eternal pre-existence of matter and time is distinctly taught (pp. 24 ff.). These extracts are put together very clumsily (see especially pp. 7 and 16), and this alone, to my mind, would prevent the ascription of the book to al-Ghazzālī; I doubt, even, if it were ever current among Muslims. Certainly if he, after writing the Tahāfut, had wished, even in a secret tractate to draw back from the position there assumed, he would have taken a little more care in what he wrote, and not simply thrown together passages from one of his former works and extracts from a handbook of astronomy. The opinion of the commentator Narbōnī is worth nothing critically, as every one who has studied such questions knows. The other points brought forward by Dr. Malter are of little weight. The form of treatment in the tractate was common to the time, and the saying ascribed to 'Ali b. Abī Taḥlib,4 “Speak to the people according to their understanding,” was quoted by all—a very large number, including as we have seen Ibn Rushd—who held that different methods must be used in approaching different grades of intelligence. Dr. Malter’s description (p. xii) of al-Ghazzālī as a man who tried to keep on good terms with all parties, though based on Ibn Rushd, is singularly opposed to the facts of the case. Rather, he got himself into trouble with all parties. He had a combative nature, especially in his earlier life, and later it took much grace and discipline to keep it down.

If the charge of a secret doctrine is to be proved against al-Ghazzālī, it must be on other and better evidence than that which is now before us.

1 Delitzsch in Cat. Euler, hoch, bldg. Lips., No. 26. Narbōnī, like Ibn Rushd, exhibits a personal hatred of al-Ghazzālī which shows how hard a blow the latter had struck.
2 In the Ismā‘, margin of SM, i. pp. 123 and 225, it is ascribed to the Prophet himself.

[The name of al-Ghazzālī is now generally written with single z, al-Ghazzālī. My reasons for adhering to the older spelling will be given at length elsewhere.—D. B. M.]

The Life of al-Ghazzālī, with special reference to his religious experiences and opinions.—By Duncan B. Macdonald, Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

In the history of the development of Muslim theology two names stand out conspicuously, each marking a great point of departure. They are those of al-Ash‘arī and al-Ghazzūlī. The former was the principal founder of scholastic theology in Islām; it was under the hands of the latter that that theology took its final form, and the Church of Muhammad owes it to his strange experiences in personal religion and in the emotional life that the form was not even harder and more unyielding than we find it now. What rigidity of grasp the hand of Islām would have exercised but for the influence of al-Ghazzūlī might be hard to tell; he saved it from scholastic decrepitude, opened before the orthodox Muslim the possibility of a life hid in God, was persecuted in his life as a heretic, and now ranks as the greatest doctor of the Muslim Church.

Of al-Ash‘arī I do not propose to say anything here. On scholastic theology as al-Ghazzūlī found it, I shall let him speak for himself; the strife of dogmaticians so far removed from us in time and interest sounds hollow on our ears. Al-Ash‘arī died about A. H. 320, with a curse of heretics as the last murmur on his lips. Al-Ghazzūlī, who knew what it meant to be cursed himself, was slow to curse others, and is memorable among the theologians of Islām in that he, over his formal signature, forbade to curse Yazīd, the slayer of al-Ḥusayn the well-beloved. It is necessary to make mention of al-Ash‘arī, if only to show the


2 See the life of al-Kiyā in Ibn Khall, ii. 229 ff. Al-Kiyā was asked the same question, was it legal to curse Yazīd, and authorised the cursing with great secrecy and at great length. Al-Ghazzūlī's reply
recoil and compromise in the work of al-Ghazzālī. We have here, as everywhere in the development of an idea, the movement of the Hegelian dialectic. The two streams of tendency—dogmatism on the one hand, logical, legal, systematic, and mysticism on the other, transcendental and intuitional—had separated far back, and the separation had kept becoming more and more pronounced until the one crystallized in lifeless form and the other ran wild in shapeless fantasy. Al-Ghazzālī, by training a theologian and lawyer, bridged the widening gap, took over mysticism with its intuitional and spiritual life into the dry body of theology, and gave the Church of Islam a fresh term of life. It is this spiritually real and living side of his character and work that constitutes his abiding interest for us. Other theologians of Islam are important as links in an historical chain; he, in virtue of what he was in himself, of the conversion he went through and the experiences he had. I propose in a subsequent paper to translate one of the books of his great work the "Reviving of the Sciences of the Faith," and to endeavour by this means to throw some light on his position as a theologian and a thinker generally. I have chosen the book which deals most with his mysticism, as his attitude to that constitutes his principal claim on our interest. But the careful reader of the forbidding it is eminently characteristic of the man, of his balance of mind and agnostic position: It is forbidden to curse a Muslim; Yazid was a Muslim. It is not certain that he slew al-Husayn, and it is forbidden to think ill of a Muslim. We cannot be certain that he ordered his death; really we cannot be certain of the cause of the death of any great man, especially at such a distance of time. We have also to remember the party spirit and false statements in this particular case. Again, if he did kill him, he is not an unbeliever because of that; he is only disobedient to God. Again, he may have repented before he died. Further, to abstain from cursing is no crime. No one will be asked if he ever cursed Satan; if he has cursed him he may be asked, Why? The only accused ones of whom we know are those who die infidels. See, further, on this abusing of Yazid, Goldziher, Muham. Studien, ii. 97, and especially the case of the Ijābaitite theologian, 'Abd al-Mugthāb b. Zuhayr al-Harrī, who actually wrote a book: Fi ṣafat il-Yazīd.

1 The text which I have used is that of the edition of Cairo 1802. I have employed also the commentary of the Sayyid Murtaḍā, Itlāf as-sadda, 10 vols., Cairo 1811. The text as given by the SM. (so I abbreviate throughout) is sometimes slightly different; that given on the margin of his commentary is the ordinary Cairo printed text. Without the preliminary matter of the SM., vol. i. pp. 1-94, I could not have compiled the following life.

little treatise will find much more in it than simple theology. It deals formally and at length with the whole subject of the relation of music and song to the emotional nature; it asks and endeavours to answer the question of the meaning of music in itself—how far it has such a definite meaning, and how far its influence is dependent on the mood of the hearer; the question also of the moral effect of music, when it is for good and when for evil. I know nothing in English dealing with the same problem in the same way except the curiously mis-named book of Mr. Hauwiller, "Music and Morals," and it is surprising at what similar results the Arabic and the English writer have arrived. It raises the whole question of the professional as opposed to the amateur; it shows how the Qu'ran suffers from possessing no human element; it considers the question of recreation in a delightfully reasonable fashion,—such are some points in which it will interest those to whom Muslim dogmatics are not in themselves interesting. I shall give later an analysis of the whole.

As al-Ghazzālī's theological position sprang directly from his spiritual experiences, so the best introduction to an understanding of that position is the story of his life. We are fortunate in that he has left us a book, almost unique to my knowledge in the

1 This is the Munqidh min al-dalāl. I have used of it the editio princeps in Schmoller's Enzic, the translation of the same by Barbier de Meynard in the Journal Asiatique, 50ème sér., tome ix., and the Arabic text of Cairo 1803. It forms the basis of my work, and the result of a careful study of it has been to convince me of the essential truth of the picture which al-Ghazzālī there gives us of his life. I thus cannot agree at all in the attitude assumed toward it by Goseke. I have also found very valuable the extracts from early biographers given in the preliminary matter of the SM. This is especially true of 'Abd al-Ghafir and Ibn as-Sam'ānī; the first knew al-Ghazzālī intimately and discusses his character with great freedom; the second belonged to the next generation. For 'Abd al-Ghafir I have been able to compare the text given in Mehran's Exposé, referred to above. The life in Ibn Khial (ii. 621 of de Siano's translation, which I use throughout except when some other reference is necessary) I have found of comparatively little value. Of European productions the life by Schmoller in Eriesch and Gruber is the best. Goseke (Ghazzālī's Leben u. Werke, from the Abhandl. der königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1858) has collected much valuable material. Munk's Mittheile has been inaccessible to me. My materials have thus been printed only. By consultation of as-Subkī's Tabaqāt, as-Sam'ānī's Anābī, and the others referred to, I have no doubt that much that is here obscure and uncertain could be cleared up. The publication of as-Sam'ānī is especially to be desired.
literature of Islām, in which he tells us about his early doubts and struggles; how at one time all light had died out from his mind, how he gradually came back to some certainty, passed through a slow but real conversion, and reached a faith which nothing could shake. It is essentially an Apologia pro Vita Sui, a defence of his life as a mystic against all his assailants, theological and philosophical; and in its autobiographic element may stand beside that of Newman. But it is also a defence of the faith written for a time of universal, all-threatening doubt, and sketches the attitude which the believer should take and the arguments which he should use against the unbeliever and the heretic. In the following outline of al-Ghazzālī’s life, fuller and more accurate, I believe, than any hitherto given, I have used this autobiography as a basis. Other records are largely mixed with legendary and mythical elements,—al-Ghazzālī in Islām became a wonder-working saint, possessed of miraculous powers, by earlier writers ascribed to him after his death, by later even during his lifetime,—and it is difficult to avoid mere subjective standards in separating what may be regarded as historically authentic from what must be viewed as the play of devout fancy. Very early such stories began to gather round his figure, and even his immediate contemporaries cannot be literally believed.

Abū Hāmid Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Tūsī al-Ghazzālī was born A. H. 450, at Tūs, now a ruin in the neighbourhood of the modern Meshhed. There had already been two scholars in the family; one, known thereafter as al-Ghazzālī al-kabīr, at whose tomb in the cemetery of Tūs prayer was answered, a paternal uncle of his father, and the other a son of the same. The elder al-Ghazzālī had taught law (fiqh) to the al-Fārābī who was later one of the teachers in Sufism of our al-

1 Curzon, Persia, i. 174.

2 Died 483; Wüstenfeld, Schaftaten, 244 f. But Wüstenfeld, while calling him al-Ghazzālī al-kabīr, speaks of him as uncle to our al-Ghazzālī. If I understand rightly the somewhat confused quotations in the SFI. (pp. 18 f.) he was a granduncle, and had a son yet more learned than himself.

3 The Sufi is the Muslim mystic. On the derivation and use of the term see Nöldeke in ZDMG. xxvili. 45 f. On Sufism generally see Hughes, Dict. of Islam, 608 ff.; but it should be noticed that he ignores the important division of the Sufis into Monotheists and Pantheists; see on this von Kromer, Herrschende Ideen. It is also worth noticing that the statements found in Hughes refer to a Sufism of a later date and a more advanced development than that of the school of al-Ghazzālī. For definitions of terms, etc., the Risāla of al-Qushayrī is a modern contemporary authority. The Īmāl of al-Ghazzālī himself (on margin of SM. I. pp. 41-232) is also of value for this. It should be noticed that the text of the Īmāl is dispersed in this edition. The breaks come on p. 164, line 4, p. 204 at δ, p. 222, line 29, and p. 241 at β. The order should be pp. (41-164) + (232-241) + (234-239) + (164-204) + (241-232). Besides this the text is often defective and corrupt.

1 See on the as-Subkīs (father and son), Ibn Khallī. I. p. xxviii.

2 According to Leo Africanus (Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, xili. 274) his father had been wealthy. The source for this I have not found.

3 In de Slane’s Ibn Khallī. I. p. xxviii, there is a quotation from as-Subkī by as-Suyūṭī to the effect that, though his father was not the first to establish Madrasa, yet he was probably the first to establish them in a fixed allowance for the support of students.
reputation and wealth which they were bringing him. He himself tells us that he broke from tafsir, simple acceptance of religious truth on authority, from his earliest youth, and that his investigation of theological differences began when he was under twenty. At Tafs he studied jurisprudence under Ahmad b. Muhammad ar-Radhi, and thereafter travelled to Jurjân and studied further under the Imam Abû Naṣr al-Isma'îlî. With this teacher he took copious notes, but neglected to impress on his memory what he had written. This was characteristic of him, and the results are evident all over his work. His quotations are exceedingly careless, and it was one of the great charges brought against him by his assailants that he falsified traditions; the fact was that he quoted from memory very freely. But on his way back to Tafs from Jurjân he was to get a lesson. He tells the story himself. Robbers fell upon him, stripped him, and even carried off the bag with his manuscripts. This was more than he could stand; he ran after them, clung to them though threatened with death, and entreated the return of his notes—they were of no use to them. Al-Ghazzâlî has a certain quality of dry humor, and was evidently tickled by the idea of these desert thieves studying law. The robber chief asked him what were these notes of his. Said al-Ghazzâlî with great simplicity, "They are writings in that bag; I traveled for the sake of hearing them and writing them down and knowing the science in them." Thereat the robber chief laughed consumedly and said, "How can you profess to know the science in them when we have taken them from you and stripped you of the knowledge and there you are without any science?" But he gave him back. "And," says al-Ghazzâlî, "this man was sent by God to teach me." So al-Ghazzâlî went back to Tafs and spent three years there committing his notes to memory as a precaution against future robbers. But he was a man of too large caliber to watch his quotings, and they were loose to the end of his life. The meaning stood to him, as his defenders said, for more than the letter. Thereafter

---

1 He uses the term tafsir in a broad sense. For the narrower and commoner usage see Goldzieher's ('Zahiriyya, 30 ff.

2 Perhaps the most astonishing case of this is where he quotes 1 Corinthians ii. 9 as though it were a passage from the Qur'an. The matter is further interesting as it involves the New Testament origin of a tradition ascribed to Muhammad. In al-Fârâbî's (Philosophische Abhandlungen (edit. Dieterici, p. 71) is the earliest occurrence I have found. It
like attacks (?) hrbāt to al-Ghazzālī, and clearness to al-Kīyā." To this period of his life belongs this remark also, made by some one unnamed. "The Imam showed externally a vain-glory disposition, but underneath there was something that when it did appear showed graceful expression and delicate allusion, soundness of attention, and strength of character." I cannot ascertain whether while he was still at Nāṣabūr he touched those depths of scepticism of which he speaks in the Manūjīhī. They must certainly have been reached sometime before the year 484, and must have been the outcome of a long drift of development; but probably so long as he was under the influence of the Imam al-Haraymānī, a devout Shī‘ī, he would be held more or less fast to his old faith.

