

A REVISED CHRONOLOGY OF GHAZĀLĪ'S WRITINGS

GEORGE F. HOURANI

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO

The author's first "Chronology," published in the *Journal*, volume 79 (1959), is here completely rewritten. The method remains the same, using only the evidence of historical sources and cross-references from Ghazālī's books, which are plentiful, and avoiding inferences from any observed or supposed development in Ghazālī's thought. The conclusions are more accurate and definite than before, owing to more careful observations and with the help of studies by Bouyges, Badawi, and Lazarus-Yafeh not available to the author at the time of his original article.

THE ORDERING OF GHAZĀLĪ'S WORKS is a task which naturally attracts attention for several reasons: the existence of a biographical framework in his own *Munqidh*, the multitude of cross references in his books, and above all the necessity of establishing an order as a basis for understanding the development of his thought, which so clearly did not remain constant throughout his life.

Pioneer attempts at a chronology were published in the first half of the twentieth century by Goldziher, Massignon, Asín Palacios and Watt.¹ Watt's list was an advance on anything previously published in the general correctness of its order and the presence of many references. But it was incidental to the main purpose of his article, and fell short of desirable fullness in omitting the works of *fiqh*, not connecting the works listed with biographical data such as known dates in Ghazālī's career, and not containing discussion of doubtful points. Moreover, Watt's groups are not purely chronological but are defined by the topics and doctrines of the works. While the four groups correspond roughly with four periods in Ghazālī's life, there is some overlap in time between particular works in different groups.

Dissatisfied with all preceding attempts known to me, I worked out the chronology afresh in an article published in 1959,² following the method to be described below. The result was a further advance in accuracy, presented in a handy format. But my effort was surpassed in the same year by the publication of an entire book on the subject whose existence had been unknown to me: that of Bouyges, which he had completed in 1924 but which had lain among his papers until after his death, when it was published by Allard.³ Bouyges' book is very detailed and remains an indispensable aid to the study of Ghazālī. Yet many of his conclusions need to be reconsidered half a century after he wrote, and even twenty years after Allard's edition with its supplementary notes.

Since 1959 two more books have been published which have made important contributions to the question of chronology. One is Badawī's bibliography of the manuscripts and printed works of Ghazālī.⁴ The other is a collection of Ghazalian studies by Lazarus-Yafeh.⁵ There have also been many new editions of Ghazālī's works and a few monograph studies, all of which will be mentioned below in the text or notes.

The sum of these contributions and my own further observations since 1959 have made it rewarding and

¹ I. Goldziher, *Die Streitschrift des Ġazālī gegen die Bāṭiniyya-Sekte* (Leiden, 1916), pp. 25–29; L. Massignon, *Recueil de textes inédits concernant l'histoire de la mystique au pays d'Islam* (Paris, 1929), p. 93; M. Asín Palacios, *La Espiritualidad de Algazel*, I (Madrid, 1935), pp. 35–36; W. M. Watt, "The authenticity of the works attributed to al-Ghazālī," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1952), pp. 24–45, including brief "Notes on chronology" (pp. 43–44).

² G. F. Hourani, "The chronology of Ghazālī's writings," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 79 (1959), pp. 225–33.

³ M. Bouyges, *Essai de chronologie des oeuvres de al-Ghazālī (Algazel)*, ed. M. Allard (Beirut, 1959).

⁴ A. Badawī, *Mu'allafāt al-Ghazālī*, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1961).

⁵ H. Lazarus-Yafeh, *Studies in Al-Ghazzālī* (Jerusalem, 1975).

even imperative to offer a new chronology, which makes use of all the preceding work and should give the most accurate account possible until new evidence is discovered. This article is based on my previous one but modifies it extensively.

The aim is to determine the order and dates of Ghazālī's works in so far as they can be learned from the more conclusive kinds of evidence: his own references to previous or projected works, and biographical data gathered from his *Munqidh* and other early sources.⁶ Only by limiting ourselves to such evidence in the first place can we provide a solid basis for tracing the development of Ghazālī's thought. To reverse this procedure by making inferences from the intellectual contents of works to their dates is bound to lead to arbitrary and erroneous results, and has already done so. After a chronology has been established by sound methods the intellectual biography of Ghazālī can be studied more accurately. Such studies in turn may at length allow scholars in later times to refine the chronology by making use of a more or less known order of development in his thought.

Problems of authenticity will not be treated to any great extent. I have listed those writings which are generally accepted as genuine, and whose positions in the series can be determined to some extent by the kinds of evidence being used. Five works which I reject as spurious are listed because they are well known and call for brief accounts. They are bracketed and inserted at places where they would have been most likely to occur if they had been genuine. Beyond these works there are many others listed by Bouyges and Badawī of which little is known; an attempt to decide their authenticity and dates would have led us too far afield and would probably have been almost fruitless. Nor have I recorded the many variant titles of works, as Bouyges and Badawī have done; I have used the title given in the edition referred to.

The system of numbering adopted in my previous article has been abandoned. It gave a misleading impression of accuracy which could not be sustained. The present list is in fact more accurate, and the expanded discussions give all the considerations which

have led to the order of the works in the lists. Serial numbers are provided only for a few small groups within which an order can be determined. It will be evident that many uncertainties remain, but the chronology as a whole should furnish a sufficient basis for placing Ghazālī's works and thought in a meaningful biographical context.

For the purpose in view Ghazālī's life can be divided into four periods, distinguished as phases of teaching activity and retirement.

(1) An early period of teaching and writing extends from an unknown date preceding the death of Juwaynī, the Imām al-Ḥaramayn (d. 478=1085/86), to Ghazālī's departure from Baghdād at the end of 488 (1095). Born at Ṭūs in 450=1058, he had gone to Nīshāpūr as a youth to study under the Imām, and it is known that he started teaching and writing there while the Imām was still alive.⁷ Only one work is definitely assignable to this time, *Mankhūl* (see below and note 10). After Juwaynī's death Ghazālī was attached to the camp-court (*ma'askar*) of the Seljūq sultān's great *wazīr*, Nizām al-Mulk, and he remained there in high favor for some six years. In 484=1091/92 he was appointed to the chair of Shafī'ite law at the Nizāmiyya College in Baghdād, and he taught there for four years, 484–88=1091/92–1095.

Ghazālī informs us in two places that he wrote on law and jurisprudence in this first period of teaching. (i) *Mustasfā*, I, 3⁸ states: "In the prime of my youth . . . I composed many books on law and jurisprudence (*fī furū'ī l-fiqhi wa uṣūlihi*); then I turned to the science of the way of the afterlife and acquaintance with the inner secrets of religion." As we know from *Munqidh*, the second sentence fixes a latter limit around 488=1095 for most of Ghazālī's legal writings, with the exception of *Mustasfā* itself which is much later. (ii) *Munqidh*, 85 states that he worked on philosophy "in my spare time between writing and lecturing on the scriptural sciences (*al-ʿulūmi sh-sharʿiyya*)," i.e., law and jurisprudence. Since this statement is in the context of Baghdād, we know that at least some of his treatises on law and jurisprudence

⁶ Sources have been given by D. B. Macdonald, "The life of al-Ghazzālī," *JAOS*, 20 (1899), pp. 71–132, and "al-Ghazzālī," *Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam* (Leiden, 1953), pp. 111–14; and by F. Jabre, "La biographie et l'oeuvre de Ghazālī reconsiderées à la lumière des *Ṭabaqāt* de Sobkī," *Mélanges de l'Institut Dominicain d'Études Orientales*, 1 (Cairo, 1954), pp. 73–102.

⁷ Ibn ʿAsākir, *Tabayīn kadhb al-mustarī*, ed. A. F. Mehren, "Exposé de la réforme de l'Islamisme," *3rd International Congress of Orientalists, Transactions*, II (Leiden, 1879), p. 322.

