

Abū Ḥammū had a highly cultivated mind and sought the society of scholars and poets; he himself composed a treatise on political ethics. His secretary, intimate friend and historian, was Yahyā b. Ḳhaldūn, who was assassinated in Ramaḍān 780/Dec. 1379, at the instigation of Abū Tāshufīn.

Bibliography: see 'ABD AL-WĀḌIDS.

(A. BEL)

ABU ḤAMZA [see AL-MUKHTĀR B. 'AWF].

ABŪ ḤANĪFA AL-NU'MĀN B. THĀBIT, theologian and religious lawyer, the eponym of the school of the Ḥanafīs [q.v.]. He died in 150/767 at the age of 70, and was therefore born about the year 80/699. His grandfather Zūṭā is said to have been brought as a slave from Kābul to Kūfa, and set free by a member of the Arabian tribe of Taym-Allāh b. Tha'āba; he and his descendants became thus clients (*mawla*) of this tribe, and Abū Ḥanīfa is occasionally called al-Taymī. Very little is known of his life, except that he lived in Kūfa as a manufacturer and merchant of a kind of silk material (*khazz*). It is certain that he attended the lecture meetings of Ḥammād b. Abī Sulaymān (d. 120) who taught religious law in Kūfa, and, perhaps on the occasion of a *ḥadīdī*, those of 'Aṭā' b. Abī Rabāḥ (d. 114 or 115) in Mecca. The long lists, given by his later biographers, of authorities from whom he is supposed to have „heard” traditions, are to be treated with caution. After the death of Ḥammād, Abū Ḥanīfa became the foremost authority on questions of religious law in Kūfa and the main representative of the Kūfian school of law. He collected a great number of private disciples to whom he taught his doctrine, but he was never a *ḥādī*. He died in prison in Baghdad, where he lies buried; a dome was built over his tomb in 459/1066. The quarter around the mausoleum is still called al-A'zamiyya, al-Imām al-A'zam being Abū Ḥanīfa's customary epithet.

The biographical legend will have it that the 'Abbāsīd caliph al-Manṣūr called him to the newly founded capital, wanted to appoint him as a *ḥādī* there, and imprisoned him because of his steady refusal. A variant makes already the Umayyad governor Yazīd b. 'Umar b. Hubayra, under Marwān II, offer him the post of *ḥādī* in Kūfa and flog him in order to make him accept it, but again without success. These and similar stories are meant to explain the end of Abū Ḥanīfa in prison, and the fact, surprising to later generations, that the master should not have been a *ḥādī*. The truth is probably that he compromised himself by unguarded remarks at the time of the rising of the 'Alids al-Nafs al-Zakiyya and his brother Ibrāhīm, in 145, was transported to Baghdād and imprisoned there (al-Ḳhaṭīb al-Baghdādī, xiii, 329).

Abū Ḥanīfa did not himself compose any works on religious law, but discussed his opinions with and dictated them to his disciples. Some of the works of these last are therefore the main sources for Abū Ḥanīfa's doctrine, particularly the *Iḥḥilāṣ Abi Ḥanīfa wa'bn Abi Laylā* and the *al-Radd 'alā Siyar al-Awzā'i* by Abū Yūsuf, and the *al-Hudūdī* and the version of Mālik's *Muwaffa'* by al-Shaybānī. (The formal *isnād* al-Shaybānī—Abū Yūsuf—Abū Ḥanīfa, that occurs in many works of al-Shaybānī, designating as it does merely the general relationship of pupil and master, is of no value in this connection). For the doctrine that Abū Ḥanīfa himself had received from Ḥammād, the main sources are the *al-Āthār* of Abū Yūsuf and the *al-Āthār* of al-Shaybānī. The comparison of Abū Ḥanīfa's successors with his

predecessors enables us to assess his achievement in developing Muhammadan legal thought and doctrine. Abū Ḥanīfa's legal thought is in general much superior to that of his contemporary Ibn Abī Laylā (d. 148), the *ḥādī* of Kūfa in his time. With respect to him and to contemporary legal reasoning in Kūfa in general, Abū Ḥanīfa seems to have played the role of a theoretical systematizer who achieved a considerable progress in technical legal thought. Not being a *ḥādī*, he was less restricted than Ibn Abī Laylā by considerations of practice; at the same time, he was less firmly guided by the administration of justice. Abū Ḥanīfa's doctrine is as a rule systematically consistent. There is so much new, explicit legal thought embodied in it, that an appreciable part of it was found defective and was rejected by his disciples. His legal thought is not only more broadly based and more thoroughly applied than that of his older contemporaries, but technically more highly developed, more circumspect, and more refined. A high degree of reasoning, often somewhat ruthless and unbalanced, with little regard for the practice, is typical of Abū Ḥanīfa's legal thought as a whole. Abū Ḥanīfa used his personal judgment (*ra'y*) and conclusions by analogy (*hiyās*) to the extent customary in the schools of religious law in his time; and as little as the representatives of the other schools, the Medinese for example, was he inclined to abandon the traditional doctrine for the sake of "isolated" traditions from the Prophet, traditions related by single individuals in any one generation, such as began to become current in Islamic religious science during the lifetime of Abū Ḥanīfa, in the first half of the second century A. H. When this last kind of tradition, two generations later, thanks mainly to the work of al-Shāfi'i, had gained official recognition, Abū Ḥanīfa for adventitious reasons was made the scapegoat for the resistance to the "traditions of the Prophet" and, parallel to this, for the exercise of personal judgment in the ancient schools of law, and many sayings shocking to the later taste were attributed to him. Al-Ḳhaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071) made himself the mouth-piece of this hostile tendency. The legal devices (*hiyal*) which Abū Ḥanīfa had developed in the normal course of his technical legal reasoning, were criticized too, but they became later one of his special titles to fame (cf. Schacht, in *Isl.*, 1926, 221 ff.).

