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The necessity of sound chronology as a framework for understanding intellectual evolution, whether of societies or of individuals, is a matter of agreement. Since the beginning of modern historiography, in the first half of the nineteenth century, studies have been conducted which have established in more or less final fashion the order and dates of the works of all major western authors from Homer onwards. That this has not been done with equal thoroughness for all Islamic authors is but one of many signs of the relative backwardness of Islamic studies, in West and East alike. In the case of Ghazáli, the lack of any study devoted specifically to this aspect of his biography is particularly noticeable because of the eminently developing character of his thought and attitudes.

The approximate order of his principal works has been common knowledge among scholars for some time, and a certain progress has been made towards a more complete register. L. Massignon has listed most of the works under four periods, gathered from a study of their prefaces; but he gives no references, and some of his conclusions require correction.¹ Valuable but fragmentary remarks on chronology have been provided by I. Goldzirfer,² M. Asín Palacios,³ and W. M. Watt.⁴ Watt’s list is an advance on anything previously done, in the general correctness of its order and the presence of many references. But it is merely incidental to the main purpose of his article, and falls short of desirable completeness in omitting the works of fiqh, not connecting the works listed with biographical data such as known dates in Ghazáli’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 Ghazáli’s life, there may be some overlap in time between particular works in different groups.

The present article aims to present the order and dates of Ghazáli’s works in so far as these can be learnt from the more conclusive kinds of evidence: Ghazáli’s own references to titles of previous or projected works, and biographical data gathered from his Munqidh and other early sources.⁵ Only by limiting ourselves to such evidence in the first place can we separate al-yaqin from the product of zann or wahm, what is known from what is speculatively guessed, and thus provide a solid basis for any further construction in chronology. In particular I shall avoid drawing any conclusions but the most obvious from the intellectual contents of works to their dates, because such a procedure seems premature in the existing state of Ghazalian studies. When a chronology has been constructed on grounds independent of content, it will then be possible for scholarship to establish a sure order of development in Ghazáli’s thought, and consequently to date a few remaining works by their contents.⁶

For the purpose in view, Ghazáli’s life as a writer may conveniently be divided into three periods. The first extends from his arrival at Nishāpūr as a youth, to study under Imām al-Ḥaramayn, to his conversion to Sufism and retirement from teaching at Baghdad at the end of

³ La Espiritualidad de Algazel, I (Madrid, 1935), 35-36.
⁴ ‘The Authenticity of the Works Attributed to al-Ghazāli,” Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (1952), pp. 24-45, including brief “Notes on Chronology” (pp. 43-44).
⁶ Nothing need be said about the special complications for dating by content created by the existence of esoteric works by Ghazāli and of spurious works attributed to him. These complications do not arise within the limits of method set in this article.
488 (1095). This may be called the early period of teaching. The date of his arrival at Nishāpur as a student cannot be determined; it was presumably before his twentieth year in 470 (1077/8), but the date matters little in the present context, for there is no record or probability of his having written any of the surviving books for several years. All we know is that he started teaching and writing at Nishāpur during the life-time of Imām al-Ḥaramayn.7 After the Imām’s death in 478 (1085/6) Ghazālī went to the camp-court (ma‘askar) of Nizām al-Mulk, where he enjoyed high favor and remained until 484 (1091/2). During the next four years, 484-88 (1091/2-1095) he was occupying the chair of Shafī‘ī law at the Nizāmiya College in Baghdad, and this was a time of prolific literary production as will be seen from the list.

The second period is that of retirement, extending for eleven lunar years from his departure from Baghdad in Dhūl-Qa‘da 488 (November 1095) to his return to teaching at Nishāpur in Dhūl-Qa‘da 499 (July 1106) (Munqīdah 153).8 The great Ihyā‘ was composed in these years. The retirement can be divided into two sub-periods, distinguished by his residence in Arab countries and in his native Tūs successively. There is no certainty when he left the Arab countries and returned to Iran, but the earliest possible year is 492 (1098/9) in view of his recorded wanderings in the former (Munqīdah 130-31).9

The third period may be called the late period of teaching, but it includes not only the years of renewed activity at Nishāpur after 499 (1106) but also a final retirement of uncertain length at Tūs, before Ghazālī’s death on Jumādā II 14, 505 (December 18, 1111).