⁸ All page references are to the edition mentioned for each book in the list, except in a few cases where a reference could be obtained only indirectly through another modern author.

were written there. Apart from this fact and the one early work of Nīshāpūr, we cannot distribute the works on these subjects precisely among the three sub-periods at Nīshāpūr, the camp-court and Baghdād.

The years in Baghdād were also a time of extensive writing on new subjects, as will be seen from the list between *Maqāṣid al-falāsifa* and *Mizān al-ʿamal*. *Munqidh*, 79ff. specifies the order of his studies of four subjects in his wide-ranging search for religious truth: theology (ʿilm al-kalām), philosophy, Ismaʿilism and Sufism. He does not say that he wrote anything on theology before writing on the other three; in fact theology was a part of his previous education, and his one book on it, the *Iqtisād*, probably belongs to the latter end of the Baghdād years. There is some overlap between the books on philosophy and on Ismaʿilism, but the order seems to be correct in a rough fashion. As for Sufism, Ghazālī studied it but had not yet started writing on it at this time, although *Mizān al-ʿamal* as a work on ethics is in accord with Ghazālī's concern for practice while he approached Sufism, as shown in *Munqidh*, 122.

(2) A period of retirement extends for eleven lunar years, from his departure from Baghdād in Dhū al-Qaʿda, 488=November, 1095, to his return to teaching at Nīshāpūr in Dhū al-Qaʿda, 499=July, 1106 (*Munqidh*, 153). The order of his travels and residences during these years can be traced fairly well from statements in *Munqidh* and by Subkī, but the lengths of the sub-periods cannot be established accurately.

He started with nearly two years in Syria, between Damascus and Jerusalem, and probably wrote all or most of his greatest work, *Iḥyāʾ ʿulūm ad-dīn*, in these two cities.⁹ From there he proceeded on a pilgrimage to Mecca and Madīna, probably that of the end of 490=November, 1097. Then he went back to Baghdād, then to Iran, ending with residence in a monastery in his home town, Tūs. (Thus he had left the Syrian area well before the arrival of the First Crusade in 1099, which he never mentions in his works.) If he spent two years in Syria out of the eleven years of this whole period, that leaves nine years to be divided between the pilgrimage, Baghdād, cities of Iran and Tūs, but where he spent most of this time remains a mystery. A reasonable answer would be Tūs, where he would have had a permanent residence, but there is no firm evidence known to me.

⁹ See below under *ar-Risāla al-Qudsiyya* and *Iḥyāʾ* for more details on these years.

(3) He came out of retirement in Dhū al-Qaʿda, 499=July, 1106, to resume teaching in Nīshāpūr. The end of this period is not known, but 503=1109/10 is a fair guess, because he completed *Mustaṣfā*, a major work on jurisprudence, on Muḥarram 6, 503=August 5, 1109, and writing on this subject does not seem like an occupation of retirement.

(4) A final retirement at Tūs lasted until his death on Jumāda II, 14, 505=December 18, 1111. Only one work, *Iljām*, can be placed with certainty in this period, a fact which confirms the opinion that the period was quite short.

AL-MANKHŪL FĪ UṢŪL AL-FIQH, in MS.

Mentioned in *Mustaṣfā* I, 3 as a concise work on law. Subkī says Ghazālī wrote it during the lifetime of his teacher Imām al-Ḥaramayn, i.e., before 478=1085/86.¹⁰ We place it first because this early time of composition is not specified for any other work. But it cannot be proved that no other work belongs to this period.

*Mankhūl*¹¹ means "sifted" and points to a summary.

1. MAʾĀKHIDH AL-KHILĀF

2. LUBĀB AN-NAẒAR

3. TAḤSĪN AL-MAʾĀKHIDH

4. AL-MABADĪʾ WA AL-GHĀYĀT

All are lost.

Miʿyar al-ʿilm, 23, which belongs to the end of the first period, 488=1095, lists in order these four works on methods of legal debate. As Badawī suggests (p. 33), the order of the list is likely to be the chronological order of composition; at least 3. must follow 1. But the group as a whole cannot be related to most of the other early works on law.

SHIFĀʾ AL-GHALĪL FĪ AL-QIYĀS WA AT-TAʿLĪL, in MSS.

(Various titles, including *ʿalīl* for *ghalīl*).

¹⁰ Tāj ad-Dīn as-Subkī (d. 722=1370), *Ṭabaqāt ash-Shāfiʿiyya al-kubrā* ed. A. F. M. al-Ḥalū and M. M. at-Ṭanāḥī (Cairo, 1388=1968), VI, 225. Confirmed by Yāfiʿī, *Mirʾāt al-janān*, fol. 257b, quoted by M. Smith, *Al-Ghazālī's life and personality* (London, 1944), p. 16.

¹¹ As in *Mustaṣfā* and Subkī; better than *manḥūl*, "emaciated," as in Macdonald, "Life," pp. 105–6, and Asín, *Espiritualidad*, I, p. 29, note 1.

After *Mabādī*² and close to it, see *Mihakk*, 91. Before *Mustaḥḥir*: fol. 79a=Goldziher, *Streitschrift*, p. 29 and Arabic, p. 52.

Three other works can be related to each other but may be before, after or interspersed with the preceding group. None of them is mentioned before *Ihyā*².

(I) AL-BASĪT, in MSS.

*Ihyā*², I, 108, ed. Cairo, 1326=1908/09, an indirect reference taken from Bouyges. (Most references to *Ihyā*² below will be to the ^cIrāqī edition of Cairo, 1356/57.)

Also mentioned in *Jawāhir al-Qurʿān*, 22, as a work of *fiqh* of his earlier life.

Regarded as a summary of Juwaynī's *Nihāyat al-maḥlab* (Bouyges, p. 12), but itself of considerable length.

(II) AL-WASĪT, in MSS.

*Ihyā*², I, 108 (ed. Cairo, 1326). Also mentioned in *Jawāhir al-Qurʿān*, 22, as a work of *fiqh* of his earlier life.

A summary of *al-Basīṭ*, as Ghazālī mentions in the preface to *al-Wasīṭ* (see Bouyges, p. 13).

(III) AL-WAJĪZ FĪ FĪQH AL-IMĀM ASH-SHĀFIʿI. (Cairo, 1317=1899/1900).

*Ihyā*², I, 108 (ed. Cairo, 1326) and *Jawāhir*, 22; in both cases third after *al-Basīṭ* and *al-Wasīṭ*. A summary of Shafiʿite law, perhaps made as a text-book for students.

Bouyges, pp. 12 and 49, dated it much later, between *Ihyā*² and *Jawāhir*, on the ground of a note on a Cairo MS, later than 656=1258, which gives the date as 495=1101. I do not think this is sufficient reason to ignore the above references by Ghazālī to *al-Wajīz* in close association with *al-Basīṭ* and *al-Wasīṭ*. Bouyges' dating is also rejected implicitly by Badawī, p. 25, and by Lazarus, pp. 210, 378–79, 407, on grounds of style and content.

KHULĀSĀT AL-MUKHTAṢAR WA NAQĀWAT AL-MUʿTAṢAR, in MS.

Mentioned in *Ihyā*², I, 30 (^cIrāqī ed., see 10). The *Mukhtaṣar* was by Ismāʿīl al-Muzanī, an early Shafiʿite lawyer (d. 877). This is a resumé of it, perhaps made as a textbook.

Bouyges, pp. 13–14, gives indecisive reasons for placing it after *al-Basīṭ* and *al-Wasīṭ*. But in fact it cannot be related definitely to any of the other early *fiqh* books.

TAH-DHĪB AL-UṢŪL, lost.

In *Mustaṣfā* I, 3 and 111, Ghazālī refers to this book as his own, and as a work on *fiqh* more detailed than *Mustaṣfā*. Bouyges knew the first reference but rejected it, p. 70, because he could not believe that Ghazālī wrote a book on *fiqh* longer than *Mustaṣfā*. Badawī pours scorn on Bouyges' reasoning, pp. 210–11. Anyhow, the matter is settled by the second reference (I, 111), where Ghazālī writes "We have discussed at length in *Tahdhīb al-uṣūl* . . ."

