

de C. Motylinski, *Bibliographie du Mzab. Les livres de la secte abadhite*, in *Bull. de Corresp. Afr.*, iii (1885), *passim*; idem, *Expédition de Pedro de Navarre et de Garcia de Tolède contre Djerba (1510) d'après les sources abadhites*, in *Actes du XIV<sup>e</sup> Congrès Intern. des Orient.*, Algiers 1905, 3<sup>e</sup> partie (suite), Paris 1908, 124, 135, 138, 139, 145-6, 150, 151; idem, *Guerara depuis sa fondation*, Algiers 1885; R. Rubinacci, *Un antico documento di vita cenobitica musulmana*, in *AIUON*, n.s., x (1961), 37-38 and pl. I-X; Abu 'l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Abi 'Uthmān Sa'īd al-Shammākhī, *Kitāb al-Siyar*, lith., Cairo 1301/1883-4; Z. Smogorzewski, Unpublished materials on the Mzāb; Watin, *Les Tolbas du Mzab. Origine. Part I* (unpublished account known thanks to the full extracts made by Z. Smogorzewski; the original was in 1913 in the Archives de la Direction du Personnel Militaire des Territoires du Sud. (T. LEWICKI)

**HALKA**, term used in Ayyūbid and Mamlūk times for a socio-military unit which, during most of the period of Mamlūk rule, was composed of non-Mamlūks. The sources do not indicate the date of its foundation, and there is no convincing explanation of the meaning of its name (for two different views, see Quatremère, *Histoire des Sultans mamlouks*, i/2, 200-2 and A. N. Poliak, in *BSOAS*, x (1940-42), 872). The *halḳa* had been in existence during most of the Ayyūbid period, being mentioned for the first time in 570/1174 (see H. A. R. Gibb, *The armies of Saladin*, in *Cahiers d'Histoire Égyptienne*, Cairo 1951, 305, reprinted in *Studies on the civilization of Islam*, London 1962, 74). Under Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn it seems to have constituted the *élite* of his army. Under his Ayyūbid successors, this unit is mentioned only rarely, yet it must have preserved a considerable part of its power and status, for even during the early years of Mamlūk rule it was still very strong. In those years the *halḳa* included a considerable number of pure Mamlūks. The commanders of the unit, called *muḳaddamū al-halḳa*, held honoured positions, and are named side by side with the Mamlūk *amirs* in all important ceremonies. They also served as envoys to important states, functions which were usually reserved for the *khāṣṣakiyya* [q.v.]. Their pay was, however, even in that early period, much lower than that of the *amirs*. Originally a *muḳaddam halḳa* was entitled to command 40 men during an actual military expedition (but not after its termination). With the decline of the *halḳa* this right had only a theoretical significance.

The members of the *halḳa* were generally called *adīnād al-halḳa*, sometimes *ridjāl al-halḳa*, and sometimes simply *adīnād*.

Until the reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Kalā'ūn, we find no clear indications of the decline of the *halḳa*. During the reign of his father, Kalā'ūn, we still hear of 4,000 *halḳa* soldiers participating in the war against the Mongols in 680/1281 as *élite* troops fighting in the centre (*ḳalb*) of the Sultan's expeditionary force; the number of the Royal Mamlūks fighting in that centre was only 800.

The first conspicuous sign of a major decline appears during the land redistributions (*rawḳ* [q.v.]) of the late 7th/13th and early 8th/14th centuries. One of the chief aims of the *rawḳs*, which included the regrouping and reallocation of the fiefs (*iḳṭā'*), was to reinforce the Royal Mamlūks and to weaken the *halḳa*. These moves against the *halḳa* were completely effective, and led to its rapid decline. After the death of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad it became usual for the members of the *halḳa* to exchange their feudal

estates against payment or compensation (*muḳāyada*), a special department called *diwān al-badal* being established for this purpose. As a result many socially inferior elements—pedlars, artisans and other kinds of "common people" (*al-sūḳa wa 'l-āmma*)—joined the *halḳa*. Towards the close of the 8th/14th century the *halḳa* lost practically all its importance as a fighting unit. Only a few of its members continued to take part in military expeditions, the majority being left behind in Cairo to perform guard duties there during the absence of the main force.

Al-Mu'ayyad Shayḳḥ (815/1412-824/1421), who tried to rejuvenate the Mamlūk army in general, attempted also to arrest the decline of the *halḳa*, but, as with his other reforms, his success was short-lived. Sultan Barsbāy (825/1422-842/1438) reversed Shayḳḥ's policy towards this unit, and from then on the *halḳa* was on a steady down-grade up to the very end of Mamlūk rule. The very name *halḳa* is gradually replaced by the term *awlād al-nās* [q.v.], one of its sub-units.

The *halḳa* regiment of Syria, like the whole of the Syrian military society under the Mamlūks, deserves a separate study, for what is true of the armies stationed in Egypt does not, in many cases, apply to the forces stationed in Syria. Generally speaking, the status of the Syrian province was far inferior to that of Egypt. Mamlūk *amirs* were usually reluctant to serve there, and the *élite* units of pure Mamlūks were concentrated in Egypt, mainly in Cairo. The Royal Mamlūks, the main cause of the *halḳa*'s decline in Egypt, had no garrisons in Syria; thus in Syria the *halḳa* was a far stronger and a far more important element than was its counterpart in Egypt. The central place which the *halḳa* units occupied in Syria may be seen from Khallī b. Shāhin al-Zāhirī's (d. 872/1468) chapter on the Syrian provinces and their armies (*Zubdat ḳaṣf al-mamālik*, 131-5), where the *halḳa* is mentioned repeatedly but the other units are mentioned only occasionally, if at all. It is true that some of the figures which this author quotes refer to the *halḳa*'s numerical strength in the past (*ḳadīm<sup>am</sup>*), but this should be taken as an indication of the general decline of the armies of Mamlūk Syria and not of the decline of the Syrian *halḳa* in particular (see also *Zubda*, 103-6, and *BSOAS*, xvi, 71-2). The *halḳa* survived in Syria, after a fashion, into Ottoman times (see B. Lewis, in *BSOAS*, xvi (1954), 479).

