the existence of a group of Arab Jews or Jews who think so, but apart from sources of Muslim scholars there are also western scholars who justify the existence of a group of Arab Jews who have regarded Ezra as the son of God. This assumption arises from the views of Mark Lidzbarski and Michael Lodhal, who stated that there might have been a Jewish sect in the time of the prophet Muhammad who had raised Ezra as the son of God. (Sirry, 2014).

This may also be related to Hirschberg's opinion, which states that there was a group of Yemeni Jews who were reluctant to name their children by the name of Ezra, arguing that they believed that Ezra had cursed them with poverty, because they did not want to follow Ezra's invitation to return to Israel. (Fried, 2014). Then the belief in the curse caused excessive cult to Ezra in some of the Arab Jewish sects. This opinion is also in line with Ibn Hazm's opinion about the Ṣaddūqiyah sect in Yemen, which states that ‘Uzayr is the son of God. (Ibn Hazm, 1348 H).

The similarity of the stories contained in Jewish literature and Muslim exegesis literature is also very supportive, although the narrations carried by the exegetes are the stories of Isra’ā Ṭiyyyat (historical narrative allegedly made by Jews or Christians) and in it also contains odd things. Comparing the narrations of Uzayr story in Muslim exegesis literature with Ezra story in the Torah is not exactly the same and accurate, because there are some stories in the narrations of ‘Uzayr that did not occur at the time of Ezra. Like the moral decadence and loss of Torah that occurred in the King Manasseh and King Amon period [Nevi’im; Malachim II. 21: 1 - 3, 19 - 23] (Hebrew-English Tanakh The Jewish Bible, 2009), and Torah found by Hilkiah (Ezra's ancestors) in the period of King Josiah [Nevi’im; Malachim II. 22: 8] (Hebrew-English Tanakh The Jewish Bible, 2009). While the narrations in the exegesis states that all happened in the time of ‘Uzayr. It seems like the oddity is due to the messed up narrations content delivered by narrators.

The following is a table about the sequence of stories contained in the Bible which has a connection with the story of uzayr:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>The Role of Ezra</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King Josiah</td>
<td>Torah Scroll founded</td>
<td>The Torah Scroll found by Hilkiah, and Ezra was not involved at all.</td>
<td>Nevi’im; Malachim II. 22: 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Jehoiakim - King Cyrus</td>
<td>Babylonian captivity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Nevi’im; Malachim II. 25: 8 - 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Cyrus - King Artaxerxes</td>
<td>Returning from the captivity and rebuilding Holy Temple</td>
<td>When the reign of King Artaxerxes, Ezra led the exodus from Babylon to Jerusalem, and he was also ordered to teach the law to the Israelites.</td>
<td>Kethuvim (Ezra. 1: 1 - 8), Kethuvim (Ezra. 7: 1 - 27).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rewriting Torah</td>
<td>Ezra rewrote the Torah using Ashurit and Aramaic.</td>
<td>Talmud (Sanhedrin 21b).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Then, the next link between Ezra and 'Uzayr, which is the location of his grave, Michael R. Fischbach in his writing in a journal about the claims of Jewish community property in Iraq, he mentioned that there was a village in Iraq called al-'Uzayr, and in the south of the city from the village of al-'Uzayr there is the tomb of Ezra which is located close to Basra in Iraq, where the area is inhabited by Shiite Muslims and they also honor the tomb of Ezra. (Fischbach, 2008).

However, regarding the location of Ezra's tomb there are a number of records stating its location in Iraq, and also there are several other records stating that the location is not in Iraq. In the Islamic tradition the tomb of Ezra ('Uzayr) is located on the edge of the Tigris river near Basra, and the tomb is also a pilgrimage site for Jews and Arabs. A similar opinion was also found in the records of an Andalusian poet in the 13th century Judah al-Harizi, who mentioned the location of Ezra's tomb in a village in Basra. And in the 12th century a Jewish traveler, Petahiyah of Regensberg stated that Ezra's tomb was at the boundary of the Babylonian land. (Fried, 2014).

