

Jerusalem Studies of Arabic and Islam, 10,  
1987 pp 167-191

DID AL-GHAZĀLĪ WRITE  
A MIRROR FOR PRINCES?  
On the authorship of *Naṣīhat al-mulūk*\*

Patricia Crone

To Professor Kister on his seventieth birthday—  
with apologies for having strayed from the *Jāhiliyya*.

It is well-known that there is a large pseudo-Ghazalian literature, and that even authentic works by al-Ghazālī have attracted interpolations and additions by other hands.<sup>1</sup> That the *Naṣīhat al-mulūk*, or 'Book of Counsel for Kings', should be classified as specimen of this literature rather than as an authentic work was suggested as far back as 1919 by Gardner,<sup>2</sup> and the same opinion was fathered on Jurī Zaydān by Zakī Mubārak in 1924.<sup>3</sup> In 1938, however, Humā'ī responded to Mubārak's aspersions on his national heritage with a vigorous defence of the authenticity of the work in his preface to the first edition of the Persian text;<sup>4</sup> and since then all Western scholars have accepted its ascription to al-Ghazālī as correct.<sup>5</sup> As will be

\* I should like to thank John Gurney, Martin Hinds and Fritz Zimmermann for helpful comments and criticisms. To John Gurney I am also indebted for making me think about the subject; and without Faraneh Alavi Moghadam I would never have got into it.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. Montgomery Watt, 'The Authenticity of the Works Attributed to al-Ghazālī', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1952; and, more recently, H. Lazarus-Yafeh, *Studies in Al-Ghazzālī*, Jerusalem 1975.

<sup>2</sup> W.R.W. Gardner, *Al-Ghazālī*, Madras 1919, p. 110.

<sup>3</sup> Z. Mubārak, *Al-akhlāq 'inda'l-Ghazālī*. Cairo 1924, p. 101. According to Mubārak, Zaydān expressed this opinion *fi fihris ta'rikh al-ādāb al-'arabiyya*. But Zaydān says nothing of this kind in any *fihris* of this work; and as noted by Humā'ī, he similarly fails to do so in the rubric on al-Ghazālī and elsewhere (cf. the following note). He does however query the authenticity of the *Sirr al-'ālamīn* in the additions and corrections appended to vol. iv (J. Zaydān, *Kitāb ta'rikh ādāb al-luḡa al-'arabiyya*, Cairo 1911-14, vol. iv, p. 321); and this is presumably what lies behind Mubārak's claim. (Mubārak did not commit himself either way in the passage cited, but in practice he treated the work as authentic, cf. *Akhlāq*, pp. 85, 88.

<sup>4</sup> Al-Ghazālī, *Naṣīhat al-mulūk*, ed. J. Humā'ī, Tehran 1315-17 (*shamsi*) (hereafter NM<sup>1</sup>), introduction, esp. pp. yb-yj.

<sup>5</sup> Thus notably A.K.S. Lambton, 'The Theory of Kingship in the *Naṣīhat al-mulūk* of Ghazālī', *Islamic Quarterly* 1954; *id.*, *State and Government in Medieval Islam*, Oxford

seen, there is in fact no question of dismissing the entire work as pseudo-epigraphic. It is nonetheless an odd idea that al-Ghazālī should have written a *Fürstenspiegel*: a religious scholar and ascetic hardly makes an obvious candidate for the authorship of a mirror, least of all for one which completely ignores the existence of the caliphate. And by 1972 Humā'ī himself had been seized by doubt. The *Naṣīhat al-mulūk*, as he noted in his preface to the second edition of the Persian text, consists of two parts. The first part is not a mirror for princes, but rather an exposition of the faith written for a prince; this part he held to be indisputably authentic.<sup>6</sup> But the second part is a mirror, or more precisely a book of practical wisdom which pays particular attention to the art of government; and this part he showed to be so uncharacteristic of al-Ghazālī in certain respects that he hesitated to accept the ascription, though accept it he did in the last resort.<sup>7</sup> In what follows I shall argue that Humā'ī was right to have doubts: the second part of the *Naṣīhat al-mulūk* is unquestionably the work of somebody other than its putative author.

The *Naṣīhat al-mulūk* (hereafter NM) is a Persian work composed for a ruler identified in the Arabic tradition as Muḥammad b. Malikshāh (died 1118), and in the Persian tradition (insofar as this tradition identifies him at all) as Sanjar (d. 1157).<sup>8</sup> There are two accounts of how al-Ghazālī came to write it. The first unambiguously envisages it as consisting of the first part only (hereafter NM1), while the second account apparently envisages it as

1981, pp. 117ff; H. Laoust, *La politique de Ghazālī*, Paris 1970, pp. 144ff (where the authenticity of the work is taken for granted); F.R.C. Bagley (tr.), *Ghazālī's Book of Counsel for Kings*, Oxford 1964, introduction, pp. xxivff (where the authenticity is defended). It is also listed as an authentic work in M. Bouyges, *Essai de chronologie des oeuvres de al-Ghazālī*, ed. M. Allard, Beirut 1959, pp. 61ff; 'A.-R. Badawī, *Mu'allafāt al-Ghazālī*, Cairo 1961, no. 47; and elsewhere. Watt did not devote much attention to the question (cf. 'Authenticity', p. 31) and Lazarus-Yafeh only deals with al-Ghazālī's Arabic works (cf. *Studies*, p. 45). But there is a rare reference to the possibility of false ascription in G.F. Hourani, 'The Chronology of Ghazālī's Writings', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 1959, p. 232.

<sup>6</sup> Al-Ghazālī, *Naṣīhat al-mulūk*<sup>2</sup>, ed. J. Humā'ī, Tehran 1351 (*shamsī*) (hereafter NM<sup>2</sup>), pp. 65ff of the introduction.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 71ff.

<sup>8</sup> For a detailed discussion of the question of the addressee, see Humā'ī, introduction to the second edition of NM, pp. 119ff; cf. also Laoust, *Politique*, pp. 145ff; Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, p. xvii. (In their attempt to resolve the problem both Humā'ī and Laoust assume the second part of NM to be genuine.)

such;<sup>9</sup> and al-Ghazālī does not himself refer to a *Fürstenspiegel* among his writings. NM must have come to include a *Fürstenspiegel* as early as the second half of the twelfth century, when it was first translated into Arabic:<sup>10</sup> the Arabic version (commonly known as *al-Tibr al-masbūk fi naṣīhat al-mulūk*) contains both parts of the work;<sup>11</sup> and numerous later sources which refer to, or borrow from, NM must also have known it in the form in which it exists today.<sup>12</sup> But the two parts of NM have also been preserved as separate works. Thus several manuscripts contain NM1 in Persian as a work of its own under the title of *Naṣīhat al-mulūk*,<sup>13</sup> while others contain it in Arabic under titles such as *Risāla fi usūl al-dīn*<sup>14</sup> or *Risāla ilā Malikshāh fi'l-'aqa'id*<sup>15</sup> (where Malikshāh is presumably a mistake for Muḥammad b. Malikshāh)<sup>16</sup> Conversely, one manuscript contains the

<sup>9</sup> According to an introduction appended to one Arabic and two Persian manuscripts of NM, al-Ghazālī wrote it at the request of Sanjar after the two had spent the whole day together in religious devotion. This clearly suggests that al-Ghazālī was asked to write a religious treatise, and in fact the three manuscripts in question contain NM1 alone (NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 289, 291; cf. Humā'ī's introduction thereto, pp. 29f; F. Meier, review of NM<sup>1</sup>, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 1939, pp. 403f). According to the *Fadā'il al-anām*, on the other hand, al-Ghazālī wrote it for an unnamed Seljuq sultan after a hostile encounter with some Hanafi 'ulamā'. This also suggests that what he was remembered as having written was a *risālah-yi i'tiqādī* rather than a book of practical wisdom (cf. Meier, review, p. 397; Humā'ī, introduction, p. 128; Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, p. xviii).

<sup>10</sup> NM was first translated into Arabic by 'Alī b. (al-) Mubārak, a dignitary of Irbil who must have flourished in the second half of the twelfth century and whose patron, according to some manuscripts, was an atabeg of Mosul who died in 595/1198f (cf. Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, pp. xviii; the translator's nephew has become his uncle at p. xix).

<sup>11</sup> Al-Ghazālī, *al-Tibr al-masbūk fi naṣīhat al-mulūk*, Cairo 1317 (among numerous other printings). For a concise analysis of the *Tibr*, see M. Asin Palacios, *La espiritualidad de Algazel y su sentido cristiano*, Madrid and Granada 1934-41, vol. iv, pp. 373ff.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Humā'ī, introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 55ff, 111ff (especially 117f).

<sup>13</sup> Meier, review of NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 403 (three Istanbul manuscripts); Humā'ī, introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 28ff (two of the same Istanbul manuscripts and one Cairene one).

<sup>14</sup> Bouyges, *Chronologie*, p. 105; Badawī, *Mu'allafāt*, no. 179 (one Munich manuscript); Meier, review of NM<sup>1</sup>, pp. 403f (one Istanbul manuscript, without indication of title).

