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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 Ghażalī's books, which are plentiful, and avoiding inferences from any observed or supposed development in Ghażalī'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 Ghażalī'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 Ghażalī'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 Ghażalī'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 Ghażalī. 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 Badawi's bibliography of the manuscripts and printed works of Ghażalī.4 The other is a collection of Ghazalian studies by Lazarus-Yafeh.5 There have also been many new editions of Ghażalī'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

---


4 A. Badawi, Mu'allafat al-Ghażalī, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1961).

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 Ghazâlî’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. Only by limiting ourselves to such evidence in the first place can we provide a solid basis for tracing the development of Ghazâlî’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 Ghazâlî 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 Badawi 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 Badawi 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 Ghazâlî’s works and thought in a meaningful biographical context.

For the purpose in view Ghazâlî’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 Juwaynî, the Imâm al-Harâmayn (d. 478=1085/86), to Ghazâlî’s departure from Baghda at the end of 488 (1095). Born at Tûs in 450=1058, he had gone to Nishâpûr as a youth to study under the Imâm, and it is known that he started teaching and writing there while the Imâm was still alive. Only one work is definitely assignable to this time, Mankhâl (see below and note 10). After Juwaynî’s death Ghazâlî was attached to the camp-court (maʿaskar) of the Seljûq sultan’s great wâzîr, Nizâm al-Mulk, and he remained there in high favor for some six years. In 484=1091/92 he was appointed to the chair of Shâfiʿite law at the Nizâmiyya College in Baghda, and he taught there for four years, 484–88=1091/92–1095.

Ghazâlî informs us in two places that he wrote on law and jurisprudence in this first period of teaching. (i) Mustasfâ, 1, 37 states: “In the prime of my youth . . . I composed many books on law and jurisprudence (fi ḥûrâʾi l-fiqhi wa ṣulûkh); 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 Ghazâlî’s legal writings, with the exception of Mustasfâ 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-ʿulûmi sh-sharʿiyya),” i.e., law and jurisprudence. Since this statement is in the context of Baghda, we know that at least some of his treatises on law and jurisprudence


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 Nishāpūr, we cannot distribute the works on these subjects precisely among the three sub-periods at Nishāpūr, 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 Māqāṣid al-falāsifa and Mīzān al-‘amāl. Munqūdīh, 797f. specifies the order of his studies of four subjects in his wide-ranging search for religious truth: theology (‘ilm al-kalām), philosophy, Isma‘ilism 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 Iqtīsād, probably belongs to the latter end of the Baghdād years. There is some overlap between the books on philosophy and on Isma‘ilism, 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 Mīzān al-‘amāl as a work on ethics is in accord with Ghazālī’s concern for practice while he approached Sufism, as shown in Munqūdīh, 122.

(2) A period of retirement extends for eleven lunar years, from his departure from Baghdād in Dhū al-Qa‘da, 488=November, 1095, to his return to teaching at Nishāpūr in Dhū al-Qa‘da, 499=July, 1106 (Munqūdīh, 153). The order of his travels and residences during these years can be traced fairly well from statements in Munqūdīh 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, Iḥyā‘ ‘ulūm ad-dīn, in these two cities.9 From there he proceeded on a pilgrimage to Mecca and Madīnah, 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.

(3) He came out of retirement in Dhū al-Qa‘da, 499=July, 1106, to resume teaching in Nishāpūr. 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, Ijām, can be placed with certainty in this period, a fact which confirms the opinion that the period was quite short.

AL-MANKHUL FI USUL AL-FIQH, IN MS.

Mentioned in Mustaṣfā, 1, 3 as a concise work on law. Subkī says Ghazālī wrote it during the lifetime of his teacher Imām al-Haramayn, 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.

Mankhūl11 means “sifted” and points to a summary.

1. MAʿAKHIDH AL-KHILĀF
2. LUBĀB AN-NAZAR
3. TAHSIN AL-MAʿAKHIDH
4. AL-MABADṬ WA AL-GHAYṬ

All are lost.

