

with religious ceremonies. At the opposite end of the canyon, where the walls separate, there is a long channel carved in the north face of the cliff, which is believed to have been used to bring water into the site.

Vast numbers of inscriptions have been found in al-Ḥidjr: in Arabic, Aramaic, Thamudic, Nabatean, Minaean, Lihyanite, and even in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. No archaeological excavations have as yet (1966) been conducted in Madā'in Šālīh, but from what evidence is available it is held that al-Ḥidjr was second only to Petra in importance during the Nabatean period [see NABAT]. The Qurʾān relates (VII, 71 ff.) that this region was inhabited by a godless people, the Thamūd [q.v.], who carved their houses out of rock. God sent the prophet Šālīh to exhort them to mend their ways, but the people of Thamūd not only persisted in their idolatry, but also slew the camel which the prophet Šālīh had miraculously conjured out of a cleft in the rock to give evidence of his divine mission. God then sent an earthquake that destroyed the town and its people. This story was the origin of the name Madā'in Šālīh (Šālīh's towns) now given to the area. Geologists see no evidence of an earthquake in Madā'in Šālīh; some believe that, because the Arabic term for earthquake can also be rendered as a "calamity from God", the town and its people may have been destroyed by another sort of disaster, such as a plague. There are other references to al-Ḥidjr, or Madā'in Šālīh, in Arab legends: one mentions that this is the place where God ordered the patriarch Abraham to abandon Hagar and her son Ishmael, who are both said to be buried here. Another legend relates that when the Prophet Muḥammad was going through the area with his army, on the occasion of the raid on Tābuk (9/631), he would not permit his soldiers to refresh themselves at the wells, because this was an accursed spot. After having flourished during the Nabatean period, the site of al-Ḥidjr seems to have declined rapidly. In the first half of the 4th/10th century al-Isṭakhrī mentions it as being only a village with few inhabitants.

The first European to visit al-Ḥidjr, and to bring back a well illustrated description of its monuments, was C. M. Doughty. Al-Ḥidjr was later also visited by J. Euting, C. Huber, and (more recently) by H. St. J. B. Philby. The most complete account of the monuments of Madā'in Šālīh is that of J. A. Jausen and R. Savignac, who visited the region in 1907.

Bibliography: Ibn Hishām, i, 898 f.; Yāqūt, ii, 208; C. M. Doughty, *Travels in Arabia Deserta*; J. Euting, *Tagbuch einer Reise in Inner-Arabien*, Leiden 1896, 1914; A. Grohmann, *Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orients, Arabien*, Munich 1963; C. Huber, *Journal d'un voyage en Arabie*, Paris 1891; J. A. Jausen and R. Savignac, *Mission archéologique en Arabie*, Paris 1909; H. St. J. B. Philby, *The land of Midian*, London 1957. (F. S. VIDAL)

HIDJRA, latinized as Hegira, the emigration of Muḥammad from Mecca to Medina in September 622. The first stem of the verb, *ḥadjjara*, means "to cut someone off from friendly association" (cf. Qurʾān IV, 34/38) or "to avoid association with" (LXXIII, 10); there is often an explicit or implicit reference to a sexual relationship, as in the first Qurʾānic verse. The third stem *ḥādjjara* refers to a mutual ending of friendly relationships. Thus *ḥidjra* properly does not mean "flight" as it has been traditionally translated but connotes primarily the breaking of the ties of kinship or association (cf. C.

Snouck Hurgronje, *Twee populaire Dwalingen verbeterd*, in *Verspreide Geschriften*, Bonn 1923, i, 297-305, esp. 305; also *LA*, vii, 110-8).

The reason for Muḥammad's leaving Mecca is the loss of support from his clan on the death of Abū Ṭālib (about 619) and his replacement as chief of the clan by Abū Lahab, who had commercial relationships with some of Muḥammad's bitterest opponents. From the fact that after his visit to al-Ṭā'if (in 619 or 620) Muḥammad had to seek the protection (*djīwār*) of the clan of Nawfal before entering Mecca, it is to be inferred that Abū Lahab had refused protection (Ṭabari, i, 1203 from Ibn Ishāk; in Ibn Hishām, 251, but only as a note by Ibn Hishām himself). After various attempts, including the visit to al-Ṭā'if, to find a suitable sphere for continuing to propagate his religion, Muḥammad negotiated successfully with representatives of all the main Arab clans of Medina, finally concluding an agreement with them at al-ʿAḳaba [q.v.] during the pilgrimage of 622 (June-July). This agreement is known as "the pledge of war" (*bayʿat al-ḥarb*), since the men of Medina agreed to defend Muḥammad by force of arms, if necessary. Even before this agreement Muḥammad had begun to encourage his Meccan followers to go to Medina, and in all about seventy went in small parties, until of those willing to go only Abū Bakr, ʿAlī and Muḥammad with their womenfolk were left.