<sup>15</sup> It has been printed in Cairo under this title (Bouyges, *Chronologie*, p. 105). This printing was hardly based on the Munich manuscript mentioned in the previous note, though Badawī seems to suggest as much (*Mu'allafāt*, no. 128).

<sup>16</sup> Al-Ghazālī refers to the *Ihyā'* in that part of NM which is a *risāla fi'l-'aqa'id* (cf. below, notes 42f), and the *Ihyā'* was composed after Malikshāh's death in 1093 (cf. Bouyges, *Chronologie*, pp. 41f. Bouyges nonetheless seems to accept Asin Palacios' dating of this epistle to Malikshāh's lifetime, cf. *ibid.*, p. 105; Asin Palacios, *Espiritualidad*, vol. i, p. 30n).

But this is  
to ignore  
his political  
engagement

second part of NM (hereafter NM2 in Arabic as a work of its own, under the title of *al-Farq bayna'l-ṣāliḥ wa-ghayr al-ṣāliḥ*.<sup>17</sup> In fact, it is clear from the contents of the two parts that they cannot have originated together, and though both are ascribed to al-Ghazālī even as separate works, the attribution to him of the second part must be rejected.

### NM1: the treatise on the faith

NM1 is a treatise on the faith which opens and closes with an address to the 'King of the East' (or 'King of East and West', 'King of the World', 'Sultan of the World').<sup>18</sup> It is a remarkably well written work. Faith is compared to a tree with ten roots and ten branches, and the exposition is ordered accordingly: it starts with a summary of the ten roots, *i.e.* the ten fundamental points of the Sunni creed, proceeds to a discussion of the ten branches, *i.e.* the ten major ways in which faith should show itself in action, more precisely in the action of a ruler, and concludes with a section on the two springs which water the tree of faith, *i.e.* insight into the nature of this world and awareness of death.<sup>19</sup> The language is simple and lucid throughout, but the style varies somewhat. Whereas the summary of the creed is concise, the discussion of the behaviour of rulers is diffuse and aphoristic. Here much use is made of stories about Biblical figures and Muslim caliphs, scholars and ascetics; and numerous sayings attributed to them, and to the Prophet, are also adduced, though few of them canonical and none of them equipped with *isnāds*. Even so, the author never loses his thread; and in the section on the transitory nature of human life the aphoristic mode of presentation is abandoned, the stories and sayings being replaced by striking parables. Poetry is absent throughout.

It is plain that the treatise was written by a professional theologian with a considerable gift for presenting his subject to laymen, and there is every

<sup>17</sup> Asin Palacios, *Espiritualidad*, vol. iv, p. 373; Badawī, *Mu'allafāt*, no. 130.

<sup>18</sup> NM<sup>1</sup>, pp. 1, 39; NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 1, 78 and the notes thereto = 3, 44. (The figures before the equation mark refer to the first and second editions of the text [above, notes 4, 6], those after it to Bagley's translation [above, note 5; based on the first edition]. I shall refer to the first edition only when it differs significantly from the second edition, which fails to indicate these differences in the notes.) The first edition has 'King of the East' in both passages; it is the manuscripts used for the second edition which have the variants.

<sup>19</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 5-13 = 6-12 (roots); 13-51 = 12-31 (branches); 52-79 = 31-44 (springs). Lambton finds the tree imagery reminiscent of Zoroastrianism (*State and Government*, p. 118), but it is derived from the Qur'ān, as al-Ghazālī himself indicates (14:29; cf. NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 2 = 4).

reason to believe that the theologian in question was al-Ghazālī. The style is certainly his. As has been noted before, his authentic works are all well organized and lucidly written.<sup>20</sup> The aphoristic style of the middle section may seem more uncharacteristic at first sight; but al-Ghazālī used precisely the same style in his discussion of precisely the same subject, *i.e.* the behaviour of rulers, in his *Mustazhiri*,<sup>21</sup> where many of the same anecdotes and sayings are cited too.<sup>22</sup> His talent for striking parables is well known. And his use of uncanonical Hadith was commented on already by medieval Muslim scholars.<sup>23</sup>

In terms of contents, there is likewise every reason to accept the ascription. Much of the work is based on other writings of his, the major source of NM1 being the *Kimiya-yi sa'adat*; NM1 could in fact be characterized as a selection of passages from the *Kimiya* adapted for the use of sultans.<sup>24</sup> And what it has to say about sultans is precisely what one would expect. As in the *Mustazhiri*, the stress is overwhelmingly on the heavy responsibilities of rulers and the dire fate that awaits them if they fail to live up to them.<sup>25</sup> Rulers are shepherds whom God will call to account;<sup>26</sup> and though the exercise of power can in principle be a source of unsurpassed happiness,<sup>27</sup> rulers do not in practice have anything but punishment in store for them. On the Day of Judgement they will all be placed on the Širāt bridge and will all fall off, be they virtuous or wicked, because there will

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Watt, 'Authenticity', p. 28, or the numerous statements cited by Lazarus-Yafeh, *Studies*, pp. 23ff. (It is hard to agree with Lazarus-Yafeh's objection that this characteristic is too vague to count as a criterion of authenticity.)

<sup>21</sup> Al-Ghazālī, *Fadā'ih al-bātiniyya*, ed. 'A.-R. Badawī, Cairo 1964, pp. 202ff; cf. I. Goldziher, *Streitschrift des Ghazālī gegen die Bātiniyya-Sekte*, Leiden 1916, p. 93.

<sup>22</sup> Goldziher, *Streitschrift*, p. 99.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 101.

<sup>24</sup> Humā'i, introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 65ff; cf. also Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, pp. xxivf.

<sup>25</sup> 'You should know that in matters between you [personally] and God, pardon is quite likely, but that anything involving injustice to mankind will not in any circumstances be overlooked at the resurrection' (NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 14 = 13; quotations are given in Bagley's translation with some modifications, often occasioned by the second edition). Compare al-Ghazālī, *Fadā'ih* (*i.e.* the *Mustazhiri*), pp. 208ff.

<sup>26</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 22 = 16f (also told in *Fadā'ih*, pp. 210f); similarly p. 24 = 18 (the corresponding passage in *Fadā'ih*, p. 211, should be emended in the light of this passage, or *Tibr*, p. 14). This concept of the ruler is attested already in Abū Yūsuf, *Kitāb al-kharāj*, Būlaq 1302, pp. 2ff = A. Ben Shemesh (tr.), *Taxation in Islam*, vol. iii, Leiden and London 1969, pp. 35ff; cf. also A.K.S. Lambton, 'Justice in the Medieval Persian Theory of Kingship', *Studia Islamica* 1962, p. 94.

<sup>27</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 14f = 14; similarly *Fadā'ih*, p. 208.

in the letters  
6. writes to  
Sajjad  
a speckling  
a silent  
testament:  
the Qur'an  
death.

The King  
for the  
of the  
sub.

not be a single one who has not taken a bribe or given an unjust verdict.<sup>28</sup> They will all be brought forth manacled, and only if they have acted righteously will they be set free.<sup>29</sup> Their chances are clearly slight: 'Woe to princes, woe to functionaries, woe to treasurers! These are the people who on the day of resurrection will wish that they had been hanged from the sky by their own curls and that they had never held office,' as the Prophet is supposed to have said.<sup>30</sup> 'Happy are you, O man', as 'Umar is said to have declared at a funeral, 'who never was a prince, overseer, scribe, bailiff or tax-collector.'<sup>31</sup>

The ideal to which rulers should seek to conform is entirely Islamic in conception and illustrated with reference to Muslim and Biblical figures alone, no Sāsānid kings (let alone Greek sages) being invoked in this part. The just ruler is someone who does not abuse his position and who makes sure that his soldiers, officials and other staff likewise refrain from doing so, for he will be held responsible for their conduct too.<sup>32</sup> He gives verdict in strict accordance with the Shari'a, not more strictly and not more leniently,<sup>33</sup> attaches great importance to the redress of grievances<sup>34</sup> and supervises everything in person, all responsibility being ultimately his.<sup>35</sup> To do this he must have justice inside him, that is self-control.<sup>36</sup> He should live modestly, avoiding sumptuous food and clothing,<sup>37</sup> and beware of all the flattery that will inevitably be heaped upon him.<sup>38</sup> And he should surround himself with

<sup>28</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 23 = 17; also told in *Fadā'ih*, p. 211.

<sup>29</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 21 = 16; *Fadā'ih*, p. 210.

<sup>30</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, *loc. cit.*; *Fadā'ih*, *loc. cit.*; compare also Fuḍayl b. 'Iyād's greeting to Hārūn: 'alas for so soft a hand unless it gets salvation from God' (NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 30 = 20; *Fadā'ih*, p. 214).

<sup>31</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 20 = 16. 'Umar himself was questioned for no less than twelve years after his death (*ibid.*, pp. 24f = 18; *Fadā'ih*, pp. 211f). And David wept on being reminded by Gabriel that he was living off the treasury: that is why God taught him the trade of armourer (NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 23f = 17; *Fadā'ih*, p. 211).