*Bibliography*: D. Ayalon, *Studies on the structure of the Mamluk Army*, in *BSOAS*, xv (1953), 448-59 (the reasons for the *halḳa*'s decline being discussed at 455 f.). (D. AYALON)

**AL-HALLĀDJ** (the wool-carder), ABU 'L-MUGHITH AL-ḤUSAYN B. MANṢŪR B. MAḤAMMĀ AL-BAYDĀWĪ, Arabic-speaking mystic theologian (244-309/857-922). His life, his teaching and his death throw light on a crucial period in the history of Muslim culture, and the interior experience which he describes can be considered a turning point in the history of *taṣawwuf*. (This article includes, as well as the article of EI<sup>1</sup>, some extensive additions drawn from the later works of L. Massignon).

#### I. — BIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS

Origins. Al-Hallādj was born in about 244/857-8 at Tūr, to the north-east of al-Bayḍā in Fars. In Tūr an Iranian dialect was spoken; al-Bayḍā was an Arabized town where Sībawayh was born. It is said that al-Hallādj was the grandson of a *gabr* and a descendant of Abū Ayyūb, the Companion of the

Prophet. His father, who was probably a wool-carder, left Tūr for the textile region which extended from Tustar to Wāsiṭ (on the Tigris), a town founded by Arabs, with a predominantly Sunnī-Hanbalī population (with, in the country districts, an extremist Shīʿī minority), and the centre of a famous school of Kūrʾān readers. At Wāsiṭ, al-Ḥusayn lost the ability to speak Persian. Before he was 12 years old, he learned the Kūrʾān by heart and became a *ḥāfiẓ*. He very early attempted to find an inner meaning in the teaching of the *sūras* and applied himself to *taṣawwuf* at the school of Saḥl al-Tustarī.

At Baṣra. When he was twenty he left Tustar to go to Baṣra. There he received the habit of the Ṣūfis from ʿAmr Makkī, and married Umm al-Ḥusayn, the daughter of Abū Yaʿqūb al-Aḳṭaʿ. He did not take any other wives and he and his wife remained united all their lives, having at least three sons and one daughter. His marriage earned him the jealousy and the opposition of ʿAmr Makkī. When he was absent from home, al-Ḥallādj was able to entrust the support of his family to his brother-in-law, a Karnabāʾī. Through the latter, he found himself in contact with a clan which supported the Zaydī rebellion of the Zandj [q.v.], who were contaminated in varying degrees by Shīʿī extremism; this is probably the origin of his persistent but unfounded reputation as being a Shīʿī *dāʿī* or "missionary preacher". He retained from this period some curious and apparently Shīʿī expressions, but continued to lead at Baṣra a fervently ascetic life and to remain profoundly faithful to Sunnism. He went to Baghdād to consult the famous Ṣūfī Ḍjunayd, but in spite of the latter's advice, tired of the conflict which existed between his father-in-law al-Aḳṭaʿ and ʿAmr Makkī, he set off for Mecca immediately after the Zandj rebellion had been crushed.

First Pilgrimage. At Mecca he made his first Pilgrimage, and made a vow to remain for one year of *ʿumra* in the courtyard of the sanctuary, in a state of perpetual fasting and silence. In this he was trying out his personal way to union with God, and, going against the discipline of secrecy, began to proclaim it. ʿAmr Makkī then broke off relations with him, yet he began to attract disciples.

Khūzistān, Khurāsān and departure from Tustar. Having returned to Khūzistān, he gave up the tunic of the Ṣūfis and adopted the "lay" habit (probably the *ḡabā*, a cloak worn by soldiers), in order to be able to speak and preach more freely. This beginning of his apostolate, the main aim of which was to enable everyone to find God within his own heart, and which earned for him the name of *Hallādj al-Asrār*, "the carder of consciences", exposed him to suspicion and hatred and scandalized the Ṣūfis. Some Sunnī or former Christians some of whom were to become viziers at Baghdād, became his disciples. But some Muʿtazilīs and some Shīʿīs, who were important treasury officials, accused him of deception and of false miracles and incited the mob against him. He left for Khurāsān to continue his preaching among the Arab colonies of eastern Iran and remained there for five years, preaching in the cities and staying for some time on the frontiers in the fortified monasteries which housed the volunteer fighters in the "Holy War". He returned to the region of Tustar, and, with the help of the Secretary of State, Ḥamd Kunnāʾī, was able to instal his family in Baghdād.