But now came a great change which led him into public life. His master the Imam died in 478, and this death seems to have set him free, or driven him away from Nāṣabūr. He went out to seek his fortune, and it brought him to the court of the great Wazir Nizām al-Mulk. On this man had weighed for more than twenty years the burden of the empire of the Seljuqs. He had served Alp-Arsalan, the successor of Tughril Beg, the first great Seljuq (Ibn Khall. iii. 224 ff.). In 429 Merv and Nāṣabūr had fallen to the Seljuqs; in 447, three years before al-Ghazzālī was born, Tughril Beg had entered Baghdad, been proclaimed Sultan, and freed the Khalifa from the Shi‘ite yoke of the Buwayhid; and before 470 all western Asia, from Afghanistan, where the Ghaznavids still somewhat held their own, to the border of Egypt with its Fatimid dynasty, and to the Christian power of the Greek Empire, had become Seljuq and orthodox Sunni. To Alp-Arsalan, the successor of this Tughril Beg, Nizām al-Mulk had been Wazir since his accession in 455. On the death of Alp-Arsalan in 465, he had secured the Empire to his son, Malik Shah, and, from that time until his assassination on the 10th of Ramaḍān 485, was the greatest man in the Empire and its ruler. When he fell, the united Empire fell with him; Malik Shah survived him but thirty-five days, and civil war broke out. Science, too, felt his fostering care. I need not tell again the story of how he and ‘Umar Khayyām and al-Fāsānī b. ’Sabbāḥ studied together at Nāṣabūr and promised one another

that whichever of the three came to eminence would help the others. The story is probably not true, but it is true that ‘Umar lived peacefully in the shadow of his beneficence, helped to reform the calendar, and wrote his Algebra, to say nothing of his Rūbū‘iyāt, which he probably did not flout before the world. Further, if Nizām al-Mulk was not the first to found Madrasas, he at least extended them largely. His influence went also to restrain the strife of sects. Up to his accession to the wazirship, the Ash‘arites had been cursed in the Friday prayers along with the Rādīfītes—a very strange combination due, apparently, to Seljuq incuriosity in theological matters; but he did away with that, and it was again possible for Ash‘arite theologians to live under the Seljuqs. It was, then, at the camp-court of this man that al-Ghazzālī sought advancement. There, among the scholars and theologians that surrounded the Wazir, he had the same success as at Nāṣabūr, and in 484 he was appointed to teach in the Madrasa at Baghdaḍ. Thus embarked on a career as an independent teacher, his lectures drew crowds. He taught, he gave fatwas, or legal opinions of weight and determining influence, he wrote, and all seemed to go smoothly until, so it seemed from the outside, he was struck down by a mysterious disease; his speech became hampered, his appetite failed, his stomach could digest nothing. His physicians gave him up; they said that the malady lay in the heart, and that there was no hope for him if he could not overcome the mental unrest that had befallen him. Then he suddenly quitted Baghdaḍ in Dhūl-Qa‘dah 488, ostensibly on pilgrimage to Mecca. He appointed his brother Ahmad to teach in

1 Chronologically it is impossible, and historically it has no foundation. See Houtsmen’s preface to his edition of al-Bondārī, p. xiv, note 2.
2 Ibn al-Athīr, sub anno 488, the year of the death of Nizām al-Mulk, and under 456, the year of the death of ‘Amīl al-Mulk al-Kunduri, Wazir to Tughril Beg and a violent anti-Shī‘ite. He persuaded Tughril Beg to order that the Rādīfītes be solemnly cursed from the pulpits, and added the Ash‘arites apparently on his own responsibility. He appears to have been a Hanafite and therefore a follower of al-Māturīdī, the rival of al-Ash‘arī in scholastic theology. This led to a four years’ exile of al-Juwaynī at Mecca, and gained him the name of Imam al-Haraymānī. See Ibn Khall. iii. 290. [On this persecution see now Schreiner, ZDMG. iii. 488 f.]
3 Houtsmen, al-Bondārī, 80.
4 Going on pilgrimage was not an infrequent way of retreat from an untenable position in public life. It may be questioned to what extent al-Ghazzālī’s contemporaries were deceived by the pretext.
his place in the Madrasa, and abandoned all his property except so much as was necessary for his own support and that of his children—he had only daughters; what he kept he secured by seafu so that the income should be paid to him or his descendants so long as there were any, and when heirs failed should revert to the establishment, muqj or madrasa as the case might be, that had charge of it. This retirement from a splendid position was unintelligible to the theologians of the time. Those in al-
‘Iraq criticised him with one accord; none of the mufisives they could think of was good. The best they could say was that it was a calumny thrown on Islam by destiny. Those at a distance thought that his flight was dictated by fear of the government. This hypothesis seemed plausible, though the efforts of the government to detain him showed its falsity. Ground for fear there might be. The times were out of joint. In 483 al-Hasan b. as-Sabbūh had seized Alamūt; since then his power had been steadily growing, and his sect of the Ismā‘īlites was developing into what we know as the Assassins. In 485 Nīvān al-Mulk, the patron of al-Ghazzālī, had been assassinated, and shortly after, in the same year, died Malik Shāh. Then came civil war, confusion, and the breaking into pieces of the Seljuq empire. In 487 Bargiyāruq became Great Seljuq, but with short dominions. At the beginning of the same year al-Mustazhir became Khalifa, and in the civil war between Bargiyāruq and his uncle Tutush he espoused the cause of Tutush. At one point victory for Bargiyāruq seemed absolutely impossible, and the Khalifa committed the imprudence of inserting Tutush's name in the public prayers. But the situation suddenly changed, and in Safar 488 Tutush was defeated and killed. Under such circumstances the Khalifa might well feel uncomfortable, and the theologians and advisers of his court might, begin to look out for themselves. Other political entanglements and responsibilities seem to fall at this time. One of these connects al-Ghazzālī with the extreme West. In 470 the epoch-making battle of az-Zalāqa' was fought in Spain, and Alfonso of Castile was driven back by the combined Muslim princes of Spain (the Reyes de Taifa) aided by the Murābīt Sultan of the Maghrib, Yusuf b. Tāshfin. After the battle Yusuf b. Tāshfin returned to the Maghrib, but in 484 he came again, and Muslim Spain was annexed to his own empire. This addition seems to have compelled him to see to the legitimacy of his title as a Sultan of the Muslims. Ibn al-Athir (d. 650) in the Kāmil, after his account of the battle of az-Zalāqa', says that the 'Ulāmā of Spain represented to Yusuf that, to make his title perfect, he would require to seek formal investiture from the 'Abbāsīd Khalifa; that he did so, and that al-Muqtādī, the Khalifa of the time (d. 487), gave him the titles of Amir of the Muslims and Nāšir al-Dīn. At his account of Yusuf's death Ibn al-Athir repeats this information, with the difference that the Khalifa is said to have been al-Mustazhir, who immediately succeeded al-Muqtadī. Here there is no mention of al-Ghazzālī; but if this investiture dates after 484, when he was appointed to teach in the Madrasa at Baghdi'd, there can be little doubt that he, the principal theologian at the court of the Khalifa, had some part in it. The point in question was the legality of the claim of Yusuf to sovereign authority under the Khalifa, and that could only be settled by trained theologians. The story as told by Ibn Khaldūn is longer and more complicated. Between 481 and 483 Yusuf obtained fatawa from the 'Ulāmā of Spain and from foreign theologians, among them al-Ghazzālī and as-Tartūśī (Ibn Khall. ii: 603), legalising his position and giving him the right to depose the Muslim princes of Spain (the Reyes de Taifa). In this connection there is no mention of the Khalifa. Again, after 493, he sent an embassy to the Khalifa al-Mustazhir (Ibn Khaldūn gives the names of the ambassadors) to ask formal investiture as a sovereign prince and the use of the title Amir of the Muslims which he had himself assumed. This was granted him by the Khalifa, and al-Ghazzālī and as-Tartūśī again supported him with fatawa. It is curious that 'Abd al-Wāhīd, who wrote in 621, makes mention of neither investiture nor fatawa. He calls Yusuf Amir of the Muslims from the very beginning of his story (see, e.g., p. 91 of Dozy's edition). In the Qur'ān a dis-

1 SM. p. 11, line 17.
2 With single / according to the MS. of 'Abd al-Wāhīd, edit. Dozy, 94, 16.
3 This was the Alfonso of the Cid Campeador, who died at Valencia, A. D. 1099 = A. H. 498.
tinction is made between him and his father. His father is called
the Amir simply; but (p. 88 of Tornberg's edit.) we are told that
Yusuf was saluted by the kings of Spain as Amir of the Muslims
after the battle of az-Zalaga, and that he struck coins acknowled-
ging the 'Abbasid Khalifa al-Muqtadir.

Such is one public act in which we can perhaps trace al-
Ghazzali. Another and more certain one lay nearer home.
Almost immediately after his accession al-Mustaghfir com-
missioned him to write a book against the Talimites, as the Isma-
'ilites or Batinites were called in Khurasan. This book was the
Mustaghfiri of which he speaks in the Mungidh.

I have already shown how al-Ghazzali's conversion and great
renunciation must have looked from the outside. Fortunately,
his has laid bare to us in the Mungidh the true causes of this
step, so mysterious at the time and so momentous in the future
for the Church of Islam. In that book, as said above, he tells us
the story of his spiritual development from the earliest stage up
to the time of his writing, when he was over fifty (lunar) years old,
i.e., after 500. In his earliest youth he had given up acceptance
of religious truth on authority; that his masters so taught him
was no longer a sufficient reason for his belief. Further, when
he was under twenty, he began to examine theological questions
and quarrels, and the effect upon him must have been very much
the same as that which befell Gibbon. So he drifted on, probably
restrained only by the influence of his great teacher, the Imam
al-Haramayn, a man of the deepest religious character; but at
the camp of Nizam al-Mulk, if not earlier, the strain became too
great, and for two months he touched the depths of absolute
scepticism. He doubted the evidence of the senses; he could see
plainly that they often deceived. No eye could perceive the
movement of a shadow, but still the shadow moved; a gold piece
would cover any star, but still the star was a world larger than
the earth. He doubted even the primary ideas of the mind. Is
ten more than three? can a thing both be and not be? Perhaps;
he could not tell. His senses had deceived him, why not his
mind? May there not be something behind the mind, transcenden-
ting it, which would show the falsity of its convictions even as the
mind showed the falsity of the information given by the senses?
May not the dreams of the Sufis be true, and their revelations in
ecstasy the only real guides? When we awake in death, may it
not be into a true but different existence? All this,—perhaps.

And so he wandered for two months. He saw clearly that no
reasoning could help him here; he had no ideas on which he
could depend, from which he could begin. But the mercy of God
is great; He sends His light to whom He wills, a light that flows
in, and is given by no reasoning. By it al-Ghazzali was saved;
he regained the power to think, and the task which he now set
before him was to use this power to guide himself to truth.
When he looked around, he saw that those who gave themselves
to the search for truth might be divided into four groups. There
were the scholastic theologians, who were much like the theologi-
ans of all times and faiths. Second, there were the Talimites,
who held that to reach truth one must have an infallible living
teacher, and that there was such a teacher. Third, there were
the followers of philosophy, basing on logic and rational proofs.
Fourth, there were the Sufis, who held that they, the chosen of
God, could reach knowledge of Him directly in ecstasy. With
all these he had, of course, been acquainted before to a greater
or a less degree; but now he settled down to examine them one
by one, and find which would lead him to a certainty by which he
could hold, whatever might come. He felt that he could not go
back to the unconscious faith of his childhood; that nothing
could restore. All his mental being must be made over before he
could find rest. He began with scholastic theology, but found
no help there. Grant the theologians their premises, and they
could argue; deny them, and there was no common ground on
which to meet. Their science had been founded by al-Ash'ari
to meet the Mu'tazilites; it had done that victoriously, but could
do no more. They could hold the faith against heretics, expose their
inconsistencies and weaknesses; but against the sceptic they could
do nothing. It is true that they had attempted to go further back
and meet the students of philosophy on their own ground, to deal
with substances and attributes and first principles generally; but
their efforts had been fruitless. They lacked the necessary knowl-
dge of the subject, had no scientific basis, and were constrained
eventually to fall back on authority. After study of them and their
methods it became clear to al-Ghazzali that the remedy for
his ailment was not to be found in scholastic theology.

1 See on them generally Steiner, Die Mu'taziliten, and Zur Geschichte
der Akdiristenthum, in Actes du huitième Congrès International des
Orientalistes. Sec. i. Fasc. i., pp. 77ff., Leide, 1891; Spitta and Mehren,
opp. cit.
Then he turned to philosophy. He had seen already that the weakness of the theologians lay in their not having made a sufficient study of primary ideas and the laws of thought. Three years he gave up to this. He was at Baghdad at the time, teaching law and writing legal treatises, and probably the three years extended from the beginning of 484 to the beginning of 487. Two years he gave, without a teacher, to the study of the writings of the different schools of philosophy, and almost another to meditating and working over his results. He felt that he was the first Muslim doctor to do this with the requisite thoroughness. And it is noteworthy that at this stage he seems to have again felt himself to be a Muslim, and in an enemy's country when he was studying philosophy. He speaks of the necessity of understanding what is to be refuted; but this may be only a confusion between his attitude when writing after 500 and his attitude when investigating and seeking truth fifteen years earlier. He divides the followers of philosophy in his time into three: Materialists; Deists (Tâbi'īn, i.e. Naturalists), and Theists. The materialists reject a creator; the world exists from all eternity; the animal comes from the egg and the egg from the animal. The wonder of creation compels the deists to admit a creator, but the creature is a machine, has a certain poise (ritâd) in itself which keeps it running; its thought is a part of its nature and ends with death. They thus reject a future life, though admitting God and His attributes. He deals at much greater length with the teachings of those whom he calls theists, but throughout all his statement of their views his tone is not that of a seeker but that of a partisan; he turns his own experiences into a warning to others, and makes of their record a little guide to apologetics. Aristotle he regards as the final master of the Greek school; his doctrines are best represented for Arabic readers in the books of Ibn Sina and al-Flâbâbi—the works of their predecessors on this subject are a mass of confusion. Part of these doctrines must be stamped as unbelief, part as heresy, and part as theologically indifferent. He then divides the philosophical sciences into six, mathematics, logic, physics, metaphysics, political economy, ethics, and discusses these in detail, showing what must be rejected, what is indifferent, what dangers arise from each to him who studies or to him who rejects without study. Throughout, he is very cautious to mark nothing as unbelief that is not really so; to admit always those truths of mathematics, logic, and physics that cannot intellectually be rejected; and only to warn against an attitude of intellectualism and a belief that mathematicians, with their acuteness and success in their own department, are to be followed in other departments, or that all subjects are susceptible of the exactness and certainty of a syllogism in logic. The damnable errors of the theists are almost entirely in their metaphysical views. Three of their propositions mark them as unbelievers: First, they reject the resurrection of the body and physical punishment hereafter; the punishments of the next world will be spiritual only. That there will be spiritual punishments, al-Ghazzâlî admits, but there will be physical as well; Second, they hold that God knows universals only, not particulars; Third, they hold that the world exists from all eternity and to all eternity. When they reject the attributes of God and hold that He knows by His essence and not by something added to His essence, they are only heretics and not unbelievers. In physics he accepts the constitution of the world as developed and explained by them; only all is to be regarded as entirely submitted to God, incapable of self-movement, a tool of which the Creator makes use. Finally, he considers that their system of ethics is derived from the teachings of the Sufis. At all times there have been such saints, retired from the world—God has never left Himself without a witness; and from their ecstatics and revelations our knowledge of the human heart, for good and evil, is derived.