<sup>32</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 36 = 23.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 22, 50f = 16f, 31. The story at p. 22 is also cited in *Fadā'ih*, p. 211, where the implications are spelt out: 'in this *hadith* it is made clear that we should not seek refuge in anything but the law, and that nothing is more important to rulers than knowledge of the rules of the law'.

<sup>34</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 47f = 29; *Fadā'ih*, p. 203.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. the story about 'Umar and the mangy sheep, NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 24 = 177f; *Fadā'ih*, p. 211.

<sup>36</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 37 = 24; cf. pp. 39ff = 25ff.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 48f = 29f; *Fadā'ih*, p. 203 (where the story cited in illustration involves 'Umar and Salmān, not, as in NM<sup>2</sup>, 'Umar and a *muslimāni*).

<sup>38</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 50 = 30 (where the Prophetic saying should read *behtarīn a'immat*, not *ummat*, cf. *Fadā'ih*, p. 206).

devout 'ulamā' 'who will instruct him in the way of justice and keep the danger of his role fresh in his mind.'<sup>39</sup> All these recommendations are in perfect accordance with those of the *Mustazhiri*, because, as we are told in NM1, 'every 'ālim who meets kings should give this sort of advice, without suppressing the word of truth and without flattering their conceit so as to share in their tyranny.'<sup>40</sup> Like the *Mustazhiri*, in short, NM1 is a typical piece of *Fürstenermahnung*, not a *Fürstenspiegel*.<sup>41</sup>

To this must be added that the author of NM1 actually identifies the *Ihyā'* as his own work,<sup>42</sup> and also mentions a book in which he has described the nature of this world at greater length, a plausible reference to the *Ihyā'* or *Kimiyā'*.<sup>43</sup> NM1, in other words, is a treatise written in al-Ghazālī's style and spirit on the basis of al-Ghazālī's works by someone who identified himself as the author of these works. It would thus be unreasonable not to conclude that the author of NM1 is indeed al-Ghazālī.

#### NM2: the mirror

Ostensibly, NM2 is a practical complement to the spiritual advice given in NM1. In fact it is a work written for a different set of readers in a quite different style and spirit: arguments for the authenticity of NM invariably rest on NM1 alone.

On the turning to NM2 one is struck by the fact that author and addressee alike are suddenly referred to in a manner different from that of NM1. Al-Ghazālī only refers to himself twice in NM1, on both occasions to say that he has dealt with the subject at greater length elsewhere, and on both occasions using the first person plural.<sup>44</sup> But the author of NM2 frequently obtrudes, not in order to mention other works of his, but rather to explain why he has mentioned a particular point, devoted such and such length to it, or what opinion he has on the question; and though he too uses the first person plural, he also refers to himself as 'I';<sup>45</sup> and his preferred

<sup>39</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 26f = 19; similarly *Fadā'ih*, pp. 202, 212.

<sup>40</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 35 = 22f.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Goldziher, *Streitschrift*, pp. 95f.

<sup>42</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 40 = 25.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 55 = 33.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. the two preceding notes (*yād kardeh im, kitābi... kardeh im*).

<sup>45</sup> 'I have related this story to demonstrate that...' (*āvardam*, NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 252; but first person plural in NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 140 = 152); 'I did not want it to be longer than this and am content to have written this much...' (*nakhāstam, iktifā kardam*, NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 94 = 104; missing in

mode of reference is the third person singular: 'the author of this book declares...' (*khudāvand-i kitāb gūyad*), as he says on numerous occasions, usually to state his own opinion.<sup>46</sup>

The addressee is no longer a specific ruler. There is no mention of the 'King of the East'. One would have expected some expression of good wishes for his success at the end of the treatise, on a par with those which come at the end of NM1; but NM2 simply peters out with a poem. It offers advice to a 'king', 'kings' and 'the kings of the present age',<sup>47</sup> and as in NM1, the king is sometimes addressed as 'you'.<sup>48</sup> But whereas NM1 sometimes adds 'O King',<sup>49</sup> or 'O Sultan of the world', NM2 never does, though once it has 'O Sultan of Islam',<sup>50</sup> and it addresses the king as 'you' precisely where NM1 avoids doing so.<sup>51</sup> What is more, it also addresses secretaries as 'you'.<sup>52</sup> In fact, the author of NM2 frequently makes clear that 'you' could be anyone: 'in case any person should find difficulty in un-

the second edition); 'we have mentioned this story for the purpose of demonstrating that...' (*āvardim*, NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 251 = 151; the first edition has *mā... āvardim*, p. 139); 'in our opinion this is wrong, because we have found and verified that...' (*bi-nazdik-i mā paydā kardim*, *bāz namūdīm*, NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 54 = 62; missing in NM<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>46</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 101 (missing in NM<sup>1</sup>), 104, 162, 183, 258, 261, 267, 281, 285 = 58, 98, 111, 157, 158, 161, 170, 172. This was also noted by Humā'i (introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 79).

<sup>47</sup> 'The king must follow the precepts and methods...' (NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 112 = 63); 'the king should never entrust his business to unworthy persons...' (*ibid.*, p. 143 = 86); cf. 'it is incumbent upon the sultan when...' (*ibid.*, 167 = 101). 'It is the duty of wise and noble kings...' (*ibid.*, p. 162 = 98); 'the kings of this present age have even more reason to do so' (*ibid.*, p. 112 = 63).

<sup>48</sup> Cf. below, note 51.

<sup>49</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 1, 3, 5, 13 = 3, 4, 6, 12 ('O King'). This form of direct address disappears in the discussion of the branches where rulers are spoken of and addressed in the third person singular (e.g. 'the holder of authority should not be dominated by pride...', *ibid.*, p. 39 = 25; '[the king] should not be satisfied with...', *ibid.*, p. 36 = 23; cf. NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 18, where the parenthetical king is explicit). The direct address is resumed in the discussion of the springs ('you should know that...'), but invariably without 'O King' or similar invocations in the first edition. The second edition, however, systematically adds 'O Sultan of the world' (NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 52, 54, 58). Given the change of title, it is hard not to take this to be an interpolation.

<sup>50</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 114. Missing in NM<sup>1</sup> and probably also an interpolation.

<sup>51</sup> 'You should also instruct your fiscal governors...' (*bifarmā'i*)... such is the situation and you should know it' (*tā danisteh bāshi tā bidāni* in MN<sup>1</sup>, p. 61], NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 121f = 69f). The author of NM<sup>1</sup> invariably uses the third person singular for this type of advice, cf. above, note 49.

<sup>52</sup> 'When you have written the letter, read through what you have included in it before you fold it up...' (*chūn nāmeḥ nibishti*, NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 195f = 118).

derstanding this...' (*agar kasirā mushkil shavad*);<sup>53</sup> 'the above story has been quoted in order that the wise may understand...' (*tā khiradmandān bidānand*);<sup>54</sup> 'we have mentioned this in order that whoever reads it may know...' (*tā har keh bar khānad... bidānad*).<sup>55</sup> At one point the author even exclaims 'understand therefore, O brother.'<sup>56</sup> One Arabic version of NM is appropriately entitled *Kitāb naṣīhat al-mulūk wa-kull ghani wa-ṣu'lūk*, 'The Book of Counsel for Kings and Every Rich Man and Beggar.'<sup>57</sup> NM2 is wisdom for everyone.

It is thus clear that NM1 and NM2 cannot have been conceived as parts of the same work. In principle, of course, both could still be authentic works by al-Ghazālī, but this possibility can be ruled out on other grounds.

First, the stylistic contrast between the two parts of NM is glaring. Where NM1 is a well organized treatise, NM2 is a rambling compilation of anecdotes, aphorisms and poetry loosely strung together in no particular order and adding up to no particular point.<sup>58</sup> It is true that al-Ghazālī himself adopts an aphoristic style in the middle section of NM1. But for one thing, he cites no poetry there; and, as Humā'i noted with some concern, he nowhere cites Persian poetry on the scale of NM2.<sup>59</sup> For another thing, the anecdotes and aphorisms of NM1 are adduced in illustration of ten fundamental points, *i.e.* the ten rules of royal behaviour: there is an overall argument behind the selection of the material. But the stories and sayings of NM2 are simply such pieces of wisdom as the author happened to know and like on the subject, with the result that they are often contradictory; even when they are not contradictory, they do not add up to a coherent argument. It is for this reason that the author has to indicate his own opinion by interspersing his 'the author of this book declares...'. As Humā'i pointed out, this is not a formula which al-Ghazālī uses elsewhere,<sup>60</sup>

<sup>53</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 83 = 47.

<sup>54</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 104. NM<sup>1</sup> uses the singular (p. 50 = 58).

<sup>55</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 184 = 111; similarly NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 94 = 104 (missing in the second edition).

<sup>56</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 259 = 157. This was noted by Bagley as a possible interpolation (*Book of Counsel*, p. xxiv, cf. xlix).

<sup>57</sup> Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, p. xxiii.

