

For the repercussions of the weakness of *hamza* on the morphological system see J. Cantineau, *Cours*, 81-2, or *Traité*, § 22. The dissimilation \*ʾarʾā > ʾarā "I see" may be noted. Dissimilation may also have been at work in ʾasʾalu > ʾasalu "I ask"; *saʾala* and its unaccomplished may have undergone various influences (see *ibid.*, § 22 b and d).

For the treatment of the pause on *hamza* see J. Cantineau, *loc. cit.*, 80-1 or *Traité*, § 21.

The action of the Arab grammarians in the question of *hamza* may be summed up as follows: adhering to the tradition of the Tamīm, their efforts at standardization were a reaction against the pronunciation of the Ḥijāz. As possible, but not obligatory, *ibdāl* they accepted only *iʾa* > *iya* and *uʾa* > *uwa*; as possible, but not obligatory *hadhf* they accepted cases like *raʾs* > *rās*, *dhīʾb* > *dhīb*, *muʾmin* > *mūmin*. In the meeting of two *hamzas*, apart from cases like ʾaʾ > ʾā given above, they set up as standard the weakening (*hamza bayna bayna*) of one of the two *hamzas*. But one thing remained outside the scope of their attack: the diversity in writing *hamza*.

Orthography of *hamza*. The very first rudimentary attempts to put the Kurʾān into writing were made according to the local pronunciation of the Ḥijāz, which subjected *hamza* to all the *takhfif* already described. The Kurʾānic orthography however was surrounded with a holy reverence which forbade any change in the traditional ductus of the words. When the Muslim community and its leaders wished to fill in the inadequacies of this orthography and pass from *scriptio defectiva* to *scriptio plena* (see R. Blachère, *Introduction*, 4, 71, 78-98) they had to give a sign to *hamza*, properly pronounced, in contrast to the usage of the Ḥijāz. They used a point, but of a colour different from that of the vowel points. The system lasted a long time; "it was still the current usage in the 5th/11th century at the time of al-Dānī" (*ibid.* 97). The current sign appears to use a little ʾayn instead of the point. Placed over *alif*, the complementary sign indicated for *alif* the glottal occlusive pronunciation (*hamza*). When, by *ibdāl*, this glottal occlusive had become *w* or *y*, entailing *wāw* or *yāʾ* in the ductus of the word, the sign of *hamza* was placed above them; this is the origin of *wāw* and *yāʾ* as *kursi* of *hamza*. When nothing remained in the spelling to recall the glottal occlusive, the *hamza* was put back in the empty space, so to say, that is, without *kursi*. These are, schematically, the principal lines of the story of writing *hamza*. It was conditioned by the anxiety to preserve the glottal occlusive *hamza* in an unalterable text which had not made provision for it. But there remain obscurities in the orthography of verbs with *hamza* as 2nd radical, in the accomplished of the forms *faʿila*, *faʿula*, *fuʿila*. See *Traité*, § 16; on the writing of *hamza*, al-Zaǧǧādī, *al-Dījumal*, 277-80; on the usage of the Cairo Vulgate, R. Blachère, *Introduction*, 151-2.

Difficult cases. According to Ibn al-Sikkīt (C. Rabin, *Anc. West-As.*, § 14 s), *hamza* sometimes develops into *h* among the Tayyī, e.g., *hin* for ʾin "if". "But it is difficult to say whether we can speak here of a sound change", adds C. Rabin. For ʾa as interrogative particle, Wright (*Ar. Gr.*, i, 282 C) quotes the ancient dialect forms *hamā* (= *ha* + *mā*) for ʾamā (= ʾa + *mā*) and *hadhā-lladhī* for ʾadhā-lladhī "Is this he who?" Is there development from *hamza* to *h*? G. Garbini, *Sull'alternanza h-ʾ in semitico* (in *AUON*, sezione linguistica, i (1959), 47-52) on every occasion when he acknowledges an alternation *h-ʾ*, considers that the *h* must be regarded as primitive and the *hamza* as secondary, thus:

*h* > ʾ, in accordance with the general tendency of "the laryngeals and the pharyngeals" to weaken.—Matters are not so simple as that. But one point at least may be observed: *hamza* as a demonstrative element appears in Arabic with the three vocalic states (as does an independent base): ʾa, ʾā, ʾay, employed as vocative particles.