Miṣyār ‘ulīm, 23, which belongs to the end of the first period, 488=1095, lists in order these four works on methods of legal debate. As Badawi 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.

SHIFĀʿ AL-GHALIL FI AL-QIYĀS WA AT-TAʿ LIĻ, IN MSS.

(Variouss titles, including ‘alīl for ghalīl).

---

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


After *Mabādiet* and close to it, see *Mīhākk*, 91. Before *Mustazhīr*: 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 *Iḥyāʾ*.

(1) **AL-BAṢĪT**, in MSS.

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

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

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

(II) **AL-WAṢĪT**, in MSS.

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

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

(III) **AL-WAFTER F I F Q H A L - I M ā M A S H - S Ħ A F I ’ Y Y T**. (Cairo, 1317=1899/1900).

*Iḥyāʾ*, I, 108 (ed. Cairo, 1326) and Jawāhir, 22; in both cases third after *al-Baṣīt* and *al-Waṣīt*. A summary of Shafiʿīite law, perhaps made as a text-book for students.

Bouyges, pp. 12 and 49, dated it much later, between *Iḥyāʾ* 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-Waṣīt* in close association with *al-Baṣīt* and *al-Waṣīt*. Bouyges' dating is also rejected implicitly by Badawi, p. 25, and by Lazarus, pp. 210, 378–79, 407, on grounds of style and content.

**KHULĀSĀT AL-MUKHTAṢAR WA NAQĀWAT AL-MUṬṢAṢAR**, in MSS.

Mentioned in *Iḥyāʾ*, I, 30 (*Iraqī* ed., see 10). The *Mukhtasār* was by Ismāʿīl al-Muzannī, an early Shafiʿīite lawyer (d. 877). This is a résumé of it, perhaps made as a textbook.

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

**TAH-DHĪB AL-UṢĪL**, 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*. Badawi 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-usūl* . . ."

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 Ismaʿīlism which can be related to each other serially with some accuracy and dated to the later part of the four years in Baghdad. There are no references which might relate this group to the previous one, but books on philosophy and Ismaʿīlism 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-FALĀṢIFAH**, ed. M. S. Kurdī (Cairo, 1355=1936), 3 parts.

As it was written in Baghdad (*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 *Tahāfuṭ*, which means it was completed hardly later than 486 (ended Jan. 20, 1094), in view of the evidence on the dates of *Tahāfuṭ* and *Mustazhīr*. 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).


After *Maqāṣid* (*Maqāṣid*, i, 2–3 and iii, 77; *Munqidh*, 84–85), MS Fāṭih, 2921 (Istanbul) records that *Tahāfuṭ* was completed on Muḥarram 11, 488=January 21.
1095; 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 Miṣyār, 22, 161, 174, all describing Miṣyār as a supplement on logic to Tahāfut. (See below, Miṣyār, for more on their relation.)

III. Miṣyār al-ʿilm fī fann al-mantiq, ed. M. S. Kurdī (Cairo, 1329=1911).

Tahāfut, 17 and 20, anticipates it as an appendix, under the title Miṣyār al-ʿaqīl. Tahāfut, 213, refers to it as Madārīk al-ʿuqūl, and implies that it has already been written (ṣannāfīnhū). Miṣyār, 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., Iḥtiṣād, 9.


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


The Mustazhirī can be closely dated by its references to two caliphs. It refers to the ʿAbbasid Mustazhirī as holding his office (fols. 3b-4a), and his accession was on Muharram 15, 487 (February 4, 1094); and to the Fatimid Mustanṣir 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 Ismaʿīlism (al-Bāṭiniyya) after philosophy. And Goldziher saw an allusion to Tahāfut in Mustazhirī, fol. 196, where Ghazālī mentions a philosophic doctrine which he had refuted ʿīl al-kalām.13

(In Jawāhir al-Qurʾān, 21 he refers to his Tahāfut as a work of kalām.)