Second Pilgrimage, distant journeys, Third Pilgrimage. With four hundred of his disciples, he then made his second pilgrimage to

Mecca, where some of his former friends, Ṣūfis, accused him of magic and sorcery and of making a pact with the *djinn*s. It was after this second *ḥajj* that he undertook a long tour in India (Hinduism) and Turkestan (Manicheism and Buddhism), beyond the frontiers of the *dār al-Islām*. "Au delà de la Communauté musulmane, c'est à toute l'humanité qu'il pense pour lui communiquer ce curieux désir de Dieu, patient et pudique, qui dès lors le caractérise..." (L. Massignon). About 290/902, al-Ḥallādj returned to Mecca for his third and last pilgrimage. He returned there clad in the *murakkaʿa*, a piece of patched and motley cloth thrown round his shoulders, and a *fūṭa*, an Indian loin-cloth, round his waist. His prayer at the station of ʿArafāt was that God should reduce him to nothing, should make him despised and rejected, so that God alone might grant grace to Himself through the heart and the lips of His servant.

Final preaching at Baghdād. After returning to his family at Baghdād, he set up in his house a model of the *Kaʿba*, prayed at night beside tombs and in the daytime proclaimed in the streets or the *sūks* his burning love of God and his desire "to die accused for his Community". "O Muslims, save me from God" ... "God has made my blood lawful to you: kill me" ... This preaching aroused popular emotion and caused anxiety among the educated classes. The Zāhirī Muḥammad b. Dāwūd was angry that al-Ḥallādj should claim a mystical union with God; he denounced him at the court and demanded that he should be condemned to death. But the Shāfiʿī jurist Ibn Suraydj maintained that mystic inspiration was beyond the jurisdiction of the courts. It was at this period that, according to the hostile account of the grammarians of Baṣra, al-Ḥallādj replied to al-Shiblī, in the Mosque of al-Manṣūr, by the famous *shāḥ* ("theopathic phrase"): *Ana ʿl-haḥḥ*, "I am [God] the Truth", proclaiming that he had no other "I" than God.

Arrest. A movement for the moral and political reform of the community was taking shape in Baghdād, inspired by the preaching of al-Ḥallādj and by those of the faithful who were anxious to see in him the hidden "Pole" [see *kuṭb*] of the time. He dedicated to Ibn Ḥamdān and to Ibn ʿIsā some treatises on the duties of viziers. In 296/908, some Sunnī reformers (under the Hanbalī influence of al-Barbahārī, see H. Laoust, *La profession de foi d'Ibn Baṭṭa*, Damascus 1958, *passim*) made an unsuccessful attempt to seize power and to raise Ibn al-Muʿtazz to the caliphate. They failed, and the infant caliph, al-Muḳtadir, was restored, his vizier being the Shīʿī financier Ibn al-Furāt. Al-Ḥallādj was involved in the consequent anti-Hanbalī repression and succeeded in fleeing to Sūs in Ahwāz, a Hanbalī town, although four of his disciples were arrested. Three years later, al-Ḥallādj himself was arrested and brought back to Baghdād, a victim of the hatred of the Sunnī Ḥāmid. He remained in prison for nine years.

Imprisonment. In 301/913, the vizier Ibn ʿIsā, the cousin of one of al-Ḥallādj's disciples, put an end to the trial (cf. the *fatwā* of Ibn Suraydj) and the imprisoned supporters of al-Ḥallādj were released. Nevertheless, owing to pressure from his enemies and the influence of the chief of police, who was an enemy of the vizier, al-Ḥallādj was exposed for three days on the pillory with "Karmaṭī agent" written above him. He was later confined in the palace, where he was able to preach to the ordinary prisoners. In 303/915, he cured the caliph of a fever, and in 305 "restored to life" the crown prince's parrot. The

Mu'tazilis denounced his "charlatanism". The vizier Ibn 'Isā, who had been favourable to al-Hallādj, was replaced in 304-6 by Ibn al-Furāt, who was anti-Hallādj, but the influence of the queen-mother prevented the latter from re-opening the trial. It appears that two of al-Hallādj's most important works date from this period: the *Tā Sin al-Azal*, a meditation on the case of Iblīs, "the disobedient monotheist", and the short work on the "ascension" (*mi'rāḍi*) of Muḥammad, who halted on the threshold, two bow-shots from the Divine Essence.

These meditations condemned Iblīs's refusal and suggested that beyond the experience of Muḥammad there could be attained a union in love between man and God. They seem to have been a reply to the Shī'ī extremist al-Shalmaghānī, who considered that faith and impiety, virtue and vice, election and damnation were all *muḥābal* ("related opposites") and equally pleasing to God. Al-Shalmaghānī had a considerable influence at the Baghdād court and even on the course of the trial of al-Hallādj.

The condemnation. The trial was re-opened and the case argued in 308-9/921-2. The background to it was Hāmid's financial speculation, which had been opposed in vain by Ibn 'Isā. It was to destroy the latter's influence that Hāmid procured the re-opening of the trial of al-Hallādj. He was helped in this by Ibn Muḍjahid, the respected leader of the corporation of the Qur'ān readers and a friend of the Sūfīs Ibn Sālim and al-Shiblī but opposed to al-Hallādj. The Ḥanbalīs, at the instigation of Ibn 'Aṭā, himself a Ḥanbalī and a mystic, held demonstrations and "prayed against" Hāmid: both in protest against his fiscal policy and in order to save al-Hallādj. They even demonstrated against al-Ṭabarī, who condemned the riot. These disorders gave the vizier Hāmid the opportunity to make Ibn 'Aṭā appear before the tribunal. But Ibn 'Aṭā refused to witness against al-Hallādj and maintained that the vizier did not possess the right to judge the conduct of "holy men". He was ill-treated by a guard during the court hearing and died from the blows he received.