Modern dialects. J. Cantineau (*Cours*, 84-5) has set out the situation of *hamza* in the modern dialects: in eastern dialects, where "hamza, though weakened, has remained a phoneme in the phonological sense of the word" (84); and in Maghrib dialects where "hamza is no longer a phoneme and has almost entirely disappeared" (*ibid.*). Reference should be made to him.

*Bibliography*: In the text *Traité* refers to H. Fleisch, *Traité de philologie arabe*, i, Beirut, 1961. The publications of J. Cantineau, *Cours de phonétique arabe*, *Esquisse d'une phonologie de l'arabe classique*, *Consonantisme du sémitique*, are quoted respectively as *Cours*, *Esquisse*, *Consonantisme*, with reference to the Jean Cantineau memorial volume *Études de linguistique arabe*. The article *hamza* in *al-Muʿdjam al-kabīr*, i, 1-32 (i.e. 1956, *Maǧmaʿ al-luġha al-ʿarabiyya*) gives an account of the whole Arab viewpoint, but wit. out references, or with vague references only. The exclusion of *hamza* from the number of the *ḥ-rūf*, attributed to Abu ʾl-ʾAbbās al-Mubarrad b. ʾ4 MSS of the *Sirr šināʿa* of Ibn Dīnnī (see he edition, i, 46), is attributed in this *Muʿdjam* (p. 1) to Abu ʾl-ʾAbbās Thaʿlab. The art. *hamza* in *LA* (i, 10-4/i, 17-22) gives the names of all the *hamzas* distinguished by the Arabs, *takhfif* and the treatment of the *ḥiraʾāt*. For the *ḥaṭaʾ* al-ʾawwām, the mistakes of the ordinary people over *hamza*, see Ibn ʾKutayba, *Adab al-kātib*, ed. Grünert, 392-400 (repeated in the *Mushir* by al-Suyūṭī, i, 311-3). The *Cours* of J. Cantineau or H. Fleisch, *Traité*, give further precise useful references; otherwise see under ḤURUF AL-ḤIḌĪĀʾ. For a general discussion of the phonetics of Arabic see MAḤḤARIDJ AL-ḤURUF. For the use of *hamza* as *mater lectionis* for the *iǧfāt* of Persian, see IDĀFA, ii. (H. FLEISCH)

**HAMZA B. ʿABD ALLĀH** [see ḤAMZA B. ʿABD AL-MUṬṬALIB].

**HAMZA B. ʿABD AL-MUṬṬALIB**, the paternal uncle of the Prophet, was the son of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib and Ḥāla bint Wuhayb. He played a part in negotiating with *Khwaylīd* b. Asad, the father of *Khadiǧa*, for the Prophet's marriage, and on his conversion became one of the bravest champions of Islam, although he had previously been an opponent of the new religion. He defended the Prophet against the insults of Abū *Djahl*, took part in the action against the Jewish *Kaynuḳāʾ* clan, and led an expedition to the sea coast at al-ʾIṣ with thirty of the *Muhāǧǧirūn*. On the way they encountered the followers of Abū *Djahl* but there was no fighting, thanks to the intervention of *Maǧdī* b. ʿAmr al-*Djuḥanī*. *Ḥamza* fought with great courage at *Badr* (2/624), distinguishing himself in single combat with many polytheists, but in the following year he was slain fighting heroically at *Uḥud* by the Abyssinian slave *Waḥṣhī* who thereby gained his manumission. After he fell, his body was barbarously mutilated by *Hind* bint ʿUṭba who chewed his liver. This was evidently a survival of prehistoric animism.