The temporal relation of the Mustazhirī to Miṣyār 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, Mustazhirī can be placed after the other two, although not conclusively. This is the order given by Bouyges, Badawi and Lazarus.

Munqidh, 119, lists Mustazhirī 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.

HUJJAT AL-HAQQ, 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 Bagdad, 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.


Mentions Tahafūt (105, 215), Miṣyār and Miḥakk (15) and Mustazhirī (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 Iḥtiṣād than in the actual Qawāʿid al-ʿaqāʾid, which is later and is but a part of Ihya.15

---

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

13 Streitschrift, p. 28.


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 al-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. Miṣyār, above).
Mentioned in Iḥyāʾ, 1, 68 and 169; therefore earlier than the earliest part of Iḥyāʾ.

These data fix the place of Iqṭiṣād 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 Taḥāfūt 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 Taḥāfūt. 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 kālām was one of the first products of his new life as a Sūfī. Bouyges, p. 34, placed it in Baghdād because he found in it the same concerns as those of Taḥāfūt, 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 Miṣḥar, Mihakk and Mustazhirī and his new attention to Sufism (Munqīdīh, 122ff.); and Iqṭiṣād 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 (Munqīdīh, 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. Kurdi and M. S. Nuʿaymī (Cairo, 1328=1909/10).

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

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 Miṣḥar so frequently and to no other of his books proves that Miṣḥar 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 Munqīdīh, 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 Miṣḥar as shown and the opinion of recent scholars as explained above.

Since Iqṭiṣād 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 Iqṭiṣād: that it is a sequel to Taḥāfūt, while Mīzān is a sequel to Miṣḥar, which is itself an appendix to Taḥāfūt. 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 Munqīdīh, 122: “When I had finished with these sciences [theology, philosophy and Ismaiʿilism], I turned my attention to the way of the Sufis, and I learned that their way is completed only by both knowledge and practice.”

Now that both Iqṭiṣād 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 Munqīdīh, 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

---

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, Asin 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. Asin thought *Mizān* must be later than *Ihya* because *Ihya* 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. 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 1159.

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‘yar* 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‘yar*, 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 *Ihya*, the most famous of Ghazālī’s works.

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, Badawi 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.


Mentioned in *Ihya*, I, 169 and 180, as a short treatise (*risāla*) written for the people of Jerusalem and subsequently incorporated into *Qawā'id al-aqā'id*, the second of the forty “books” of *Ihya*. The colophon of two manuscripts, Cairo, Majāmī 66 and London, SOAS 45818, state that the work was completed in the Aqṣā 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 *Iqtiṣād* and *Mizān* and before *Ihya*. 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‘da, 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. 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.

---


19 *Tabaqāt*, 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 Ḩyā's in a limited way, as will be explained.


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 Ghazâlî'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 Ghazâlî 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 Ghazâlî in all his authentic writings. 5. The author shows little knowledge of Islamic Traditions or theology. Lazarus concludes that Ghazâlî 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 Ghazâlî 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


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

Since ar-Risâla al-Qudsiyya was inserted into Book 2 of Ḩyā', it is most probable that the whole of Ḩyā' was composed after the Risâla, or at the outside that Book 1 alone was prior. This would place the beginning of Ḩyā' not before 490=1097, when Ghazâlî was in Jerusalem, according to his own chronology; or not before 489=1096, according to Subkî (see above on the Risâla).

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

The date of completion cannot be determined accurately from Ghazâlî's references alone. All we know by this method is that at least five works were written between the completion of Ḩyā' and the return to Nishâpur in Dhû al-Qa'da, 499=July, 1106. (See below on Bidayâ, Madnûn, Maqṣad, Jawâhir al-Qur'ān and Kîmiyâ). Thus the completion of Ḩyā' 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. Subkî reports22 that Ghazâlî read Ḩyā' publicly on his return to Baghdâd, which followed his pilgrimage to Mecca and Madâna in Dhû al-Hijja, the last month of 490=November/December, 1097. Subkî's assertion is confirmed by a younger contemporary of Ghazâlî, Abû Bakr ibn al-'Arabî (468–543=1076–1148), an Andalusian scholar who writes that he heard Ghazâlî read the Ḩyā' in Baghdâd.23 Now the reading in Baghdâd still does not provide a firm date for the completion of Ḩyā', for we do not know how long