<sup>58</sup> 'The book is arranged in a logical and orderly fashion' (Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, p. xxxix); 'mal composée et manifestement écrite avec une certaine hâte' (Laoust, *Politique*, p. 151). Both are verdicts on NM, formed on the basis of NM<sup>1</sup> and NM<sup>2</sup> respectively.

<sup>59</sup> Humā'i, introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 72f.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 79.

evidently because his manner of presentation makes it quite superfluous. There is accordingly no question of explaining the disorderly nature of NM2 with reference to the assumption that it was composed in a hurry.<sup>61</sup> NM1 and NM2 exemplify two quite different methods of work. In fact, such evidence as we have suggests that it was the *first* part of NM which was composed in a hurry,<sup>62</sup> and this might explain why so much of it is lifted from the *Kimiyā*:<sup>63</sup> pressed for time, in other words, al-Ghazālī would respond by recycling earlier arguments, formulations and illustrations, not by throwing everything together in a messy compilation. The method of work exemplified by NM2 simply is not his. Where, as Montgomery Watt notes, 'we find works that are a cento of varied materials, put together without any clear principle... we can say at once "these were not put together by al-Ghazālī."' <sup>64</sup>

Secondly, NM2 in no way reflects the preoccupations and convictions of al-Ghazālī, still less his intellectual stature. Thus it completely omits discussion of the imamate, an oddity which has been noted before, but never satisfactorily explained. Mirrors did of course usually ignore the question, but the genre did not preclude discussion of it; and at all events, as Bagley notes, 'even though a "Mirror for Princes" cannot be expected to contain legal discussion, it nevertheless seems remarkable that *Naṣīhat al-mulūk* should not give to the Sultan a single word of advice to respect and honour the Caliph.'<sup>65</sup> Laoust infers that al-Ghazālī saw himself as a practical man and defender of the sultan in NM, whereas he was a theoretician and defender of the caliph in the *Mustazhiri* and other works in which he dealt with the imamate at length.<sup>66</sup> But if al-Ghazālī had wished

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Laoust, above, note 58.

<sup>62</sup> According to the introduction to NM<sup>1</sup> as a treatise of its own, al-Ghazālī promised to send Sanjar the work he had requested as soon as Sanjar reached home (NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 291; cf. above, note 9).

<sup>63</sup> Thus Humā'ī, introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 71.

<sup>64</sup> Watt, "Authenticity", p. 28.

<sup>65</sup> Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, p. lii. Bagley suggests that maybe the loyalty of the Seljuq ruler in question could be taken for granted.

<sup>66</sup> Laoust, *Politique*, p. 146 (where the second 'théoricien' must be dittographic for 'practicien'). The explanation suggested by Lambton, *State and Government*, p. 117, is similar. In Lambton, "Theory of Kingship", pp. 49f, the absence of the imamate is explained with reference to the contemporary situation: after Malikshāh, the sultans only endeavoured to obtain the caliph's recognition in order to strengthen their position vis-à-vis their rivals. Why this should make al-Ghazālī drop the subject is not entirely clear.

to defend the sultan, he would have done so by sorting out his legal position vis-à-vis the caliph, not by ignoring the problem altogether; and if he had wished to be a practical man, he would have done so by writing a lucid summary of the Muslim laws of taxation, war, treatment of *dhimmi*s and so forth, not by dilating on subjects such as the art of cutting the pen, the aphorisms of the sages, or the good and bad points of women.<sup>67</sup> NM2 evidently is not a particularly practical work at all. It does not even have a chapter on the army.

The imamate is absent from NM2 for the simple reason that the author had no interest in it: he displays no interest in Islamic law at all, be it constitutional or other, as he would inevitably have done if he had been al-Ghazālī. There is a brief reference to the Shari'ca in the discussion of the ruler's religion,<sup>68</sup> but none in the definition of perfect justice;<sup>69</sup> and the exhortations to observe the law characteristic of the *Mustazhiri* and NM1 are completely absent from NM2.<sup>70</sup> Indeed, where NM1 warns the ruler not to drink wine,<sup>71</sup> NM2 takes it for granted that rulers drink and merely exhorts them not to get drunk, citing a poem on the question.<sup>72</sup> There is no reference to the ruler's duty to conduct *jihād*,<sup>73</sup> nor are there any warnings against the collection of uncanonical taxes, a subject on which al-Ghazālī had written in uncompromising terms in the *Ihyā'*:<sup>74</sup> such advice as NM2 has to offer on the subject of taxation is given in a completely non-legal vein, unlawful behaviour being disrecommended on the ground that it is *inauspicious*.<sup>75</sup> The claim that 'Umar killed his own son

<sup>67</sup> NM, chh. 3, 5, 7.

<sup>68</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 106; missing in NM<sup>1</sup> (pp. 51f = 59f).

<sup>69</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 121 = 69f.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Goldziher, *Streitschrift*, pp. 93f; above, note 33. Lambton also noted that the Shari'ca plays a minor role in NM ("Theory of Kingship", p. 50).

<sup>71</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 14 = 13; cf. p. 51 = 31.

<sup>72</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 112 = 64 (Sāsānid wine-drinking); 136 = 79f (constant wine-drinking, chess-playing and so forth are not recommended); 142 = 85 (poetic exhortation against getting drunk; there is another such exhortation in NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 46 = 54, but NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 97, has *zishṭi* for *mastī*); 228 = 138n (pure wine is good for the eyes); 250 = 150f (wine-drinking at the court of al-Ma'mūn). That this is most unlike al-Ghazālī was noted by Humā'ī, introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 77f, 79; cf. also Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, p. xlv.

<sup>73</sup> Also noted by Lambton, "Theory of Kingship", p. 49n, who suggests that the topic is absent because Syria was no longer controlled by the great sultan.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. al-Ghazālī, *Ihyā' 'ulūm al-dīn*, Bulāq 1282, vol. ii, pp. 110ff (*kitāb al-halāl wa'l-harām*, ch. 5); Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, p. iii.

<sup>75</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 185f = 112: tax-collectors may not seize estates when heirs are present, but must shun greed, as it is *nā mubārak*.

in the course of inflicting *ḥadd*-punishment on him is made by way of illustration of the excellent discipline that 'Umar maintained, not with a view to stressing the importance of observance of the law;<sup>76</sup> and the story of the law-suit between a Magian and Yahyā al-Barmakī is told from a Shu'ūbī rather than a Shar'ī point of view: whoever the author of NM2 may have been, he had neither professional knowledge of the Shar'īa nor a strong commitment to it.<sup>77</sup>

In fact, it is clear that the author of NM2 was not an 'ālim at all, still less a thinker. No religious scholar worth the name would have been able unselfconsciously to refer to a Būyid ruler by the blasphemous title of *Shāhānshāh*,<sup>78</sup> nor would he have been so ignorant as to claim that 'Umar killed a son of his own.<sup>79</sup> No thinker, least of all al-Ghazālī, would have been capable of dealing with the subject of intelligence by citing a string of entertaining stories and platitudinous sayings ascribed to Sāsānid and other sages,<sup>80</sup> or of compiling a whole chapter of such platitudes ascribed, *inter alia*, to the Greek philosophers whose real views al-Ghazālī knew and rejected as infidel;<sup>81</sup> still less would he have been so naive as to tell a story in which God sends down a letter from heaven saying, 'This is a warrant from God, *al-ʿazīz*, to 'Umar b. 'Abd al-ʿAzīz. We have exempted 'Umar b. 'Abd al-ʿAzīz from hell-fire.'<sup>82</sup> Al-Ghazālī was a

<sup>76</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 114 = 65.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 170f = 104. A Magian brought a claim against Yahyā al-Barmakī, but had no witnesses; Abū Yūsuf made Yahyā swear (an oath of denial), boasting that he had placed Yahyā and the Magian on an equal footing in accordance with the Shar'īa. Bagley describes this as a story with 'an authentically Ghazālīan note of sincerity' in which Abū Yūsuf gives redress to the Magian solely on the strength of the latter's sworn declaration, though strictly speaking this was contrary to the law (*Book of Counsel*, pp. 1, 104n). But apart from the fact that a story identifying a non-Shar'ī procedure as Shar'ī could not be authentically Ghazālīan, it is Yahyā who swears the oath. (This is unclear in NM<sup>1</sup> [p. 93], but Bagley himself identifies him as the oath-taker in his translation.) And the fact that non-Muslims cannot act as witnesses against Muslims does not mean that they cannot bring claims against them. The point of the story is that Abū Yūsuf submits Yahyā to the indignity of swearing an oath of rebuttal (in perfect accordance with Islamic law) instead of dismissing the claim (as he could have done): good Muslims are decent to Zoroastrians. It is the author's failure to adduce a specific Shar'ī injunction on the treatment of *dhimmis* which shows that he is not a lawyer.

<sup>78</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 191 = 115.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. above, note 76.

<sup>80</sup> NM, ch. 6. It did cross Bagley's mind that this chapter might not be authentic (*Book of Counsel*, p. ix).

<sup>81</sup> NM, ch. 5. This was another problem for Bagley (*Book of Counsel*, p. 1xx).