*Bibliography*: Ibn *Hišām*, 69, 120, 184, 232, 322, 344, 419, 433, 442, 485, 516, 563, 567, 584, 607;

Ibn Sa'd, iii/1, 3-11; Ibn Ḥaǧǧar, *Iṣāba* (Cairo edition), i, 353-4; H. Lammens, *L'âge de Mahomet et la chronologie de la Sira*, in *JA*, 1911/1, 209-50; Sprenger, *Das Leben des Moḥammad*, ii, 69, 81, 88; iii, 108, 120, 172, 180; H. Lammens, *Faṭima et les filles de Mahomet*, 23, 25, 30, 45, 46, 138; Ibn Kays al-Ruḳayyāt, *Diwān* (ed. Rhodokanakis), no. xxxix, 20; *Aghānī*, iv, 25; xiv, 15, 22; xix, 81-82.

Like so many heroes, Ḥamza passed into the world of legend after his death and became the central figure of a popular romance to whom were attributed all manner of fantastic adventures. These took place in lands which the real Ḥamza never visited—Ceylon, China, Central Asia and Rūm. The explanation suggested by Bahār (*Sabḥ-shināsī*, i, 284-5) is that the source was a work, no longer extant, entitled *Kiṣṣa-i maghāzī-i Ḥamza* which is mentioned in the *Ta'riḫ-i Sistān*. This deals with the exploits of a Persian *Khārīdī* leader, Ḥamza b. 'Abd Allāh, who led an insurrectionary movement against Hārūn al-Raṣhīd and his successors. According to the *Ta'riḫ-i Sistān*, Ḥamza undertook expeditions to Sind, Hind and Sarandīb (i.e., India and Ceylon). His boldness appealed to the Persian imagination long after the *Khārīdī* movement had died down and, by identification with the Prophet's uncle, he became an orthodox Muslim hero in popular literature, acceptable to all.

Before passing to the Romance of Amīr Ḥamza, it is necessary to discuss the career of Ḥamza b. 'Abd Allāh very briefly. His name is given in the *Zayn al-akhbār* of Gardīzī as Ḥamza b. Aḏḥarak, which is spelt in the Arabic sources as Adrak or Atrak. Ṭabarī gives only a brief outline of his life but a more detailed account occurs in the Persian sources. He was a native of Sistān and the son of a *dihkān*, tracing his genealogy to Zav, the son of Tahmāsb. Since one of the Caliph's agents had made insulting remarks about his lineage, he rebelled. Ṭabarī and Ibn al-Aṭhīr (whom Gardīzī follows) state that this took place in 179/795-6. In the *Ta'riḫ-i Bayḥak*, however, the date is given as 181/797-8, which is accepted by Mme Pigulevskaya. Ḥamza successfully defied al-Raṣhīd and prevented the men of Sistān from paying the *kharaḏjī*. Against his growing power, 'Alī b. 'Isā, the governor of Khurāsān, asked for help from the Caliph who came in person to Sistān in 192/807-8. Although the latter gave him a written promise of safe-conduct, Ḥamza refused to accept it and determined on further resistance. After the death of al-Raṣhīd, he led expeditions to Sind and Hind and died in 213/828-9. Gardīzī says, on the other hand, that he was killed in battle in 210/825-6.

In favour of Ḥamza the *Khārīdī*, it can be said that he was certainly a patriot and champion of local rights but the good in him was outweighed by the ruthlessness and cruelty he displayed to gain his ends. *Shahraṣṭānī* (96) mentions the religious views of his associates, the Ḥamziyya. These held rigid views on predestination—that even the children of their adversaries and of polytheists were destined for hell-fire. He also states that Ḥamza was one of the companions of al-Ḥuṣayn b. al-Ruḳād who rebelled in Sijīstān. "Khalaf the *Khārīdī* opposed him in the doctrine of predestination and on the category of persons worthy to hold power, and so they separated. Ḥamza held it lawful that there could be two Imāms at the same time as long as there was general theological agreement and the enemy were not subdued" (*Baghdādī*, *Fark*, 76-80).