In the following lists, a number is given to each work which is anchored at both ends, i.e. known to be after another work and before a third. Where two works fall between the same anchors, but the order of these two relative to each other is not known, they are given the same number with the addition of letters: thus, 15a and 15b both come between 14 and 16, but the letters a and b have no significance for order. Where a work is anchored at one end, i.e. by a terminus post quem or a terminus ante quem, it is listed as “after x” or “before y.” It is then placed in the position that the evidence warrants, which in some cases may be considerably after or before its anchor.

In the list which follows I shall include all those writings of Ghazālī which are probably genuine and whose positions in the chronological series can be determined to some extent by the kinds of evidence being used.

**AUTHENTIC DETERMINABLE WORKS**

In Mustaṣfā I, 3 Ghazālī says: “In the prime of my youth . . . I composed many books on the particulars and principles of law (fī ḥurū‘ī l-fiqh wa usūlīhi); then I came to the science of the way of the after-life and acquaintance with the inner secrets of religion.” In Munqīdah 19 ff. he specifies the order of his studies in Baghdad more exactly, as theology (‘ilm al-kalām), philosophy, Ta‘līminism and Sufism; and in 85 he says that he worked on philosophy “in my spare time between writing and lecturing on the scriptural sciences (al-ulām ash-shar‘iya)” —i.e. kulām and fiqh. These assertions justify us in placing works of fiqh in the earliest period of Ghazālī’s career as an author, unless there is evidence to the contrary. One of them can be assigned to the years of youth at Nishāpur; for the others there is no clue to whether they belong to Nishāpur, the camp-court or Baghdad.

**Before 15b. AL-MANKHŪL FĪ UṢUL 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 (1085/6).10 Mankhūl 11 means “sifted” and points to a summary.

**Before 6b. SHIFA‘ AL-ʿALĪL FĪ UṢUL AL-FIQH, lost.**

Mentioned in Mustaẓhirī fol. 79a under this

---


8 All page references to Ghazālī are to the edition mentioned in the listing of the work.

9 See below, under Ṛadd and Ihyā‘, for more details on this period.


title. It is referred to in Mustasfā II, 96 as a work which treats questions of fiqh in detail.

In Mīyār al-‘ilm 23, which belongs to the end of the first period, four works on methods of legal debate are mentioned in the order of their composition. All are lost.

**Before 7a.**
1. MA‘KHADH AL-KHILĀF
2. LUBĀB AN-NAZĀR
3. TAHSĪN AL-MĀ‘AKHIDH
4. AL-MABĀDĪ WAL-GHĀYĀT

**Before 9.** KHULĀSAT AL-MUKHTAṢAR, lost.

Mentioned in Iḥyā‘ I, 30. The Mukhtāṣar was by Ismā‘il al-Muzani, an early Shafi‘iite lawyer (d. 877). This is a résumé of it; perhaps Ghazālī made it as a text-book for students.

A group of three works follows which can be related to each other but not to the other early works of fiqh; none of them is mentioned before 11, Jawāhir al-Qur‘ān. They are put here on the general grounds given above (p. 226).

**Before 11. AL-BASĪT, in MSS.**


**Before 11. AL-WASĪT, in MSS.**


**Before 11. AL-WAJIZ FĪ FIQH AL-IMĀM ASH-SHĀFI‘Ī (Cairo, 1317 = 1899/1900).**


**Before 15b.** TAHDHĪB AL-USŪL, lost.

Mentioned in Mustasfā I, 3 as a work on fiqh of considerable depth and detail.

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

As it was written in Baghdad (Munqidh 85), it could not have been started earlier than 484 (1091/2). 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 Mustazhirī. 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 (Munqiḍīḥ 85).

6a. TAHFUṬ AL-FALĀSIFA, ed. M. Bouyges, Bibliotheca Arabica Scholasticorum II (Beirut, 1927).