20 Jabre, MIDEO, 1, 97. Subkî, Ṭabaqât, VI, 199, reports an Egyptian journey, but as a matter of doubtful hearsay (wa yuhbk ḍahu hikâyâ), see Tibawi, p. 4. No other source mentions Egypt.

21 A statement in Ḩyā', 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 Ḩyā'. 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.

Ṭabaqât, VI, 200.

23 Al-'Awāṣ im min al-qawāṣim, Cairo: Dâr al-kutub, ms 22031 B, fol. 7; ms dated 536=1141/2. See Jabre, pp. 87–88. Ibn al-'Arabî asserts that Ghazâlî entered the Sūfi path in 486=1093/94, which is two years too early; and he gives the month of his meeting with Ghazâlî in Baghdâd as Jumâdâ II, 490=June, 1097, which does not allow Ghazâlî 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-'Arabî's claim that he attended Ghazâlî's Baghdâd reading.

Ibn al-'Arabî had performed the pilgrimage in 489=1096, a year before Ghazâlî; ibn Khallîkân, I, 619.
Ghazālī spent in Hijāz, whether he returned directly from there to Baghdaḍ,24 how long he stayed in Baghdaḍ before the reading, and even whether the entire book had been completed at the time of the reading. But Ibn al-Athir (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 tranquility 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 Iḥyā’ as preceding them. Thus the order in which in these works are listed is not significant of temporal relations between them or with other late works.

AR-RISĀLA AL-WAṢĪYYA, in the collection Al-Jawāhir al-ghawālī min rasā’il al-imām ʿuṣūl al-Islām al-Ghazālī (Cairo, 1353=1934), pp. 151–55. Also called RISĀLAT AL-WAṢĪZA WA AL-ʾIṢQĀD. See Badawī, Nos. 49, 145.

155 refers to Qawāʿid al-ʾaqāʾid, i.e., Iḥyā’, 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).

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

29 and 59, mentions Iḥyā’.

A prologue usually attached to this opuscule, 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 Iḥyā’.

AL-ĪMLĀʾ FT IṢHĀʿĀʾ AL-IḤYĀʾ, printed at the end of Iḥyā’, in the ʿIrāqī edition, XVI.

2, mentions criticisms of Iḥyā’ by ignorant readers and a ban on it somewhere. The criticisms imply a certain interval after the publication of Iḥyā’. 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. Tāshfin,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 Iḥyā’. If any of them is genuine, this is the only indication of date.

[AL-ḤIKMA FT MĀḤLŪQĀT ALLĀH, ed. M. Qabbanī (Cairo, 1321=1903/04).

According to Asin, Iḥyā’ 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 Ḥikma 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 Ibn al-Athir, al-Kāmil fi at-taʾrīkh (Cairo, 1883/84), Part 10, p. 87, sub anno 488, takes him directly from the pilgrimage to Baghdaḍ.


26 Espiritualidad, IV, 80, referring to Iḥyā’, 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.]

[MARĀḠĪ 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 Ḥilmā, printed in the margin of Murtada az-Zabīdī, Ḥifṣ as-sâda (Cairo, 1311=1893/94), IV, 397.]

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

30, mentions Ḥiyā, as the only other book of his to date containing these truths. If Madnūn is authentic, this would give a time after Ḥiyā. But if it is not authentic, it only shows that forgers liked to refer to Ḥiyā, 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” (baʿdi kutubinā l-madnūnī bihā ʿălā ghayrī ahlihā). But this is not a title, for bihā 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 Tahāfuṭ.]