There is every indication that the Romance of Amīr Ḥamza (called variously *Dāstān-i Amīr Ḥamza*, *Ḥamza-nāma*, *Kiṣṣa-i Amīr Ḥamza*, *Asmār-i Ḥamza* or *Rumūs-i Ḥamza*) was of Persian origin. The action centres round the Sāsānian court at Ctesiphon, and Van Ronkel draws an interesting parallel between events in the Romance of Ḥamza and the adventures of Rustam in the *Shāh-nāma*. Earlier and simpler recensions reveal some traces of archaic phraseology which might easily be as early as the 5th/11th century. It is significant also that none of the Arabic sources makes any reference to the existence of a Romance before the 7th/13th century. At that time Ibn Taymiyya refers to stories current among the Turcomans of Syria about the mighty feats of Ḥamza (*Minḥādī al-sunna*, Būlāḳ 1322, iv, 12). In the Persian version the number of sections varies between 69 and 82. At least three different recensions can be recognized from the numerous lithographed editions and manuscripts (see *BSOAS*, xxii/3 (1959), 473-4). One of these was the archetype of all subsequent versions in various languages. The Romance was ascribed to Djalāl-i Balkhī, but in a manuscript at Dresden the author's name appears as Shāh Nāsir al-Dīn Muḥammad Abu 'l-Ma'ālī. An anonymous poetical version entitled *Shāhib-kirān-nāma* is mentioned by Dr. Safā (*Ḥamāsa-sarā'i dar Irān*, 379). It is in 62 sections and was composed in 1073/1662-3.

There is a considerable difference between the Arabic *Sīrat Ḥamza* and the Persian Romance. In its most complete form the Arabic version is in ten parts, and many new names and episodes appear. The hero is not the well-known uncle of the Prophet as in the Persian version, but is an entirely different person who is, however, some relative of the Prophet. Copies of the Arabic version at Gotha and Paris are ascribed to Ahmad b. Muḥammad Abu 'l-Ma'ālī al-Kūfī al-Bahlawān who may be the same as the author of *Sayf b. Dhī Yazan*. To complicate further the vexed question of authorship, a copy of the Arabic version in the Ambrosiana Library at Milan is said to be by Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad al-Dahhān.

From Persia the Romance of Ḥamza spread to India and achieved great popularity at the Mughal court. The story was much embroidered at this period and it became a favourite subject for the miniature-painter. An Urdū translation was made which, according to Garcin de Tassy, was written by a certain Aṣḥk. The latter mentions a version in fourteen volumes prepared for Maḥmūd of Ghaznī—a statement of dubious authenticity. In the majority of Urdū versions the story has been divided into nineteen *daftars*, each of which has a title of its own. A partial English translation from the Urdū was published at Calcutta by Shaykh Saḏīdīād Ḥusayn in 1892. Translations were also made into Bengali and Tamil.

According to Köprülü, the Ḥamza cycle became very popular among the Turks. Ewliyā Çelebi mentions a series of miniatures depicting the combats of Ḥamza with well-known champions and demons. The earliest Ottoman version was made by Ḥamzawī (d. 815/1412-3) in twenty-four volumes. It was in prose, freely interspersed with verses. Copies of Turkish versions are to be found in Vienna (Flügel, ii, 29-30), in Paris (Blochet AF 352: S 632, 647-9, 654, 656), and in Milan (Ambrosiana, no. 226, 330). In the 10th/16th century, Āḫūremīrizāde Hāshimī wrote, in the popular language of the story-tellers, a poem *Berk-i pulād-dil* on the exploits of the son of Ḥamza, which is mentioned by 'Aṣḥk Çelebi.

Among the adaptations and imitations of the Romance in other languages, the Georgian romance cycle entitled *Amiran-Darejaniani* is important as one of the first made from the Persian. It is attributed to Mose Khoneli who is said to have lived in the 12th century. A full Georgian translation, however, was not made until the 19th century (Bodleian Library Ms. Wardrop c. 3). Other versions were made in Malay (*Hikāyet Amir Ḥamza*), and Javanese (*Menak*) from which the Balinese and Sundanese translations originated.