Thus in philosophy he found little light. It did not correspond entirely to his needs, for reason cannot answer all questions nor unveil all the enigmas of life. He would probably have admitted that he had learned much in his philosophical studies—so at least I gather from his tone; he never speaks disrespectfully of philosophy and science in their own sphere; his continual exhortation is that he who would understand them and refute their errors must first study them; that to do otherwise, to abuse what we do not know, brings only contempt on ourselves and on the cause which we champion. But he cannot find his religion on intellect; nor can I understand that a man of al-Ghazzâlî's temperament could ever have persuaded himself to find peace in pure thought. He could be indifferent, a keen legal-minded onlooker upon the theological fights round him, such as we find him in his earlier life; but once the religious instinct was aroused, nothing could satisfy him except what he eventually
found. It is absurd to speak of him as a renegade from philosophy, as one who turned his back on the light in which he had walked for a season and went again into the darkness of the obscurant. He was never a cold-blooded student like al-Fārābī, Ibn Sinā, or, later, Ibn Rushd. He had never given his allegiance to pure reason, he had hardly even been a student of philosophy until he took it up in his search for help in the darkness; he had been a student of law, and what went with it, scholastic theology; but when his heart awoke and cried out and he found himself standing alone with the great world stretching around him, he could have followed no other path than that in which he did tread. It is still more absurd to speak of him as a conscious traitor, as one with a secret teaching only confined to his closest pupils, an unbelieving philosophy running in the teeth of his public utterances. His story rings true from beginning to end; his mental development is clear; we can see how, point by point, such and such only could he have been. And so, two possibilities, and two only were before him, though one was hardly a real possibility if we consider his training and mental powers. He might fall back on authority. It could not be the authority of his childish faith; “our fathers have told us,” he himself confesses, could never again have weight with him. But it might be some claimer of authority in a new form, some infallible teacher with a doctrine which he could accept for the authority behind it. As the Church of Rome from time to time gathers into its fold men of keen intellect who seek rest in submission, and the world marvels, so it might have been with him. Or again he might turn directly to God and to personal intercourse with Him; he might seek to know Him and to be taught of Him without any intermediary, in a word, to enter on the path of the mystic.

He came next to examine the doctrine of the Ta’limites. And here we touch at last a dating point. He tells us that just when he felt driven himself to study this sect, the Khalifa of the time laid on him a command to write a book against their teachings. We must remember that he was an eminent professor in the Madrasa at Baghdād, was in the odor of orthodoxy, and would naturally be called upon to write against any heretical sect that might be troublesome at the time. The book which he wrote

was the Mustaṣḥirī, which shows that the Khalifa in question must have been al-Mustaṣḥirī, who succeeded al-Muqtādī on 15th Muḥarram 487. As al-Ghazzālī finally left Baghdād in Dhūl-Qa’dā 488, he must have been studying the Ta’limites early in 487. He says that they were a sect which had recently appeared; and from the Khalifa’s command we can see that their teachings were making rapid strides, and that orthodox Islam felt it necessary to enter the field against them. From the nature of their doctrines as developed by al-Ghazzālī, it is evident that we have here the sect of the Ismā’īlites that was founded by al-Ḥasan b. aṣ-Ṣabbāh. Ash-Shāhrastānī has described his teaching, and shows that it began and ended with the claim that only by an infallible teacher could truth be reached, that his sect had such a teacher or Imām, and that no other sect had. This is exactly the position which we find al-Ghazzālī combatting. He does it with a warmth which shows how close the battle was. He gives in detail how such a claim should be met, what arguments may be used against it, and what are useless. I need not give these arguments here. They would add nothing to our knowledge of al-Ghazzālī at this point of his life, as they were intended for the assistance of good Muslims at the time of his writing the Munqīdah. It is enough that al-Ghazzālī found the Ta’limites and their teachings eminently unsatisfactory; they had a lesson which they went over parrot-fashion, but beyond it they were in dense ignorance. The trained theologian and scholar had no patience with their slackness and shallowness of thought. He

1 There is a curious mistake in Stanislas Guyard’s article in the Journal Asiatique, 1848, i. 194 ff., “Un grand maître des assassins.” On pp. 335, 336, he dates the Munqīdah before the rise of Ḥasan b. aṣ-Ṣabbāh, and before the development of the Ismā’īlīn herey into a political sect at open war with all around. But Ḥasan seized Alamūt in 488, and the Munqīdah was written after 500; between, to follow certain historians, came some of the most important assassinations in their record, Nisām al-Mulk, Mulk Shāh, Fakhr al-Mulk. There must be another reason for the milder terms which al-Ghazzālī uses towards them in the Munqīdah. Even the Munṣṭirī was written after the seizure of Alamūt, which may, indeed, have been its cause.

1 Haarbrucker’s translation, p. 253. Ash-Shāhrastānī was a younger contemporary of al-Ghazzālī. He went to Baghdād in 510. I do not attempt here to enter on a consideration of the truth of the history of Ḥasan and his sect as commonly received. It is in great part based on very late authorities, and seems open to grave doubt.
laboured long, as ash-Shāhrastānī confesses he too did, to penetrate their mystery and learn something from them, but beyond the accustomed formulae there was nothing to be found. He even admitted their contention of the necessity of a living, infallible teacher, to see what would follow—but nothing followed. "You admit the necessity of an Imām," they would say, "it is your business now to go and seek him; we have nothing more to do with it." But though neither al-Ghazzālī nor ash-Shāhrastānī, who died 43 (lunar) years after him, could be satisfied with the Ta'limites, many others were. The conflict was hot, and al-Ghazzālī himself wrote several books against them; the Murtadā already mentioned; a Ḥujja al-haqiq, also written in Baghdad but perhaps during his second residence there; a Mufassil al-khifāf, written in Hamadan (when he was there I do not know, perhaps during his ten years of wandering life); a Kitāb ad-durūj, written in tabular form, the record of a controversy at Tūs; also in his Ḍīnād, an attempt to lay down a rule of guidance in theological dispute, there is a demonstration that those who have such a rule have no need of an Imām.

The other possibility, the path of the mystic, now lay straight before him. In the Mughalī he tells us how, when he had made an end with the Ta'limites, he began to study the books of the Ṣūfīs, without any suggestion that he had had a previous acquaintance with them and their practices. But probably this means nothing more than it does when he speaks in a similar way of studying the scholastic theologians; namely, that he now took up the study in earnest and with a new and definite purpose. His native country was steeped in Ṣūfīism; his old teacher, the Imām al-Ḥaramayn, had been a devout Ṣūfī; according to the tradition the friend to whom his father had entrusted his brother and himself had been a Ṣūfī. The Sayyid Murtadā also enters into some details on his Ṣūfī studies, though, these, of course, cannot be depended upon absolutely and are largely mixed with legend. His principal teacher—this on the authority of 'Abd al-Ghāfīr is certain—was the Imām, the Zāhid, Ābū ʿAlī al-Faḍl b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Fārmādī at-Tūsī (SM. p. 19; I give the name in full, as the only reference I can find to him is a mere mention in Yāqūt under Fārmādī), one of the chiefest of the pupils of al-Qushayrī, the author of the celebrated Ṭisān, and, on the authority of as-Samānī in his Ansāb (SM. p. 19), a pupil of the older al-Ghazzālī, the grand-uncle. Al-Fārmādī died in Tūs in 477, and theré al-Ghazzālī studied with him. 'Abd al-Ghāfīr tells how, after he had made great progress in science, he was seized with disgust and weariness at it, and turned to what would avail for the future life. Al-Fārmādī guided him, and he followed his path and imitated all the practices that were put before him. He took part in ḍhikrās, and passed through all the labours and weariness of the Ṣūfī neophyte, but did not attain what he sought. Obviously, his time was not yet come; his mind was not yet prepared to open to spiritual light. So he went back to his worldly studies, to the weighing of proofs and the settling of legal difficulties. But, at last, in 'Abd al-Ghāfīr's picturesqueness of phrase, a door of fear was opened upon him, and the change described above came. Further, there is mentioned a certain Yūnus as-Sajjāj, or, an-Nassājī, of whom elsewhere I can find no trace. The following story goes back directly to al-Ghazzālī through the autograph manuscript of Ḥub ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Iṣābī (SM. p. 9): "I used at first to deny the ecstatic states of the saints and the grades of advancement of the initiated until I accompanied with my Shaykh Yūnus an-Nassājī in Tūs, and he kept polishing at me with exercises until I was graced with revelations and I saw God in a dream and He said to me, 'O Abū Ḥāmid!' I said, 'Is Satan speaking to me?' He said, 'Nay, but I am God that encompasseth all thy ways; am I not [thy Lord]?'" Then he said, 'O Abī Ḥāmid, abandon thy formal rules, and company with the people whom I have made the resting-place of My regard in My earth; they are those who have sold the Two Abodes for My love.' Then I said, 'By Thy might, I adjure Thee to give

---

1 Mehren has curiously misunderstood and mistranslated what 'Abd al-Ghāfīr says, making al-Ghazzālī study at Nayṣābūr after his ten years of wandering life. But al-Fārmādī, as we have seen, died in 477.

2 The "Path" (ṭarīqā) of the Muslim mystic is the discipline which he follows on his way to his ideal of absolute communion with the Divine. See Hughes, Dict. of Islam, pp. 608 ff., and Fitāgel's article on ash-Shāhrastānī in ZDMG. xx. 41, note 52.

3 For the religious services called ḍhikrās see Hughes, Dict. of Islam, pp. 705 ff., Lane, Modern Egyptians, chap. xxiv.

4 Qur. vii. 172; a celebrated passage where God takes a covenant from all men, as the seed of Adam, on the day of his creation, that they will acknowledge Him on the day of Resurrection as their Lord. There are many references to the day of al-āsāt.
me again to taste good thought of them." Then he said, "I do
so; that which separated between thee and them was thy being
occupied by the love of this world, so come out from it by free
will before thou comest out from it abjectly [at death]. I pour
forth upon thee lights from the protection of My holiness, so
seize them and apply thyself." Then I awoke in great joy and
got to my shaykh Yūsuf an-Nassaj and related to him the
dream. And he smiled and said, "O Abū Ḥamīd, these changing
states and grades we obliterate with our feet; yea, if thou coman-
priest with me the glance of thy insight will be kohled with the
ithni of succor until thou seest the Empyrean Throne and those
around it." Then thou wilt not be satisfied with that until
thou witnessest that to which glances can not attain, and thou
will be purified from the uncleanness of thy nature and ascend
beyond the limits of thy reason and hear discourse from God;
Most Illigh like Muḥ at, Verily, I am God, the Lord of the
Worlds." Another story is traced back through 'Abd al-Wah-
hūb ash-Sha' rānī: "Al-Ghazzalī was wont to say, "When I wished
to plunge into following the People and to drink of their drink, I
looked at my soul and I saw how much it was cumbered in,"—at
this time he had no shaykh,—so I retired into solitude and
busied myself with religious exercises for forty days, and there
was doled to me of knowledge what I had not had, purer and
finer than what I had known. Then I looked upon it, and lo, in
it was a legal element. So I returned to solitude and busied my-
self with religious exercises for forty days, and there was doled
to me other knowledge, purer and finer than what had befallen
me at first, and I rejoiced in it. Then I looked upon it, and lo, in
it was a speculative element. So I returned to solitude a third
time for forty days, and there was doled to me other knowledge;
it was finer and purer. Then I looked on it, and lo, in it was
an element mixed with a knowledge that is known [i.e., not sim-
ply perceived, felt], and I did not attain to the people of the
inward sciences. So I knew that writing on a surface from
which something has been erased is not like writing on a surface
in its first purity and cleanliness, and I never separated my-
self from speculation except in a few things." On this there is
the remark, "May God have mercy on Abū Ḥamīd, how great
was his justice and his guarding of himself from making any
claim!"

We may take these stories for what they are worth. The last,
which evidently describes his effort to free his mind from the
burden of all his legal and theological studies and present it as a
tabula rasa to the new impressions, has great psychological
probability. But in the Munqīdth we have numerous details as to
his struggles at this period and how he came out of them, which
must be regarded as authentic. He recognized that for him
study of the doctrines of the Sāfāt in contained in their books
was easier than following their practices. He therefore read
carefully the Qaṭī al-qulūb of Abū Tālib al-Makki, the works of
al-Jārīth al-Maḥāsinī, the fragments of al-Junaydī, ash-Shābi,1
and Abū Yazīd al-Bīšā'amī. He had also the benefit of oral

1 Al-ṿilaḥ al-ladunyā. Al-Ghazzalī in the Itḥā (vii, p. 260) explains
this by a reference to Qur. xviii. 84, wa-ʾallāmun in ladun ṭiḥman.
All knowledge is from God, but that which is immediately revealed by
Him in the secret heart, fi sirri al-qulūbi, without any intermediary is
called 'ilm al-ladun. Compare de Sacy, les sciences qui sont en Dieu
(Notices et Extraits, xi, 303, note 9), and Goldziher, die heilige Wissen-
schaft, ZDMG. xxviii. 321.

2 Ibn Khall. iii. 20. Dīd. 886. He was not "originario de la
Mequée," as Barbier de Meynard says, but only a resident there, a Jār
Allāh or Nāẓī Makka.

3 Ibn Khall. i. 47 and iii. 32. He evidently believed that he had actu-
ally seen Surah and Mubarrad. On seeing God in a dream, see i. 46, note
7, and references there; also Al-Ghazzalī's Muḥāfīn, edit. of Cairo, 1900,
p. 553. See, too, Patton, Abīmed ibn Hanbal, 192, note 4. Curiously
enough, Patton seems to regard it as a proof of peculiar superstition in
Abī Hanbal that he believed in dreams.

4 Rifāḍa al-Al-Qushayrī, p. 17 of edit. of Cairo 1904. Barbier de Mey-
nard prints the name Zul, but that is an error.
teaching; but it became plain to him that only through ecstasy and a complete transformation of the moral being could he really understand Šāfism. He saw that it consisted in feelings more than knowledge; that he must be initiated as a Šāfī himself, live their life and practice their exercises, to attain his goal. On the way on which he had come up to this time, he had gained three fixed points of faith. He now believed firmly in God, in prophecy, and in the last judgment. He had also gained the belief that only by detaching himself from this world, its life, enjoyments, honours, and turning to God could he be saved in the world to come. He looked on his present life, his writing and his teaching, and saw of how little value it was in the face of the great fate of heaven and hell. All he did now was for the sake of vain glory and had it no consecration to the service of God. He felt on the edge of an abyss. The world held him back; his fears urged him away. He was in the throes of a conversion wrought by terror; his religion, now and always, in common with all Islam, was other-worldly. So he remained in conflict with himself for six months, from Rajab of 488. Finally, his health broke down under the strain. In his feebleness and overthrow he took refuge with God as a man at the end of his resources. God heard him and enabled him to make the needed sacrifices. As I have already described, he abandoned all and wandered forth from Baghdad as a Šāfī. He had put his brilliant present and brilliant future absolutely behind him, had given up everything for the peace of his soul. This date, Dhî-l-Qa‘da 488, was the great era in his life; but it marked an era, too, in the history of Islam. Since al-Ash‘arî went back to the faith of his fathers in 300 and cursed the Mutazilites and all their works, there had been no such epoch as this flight of al-Ghazzâli. It meant that the reign of pure scholastic theology was over; that another element was to work openly in the future Church of Islam, the element of the mystical life in God, of the attainment of truth by the soul in direct vision. But to trace these consequences belongs to a history of Muslim theology.