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

AL-MARĀḠĪ AL-ʿANĀṢ AL-SHARĪʿ MAʿĀṬ ASMĀʾ ALLĀH AL-ḤUSNĀ, ed. F. A. Shehadi (Beirut, 1971).


BIDĀYAT AL-HIDAYA (Cairo, 1353=1934).

Mentions Ḥiyā in several places; 34 mentions the fourth quarter, on “Things leading to salvation.” Mentioned in Arbaʿīn, 29.


A passage quoted by Ateş places it after Mustazhirī.28 Mentioned in Jawāhir al-Qurʾān, 21, and Qistās, 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 Mustazhirī and Hujjat al-Haqq, i.e., before Ghazālī left Baghdād. Thus the three polemical works against the Ismāʿīlīs would belong to the same period. This cannot be disproved, because Qawāṣīm contains no reference to Ḥiyā. But it makes even heavier the load of writing done in the final year at the Niẓāmiyya College.

JAWĀĪB MUFAṢṢĪL AL-KHILĀF, lost.

Mentioned with Qawāṣīm in Jawāhir al-Qurʾān, 21 and Qistās, 66 as refuting the Ismāʿīlīs; also referred to in Qistās, 84. Munqidh, 119 describes it as the third book against the Ismāʿīlīs, after Mustazhirī and Hujjat al-haqq and before Kitāb ad-Dār; 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 Jawāīb is to be placed between Hujjat al-haqq 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 Baghdād. This would place it later than Ḥiyā, 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 Barkiyarq around 493=1099/1100, as Jabre conjectures.29

---

27 Misprinted as Mawādim in an older edition (Cairo, 1324=1906/07), IV, 116. See now Tabaqāṭ, VI, 226, note 2.
JAWĀHİR AL-QURʾĀN (Cairo, 1352=1933, Rahmāniyya Press).

24, mentions the 40 books of Iḥyā'.
After Bidāya and Maqṣad, because they are mentioned in Arbaṭin, the sequel to Jawāhīr (Jawāhīr, 6). (Maqṣad is also mentioned in Jawāhīr (Cairo, 1329=1911), 57, according to Bouyges, p. 46, note 4).
References to Jawāhīr in Qīṣṭās, 70, 92, 93.
Described in Mustasfā, I, 3 as before the return to teaching at Nūshāpūr, Dhū al-Qā‘da, 499=July, 1106.

AL-ARBAṬIN ET UŞUL AD-DĪN (Cairo, 1344=1925, Istiqāma Press).

29, mentions Bidāya. 13, 25, mentions Maqṣad. 305, describes itself as a sequel to Jawāhīr al-Qurʾān (see above).

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

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

But we can probably date it later, if we can give a chronological interpretation to a passage in Ibn Rushd's Kitāb al-Kashf ʿan manāhib 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 Şūfis. Then Ghazālī let the whole cat out of the bag in his Maqṣāsid, Taḥāfiṣt, Jawāhīr al-Qurʾān, Madānūn, Mishkāt, Munqīdāt and Kīmīyā, mentioned in this order. If it was intended as a chronological order and if Ibn Rushd was well informed on this point, Mishkāt can be placed after Jawāhīr al-Qurʾān. (Madānūn can be ignored if it is spurious, even though Ibn Tufayl and Ibn Rushd thought it genuine.) This conclusion was accepted by Bouyges, p. 66.

But Badawī, pp. 147–48, in commenting on Jawāhīr al-Qurʾān, 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 Şūfis 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 Taḥāfiṣt, Jawāhīr and Mishkāt 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 Maqṣāsid to Kīmīyā Ibn Rushd mentions Fāyṣal at-taqriqa, whereas Fāyṣal is known to be earlier than Munqīdāt from a reference in Munqīdāt, 99. But Ibn Rushd mentions Fāyṣal 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 Fāyṣal in no way invalidates the chronological character of the preceding series of books listed.

