

to sectarian dissent, on the ground that the tenth Imām was the last Imām, and owing to the claims of *Dja‘far* to the Imāmate.

The eleventh Imām fell ill on 1 Rabi‘ I 260/25 December 873 and died seven days later. He was buried in his house beside his father. His Bāb was ‘Uḥmān b. Sa‘īd. Early *Shi‘i* authorities (al-Kulīnī, *Uṣūl*, 326; al-Mufīd, *al-Irshād*, 365) say that during the week of his illness, the caliph al-Mu‘tamid sent his doctors and servants to attend the Imām, and that a considerable number of ‘Alid and ‘Abbāsīd notables visited him. Later *Shi‘i* sources accuse al-Mu‘tamid of poisoning him.

At the death of the eleventh Imām, further dissension arose among the *Shi‘a* on the question of his posterity [see MUḤAMMAD AL-KĀ‘IM]. Some believed that he left a child named Muḥammad; other denied it. The latter were of no unanimous view: some held that Ḥasan al-‘Askarī was al-Kā‘im and would return; others regarded his childless death as a proof of their error in supporting his Imāmate and turned to his brother *Dja‘far*. Al-*Shahrastānī* mentions twelve dissident sects (*Mīāl*, ed. Cureton, ii, 128-31) while Mas‘ūdī speaks of twenty (*Murūdj*, viii, 40).

Bibliography: An early and detailed account of the life, miracles, companions and agents of the eleventh Imām is given by al-Kulīnī, *Uṣūl*, lith. Bombay 1302, 324-33 and 202-4. A full account of the sources with extensive citation is given by Muḥammad Bākīr al-Maḍīlisī, *Bihār al-anwār*, Tehrān 1302, xii, 154-79. See also al-Mufīd, *Kitāb al-Irshād*, Tehrān 1308, 365-8; Nawbakhtī, *Firaḳ al-Shi‘a*, ed. Ritter, 78-89; Ibn Khallikān (De Slane trans.), i, 390-1; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, vii, 189; al-Khaṭīb, *Ta‘rīkh Baghdād*, vii, 366; Ibn Ṭūlūn, *al-A‘imma al-iḥnā‘a‘ashar*, ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjidī, Beirut 1958, 113; Ibn al-‘Imād, *Shadhārāt*, ii, 141 ff.; Abu ‘l-Maḥāsīn, *Nudjūm* (Cairo ed.), iii, 32.

In addition to the sources mentioned in the article, reference may also be made to ‘Abbās Ikbāl, *Khānadan-i Naubakhtī*, Tehrān 1311 solar, index; D. M. Donaldson, *The Shi‘ite Religion*, London 1933, 217-25; and J. N. Hollister, *The Shi‘a in India*, London 1953, 90-2.

(J. ELIASH)

HASAN BABA, dey of Algiers from the beginning of 1682 till 22 July 1683. He first exercised the functions of corsair-captain (*ra‘īs*) at Algiers; in this capacity he took part in the revolt of 1671 which replaced the powers of the *aḡhas* by that of the deys. Son-in-law of the first dey, Ḥāḍidī Muḥammad Ṭriḳī who was also a corsair, he already played an important part in the days of this timid old man. Thus, when Ḥāḍidī Muḥammad fled to Tripoli on receiving news that a French fleet was coming to attack Algiers, Ḥasan Baba had no difficulty in seizing power (beginning of 1682). He engaged in a brief campaign to repulse the Moroccan troops threatening Tlemcen, but hurried back to Algiers, towards which Duquesne's fleet was sailing. The fleet arrived there on 29 July, bombarding the town from 26 August to 12 September. During this time the dey exercised a rigid authority over the town.

Having on this occasion gained nothing, Duquesne returned in 1683 and began to bombard the city afresh on 26 June. This time the dey agreed to negotiate and to hand over hostages, among whom was a *ra‘īs* whom he regarded as his rival, Ḥāḍidī Ḥusayn nicknamed Mezzomorto. The latter succeeded in procuring his release by Duquesne on 22 July and

led the other corsairs to make an attack on Ḥasan Baba, who was murdered the same day.