As a theologian, too, Abū Ḥanīfa has exercised a considerable influence. He is the eponym of a popular tradition of dogmatic theology that lays particular stress on the ideas of the community of the Muslims, of its unifying principle, the *sunna*, of the majority of the faithful who follow the middle of the road and avoid extremes, and that relies on scriptural rather than on rational proofs. This tradition is represented by the *al-'Ālim wa'l-Muta'allim* (wrongly attributed to Abū Ḥanīfa) and by the *Fikḥ al-Absaṭ*, which both originated in the circle of Abū Ḥanīfa's disciples, and later by the works of Ḥanafī theologians, including the creed of al-Taḥāwī (d. 321/933) and the catechism of Abū 'l-Layṭ al-Samarḳandī (d. 383/993) which has always been very popular in Malaya and Indonesia, in territory which in matters of religious law is solidly Shāfi'i. This dogmatic tradition arose out of the popular background of the theological movement of the Murdji'a [q.v.], to which Abū Ḥanīfa himself belonged. The only authentic document by Abū Ḥanīfa which we possess is, in fact, his letter to 'Uthmān al-Battī, in which he defends his murdji'ite

views in an urbane way. (It was printed, together with the *al-ʿĀlim wa'l-Muta'allim* and the *Fikḥ al-Absaṭ*, in Cairo 1368/1949). Another title that was ascribed to Abū Ḥanīfa is the *Fikḥ al-Akbar*. Wensinck has shown that the so-called *Fikḥ al-Akbar I* alone is relevant. This exists only embedded in a commentary wrongly attributed to al-Māturīdī (printed as no. 1 in *Maḍmūʿat Shurūḥ al-Fikḥ al-Akbar*, Hyderabad 1321). The text itself consists of ten articles of faith outlining the orthodox position as opposed to the *Khāridjīs*, the *Qadarīs*, the *Shīʿites*, and the *Djahmīs* [see these articles]. Propositions directed against the *Murđjīʿa* as well as against the *Muʿtazila* [q.v.] are lacking. This means that the author was a *Murđjīʿite* who lived before the rise of the *Muʿtazila*. All but one of the theses of the *Fikḥ al-Akbar I* occur also in the *Fikḥ al-Absaṭ*, which consists of statements of Abū Ḥanīfa on questions of theology in answer to questions put to him by his disciple Abū Muṭīʿ al-Balkhī (d. 183/799). The contents of the *Fikḥ al-Akbar I* are therefore authentic opinions of Abū Ḥanīfa, though nothing goes to show that he actually composed the short text. But the so-called *Fikḥ al-Akbar II* and the *Waṣīyyat Abi Ḥanīfa* are not by Abū Ḥanīfa. The authenticity of a number of other short texts attributed to Abū Ḥanīfa has not yet been investigated and is at least doubtful; the *Waṣīyya* addressed to his disciple Yūsuf b. *Khālid al-Sumṭī al-Baṣrī* represents Iranian courtiers' ethics and cannot be imagined as a work of a specialist in Islamic religious law.

The later enemies of Abū Ḥanīfa, in order to discredit him, taxed him not only with extravagant opinions derived from the principles of the *Murđjīʿa*, but with all kinds of heretical doctrines that he could not possibly have held. For example, they ascribed to him the doctrine that hell was not eternal—a doctrine of the *Djahmīs*, against whom Abū Ḥanīfa ranged himself explicitly in the *Fikḥ al-Akbar*, or the opinion that it was lawful to revolt against a government—a doctrine which goes straight against Abū Ḥanīfa's own tenets as expressed in the *al-ʿĀlim wa'l-Muta'allim*; he even was called a *Murđjīʿite* who believed in the sword, a *contradictio in adjecto*. (This is perhaps deduced from his attitude at the time of the revolt of al-Nafs al-Zakiyya).

Among his descendants, his son Ḥammād and his grandson Ismāʿīl, *kāfī* in *Baṣra* and in *Raḥka* (d. 212/827), distinguished themselves in religious law. Among his more important pupils were: Zufar b. al-Hudhayl (d. 158/775); Dāwūd al-Tāʾī (d. 165/781-2); Abū Yūsuf [q.v.]; Abū Muṭīʿ al-Balkhī (see above); Al-Shaybānī [q.v.]; Asad b. ʿAmr (d. 190/806); Ḥasan b. Ziyād al-Luʾluʾī (d. 204/819-20). Among the traditionists, ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mubārak (d. 181/797) esteemed him highly.