<sup>82</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 120 = 68. The translation given here reflects the wording of NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 60.

thinker who popularized by making things lucid and simple, not by being facile, naive or commonplace; and he was a religious scholar in everything he wrote. The author of NM2, by contrast, was a compiler who delighted in elegant, witty and otherwise memorable formulations of commonplace sentiments; of Islamic learning he had little, and of systematic thought there is no trace at all.

The same point can be made by a comparison of what al-Ghazālī and the author of NM2 have to say about women. Al-Ghazālī wrote extensively on the subject in the *Ihyā'* and, in abbreviated form, the *Kimiyā*, setting out his views in his typically systematic and lucid fashion in both works.<sup>83</sup> The author of NM2 by contrast offers a jumble of anecdotes, poetry and *bon mots*.<sup>84</sup> The author of NM2 does not refer to the fact that he has dealt with the subject at greater length elsewhere, as he would have done if he had been al-Ghazālī, and he does not draw his material from al-Ghazālī either. He shares with him sentiments such as that one should feel compassion for women because of their feeble intelligence,<sup>85</sup> and that one should act contrary to their advice (though on this point he also says the opposite);<sup>86</sup> but these are commonplace views, and there is nothing to indicate dependence. Two sayings do occur in both al-Ghazālī's works and NM2; but they occur in different forms, and one of them is ascribed to different authorities as well.<sup>87</sup> The classifications of women adopted in the *Ihyā'* and NM2 are different.<sup>88</sup> The author of NM2 counsels against

<sup>83</sup> Al-Ghazālī, *Ihyā'*, vol. ii, pp. 16ff (*kitāb adāb al-nikāh*) = *Le livre des bons usages en matière de mariage*, tr. L. Bercher and G.-H. Bousquet, Paris and Oxford 1953; *id.*, *Kitāb kimiyā-yi sa'adat*, ed. A. Ārām, Tehran 1319, vol. i, pp. 269ff.

<sup>84</sup> NM, ch. 7.

<sup>85</sup> *Ihyā'*, vol. ii, p. 33 = 68; cf. *Kimiyā*, vol. i, p. 281; NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 282f = 171.

<sup>86</sup> *Ihyā'*, vol. ii, p. 35 = 72; *Kimiyā*, vol. i, p. 282; NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 282f = 171; for the opposite view, see *ibid.*, pp. 266f = 161.

<sup>87</sup> Thus al-Ghazālī cites the Prophet as saying that the best women are the most beautiful of face and the most moderate in terms of dower (*Ihyā'*, vol. ii, p. 32 = 62; *Kimiyā*, vol. i, p. 279); but NM inserts 'the most prolific in childbirth' before the other two characteristics (NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 261 = 158. Similarly, al-Ghazālī cites 'Alī as saying that three vices in men are virtues in women (*Ihyā'*, vol. ii, p. 31 = 58); but NM omits one of the vices and ascribes the saying to a clever woman (NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 269 = 163).

<sup>88</sup> Al-Ghazālī cites a list of six types of women that one should not marry, and another of four that one should equally avoid (*Ihyā'*, vol. ii, pp. 30f = 57f). But NM gives a quite different list of ten (mainly undesirable) types, each one characterized by affinity with a certain animal (NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 273ff = 165f).



marrying for nobility, a possibility that did not preoccupy al-Ghazālī,<sup>89</sup> and he blames all evils of this world on women (saying nicer things about them too), which al-Ghazālī does not.<sup>90</sup> Conversely, al-Ghazālī evaluates marriage in terms of its capacity to promote or impede a religious life, a line of thought which is alien to the author of NM2.<sup>91</sup> In short, al-Ghazālī and the author of NM2 have little in common; and here as elsewhere it is clear that the latter was not a religious scholar.

Thirdly, the author of NM2 voices a wide variety of opinions which are completely at odds with those of al-Ghazālī. He does, it is true, share some views with him. Thus he has one reference to the concept of rulers as shepherds accountable to God for their flocks,<sup>92</sup> and one saying stressing the temporary nature of human life (but put into the mouth of Alexander),<sup>93</sup> two sayings enjoining avoidance of rulers,<sup>94</sup> and a fairly lengthy section on 'Umar I, 'Umar II and other Muslim figures who here as elsewhere exemplify virtues such as modesty and humility, scrupulous respect for public money and insistence on personal supervision.<sup>95</sup> But for the rest NM2 is expressive of an altogether different ethos. It fails to reflect the preoccupations of al-Ghazālī because its author has preoccupations of his own, and these preoccupations are as thoroughly Iranian as those of al-Ghazālī are Islamic.

Thus NM2 opens with the statement that 'God on High chose two classes of men and endowed them with superiority over the rest, one of them being prophets... and the other kings', and proceeds to inform us that since kingship and divine effulgence (*farr-i izādī*) have been granted to them by God, they must be loved and obeyed by 'everyone to whom God has given religion.'<sup>96</sup> Where al-Ghazālī refuses to flatter rulers, the author of NM2 happily elevates them to a status of parity with prophets; and where al-Ghazālī reminds them of their future punishment, the au-

<sup>89</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 261 = 158; that the woman should be *nasiba, az nasabi muhtaram* is simply a minor desideratum to al-Ghazālī (*Ihyā'*, vol. ii, p. 33 = 65; *Kimiyā*, vol. i, p. 279).

<sup>90</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 285 = 172f, where the view that 'all the trials, misfortunes and woes which befall men come from women' is given as the author's own opinion and illustrated in the poem with which the book concludes.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. *Ihyā'*, vol. ii, p. 17 = 7, and *passim*; *Kimiyā*, vol. i, pp. 273, 275.

<sup>92</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 121f = 70.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 227 = 138.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 145f = 87.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 114ff = 65ff.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 81f = 45f; cf. p. 183 = 111.

thor of NM2 by contrast singles them out as God's favourites, stressing that as such they are entitled not just to obedience, but also to positive love from their subjects. The moral position of the Muslim king is here as unproblematic as that of his Sāsānid predecessor,<sup>97</sup> and whereas Sāsānid kings are absent from both the *Mustazhiri* and NM1, they are invoked time and again in NM2.<sup>98</sup>

A high appreciation of kingship goes with a high appreciation of royal service. It is thus somewhat inconsistent of the author of NM2 to cite sayings such as 'woe unto him who is afflicted with association with kings; for he will have no friends, no kinsmen, no sons, no servants and no sympathy.'<sup>99</sup> But as might be expected, he also has a view of government service as a privilege rather than a calamity, and this privilege, we are told, should be reserved for those of noble birth: 'the king should never entrust his business to unworthy persons, but to men of noble origin.'<sup>100</sup> Indeed, as a qualification for government service, nobility is more important than piety and unworldliness.<sup>101</sup> The author thus finds himself in agreement with Ibn al-Muqaffa<sup>c</sup>, who had voiced similar ideas to al-Manṣūr.<sup>102</sup> He does not find himself in agreement with al-Ghazālī or other Muslim '*ulamā*'.

Nobility is a concept which looms large in the author's mind.<sup>103</sup> One aspect of it, we are told, is magnanimity, a behavioural pattern found 'in kings and high-ranking persons (*mihtarān*).'<sup>104</sup> Where NM1 enjoins abstemiousness and non-attachment to this world, NM2 thus recommends lavish generosity and expenditure.<sup>105</sup> No king thinks in terms of less than a

<sup>97</sup> Compare the passages from the *Dēnkart* cited by M. Molé, *Culte, mythe et cosmologie dans l'Iran ancien*, Paris 1963, pp. 38, 44: the best of people are the good, sovereign and wise king and the religious leader of the age... the origins of good kingship is the grant of kingship by Ohrmazd.

<sup>98</sup> This was one of the points that worried Humā'i (introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 74). Lambton also found the prominence of the Sāsānid tradition surprising in a work by al-Ghazālī ('Theory of Kingship', p. 48, cf. p. 50).

<sup>99</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 145 = 87. (In accordance with the first edition, Bagley has 'service of the sultan' for 'association with kings' and 'respect' for 'servants'.)

<sup>100</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 143 = 86.

<sup>101</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 143 = 85f.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. C. Pellat (ed. and tr.), *Ibn al-Muqaffa<sup>c</sup>, "Conseiller" du Calife*, Paris 1976, §§ 44ff.

<sup>103</sup> Also noted by Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, pp. 1v, xii.

<sup>104</sup> NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 107 = 119; cf. NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 197, where the high-ranking persons have been omitted.