After Maqāṣid (Maqāṣid i, 2-3 and iii, 77; Munqidh 84-85), MS. Fāṭiḥ 2921 (İstanbul) records that the writing of Tahāfut was completed on Muḥarram 11, 488 = January 21, 1095; this sets the writing of it probably most 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.

Mustazhirī overlaps with Tahāfut—see 6b.

There are numerous later references to Tahāfut, of which the most pertinent for chronology is Mīyār 22; conversely Tahāfut, 17 and 20, promises Mīyār, under the title Mīyār al-‘aqīl (the reading preferred by Bouyges). Tahāfut 213 refers to the same work under the title Madārik al-‘uqūl (Bouyges), and implies that it has already been written (ṣanā‘fānahu).


The Mustazhirī can be closely dated by its references to two caliphs. It refers to the ‘Abbasid Mustazhir as holding his office, (fols. 3b-4a), and his accession was on Muḥarram 15, 487 (February 4, 1094); and to the Fatimid Mustanṣir as still alive (fol. 18a), and he died on Dhul-Ḥijja 17, 487 (December 29, 1094). Thus the book must have been at least begun before Tahāfut was completed. On the other hand it is shown by Munqidh, 79 and 109, that Ghazālī worked on Ta‘līmism (al-Bāṭinīya) after philosophy. (Goldziher saw an allusion to Tahāfut in Mustazhirī, fol. 19b, where Ghazālī mentions a philosophic doctrine which he had refuted fil-kalām.) In Jawāhir al-Qur‘ān 21 he does refer to his Tahāfut as a work of kalām). The fact is that there is

---

12 Bouyges, Introduction to Tahāfut al-falāsifa, pp. ix, xiii.
13 Streitschrift, p. 28.
nothing unusual about an author writing a new book before the last one has been revised or copied.


Mentioned in Jawāhir al-Qurān 21. Described in Munqidh 119 as a reply to criticisms by the Ta'limis made against him in Baghdad. This does not prove that he wrote it in Baghdad, but it suggests that he was there, or had been there recently. Macdonald thought "perhaps during his second residence there," but there is no way to decide.

7a. **Mi'yar al-Ilmī fī Fann al-Maštiq**, ed. M. S. Kurdi (Cairo, 1329 = 1911).

Tahāfut, 17 and 20, anticipates it as an appendix, and Tahāfut 213 refers to it as Modārak al-'uqā'il, and implies that it has already been written (sa'nannāhnā). Mi'yar justifies itself (22) partly on the ground that it explains the technical terms in Tahāfut. Thus the relation of the two works is close. Mentioned in several later books: e.g. Iqtiṣād 9.


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


Mentions Mi'yar and Miḥakk (9), and Mustaṣḥirī (107); so cannot be earlier than 1087 (1094/5). There is probably a forward reference to it in Tahāfut 78, though the title given there is Qawā'id al-'aqa'id. He says there that after finishing Tahāfut he hopes to write a constructive work on dogma, as the present one is destructive. Such an intention seems fulfilled more specifically in Iqtiṣād than in the actual Qawā'id al-'aqa'id, which is later and is but a part of Ihyā'.

---


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 Qawā'id al-'aqa'id. Ghazālī may well have changed his mind about the title of a book (cf. 6a and 7a, on Mi'yar).

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

These data fix the place of Iqtiṣād in the sequence of writings almost precisely. But we still need to know whether its date is late Baghdad or early retirement. The former is in fact almost certain, because it is difficult to believe that this prosaic piece of kalām was the first composition of his new life as a Šūfi. Tahāfut promises a positive work on dogmatics "after finishing this book," so that Ghazālī at least intended such a work at an early date as a completion of a trilogy whose first parts were Maqāṣid and Tahāfut. The best available time would be the first half of 488 (1095), before his crisis became acute in Rajab (July).

After 7a. **Mizān al-amal**, ed. M. S. Kurdi and M. S. Nu'aymī (Cairo, 1328 = 1909/10).

Mizān is anticipated at the end of Mi'yar (195) as a companion work. Both knowledge ('ilm) and practice ('amal) are required for happiness in this world and the next, and as the earlier book gives the criteria of sound knowledge, so another one is to be written which will give the criteria for sound action. Mizān 3, 28, 56, 153, 156, mentions Mi'yar. Therefore it is certainly after Mi'yar.