There is no way to date this last work with any accuracy, but it is more likely to be a product of the first period, with most of the other legal works.

There follow five books on philosophy and Ismaʿilism which can be related to each other serially with some accuracy and dated to the later part of the four years in Baghdād. There are no references which might relate this group to the previous one, but books on philosophy and Ismaʿilism are generally to be placed after those on law because Ghazālī gives this as the order of his studies in *Munqidh*, 79ff. Some overlap is not precluded.

I. MAQĀṢID AL-FALĀSIFA, ed. M. S. Kurdī (Cairo, 1355=1936), 3 parts.

As it was written in Baghdād (*Munqidh*, 85), it could not have been started earlier than 484=1091/92. *Maqāṣid*, i, 2–3 and iii, 77, as well as *Munqidh*, 84–85, make it plain that the book was written as a background to *Tahāfut*, which means it was completed hardly later than 486 (ended Jan. 20, 1094), in view of the evidence on the dates of *Tahāfut* and *Mustaḥḥir*. It must have been written during the "less than two years" when Ghazālī was studying philosophy in his spare time with the primary aim of understanding it (*Munqidh*, 85).

II. TAHĀFUT AL-FALĀSIFA, ed. M. Bouyges, Bibliotheca Arabica Scholasticorum, II (Beirut, 1927).

After *Maqāṣid* (*Maqāṣid*, i, 2–3 and iii, 77; *Munqidh*, 84–85). MS Fātih, 2921 (Istanbul) records that *Tahāfut* was completed on Muḥarram 11, 488=January 21,

1095;¹² so most of it was probably written in 487=1094. In *Munqidh*, 85 Ghazālī says he spent “nearly a year” in critical reflection on philosophy, after the less than two years spent in understanding it.

There are numerous later references to *Tahāfut*. The most pertinent to chronology are *Miʿyār*, 22, 161, 174, all describing *Miʿyār* as a supplement on logic to *Tahāfut*. (See below, *Miʿyār*, for more on their relation.)

III. *MIʿYĀR AL-ʿILM FĪ FANN AL-MANṬIQ*, ed. M. S. Kurdī (Cairo, 1329=1911).

Tahāfut, 17 and 20, anticipates it as an appendix, under the title *Miʿyār al-ʿaql*. *Tahāfut*, 213, refers to it as *Madārik al-ʿuqūl*, and implies that it has already been written (*ṣannafnāhu*). *Miʿyār*, 22, 161, 174, justifies itself partly on the ground that it explains the technical terms in *Tahāfut*. Thus the relation of the two works is close. There is nothing unusual about an author writing a new book before the last one has been revised or published.

Mentioned in several later books, e.g., *Iqtisād*, 9.

IV. *MIḤAKK AN-NAẒAR FĪ AL-MANṬIQ*, ed. M. Ḥalabī and M. Qabbānī (Cairo, n.d., Adabiyya Press).

P. 131 mentions *Miʿyār* as still unpublished, awaiting corrections; it is made clear that *Miʿyār* was substantially written first but published later. The two books are mentioned together in *Iqtisād*, 9 and elsewhere.

V. *AL-MUSTAẒHIRĪ, OR FAḌĀʾIH AL-BĀṬINIYYA WA FAḌĀʾIL AL-MUSTAẒHIRIYYA*, selections, ed. I. Goldziher, *Streitschrift des Gazālī gegen die Bāṭinijja-Sekte* (Leiden, 1916). (Complete text, ed. A. Badawī, *FaḌĀʾih al-Bāṭiniyya*, Cairo, 1964.)

The *Mustaẓhirī* can be closely dated by its references to two caliphs. It refers to the ʿAbbasid *Mustaẓhir* as holding his office (fols. 3b–4a), and his accession was on Muḥarram 15, 487 (February 4, 1094); and to the Fatimid *Mustansir* as still alive (fol. 18a), and he died on Dhū al-Ḥijja 17, 487=December 29, 1094. Thus the book must have been at least begun before *Tahāfut* was completed (January, 1095, see above). But it was probably completed after *Tahāfut*. For *Munqidh*, 79 and 109, shows that he

worked on Ismaʿilism (*al-Bāṭiniyya*) after philosophy. And Goldziher saw an allusion to *Tahāfut* in *Mustaẓhirī*, fol. 196, where Ghazālī mentions a philosophic doctrine which he had refuted *fī al-kalām*.¹³ (In *Jawāhir al-Qurʾān*, 21 he refers to his *Tahāfut* as a work of *kalām*.)

The temporal relation of the *Mustaẓhirī* to *Miʿyār* and *Miḥakk* is less clear. We have shown that all three overlap with *Tahāfut*. They may also overlap with each other. But, on the basis of *Munqidh*'s account of Ghazālī's work, *Mustaẓhirī* can be placed after the other two, although not conclusively. This is the order given by Bouyges, Badawī and Lazarus.

Munqidh, 119, lists *Mustaẓhirī* first among five books against the Ismāʿīlīs, and since he numbers the five in order and gives the places of the other four, the order of his list must be accepted as chronological.

ḤUJJAT AL-ḤAQQ, lost.

Mentioned in *Jawāhir al-Qurʾān*, 21. Listed second in *Munqidh*, 119, as a reply to criticisms by the Ismāʿīlīs made against him in Baghdād. This does not prove that he wrote it in Baghdād, but it suggests that he was there, or had been there recently. Macdonald thought “perhaps during his second residence there,”¹⁴ but there is no way to decide.

AL-IQTISĀD FĪ AL-ʿIṬIQĀD, ed. I. A. Çubukçü and H. Atay (Ankara, 1962).

Mentions *Tahāfut* (105, 215), *Miʿyār* and *Miḥakk* (15) and *Mustaẓhirī* (239); so cannot be earlier than 488=1095. There is probably a forward reference to it in *Tahāfut*, 78, though the title given there is *Qawāʿid al-ʿaqāʾid*. He says there that after finishing *Tahāfut* he hopes to write a constructive work on doctrine, as the present one is critical. Such an intention seems fulfilled more specifically in *Iqtisād* than in the actual *Qawāʿid al-ʿaqāʾid*, which is later and is but a part of *lḥyā*.¹⁵

¹³ *Streitschrift*, p. 28.

¹⁴ “Life,” p. 88.

¹⁵ The text of *Tahāfut*, 78, should not, however, be emended, as is done by S. Van den Bergh in his translation of Ibn Rushd's *Tahāfut at-tahāfut* (London, 1954), I, 68= Bouyges, *TT*, 116. There is no textual authority for any reading but *Qawāʿid al-ʿaqāʾid*. Ghazālī may well have changed his mind about the title of a book (cf. *Miʿyār*, above).

¹² Bouyges, *Introduction to Tahāfut al-falāsifa*, pp. ix, xiii.

Mentioned in *Iḥyāʾ*, I, 68 and 169; therefore earlier than the earliest part of *Iḥyāʾ*.

These data fix the place of *Iqtīṣād* in the sequence of writings almost precisely (except for its relation to *Mīzān al-ʿamal*, to be discussed below). But we still need to know whether it was one of the latest works of Baghdād or one of the earliest of the period of travel. We know from the passage in *Tahāfut* that Ghazālī intended to write such a book "after finishing this book," as a completion of a trilogy whose first two parts were *Maqāṣid* and *Tahāfut*. But did he actually write it or complete it in Baghdād? That seems more likely than the alternative, for it is hard to believe that this prosaic piece of *kalām* was one of the first products of his new life as a Ṣūfī. Bouyges, p. 34, placed it in Baghdād because he found in it the same concerns as those of *Tahāfut*, still very much alive. (Badawī is silent on this question, pp. 87–88. Lazarus, p. 440, places it in Baghdād without explanation.)