<sup>105</sup> This contrast was also noted by Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, p. xi.



thousand.<sup>106</sup> No gift should be worth less than the income from a town. Al-Ma'mūn excluded his son al-'Abbās from succession on hearing him talk of 'half a dirham.'<sup>107</sup> Kings should not detract from their good name by worrying about dirhams and *dāngs* after the fashion of merchants,<sup>108</sup> just as noblemen should not jeopardize their rank and dignity for the sake of a mere estate.<sup>109</sup> Even 'Umar, elsewhere invoked for his scrupulous attitude to public money, is here made to say that nothing is more degrading than mean-mindedness.<sup>110</sup>

Naturally, the author of NM2 requires the king to be not only magnanimous, but also just, and as mentioned already, this is a subject on which he has something in common with al-Ghazālī. But in addition to adducing 'Umar I, 'Umar II and other Muslim rulers as embodiments of justice, he also refers a great deal to Sāsānid kings, and the concept of justice which they personify is a quite different one. Their justice was something intimately linked with prosperity. Thus it was through justice that the Magians developed the universe,<sup>111</sup> and through justice that Anūshirvān made everything prosperous.<sup>112</sup> he even resorted to strata-gems to ascertain whether there were any ruined places in his kingdom which he needed to repair and repopulate.<sup>113</sup> The kings before Anūshirvān all showed concern for prosperity and justice: 'They founded villages, excavated irrigation tunnels and brought out all the hidden waters.'<sup>114</sup> It was because of their justice that the Magians endured for 4000 years, for though sovereignty will endure with unbelief, it will not endure without justice.<sup>115</sup> 'Where injustice and oppression are present, the people have no foothold; the cities and localities go to ruin, the inhabitants flee and move to other territories, the cultivated lands are abandoned, the kingdom falls into decay...'<sup>116</sup>

For this type of justice, we are told, the king needs orthodoxy, for

<sup>106</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 198 = 119.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 198f = 120.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 199f = 121.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 200 = 121.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 197 = 119.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 82 = 46.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 99 = 55.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 99f = 55f.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 99 = 55. (Following the first edition, Bagley has 'all the waters that were being wasted to give life to the land'.)

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 82 = 46.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 100 = 56.

religion and kingship are like brothers.<sup>117</sup> But if the king is orthodox and just, then so are his subjects, for the subjects take after their kings, a view which the author presents several times and defends with some passion.<sup>118</sup>

These ideas are all Iranian. According to the *Dēnkart*, good kingship manifests itself, among other things, in justice, prosperity and happiness, whereas evil kingship manifests itself in injustice, unhappiness and destruction;<sup>119</sup> and here as there, the personal virtues of the king play a crucial role in the moral and material welfare of the world: 'every time orthodoxy and good kingship are united in... the person of the good and orthodox king, the world finds itself well-ordered and illustrious; vices decrease, virtues increase... the good are happy and powerful, the evil ones terrified and powerless; the world becomes prosperous and the entire creation happy.'<sup>120</sup> The Iranian origin of the tag that religion and kingship are (like) brothers (or twins) is well known.<sup>121</sup> But these are not al-Ghazālī's ideas. He did subscribe to the view that religion and kingship are brothers, but he cites the tag in a different form.<sup>122</sup> There are no references in the

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 106 = 59.

<sup>118</sup> 'You must understand that the development or desolation of the world depends on kings; for if the king is just, the world is prosperous... whereas when the king is tyrannical, the world becomes desolate...' (NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 83 = 46f). 'You should understand that the piety of the people depends on the good character (*nikūsirati*) of the king... sages have said that the character of the subjects spring from the character of the kings; for (they)... acquire their habits from them. Have you not observed... (how people took after their caliphs in the days of al-Walid, Sulaymān and 'Umar II)... in view of this, you will understand that the people in every epoch choose to do as their sultan does...' (*ibid.*, pp. 107f = 60f). 'There is a saying... that "we get such *amīrs* as we deserve"... in our opinion this is erroneous, because we have found and verified that... the conduct of mankind varies with their conduct' (NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 54 = 62; missing in NM<sup>2</sup>). 'What the sages say is right: "people resemble their kings more than their time"... there is also a tradition that "people follow the religion of their kings"' (NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 110 = 62).

<sup>119</sup> *Dēnkart* cited by Molé, *Culte*, p. 44. The Sāsānid kings took this concept of good kingship very seriously in practice, cf. R. McC. Adams, *Land Behind Baghdad*, Chicago and London 1965, pp. 69f.

<sup>120</sup> *Dēnkart* cited by Molé, *Culte*, p. 38.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, p. 59n. It is not to my knowledge attested in the extant Zoroastrian books, but compare statements such as 'kingship is religion and religion essentially kingship... kingship supports itself on religion and... religion on kingship... just as kingship is religion and religion kingship, anarchy is fundamentally evil religion and evil religion anarchy' (*Dēnkart* cited by Molé, *Culte*, pp. 51f).

<sup>122</sup> Cf. *Fadā'ih*, p. 205: *al-islām wa'l-sultān akhawān taw'amān lā yasluhu ahaduhumā illā bi-sāhibihī*, ascribed to the Prophet. NM2 has *pādshāhī u dīn chūn do barādarand* (NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 51, where *do* is omitted; NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 106, which adds *al-dīn wa'l-dawla taw'amān* by way of chapter heading); and it is cited as a saying, not as Hadīth.

*Mustazhiri* to the importance of digging irrigation channels; and the idea that the piety, morality and happiness of a Muslim population depends on the character of its ruler runs counter to everything that an *‘ālim* believes. Here, as in so many places, the author of NM2 declares himself committed to Iranian ideas which had *not* been absorbed into mainstream Islam.

Thus the author of NM2 also subscribes to un-Islamic ideas in respect of fame. Where al-Ghazālī is concerned with the ruler’s prospect of gaining salvation in the next world, the author of NM2 is much more interested in the name which he will leave behind in this one: the righteous ruler will gain eternal renown. The kings of pre-Islamic Iran, we are told, have all passed away, ‘but their names endure – for deeds such as we have enumerated. You should know for certain that men leave behind a memorial in what gets said about them; if a man is virtuous, he will be remembered for his virtue; if wicked, for his wickedness.’<sup>123</sup> People still talk about Anūshīrvān because of his justice.<sup>124</sup> You can still see the remains of the buildings of his predecessors.<sup>125</sup> ‘There is a saying that the memory which noble men (*āzādmardān*) leave behind them is their second life in this world.’ Not only kings, but everyone should therefore shun vices so as not to leave behind a bad name: ‘after you, only talk of you will last – take good care that such talk be of the best’. But kings in particular should cultivate virtue so as not to be remembered for their wickedness.<sup>126</sup>

The memorial left behind by the righteous ruler constitutes an example which should be studied and followed. ‘The king must follow the precepts and methods of these kings who preceded him, and govern righteously like them. He must also read the books of good counsel. . . just as Anūshīrvān. . . used to read the books of former kings, ask for stories about them and follow their ways.’<sup>127</sup> Divine effulgence, we are told, expresses itself among other things in ‘frequent reading of the reports (of the pious ancestors), constant attention to the biographies of kings and enqui-

<sup>123</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 96 = 53. The first edition has *ba‘da az mardum* for *yādgār-i mardum* (NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 46), whence Bagley’s different translation.

<sup>124</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 99 = 55. Compare p. 113 = 64: the kings of old strove to make their realms prosperous ‘with the result that their good reputation (*nām-i nikū*) endures’.

<sup>125</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 99 = 55.

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 96f = 53f.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 112 = 63.

ry into the kings of old, because the present world is a continuation of the empire of the forerunners, who reigned and departed, each leaving a memorial to his name . . .’<sup>128</sup>

This idea of living on in one’s name, setting a memorial to oneself and at the same time an example to future generations by one’s good behaviour, is well attested for pre-Islamic Iran. Thus Kartīr, a famous Sāsānid priest, boasts in an inscription with the modesty typical of cultures appreciating fame that ‘the great goodness’ of his own name has often been written in a variety of official documents, that future perusers of these documents will know that he was the Kartīr who held such and such high office under such and such kings,<sup>129</sup> that he has established a record ‘such that by it I make known the path to heaven and hell’, and that his example should be followed: ‘Whoever may see and examine this inscription, let him be pious and upright for the gods and lords, and for his own soul.’<sup>130</sup> In much the same spirit Xerxes had set an example to future generations in the inscription recording his eradication of *daiva* cults: ‘Where the *daivas* have previously been worshipped there did I worship Ahura Mazdāh in accordance with Truth and using the proper rite. . . O thou who shalt come after me, if thou wouldst be happy when alive and blessed when dead, have respect for the law which Ahura Mazdāh has established and worship Ahura Mazdāh in accordance with Truth and using the proper rites.’<sup>131</sup> ‘Now just as we serve and adore the gods with zeal. . . so also he who comes after us. . . should serve and adore the gods

<sup>128</sup> NM<sup>1</sup>, pp. 65f = 74; NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 127f (where the *salaf-i ṣāliḥ* have dropped out). Compare also NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 118f = 67: ‘if you wish to understand why justice, piety and equitable rule are what leave the sultan with a good name (*nikūnāmi*), you should study the reports about ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’.

<sup>129</sup> R. N. Frye (ed. and tr.), ‘The Middle Persian Inscription of Kartīr at Naqš-i Rājāb’, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 1964f, pp. 218, 224f. Kartīr says much the same in M.L. Chaumont (ed. and tr.), ‘L’inscription de Kartīr à la ‘Ka‘bah de Zoroastre’, *Journal Asiatique* 1960, p. 345 = 349 (lines 16ff), though in this inscription he omits the ‘great goodness’ of his name.