Comparing Ghazālī's plan of work at the end of Mi'yar with the order of his studies given in Munqidh 78 ff., we find the same progression in both: from the study of philosophy and logic to that of Sufism, which was primarily a practical "path." It is very likely that he set out to write a Mizān al-'umal in Baghdad in 488 (1095), and that it was by way of preliminary studies for this work that he became so deeply involved in reflection on the Šūfi practice. This reflection convinced him that he was himself in need of such a practice, not of further knowledge alone, and contributed to the crisis of that year (Munqidh 122-28). The writing of Mizān, therefore, was probably postponed at this time. That it was written after he had become a Šūfi is confirmed by the fact that it expounds Šūfi doctrine (in parts not judged spurious by Watt).

To fix the time of Mizān any more closely will require a careful study of its contents and their relation to other works of Ghazālī, and that will be a complicated process. To illustrate the pitfalls of such a study we may consider the argument for a late date of Mizān put forward by H. Ḥāshim.
in the introduction to his French translation.\(^{17}\) Hāshim’s argument rests on the book’s denial of a bodily resurrection, contrasted with Ghazālī’s condemnation of such denial in his other works and as late as Munqidh. He concludes that Ghazālī must have changed his views after Munqidh and that Mīzān belongs to this very late time. Such an argument ignores two other explanations of apparent inconsistencies which must also be kept in mind in considering the works of Ghazālī. (a) It is possible that the doctrine in question occurs in a pseudo-Ghazalian text. There are many spurious writings, and Watt considers that parts of Mīzān are so. If this is true it removes the evidence for date altogether. (b) The work may be esoteric. Ghazālī strongly advocates in many places the practice of not revealing advanced thought in widely published works, and certainly he wrote at least one esoteric work, the Madnūn (see below). Now according to medieval Islamic convention an esoteric work may expound a doctrine that is inconsistent with that of the same writer’s exoteric works.

I am not attempting to draw any conclusions on these questions in the case of Mīzān, but merely advising that the full range of alternatives should be considered carefully before any conclusions are reached. I shall therefore leave the period of Mīzān unresolved beyond what has been mentioned.\(^{18}\)

Before 9. AR-RISĀLA AL-QUDSIYA (Alexandria, no date).

Mentioned in Iḥyā‘ I, 169 and 180, as an epistle written to the people of Jerusalem and subsequently incorporated into Qawā'id al-aqā'id, the second of the 40 “books” of Iḥyā‘. So it is presumably later than Ghazālī’s visit to Jerusalem.


Ghazālī’s polemic against Christian theology cannot be related directly to other works, but it can be dated approximately. Its editor has shown that it is genuine, and that it was composed in Egypt, for there is constant reference to Christianity in its Coptic, Monophysite form, including a sentence in the Coptic language (47\(^{\text{a}}\)). Indeed the book is a good part of the evidence that Ghazālī really visited Egypt. Subki says that after leaving Damascus (the second time) Ghazālī went to Cairo and Alexandria where he stayed awhile.\(^{19}\) If time is allowed for nearly two years in Damascus, a visit to Jerusalem and the pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina, the visit to Egypt can hardly have been before 492 (1099).


I, 169 and 180, mentions Ar-Risāla al-Qudsiya; I, 68 and 169, mentions Iqtisād.

Mentioned in most later works; among the earlier of these, it is referred to in Bidāya 14, 28, 33, 34, 39; 34 refers to sins of the heart which are dealt with in the third quarter of Iḥyā‘. Maqṣād 63 refers to Iḥyā‘, “Book” xxxvi.

It is thus practically certain that Iḥyā‘ was begun after Ar-Risāla al-Qudsiya and concluded before Bidāya, Maqṣād and many other works. But this statement leaves a wide latitude, as we have no dates for works of the period of retirement, Bidāya, Maqṣād, etc. Since Iḥyā‘ must have been written over a space of years, it would be desirable to narrow down the times of its beginning and ending as closely as possible. Unfortunately there are discrepancies between Ghazālī’s account of this period and those of his biographers which make it difficult to establish a sure chronology.\(^{20}\) Without attempting to unravel the tangle, we can do little more than present side by side the alternatives for Iḥyā‘ that are suggested by the sources.