By this time Kuraysh are said to have become suspicious, and this was probably the case (though by no means all the stories which became attached to the *Hidjra* are to be believed). Ibn Ishāk says that at a meeting of most of the clans it was agreed that chosen young men, one from each clan, should simultaneously attack Muḥammad with their swords and kill him; in this way, since so many clans were involved, Hāshim could not exact revenge but would have to be content with blood money. The young men assembled at Muḥammad's house, but he slipped away secretly, leaving ʿAlī in his bed to make them think he was still asleep. Whether this story is accepted or not, Muḥammad must have slipped out of Mecca secretly in the company of Abū Bakr, since a later passage of the Qurʾān reminds men of it (IX, 40): "If you do not give him support, still God already supported him when the unbelievers drove him out as the second of two; the two were in the cave, and he was saying to his companion, Do not grieve; God is with us . . .". They spent three days in the cave, then accompanied by ʿAmir b. Fuḥayra, a freedman of Abū Bakr, and a nomad as guide, and mounted on two camels, made their way by an unusual route to Medina. Their arrival at Ḳubāʾ in the south of the oasis of Medina is dated Monday 12 Rabiʿ I by Ibn Ishāk, which in the accepted calendar corresponds to 24 September 622, but is a Friday. The reason for their going into hiding and avoiding the main road is presumably that when Muḥammad left Mecca he would cease to be under the protection of Nawfal, but until he reached Medina he would not come under the protection of his followers there.

In the document sometimes called the Constitution of Medina (Ibn Hishām, 341-4) those who had thus made the *ḥidjra* with Muḥammad appear as the "emigrants (*muhādjjirūn*) of Kuraysh", and have collectively a position comparable to that of one of the Arab clans of Medina. As time went on the status of *muhādjjir* (fem. *muhādjjira*) came to be greatly prized, perhaps sometimes placing people in a higher category in the *dīwān* or stipend-list; and the status

was granted to others than those who had actually journeyed from Mecca to Medina in 622. Members of nomadic tribes could pledge themselves to Muḥammad with the pledge of migration (*bayʿat hiǧira*) (Ibn Saʿd, iv/2, 66, line 3); they then settled in Medina, presumably as his clients (*mawālī*; cf. al-Bukhārī, *Manāḥib*, 2), thus counting as belonging to the "clan" of *muhādīrūn*. Those who went to Abyssinia about 615 and remained there until fetched to Medina by Muḥammad in 7/628 were counted as having made a *hiǧira*, viz. to Abyssinia; perhaps this was part of the inducement to go to Medina. A consequence was that those who had gone to Abyssinia, returned to Mecca before 622 and then made the *hiǧira* with Muḥammad could claim two *hiǧiras* (cf. Ibn Saʿd, iv/1, 79 line 8; viii, 205 foot). The tribe of Muzayna was given the status of *muhādīrūn* without actually settling in Medina (Ibn Saʿd, i/2, 38, 11-4); Aslam and Khuzāʿa were in a similar position. There is also evidence of other uses of the status of *muhādīr* (al-Māwardī, *al-Aḥkām al-sulṭāniyya*, ed. Enger, 220; tr. Fagnan, 270).

Nāfiʿ b. al-Azrak, leader of the Khārīdī sect of the Azārīka, held that only those who actively supported him were genuinely Muslims, and spoke of them as *muhādīrūn*, who made the *hiǧira* to his camp, which was *dār al-hiǧira* (al-Ashʿarī, *Maḥālāt*, i, 86-9).

Muslim dates are normally given according to the era of the *hiǧira* (see TAʿRĪKH) which may be distinguished by the initials A.H. (= Anno Hegirae). This era does not begin on the date of Muḥammad's arrival at Medina, but on the first day of the lunar year in which that event took place, which is reckoned to coincide with 16 July 622. This result is based on the assumption that intercalary months did not occur after the *Hiǧira*, but this is by no means certain (see further TAʿRĪKH).

Bibliography: Ibn Hishām, 323-35; Tabarī, i, 1228-35; al-Masʿūdī, *Murūǧ*, iv, 137 f., ix, 39, 53, 87; F. Buhl, *Das Leben Muhammads*, Leipzig 1930, 191-5; W. Montgomery Watt, *Muḥammad at Mecca*, Oxford 1953, 145-51; idem, *Muḥammad at Medina*, Oxford 1956, 242, etc.; F. Krenkow, *The topography of the Hijrah*, in *IC*, iii (1929), 357-64. (W. MONTGOMERY WATT)

HIDJRA [see HIDJAR].