The evidence of Ibn Rushd, then, is that Mishkāt is later than Jawāhīr al-Qurʾān. 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 Mishkāt between Jawāhīr al-Qurʾān 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 Mishkāt, need not be discussed in this place.31 We might just as well have

---

30 Ed. M. J. Müller (Munich, 1859), pp. 70–71.
inserted Mishkāt at any later point, but have preferred to do so at the earliest possible point, after Arba‘īn which is the close sequel to Jawāhir al-Qur‘ān as has been seen. Mentioned in Munqīd, 99. Lazarus, p. 37 perceives a close linguistic affinity between Faysāl and Munqīd. Another late reference in Mustasfā (Cairo, 1322=1904/05), I, 185.

KITĀB AD-DARJ (OF AD-DURJ) AL-MARQOM BI AL-JADĀWIL, lost.

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 Iḥyā‘, thus likely to have been composed after Ghazālī’s return from the Arab countries. The preface refers to Jawāhir al-Qur‘ān, making it later than Jawāhir Arba‘īn. From the other direction, Mustasfā, I, 3 mentions it as before the return to teaching in Nishāpūr (Dhū al-Qa‘da, 499=July, 1106). So it can be confidently assigned to the first period of retirement at Tūs.

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

“REFUTATION OF THE PERMISSIVISTS”


As Ibāḥīya is written in Persian it is likely to be later than Ghazālī’s return from the Arab countries. Munqīd, 154 declares: “As for the delusions of the Permissivists (ahl al-ibāḥa), we have grouped their errors into seven kinds and exposed them in Kīmiyā as-sa‘āda.” Now Kīmiyā contains passages which can be considered answers to the Ibāḥīs, but not systematically under seven heads. Ibāḥīya 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 Munqīd 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 Munqīd should be enough. I prefer to regard it provisionally as genuine, although subject to

AL-QISTĀS 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-Qur‘ān, thus posterior to it and its sequel Arba‘īn. Munqīd, 119, names it after Darj as the fifth of the polemical works against Isma‘īlism.

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


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

Lazarus, pp. 299–300. Lazarus points out that the descriptions in Mishkāt 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 Iḥyā‘ and even Tahāfut.
further study. Bouyges-Allard and Lazarus are silent about the work.

Pretzl judges that Munqīdḥ shows fairly certainly that the book was written at the Niẓāmiyya College in Nīshāpūr after 499 (1106). He does not give reasons, but it is likely that he relies on Munqīdḥ, 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 Munqīdḥ, 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.


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 Loust. It has been noticed that the presentation of the faith of Islam in this work follows closely the organization and contents of Kāmil yā sī aṣdei. 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 “Muhammad b. Malikshāh, sultān of the East and the West.” This Great Seldjūq 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 Muhammad 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 Niẓāmiyya College of Nīshāpūr (499=1106), and Nīshāpūr was in Sanjar’s province.

This new view, endorsed and elaborated by Loust, does not directly bring about any progress in the dating of the work. But it does create a presumption that Naṣīḥat al-multāk 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, Kāmil yā, Ibāḥiyā and Naṣīḥa, and the two Arabic works of Nīshāpūr, Munqīdḥ and Mustasfā. While the Naṣīḥa could have been written in Tūs, 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 Munqīdḥ and Mustasfā.


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-Qa’da, 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 Tūs. This fact and his age allow us to place Munqīdḥ 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.


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

1, 3, mentions the return to Nīshāpūr in 1106, also Jawāhir al-Qurʾān and Kāmil yā. Bouyges, p. 58, n. 3, also gives a reference to Fayṣal (in an older edition).

---

32 Sitzungsberichte (1933), p. 16.
34 Bagley, pp. xxiv–xxv, referring to Humād and to a doctoral thesis by H. Spencer (Edinburgh University).
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 ʿI, 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 Shaʿbān, 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. *Sabāʿ* (“seven”) is quite clear in my enlargement taken from the Arab League microfilm collection, listed as Tawhīd 34 in F. Sayyid, *Fihrist al-makhfūjat al-musawwara* (Cairo: Arab League Cultural Commission, 1954).