<sup>130</sup> Frye, ‘Inscription’, pp. 215f, 224 (I have changed Frye’s ‘writing’ (*nāmak*) to ‘inscription’); cf. also Chaumont, ‘L’inscription’, p. 345 = 349 (line 18).

<sup>131</sup> Xerxes in R.C. Zaehner, *The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism*, London 1961, p. 159. (For the text and another translation, see R.G. Kent, *Old Persian, Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*<sup>2</sup>, New Haven 1953, pp. 151f; for a translation of the Akkadian version, see J.B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, Princeton 1955, p. 317.)

with zeal,' as Shāhpūr echoes in the Naqsh-i Rostam inscription.<sup>132</sup> And a *vuzurgframadar* who had contributed to the prosperity of the world by building a bridge similarly recorded his good deed inscriptionally, at the same time asking 'whoever has come on the road' to give blessings to himself and his sons.<sup>133</sup> It is within this tradition that Anūshirvān drinks in NM2 to 'the brave men who will come after us', hoping that 'they will remember us just as we remember those who were before us.'<sup>134</sup>

The author of NM2 also subscribes to completely un-Islamic ideas in respect of fate. In the last resort, he thinks, life is dominated by 'fortune' (*dawlat*) or the 'misfortunes of time' (*āfathā-yi zamāneh*),<sup>135</sup> or in other words by an impersonal fate which has little to do with the divine predestination of Muslim theology.<sup>136</sup> It is in this spirit that he cites a well known Zoroastrian statement to the effect that five aspects of life are pre-determined (by fate), *i.e.* wife, children, money, kingship and lifespan, whereas others depend on effort, temperament and so forth.<sup>137</sup> More strikingly, he declares as his own opinion that 'the wheel does not pause at any point in its rotation, that good fortune cannot be relied on, and that the decree of heaven (*qadā-yi asmāni*) cannot be held back by armies and treasuries, but that when fortune's rope swings back, all these things will

<sup>132</sup> A. Maricq (ed. and tr.), "Classica et Orientalia: 'Res gestae divi Saporis'", *Syria* 1958, p. 331 = 330.

<sup>133</sup> W.B. Henning (ed. and tr.), "The Inscription of Firuzabad", *Asia Major* 1954, p. 101.

<sup>134</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 112f = 64.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 162, 225 = 98, 137.

<sup>136</sup> Cf. M. Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, Cambridge 1981, pp. 150ff. Zoroastrian fatalism, though certainly an aspect of the determinist mood of the (overwhelmingly theistic) Middle East on the eve of Islam, is not usually presented in theistic terms.

<sup>137</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 224f = 136f. Compare S. Shaked (ed. and tr.), *The Wisdom of the Sasanian Sages. Dēnkart VI*, Boulder 1979, p. 174 = 175, where it is ascribed to Āturpāt. Āturpāt's saying is also quoted, together with an anonymous version from Jamasp-Asana's *Pahlavi Texts* and that from NM, in R.C. Zaehner, *Zurvan, a Zoroastrian Dilemma*, Oxford 1955, pp. 407f. A similar statement is found in the *Dātistān-i dēnik* (cited by H. Ringgren, *Fatalism in Persian Epics*, Uppsala and Wiesbaden 1952, p. 93) and in the commentary to the *Videvdāt* (cited *ibid.*, p. 94; H.W. Bailey, *Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth Century Books*<sup>2</sup>, Oxford 1971, pp. 34f; Zaehner, *Zurvan*, pp. 405f). According to Humā'i, the author of NM2 knew the saying from the *Jāvidān-i khirad* (introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 89; cf. Ibn Miskawayh, *al-Hikma al-khāliḍa [Jāvidān-i khirad]*, ed. °A.R. Badawi, Cairo 1952, p. 67). But it is ascribed there to Ādhurbādī, who does not figure in NM at all; and it is practically identical there with the version given in the *Dēnkart*, whereas NM's version is closer to that of *Pahlavi texts* (cf. Shaked, *Dēnkart VI*, pp. 297ff).

lose significance, and remorse then becomes useless'; and he illustrates this point with a story about Marwān II, who knew that 'when time is up (*chūn muddat biguzarad*), this equipment will be useless, and when doom (*qadā*) comes, this army, huge though it is, will look small.'<sup>138</sup> In much the same way a Zoroastrian book asks, 'is it possible to strive against fate with wisdom and knowledge or not?' the answer being that it is not: 'Though (one be armed) with the valour and strength of wisdom and knowledge, yet it is not possible to strive against fate. For once a thing is fated and comes true, whether for good or the reverse, the wise man goes astray in his work, and the man of wrong knowledge becomes clever in his work; the coward becomes brave, and the brave man cowardly; the energetic man becomes a sluggard, and the sluggard energetic. For, for everything that has been fated, a fit occasion arises which sweeps away all other things.'<sup>139</sup> And the Zoroastrian literature also reassures us that remorse is useless: 'Anxiety is not to be suffered for this reason.'<sup>140</sup>

It is because the author thinks in such completely Iranian terms that he takes wine-drinking, chess-playing, ball-games and the like for granted,<sup>141</sup> finds the title of Shāhānshāh unobjectionable,<sup>142</sup> and gives a glowing account of the Nawrūz celebrations of the Sāsānid kings, for all that al-Ghazālī had condemned these celebrations as pagan rites deserving of extirpation.<sup>143</sup> There clearly is no question of explaining these and other features with reference to the possibility that al-Ghazālī may not have been a wholly consistent thinker, or that the mirror genre imposed certain restraints on him:<sup>144</sup> in NM2 we find ourselves in a completely different world of thought.

What then can we say about the author? He was certainly an Iranian, more precisely an Iranian nationalist. Thus he takes pride in the fact that the Magians held power for 4000 years and readily explains that this was because their religious system, *i.e.* Zoroastrianism, did not permit injus-

<sup>138</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 162f = 98f.

<sup>139</sup> *Mēnōk-i khrat* cited by Zaehner, *Zurvan*, pp. 402f (also cited by Ringgren, *Fatalism*, p. 91).

<sup>140</sup> *Shāyast nē shāyast* cited by Ringgren, *Fatalism*, p. 91.

<sup>141</sup> Above, note 72.

<sup>142</sup> Above, note 78.

<sup>143</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 82 = 46; cf. Humā'i, introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 75, and the references given there.

<sup>144</sup> Cf. Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, p. 1i.

tice or oppression.<sup>145</sup> It is with a view to persuading sceptics that no oppression was committed for 4000 years that he gives his long account of the kings of Iran from Kayūmarth to the Muslim conquest (in which, naturally, he contradicts himself by classifying several kings as tyrants).<sup>146</sup> Zoroastrians are warmly presented throughout;<sup>147</sup> and as for the Iranian kings, their virtues were such that God Himself instructed David not to let his people speak ill of the *‘ajam*.<sup>148</sup>

He does not betray any knowledge of Middle Persian, and none of his material seems to come directly from Zoroastrian books, though Zoroastrian literature was clearly the ultimate source of most of what he had to say.<sup>149</sup> But he writes in the same remorselessly antithetical style as the authors of these books (the best is. . . the worst is)<sup>150</sup> and has the same

<sup>145</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 82 = 46. The author's Shu'ūbī tendencies were also noted by Humā'i (introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 74).

<sup>146</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 83ff = 47ff. That this account is untypical of al-Ghazālī was also noted by Humā'i (introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 74).

<sup>147</sup> For the law-suit between the Magian and Yahyā al-Barmakī, see above, note 77. A chief mobed told al-Ma'mūn that the kings of Persia had three virtues which he lacked; it was for this reason that al-Ma'mūn opened Anūshīrvān's tomb (NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 137f = 81f; noted by Humā'i, introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 74f); and the chief mobed is an embodiment of justice in the account of the pre-Islamic *nawrūz* celebrations (NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 167ff = 102f).

<sup>148</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 82f = 46.

<sup>149</sup> The direct sources are discussed by Humā'i, introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 85ff; Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, pp. viif. For the Sāsānid origins of the division of this world's activities into twenty-five kinds, see above, note 137; and cf. the following note on Anūshīrvān's international symposium. Similarly, when Buzurgmihr tells Anūshīrvān that 'ruining that which has been developed is easier than developing that which has been ruined; breaking goblets is easier than mending them' (NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 223 = 135), he is echoing the *Dādīstān-i dēnik*, according to which a proverb says that it is easier to teach learning already taught and easier to repair than to build (from the start) (E.W. West [tr.], 'The Dādīstān-i Dīnk' in *Pahlavi Texts*, part ii [*Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xviii], Oxford 1882, p. 80). The story of the clever woman and the rapist also has a Sāsānid counterpart: an 'Alid at Samarqand saw a pretty woman pass by and dragged her in; she asked him whether the child would be an 'Alid or not, and, on receiving an affirmatory reply, said, 'but no genuine 'Alid would do what you are about to do' (NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 276f = 167). Compare J.M. Unvala (ed. and tr.), *Der Pahlavi Text "Der König Husrav und sein Knabe"*, Vienna 1917, §§ 115ff: a noble page made an indecent proposal to a woman; she asked him whether he would let her have all his good deeds in return for her sins (the good deeds of the nobleman equalling the merits of 'Alid descent). Like the 'Alid, he was abashed and thought better of it.