Under the growing pressure of traditions his followers, starting with Yūsuf, the son of Abū Yūsuf, collected the traditions from the Prophet that Abū Ḥanīfa had used in his legal reasoning. With the growth of spurious information, typical of a certain aspect of Muhammadan law, the number of these traditions grew, too, until Abu 'l-Muʿaẓẓad Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd al-Khārizmī (d. 655/1257) collected fifteen different versions into one work (*Diāmiʿ Masānīd Abi Ḥanīfa*, Hyderabad 1332). We are still able to distinguish and to compare the several versions, but none of them is an authentic work of Abū Ḥanīfa.

Bibliography: *Ashʿarī*, *Maḥalāt*, 138 f.; *Fihrist*, 201; al-Khaṭīb al-Baḥdādī, *Taʾrīkh Baḥdād*,

xiii, 323-454; Abu 'l-Muʿaẓẓad al-Muwaffaq b. Aḥmad al-Makkī, and Muḥ. b. Muḥ. al-Kardārī, *Manāḥib al-Imām al-Aʿẓam*, Hyderabad 1321; Ibn Khallikān, no. 736 (tr. de Slane, iii, 555 ff.); Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat al-Huffāẓ*, i, 158 ff.; Ahmad Amīn, *Duḥa 'l-Islām*, ii, 176 ff.; Muḥammad Abū Zahra, *Abū Ḥanīfa*, 2nd ed., Cairo 1947; I. Goldziher, *Zāhiriten*, 3, 12 ff.; A. J. Wensinck, *Muslim Creed*, index; H. S. Šibay, in *IA*, iv, 20 ff.; J. Schacht, *Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, index; Brockelmann, I, 176 f.; S, I, 284 ff. (contains several mistakes). (J. SCHACHT)

ABŪ ḤANĪFA AL-DĪNAWARĪ [see AL-DĪNAWARĪ].

ABU 'L-ḤASAN ʿALĪ, tenth ruler of the dynasty of the Marinids of Fez, was 34 years old when, in 731/1331, he succeeded his father, Abū Saʿīd ʿUṭmān. Of a strong constitution, he seems also to have possessed the energy and the wide outlook of a great prince. Numerous public buildings show his piety and his magnificence. His reign saw not only the zenith of the dynasty and its greatest territorial expansion, but also the beginning of its decline. In Spain, he took Gibraltar from the Christians (1333), but after a success at sea, he suffered a disastrous defeat at the Rio Salado, near Tarifa, which put an end to the holy war for the Marinids (1340). In Barbary, he took up again the expansionist policy of the great Almohades; he besieged Tlemcen, rebuilt the town-camp of al-Manšūra and, after three years, at last took the capital of the ʿAbd al-Wādids. In conquered Tlemcen, he received the congratulations of the Mamlūk sultan of Egypt and of the king of the Sudan. In support of his ally, the Hafṣid of Tunis, he marched on Ifrikiya; but, after a period of success, he was crushingly defeated near al-Qayrawān (Kairouan) by a coalition of the nomad Arabs (1348). He left Tunis by sea, his fleet sank; he managed to disembark at Algiers and tried to recover his kingdom, which his son Abū ʿInān had seized. He died in 752/1352. Abū ʿInān had him buried at Chella (*Shālla* [q.v.]).

Bibliography: Ibn Khaldūn, *Hist. des Berbères*, ed. de Slane, ii, 373-426; transl. iv, 211-92; Ibn al-Aḥmar, *Rawḍat al-nisrin*, ed. and transl. Bouali and G. Marçais, 20-2, 75-9; Ibn Marzūq, *Musnad*, ed. and transl. E. Lévi-Provençal, in *Hesp.*, 1925, 1-81; H. Terrasse, *Hist. du Maroc*, ii, 51-62; G. Marçais, *Les Arabes en Berbérie du XI^e au XIV^e siècle, passim*; H. Basset and E. Lévi-Provençal, *Chella*, extract from *Hesp.*, 1922.

(G. MARÇAIS)

ABŪ ḤĀSHIM ʿABD ALLĀH, *Shīʿite* leader, son of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya, whom he succeeded as head of the smaller branch of the *shīʿa* [see KAYSĀNIYYA]. The only information we have about him concerns his death and his testament in favour of the ʿAbbāsids. Old historical and heresiographical sources relate that Abū Ḥāshim went, with a group of *Shīʿites*, to the court of Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik, who, afraid of his intelligence and authority, had him poisoned during his return journey. Feeling his approaching death, Abū Ḥāshim made a detour to Ḥumayma, not far from the residence of the ʿAbbāsids, where he died after bequeathing his rights to the Imamate to Muḥammad b. ʿAlī [q.v.]. This tradition has been generally taken as an invention of the philo-ʿAbbāsīd party. Nevertheless, stripped of incongruities and superstructures, it may well contain a kernel of truth, especially as, in effect, immediately after the death of Abū