Hāmid and the Mālikī *kāḍī* Abū 'Umar Ibn Yūsuf, who always supported those in power at the time, arranged in advance the judgement of the tribunal which was to condemn al-Hallādj. Al-Hallādj had said "The important thing is to proceed seven times around the *Ka'ba* of one's heart": they therefore accused him of being a Ḳarmatī rebel who wished to destroy the *Ka'ba* of Mecca. There was no Shāfi'ī present at the trial. The Ḥanafī *kāḍī* declined to give judgement, but his assistant agreed to support Abū 'Umar, and the syndic of the professional witnesses succeeded in producing eighty-four signatories. Sitting in judgement, Abū 'Umar, urged by Hāmid, pronounced the formula: "It is lawful to shed your blood".

The execution. For two days the grand chamberlain Naṣr and the queen-mother interceded with the caliph, who, stricken with a fever, countermanded the execution. But the intrigues of the vizier triumphed over the hesitation of al-Muqtadir who, as he was leaving a great banquet, signed the warrant for al-Hallādj's execution. On 23 *Dhu 'l-Ka'da*, the sounding of trumpets announced the impending execution. Al-Hallādj was handed over to the chief of police, and in the evening in his condemned cell exhorted himself to face martyrdom and foresaw his glorious resurrection. These prayers, noted down and handed on, were to be re-grouped in the *Akhbār al-Hallādj*.

On 24 *Dhu 'l-Ka'da*, at Bāb *Khurāsān* "before an enormous crowd", al-Hallādj, with a crown on his head, was beaten, half-killed, and exposed, still alive, on a gibbet (*ṣalīb*). While rioters set fire to the shops, friends and enemies questioned him as he hung on the gibbet and traditions relate some of his replies. The caliph's warrant for his decapitation did not arrive until nightfall, and in fact his final execution was postponed until the next day. During the night there spread accounts of wonders and supernatural happenings. In the morning, according to al-Tūzārī, those who had signed his condemnation, grouped around Ibn Mukram, cried out: "It is for Islam; let his blood be on our heads". Al-Hallādj's head fell, his body was sprinkled with oil and burned and the ashes thrown into the Tigris from the top of a minaret (27 March 922).

Witnesses reported that the last words of the tortured man were: "All that matters for the ecstatic is that the Unique should reduce him to Unity", recapitulating the appeal to the one authentic *tawḥīd*, that which God utters in the heart of His friends; and that he then recited Qur'ān, XLII, 18.

## II. — PRINCIPAL (PUBLISHED) WORKS

(1) Twenty-seven *Riwayāt*, collected by his disciples in about 290/902, in the form of *ḥadīth kudsī*, Arabic text in 3rd ed. of the *Akhbār al-Hallādj* (Fr. tr. L. Massignon, *Passion d'al-Hallādj*, Paris 1922, 893-904); (2) *Kitāb al-Tawāsin*, a series of eleven short works (including the *Tā Sin al-Azal*), Arabic text and Persian version of Baḳī, ed. by L. Massignon, Paris 1913 (Fr. tr. L. Massignon, *Passion d'al-Hallādj*, 830-93); (3) some poems collected (cf. *Kitāb al-Ta'arruf* of al-Kalābādhī) in the *Diwān d'al-Hallādj*, Arabic text and Fr. tr., ed. L. Massignon, Paris 1931; new Fr. tr., Paris 1938; (4) some *logia* and especially the *novissima verba* of the last night, collected in the *Akhbār al-Hallādj*, ed. L. Massignon (Paris 1914; \*Paris 1936; \*Paris 1957).

(For the other writings of al-Hallādj and the discussion of their authenticity, see L. Massignon, *Kitāb al-Tawāsin*, introd. i-iv; *Passion d'al-Hallādj*, 804-22; *Diwān d'al-Hallādj*, 1931 ed., 1-9; and *Opera Minora*, Beirut 1963, ii, 40-5 and 191).

## III. — THE MAIN ACCUSATIONS

The trial of al-Hallādj took place against the background of the religious and political intrigues, and those concerning financial policy, which disturbed the Baghdād court during the minority of al-Muqtadir. It illustrates the position of the 'Abbāsīd dynasty at the beginning of the 4th/10th century and the rôle played in it by the viziers held together by common interests. Al-Hallādj's two main enemies were the Shī'ī vizier Ibn al-Furāt and the Sunnī vizier Hāmid. All his sermons in the Baghdād *sūks* were aimed at a drastic application of the values of faith to the inner life and at the proclamation of a union in love between the soul and God: all this within the framework of a dogma which deliberately stressed his Sunnī adherence. But his sermons fell on deaf ears, not only among the political circles of the court, but also in the world of the traditional jurists, the majority of them Mālikīs and Ḥanafīs, who revolved around them. It is surprising that al-Hallādj's strongest supporters were recruited among the Ḥanbalīs, whose pietism had at that time a considerable influence among the common people. Al-Hallādj's demands for moral reform and his influence on the

people were an annoyance to many of those in power. They based their accusation on two pretexts:

(a) Religious pretext: al-Ḥallādj's unmeasured utterances called in question the esoteric prudence and the discipline of secrecy which had become the rule in Ṣūfī circles since the time when Nūrī and his followers had been called to give an account before the courts of their teaching on the love of God. One result was that the Ṣūfis such as 'Amr Makki and Ḍjunayd who had been al-Ḥallādj's friends blamed him for having spoken publicly of his personal experience and for having expressed it in "theopathic statements" (*ṣhaṭahāt*); in addition, some rather confused Ṣūfī tendencies, particularly those concerning "'Uḍhrī love", felt that they had to condemn the search for the One through willing love and the way of suffering. This was perhaps the main reason why the Ṣāḥirī Ibn Dāwūd became an enemy of al-Ḥallādj, bent on his destruction. After this al-Ḥallādj was accused of blasphemy and of claims to *ḥulūl* (substantial union with God); and his anxiety to give an inner significance to ritual acts ("proceed seven times round the Ka'ba of your heart") was denounced as a wish to abolish the acts themselves.