<sup>150</sup> 'The best king is he who... the worst king is he who...' (NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 159 = 96); 'four things you must always keep with you... four things you must never have with you...' (*ibid.*, p. 139 = 83); 'what are the bitterest things in the world and what are the sweetest?' (*ibid.*,

penchant for endless cataloguing (men are of four sorts. . . six things would be cheap. . . five things destroy men).<sup>151</sup> Altogether, he cannot have come from a very Islamized background.

In terms of religion, there is nothing to suggest that he was anything but a Sunnī, possibly a Hanafī.<sup>152</sup> By occupation he was presumably a secretary. This would explain why he has a chapter on secretaries, a subject 'on which there is a great deal to be said',<sup>153</sup> though he has none on the army. He is also well informed about pens, the variety that should be

pp. 229f = 139); 'which women are the best... which women are the worst?' (*ibid.*, p. 269 = 163). Compare 'the best of men are the good, sovereign and wise king... and the worst of men the bad, tyrannical sovereign'; 'factors leading to a better existence are... those which lead to a worse existence are...'; 'the foundations of good kingship are... the foundations of evil sovereignty are...'; 'the source of the good religion is the following proposition... the fundamental proposition of the evil religion is...' (Molé, *Culte*, pp. 38f, 44, 50, 54, citing the *Dēnkart*). 'Be very diligent with regard to these three things... turn away strongly from these three things...' (Shaked, *Dēnkart VI*, p. 38 = 39). 'For kings which is the one thing more advantageous and which the more injurious?' (E.W. West [tr.], 'Dīnā-i Mainōg-i Khīrad' in *Pahlavi Texts*, part iii [*Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxiv, Oxford 1885, p. 50]. Compare also NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 113f = 64f, where Anūshīrvān discusses which is best in the world with the kings of Byzantium, China and India (plus the Khaqān, according to the first edition), and J.P. Asmussen, "Einige Bemerkungen zur sassanidischen Handarz-Literatur" in *Atti sul convegno internazionale sul tema: la Persia nel medioevo*, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rome 1971, pp. 275f, where a Byzantine and Indian sage similarly discuss with Āturpāt which is best, which is worst.

<sup>151</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 221f, 226, 229 = 134, 137, 139. Most of the aphorisms cited in ch. 5 are of this or the antithetical kind. Compare 'people are of four kinds... people are of three types... these ten things are most similar (to each other)... these four faults are present in the hostility of people... there are three kinds of heretics... the material world is governed by these six things... these three things are fairest in men...' (Shaked, *Dēnkart VI*, pp. 70, 78, 96, 174, 202 = 71, 79, 97, 175, 203). Note also the profusion of (non-antithetical) questions such as 'what is wealth... what is love... which friend is the most faithful... what things among men are greatest?' (NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 230, 236 = 139, 143). Compare 'What is purity? What is donation? What is truthfulness? What is immortality? What is resurrection?' (Shaked, *Dēnkart VI*, p. 104 = 105); 'Who is the most patient, who is the most powerful, who is the most sharp, who is the most joyful, who is the most miserable, who is the most hopeless?' (*Mēnōk-i khrat* in Zaehner, *Zurvan*, p. 396; cf. the same type of questions cited *ibid.*, p. 397; Bailey, *Zoroastrian Problems*, p. 50). In Unvala, *Husrav und sein Knabe*, the king tests the young man's knowledge by asking a whole barrage of such questions: 'which dish is the finest... which flower is the sweetest-smelling... which woman is best?' (§§ 19, 68, 95), and so forth.

<sup>152</sup> 'Alī is referred to as *amir al-mu'minin* (NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 148), but so is 'Umar, who is referred to far more often (cf. *ibid.* and elsewhere). Abū Yūsuf is the only lawyer invoked (above, note 77).

<sup>153</sup> *Andar bāb-i dabīrī sukhan-i bisyār ast* (NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 196 = 118; Bagley takes this to mean that much has been said on the subject of secretaries).

used for the writing of a particular language, the way in which they should be cut, and so forth;<sup>154</sup> and it is in addressing secretaries that he lapses into the use of 'you', otherwise reserved for kings and the general reader.<sup>155</sup>

He must have flourished after Nizām al-Mulk (d. 1092), possibly in the time of the latter's sons, inasmuch as he mentions the vizierate of Nizām al-Mulk's family in glowing terms,<sup>156</sup> and he must have written before 1199, the latest date for the Arabic translation.<sup>157</sup> He would thus seem to have been a younger contemporary of al-Ghazālī, and in linguistic terms there is little to tell the two apart.<sup>158</sup> His work must have come to be attributed to al-Ghazālī within a short period of the latter's death, as is true of other pseudo-Ghazalian literature too,<sup>159</sup> but there is nothing to suggest that he himself was a forger. Admittedly, NM2 lacks a formal *incipit*, which could be taken to mean that it was written with NM1 in mind; but it also lacks a formal *explicit*, and the author makes no attempt to impersonate al-Ghazālī by writing in his style, quoting him or referring to his works. Whoever put the two works together presumably felt that

<sup>154</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 192 = 115.

<sup>155</sup> Above, note 52.

<sup>156</sup> NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 183f; cf. Humā'i, introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 122ff. NM<sup>1</sup> only mentions the vizierate of Nizām al-mulk (p. 100 = 111); but inasmuch as the Arabic translation says that the Seljuqs brought *them* to the level of the viziers of old and that everybody benefited from *their* bounty, the family (*āl*) was presumably in the original (cf. *Tibr*, p. 89; Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, p. 111nn).

<sup>157</sup> Cf. above, note 10.

<sup>158</sup> Cf. Humā'i, introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 72, 145ff. Most of the archaisms are from NM<sup>2</sup>, but then it is the longer work. The archaic language of NM as a whole has been somewhat exaggerated by Bagley. Thus he claims that it uses the pleonastic *rā* after the prepositions *barā-yi* and *az bahr-i* (*Book of Counsel*, p. xxv), but neither NM<sup>1</sup> nor NM<sup>2</sup> does anything of the kind (cf. NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 37<sup>3</sup>, 7<sup>13</sup>, 38<sup>9</sup>, 48<sup>9</sup>, 51<sup>1</sup>, 59<sup>8</sup>; NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 152<sup>7</sup> (*barā-yi*); NM<sup>2</sup>, pp. 38<sup>6</sup>, 45<sup>9</sup>, 104<sup>6</sup>, 121<sup>10</sup>, 16<sup>248</sup>, 265<sup>175</sup>, 267<sup>2</sup> and frequently elsewhere (*az bahr-i*, much preferred to *barā-ye* in NM<sup>2</sup>). Humā'i merely claimed that it used this *rā* after *bahr-i*, adducing one example which, as he later admitted, was a false one (Humā'i, introduction to NM<sup>1</sup>, p. yw, with reference to NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 71; *id.*, introduction to NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 148, with reference to NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 136; Meier also misunderstood him, cf. review of NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 396). It is likewise an exaggeration to say that NM frequently places cardinal numbers after their nouns (Bagley, *Book of Counsel*, p. xxv). NM<sup>1</sup> never does. NM<sup>2</sup> does once in the old edition (NM<sup>1</sup>, p. 111; not in NM<sup>2</sup>) and once in the new edition (NM<sup>2</sup>, p. 157; not in NM<sup>1</sup>); but given the proliferation of cardinal numbers in NM<sup>2</sup>, this is not impressive.

<sup>159</sup> Lazarus-Yafeh, *Studies*, p. 256 (already Ibn Tufayl, d. 1185, was familiar with some of it).

the creed for a prince needed a practical complement: from the point of view of salesmanship he was certainly right.

But whoever put the two together must certainly also have contributed his fair share to al-Ghazālī's torments in the grave: the imam cannot have taken well to his posthumous fame as the author of so un-Islamic a book.<sup>160</sup> NM<sup>2</sup> is in fact yet another testimony to the survival of pre-Islamic values in Seljuq Iran. It is also a good illustration of Gibb's dictum that the Sasanid tradition constituted a kernel of derangement in Islam, being 'never wholly assimilated yet never wholly rejected':<sup>161</sup> Iranian and Islamic notions are presented side by side in this book with only the most superficial attempts at the hopeless task of harmonization. But from the point of NM<sup>2</sup> itself Gibb's dictum should be reversed: it is the Sasanid tradition which is coherent here and Islam which causes the derangement, having failed to be assimilated, let alone rejected.

<sup>160</sup> And Goldziher's conjecture that Turtūshī (d. 1126 or 1131) wrote his *Sirāj al-mulūk* with the idea of emulating al-Ghazālī must clearly be dropped (cf. *Streitschrift*, p. 100).

<sup>161</sup> H.A.R. Gibb, *Studies on the Civilization of Islam*, Princeton 1962, p. 72.