He betook himself at once to Syria, and remained there almost two years, living in strict retirement and giving all his time to

---

1 On the other-worldliness of Islam compare the case of Ibn Rushd, a man at the opposite pole of thought from al-Ghazzâlî, Philos. u. Theol. von Avroren, übers. von M. J. Müller, 18.
family affairs, and the anxieties of life, kept continually disturbing him. This went on, he tells us, for almost ten years, and in that time there were revealed to him things that could not be reckoned and the discussion of which could not be exhausted. He learned that the Šūfis were on the true and only path to the knowledge of God; that neither intelligence nor wisdom nor science could change or improve their doctrine or their ethics. The light in which they walk is essentially the same as the light of prophecy; Muhammad was a Šūfi when on his way to be a prophet. There is none other light to light any man in this world. A complete purifying of the heart from all but God is their Path; a seeking to completely plunge the heart in the thought of God is its beginning, and its end is complete passing away in God. This last is only its end in relation to what can be entered upon and grasped by a voluntary effort; in truth, it is only the first step in the Path, the vestibule to the contemplative life. Revelations (mukābala, unvelings) come to the disciple from the very beginning; while awake they see angels and souls of prophets, hear their voices, and gain from them guidance. Then their State passes from the beholding of forms

1 According to al-Qushayrī in the Risāla (p. 50 of ed. of Cairo 1904), mukābala comes after muḥāḍarāt and precedes muḥāḍhāt. Muhāḍhara is simply a presenting of the heart before God, on the part of the worshipper. Mukābala joins to this the quality of explaining (bayān), without the need in this state of considering a guide or a means, and no one seeks aid against causes of error, and no one is curtailed off from the Unseen World. Muslahāda follows, and in it there is the presence of the Truth itself without any anxiety remaining; there are no veiling clouds, and the sun of witness shines brightly. Al-Junayd said, “It is the presence of the Truth along with the lack of Thee.” Al-Qushayrī adds much more. See, further, Flügel’s article on ash-Sharāfīn, ZDMG. xx. 25, note 6; al-Ghazzālī’s Imlā, margin of SM. I. p. 54.

2 State (ḥālāt and ḍala, pl. ḍalāl) is a term which will occur very frequently in the translation from al-Ghazzālī, sometimes in its ordinary meaning and sometimes in the technical meaning here intended. Al-Qushayrī in the Risāla (pp. 40 ff.) explains it, and distinguishes it carefully from maqām, station. It is a condition of joy or sorrow, of station or depression, of longing, of reverence, etc., which descends upon the heart without intention or assay or seeking on its part. States are pure gifts, but stations are sought-for gains. States come without effort, but stations are gained by the utmost application. He who is in a station remains there, but he who is in a state is always mounting higher from that state. Further details follow in the Risāla as to the possibility of the continuance of states. See, too, al-Ghazzālī’s Imlā, margin of SM. I. p. 59.

3 In Ibn Tufayl’s Riḍālā Ilāh b. Yaqūb (edit. Pococke, p. 22) this is Al-maqād al-asmā. A Maqād al-asmā is described by Goezhe (p. 251) as on the Names, but there must be some mistake; Goezhe’s descriptions of the MSS. used by him are not faultless, e.g. that of the MSS. of the Durra, see Gautier, pp. viii ff. In the SM.’s list there is neither a Maqād al-asmā nor al-asmā but there is a Kithāb al-asmā al-ḥamid, evidently on the Names. In IJK, vi. 89 there is a Maqād al-asmā fi sharh al-asmā al-ḥamid, apparently the book in the SM.’s list. So, also, is the title in the list of books by al-Ghazzālī in Caasir, i. 465, no. 1125. (Note: contra Goezhe, that there is no evidence that this list is of date A. H. 611.) Aziz b. Muhammad an-Nasa’ī wrote a Maqād al-asmā (IJK, i. e.), translated by Palmer in his Oriental Mysticism, Cambridge, 1897, the contents of which seem the same in character as those of the book mentioned here. Evidently the title could apply to a book of the nature required by this reference and by that in Ibn Tufayl.

4 With the karāmāt of the shaitans (amīlīyā) Lane compares the ṣulqān, 1 Corinthians xii. 9, and suggests as a rendering ‘thumaturgy.’ They are wonders granted by God to His walls, who may be ignorant that they are working them, and who ought rather to conceal them than to show them openly. They are sharply distinguished from the muṣfīdāt, or miracles of the prophets, which are evidential signs proving the truth of the claim to prophecy, and therefore of a public, open nature. The prophet works muṣfīdāt at his will; the saint has wonders worked for him by God, and he may not know it. But karāmāt are granted also to the prayer of the saint, and it is lawful for him to show them to chosen persons. So the essential difference is that they are not used as proofs and coupled with a claim to prophecy. See the Risāla, pp. 207 ff. of Cairo ed. 1904; the Ishrāq of Ibn Sīnā (edit. Forget, pp. 207 ff.); al-Fāraḥū’s Philosophy, Abhānāli, edit. Dideriel, p. 72 (on miracles of prophets and their possibility in the scheme of nature); the SM. in his commentary, vol. ii. pp. 208 ff.; al-Ghazzālī himself, vol. vii. pp. 244 ff. (in ‘Aṭīb al-qalb); al-Tafṣīl al-ṣabir b. Sharh on the Ṣaḥīḥ of an-Nasa’ī, edit. Constant. 1810, pp. 175 ff.; Dict. of Tech. Terms, i. 444 ff., under kāhīrīq, i.e. what violates the ordinary course of nature. Also Flügel’s article on ash-Sharāfīn in ZDMG. xx. 34, note 86, and p. 42, note 58; al-Ghazzālī’s Imlā, margin of SM. I. p. 204; Ibn Khdūn, Musaddāma, pp. 305 ff. of edit. of Būnāq.
the existence of prophecy can be proved, and then the life itself of Muḥammad proves that he was a prophet. Al-Ghazzālī goes on to deal with the nature of prophecy, and how the life of Muḥammad shows the truth of his mission; but enough has been given to indicate his attitude and the stage at which he had himself arrived. During this ten years he had returned to his native country and to his children, but had not undertaken public duty as a teacher. Now that was forced upon him. The century was drawing to a close. Everywhere there was evident a slackening of religious fervor and faith. A mere external compliance with the rules of ʿIṣlām was observed; men even openly defended such a course. His adduces as an example of this the Wasiya of Ibn Sinā. The students of philosophy went their way, and their conduct shook the minds of the people; false Ṣāfiya abounded, who taught antinomianism; the lives of many theologians excited scandal; the Taʿlīlimos, of whom we have already heard, were still spreading. A religious leader to turn the current was absolutely needed, and his friends looked to al-Ghazzālī to take up that duty; some distinguished saints had dreams of his success; God had promised a reformer every hundred years, and the time was up. Finally the Sultan laid a

---

1 There is a curious parallelism in al-Ghazzālī’s attitude here to the latest phase in Christian apologetics. The argument from miracles seems now to be practically thrown aside; the doctrine rather must prove the miracle. The unique fact of the life and person of Christ is emphasized; it is shown how it appeals immediately to the human consciousness, and on that the proof of the truth of His mission is built up. Logically this position is faulty; and practically it proves whatever you wish. Al-Ghazzālī uses it to prove the truth of the mission of Muḥammad. Miracles are difficult, almost impossible to prove—here we have again his attitude of historical agnosticism; but if any one will read the record of Muḥammad’s life, he will receive a general impression that will assure him of the truth of the mission. The personality of Muḥammad will be its own proof.

2 The SM. devotes an entire section to the tradition promising a renewer of religious life every hundred years. He then gives lists of all those for whom the honour of being such a reformer had been claimed. At the end of the first century came Umar b. ‘Abd al-ʿAziz, the pious Umāya Khalifa, who died in 99. At the end of the second, ash-Shāfiʿī, who died in 204. The honour of reforming the fourth century was claimed for al-Ashʿarī (d. 320?) and also for Ibn Surayj (d. 306). For the fifth century three names are given, al-Qasimīn (d. 406), as-Salāḥī (d. 407 or 402 or 404), al-Bāqillānī (d. 408). The position of al-Ghazzālī as reformer of the sixth century seems undisputed, though, at one time, the Khalifa al-Mustarshid was set up against him (Mehren, p. 181).

command upon him to go and teach in the Madrasa at Naysābūr, and he was forced to consent. His departure for Naysābūr fell in Dhūl-Qa’dā 449, exactly eleven years after his flight from Baghdād.

So far I have followed in this sketch of al-Ghazzālī’s wandering life his own account in the Ṣanqūlī, but it can be supplemented from other sources. These, it is true, contradict one another flatly and tell many things that are evident impossibilities, but some gleanings of fact are possible. Ibn al-Athir (d. 630) in the Kāmil (Hanawīdīth of 488), tells us that al-Ghazzālī composed the Ḥaḍātī at this time, returned to Baghdād after pilgrimaging in 449, and from there went to Khurāsān. This is all probably correct, though it is difficult to make up al-Ghazzālī’s “almost two years” between Dhūl-Qa’dā 448 and Dhūl-Qa’dā 449. That the Ḥaḍātī was written about this time his biographers agree, and we may accept it as tolerably certain. The stories which they tell of his life at Damascus are by no means so certain, though some of them seem to go back through adh-Dhahabi (d. 748) to Abūl Qāsim b. ʿAsākir, the author of the great history of Damascus, who died in 571. After al-Ghazzālī himself, the best authority on his life is undoubtedly the ʿAbd al-Ghāfīr already mentioned, who was an immediate contemporary and personal friend. What he tells us of al-Ghazzālī’s life must have been gained from personal knowledge or go back immediately to al-Ghazzālī. According to him, al-Ghazzālī set out on pilgrimage to Mecca (qaṣāda ḥaṭṭa bayt-l-Lāhī in SM, not qaṣāda bayt-l-Lāhī wa qaṣāda as in Mehren), then went to Syria, and remained there meditating from place to place and shrine to shrine nearly ten years. At this time he composed several of his works, the Ḥaḍātī and books abbreviated from it, such as the Arbūṭīn and Ṭabīṭīn, besides laboring at his own spiritual advancement and growth through the religious exercises of the Ṣāfiya. Then he returned to his home (ṣaḥāra) and lived there a retired life for some time, absorbed in meditation, but gradually becoming more and more sought after as a teacher and guide in the spiritual life. At length Fakhr al-Mulk ʿAlī b. Niẓām al-Mulk Jamāl ash-Shuhādā, who had previously been Wazīr to Bargyārūn, became Wazīr to Sīnŷr, the son of Mālik Shāh at Naysābūr, and by him such pressure

---

1 Ibn al-Athir, A.H. 488, Hanawīdīth.
2 Ibn Khallīf. f. 606.
was put on al-Ghazālī that he finally consented to resume teaching in the Maymūna Niẓāmiya Madrasa there. As Fakhr al-Mulk was assassinated by a Bāṭini on the day of 'Ashūrā, i.e. the tenth of Muharram, 500, it is evident that al-Ghazālī’s own date of Dhū-l-Qa‘da 499 is the latest possible, and is thus protected against the suspicions of Goehe. It may also be worth noticing that Bargjārāq had died in Rabi‘ II, 498; this may have removed an obstacle to al-Ghazālī’s return to public life. It will be remembered that his flight from Baghdād fell after the final victory of Bargjārāq over Tutush, and that the Khalīfa, at whose court he was, had declared for Tutush.

It remains now to endeavor to gather up what can be gained from other sources with regard to this mysterious ten years. Ibn al-Athīr (loc. cit.) tells us that on his journey he composed the Iḥyā‘, and that many heard it from him in Damascus; and that after he had pilgrimaged he returned to Baghdād. ‘Abū al-Ghālīf has already told us about the writing of the Iḥyā‘, and this dating point renders possible the dating of some other of his books. In the Maqāsid al-ğalāṣiyya (p. 4 of Bör’s text) he states that he intends to follow it immediately with a book to be entitled Tahāfut al-ğalāṣiyya. There is a corresponding statement in the prologue to the Tahāfut (p. 6 of edit. of Cairo 1303), only there the Maqāsid is called Miṣyār al-‘ilm; but Goehe has already noticed that these two are titles of one book. Further, in the Tahāfut, p. 21, it is explained that in turn is to be followed by a Qawā'id al-aqā'id. Such a book does not appear in the S.M.’s list, but stands 41 in the list in Wüstenfeld’s Academien. I would suggest that the book in the Iḥyā‘ which bears this title is meant, the second of the first Rubā‘. These three books are all closely related to one another, and al-Ghazālī in the places cited has explained their relationship. The Maqāsid is a compendious statement of the true teachings of the philosophers in all those subjects where doubt can enter, that is logic, physics, and theology. Arithmetic and geometry are excluded as resting on an absolutely demonstrable basis. You may be a believer or not, but you must accept their results in these subjects. All that he intended in this book was to state the facts as to the views of the philosophers. Then in the Tahāfut these views are overthrown by argument; the aim is purely destructive. Finally, in the Qawā'id a system of positive truth is built up to take the place of the errors of the philosophers. Thus the three books follow and complement one another. If, then, the Qawā'id here spoken of is the book so called in the Iḥyā‘, written in the earlier part of his retreat, are we to see in the Maqāsid and Tahāfut the results written at Baghdād of his study of philosophy there? This seems highly probable; we can then regard the Maqāsid as in a sense notes of his two years’ reading, and the Tahāfut as the fruit of his further year of meditation.

To return to his stay at Damascus; that he taught the Iḥyā‘ there may be taken as tolerably certain. Adī-Dhahabī (d. 748) gives us from Ibn ‘Asikir (but the S.M. could not find it in Ibn ‘Asikir’s text) that he used to sit a great deal in the corner (zāniyya) of the Shaykh Naṣr al-Maqīšī in the Ummay Jāmi‘, which is on that account called the Ghazzālī corner. This must be Abū-l-Fath Naṣr b. Ibrāhīm al-Maqīšī, no. 41 in Wüstenfeld’s Academien. Ibn Shubba (died at Damascus 850 or 851) says there (p. 5 of the Arabic text) that Abū-l-Fath became acquainted with al-Ghazālī there and learned from him. As he died in Muharram 490, al-Ghazālī must have been at Damascus for some time before that date. Wüstenfeld (p. 33) says that in this corner the Madrasa Ghazzālīya was afterwards established. That may well have been the case, but I have found no authority for his statement. Adī-Dhahabī goes on to say that he was finally driven away from Damascus by hearing himself quoted formally as an authority by a teacher in the Aminiyā Madrasa. This story can not be true as it stands, for that Madrasa was not founded till 514; and the further stories with which he follows it up are equally impossible. Al-Ghazālī is said to have gone to Alexandria, to have stayed there a time, and to have determined on setting out to Yūsf b. Tashfin, the great Murābiṭ Sulțān of the West on whose behalf we have already found him giving fatwās, when the news of the latter’s death arrived. ‘Ali, the son and successor of Yūsf b. Tashfin, did not show the gratitude for those fatwās which might have been expected. Some such influence as that of Al-Ghazālī could have been vastly needed in the West. The study of the Qur’ān, of tradition, and of theology in the narrower sense (kalām), fell into complete disrepute, and

1 Ibn al-Athīr, A. H. 500; Houtsma, al-Bonārl, 265; Well, Chalīfīn, ill. 209.
1 See, too, Mehren, p. 320; Ibn Khallīl, i. 42.
foreign elders, in the Cradle of 'Isa (upon him be peace) in Jerusalem, and he (al-Ghazzâli, apparently) recited these two lines,

‘May I be thy ransom! were it not for love thou wouldst have ransomed me, but by the magic of two eye-pupils thou hast taken me captive.