Bibliography: Chevalier d'Arvieux, *Mémoires*, v, Paris 1735; H. de Grammont, *Hist. d'Alger sous la domination turque*, Paris 1887, 220-5, 242-51.

(R. LE TOURNEAU)

HASAN AL-BAŞRĪ, ABŪ SA‘ĪD B. ABĪ ‘L-ḤASAN YASĀR AL-BAŞRĪ (21/642-110/728), famous preacher of the Umayyad period in Baṣra, belonging to the class of the “successors” (*tābi‘ūn*). His father, whose name was originally Pērōz, was made prisoner at the taking of Maysān in Irak, and is said to have been brought to Medina, where he was manumitted by his owner, a woman whose identity cannot be definitely established, and married Ḥasan's mother, *Khayra*. According to tradition, Ḥasan was born in Medina in 21/642 (for a critique of this tradition see Schaefer, *op. cit.* in bibl., 42-8). He grew up in Wādī ‘l-Kurrā and, one year after the Battle of Ṣiffin, went to Baṣra. As a young man he took part in the campaigns of conquest in eastern Iran (43/663 and the following years). Thereafter he lived in Baṣra until his death in 110/728. His fame rests on the sincerity and uprightness of his religious personality, which already made a deep impression on his contemporaries (Ritter, 14 ff., 33, n. 5), and above all on his famous sermons and pronouncements in which he not only warned his fellow citizens against committing sins, but commanded them to consider and to regulate their whole life *sub specie aeternitatis*, as he did himself. These sermons, of which only fragments have been preserved, are among the best surviving specimens of early Arabic prose. Their vivid images and striking antitheses place them in the class of great rhetoric. It was not without reason that anthologists such as *Djāhīz* and *Mubarrad* quoted them together with the famous speeches of the political leaders of the Umayyad period as models of style, and many of his sayings have even found their way into the great dictionaries. Two famous examples are: *hādithū hādithī ‘l-kulūba fa‘imnahā sarī‘atu ‘l-dulhār* “Repel these hearts (the seats of religious feeling), for they very quickly grow rusty!” (Ritter 34, mistranslated); *idī‘alī ‘l-dunyā ka ‘l-ḥanṣarati kadī‘usu ‘alayhā walā ta‘muruhā!* “Make this world into a bridge over which you cross but on which you do not build!” (*Mubarrad*, *Kāmil*, ed. Wright, 158). It is natural that there is hardly any work of hortatory literature in which some of Ḥasan's sayings are not quoted. His political judgements of the earlier caliphs are not, as is usually the case, confessions of allegiance to a political party, but arise from his religious principles. He criticized fearlessly the rulers of his time, the governors of ‘Irāk. When he went so far as to criticize the founding of Wāsiṭ by Ḥāḍidīādī in 86/705, he incurred the displeasure of the governor and had to go into hiding until Ḥāḍidīādī's death (Schaefer, 55-63; Ritter, 53-5). Nevertheless Ḥasan disapproved of those who took part in attempts to remove by rebellion the evil governors (*taghyīr al-munkar*). When the followers of the rebel Ibn Aṣh‘aṭh (81/700) ordered him to join them, he explained that the violent actions of tyrants were a punishment sent by God which could not be opposed by the sword but must be endured with patience (Schaefer, 56-7; Ritter, 51). In his sermons he constantly warned against worldly attitudes and attachment to earthly possessions: men are already on the way to death and those who are already dead are only waiting for the others to follow (Ritter, 20). He was suspicious of those who amassed riches. He rejected a suitor for his daughter's hand who was famous for