(b) Political pretext: this was probably the most telling and the most decisive. Al-Ḥallādj's marriage had connected him with the Zaydī Zandj; his distant travels made him seem to be a Ḳarmāṭī *dā'i* ("missionary"); and the language which he used, and even his themes of meditation, did borrow a certain number of Ṣhī'ī elements, even although his replies to the interrogations on this matter remained of profoundly Sunnī inspiration. His accusers, who feared his influence on the people as well as on the members of the court, then decided to present him as an agitator and a rebel who was a threat to the order of the Community. A falsely literal exegesis of some of his sayings (see above) accused him of wishing, like the Ḳarmāṭīs, to destroy the Ka'ba at Mecca. It thus became "lawful to shed his blood" in the name of the Community itself.

Actually, during the last years of his life, al-Ḥallādj seems to have drawn onto himself his torture and condemnation—but for quite different reasons: recognizing that the way of union with God through love and suffering which he must follow was something which transcended the juridical framework of the Community, and offering himself as a sacrifice for this Community by submitting voluntarily to its laws.

#### IV. — SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EXPERIENCE AND THE WITNESS

In the history of *taṣawwuf*, al-Ḥallādj retains a privileged position in the line known as *waḥdat al-ṣhuhūd*. It has sometimes been suggested that this phrase should be translated as "unity of vision" or of look" (in reference to the meaning of the 3rd form of the root *ṣh h ā*); or, rather better, by "unity of presence". But *ṣhuhūd* really means the act of being present at, of being a witness of, and we consider it advisable to retain the meaning of "unity of witness" (or "monisme testimonial", L. Massignon, *Lexique technique de la mystique musulmane*, Paris 1954, 103). The *waḥdat al-ṣhuhūd* is not only "sight" or "look", but an actual presence which is total witness: it is God witnessing to Himself in the heart of His votary (*ābid*). This union with God (*ḍjam*) leads to a unification (*ittiḥād*) which is not a unification of substance, but operates through the act of

faith and of love (*ʿiṣṣḥ, maḥabba*), which welcomes into the emptiness of oneself the Loving Guest (= God), "the essence whose Essence is Love", as al-Ḥallādj expressed it.

The mystical experience thus understood was to be sharply criticized by the other main Ṣūfī line, that of the *waḥdat al-wuḍūd* ("unity of the Being" or "monisme existentiel", Massignon, *ibid.*), which was dominant from the 6th-7th/12th-13th centuries [see ALLĀH, 416]. A double objection was made:

(1) An objection to the idea of *ḥulūl*, infusion of substance, "incarnation",—this was an alignment with one of the accusations at the trial. Al-Ḥallādj had in fact written: "Thy Spirit has mingled itself with my spirit as amber mixes with fragrant musk" (*Diwān*, M. 41), and above all "We are two spirits fused together (*ḥalalnā*) in a single body" (*ibid.*, M. 57). But the whole context of the poems and the writings makes it clear that *ḥulūl* here was not to be understood in the sense, which later became current, of "incarnation" or union of substance. In its most obvious sense the *ḥulūl* of al-Ḥallādj is to be understood as an *intentional* complete union (in love), in which the intelligence and the will of the subject—all in fact which enables him to say "I"—are acted upon by Divine grace. Thus the "we are two spirits fused together in a single body" should be compared with the saying of the Christian mystic St. John of the Cross: "Two natures (God and man) in a single spirit and love of God".

(2) From this arose the second, and most frequent, objection aimed at al-Ḥallādj by the *waḥdat al-wuḍūd*, which was to be, as expressed by Ibn 'Arabi, that he maintained in the *ḍjam* and the *ittiḥād* a "duality". The monism of the "unity of Being" in fact intends that the *ittiḥād* should operate not, indeed, through *ḥulūl* but through a total substitution of the divine "I" for the empirical "I". To be "one" (*ahad*) with God is to make actual the divine which in man's spirit has emanated from God (emanated, not been created *ex nihilo*; cf. al-Ḡhazālī's statement in the *Risāla ladūniyya*: "the (human) spirit is from the *amr* of God"). This charge of "duality" aimed at the "unity of witness" reveals the difference in orientation between the two ways: the unification in and through the acts of faith and love (supreme Witness), for the *waḥdat al-ṣhuhūd*; and the re-absorption of the acts of the created being in his first act of existence (conceived here as emanating from the Divine Being) for the *waḥdat al-wuḍūd*.

#### V. — VOCABULARY AND "TECHNICAL TERMS"

The principal writings of al-Ḥallādj are either meditations on themes symbolizing the progress of the mystic in his quest for God, or the direct (poetic) expression of this actual progress. He was constantly making his vocabulary more precise; his profound knowledge of the technical vocabularies of *fiḥḥ*, of *ʿilm al-kalām* and of the nascent *falsafa* combined to produce a semantic equipment which was strikingly suited to the analysis of the "spiritual states" (*ahwāl*). "Ḥallādj, a dialectician and an ecstatic (cf. Lullius, Swedenborg), endeavoured to bring dogma into harmony with Greek philosophy on a basis of mystic experience; he was in this a precursor of Ḡhazālī" (L. Massignon in *EI*).