HIFZ [see KIRĀʿA and KURʿĀN].

HIKĀYA (A.), verbal noun of *ḥakā*, originally meaning "to imitate", but which, in consequence of a readily explained semantic evolution, came to acquire the meaning of "to tell, to narrate"; similarly the noun *ḥikāya*, starting from the meaning of "imitation", has come to mean more specifically "mimicry", and finally "tale, narrative, story, legend". In classical Arabic the intensive form *ḥākīya* meant a "mimic" and modern Arabic has adopted the active participle *ḥākī* to translate "gramophone".

The radical *h.k.y./w.* is not represented in the Kuṛʿān but it is found in *ḥadīth* with the primary meaning of "to resemble" or "to imitate" (see *LA*, s.v.), a meaning expressed and retained up to the present in the 3rd form, *ḥākā*; this is the only meaning given to it in the classical dictionaries; the *Lisān*, which makes no mention of the meaning of "to relate" for the verb and "story" for the noun, states that both the first and the third forms have a slightly pejorative shade of meaning: "to try to imitate, to ape". The problem is therefore to discover by what process *ḥakā* and *ḥikāya* have acquired the meaning which they now usually have; then we

shall try to draw up a classification of stories and to establish the place occupied by those which are now called *ḥikāya* in the Arabic narrative or recreational literature.

I. — Once again al-Djāhīz provides a convenient starting point. In a well-known passage of the *Bayān* (ed. Hārūn, i, 69-70), he discloses that there existed imitators (*ḥākīya*) able, he says, not only to copy the mannerisms, gestures, the voice and the habits of speech of the different ethnic groups which formed the population of the empire, and more particularly of the capital, but also to reproduce with the most exact fidelity the demeanour and bearing of various types of people, the blind for example, and finally to imitate the calls of wild and domestic animals. Al-Djāhīz adds that these imitators created real types whom they endowed with all the characteristic traits of the groups that they were mimicking. This gift of imitation, which demands no ordinary power of observation, had long been exploited in the East by professional and amateur entertainers (see J. Horowitz, *Spuren griechischer Mimen in Orient*, Berlin 1905), and we find for example in the "Book of the crown" of the Ps.-Djāhīz (tr. Pellat, 149), an anecdote of a courtier who managed to restore himself to favour with a Persian king by means of a stratagem based on mimicry of the cries of various animals. A. Mez (*Abulḥāsīm, ein bagdāder Sittenbild*, Heidelberg 1902, xv-xvi) has already remarked that the proliferation of mimics and the development of a form of entertainment much favoured by monarchs was certainly helped by the existence of Arabic dialects very different from one another and by the more or less successful attempts made by the non-Arab populations to speak the language of the conquerors. There were often mimics among the entertainers and the jesters who were regularly or occasionally admitted into the presence of the sovereigns, and al-Masʿūdī (*Murūǧ*, viii, 161 ff.; cf. A. Mez, *Renaissance*, 386-7, Eng. tr., 408) confirms this in relating the success with al-Muʿtaḍid of one Ibn al-Maghāzilī who mimicked (*yahkī, yuhākī, ḥikāya*) all kinds of people, with an accompanying patter of humorous anecdotes (*nādira*). The *ḥikāya*, in fact, could not be a silent mimicry, and the performer was obliged to compose a little recitation or think up a story to add piquancy to his imitation. Thus one must be well experienced to avoid translating *ḥikāya* in such cases by "story", although one can understand that this term, originally applied solely to the imitation, later covered the gestures and the words, and finally the words alone, especially when authors began to commit to writing the words recited by the *ḥākīyas*. This evolution, further encouraged by the carelessness of writers over the exact use of words, hides to a large extent the fact that the mimics persisted, proof of which, however, is to be found throughout the Middle Ages; A. Mez (*Renaissance*, 399; Sp. tr. 505; the English translation, p. 423, misses the point) mentions one in 415/1024 and it is worthy of note that the performance in question entailed also shadow plays (*ḥayāl*). Although the modern theatre takes its origins from abroad, its historians have not failed to find antecedents for it precisely in the *ḥikāya* and the *ḥayāl* (cf. J. Landau, *Studies in Arab theater and cinema*, Philadelphia 1958, 1 ff.); they have also been induced to take into account the existence, in Turkey, of the *meddah* (*maddāh* [q.v.]) or *muhallī* (*muhallid*, corresponding exactly to the *ḥākīya*) who related anecdotes while performing amusing imitations and expressive mimicries and even