his wealth simply because of his riches (Ritter, 25), and it did not occur to him to accept uncultivated land (*mawāt*) which was being distributed free: "if I could have everything that lies between the two bridges for a basketful of earth, it would not please me" (Ritter, 25-6). Ḥasan called the worldlying, whose faith sat lightly on him and who sinned without concern, by the term *munāfiḥ*, which only he used in this sense. Hence he appears in the doxographies as the chief representative of the doctrine that the *ṣāhib al-kabīra* was a *munāfiḥ* (Ritter, 42-4). He judged sins strictly (*tashdīd al-ma'āṣi*) and considered that the sinner was fully responsible for his actions. He cannot exculpate himself by saying that God created all actions. This is the attitude of the Qadariyya. Ibn Taymiyya recognizes the connexion between *tashdīd al-ma'āṣi* and Qadariyya when he says: "Men call everyone who judges sin harshly a Qadari", and states that for this reason Ḥasan has been accused of adhering to Qadari doctrine. There is no doubt that Ḥasan had taken the standpoint of the Qadarīs, although attempts were made already at an early date to clear his reputation of this stain (Ritter, 57 ff.). It appears to be demonstrated also by the *risāla* to 'Abd al-Malik (ed. Ritter, 67-83). Ḥasan's *ukhuwwa* "brotherly feeling" and his altruism are also stressed. One of his admirers was the poet Farazdaq [q.v.], who called him as a witness for his divorce from his wife Nawār (Mubarrad, *al-Kāmil*, 70).

Not much of Ḥasan's work has survived. In addition to the fragments of sermons already mentioned we have a *risāla* to 'Umar II of an ascetic and hortatory character (Ritter, 21 ff.), a *risāla* to a "brother" in Mecca, to whom he recommended *muḍāwara*, residence in Mecca (Ritter, 8-9), a work on the 54 *ṣarīḥa*, whose authenticity is not yet established (Ritter, 7-8). According to the *Fihrist* (34, 1), Ḥasan had written a *tafsīr*. L. Massignon, in *Essai*, 162-3, cites a few details of Kur'ānic exegesis. G. Bergsträsser, in *Islamica*, ii, 11 ff., deals with Ḥasan's much sought-after "readings" of the Kur'ān. Measured by later standards, Ḥasan handled *ḥadīth* in a very careless fashion. His own sayings were circulated as *ḥadīths*, and he did not protest (Ritter, 11). Hence he is judged harshly by the critics of the *muḥaddithūn*. Dhahabī designates him in the *Mizān*, s.v., as *kaḥṣir al-taḍlīs* "rich in forgeries" (Ritter, 2-3).

Influence: The Ahl al-sunna wa 'l-djamā'a and the Mu'tazilīs both considered him as one of them, although the latter at times claimed that their origin was not connected with him. The followers of *futuwwa* considered him, because of his *ukhuwwa*, as their *imām* (Ritter, 40 ff.). His name appears in the *silṣilas* of many Ṣūfī orders as a link in the chain, and he is cited innumerable times in moral works of exhortation. The influence of his ascetic piety persisted in Baṣra (Ritter to be corrected). In the chief work of the Ṣūfī school of Baṣra, the *Kūt al-kulūb* of Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī, it is stated: *wa 'l-Ḥasanu rahimahu 'llāhu imāmuna fī ḥādha 'l-ṣilmi 'lladhī natakallamū bih, aḥaraku nakṣū wa sabillahu naṭba'u wa min mishḥātihī nastaḍī* "and Ḥasan is our *imām* in this doctrine which we represent. We walk in his footsteps and we follow his ways and from his lamp we have our light" (*Kūt*, i, 149).

Bibliography: Sources: There is hardly any Arabic annalistic or general biographical work which does not contain something concerning Ḥasan and hardly a work on ethics, exhortation, mysticism or *adab* which does not cite one of Ḥasan's