**Bibliography:** 1. On Ḥamza b. ʿAbd Allāh see Yaʿkūbī, ii, 554; Yaʿkūbī, *Buldān*, 304-5; Ibn al-Athīr, 101, 103-4; Ṭabarī, 638, 650; Masʿūdī, *Murūdj*, viii, 42; *Taʾriḫ-i Sīstān* (ed. Bahār), introduction, 32, 156-79 passim, 210; *Zayn al-akhbār* (ed. Nafīsī), 103-8; *Taʾriḫ-i Bayhaḳ* (ed. Bahmanyār), 44, 267; Spuler, *Iran*, 53, 55, 169; L. Vecchia Vaglieri, *Le vicende del harigismo in epoca abbaside*, in *RSO*, xxiv (1949), 41; O. Caroe, *The Pathans 550 B.C.—A.D. 1957*, London 1958, 103-7; N.V. Pigulevskaya and others, *Istoriya Irana s drevneyshikh vremen do kontsa 18 veka*, Leningrad 1958, 110-1; B. Skladenec, *Powstanie Charydzyckie Hamzy al-Hāriḡi w Sistanie*, in *Przegľad Orientalistyczny*, i/33 (1960), 25-37.

2. On the Ḥamza Romance see Saḡā, *Taʾriḫ-i adabiyāt-i Irān* i, 34-5; Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, *Taʾriḫ*, 211; *Bābur-nāma*, ed. Beveridge, 176; Glück, *Die indischen Miniaturen des Haemza-Romanes im Oesterreichischen Museum für Kunst und Industrie in Wien und in anderen Sammlungen*, Vienna-Leipzig 1925; S. van Ronkel, *De Roman van Amir Hamza*, Leiden 1895; Fleischer, *Kleinere Schriften*, iii, 228; C. Virolleaud, *Le roman iranien de l'émir Hamza*, in *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles lettres*, April-June 1948; idem, *Le roman de l'émir Hamza, oncle de Mahomet*, in *Ethnographie*, liii (1958-9), 3-10; Hammer-Purgstall, *GOD*, i, 71-2; *TM*, i, 9-10; *Gr.I.Ph.*, ii, 2, 319; D. M. Lang and G. M. Meredith-Owens, *Amiran-Darejaniani: A Georgian romance and its English rendering*, in *BSOAS*, xxii/3 (1959), 454-90. This contains further bibliographical information concerning manuscripts and lithographed editions. There is an English translation of the Georgian version by R. H. Stevenson entitled *Amiran-Darejaniani: a cycle of medieval Georgian tales traditionally ascribed to Mose Khoneli*, Oxford 1958; Garcin de Tassy, *Histoire de la littérature hindoue et hindoustanie*, Paris 1870-1, i, 236; Borst, *Twē Soendasche Amir Hamzah-Verhalen*, in *TITLV*, lxxviii (1938), 137-57. (G. M. MEREDITH-OWENS)

**ḤAMZA B. ʿALĪ B. AḤMAD**, the founder of the Druze religious doctrine. He was of Persian origin from Zūzan and a felt-maker.

Among the Ismāʿīlī followers of the Fāṭimid caliph al-Ḥākim [q.v.] there had been speculations encouraged by his strange conduct and predictions of earlier authorities that he might be the expected *Ḳāʾim*. While the leaders of the official propaganda organization tried to counteract these speculations, al-Ḥākim early in 408/summer 1017 began to favour a movement led by al-Ḥasan al-Aḫḫram proclaiming his divinity. Al-Aḫḫram tried to win over prominent officials by sending them letters and was honoured in public by al-Ḥākim. In Ramaḍān 408/January-February 1018 he was murdered while riding in the retinue of al-Ḥākim. The caliph punished the murderer but cut off completely his connexion with the movement.