The best available time would be the first half of 488=1095, before his nervous crisis became acute in Rajab (July). But even this time seems crowded, between the completion of *Mīʿyār*, *Mihakk* and *Mustaḥsirī* and his new attention to Sufism (*Munqidh*, 122ff.); and *Iqtīṣād* itself is neither short nor easy. It is possible, then, that it was completed during the second half of 488=1095, in spite of the crisis, for Ghazālī does not say he was inhibited from writing, only from lecturing (*Munqidh*, 128). As we shall see, *Mīzān al-ʿamal* was probably written in these six months. We may wonder whether the prolific and intense writing of 477–88=1094–95 was a contributing cause of the strain which led to a breakdown of health.

MĪZĀN AL-ʿAMAL, ed. M. S. Kurdī and M. S. Nuʿaymī (Cairo, 1328=1909/10).

Mīzān is anticipated at the end of *Mīʿyār* (195) as a companion work. Both knowledge (*ʿilm*) and practice (*ʿamal*) are required for happiness in this world and the next, and as *Mīʿyār* gives the criteria for sound knowledge, so another book is to be written which will give the criteria for sound action. *Mīzān* refers to *Mīʿyār* six times, (3, 28, 56, 64, 153, 156). Therefore it is certainly later than *Mīʿyār*.

But how much later? Unfortunately there is not a single reference to *Mīzān* in any subsequent work of Ghazālī, so we cannot fix a late limit by the usual kind of evidence. But the fact that *Mīzān* refers to *Mīʿyār* so frequently and to no other of his books proves that *Mīʿyār* was very much in his mind when he wrote *Mīzān*, and points to a date in his last year

in Baghdād, 488=1095. This dating is confirmed by most recent scholars (Bouyges, Badawī, Sherif, Lazarus) and by Goldziher among the older ones, on grounds of content: that it reflects an attitude "still before his complete conversion to Sufism, yet already standing at its gate," as Goldziher put it.¹⁶ Such a date also accords perfectly with the order of studies outlined in *Munqidh*, 78ff., because a book on ethics would be a natural product of the time when Ghazālī was involved in the study of Sufism, a practical discipline.

A date after Ghazālī's departure from Baghdād was favored by me in my former article, but I am now convinced of the earlier date, because of the closeness to *Mīʿyār* as shown and the opinion of recent scholars as explained above.

Since *Iqtīṣād* and *Mīzān* are both to be placed in Ghazālī's final year at the Nizāmiyya College in Baghdād (488=1095), we have to ask which is earlier. There are no indications from references. But some simple considerations seem to indicate the priority of *Iqtīṣād*: that it is a sequel to *Tahāfut*, while *Mīzān* is a sequel to *Mīʿyār*, which is itself an appendix to *Tahāfut*. In other words, Ghazālī would more naturally have completed his writing on metaphysics and theology before turning to ethics, just as he says he did in *Munqidh*, 122: "When I had finished with these sciences [theology, philosophy and Ismaʿilism], I turned my attention to the way of the Ṣūfīs, and I learned that their way is completed only by both knowledge and practice."

Now that both *Iqtīṣād* and *Mīzān* have been placed with some confidence in the period when Ghazālī was approaching or actually immersed in the intense spiritual crisis of his life, the importance of these two works for understanding the evolution of his thought will readily be understood. Both of them therefore deserve more serious studies than they have hitherto received, and they should be read in the context of the author's revealing account of his state of mind at the time, narrated in *Munqidh*, 122–30.

I have postponed until the end consideration of the authenticity of *Mīzān*, brought into question in a notable article by Montgomery Watt in 1952, because

¹⁶ I. Goldziher, *Die Richtungen der Islamischen Koranauslegung* (Leiden, 1920, 1952), p. 205. Bouyges, pp. 28–30; Badawī, pp. 79–81; M. A. Sherif, *Ghazālī's theory of virtue* (Albany, 1975), pp. 6, 171; Lazarus, pp. 211, 259, 300; M. Abul Quasem, *The Ethics of al-Ghazālī* (Delmar, N.Y., 1978), p. 37, n. 25.

Watt's arguments were to a large extent bound up with the question of date. Watt accepted the view of several of the older scholars (Gairdner, Asín Palacios, Massignon, Hachem) that, if *Mizān* is genuine, it must belong to a late period—after *Munqidh* according to Hachem. He then proposed that it could not belong to that period, because of certain assertions in *Mizān* about the primacy of reason and the non-resurrection of the body which are incompatible with Ghazālī's later views as known from other late works. However, the reasons given by those scholars for a late date are slim. Gairdner and Massignon gave no reasons. Asín thought *Mizān* must be later than *Ihyā'* because *Ihyā'* has no references to it—a dubious argument from silence. Hachem placed it after *Munqidh* because it denies the resurrection of the body: precisely one of the reasons for which Watt declared it could not be after *Munqidh*, and for which he dismissed it as mostly spurious!¹⁷ But Watt's arguments, based on the assumption of a late date as the only possible one, are undercut by the solid reasons given above for dating *Mizān* much earlier, close to *Mi'yār*.

Watt's other reason for rejecting *Mizān* is that its organization is very confused and self-contradictory, unlike most of Ghazālī's books. Watt concluded that, while some pages may have been taken from Ghazālī, as a whole "the *Mizān* is an unintelligent compilation from very varied sources." But may not the confusion be seen rather as confirming the dating of the book to the period of Ghazālī's nervous disorder? The disorganization will in that case be of the deepest interest, when it is re-examined in light of the biographical context of 488=1095.

Further, if *Mizān* is a forgery, the cross references cited above will be difficult to explain, although not quite impossible. The forward reference in *Mi'yār* would state an intention of Ghazālī which he never carried out, or which he completed in a book that was soon lost. The six *Mizān* references back to *Mi'yār*, a work of lesser renown, would be the only ones inserted by the forger, for no apparent purpose, whereas other certainly spurious pseudo-Ghazalian books usually try to impress readers by referring to *Ihyā'*, the most famous of Ghazālī's works.

¹⁷ Watt, *JRAS* (1952), W. H. T. Gairdner, "Al-Ghazālī's *Mishkāt al-anwār* and the Ghazālī-problem," *Der Islam*, 5 (1914), p. 131; M. Asín Palacios, *Los precedentes musulmanos del *Pari de Pascal** (Santander, 1920), p. 15; Massignon, *Recueil*, p. 93; H. Hachem, French tr. of *Mizān*, *Critère de l'action* (Paris, 1945), Introduction.

Again, Bouyges mentions a reference to *Mizān* by Abū Bakr at-Turtūshī (1059–1126), a contemporary of Ghazālī.

Finally, Watt's conclusion of 1952 has been rejected by four recent scholars aware of it: Allard in an editorial note on Bouyges, Badawī by implicit acceptance of *Mizān*, Lazarus by acceptance and a generally critical view of Watt's interpretations, and Sherif in a detailed appendix refuting Watt directly. Sherif points out that Watt himself in a later article assumes *Mizān* as genuine except for certain parts.¹⁸

AR-RISĀLA AL-QUDSIYYA, ed. and Eng. tr. A. L. Tibawi, *Al-Ghazālī's tract on dogmatic theology* (London, 1965).

Mentioned in *Ihyā'*, I, 169 and 180, as a short treatise (*risāla*) written for the people of Jerusalem and subsequently incorporated into *Qawā'id al-^caqā'id*, the second of the forty "books" of *Ihyā'*. The colophons of two manuscripts, Cairo, Majāmi^c 66 and London, SOAS 45818, state that the work was completed in the Aqsā Mosque of Jerusalem (Tibawi, pp. 10–11 and Bouyges, p. 35). Thus it is easy to fix the locale of the treatise, in Jerusalem, and its place in the serial order, after *Iqtisād* and *Mizān* and before *Ihyā'*. It can also be stated with confidence that it was the first surviving work completed during the period of retirement, which began in Dhū al-Qa^cda, 488=November, 1095 (*Munqidh*, 153).