The beginning of Iḥyā‘ is after Ar-Risāla al-Qudsiya (see above), and this epistle is presumably later than Ghazālī’s visit to Jerusalem. According to Ghazālī’s own account this visit came after “nearly two years” at Damascus (Munqidh 130), so he could not have reached Jerusalem much before the beginning of 491 (December 9, 1097). Thus Iḥyā‘ could not have been begun before early 491 (1098), at some time during the subsequent

\(^{17}\) Critère de l’action (Paris, 1945), pp. xii-xv.
\(^{18}\) Parallels with Iḥyā‘ occur in parts which Watt considers probably spurious. Even if these were genuine it would still have to be decided which of the two sets of parallel passages was prior.
\(^{19}\) Tabaqāt, IV, 105. F. Jabre, “La biographie et l’œuvre de Ghazālī,” MIDEO 1, 97, does not think the evidence sufficient to outweigh the silence of other reliable sources on an Egyptian sojourn. But I find it hard to explain otherwise the internal evidence noted by Chidiac.
\(^{20}\) See Jabre, pp. 94-97, for a tabulation of statements of the sources and a tentative reconstruction.
travels to the Holy Cities of Arabia and back to Khurāsān. But the biographers give a different picture. According to the quite circumstantial account composed by Subki from various sources, Ghazālī went to Jerusalem in 489 after a first stay of only a few days in Damascus.21 After leaving Jerusalem he returned to Damascus for a longer stay22 and, as we shall see, the biographers have him write Iḥyā‘ there.

The divergences are no smaller concerning the completion of the work. Iḥyā‘ VII, 157, which is at the end of the second quarter, mentions that “about 500 years have now elapsed” (since the Ḥijra). The statement must not be taken too precisely, as by Asīn, who inferred from it that all works that mention Iḥyā‘ must be later than 500.23 His conclusion would directly contradict the fact that at least five works were written between the completion of Iḥyā‘ and the return to Nishāpūr in Dhūl-Qa‘da, 499 (July, 1106), as is known from cross-references (see below on Bidāya, Madnān, Maqṣad, Jawāhir al-Qur‘ān and Kīmiyā‘). In the context of Iḥyā‘ VII, 157 Ghazālī is speaking in terms of centuries, and the words need only show that he finished the first two quarters of Iḥyā‘ a few years before the turn of the century. The fact that he wrote at least five works between Iḥyā‘ and Dhūl-Qa‘da, 499, proves that the great work was completed some time before the latter date.

But the biographers and historians take us back to a much earlier date of completion. Subki reports that Ghazālī recited Iḥyā‘ on his return to Baghdad, after his wanderings in the Arab countries and before his return to Khurāsān.24 His assertion is confirmed by an early source not used by Subki, a certain Abū Bakr Ibn al-‘Arabī, who writes that he personally heard Ghazālī read Iḥyā‘ in Baghdad.25 It is further claimed by Ibn al-Athīr in his brief notice on Ghazālī that he recited Iḥyā‘ in Damascus.26 Ibn ‘Asākir is vaguer, merely saying that he began Iḥyā‘ during the period of his wanderings “in those lands,” before returning to Tūs.27

Any definite conclusions about the dating of Iḥyā‘ must await an intensive study and evaluation of the sources, as well as a study of Iḥyā‘ itself. All that can be offered here is a provisional opinion based on the evidence that has been presented. It seems to me probable that Ghazālī’s account of his movements in the Arab countries is simplified, and that he really had two sojourns in Damascus as stated by Subki. During the second and longer stay there he wrote Iḥyā‘, and on his return to Baghdad he read it publicly for the first time.

We place next a group of works of which it is only known for certain that they came after Iḥyā‘. It is true that there are many spurious and suspected works besides of which the same can be said, but I list here only those whose genuineness has not been challenged.

After 9. KITĀB AL-ḤIKMA FĪ MAKLÛ-QĀT ALLĀH, ed. M. Qubbānī (Cairo, 1331 = 1903/4).