While the opinion stating its location is not located in Iraq emerged from Rabbi Yishaq Elfarra, he noted when the pilgrimage to Jerusalem he saw Cloud appear from the tomb of Ezra in the village of Allepan (Allepo) Taduf (Tadef) Syria. (Fried, 2014). Another opinion arises from the record of Josephus who recorded after the reading of the law read by Ezra, he mentioned that Ezra died and was buried in Jerusalem. (Fried, 2014). Here is a table of opinions that mentions the location of Ezra's tomb.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Source of Opinion</th>
<th>Ezra Tomb Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The Majority of Muslims</td>
<td>al-'Uzayr Village/ a village in the edge Tigris river, Basra - Iraq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Rabi Yishaq Elfarra</td>
<td>Allepo-Tadef, Syria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these records we cannot immediately ascertain the exact location of Ezra's tomb, whether the tomb is in the al-'Uzayr village in Iraq, or located in Syria or located in Jerusalem. But if we connect with its location located in Iraq, in a village called al-'Uzayr as Fischbach has said, it may not necessarily indicate that Ezra was' Uzayr, because it could be that the naming of the village to be al-'Uzayr occurred when the area was under Muslim rule, and because of the location of the village there was the tomb of Ezra which was highly respected by the Jews, so as to honor one of those who were known to be pious among the Jews, and because in the Arab tradition there was a widespread story that 'Uzayr is Ezra, so the village is named the village of al-'Uzayr.

But if it is observed about the location of Ezra's tomb based on these records, in general the location of Ezra's tomb is known to be located in the Basrah region or in Iraq, or maybe people would say that the location is still in the Babylonian region, as Petahiyah said. However, if we look at it from a view that states its location only in Babylon, then Josephus view that states its location is in Jerusalem, with the opinion of R. Yishaq Elfarra stating its location in Syria, can still be classified within the Babylonian region, as Basrah-Iraq also still included in it.

In addition, in the author's view, it is possible that Ezra did indeed live and live in Jerusalem, after the massive Exodus of the Israelites from Babylon to Jerusalem. But Ezra was not always in Jerusalem, given his role as the HaSofer (Scribe) of the kingdom, which enabled him to enter Jerusalem in the interests of the kingdom. So it is not impossible Ezra died and was buried outside the Jerusalem area, and also based on the search of the author of a picture on one website, showing that the tomb of Ezra in the village of al-'Uzayr in Iraq clearly wrote the name Ezra in the text the Hebrew language on the tombstone, beside which there are writings that are partially unreadable. The only part that reads HaSo which is most likely is HaSofer (Scribe), which is the title for Ezra. (Salman, 2008).

As for R. Yishaq Elfarra's statement stating the location of his grave in Allepo-Tadef, according to the author's view it is still quite difficult to prove the truth, and there are only two possibilities that still may be concerning the location of his tomb, namely between Iraq and Jerusalem. Whereas if viewed from the number of opinions, among the opinions that state its location in Iraq and in Jerusalem, based on the data that the authors have most opinions tend to indicate that the location of the tomb is located in Iraq rather than Jerusalem, because the opinion stating the location of the tomb in Jerusalem comes only from Josephus' record.

The fitness between the figure of 'Uzayr and of Ezra does make more sense when comparing them through the form and meaning of word in names,
related histories, as well as the general views of linguist and exegetes. As for identification efforts that gave rise to various opinions about 'Uzayr's identity, it seems that most of these opinions are still presumptive, because there is a desire to respond that the Jews did not consider Ezra as the son of God.

However, it becomes unnecessary when we know that the verse came down because of the statements of only a few Jews of Medina, and the verse came down to respond to the statement. If it is related to Bellamy's statement about the misinformation of the Apocrypha, then the confusion came from the Arab Ahl al-Kitab (People of The Book), because among them there were also those who were illiterate like most Arabs at the time (Quran 2: 78), and perhaps they (Arab Jews) had received information from Christians and then suspect that the intended son of God was Ezra.

Then, regarding the general use of the word “Jew” while only a few of them said so. al-Qurtubi stated that it was similar to the interpretation of “the people said” on Ali ‘Imran: 173, which means that not everyone said so, similarly to the word “the Jews say” at al-Tawbah: 30 (al-Qurtubi, 1964). Thus, this verse does not aim to respond to Jews as a whole, and when we know the context of this verse the translation of ‘Uzayr as Ezra will not be a problem.

4 CONCLUSIONS

In the end, the author argues that the ‘Uzayr figure is more appropriate when identified as Ezra rather than figures, and the statement from the Quran 9: 30 does not apply to accusing all Jews of having said that. Likewise, it is not appropriate for Jews to accuse the prophet Muhammad or Muslims of using this verse without understanding the context. It would be nice as a religious community that we respect and decorate the earth with mutual love even though we embrace different religions, and it is our duty to be together as religious students to clarify existing religious issues.
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