The date of Ghazālī's stay in Jerusalem is uncertain, since there is a discrepancy between his own account of his travels in *Munqidh*, 130–31, and that of Subkī.¹⁹ According to Ghazālī, he spent "nearly two years" in Syria (*ash-Shām*), starting in Damascus and proceeding to Jerusalem, and staying a considerable time in each city. Thus he would be in Jerusalem during 490=1097. Subkī gives him only a few days at the beginning in Damascus, then a residence in Jerusalem followed by a second residence in Damascus.

¹⁸ Bouyges, p. 30, on Turtūshī, referring to a text quoted by M. Schreiner, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 52 (1898), p. 503. M. Allard in Bouyges, p. 30; Badawī, pp. 79–81; Lazarus, pp. 211, 259, 281, 300, etc.; Sherif, *Ghazālī's theory of virtue*, pp. 170–75. Watt, "al-Ghazālī," *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed.

¹⁹ *Ṭabaqāt*, VI, 197. F. Jabre, "La biographie et l'oeuvre de Ghazālī," *MIDEO*, I, 94–97, tabulates the statements of the sources and offers a tentative reconstruction of the chronology.

By this timetable he would be in Jerusalem in 489=1096. The difference is of small significance, as it does not affect the order or time of other books, except the *Ihyā'* in a limited way, as will be explained.

AR-RADD AL-JAM'IL 'ĀLA ILĀHIYYĀT 'ISĀ BI-ŠARĪḤ AL-INJIL, ed. R. Chidiac in *Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études: Sciences religieuses*, 54 (Paris, 1939).

I formerly accepted this work as genuine on the basis of arguments by Chidiac in the introduction to his edition. Since then, however, Lazarus has proved decisively that it is inauthentic (pp. 458–77). Her reasons may be summed up in a few sentences. 1. The book is not mentioned in any list of Ghazālī's works before the beginning of the twentieth century. It is only mentioned, with two quotations, in a book by a Coptic theologian in the thirteenth century. 2. There are no cross-references by Ghazālī to or from the *Radd*, contrary to his usual habit. 3. The style and vocabulary of the book are very different from those of his authentic books. 4. The author shows detailed knowledge of Christian doctrines and sects, quotes from the Bible giving chapter and verse, and even quotes two sentences in Hebrew and one in Coptic (transcribed into Arabic)! All this goes far beyond the knowledge displayed by Ghazālī in all his authentic writings. 5. The author shows little knowledge of Islamic Traditions or theology. Lazarus concludes that Ghazālī could not have composed the *Radd*, and that the author "may have been a converted Muslim, a former Christian, probably a Copt" (p. 475).

If Ghazālī did not compose the *Radd*, there is little solid evidence that he visited Egypt, and I accept the opinion of Jabre that he never did so.²⁰

IHYĀ' 'ULŪM AD-DĪN, 'Irāqī ed., 16 vols. (Cairo, 1356–57=1937–39).

I, 169 and 180, mentions *ar-Risāla al-Qudsiyya*; I, 68 and 169, mentions *Iqtiṣād*.

Since *ar-Risāla al-Qudsiyya* was inserted into Book 2 of *Ihyā'*, it is most probable that the whole of *Ihyā'* was composed after the *Risāla*, or at the outside that Book 1 alone was prior. This would place the beginning of *Ihyā'* not before 490=1097, when Ghazālī was

in Jerusalem, according to his own chronology; or not before 489=1096, according to Subkī (see above on the *Risāla*).

Mentioned in most later works; among the earlier of these, it is referred to in *Bidayā*, 14, 28, 33, 34, 39; 34 refers to sins of the heart which are dealt with in the third quarter of *Ihyā'*. *Maqṣad*, 63 refers to *Ihyā'*, Book 37, i.e., near the end of the fourth quarter.

The date of completion cannot be determined accurately from Ghazālī's references alone. All we know by this method is that at least five works were written between the completion of *Ihyā'* and the return to Nishāpūr in Dhū al-Qa'da, 499=July, 1106. (See below on *Bidayā*, *Madnūn*, *Maqṣad*, *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān* and *Kīmīyā*). Thus the completion of *Ihyā'* could hardly have been later than the end of 498=August/September, 1105.²¹

But external evidence takes the probable date of completion back to the two years in Syria. Subkī reports²² that Ghazālī read *Ihyā'* publicly on his return to Baghdād, which followed his pilgrimage to Mecca and Madīna in Dhū al-Hijja, the last month of 490=November/December, 1097. Subkī's assertion is confirmed by a younger contemporary of Ghazālī, Abū Bakr Ibn al-'Arabī (468–543=1076–1148), an Andalusian scholar who writes that he heard Ghazālī read the *Ihyā'* in Baghdād.²³ Now the reading in Baghdād still does not provide a firm date for the completion of *Ihyā'*, for we do not know how long

²¹ A statement in *Ihyā'*, VII, 157 that "nearly 500 years have now passed" since the hijra gives a date before 500=1106/07 for the completion of the second quarter of *Ihyā'*. But this is of little help, because the date is vague and in any case gives no clue to the completion of the third and fourth quarters. Moreover, external evidence, to be mentioned below, indicates a date of 490=1097 or soon after.

²² *Ṭabaqāt*, VI, 200.

²³ *Al-Awāṣim min al-qawāsim*, Cairo: Dār al-kutub, ms 22031 B, fol. 7; ms dated 536=1141/42. See Jabre, pp. 87–88. Ibn al-'Arabī asserts that Ghazālī entered the Ṣūfī path in 486=1093/94, which is two years too early; and he gives the month of his meeting with Ghazālī in Baghdād as Jumādā II, 490=June, 1097, which does not allow Ghazālī nearly two years in Syria plus the pilgrimage at the end of 490=1097. But these inaccuracies in dating, no doubt dependent on memory, do not invalidate Ibn al-'Arabī's claim that he attended Ghazālī's Baghdād reading.

Ibn al-'Arabī had performed the pilgrimage in 489=1096, a year before Ghazālī; Ibn Khallikān, I, 619.

²⁰ Jabre, *MIDEO*, I, 97. Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt*, VI, 199, reports an Egyptian journey, but as a matter of doubtful hearsay (*wa yuḥkā 'anhu ḥikāyāt*), see Tibawi, p. 4. No other source mentions Egypt.

Ghazālī spent in Ḥijāz, whether he returned directly from there to Baghdād,²⁴ how long he stayed in Baghdād before the reading, and even whether the entire book had been completed at the time of the reading. But Ibn al-Athīr (555–630=1160–1233) reports that Ghazālī read it in Damascus, i.e., at some time before the fall of 1097 when he would have to start on his pilgrimage. It also seems more likely that he wrote and completed this book in 489–90=1096–97 in the tranquillity of the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus and the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem (*Munqidh*, 130–31), rather than after the pilgrimage when he began to be distracted by concern for his family and other matters not specified (*Munqidh*, 131).

I place next a group of works which cannot be related to any other book but only to *Iḥyāʾ* as preceding them. Thus the order in which these works are listed is not significant of temporal relations between them or with other late works.

AR-RISĀLA AL-WAʿZIYYA, in the collection *Al-Jawāhir al-ghawālī min rasāʾil al-imām ḥujjat al-islām al-Ghazālī* (Cairo, 1353=1934), pp. 151–55. Also called RISĀLAT AL-WAʿZ WA AL-ʿITIQAḌ. See Badawī, Nos. 49, 145.

155 refers to *Qawāʿid al-ʿaqāʾid*, i.e., *Iḥyāʾ*, Book 2.

Its authenticity is not questioned by Bouyges, p. 64, or Badawī, pp. 190, 313. Lazarus says it “abounds in expressions and images typical of Al-Ghazālī” (p. 138).

AYYUḤĀ AL-WALAD, ed. T. Sabbāgh (Beirut, 1959), with introduction by G. H. Scherer.

29 and 59, mentions *Iḥyāʾ*.