I came to thee when my breast was straitened through love, and if thou hast known how was my longing, thou wouldst have come to me.'

Then Abû-l-Hasan al-Baṣrî constrained himself to an ecstasy1 which affected those that were present, and eyes wept and garments were rent, and Muhammad al-Kâzîrânî2 died in the midst of the assembly in ecstasy. I was myself present and saw it.” For the people of Jerusalem, according to SM. (p. 49), he wrote the Risâla al-Qudsîya, as Gosche has already guessed (p. 251). The full title is Ar-risâla al-qudsîya b‘udilatîhî ‘alâ murâdîya fî ‘ilm al-kalâm; a shareh it was written by the author. All this must have been before 492, for in Shaban of that year Jerusalem was captured by the crusaders after having been taken in 491 from the Seljuqs by the Fâtimids. It seems possible to fix with tolerable definiteness another point in his wandering life. Abî-Dhabîhî says that he returned to Baghîdâ, and taught the Ihyâ and preached there. That he was a preacher is certified by his book of sermons, Al-Majâlis al-Ghazzâliyya (SM. p. 42). As-Subki narrates that when he acted as preacher at Baghîdâ, people

1 On the little Masjid near the Stable of Solomon called Mahd ‘Isâ, see Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 166, and Baedeker, Pal. u. Syr., 54.
2 From the root w.j.d, meaning ‘to find,’ then ‘to know’ by means of the intellect, and ‘to love passionately,’ come a number of words of the greatest importance in Sifism. Among them are wujûd, ‘to fall into an ecstasy,’ turwîjada, ‘to constrain oneself to an ecstasy,’ by the will; wujîd, ‘an ecstasy’; wujîd, ‘knowing.’ On the progress toward God, first comes turwîjada, he constrained himself to an ecstasy; then wujîd, the ecstasy itself; then wujîd, the actual knowledge. The use of wujâbîl, or straining to attain ecstasy, is defended by the tradition of the Prophet, “Weep, and if you cannot weep, then strive (or feign) to weep.” See Risâla, pp. 48 ff., and al-Ghazzâli’s Ihyâ, SM. 1, pp. 60 and 65, margin.
3 This cannot be the Muhammad al-Kâzîrânî in Ibn Khall. i. 277; he died 455.
crowded to hear him, and Sā'īd b. Fāris, known as Ibn al-Labhān, sat in the background and took down his sermons to the number of 183; then he read them over to al-Ghazzālī, who corrected them and gave him an ījāza to teach them. The following story is told of his life at this time. I have no other authority for it than the mere name of Abu Sa‘īd an-Nawqānī as quoted by SM. (p. 25), but it fits psychologically into this period of al-Ghazzālī's life. He says that al-Ghazzālī once when teaching the Ihya at Baghdad began to quote,

"He has made beloved the homes of men, as abodes of desire which the heart has decreed them; Wherever they remember their homes these remind them of the pledges of youth there, and they long thither."

Then he wept and those present wept with him. Thereafter some one saw him in the open country with a patched darwish-garment on, a water-vessel and an iron-shod staff in his hand,—all in strange contrast to the state in which he had seen him before, with three hundred pupils around him including one hundred of the chief men of Baghdad. So he said, "O Imām, is not the teaching of science more fitting?" But al-Ghazzālī looked at him with red eyes and said, "When the full moon of happiness rises in the firmament of will, the sun of setting departs in the East of union." Then he recited,

"I abandoned the love of Layla and my happiness was far, and I returned to the companionship of my first alighting-place; then cried to me my longings, 'Welcome! these are the alighting-places of her whom thou lovest, draw up and alight.'"

What he thought of preaching, and how dissatisfied he was with himself as a preacher, is evident from the following quotation which as-Sam‘īnī (SM. p. 12) gives from a letter of his, "I do not think myself worthy to preach; for preaching is like a tax, and the property on which it is imposed is the accepting of preaching to oneself. He, then, who has no property, how shall he pay the tax? and he who lacks a garment, how shall he cover another? and 'When is the shadow straight and the wood crooked?' And God revealed to 'Isa (upon him be peace!), 'Preach to thyself; then, if thou acceptest the preaching, preach to mankind, and if not, be ashamed before me.'"

So he came back at last to Tūs, his native place, towards which he had so longed, and settled down to study and the contemplative life. We have already seen what theological position he had reached. Philosophy had been tried and found wanting. In the Tuhfa he had smitten the philosophers hip and thigh; he had turned, as in earlier times al-Ashtārī, their own weapons against them, and shown that with their premises and methods no certainty could be reached. In that book he goes to the extreme of intellectual skepticism, and, seven hundred years before Hume, he cuts the bond of causality with the edge of his dialectic and proclaims that we can know nothing of cause or effect, but simply that one thing follows another. He combats their proof of the eternity of the world, and exposes their assertion that God is its creator. He demonstrates that they cannot prove the existence of the creator, or that that creator is one; that they cannot prove that he is incorporeal, or that the world has any creator or cause at all; that they cannot prove the nature of God, or that the human soul is a spiritual essence. When he has finished there is no intellectual basis left for life; he stands beside the Greek skeptics and beside Hume. But his end is very different from that of Hume. We are thrown back on revelation, that given immediately by God to the individual soul or that given through prophets. All our real knowledge is derived from these sources. So it was natural that in the latter part of his life he should turn to the study of the traditions of the Prophet. The science of tradition must certainly have formed part of his early studies, as of those of all Muslim theologians, but he had not specialized in it; his bent had lain in quite other directions. His master, the Imām al-Hāramayn, had been no student of tradition; among his many works is not one dealing with that subject (Wartenfeld, Schriftiten, p. 252). Now he saw that the truth and the knowledge of the truth lay there, and he gave himself to the new pursuit with all the energy of his nature. Ibn as-Sami‘īnī (SM. p. 19) tells us that he invited the Ḥāfs Abū-ʿAbdullāh Fīyān, 'Umar b. Abū-ḥasān ar-Ru‘ānī at-Dhīhānī to Tūs, and heard
from him the two Șahibīs, that of al-Bukhārī and that of Muslim. The names of others with whom he studied hadīth are given by his biographers, and all agree in the fact of his change of study. The only point of doubt is whether it fell before or after his call by Fākhīr al-Mulk to teach at Naysābūr. For he did not teach there long; before the end of his life, which was near, we find him back at Tūs, living in retirement among his personal disciples, and having in charge a Madrasa for students and a Khamīqī with monastery, for Şāfīs. But every moment was filled with study, teaching, or devotion, until the end came. The keenness of his intellectual life and the austerities and privation of his long wanderings early wore him out. Nor was his latter end one of peace. ʿAbd al-Ghāfir tells us that it was clouded with controversy, envy and slander, and perhaps in that way the cause of his removal so soon from Naysābūr to Tūs. Ibn as-Samānī (SM. p. 12) tells a story that seems to fit in at this point, and which shows us al-Ghazzālī’s position and influence. He gives it as having been heard by him in Marw directly from the narrator, the muqīr Ṭabīr b. ʿAṣār b. ʿAḥsan b. Ṭabīr. “I went in to the Imám ʿAbd al-Hāmid to take leave of him, and he said to me, ‘Carry this letter to al-Muʿīn ʿAbd al-Qāsim al-Bayhaqī,’ Then he added, ‘There is a complaint in it aganist al-ʿAzīz, the superintendent of muqafs in Tūs.’ [al-ʿAzīz was the nephew of al-Muʿīn.] Then I said, ‘I was at Harān with his uncle al-Muʿīn, and a deputation came from Tūs with a petition praising al-ʿAzīz, and your writing was in it. His uncle had rejected him and driven him away, but when he saw your writing and your praise of him he received him back into favor.’ Then the Imám said, ‘Give the letter to al-Muʿīn and write in it this line, “I have never seen tyranny like the tyranny he has brought on us; he does evil to us, then commands us to be grateful!”’

A man of this kind in such a position could not easily keep out of trouble. Yet his friends recognized how much he was changed from the supercilious, self-confident, fighting al-Ghazzālī of his earlier life. ʿAbd al-Ghāfir has a remark which throws a flood of light upon him at both periods: “However much he met of contradiction and attack and slander, it made no impression on him, and he did not trouble himself to answer his assailants. I visited him many times, and it was no bare conjecture of mine that he, in spite of what I saw in him in time past of malice and roughness towards people, and how he looked upon them contemptuously through his being led astray by what God had granted him of ease in word and thought and expression, and through the seeking of rank and position, had come to be the very opposite and was purified from these stains. And I used to think that he was wrapping himself in the garment of pretence, but I realized after investigation that the thing was the opposite of what I had thought, and that the man had recovered after being mad.” 1 We see here the difficulty that his acquaintances had in grasping the change that had been worked in the brilliant legist. Again, no one ever accused him of a desire for gain. According to Ibn ʿAṣākir (SM. p. 11) he had by inheritance and by what he had earned a fortune sufficient to supply his own needs and those of his family and children. He never needed to appeal to any one in worldly goods, and though fortune presented itself to him he would not receive it, but turned aside from it and was satisfied with that amount by which he could protect his religion and escape the need of asking from any one. How rare this was among Muslim scholars, it is hardly necessary to say.

Another curious illustration of the completeness of the change that came over him and how it was recognized by others is to be found in the fate of his book, the Munāḥāt. It was written in his latter period, for in the Mustaṣfā (SM. p. 42), after mentioning

1 I have put this together from Mehrīn, p. 324, and SM. p. 8. The readings in Mehrīn’s text are sometimes better, but he has altogether omitted the most important part. His abbreviation of Ibn ʿAṣākir is unfortunate, and the further abbreviation in the French version is often misleading.

2 The honesty of this opinion is shown by the fact that ʿAbd al-Ghāfir in some respects thought more highly of al-Kiyā; see Mehrīn, p. 221, and Ibn Khallīf, ii. 229.

3 This seems in contradiction with the story told of the small sum left by his father in charge of his Şāfī friend, above, p. 75.
the Ihya, the Kimmia as-sa’ādu, and the Jawāhir al-Qurʾān, he goes on, "Then the divine decree drove me to promotion to teaching (ṣagārīn il-a-taṣaddun li-ta’dir), and they (my pupils) wrote down some of my notes in the science of the bases of fiqh and obtained a composition whose like never happened in the orderly statement of the bases. Then when they had completed it they offered it to me, and I did not reject their labor but named the book the Manḥīl." But in this book were certain grievous statements' with regard to the Imam Abū Hanifa. They are to be found also in the life of the Imam in the Tawīk of the Haṭthi and in the Mutnaṣim of Abū-l-Faraj al-Jawzi, and do not seem, as given in these last, to have referred to points of doctrine. Al-Ghazzālī was a Shaṭīrī and he did not spare the feelings of the Hanafites. These met the attack in different ways. Some answered railing with railing. So al-Karalari, he attacked in his reply both al-Ghazzālī and ash-Shaṭīrī. Others, again, could not understand how the writer of the Ihya, with its words of praise and respect for Abū Hanifa, could say these things of him. Ibn Ḥajir considered either that the book was forged or that these passages were interpolated. Some went the length of saying that there was a certain Mahmūd al-Ghazzālī, a Muṭtazīlīte, to whom the book ought to be ascribed. But Ibn as-Ṣāhibī and

1 Here I use the Khuyrāt al-ḥiṣān fi manaqib al-Imām Abū Ḥanifa by Ibn Ḥajir al-Haytamī, pp. 4 and 17 of edit. of Cairo 1904.
2 Died 493. Ibn Khallī. i. 75; compare on these animadversions of his on Abū Ḥanifa, Ibn Khallī. ii. 592.
3 Died 597. Ibn Khallī. ii. 296; but al-Jawzi was noted as a fanatical Ḥanbalite and assailant of all the other Imāms and their sects.
4 Schmoller's in his life of al-Ghazzālī in Ersch and Gruber says that al-Ghazzālī's attack evidently bore on very slight details of the ceremonial law. He bases this view on the counter-attack of Muḥammad al-Imādī al-Kurdi, which he examined in the Refa'iyyah MS. 152. With this fails to the ground the note of Geesch (p. 308, note 63). He endeavors to prove from al-Ghazzālī's having fallen foul of Abū Ḥanifa, his wide divergence from orthodox Ḥanāfī. It was really a case of the ta’assub that always raged to a greater or less degree among the followers of the different Imāms.
5 Bi-fathih-a-l-kaf, Ibn Ḥajir, p. 10. Is this al-Kurdi, the author of Refa'iyyah 152?

1 Ḥkh. iii. 833, No. 5897, on the authority of al-Ṭabi b. Khāqān (author of the Qudam’id), who had found a marginal note to that effect in a MS. Yet mystics were hostile to Abū Ḥanifa; see Goldscheider in ZDMG. xxviii. 308.
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others, especially pupils of at-Taftāzānī,—and this is the point to which I would draw attention,—considered in the teeth of al-Ghazzālī's own statement, or in ignorance of it, that the Manḥīl was a work of his youth, of his green and fighting days before his conversion. From the way in which Ibn Ḥajir speaks it is evident that there was a great gulf recognized between his two periods. In the first he was an unregenerate lawyer, jealous for his own party and given up to dialectic controversy of a burschikos nature, if I understand rightly the Arabic bi-hāṣami talababī-‘ilím; in the second he was a theologian, grave and reverent in his attitude and methods, though in the Iḥyā he sometimes displays a vein of humorous sarcasm that must have made him a terror in his younger days, as when, in defence of the singing of poetry, he explains elaborately that nightingales do not recite from the Qurʾān.

The last of his works' was the Minhāj al-‘ābidīn, a guide on the way to the other world for those who were not fitted to understand the Iḥyā. Mahfīz ad-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī claimed it for a certain Abū-l-Ḥasan ‘Ali b. Khallī as-Sibī‘.

Al-Ghazzālī died on Monday, the fourteenth of Jumāda II, 505 (Dec. 18th, 1111). His brother Ahmad (quoted by SM. p. 11 through Ibn Jawzi's Kitāb ath-thabāb ‘ind-al-mamāl) gives the following account of his death: "On Monday, at dawn, my brother performed the ablation and prayed. Then he said, 'Bring me my grave-clothes,' and he took them and kissed them, and laid them on his eyes and said, 'I hear and obey to go in to the King.' And he stretched out his feet and went to meet Him, and was taken to the good will of God Most High." He was buried at, or outside of, Tābrīz, the citadel of Tūs, and Ibn as-Sam‘īn visited his grave there.