Iḥyā‘ promises this work, in iv, 90.28


Before Imlā‘. MARĀQĪ AZ-ZULFĀ‘, lost. Mentioned in Imlā‘.29 May be earlier than

well away from Syria before the First Crusaders arrived; otherwise we should expect some reaction to this sensational event in Islamic history in his life and writings. On this point see Jabre, pp. 97-98.

20 Al-Kāmil fit-ta‘rīkh, sub anno 488 (1095), (Cairo, 18—), Part 10, p. 87.
21 In Mehren, “Exposé,” p. 323. As Ibn ‘Asākir allots “about ten years” to the wanderings, the statement about Iḥyā‘ is of little help. In any case ten years in the Arab countries is much too long in view of other evidence, and is probably a distortion of Ghazālī’s figures for his total retirement, including Tūs, before his return to Nishāpūr: “about ten years” (Munqidh 144), “eleven years” (Munqidh 153, mentioning the months of beginning and ending).
22 Asīn, Espiritualidad, IV, 80, gives this reference, which may be to the Cairo edition of 1316 (1898/9) in 4 vols. I have been unable to locate it in the ‘Irāqī edition.
23 In the margin of Sayyid Murtaḍā az-Zābīdī’s Ithāf as-sūda (Cairo, 1311 = 1893/4), IV, 397.
Ihyā', but is conveniently placed here because of the connection with Imlā'.

After 9. AL-IMLĀ' FI ISHKĀLĀT AL-IHYĀ', after Ihyā' in the 'Irāqī edition, XVI.

2, mentions criticisms by ignorant readers, and banning of Ihyā' somewhere. If this refers to the banning of his books in the Maghrīb by the Almoravid amīr 'Ali Ibn Yūsuf, that would date Imlā' well after 500 (1106/7), when 'Ali's reign began. Even if this is not so an interval must be allowed after the publication of Ihyā' for the public reactions which gave cause for Imlā'.


29 and 59, mentions Ihyā'.

Scherer considers it a work of Ghazālī's final retirement at Tūs, without giving reasons. A ground for a late date might be suggested from the prologue (not by Ghazālī), 5, which explains that the opusculum is a reply to the request of a former student who had spent “the best part of my life” (ray'īna 'umri) in learning, and now would like to have something useful for the morrow and of assistance in the tomb. This might be thought to imply an aged student, and so an aged Ghazālī. But the title “Oh Boy!,” “O Kind!,” “O jeune homme,” (repeated in the text, 9, 11, etc.) does not support this view of the student’s age. Moreover, on p. 9 Ghazālī quotes the Prophet as saying that he who has reached the age of 40 without mastering the evil side of himself should prepare for hell-fire. To say this to a man over 40 would be pointless and discouraging. On the kind of evidence being used in this article no judgment can be made about the date of this work except that it is after Ihyā’.

10a. BIDĀYAT AL-HIDAYA (Cairo, 1353 = 1934).

Mentions Ihyâ’ in several places; 34 mentions the fourth quarter, on “Things leading to salvation.” Mentioned in Arba‘in 29.

10b. AL-MADNŪN BIHI ‘ALĀ GHAYR AHH乎H (Cairo, 1309 = 1891/2).

30, mentions Ihyā’, as the only other book of

his to date containing these truths. Mentioned in Arba‘in 25.

10c. AL-MAQŠAD AL-ASNA Fī MA‘ĀNĪ ASMA‘ ALLĀH AL-ḤUSNĀ (Cairo, 1324 = 1906, Sharafiyâ Press).

56, 63, 81 mentions Ihyā’; 63 refers to “Book” xxxvi. Mentioned in Arba‘in 13, 25.

After 10c. MISHKĀT AL-ANWĀR, in Al-Jawāhir al-ghawālî (Cairo, 1353 = 1934).

This is generally regarded as late on account of its developed mystical doctrine; but all that can be said from the present point of view is that it is after Maqṣad, which it mentions, 122.

Before 11. QAWĀSIM AL-BĀTINIYA, lost.

Mentioned in Jawāhir al-Qurān 21; and Qistās 174, as referring to the Ta‘lims. Presumably this is the work listed as Mawāhim al-Bāṭiniya in the printed edition of Subki.