A prologue usually attached to this opusculum, but not written by Ghazālī, makes out (5) that it is addressed to a former student, who had spent most of his life studying various sciences but would now like to receive some advice to prepare him for life beyond the tomb. This suggestion of an older man does not ride well with the title referring to a child, which is repeated in the text (9, 11, etc.) Nothing can be

learned about chronology from such evidence, and we can only say with confidence that the work is later than *Iḥyāʾ*.

AL-IMLĀʾ FĪ ISHKĀLĀT AL-IḤYĀʾ, printed at the end of *Iḥyāʾ* in the ʿIrāqī edition, XVI.

2, mentions criticisms of *Iḥyāʾ* by ignorant readers and a ban on it somewhere. The criticisms imply a certain interval after the publication of *Iḥyāʾ*. If the ban refers to the burning of Ghazālī's books in the Maghrib, which took place on the orders of the Almoravid *amīr al-muslimīn* ʿAlī b. Yūsuf b. Tāshfīn,²⁵ that would date *Imlāʾ* later than 500=1106/07, when ʿAlī's reign began. But we cannot be sure that Ghazālī is referring to this event.

Three works that are probably spurious are placed here because they all refer to *Iḥyāʾ*. If any of them is genuine, this is the only indication of date.

[AL-ḤIKMA FĪ MAKHLŪQĀT ALLĀH, ed. M. Qabbānī (Cairo, 1321=1903/04).

According to Asín, *Iḥyāʾ* promises this work,²⁶ but I have been unable to trace his reference and it is not mentioned by Bouyges or Badawī. There is no other indication of its date.

Bouyges accepts it as probably genuine, merely because “le *Hikma* serait digne d'Algazel” (p. 89). Badawī places it among works of doubtful authenticity (pp. 257–59). Lazarus barely refers to it (pp. 31, 452) and raises no questions. On the basis only of its title and table of contents I am inclined to doubt its authenticity. “The wisdom of God's creation” sounds more like the philosophic view of God's providence. The Qurʾān emphasizes rather the benevolence of God in making the world fit for the use and enjoyment of man (see especially sūra xvi). The contents as given by Badawī show a treatment of the wisdom in the parts of nature in turn, from the heavens to the

²⁴ Subkī inserts a possible visit to Egypt, but this is doubtful; see note 20 above. Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī at-tārīkh* (Cairo, 1883/84), Part 10, p. 87, *sub anno* 488, takes him directly from the pilgrimage to Baghdād.

²⁵ ʿAbd al-Wāḥid al-Marrākushī, *al-Muʿjib fī talkhīṣ akhbār al-Maghrib*, ed. M. S. al-ʿArayān and M. A. al-ʿAlamī (Cairo, 1368=1949), p. 173; ed. M. Dozy, 2nd ed. (Leiden, 1881), p. 123. Bouyges, pp. 75–78, gives more references to the book burning and discusses its date further, but it is unnecessary to pursue this question since we cannot definitely connect Ghazālī's *Imlāʾ* with it.

²⁶ *Espiritualidad*, IV, 80, referring to *Iḥyāʾ*, iv, 90, perhaps in the Cairo edition of 1316=1898/99 in 4 vols.

species of animals and plants. This would require an interest in and knowledge of natural science which Ghazālī does not generally display. The organization is too systematic.]

[MARĀQI AZ-ZULFĀ, lost.

Considered doubtful by Bouyges, p. 159, and Badawī, No. 302. But they give references to Ḥajjī Khalīfa and other Arabic bibliographers. A possible reference to it in *Imlāʿ*, printed in the margin of Murtaḍā az-Zabīdī, *Iḥāf as-sāda* (Cairo, 1311=1893/94), IV, 397.]

[AL-MADNŪN BIHI ʿALĀ GHAYR AHLIHI (Cairo, 1309=1891/92).

30, mentions *Iḥyāʿ*, as the only other book of his to date containing these truths. If *Madnūn* is authentic, this would give a time after *Iḥyāʿ*. But if it is not authentic, it only shows that forgers liked to refer to *Iḥyāʿ*, a fact which is confirmed by several other cases.

Arbaʿīn, 25, mentions "some of our books which are restricted for those who are unqualified to use them" (*baʿḍi kutubinā l-madnūni biḥā ʿalā ghayri ahlihā*). But this is not a title, for *biḥā* refers to *kutub*, plural.

Without going into the long history of doubts about the authenticity of this *Madnūn*, I accept the conclusion of Lazarus, pp. 251–53, that it is spurious, as shown by a philosophical vocabulary not found in the authentic works, except where Ghazālī is expounding the theories of philosophers, as in *Maqāṣid* and *Tahāfut*.

There follows a group of works which contain references bracketing them between *Iḥyāʿ* and *Jawāhir al-Qurʾān* or its sequel *Arbaʿīn*. They cannot be related to each other.

AL-MAQṢAD AL-ASNĀ FĪ SHARḤ MAʿĀNĪ ASMĀʾ ALLĀH AL-ḤUSNĀ, ed. F. A. Shehadi (Beirut, 1971).

115, 127, 161, mention of *Iḥyāʿ*; 127, refers to Book 36. Mentioned in *Arbaʿīn*, 13, 25. Bouyges, p. 46, note 4, also gives a reference from *Jawāhir al-Qurʾān* (Cairo, 1329=1911), 57. Mentioned in *Mishkāt*, 122.

BIDĀYAT AL-HIDĀYA (Cairo, 1353=1934).

Mentions *Iḥyāʿ* in several places; 34 mentions the

fourth quarter, on "Things leading to salvation." Mentioned in *Arbaʿīn*, 29.

QAWĀṢIM AL-BĀṬINIYYA,²⁷ ed. A. Ateş in *Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi*, III (1954), pp. 23–54.

A passage quoted by Ateş places it after *Mustazhir*.²⁸ Mentioned in *Jawāhir al-Qurʾān*, 21; and *Qisṭās*, 66, as concerning the Ismāʿīlīs. Not mentioned in *Munqidh*, 119, among the books against the Ismāʿīlīs which are listed there.

Badawī, p. 86, places it immediately after *Mustazhir* and *Hujjat al-Ḥaqq*, i.e., before Ghazālī left Baghdad. Thus the three polemical works against the Ismāʿīlīs would belong to the same period. This cannot be disproved, because *Qawāṣim* contains no reference to *Iḥyāʿ*. But it makes even heavier the load of writing done in the final year at the Nizāmiyya College.

JAWĀB MUFAṢṢIL AL-KHILĀF, lost.

Mentioned with *Qawāṣim* in *Jawāhir al-Qurʾān*, 21 and *Qisṭās*, 66 as refuting the Ismāʿīlīs; also referred to in *Qisṭās*, 84. *Munqidh*, 119 describes it as the third book against the Ismāʿīlīs, after *Mustazhir* and *Hujjat al-Ḥaqq* and before *Kitāb ad-Darj*; since *Darj* is not mentioned in *Jawāhir al-Qurʾān*, among these polemical works, Bouyges, p. 56, rightly infers that it had not yet been written. Thus *Jawāb* is to be placed between *Hujjat al-Ḥaqq* and *Jawāhir al-Qurʾān*.

Munqidh, 119, calls it "a reply to criticisms made against me in Hamadān."

A residence in Hamadān is likely to have been after his second residence in Baghdad. This would place it later than *Iḥyāʿ*, as Bouyges points out, p. 45. But it is uncertain whether he passed by Hamadān on his way home to Khurāsān, as Bouyges supposes, p. 4, or returned to Hamadān some time later with a Seljūq army which captured it from Barkiyarūq around 493=1099/1100, as Jabre conjectures.²⁹

²⁷ Misprinted as *Mawāhim* in an older edition (Cairo, 1324=1906/07), IV, 116. See now *Ṭabaqāt*, VI, 226, note 2.

²⁸ See G. Makdisi, *Ibn ʿAqīl et la résurgence de l'Islam traditionaliste au XIe siècle* (Damascus, 1963), pp. xiv, 212, n. 2, 290, n. 2.