Such is the simple story of his death and burial which his immediate biographers give; but the pious imagination could not be so easily satisfied, and legends soon began to spring up. One of them is given by the SM. (p. 11) from the Baḥja an-nawzīn wa’uns al-‘ārifīn by Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-‘Āzm al-Uṣummārī, a source which I am unable to verify. His story runs, 'When death drew near to the Imam Abū Ḥamīd al-Ghazzālī, he com-

1 SM. p. 43, and Schreiner in ZDMG. xlviii. 43, with references there.
2 Abū-l-Fidā, Geography, p. 123 of Arabic text. In Yaqūṭ there is only a line saying that Uṣummār belongs to Ṣanḥāja.
manded his servant, an excellent and religious man, to dig his grave in the middle of his house and to summon the people of the neighboring villages to attend his funeral; that they should not touch him, but that a company of three men unknown in the region of al-Irāq would come out of the desert, that two of them would wash him and the third would undertake the prayer over him without the advice or command of anyone. Then, when he died, the servant did according to all that he had commanded, and required the presence of the people. And when the people gathered to attend the funeral, they saw three men who had come out of the desert. Two of them began to wash the corpse, while the third vanished and did not appear. But when they had washed him and arranged him in the grave-clothes and carried his bier and laid it on the edge of the grave, the third appeared wrapped in his robe with a black border on both sides, turbaned with wool, and he prayed for him and the people prayed with him. Then he gave the benediction and departed and hid from the people. And some of the excellent of the people of al-Irāq who were present at the funeral had noticed him carefully, but did not know him until some of them heard a Hātīf in the night saying to them, 'The man who led the people in prayer is Abū 'Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Ishāq Amghar, the Sharīf. He came from the farthest Maghrib, from 'Ayn al-Qatr (?), and those who washed the corpse are his comrades Abū Shu'ayb Ayyūb b. Sa'd b. Uzummūr and Abū ʿĪsā Wāṣījīh.' And when they heard that they journeyed from al-Irāq to Sanhāja of Uzummūr, to the farthest Maghrib, and when they had reached them and asked of them their prayers, they returned to al-Irāq and related it to the Sāfīs and published their miracle (karāma). Then a company of them, when they heard that, went to visit them and found them to be those whom they had noticed carefully, and they asked of them their prayers. And this is a strange story."

 There is also a story told of a celebrated saint, the Qub Shihāb ad-Dīn ʿAbd Allâh aṣ-Ṣayyād al-Yamani az-Zabīdī, a contemporary of al-Ghazzālī, that he said, "While I was sitting one day, I perceived the gates of heaven opened, and a company of blessed angels descended, having with them a green robe and a precious steed. They stood by a certain grave and brought forth its tenant and clothed him in the green robe and set him on the steed and ascended with him from heaven to heaven till he passed the seven heavens and rent after them sixty veils, and I know not whither at last he reached. Then I asked about him, and was answered, 'This is the Imām al-Ghazzālī.' That was after his death; may God Most High have mercy on him!" The same writer tells us on the authority of ʿAbd al-Amīrī that al-Ghazzālī enjoyed the supreme dignity of Qub for three days. Naturally, the working of miracles (karāma) was ascribed to him, and we can trace the development of belief in this. 'Abd al-Ghāfir, his personal friend, does not seem to ascribe karāma to him anywhere, but Abū Bakr ash-Shāhī (i. Shawwāl 507, rather more than two years after al-Ghazzālī; see Mehrz, p. 324, and Ibn Khalīl, ii. 925) has a story that is worth telling. "In our time there was a man in Egypt who disliked al-Ghazzālī and abused him and slandered him. And he saw the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace!) in a dream; Abū Bakr and 'Umar (may God be well pleased with both of them!) were at his side, and al-Ghazzālī was sitting before him, saying, 'O Apostle of God, this man speaks against me!" Thereupon the Prophet said, 'Bring the whip!' So the man was beaten on account of al-Ghazzālī. Then the man awoke from sleep, and the marks of the

1 From the Taʾrīf al-ahyā bi-faqāṭīl al-Ilāy by 'Abd al-Qādir b. Shāykh b. 'Abd Allāh b. Shāykh b. 'Abd Allāh al-ʿAydarus al-BaʿAlawi; 978-1038. He is No. 54 in Wustenfeld's Chresten in Süd-Arabien, and this book is No. 12 on p. 38 of the same. He, therefore, cannot be the al-ʿAydarus of whom the SM. speaks on p. 18 as his shaykh, and says that he heard from him. On the meaning of ʿAydarus and BaʿAlawi see Wustenfeld's book above.

I can find no trace of him. The SM. also was from Zabīd, and his nisba is not Zubayyīd as sometimes written.

2 Compare the Durra (edit. Gautier), 11 ff.

3 Goldscher, Muham. Studien, ii. 289, and the passages there referred to. Also Fisgel in his article on ash-Sharʿānī, ZDMG. xx. 97 ff., note 48-59.

4 Goldscher, ii. 972 ff.
whips remained on his back, and he was wont to weep and tell the story. The Muslim imagination was evidently tickled by this kind of dream, for a similar story is told, with a long *iṣnad*, of Ibn Ḥirzahānān al-Maghribi, another assailant of al-Ghazzālī. At first the miracles were ascribed to al-Ghazzālī after his death. Fakhr ad-Dīn ibn ‘Asākir (d. 629) says that God distinguished him with different kinds of *karāmāt* in the other world, as He had distinguished him with various sciences in this; but ‘Abd al-Qādir (quoted above) boldly changes (margin of SM. p. 28) “with various sciences” (*bi-funūnati-ṭīlm*) into “with them” (*bihā*), and gives him miracles in both worlds. In some cases these later miracles involve chronological difficulties so serious that even the SM. sees them. Several (pp. 10 and 22) are connected with the burning of the *Iḥyā‘* al-Mahrīya by order of the last Murūbšt Sultan, ‘Alī b. Yūnūs b. Tashfin (reg. 500–537). According to the story the fortune of the Sultan changed immediately thereafter, and the success of the Muwahhidī leader ‘Abd al-Mu‘min h. ‘Ali was due to the insult to al-Ghazzālī. Certainly the punishment was long in coming if we are to believe another story, which dates the burning on the eleventh of Muharram or Safar 560.

On that date a certain Abu ‘Abd Allāh Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Mun‘im al-‘Afdāri saw in sleep at Alexandria the sun rising in the west. Dream-readers interpreted this as some strange event happening there, and in a few days news arrived of the burning. But the most impossible of all chronologically is a story of the fate of the Qādī ‘Iyād who gave a formal *fitna* condemning the books of al-Ghazzālī. He is said (in its later forms the story is long and picturesquely told) to have died suddenly in the bath at the moment when al-Ghazzālī cursed him. Even the SM. stumbles at this, and points out that the Qādī ‘Iyād died 544, thirty-nine years after al-Ghazzālī. Further, this must be some quite different story of the condemnation and burning of the *Iḥyā‘*, for in ‘Abd al-Wahīd’s narrative and that in the *Hudūl* (*vide supra*) the

---

1 SM. p. 27. Compare ḤKh. i. 81 and vii. 570, where the story is given at length.
2 Ibn. Khall. iii. 206 and iv. 460.
3 *Vide supra*, where, however, the *Iḥyā‘* is not specially mentioned and nothing is said of al-Mahrīya. In the narrative here I use the SM.
4 Compare the story of al-Ṭarṣūshīf and how he killed al-Afdal Shāhīnshāh; Ibn Khall. ii. 668.
5 Ibn Khall. ii. 417.

---

Qādī Abū-l-Faḍl ‘Iyād does not come in at all. Nor can I find in the lives of him in Ibn Khalilikān, in the *Ṣiḥa* of Ibn Bashkuwāl (no. 972), or in the *Muṣlam* of Ibn al-Abbār (no. 279), any reference to this incident, or to that other story of his death which the SM. tells, how the people of his district accused him to Ibn Tūmart, the Mahdi, of being a Jew because he did not come among them on the Sabbath,—this was really because he was writing at that time his great book the *Ṣifā‘*, whereupon the Mahdi had him put to death. In such a bundle of anachronisms it is a mere detail that the Mahdi died in 524, twenty years before his victim. It is, further, hardly necessary to point out that the burning cannot be dated in 500 on any hypothesis, least of all if the Qādī ‘Iyād is to be made responsible for it; at that date he was only twenty-four.

But there does seem to be foundation for the story which ascribes to al-Ghazzālī an early influence on the life of Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Tūmart, the Mahdi of the Muwahhidīs, or Almohades, called shortly Ibn Tūmart or al-Mahdī. The materials for his life are tolerably copious and most intolerably contradictory. I have been unable to find any that can be regarded as first-hand sources. I have here to deal only with that part which brings him into contact with al-Ghazzālī. ‘Abd al-Wahīd (wrote 921) says that Ibn Tūmart traveled in the East in pursuit of knowledge in 501 (this makes Ibn Khalilikān’s statement that he was born in Muharram 488 scarcely possible), and that he met al-Ghazzālī in Syria in the latter’s ascetic days—but God knows best. (‘Abd al-Wahīd’s doubt is justifiable, for we have seen that al-Ghazzālī’s wandering life ceased in 490.) Further, that al-Ghazzālī was told in Ibn Tūmart’s presence about the burning of his books, and thereupon cursed ‘Ali and prayed that his kingdom might pass away and his children be slain. “And I do not think that he who is entrusted with that is any but one present in our assembly,” al-Ghazzālī added. Then Ibn Tūmart returned to the Maghribī by way of Alexandria by ship. On the voyage he so worried the crew with his exhortations to piety that they flung him overboard. He is kept afloat and alongside the ship for half a day till the crew see he is a saint. Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630) *sub anno* 514 also gives a life of Ibn Tūmart: he

---

1 The SM. gives him in the list of al-Ghazzālī’s pupils (p. 44), but has no details.
travels as a youth in al-Iraq and studies under several theologians; the story of his meeting al-Ghazzali is an invention of the Maghrabi historians; he makes a stay at Mecca and returns to al-Mahdiya in Africa in 505. Ibn Khalidān, iii. 205 ff., gives a long life: Ibn Tūmart went in pursuit of knowledge to al-Iraq, there met al-Ghazzali and others, pilgrimaged, and stayed a long time at Mecca, returned home by way of Cairo and Alexandria, and arrived at al-Mahdiya some time between 505 and 512; al-Qiftī (d. 646) is quoted as dating his departure from Egypt in 511. In the Qarṣa (ed. Tornberg, pp. 110 ff.) we have a similar story: he studied with al-Ghazzali, who paid great attention to him and said he showed the qualities of a founder of empire. He spent three years with him, and left the East finally in 510. Ibn Khalidān (Histoire des Berbères, trad. de S. de Slane, ii. 163 ff.; and on Ibn Tūmart as Mahdi, Prolegomenes, trad. de Slane, i. 53) tells of an interview of Ibn Tūmart with al-Ghazzali, who encouraged him in his design; but from the tone it is doubtful whether Ibn Khalidān believed this. It seems to be certain that Ibn Tūmart travelled and studied in the East during the latter part of al-Ghazzali's life, and perhaps after his death. An early and persistent tradition among Western historians, makes him a pupil of al-Ghazzali, and in this tradition there is nothing impossible. That he commissioned Ibn Tūmart to avenge the burning of his books we may leave alone; it is improbable that that event took place during his life-time. Even that he saw in Ibn Tūmart a future reformer of religion in the West may be regarded as unlikely. He had not long before given a fatwā in support of Yāsuf b. Tāshfin, the father, and the corruption of manners and hostility to the study of theology could not, before his death, have gone so far that he would turn against 'Ali, the son. But it is undoubtedly the victory of the Muwahhidūn was a victory for the theology which al-Ghazzali had identified himself. 1 Though Ibn Tūmart professed to be the Mahdi and a descendant of 'Ali b. Abī Tālib, he was an orthodox Ash'arīte in all but two points: he held the impeccability of the Imām; and inclined to Mu'tazīlīte views as to the Qualities (aṣīfāt) of God, running perilously near, if not entirely

---

1 Since writing the above I find the same general conclusion reached by Goldziher in his article on the Almohadī in the ZDMG. xii. 30-140; see especially p. 66.

---

*It may be worth noticing that Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Māzarī (d. 536; Ibn Khallī, iii. 4) regarded the Iṣlāḥ as made up of a mixture of the doctrines of the Muwahhidūn, the Philosophers, and the Sūfīs. Al-Māzarī's chronology is shaky, but he gives early testimony to the belief in a connection between al-Ghazzālī and Ibn Tūmart. The SM. (p. 29) quotes him apparently though Ibn as-Subkī, who goes on to discuss his position, and explains it as due to Muḥtārī, especially Maghrūbi, anti-Shāfi'i jealousy. Al-Māzarī further asserts that al-Ghazzālī based on the books of Abū Hāyān at-Tawhsīlī; this is combated by Ibn as-Subkī, who says that rather the reverse is true, al-amr bi-khilaṣ dhikrīya. If this is the Abū Hāyān at-Tawhsīlī of Ibn Khallī, i. 50 and iii. 504, who was a shaykh of the Sūfīs and was alive in 400, I do not understand how he could say so; but I can find no other Abū Hāyān at-Tawhsīlī. 1Kkh. gives many of his books. It is also a possibility that al-Māzarī's reference may not be so anachronistic after all. He may not have meant the political sect of the Muwahhidūn, which was only rising to importance in his day, or the pantheistic views of Ibn Tūmart in which he separated from the Ash'arīes (see his Tawhīdī formula in Goldziher, ZDMG. xii. 72 ff.). There may have been a religious sect of old date holding the same or similar pantheistic views, and the curious nīshāt, at-Tawhīdī, may be related to it. The explanations of the nīshā at given by Ibn Khallī and the Anābīb writers are evidently absurd. Tawhīdī as a theological formula usually refers to God's oneness; but it may also have had another, narrower, and somewhat pantheistic nuance. Ibn Khallī, iii. 20 tells us that Abū Tālib al-Makki, a high Sūfī and the author of the Qīr al-qurūb, wrote on Tawhīd. 1 On the original book al-Jafī, left by 'Abī, but only to be interpreted finally by the Mahdī, see Dict. of Techin. Terms, i. 302 f.; Ibn Khallī, Musqaddāma, Bulāq ed. 278 f.; 1Kkh. ii. 603 ff. On Ibn al-Jafī and the literature it produced see Ahlwardt in Berlin Cat., iii. 531 f.; Rieu, Suppl. to the Cat. of Arab. MSS. in Brit. Mus., No. 828, and literature vol. xx.
legend, too, constructed by some one who had no very intimate acquaintance with al-Ghazzālī's views. We have seen what he thought of the Ta'limites with their infallible Imām. I have not yet found any allusion in him to the Jafry, but he probably thought the same of it and of the believers in it. Evidently he was regarded by the Muwāhidūn as its custodian till it passed into the hands of Ibn Tūmart, the Maliki and its final interpreter. The story goes in the same class with that of his three days, Qutb-shāh; I have no further light on either.

So much it has seemed necessary to add concerning al-Ghazzālī's position in the popular mind after his death, and the legends that gathered round his figure. It now remains to consider somewhat more systematically his theological and philosophical position, and especially, the charge which has been brought against him of insincerity and of having a secret doctrine. This consideration of his intellectual position can lay no claim to be exhaustive—the time has not yet come for such a treatment; its aim is only to bring out the salient points of his teaching and to render somewhat more intelligible his mystical views.