Ḥamza had participated in the proclamation of al-Ḥākim's divinity and the end of the distinction between exoteric and esoteric Islam, but had remained in the background. After al-Aḫḫram's death he suspended his propaganda. In Muḥarram 410/May 1019 al-Ḥākim again showed his favour to the movement. Now Ḥamza claimed the leadership as the Imām and *Ḳāʾim al-zaṃān* and adopted the title *Hādī al-mustadjībīn*. The centre of his activity was the Rayḍān mosque near the Bāb al-Naṣr outside the walls of Cairo. He met a prominent rival in the Turkish official al-Darazī [q.v.] who, after trying in vain to come to terms with Ḥamza, acted independently and attracted many of Ḥamza's followers. On 12 Ṣafar 410/19 June 1019 Ḥamza sent a delegation to the chief *Ḳāḍī* in the Old Mosque with a letter demanding his conversion. Three of the men were killed by the mob and riots ensued. Al-Ḥākim had the transgressors arrested and executed at various times. The Turkish troops were incensed by this and turned against their countryman al-Darazī, besieging him in his residence (*dār*). Forty of his followers were killed but he escaped to the palace. The Turks demanded his extradition from al-Ḥākim, who put them off to the following day. On their return he informed them that al-Darazī had been killed. Now all the soldiers turned against Ḥamza in the Rayḍān mosque and besieged him with twelve of his men. Ḥamza escaped and had to hide a short time but by Rabiʿ II 410/August 1019 regained al-Ḥākim's favour. He now built up a strong missionary organization, attributing cosmic ranks to its leaders. The movement spread rapidly, particularly in Syria. When al-Ḥākim disappeared in Shawwāl 411/January 1021, the adherents of the Ḥākim-cult were persecuted and Ḥamza had to hide. In some letters (which appear to be genuine) he promised his followers his triumphal return. According to Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd he was killed some time after his flight. Bahāʾ al-Dīn al-Muḫtanāḡ, who became the leader of the movement, pretended to be in touch with him and still in 430/1038 predicted his near reappearance.

For Ḥamza's religious doctrine see *DURŪZ*.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Zāfir, *Aḫbār al-duʿwā al-munkaṭiʿa*, apud F. Wüstenfeld, *Geschichte der Fatimiden-Chalifen*, Göttingen 1881, 202 ff. (copied with an erroneous "correction" by al-Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat al-arab*, transl. S. de Sacy in *Exposé de la religion des Druzes*, Paris 1838, i, pp. CCCXXX ff.) is based on a good source, but the stories of al-Aḫḫram and al-Darazī are placed a year too late. Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṭākī, *Taʾriḫ*, ed. L. Cheikho, B. Carra de Vaux and H. Zayyat, Beirut 1909, 220 ff., 237 (followed by al-Makīn) replaces al-Aḫḫram wrongly by al-Darazī. Al-ʿAsḳalānī, *Raḡʿ al-isr*, apud *The Governors and judges of Egypt*, ed. R. Guest, London 1912, 612. For the evidence of the Druze writings see de Sacy, *op. cit.*, particularly i, pp. CCCLXXXVII ff., 101 ff., ii, 101 ff.; H. Wehr, *Zu den Schriften Hamzas im Drusenkanon*, in *ZDMG*, xcvi (1942), 187 ff.; W. Madelung, *Das Imamāt in der frühen ismailitischen Lehre*, in *Isl.*, xxxvii (1961), 115 ff.; A. F. L. Beeston, *An ancient Druze manuscript*, in *Bodl. Libr. Rec.*, v (1956), 286 ff.; M. G. S. Hodgson, *Al-Darazī and Ḥamza in the origin of the Druze Religion*, in *JAOS*, lxxxii (1962), 5 ff. (W. MADELUNG)

**ḤAMZA B. BĪD** AL-ḤANAFĪ AL-KŪFĪ (the spelling Bīd is attested by a verse where this name rhymes with *tanbiḡ*; al-Dīḥāzī, *Bayān*, ed. Hārūn, iv, 47), is one of those Arab poets, full of wit and verve,