²⁹ "Biographie," pp. 98–99.

JAWĀHIR AL-QUR'ĀN (Cairo, 1352=1933, Raḥmā-niyya Press).

24, mentions the 40 books of *Iḥyā'*.

After *Bidāya* and *Maqṣad*, because they are mentioned in *Arbaʿīn*, the sequel to *Jawāhir* (*Jawāhir*, 6). (*Maqṣad* is also mentioned in *Jawāhir* (Cairo, 1329=1911), 57, according to Bouyges, p. 46, note 4).

References to *Jawāhir* in *Qisṭās*, 70, 92, 93.

Described in *Mustaṣfā*, I, 3 as before the return to teaching at Nīshāpūr, Dhū al-Qaʿda, 499=July, 1106.

AL-ARBAʿĪN FI UṢŪL AD-DĪN (Cairo, 1344=1925, Istiqāma Press).

29, mentions *Bidāya*. 13, 25, mentions *Maqṣad*.

305, describes itself as a sequel to *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān*.

Before *Qisṭās*, because that work mentions the companion volume of *Arbaʿīn*, *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān* (see above).

MISHKĀT AL-ANWĀR, ed. A. A. ʿAfīfī (Cairo, 1964).

46, mentions *Iḥyā'*, Book 21. 47, mentions *Miʿyār* and *Miḥakk*. 56, mentions *al-Maṣṣad al-asnā*. Thus it is certainly after *Maṣṣad*.

But we can probably date it later, if we can give a chronological interpretation to a passage in Ibn Rushd's *Kitāb al-Kaṣḥf ʿan manāḥij al-adilla* where he refers to several of Ghazālī's works in close succession.³⁰ Ibn Rushd is describing how philosophy was gradually made known to the Muslim public, first by the Kharijites, then by the Muʿtazilites, Ashʿarites and Sūfīs. Then Ghazālī let the whole cat out of the bag in his *Maqāṣid*, *Tahāfut*, *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān*, *Madnūn*, *Mishkāṭ*, *Munqidh* and *Kīmīyā*, mentioned in this order. If it was intended as a chronological order and if Ibn Rushd was well informed on this point, *Mishkāṭ* can be placed after *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān*. (*Madnūn* can be ignored if it is spurious, even though Ibn Ṭufayl and Ibn Rushd thought it genuine.) This conclusion was accepted by Bouyges, p. 66.

But Badawī, pp. 147–48, in commenting on *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān*, denied it, saying that "the text shows no indication whatever that Ibn Rushd in this passage is enumerating Ghazālī's books in their chronological order." I believe that Badawī is mistaken about this, and that there are clear indications of a chronological

order. The whole context is an account of a historical development, from the Kharijites to Ghazālī, which is given in a true temporal sequence, allowing for the overlap of the Sūfīs with the other schools, especially the Ashʿarites. Then, when he comes to Ghazālī, he mentions the first three works in their correct chronological order, just as we have shown it. Moreover the chronological order is made explicit by Ibn Rushd, who begins the sentences referring to *Tahāfut*, *Jawāhir* and *Mishkāṭ* with the word *thumma*, "then." It might be suggested that Ibn Rushd is using *thumma* as Fārābī does in his *Philosophy of Plato*, to connect a series of philosophical topics in a logical order which is unrelated to the chronology of Plato's dialogues. But, whereas the logical order is obvious in Fārābī, in Ibn Rushd there is no clue to one and the only order which is obvious is a chronological one. As for Ibn Rushd's knowledge of this, it seems to have been rather accurate, since little fault can be found in it.

Badawī's only textual argument that the order is not chronological is the fact that after this sequence of Ghazālī's books from *Maqāṣid* to *Kīmīyā* Ibn Rushd mentions *Fayṣal at-tafrīqa*, whereas *Fayṣal* is known to be earlier than *Munqidh* from a reference in *Munqidh*, 99. But Ibn Rushd mentions *Fayṣal* more than half a page later than the other books, in a new context in which he is no longer explaining what Ghazālī did but the harmful consequences that followed from it, and here chronology is of no concern. Thus the reference to *Fayṣal* in no way invalidates the chronological character of the preceding series of books listed.

The evidence of Ibn Rushd, then, is that *Mishkāṭ* is later than *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān*. Such evidence cannot weigh as much as that of the direct cross-references in Ghazālī's own books, which we have been using for the most part. But we have seen that Ibn Rushd's knowledge was quite good, as should be expected from such a careful scholar writing less than 70 years after Ghazālī's death.

There is no way to attain further accuracy on the date of *Mishkāṭ* between *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān* and Ghazālī's death, using the kinds of evidence to which this article is limited. Therefore several attempts to base a late date on grounds of content, such as an advanced mystical doctrine in *Mishkāṭ*, need not be discussed in this place.³¹ We might just as well have

³⁰ Ed. M. J. Müller (Munich, 1859), pp. 70–71.

³¹ See W. H. T. Gairdner, "Al-Ghazālī's *Mishkāṭ al-anwār* and the Ghazālī-problem," *Der Islam*, 5 (1914), p. 121; Macdonald, "al-Ghazālī," *Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam*; Bouyges, p. 65; Watt, "Authenticity," *JRAS* (1952), p. 44;

inserted *Mishkāṭ* at any later point, but have preferred to do so at the earliest possible point, after *Arbaʿīn* which is the close sequel to *Jawāhir al-Qurʾān* as has been seen.

KITĀB AD-DARJ (OR AD-DURJ) AL-MARQŪM BI AL-JADĀWIL, lost.

Mentioned in *Munqidh*, 119, as a retort to feeble criticisms by the Ismāʿīlīs in Ṭūs against Ghazālī. Thus it must have been composed while he was living in Ṭūs before his return to Nīshāpūr in 499=1106, or very soon after that. But it can be fixed more accurately than that. *Munqidh* lists it as the fourth in temporal order of the anti-Ismāʿīlī works, before *al-Qisṭās al-mustaqīm*. On the other hand, in the earlier book *Jawāhir al-Qurʾān*, 21, where Ghazālī lists three books as directed against the Ismāʿīlīs, (*Mustaḥḥirī*, *Hujjat al-ḥaqq* and *Qawāṣim al-Bāṭiniyya*), *Darj* is not mentioned; from this silence Bouyges, p. 56, rightly concluded that it had not yet been written, for Ghazālī is not reticent about his own books.

In brief, *Darj* can be firmly placed after *Jawāhir Arbaʿīn* and before *Qisṭās*, and belongs to the residence in Ṭūs before 499=1106.

AL-QISṬĀS AL-MUSTAQĪM, ed. V. Chelhot (Beirut, 1959).

The place of this work in the order can be determined precisely by references. 70, etc. mentions *Jawāhir al-Qurʾān*, thus posterior to it and its sequel *Arbaʿīn*. *Munqidh*, 119, names it after *Darj* as the fifth of the polemical works against Ismaʿilism.

On the other side it is referred to in *Fayṣal*, 88 and 96. No other known work could have intervened between these two, except *Mishkāṭ* whose exact position remains undetermined as explained above.

FAYṢAL AT-TAFRIQA BAYNA AL-ISLĀM WA AZ-ZANDAQA, in *Al-Jawāhir al-ghawālī* (Cairo, 1353=1934).

This book too can be placed easily, although less exactly at the latter end. 88 and 96, mentions *Qisṭās*.

Lazarus, pp. 299–300. Lazarus points out that the descriptions in *Mishkāṭ* of intuitive mystical knowledge (*dhawq*), which Watt took as evidence of a late date, are already anticipated in different language in earlier works such as *Ihyāʾ* and even *Tahāfut*.

Mentioned in *Munqidh*, 99. Lazarus, p. 37 perceives a close linguistic affinity between *Fayṣal* and *Munqidh*. Another late reference in *Mustaṣfā* (Cairo, 1322=1904/05), I, 185.