And here, in the first place, it must be said that his views tend upon examination to lose their peculiar individuality. He does not cease to be either a mystic or a sceptic, to lead generation back to the study of Scripture and Tradition, or to arouse their consciences by the fear of hell, but we find that others—his predecessors, contemporaries, and successors—were and did the same. Thus the Mutakallimīn, Asbārite, Māturidīte, and Mu'tazīlate, were sceptics before him; all, philosophers and theologians, were mystics more or less; reform in Islam and re-awakening of religious life had always come and have always come through a return there; Steinacher in ZDMG. xxviii. 630 and 633. Compare, too, on the whole subject, Goldziher, Literaturgeschichte der Sīta, 54 ff.; de Goeje, Mémoire sur les Caramathés, 118 ff.; Goldziher, ZDMG. xli. 129 ff.; Kay, Early Medieval History of Yaman, pp. 39, 145, 249. M. P. Casonova, in an exceedingly interesting and important Notice in a recent number of the Journal Asiatique (1886 sér., xli. 151 ff.), brings together the equally mysterious Jamā'ā, the Ikhbān as-Ṣafīd, and the Assasain. His promised article in the Notices et Extraits will throw much light on all three.

1 Compare the similar story given from a Turkish MS. by Goldziher in ZDMG. xli. 124, note 1.

1 The system of Dante and Milton and Shakspeare; see a good description of it and of its use by Dante in The Quarterly Review for April, 1898.

2 How far al-Ghazzālī would have assented in its details to the view of the origin of the universe developed on Aristotelian and Neoplatonic lines by al-Fārābī in his ʿUyun al-maṣādīl (edit. Dieterici, pp. 56 ff.),

to the study of the simple Word and a realization of the terrors of an avenging God. Al-Ghazzālī becomes part of a stream of tendency, and shows his greatness in that, with the same views and starting-point as those around him, he has transcended all the other doctors of Islam and graven his name ineffaceably in the record of the toils and triumphs of the human mind.

His views on science, as we have already seen, were the same as those of the contemporary students of natural philosophy. Their teachings he accepted, and, so far, can be compared to a theologian of the present day who accepts evolution and explains it to suit himself. His world was framed on what is commonly called the Ptolemaic system. He was no flat-earth man like the present Ulama of Islam; God had "spread out the earth like a carpet," but that did not hinder him from regarding it as a globe. Around it revolve the spheres of the seven planets and that of the fixed stars; Alfonso the Wise of Castile had not yet added the crystalline sphere and the primum mobile. All that astronomers and mathematicians teach us of the laws under which these bodies move is to be accepted. Their theory of eclipses and of the other phenomena of the heavens is true, whatever the ignorant and superstitions may clamor. Yet it is to be remembered that the most important facts and laws have been divinely revealed; as the weightiest, truths of medicine are to be traced back to the teaching of the prophets, so there are conjunctions in the heavens which only occur once in a thousand years and which man can yet calculate because God has taught him their laws. And if this structure of the heavens and the earth is the direct work of God, produced out of nothing by His will, guided by His will, every dependent for its existence on His will, and one day to pass away at His command. So al-Ghazzālī joins science and revelation. Behind the order of nature lies the personal, omnipotent God who says, "Be!" and it is. The things of existence do not proceed from Him by any emanation or evolution, but are produced directly by Him. The ʿṢuṣūm in which he had found light tended later to ally itself with a form of Neoplatonism,
assimilating to itself the system of Plotinus with its ṣūra, its ṣwx, its ṣwār, its receptive and active intellects, its being and non-being, a tendency which so increased in time that Suffism came to mean pantheism; but al-Ghazzālī is still a strict theist.

Further, there is another side of al-Ghazzālī's attitude towards the physical universe that deserves attention but which is very difficult either to grasp or to express. Perhaps it may be stated thus: Existence has three modes; there is existence in the ʿālam al-mulk, in the ʿālam al-jabarī, and in the ʿālam al-malakāt. The first is this world of ours which is apparent to the senses; it exists by the power (qudra) of God, one part proceeding from another in constant change. The ʿālam al-malakāt exists by God's eternal decree, without development, remaining in one state without addition or diminution. The ʿālam al-jabarī comes between these two; it seems externally to belong to the first, but in respect of the power of God which is from all eternity (al-qudra al-asāliyya) it is included in the second. The soul (nafs) belongs to the ʿālam al-malakāt, is taken from it, and returns to it in sleep and in ecstasy, even in this world, it can come into contact with the world from which it is derived. This is what happens in dreams—sleep is the brother of death, says al-Ghazzālī (Maḏnūn, p. 42); and thus, too, the saints and philosophers attain divine knowledge. Some angels belong to the world of malakāt; some to that of jabarī, apparently those who have shown themselves here on earth as messengers of God (Durra, p. 2). The things in the heavens, the Preserved Tablet, the Pen, the Balance, etc., belong to the world of malakāt (Imāl, pp. 216 ff). On the one hand, these are not sensible, corporeal things; and on the other these terms for them are not metaphors. Thus al-Ghazzālī avoids the difficulty of Muslim eschatology with its bizarre concreteness. He rejects the right to allegorize—things are real, actual; but he relegates them to this world of malakāt. Again, the Qurān, Islam, and Friday (the day of public worship) are personalities in the worlds of malakāt and jabarī (Durra, pp. 107 ff). So, too, the world of mulk must appear as a personality at the bar of these other worlds at the last day. It will come as an ugly woman, but Friday as a beautiful young bride. This personal Qurān belongs to the world of jabarī, but Islam to that quality denoted by the epithet jabārī. I can give nothing to bridge the gap between these usages and those of al-Ghazzālī. Al-Fārābī already appears to have the same view of the words as al-Ghazzālī; see his Philosophische Abhandlungen, pp. 90 and 71, §§ 13 and 26, in the Arabic text of Dieterici's ed.—the German transl. is hardly adequate. But after him 'Abd ar-Razzāq (i.e. p. 161) explains the world of jabarī as that of the angels, whose qualities and perfections repair the imperfections of the other beings, or who constrain the other beings to seek perfection, according to the two meanings of the root jbr; and (p. 107) the world of malakāt as that which moves by the permission of God, sets everything in motion, and directs the affairs of the universe, evidently thinking of the name as meaning reigning, ruling. The world of mulk is referred to by 'Abd ar-Razzāq as the world of shahāda, i.e. of witness, or the sensible world.

Durra, 70. With an appreciation of this falls to the ground Nöldeke's criticism of al-Ghazzālī in his review of the Durra in the Liter. Centralblatt, Jan. 12, 1878, col. 56.

Is there a connection here with the Sabbath Bride (Heine's Princess Sabbath) of Judaism?
of malakāt, thus agreeing with the later position of 'Abd ar-Razzāq (l. c. pp. 160 ff.), who gives as a name for the 'ālam al-jabarāt, the ʿumm al-kitāb, and for the universal soul which exists in the 'ālam al-malakāt, the nābī al-malāfīk.

But, just as those three worlds are not to be thought of as separate in time, so they are not separate in space. They are not like the seven heavens and seven earths of Muslim literatis, which stand, story-fashion, one above the other. Rather, they are, as I expressed it above, modes of existence, and might be compared to the speculations upon another life in space of a dimensions framed, from a very different standing point and on a basis of pure physics, by Balfour Stewart and Tait in their Unseen Universe. On another side they stand in close kinship to the Platonic world of ideas, whether through Neoplatonism or more immediately. Šāfiʿism at its best, and when stripped of the trappings of Muslim tradition and of Qurʿānic exegesis, has no reason to shrink from the investigation either of the physicist or of the metaphysician. And so it is not strange to find that all Muslim thinkers have been tinged with mysticism to a greater or less degree, though they may not all have embraced formal Šāfiʿism and accepted its vocabulary and system. This is true of al-Fārābī, who was avowedly a Šāfiʿī; 2 true also of Ibn Sinā, who, though nominally an Aristotelian, was essentially a Neoplatonist, and admitted the possibility of intercourse with superior beings and with the Active Intellect, of miracles and revelations; 3 true even of Ibn Rushd, who does not venture to deny the immediate knowledge of the Šāfiʿī saints, but only argues that the experience of it is not sufficiently general to be made a basis for theological science.

In ethics, as we have already seen, the position of al-Ghazzālī is a simple one. All our laws and theories upon the subject, the analysis of the qualities of the mind, good and bad, the tracing of hidden defects to their causes, and the methods of combating them, are not original. All these things we owe to the saints of God to whom God Himself has revealed them. Of these there have been many at all times and in all countries,—God has never left Himself without a witness,—and without them and their labors and the light which God has vouchsafed to them, we could never know ourselves. Here, as everywhere, comes out clearly al-Ghazzālī's fundamental position that the ultimate source of all knowledge is revelation from God. It may be major revelation, through accredited prophet who come forward as teachers, divinely sent and supported by miracles and by the evident truth of their message appealing to the human heart, or it may be minor revelation—subsidiary and explanatory—through the vast body of saints of different grades to whom God has granted immediate knowledge of Himself. Where the saints leave off, the prophets begin; and, apart from such teaching, man, even in physical science, would be groping in the dark.

This position becomes still more prominent in his philosophical system. I have already sketched his agnostic attitude towards the results of pure thought. It is essentially the same as that taken up by Mansell in his Bampton Lecture on The Limits of Religious Thought. Mansell, a pupil and continuator of Hamilton, developed and emphasized Hamilton's doctrine of the relativity of knowledge, and applied it to theology, maintaining that we cannot know or think of the absolute and infinite, but only of the relative and finite. Hence, he went on to argue, we can have no positive knowledge of the attributes of God. This, though disguised by the methods and language of scholastic philosophy, is al-Ghazzālī's attitude in the Taḥāšt. Mansell's opponents said that he was like a man sitting on the branch of a tree and sawing off his seat. Al-Ghazzālī for the support of his seat went back to revelation, either major, in the books sent down to the prophets, or minor, in the personal revelations of God's saints. But in this sceptical attitude al-Ghazzālī was not original; it had been already held by the Mutakallimun, or scholastic theologians, and for an excellent development of their philosophical system reference can be made to Ritter's Essay Über unsere Kenntniss der arabischen Philosophie. 4 This I consider the best part of

1 The later Šāfiʿism of Ibn 'Arabī and his followers seems to have borne much the same relation to the Šāfiʿism of al-Ghazzālī and his times that in Neoplatonism was borne by the Syrian thaumaturgic school of Iamblichus and his followers to the earlier Alexandrian school of Plotinus.


4 Göttingen, 1844. Not so good in his Geschichte der Philosophie, Hamburg, 1844, vii. 708 ff. The strict founder of the sceptical school of scholastic theologians appears to have been al-Baṣīrī (d. 408); see on him Schreiner, Zur Geschichte des Avicenthus, 108 ff.
his treatment of the Arabic philosophy, and his judgment that it is rather in the schools of the Muslim dogmatic theologians than in those of the Arabic Aristotelians that the real Arabic philosophy is to be sought, to be the true word yet spoken on this subject. Further, it was not only in the Muslim schools that this attitude towards philosophy prevailed. Yehuda Halevi (d. A. D. 1145; al-Ghazzālī d. 1111) also maintains in his Kusūrī the insufficiency of philosophy in the highest questions of life, and bases religious truth on the incontrovertible historical facts of revelation. And Maimonides (d. 1204) in his Moreh Ne'uchotim takes essentially the same position."

Of his views on dogmatic theology little need be said. Among modern theologians he stands nearest to Ritschl. Like Ritschl, he rejects metaphysics, and opposes the influence of any philosophical system on his theology. The basis must be religious phenomena, simply accepted and correlated. Like Ritschl, too, he was emphatically ethical in his attitude; he lays stress on the value for us of a doctrine or a piece of knowledge. Our source of religious knowledge is revelation, and beyond a certain point we must not enquire as to the how and why of that knowledge; to do so would be to enter metaphysics and the danger-zone where we lose touch with vital realities and begin to use mere words. On one point he goes beyond Ritschl, and on another Ritschl goes beyond him. In his devotion to the facts of the religious consciousness Ritschl did not go so far as to become a mystic; al-Ghazzālī did. But, on the other hand, Ritschl refused absolutely to enter upon the nature of God or upon the divine attributes—that was mere metaphysics and heathenism; al-Ghazzālī did not so far emancipate himself, and his only advance was to keep the doctrine on a strictly Qurānī basis—so it stands written; not, so man is compelled by the nature of things to think.

Passing from these general considerations to details, any one who will read his creed, translated by Ockley and prefixed by him to his History of the Saracens, and compare it with that of al-Ash'ārī, or with such a standard creed as that of ān-Naṣṣāfī, will see that he stood on the basis of orthodox Islam. It is true that he was attacked by the theologians of his own time and later. Among them were al-Māzārī (d. 536; Ibn Khall. iii. 4), al-Tarāfshī (d. 520; Ibn Khall. ii. 685), Ibn al-Ṣāliḥ (d. 643; Ibn Khall. ii. 188), and Ibn Qayyim (d. 731; Ḥikh. sub Shems ad-Din Mohamad b. Abi Bekr); but the points which they raise are either trifling or show that their objection is to his method of approaching theology, that is to say that he is philosophical or to his Sufi studies. In this connection it must always be borne in mind that there is nothing as to a theologian's dogmatic position. He may be orthodox or heretical, an Ash'ārites, a Muṭṭaliqites, a Mu'tazilites, a theist or a pantheist, a Shāffīte or a Ḥanāfite. Thus al-Ghazzālī was a theist, an Ash'ārite, and a Shāffīte, but, as far as his Sufism was concerned, he might have been anything else. One of the most important of the points raised against him was that he said that this was the best possible world, and that he therefore limited the power of God. The SM. (i. pp. 32 ff.) deals with this point himself; but it had arisen even in al-Ghazzālī's time, and he has treated it at length in the Imālī (edit. on margin of SM. i. 92 ff.). Taqī ad-Din ad-Subkī also wrote a defence of al-Ghazzālī, and the SM. (i. p. 31) quotes an interesting passage from it, in which he compares al-Ghazzālī to a Muslim champion who attacks the unbelievers, defeats them, and drives them in flight; then he returns, bespattered with their blood, washes it off before the people, and engages in public prayer; some Muslims imagine that he has not washed it off completely, and blame him. Evidently ad-Subkī felt that some experiences of al-Ghazzālī in his polemic life might have been compromising, or some of his utterances rash, but that he had later cleared himself, and that these should be passed over for the services done by him to the Faith. Another point often raised against him was that he degraded the scientific study of theology and opposed it to the pietism and cæstasies of the Śāfīs. All his theological opponents seem to have alleged this (for an account of these attacks generally see SM. i. pp. 28-40), and we find it also brought forward, from a philosophical standpoint, by Ibn Rushd. Yet no reader of the little treatise which I have translated can fail to notice the emphasis which al-Ghazzālī throws upon ʿilm, or science, in theol-

---

1 Ueberweg, History of Philosophy, pp. 437 ff. of the English trans. of 1876.

2 Spitta, Al-Ash'arī, 88 ff.

3 Translated and commented on in The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, xii. 93 ff., and xiii. 140 ff.