In the last section of the *Kitāb al-Ta'arruf*, al-Kalābādhī devotes several chapters to the *iṣṭilāḥāt* ("technical terms") of Ṣūfism. The definitions of these terms are clearly based on al-Ḥallādj: thus *waḍḍ* ("ecstasy"), *ṣukr* ("intoxication"), *ḍjam* ("union"), etc., and in particular those *muḳābāl*

("related opposites") which are *taḍīrid* ("enclosed solitude") and *tafrīd* ("open solitude"), *taḍjallā* ("irradiation") and *istiḥār* ("the action of veiling, making secret"), *fanāʾ* ("annihilation") and *baḳāʾ* ("continuing existence"), etc. These terms were to have a very precise meaning in the *waḥdat al-shuhūd* of the school of al-Ḥallādj; they were to receive another meaning in the future *waḥdat al-wuḍūd*; and in each case were to be understood with reference directly to the experience being described and to the conception of the world which underlay their formulation. Nevertheless their first definition by al-Ḥallādj was of prime importance in the development of the *ʿilm al-ṭasawwuf*. It often gave rise to disagreements, even among al-Ḥallādj's followers themselves: as with the use of *ʾishk*, concurrently with, and often in preference to, *maḥabba*, for the love of God and of man. *ʾIshk* was part of the vocabulary of the earliest Ṣūfism (cf. al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī); but the sense of "desire", which was one of its usual connotations, was to be rejected, through fear of attributing to God either mutability or passivity. L. Massignon has shown that the editors of the texts of al-Ḥallādj, among them the Shīʿī Baḳlī, had no hesitation in substituting *maḥabba* for *ʾishk* in these texts, thus diluting al-Ḥallādj's thesis that *ʾishk* is a divine attribute of Essence (cf. *Notion de l'essentiel Désir*, in Massignon, *Opera Minora*, Beirut 1963, ii, 226-53).

#### VI. — THE SCHOOL AND THE SECTS OF THE ḤALLĀDJĪYYA

It seems that in 309/922 al-Ḥallādj's disciples had been formed into a *ṭarīqa* (religious fraternity). After the execution of their Master, they went into hiding and dispersed, and thus even became split up. In fact legal persecution continued, and in 311-2/924-5 several followers of al-Ḥallādj were beheaded in Baghdād.

A certain number of disciples fled to Khurāsān, where several of them took part in the Ḥanafī-Māturīdī reform movement. Ibn Bishr and particularly Fāris Ibn ʿIsā (founder of the *Ḥallādjīyya-ḥulūliyya*) upheld and spread al-Ḥallādj's teaching in the Ṣūfī circles in Khurāsān. The *Kitāb al-Taʿarruf* of al-Kalābādhī stems from this tradition. In the 5th/11th century, according to al-Sulamī and al-Khaṭīb, there were still at Nishāpūr some Ḥallādjī "extremists". Among them may be included Ibn Abī ʿl-Khayr (the subject of a study by Nicholson) and Fārmadhī, who was the *shaykh* of al-Ghazālī—hence the latter's favourable judgement of al-Ḥallādj.

Other disciples, such as Ibn Khafīf (who had been al-Ḥallādj's friend at the end of his life rather than his disciple), introduced some Sālimiyya elements into the reform movement of al-Ashʿarī.

In Ahwāz and at Baṣra an ephemeral sect of the Ḥallādjīyya (known however only through the attacks of its enemies, especially al-Tanūkhī) is said to have adopted extreme positions. Its main representative, al-Hāshimī, is said to have declared himself to be a prophet inspired by the Spirit who, after having been "fused" into al-Ḥallādj, abode in one of his sons, hidden from all (Ismāʿīlī influences).

At Baghdād, other Ḥallādjīyya, mentioned by ʿAṭṭār, presented themselves as Sunnīs, but in a very liberal sense, and saw a connexion between the *Ana ʾl-hakk* of the Master and the Divine Word addressed to Moses from the Burning Bush (Qurʾān, XX, 14). The important Ḥanbalī, Ibn ʿAḳīl (studied by George Makdisi), after having first defended al-Ḥallādj, was obliged to retract.

In his *Fark*, al-Baghdādī cites the Ḥallādjīyya among the sects which had to be treated legally as apostates. During the 5th/11th century, there was lively polemical argument. The principal points at issue seem to have been the following:

(a) In *fiḵḥ*: the five "personal obligations" (*farāʾid*) are replaceable, even the *ḥaḍḍi* (= *iskāt al-wasāʾiʿ*).

(b) In *kalām*: the transcendence of God (*ṭansīh*) beyond the dimensions of the created (*ṭūl*, *ʿarḍ*); the existence of an uncreated Spirit of God (*rūḥ nāṭika*) which comes to unite itself to the created *rūḥ* of the ascetic (*ḥulūl al-lāhūt fi ʾl-nāsūt*); the saint (*walī*) becomes the living and personal witness of God (*ḥuwa huwa*), whence the theopathic expression *Ana ʾl-hakk*.

(c) In *ṭasawwuf*: complete union with the Divine Will (*ʿayn al-dīam*) through suffering accepted and desired. The *dhikr* which the *shaykh* al-Sanūsī attributes to the Ḥallādjīyya is modern.