Before 11. JAWĀB MUFAṢṢAL AL-KHI-LĀF, lost.

Mentioned with Qawaṣim in Jawāhir al-Qurān 21, and Qistās 174, as referring to the Ta‘lims. Munqidd 119 describes it as a reply to criticisms made against Ghazālī in Hamadān, and a refutation of the Ta‘lims. It is not known whether or when Ghazālī was in Hamadān. Watt in his translation of Munqidd equates this work with Faṣal at-tafrīqa; this is improbable, chronologically if for no other reason, because Faṣal refers to Qistās, while Qistās refers to the present work.

11. JAWĀHIR AL-QURĀN (Cairo, 1352 = 1933, Raḥmāniya Press).

24, mentions the forty “books” of Ihyā’. This book is placed after Bidāya, Maḏnūn and Maqṣad because these are mentioned in its companion volume Arba‘in. 6, refers to Arba‘in as a sequel to itself.

Mentioned in Qistās 177, etc.

Described in Mustasfa I, 3 as before the return to teaching at Nishāpūr, Dhūl-Qa‘da, 499 = July, 1106.

12. AL-ARBA‘IN FI UṢUL AD-DĪN (Cairo, 1344 = 1925, Iṣtiqāma Press).

29, mentions Bidāya; 25, mentions Maḏnūn; 13, 25, mentions Maqṣad.

---

"Tabaqât IV, 116.

"Tahā, the faith and practice of al-Ghazālī (London, 1953)."
305, says it is a sequel to Jawāhir al-Qurān.

Placed before Qīstās because that work mentions the companion volume, Jawāhir al-Qurān. See 11.


177, etc., mentions Jawāhir al-Qurān.

Mentioned in Faysal 88.


88 and 96, mentions Qīstās.

Mentioned in Munqīdhd 99.

Goldziher mentions a reference to Faysal in Mustasfā I, 185, but this refers to an old edition, and I could not find the reference in the 1937 edition.

Before 15a. KITĀB AD-DARJ, lost.

Mentioned in Munqīdhd 119, as an answer to feeble criticisms by the Ta’līmīs against Ghazālī in Tūs. If this implies that Ghazālī was in Tūs at the time, the book must be either before his return to Nishāpūr in 499 (1106) or after his final retirement from Nishāpūr.


As Ibāḥīs is written in Persian it is likely to be later than Ghazālī’s return from the Arab countries.

Munqīdhd 154 declares: “As for the imaginings of the Latitudinarians (ahl al-ibāḥa), we have collected their doubts under seven heads, and exposed them in Kimiyāʾ as-saʿāda.” Now Kimiyāʾ contains parts which can be considered answers to the Ibāḥīs, but not systematically under seven heads. Ibāḥīs on the other hand does accuse the Ibāḥīs of eight errors, and it answers them in turn. The number could easily be mistaken in writing from memory, as Ghazālī habitually did. Thus it is probable that Munqīdhd is really referring to this book, and slipped in citing the title.

Pretzl judges that Munqīdhd shows fairly certainly that the book was written at the Nizāmiya College in Nishāpūr after 499 (1106). He does not give reasons, but it is likely that he relies on Munqīdhd 151, where Ghazālī says he was ordered by the Sulṭān to hasten to Nishāpūr to tackle the problem of religious indifference. The preceding pages of Munqīdhd, however, show that he was already delving into this problem intellectually in his previous retirement, so he may also have been writing about it then. Thus the book cannot be assigned certainly to before or after 499.


The original is in Persian, so it is likely to be later than Ghazālī’s return from the Arab countries. The book is an abridged popular version of the Iḥyāʾ, so it should also be later than Iḥyāʾ.

Mentioned in Mustasfā I, 3, as before the return to teaching (Dhūl-Qaʿda, 499 = July, 1106).

Thus Kimiyā can be assigned with some confidence to the years at the zāwiyya at Tūs, before the return to Nishāpūr.


67, Ghazālī gives his age as “over 50,” i.e. after Muḥarram 1, 500 = Sept. 2, 1106, at the earliest. 153, mentions the month of his return to Nishāpūr, Dhūl-Qaʿda, 499 = July, 1106. 99, mentions Faysal.