sayings. The following may be mentioned: Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaḳāt*, vii/1, 114 ff.; *Fihrist*, 183; Ibn al-Murtaḍā, *Ṭabaḳāt al-Mu'tasila*, ed. Susanna Wilzer (Bibl. Isl. 21), 18 ff.; Ibn Kutayba, *Uyūn al-akhbār*, Cairo 1925, index; Ibn Khallikān, no. 155; *Shahrasṭānī, al-Milāl wa 'l-mihāl*, ed. Cureton, 32; Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī, *Kūt al-kulūb*, Cairo 1310, *passim*; Abū Nu'aym, *Hilyat al-awliyā*, Cairo 1932-8, *passim*; Ḥudjwiri, *Kashf al-maḥdīyāt*, tr. R. A. Nicholson, GMS xvii, 86 f.; Farīd al-Dīn 'Aṭṭār, *Tadhkirat al-awliyā*, ed. Nicholson, i, 24 ff.; Ibn al-Dīawzi, *Adab Ḥasan al-Baṣrī*, Cairo 1931; *Akhbār Ḥasan al-Baṣrī*, ms. Ḥāhiriyya, Damascus, cf. *Fihris (Ta'rikh)*, 306 (not seen); *Dīāhiz, al-Bayān wa 'l-tabyīn*, Cairo 1949, index; Mubarrad, *al-Kāmil*, index; *Djamharat rasā'il al-'Arab*, ed. Aḥmad Zakī Ṣafwat, Cairo 1937, i, 378-89.

Modern studies: L. Massignon, *Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane*, Paris 1922, 152-75; H. H. Schaeder, *Hasan al-Baṣrī, in Isl.*, xiv (1925), 42 ff.; H. Ritter, *Studien zur Geschichte der islamischen Frömmigkeit*, i, *Hasan al-Baṣrī, in Isl.*, xxi (1933), 1-83; idem, in *IA*, s.v. Hasan Basri; J. Obermann, *Political theory in early Islam*, Publications of the American Oriental Society, Offprint series no. 6, 1935; Iḥsān 'Abbās, *al-Hasan al-Baṣrī*, Cairo 1952 (not seen). (H. Ritter)

HASAN BEY-ZÂDE, AHMED (d. ? 1046/1636-7), Ottoman historian, was the son of 'Küçük' Ḥasan Bey, who was *Re'is al-küttāb* for the four months of Khādim Mesīḥ Paṣha's Grand Vizierate (Dhū'l-Hijda 993—Rabi' II 994/December 1585—April 1586) and died in Muḥarram 995/December 1586. Obligated by poverty to abandon the theological career, Ḥasan Bey-zāde entered the *ḫalem* service (probably in 998/1590 or 999/1591) as a clerk to the *Diwān-i Hümayūn*. He was present on the Hungarian campaigns of 1005/1596 and 1007/1598 as secretary of the *serdār*. At the beginning of the Uyvar/Neuhausel campaign of 1008/1599, Ibrāhīm Paṣha made him his *bash tedhkereḍji* (Na'imā, *Ta'rikh*, ed. of 1281-3, i, 214), in which post, with a short period as 'acting' *re'is al-küttāb* during the Kanizha campaign (Solakzāde, 656), he served successive *serdārs* until at least 1013/1604. He is mentioned as *defterdār* of Anadolu in 1018/1609 (Na'imā, ii, 71). Thereafter, but with many periods out of office, he held a succession of posts whose sequence and duration is not yet established (*defterdār* of Tuna (twice), Aleppo, Karaman; *beglerbegi* of Keke, Karaman). According to Hādjdī Khalifa (i, 285 = ed. Flügel, no. 2160) he died in 1046/1636-7.

His History of the Ottomans, as yet unpublished, falls into two parts: the first two-thirds is an abridgement of the *Tāzī al-tawārikh* of Sa'd al-Dīn [q.v.]; the rest is apparently original and, for the later reigns, of great importance, since it depends on Ḥasan Bey-zāde's own experiences. Manuscripts are fairly numerous: to those listed in Babinger, 174 and 414, in *Istanbul Kültüphanleri Tarih-Coğrafya yazmaları katalogları*, i/2, 1944, 116-8, by O. F. Köprülü [see *Bibl.*], and in F. E. Karatay, *Topkapı Sarayı ... türkçe yazmalar katalogu*, i, 1961, nos. 745-7, add Konya, Mevlana Müzesi 3086. The History was first composed in 1031-2/1622-3 (see Flügel, ii, 255); but the manuscripts vary both in their content (? two recensions, see *Tarih Dergisi*, ii/3-4, 99) and in the points to which they reach: at least three (Nuruosmaniye 3106, Tarih Kurumu 517, Konya) have continuations to 1039 (= Solakzāde, p. 749, see below),