In Shīʿī-Imāmī circles, the first reaction was to condemn and excommunicate the Ḥallādjīyya as *ghulāt*, heterodox extremists. Later the follower of Avicenna Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī (7th/13th century) and Ṣadr al-Dīn Shīrāzī (11th/17th century) declared al-Ḥallādj to be a saint, though it is true that they interpreted his road to union according to their own philosophical tenets. In this way a cult of al-Ḥallādj continued to exist in certain Iranian circles, but it was severely attacked by other movements. In Sunnī Islam the term *Ḥallādjīyya* came to mean no longer a religious fraternity but any juriconsults, theologians or mystics who, through personal conviction, believed in the sainthood of al-Ḥallādj (cf. above the attitudes of Ibn ʿAḳīl, of al-Ghazālī, etc.): this was strongly condemned by Ibn Taymiyya. The last Ḥallādjīyya adherents were to merge into the *ṭarīqa* of the Kādiriyya [q.v.]. Today there exist no more Sunnīs who are openly Ḥallādjī. Many of them "excuse" al-Ḥallādj according to the Shāfiʿī juridical formula; but they go no further. He continues to be invoked however, and his tomb is visited by pilgrims from distant towns.

#### VII. — JUDGEMENTS OF HIS CONTEMPORARIES AND OF POSTERITY

Few persons in Islam have been so much discussed as al-Ḥallādj. In spite of the *idmāʾ* [q.v.] of the judges who condemned him, he had his devotees among the doctors as well as among the people. We give here, with a note of their opinions, a list of the principal doctors who have taken part in this famous discussion. The various opinions can be divided into three groups: (a) *taraddud* (condemnation), which is subdivided into *radd* (simple rejection) and *taḳfīr* (excommunication): indicated in the following list by the sigla *rdd*; (b) *tarāḥḥum* ("canonization") or *wilāya* (affirmation of sainthood), which is subdivided into *ʾitidhār* (justification with excuse) and *kaḅūl* (full and complete acceptance): sigla *w*; (c) *tawāḳḅuf* (suspension of judgement, abstention): sigla *t*.

(A) Jurists (*fuḳahāʾ*): *Zāhiris*: Ibn Dāwūd and Ibn Ḥazm (*rdd*); *Imāmīs*: Ibn Bābūya, Abū ʿIjāʿfar Ṭūsī and Ḥillī (*rdd*), Shūstari, ʿAmīlī (*w*); *Mālikīs*: Ṭurtūshī, ʿIyād, Ibn Khaldūn (*rdd*), ʿAbdarī, Dulundjāwī (*w*); *Hanbalīs*: Ibn Taymiyya (*rdd*), Ibn ʿAḳīl (who retracted), Ṭawfī (*w*); *Ḥanafīs*: Ibn Buhlūl (*t*), Nābulūsī (*w*); *Shāfiʿīs*: Ibn Surayḍī, Ibn Ḥadjār, Suyūṭī, ʿUrḍī (*t*), Djuwaynī, Dhahabī (*rdd*), Maḳdisī, Yāfīʿī, Shaʿrāwī, Haythamī, Ibn ʿAḳīla, Sayyid Murtaḍā (*w*).

(B) "Theologians" (*mutakallimūn*): *Muʿtazilīs*:

Ḍjubbāʾī, Kaẓwīnī (*rdd*); *Imāmīs*: Muḥid (*rdd*), Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, Maybudhī, Amīr Dāmād (*w*); *Sālimiyya*: in *globo*, (*w*); *Ashʿarīs*: Bāḳillānī (*rdd*), Ibn Khaffī, Ghazālī, Fakhr al-Dīn Rāzī (*w*); *Māturīdīs*: Ibn Kamāl-pāshā (*rdd*), Kārī (*w*).

(C) "Philosophers" (*jalāsifa* and *ḥukamāʾ*): Ibn Ṭufayl, Suhrawardī (*Shaykh al-ishrāʿ*), Ṣadr al-Dīn Shīrāzī (*w*).

(D) Ṣūfīs (*ṣūfiyya*): 'Amr Makki and the majority of the early teachers (*rdd*), with the exception of Ibn 'Aṭā', Shīblī, Fāris, Kalābādhi, Naṣrābādhi, Sulamī (*w*), and Ḥuṣrī, Daqqāk, Kuṣhayrī (*ṭ*). Later: Ṣaydalānī, Ḥudjwīrī, Ibn Abī 'l-Ḳhayr, Anṣārī, Fārmaḍhī, 'Abd al-Ḳādir Ḍīlānī, Baḳlī, 'Aṭṭār, Ibn 'Arabī, Ḍjalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, and the majority of the moderns: (*w*). There should be noted the abstention (*ṭ*) of Aḥmad Rifāʿī and of 'Abd al-Ḳarīm Ḍīlī. It can be said that, although al-Ḥallādj would have repudiated their prudent esotericism, the Ṣūfīs as a whole made of him their "martyr" par excellence. For the details, discussions and analyses, see L. Massignon, *Passion*, chap. ix, "Hallāj devant le ṣūfisme", 400-29.

Al-Ḥallādj's "survival after death" was to develop into a "legend", sometimes scholarly (in Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Hindustani, Malayan and Javanese) and sometimes popular. See L. Massignon, *op. cit.*, chap. x, 430-60, and idem, *La Légende de Hallacé Mansur en pays turcs*, in *Opera Minora*, ii, 93-139.

In the West, there has been as great a diversity of opinion on al-Ḥallādj. The opinions of the earlier writers were superficial. Thus A. Müller and d'Herbelot believed him to be secretly Christian; Reiske accuses him of blasphemy, Tholuck of paradox; Kremer makes him a monist, Kazanski a neuropath, and Browne "a dangerous and able intriguer", etc. But the outstanding researches of L. Massignon restored this incomparable figure to his rightful place in his environment and in the development of Muslim thought. After this, there is scarcely a work devoted to the culture of the Islamic countries which omits to mention al-Ḥallādj; while there is continual confirmation of the value and authenticity of his mystic approach and of the witness of his life and of his death. In addition to the works of the specialists, it can be said that the fame of al-Ḥallādj has become part of universal culture (see, for example, the articles of P. Marechal written as early as 1923, and the recent work (1964) of R. Arnaldez).