As there are no references to Munqīdhd in other late works, we cannot tell how long before his death it was written.

15b. AL-MUSTAŞFĀ MIN ʿILM AL-UṢŪL (Cairo, 1356 = 1937, Tijārīya Press).

I, 3, mentions the return to teaching at Nishāpūr, i.e. after Dhūl-Qaʿda, 499 = July, 1106; also mentions Jawāhir al-Qurān and Kimiyāʾ.

There is no evidence for its temporal relation to Munqīdhd.

Before 16. AT-TIBR AL-MASBUK FI NASIḤAT AL-MULŪK (Cairo, 1317 = 1899/1900).

Addressed to the Seljūq Sulṭān Muhammad Ibn Malikshāh, whose reign began in 1105; i.e. if genuine it was written between that year and Ghazālī’s death in 505 (1111).

** Streitschrift, p. 27, n. 3.

* Sitzungsberichte (1933), p. 16.
16. **IIJĀM AL-`AWĪM `AN `ILM AL-KALĀM** (Cairo, 1309 = 1891/2, Maymūnîya Press).

There has fortunately come to light a manuscript dated 507 (1113), which gives the date of completion of the work as "the first days of Jumādā II, 505." 25 Ghazālī died on the 14th of that month (December 18, 1111).

44, mentions Qistās.

* * *

**INDETERMINABLE OR SPURIOUS WORKS**

There are many other works attributed to Ghazālī. Some are probably genuine, but contain no indications of date or have been inaccessible, existing only in manuscript, or known only by title from references in later Arabic writers. Others are probably spurious, including some which have been printed. A number of the spurious works contain references to *Iḥyā‘* alone of the genuine works. This fact, far from indicating authenticity or date, actually arouses suspicion, for it is usually a clumsy means used by forgers to suggest genuineness, as a person who knows little of Shakespeare might refer to *Hamlet.* There is no point here in listing these works or attempting to separate the genuine from the spurious, a task which would go far beyond the present undertaking. But it may be useful to make a comment on the claim of *Minhāj al-`abidin* to be the latest work of Ghazālī. This work, ed. I. Ibn Ḥasan al-Anbābī (Cairo, 1919), was suspected by Muhīy ad-dīn Ibn `Arabī and is now rejected by Watt on several grounds. 36 On p. 2 it claims to have been dictated to Ḥabīb b. Malik Ibn `Abdallāh and to be "the last book he wrote." The latter assertion is now contradicted by the manuscript evidence on *Iljām,* mentioned above. This is an additional reason for rejecting the book as spurious.

* * *

It will be seen from this survey that there are clues to the chronology of the most important works of Ghazālī, and that a fair number can be dated quite accurately. These results are about as much as can be achieved by the present methods. Further progress must rely mainly on two methods. One is the careful reconstruction of Ghazālī's intellectual evolution, with special attention to the development of his theory of knowledge. This task can only be performed on the basis of a chronology worked out independently of it, and it is hoped that the present article will provide such a basis. The other method is intensive study of particular works, which can both bring to light fresh indications of the kind we have been seeking and draw conclusions from a sound intellectual biography of the grand Imām.

---

**MĀNAVA-DHARMAŚĀSTRA VERSES IN CĀṆAKYA’S COMPENDIA**

**LUDWIK STERNBACH**

**NEW YORK**

1. **Introductory Note**

Aphorisms and maxims found in Cāṇakya's compendia are very numerous. The author has been able to collect 2433 different aphorisms and maxims which he found in 171 editions and manuscripts.2 This large number of aphorisms and maxims suggests that it could not have been possible for one man—Cāṇakya—to compose all of them.

The origin of the aphorisms and maxims is in most cases unknown. They passed orally from one person to another, just as today "golden rules" and proverbs float among people of different nations. But in India this floating mass of oral tradition and wisdom was very often in majorem gloriam attributed to one man: Cāṇakya—the moralist, Cāṇakya—the idealized minister of Candragupta Maurya. Others were incorporated in the classical Sanskrit literature, in particular the