KĪMĪYĀ-YI SAʿĀDET.

Not having access to this work in the Persian original, I rely on the accounts of Bouyges, pp. 59–60, and Badawī, pp. 172–78. The latter mentions some editions published in India, of which the latest is Lucknow, 1291=1874

This large book is a Persian version of *Ihyāʾ*, thus likely to have been composed after Ghazālī's return from the Arab countries. The preface refers to *Jawāhir al-Qurʾān*, making it later than *Jawāhir-Arbaʿīn*. From the other direction, *Mustaṣfā*, I, 3 mentions it as before the return to teaching in Nīshāpūr (Dhū al-Qaʿda, 499=July, 1106). So it can be confidently assigned to the first period of retirement at Ṭūs.

The reference to this title in *Munqidh*, 159, is probably meant for another work, as will be explained under the next title.

"REFUTATION OF THE PERMISSIVISTS"

A Persian "Refutation of the Permissivists," ed. and German tr. O. Pretzl, "Die Streitschrift des Gazālī gegen die Ibāhīja," *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosophisch-historische Abteilung, 1933, Heft 7 (Munich, 1933).

As *Ibāhiyya* is written in Persian it is likely to be later than Ghazālī's return from the Arab countries.

Munqidh, 154 declares: "As for the delusions of the Permissivists (*ahl al-ibāḥa*), we have grouped their errors into seven kinds and exposed them in *Kīmīyā as-saʿāda*." Now *Kīmīyā* contains passages which can be considered answers to the Ibāhīs, but not systematically under seven heads. *Ibāhiyya* on the other hand does accuse them of eight errors, which it answers in turn. As Ghazālī habitually relied on his memory for facts, it is probable that in *Munqidh* he is referring to this book and slipped in citing its title and the number of errors.

Because of these uncertainties, and the lack of other references by Ghazālī, Badawī suspends judgement about authenticity (pp. 467–68). But the fact remains that the book that exists corresponds in its subject and organization to Ghazālī's description. A single reference in *Munqidh* should be enough. I prefer to regard it provisionally as genuine, although subject to

further study. Bouyges-Allard and Lazarus are silent about the work.

Pretzl judges that *Munqidh* shows fairly certainly that the book was written at the Nizāmiyya College in Nīshāpūr after 499 (1106).³² He does not give reasons, but it is likely that he relies on *Munqidh*, 151, where Ghazālī says he was commanded by the Sultān to return urgently to Nīshāpūr to combat the spread of religious indifference. The preceding pages of *Munqidh*, however, show that he had already been concerned with this trend in his previous retirement, so he may also have been writing about it then. Thus the book cannot be assigned with certainty to before or after the return.

NAṢĪḤAT AL-MULŪK, Persian, ed. J. K. S. Humāʿī (Tehran, 1937–39).

In considering this work I have relied on the English translation by Bagley, as well as on the discussion of it in his introduction and in recent works by Lambton and Laoust.³³

It has been noticed that the presentation of the faith of Islam in this work follows closely the organization and contents of *Kīmīyā-yi saʿādet*.³⁴ Beyond that, the dating of the work depends mainly on the interpretation of the dedication and the related historical circumstances.

The introductory remarks of the Arabic translation, which is early, state that the work is addressed to “Muḥammad b. Malikshāh, sultān of the East and the West.” This Great Seljūq sultān did not accede to the full title until 499=1105. On this basis it has generally been concluded that the book is posterior to that year. But Lambton has now argued convincingly that the work is addressed to Sanjar, the brother of Muḥammad who was provincial governor of Khurāsān from 1103 on and who was also entitled “sultān.” For the Persian original addresses itself to “the sultān of the East” only. Moreover, it was Sanjar’s wazīr Fakhr al-Mulk who invited or commanded Ghazālī to take up

teaching again at the Nizāmiyya College of Nīshāpūr (499=1106), and Nīshāpūr was in Sanjar’s province.

This new view, endorsed and elaborated by Laoust, does not directly bring about any progress in the dating of the work. But it does create a presumption that *Naṣīḥat al-mulūk* is connected with the program of religious revival for which Ghazālī was brought back from his retirement to an active life of teaching and writing in Nīshāpūr. We can find a pattern of missionary writing in the three Persian works, *Kīmīyā*, *Ibāhiyya* and *Naṣīḥa*, and the two Arabic works of Nīshāpūr, *Munqidh* and *Mustasfā*. While the *Naṣīḥa* could have been written in Ṭūs, either immediately before 1106 or soon after 1109, the book is more suited to the intervening period in Nīshāpūr, when Ghazālī was working in a more urban and political environment.

There are no references to indicate its temporal relations to *Munqidh* and *Mustasfā*.

AL-MUNQIDH MIN AD-ḌALĀL, ed. J. Ṣalībā and K. ʿAyyād (Damascus, 1939).

99, mentions *Fayṣal*, and 154, mentions one or the other of the two Persian works as explained above.

153, mentions the month of his return to Nīshāpūr, Dhū al-Qaʿda, 499=July, 1106. 67, Ghazālī gives his age at the time of writing, “over 50,” i.e., after the beginning of 500=Sept. 2, 1106.

153, Ghazālī refers to himself as teaching, so he was still at Nīshāpūr before his final retirement to Ṭūs. This fact and his age allow us to place *Munqidh* somewhere between late 1106 and 1109, as proposed by Bouyges, pp. 70–71, and confirmed by Poggi in the most thorough examination of the question to the present time.³⁵

AL-MUSTAṢFĀ MIN ʿILM AL-UṢŪL, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1356=1937, Tijāriyya Press).

The date of completion is given in the colophons of two manuscripts of 1182/83 and 1193, as well as by Ibn Khallikān: Muḥarrām 6, 503=August 5, 1109. This was noted by Bouyges, pp. 73–74, with references.

I, 3, mentions the return to Nīshāpūr in 1106, also *Jawāhir al-Qurʿān* and *Kīmīyā*. Bouyges, p. 58, n. 3, also gives a reference to *Fayṣal* (in an older edition).

³² *Sitzungsberichte* (1933), p. 16.

³³ F. R. C. Bagley, English tr., *Ghazālī's Book of counsel for kings* (London, 1964), pp. xvi–xxvi. A. K. S. Lambton, “Justice in the medieval Persian theory of kingship,” *Studia Islamica*, 17 (1962), pp. 91–119. H. Laoust, *La politique de Ghazālī* (Paris, 1970), pp. 144–47.

³⁴ Bagley, pp. xxiv–xxv, referring to Humāʿī and to a doctoral thesis by H. Spencer (Edinburgh University).

³⁵ V. J. Poggi, *Un classico della spiritualità musulmana* (Rome, 1967), pp. 3–15.

There are no cross references between *Munqidh* and *Mustasfā*. As a conjecture I would put the completion of *Mustasfā* later, because the phrase "over 50" for *Munqidh* (67) puts it closer to 1106 than 1109, and more time would be needed to complete the substantial *Mustasfā*. But the writing of these two books may well overlap.

ILJĀM AL-^ʿAWĀMM ^ʿAN ^ʿILM AL-KALĀM, (Cairo, 1309=1891/92, Maymūniyya Press).

This work is dated precisely by a colophon as having been completed in "the first days of Jumāda II, 505," i.e., a few days before Ghazālī's death on the

14th of that month (December 18, 1111). The colophon is in a very early manuscript, Istanbul: Shehīd Ali 1712:1, which gives its own date of completion as the middle of Sha^ʿbān, 507=1113.³⁶

³⁶ Bouyges was the first to notice this colophon (pp. 80–82), but he misread the year of the manuscript as 509, and this error has been repeated by later scholars. *Sab*^ʿ ("seven") is quite clear in my enlargement taken from the Arab League microfilm collection, listed as Tawhīd 34 in F. Sayyid, *Fihrist al-makhṭūṣāt al-muṣawwara* (Cairo: Arab League Cultural Commission, 1954).