*Bibliography*: To the works of L. Massignon cited in the article add: idem, *Recueil de textes inédits concernant l'histoire de la mystique en pays d'Islam*, Paris 1929, 57-70; idem, *Opera Minora*, Beirut 1963, ii, 11-342. There is an exhaustive bibliography of al-Ḥallādj (up to 1922) in L. Massignon, *La Passion d'al-Hallāj, Martyr mystique de l'Islam*, chap. xv (appendix); and up to 1948 in idem, *Nouvelle Bibliographie hallāgienne*, in *Opera Minora*, ii, 191-220. To these should be added various more recent works, including: L. Gardet, *Expériences mystiques en terres non-chrétiennes*, Paris 1953, 131-141, 173; A. J. Arberry, *Revelation and reason in Islam*, London and New York 1957, 29-30 and 107-8; L. Gardet, *Thèmes et textes mystiques*, Paris 1958, 19, 135-40; Paul Nwyia, *Ibn 'Abbād de Ronda*, Beirut 1961 (see index s.v.); G.-C. Anawati and L. Gardet, *Mystique musulmane*, Paris 1961, 35-40, 101-4, 107-10, 118-21, 171-3, and passim; G. Makdisi, *Ibn 'Aqil et la résurgence de l'Islam traditionnel au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Damascus 1963 (see index, s.v.); R. Arnaldez, *Hallāj ou la religion de la croix*, Paris 1964; H. Corbin, *Histoire de la philosophie islamique*, Paris 1964,

275-9. A revised edition of *La Passion d'al-Hallāj*, considerably augmented from the texts and notes left by L. Massignon, is in course of preparation by G. and D. Massignon.

(L. MASSIGNON-[L. GARDET])

**ḤALY**, a group of about 35 villages in a cultivated area on the Arabian Red Sea coast, latitude 18° 45' N. An *amīr* appointed by the Saudi Arabian Government resided, in 1383/1963, at the chief village of al-Suffa, near the coastal road. The larger markets are here and at the neighbouring hamlet of Kiyād. Other important villages are al-Shī'b, Kudwat al-A'wadj, and al-Bayḍayn, all of which had government elementary schools in 1383/1963. The agricultural economy of Ḥaly is based on the seasonal flow of Wādī Ḥaly. Sesame, sorghum, and millet are cultivated in an irrigated area of 200 sq. km which is liable to damage by floods. Some produce is sold in al-Kunfidha, 53 km to the northwest. The people of Ḥaly come chiefly from al-Hiyala, Kināna, and al-'Umūr tribes.

Ḥaly, also known as Ḥaly Ya'qūb or Ḥaly Far'ūn, was ruled by a chief of Kināna when Ibn Baṭṭūṭa landed there in c. 731/1330. The traveller left a description of Qabūla al-Hindī, one of a group of Muslim ascetics at Ḥaly. In later times the district was taxed intermittently by the *sharīfs* of Mecca; and Egyptian troops passed through the villages on their 19th century campaigns against al-Ḥidjāz and 'Asīr. Occupied briefly by the Wahhābīs in ca. 1218/1803, Ḥaly became a part of the modern Sa'ūdī state after 'Abd al-'Azīz Ibn Sa'ūd conquered al-Ḥidjāz in 1344/1925.

*Bibliography*: Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, ii, 163-5 (Eng. tr. Gibb, ii, 364-5); K. Niebuhr, *Beschreibung von Arabien*, 375; K. Ritter, *Erdrunde*, xii, 185-7, 208, 234; A. Sprenger, *Die alte Geographie Arabiens*, 52, 251.

(J. MANDAVILLE)

**ḤĀM** (Cham), son of Noah [see NŪḤ]; he is not explicitly mentioned in the *Ku'rān*, but is perhaps alluded to as the unbelieving son of the Patriarch who refused to follow his father at the time of the Flood (XI, 44[42]-49[47]). Later tradition is acquainted with the Biblical story in *Genesis*, IX, 18-27 (according to which it is not Ḥām but his son Canaan who was cursed for a sin committed by his father) and with the legendary amplifications elaborated by Jews and Christians; as the story in the *Ku'rān* in conjunction with these details calls for a fourth son of Noah, it is Canaan or an invented son called Yām who fills this rôle. Ḥām's sins—carnal relations in the Ark (according to the Jewish Aggada), an offence against his father—are variously told by Muslim historians, who know also that this character, born white, turned black as a result of his father's curse. It is also told that Jesus ('Isā [q.v.]) brought Ḥām back to life for a while (so al-Ṭabarī; Sām according to al-Ṭha'labī) and that the latter told the Apostles some of the episodes of life in the Ark and the end of the Flood. The Muslim authors also mention the lot of the three sons of Noah; a version handed down by al-Ṭabarī, however, softens the fate of Ḥām who, reduced to servitude, nevertheless profited from the leniency of his brothers (it is to be remarked that according to Bal'ami, Japhet was similarly cursed, which is explained by the fact that the Iranian author did not favour "the Turks, the Slavs, Gog and Magog", reputed to be descended from the latter). Finally, Muslim historiography has retained from the list of nations in *Genesis* X elements which were adapted to the geographico-political situation of the time; this explains how, apart from the genealogical