---

1 The SM. mentions Ibn Rushd’s reply to the Tahdīf, but does not seem to know anything more about him. His book on the relation of philosophy and theology, to which we shall come shortly, was evidently unknown to him.
ogy. It is a case of the common inability of one theological mind to appreciate or to do justice to the position of another. In this respect the history of Muslim polemics is even more exasperating to the student than that of Christendom; and in this case Ibn Rushd, the Aristotelian philosopher, is quite as blind a partisan as any of the theologians; Ibn Ṭūfayl (Ḥay b. Yaqqūn, pp. 18 ff.) shows much more appreciation and insight. From the account which has preceded of al-Ghazzālī's experiences in his own search for truth, the relation which he laid down between scientific theology and the immediate insight of the Sufi should be clear. He had gained a knowledge of, and a belief in, God, prophecy, and the future life, through thought; but it was not an absolutely certain knowledge. It did not stand so sure to him as that the whole must be greater than the part; but yet it was a satisfactory, sufficient knowledge and belief. It had broken down before, it might break down again; yet where one could not have any more, it was ample for the religious life, and the man who had it should call himself a believer. But through the vision of the Sufi it became absolutely certain and immediate; these things from objects of thought changed to objects of direct knowledge. And so he held that any one who wished to reach such absolute certainty and immediate knowledge must follow the path of the mystic; only so could he find rest. But, again, no one except one who was theologically schooled should venture to enter upon that path. It was beset with pitfalls; at every turn lay the risk of some frightful blasphemy. Many had been ruined in this way, and none could pass safely but the scientific student.

I give now a brief statement of al-Ghazzālī's work and influence in Islam. It may be said to have been fourfold: First, he led men back from scholastic labour upon theological dogmas to living contact with, study and exegesis of, the Word and the Traditions. What happened in Europe when the yoke of medieval scholasticism was broken, what is happening with us now, happened in Islam under his leadership. He could be a scholar with scholastics, but to state and develop theological doctrine on a Scriptural basis was emphatically his method. We should now call him a Biblical theologian. To get back in this way to fundamental facts, and away from the reasoning about facts, has always proved, and it alone can prove, the exit from scholasticism. Al-Ash'ari had done the same two hundred years before. One hundred years later Ibn Rushd again attempted it. In our own time Aloys Sprenger tried the same path to introduce new life into Indian Islam, but he failed. The bones were too dry, or he had not the faith and personality of al-Ghazzālī.

Second, in his preaching and moral exhortations he re-introduced the element of fear. In the Munāqṣa and elsewhere he lays stress on the need of such a striking of terror into the minds of the people. His was no time, he held, for smooth, hopeful preaching; no time for optimism either as to this world or the next. The horrors of hell must be kept before men; he had felt them himself. We have seen how other-worldly was his own attitude, and how the fear of the Fire had been the supreme motive in his conversion; and so he treated others.

Third, it was by his influence that Sufism attained a firm and assured position within the Church of Islam. He did not first introduce it to orthodox Islam; from its earliest beginnings it had been within the pale; though, it is true, there had always been a pantheistic Sufism without the pale, compromising that which was within. The Imam al-Haramayn had been a devout Sufi: al-Qushayri, the well-known author of the Risāla, had been a Sufi; many besides of his teachers had been Sufis. But just as Al-Ash'ari's introduction of Kalam, or scholastic theology, had been but the final stage of a long previous development, culminating in his personal experience and public work, so it fell to al-Ghazzālī to give tasawwuf formally a place in the system of Islam. With the names of those two men are associated the two greatest turning-points in the history of the Muslim Church; both were great leaders, men of intense personality and force, yet both were, in a singular degree, children of their times.

Fourth, he brought philosophy and philosophical theology within the range of the ordinary mind. Before his time they had been surrounded, more or less, with mystery. The language used was strange; its vocabulary and terms of art had to be specially learned. No mere reader of the Arabic of the street or the mosque or the school could understand at once a philosophical tractate. Greek ideas and expressions, passing through a Syriac version into Arabic, had strained to the utmost the

1 For an account of this see ZDMG. xxxii. 12.
2 See Goldscheider in ZDMG. xxviii. 323.
3 On this most interesting and essential distinction see von Kremer's account of the origins of 'Sufism in his Herrschende Ideen, 59 ff.
4 Splita, Al-Ash'ari, 9 ff.
resources of that most flexible tongue. A long training had been thought necessary before the elaborate and formal method of argumentation could be followed. All this al-Ghazzālī changed, or at least tried to change. His Ṭuḥafūt is not addressed to scholars only; he seeks with it a wider circle of readers, and contends that the views, the arguments, and the fallacies of the philosophers should be perfectly intelligible to the general public (edit. of Cairo, 1303, p. 5). This is what peculiarly arouses the wrath of Ibn Rushd in the tractate with which I shall come immediately to deal more fully. Here he, the supposed scientiflemen-minded and thorough-going Aristotelian philosopher, is much more an obscurant than al-Ghazzālī. He would have the state step in and absolutely forbid the treatment of these subjects in books intended for general reading, and also the general circulation of books dealing with these subjects. On this account the destruction and prohibition of al-Ghazzālī's works met with his approval, and he would have approved of such another burning.\footnote{M. J. Müller, \textit{Philosophie u. Theologie von Avemroes}, Münch. 1875, p. 17. This is a translation of Ibn Rushd's \textit{Fasāl al-maqāl} and other \textit{Rāsūl}, of which Müller had published the Arabic text in 1859. It is a curious proof of Ibn Rushd's complete failure to make any impression on Islam that his answer to the \textit{Tuḥafūt} of al-Ghazzālī and a reprint of this text edited by Müller are the only works of his which have appeared in type in the East. The answer to the \textit{Tuḥafūt} was printed along with it and the third \textit{Tuḥafūt} by Khwāja Zāda at Cairo in 1303, apparently from an earlier Constantinople edition, and the reprint of this present work appeared in 1313. That it is a reprint of Müller's text is evident by its reproducing his conjectural emendations even in cases where they were unnecessary. Compare with the Cairo text Müller's translation, p. 22, note 8; p. 28, note 1; p. 27, notes 1 and 8; p. 118, note 5; p. 120, note 4.}

by leading Islam back to its fundamental and historical facts, and by giving a place in its system to the emotional religious life. But it will have been noticed that in none of the four phases was he a pioneer. He was not a scholar who struck out a new path, but a man of intense personality who entered on a path already trodden and made it the common highway. We have here his character. Other men may have been keener logicians, more learned theologians, more gifted saints; but he, through his personal experiences, had attained to overpowering a sense of the divine realities that the force of his character—once combative and restless, now narrowed and intense—swept all before it, and the Church of Islam entered on a new era of its existence.

This view of his character and work, if it is just, itself disposes of the third question to which I now turn. Had al-Ghazzālī an esoteric teaching, did he secretly accept and teach the positions of the Aristotelian philosophers, while publicly branding them as unbelief? I cannot believe that the attentive student of his life will hesitate as to the answer to this question. The psychological development which I have traced above speaks for itself. Al-Ghazzālī has taken us into his confidence, and laid before us, step by step, his doubting youth, his descent into the abyss of scepticism, and his gradual re-ascent to light and faith. From point to point each change is motivated, and organically united with what precedes and follows it. Only at the supreme moment does the chain break; then all al-Ghazzālī can say is that God had mercy upon him, and gave him back the power to think and a trust in the operations of the mind. And this is psychologically true: arrived at such a point, no formula, no argument, could have saved him; there had to come, as did come, the free spirit of God, the wind that bloweth where it listeth.

The evidence for an esoteric teaching is twofold. It consists, first, of what he has said himself in his acknowledged works against the communication of certain doctrines and reasonings to those who are not fitted to receive them; and, second, of what has been said by others concerning alleged esoteric books of his, and the contents of these books when they can be found. As to the first point, it is perfectly true that he preached an economy of teaching. In the \textit{Imlā} (SM. i, pp. 150 ff. and 247 ff.) we have a formal defence of the practice of keeping certain theological
reasonings and developments secret from those who are not in a position to, hear them understandingly and who would therefore be led by them either into unbelief or into actions contrary to the Law. But we must distinguish this sharply from an esoteric teaching in the ordinary sense. In this advanced teaching there was nothing contrary to that of the earlier stages; it simply went further into details of doctrine and of argument. It was in fact an application of the principle of bi'lā kayfa, i.e., ‘without enquiring how,’ which had long been laid down and accepted in Muslim dogmatics. Spitta has traced for us excellently the early development of kalām, and how the orthodox theologians fought against its introduction. Ash-Shafi’i (d. 204) said that whoever busied himself with kalām should be fettered to a post and carried through the land with a herald proclaiming, “This is the reward of him who abandons the Revelation of God and the Sunna of the Prophet to take up kalām.” Yet he is said to have admitted that a few men might take up the study in order to protect the Faith against heresies; only the study should not be allowed to become public, and those who did undertake it should be of approved diligence, intelligence, and moral conduct. Al-Ash’ari (d. 324) introduced kalām, as we have seen, into orthodox Islam, but under limitations. When he considered that further public examination or discussion of a doctrine was unadvisable, he cut it off with the above phrase, since then famous, bi'lā kayfa. Thus, in his creed (Spitta, pp. 45 and 90) he lays down that God has two hands and two eyes, “without inquiring how.” To advanced students, who were capable of entering upon such studies without injury to themselves and to whom such studies for the defence of the Faith were necessary, he permitted to go further; but that was all. Now this was essentially al-Ghazzālī’s attitude. In the Minhād he warns against the study of philosophy; but he warns those who, in his opinion, are unfit for it and would be injured by it, not those who, on account of their intelligence and character, could go through its fires untouched. In the Ihyāʾ he divides knowledge (‘ilm) into useful and harmful, and thus greatly shocks Gosehe, who considers that Ibm Rushd stands incomparably freer in his estimation of philosophy (pp. 256 ff.). But the fact is that Ibm Rushd took up exactly the same position, and in his turn was shocked because al-Ghazzālī had not gone so far in it as he him-

1 Al-Af'ari, 52 ff. For later developments see Schreiner, Zur Geschichte des Af'arismus, and Goldsifier, Zahiriten, 188 ff.

self thought right. In the collection of Rasāʾil1 mentioned above, Ibm Rushd makes it absolutely clear how he felt on this matter generally, and how the thing to which above all others he objected in al-Ghazzālī was the openness and publicity with which al-Ghazzālī had discussed difficult and contested points of theology. As his theological attitude in this respect seems to be little known and is of the first importance for our understanding and judging that of al-Ghazzālī, it will be necessary to enter into some details. The Rasāʾil in question were written in 575, when the author was in favour with the Muwāhid Sulṭān, Yūsuf b. ‘Abd al-Mu’min (d. 580). Their object was to bring about a reform of religion in itself, and also of the attitude of theologians to students of philosophy (p. 26 of translation). In them he sums up his own position under four heads: First, that philosophy agrees with religion and that religion recommends philosophy. Here he is fighting for his life. Religion is true, a revelation from God, and philosophy is true, the results reached by the human mind; these two truths cannot contradict each another. Further, men are frequently exhorted in the Qurʾān to reflect, to consider, to speculate about things; that means the use of the intelligence, which follows certain laws long ago traced and worked out by the ancients. We must, therefore, study their works and proceed further on the same course ourselves i.e. we must study philosophy.

Second, there are two things in religion, literal meaning and interpretation. If we find anything in the Qurʾān which seems externally to contradict the results of philosophy, we may be quite sure that there is something under the surface. We must look for some possible interpretation of the passage, some inner meaning; and we shall certainly find it.

Third, the literal meaning is the duty of the multitude, and interpretation the duty of scholars. Thus the external content of religion for different classes must vary. Those who are not capable of philosophical reasoning must hold the literal truth of the different statements in the Qurʾān. The imagery must be believed by them exactly as it stands, except where it is absolutely evident

1 That the translation appeared so long after the text (see note above, p. 124), seems to have prevented much notice being taken of either. Renan in his Averroes et l’Averrolisme, 167 ff., knows the text but makes little use of it. I doubt if he had read it. It appeared too late to be used by Munk, who has given an analysis from a Hebrew version.
that we have only an image. On the other hand, philosophers must be given the liberty of interpreting as they choose. If they find it necessary, from some philosophical necessity, to adopt an allegorical interpretation of any passage or to find in it a metaphor, that liberty must be open to them. There must be no laying down of dogmas by the Church as to what may be interpreted and what not. In Ibn Rushd's opinion the orthodox theologians sometimes interpreted when they should have kept by the letter, and sometimes took literally passages in which they should have found imagery. He did not accuse them of heresy for this, and they should grant him the same liberty.

Fourth, those who know are not to be allowed to communicate interpretations to the multitude. So 'Ali said, "Speak to the people of that which they understand; would ye that they give the lie to God and His messenger?" Ibn Rushd considered that belief was reached by three different classes of people in three different ways. The many believe because of rhetorical syllogisms (khita'iyı̄n), i.e. those whose premises consist of the statements of a religious teacher (maqābūt), or are presumptions (maqāminūt). Others believe because of controversial syllogisms (jadīyīn), which are based on premises which are conventional principles (mashābārūt) or admissions (musallāmūt). All these premises belong to the class of propositions which are not absolutely certain. The third class, and by far the smaller, consists of the people of demonstration (burhān). Their belief is based upon syllogisms composed of propositions which are certain. These consist of axioms (a'wādīyīıt) and five other classes of certainties. Each of these three classes of people has to be treated in the way that suits its mental character. It is wrong to put demonstration or controversy before those who can understand only rhetorical reasoning. It destroys their faith and gives them nothing to take its place. The case is similar with those who can only reach controversial reasoning but cannot attain to demonstration. Thus Ibn Rushd would have the faith of the multitude carefully screened from all contact with the teachings of philosophers. Such books should not be allowed to go into general cir-

culation, and if necessary the civil authority should step in to prevent it. If these principles were accepted and followed, a return might be looked for of the golden age of Islam, when there was no theological controversy and men believed sincerely and earnestly.

But, in the second place, the existence has been alleged of esoteric books by al-Ghazzālī which taught doctrines directly opposed to those in his public writings. Ibn at-Tūfayl (d. 1185; pp. 18 ff., ed. Pococke) treats of al-Ghazzālī in his Rūṣūṭ, and tells that there were certain books of his asserted to be of an esoteric nature, but they had not come to Spain, so far as he knew. Some of an alleged esoteric character had reached Spain, such as the Ma'dārīf al-ḥaqiqā, the Naḍkh wa-t-tauūrīya, and the collection of Muṣāfīl, but he himself could find nothing peculiar in their teaching. Ibn Rushd speaks more dogmatically and goes much further. Ibn at-Tūfayl appears to have thought that these esoteric books— if they existed, which he doubted—only entered into greater mystical detail, and were heretical by admixture of pantheistic Slōfism. Ibn Rushd, on the other hand, sees in al-Ghazzālī a philosopher who, for the sake of peace and worldly profit, has given himself up to the enemy and professed to embrace their faith, though all the time holding and teaching secretly the doctrines of the philosophers whom he has betrayed, (Renan, Averroes et l'Averroisme, 98 and 104). Over some of the proofs of al-Ghazzālī's duplicity brought forward by Ibn Rushd we do not need delay. They are simply bits of wrong-headedness, perhaps wilful, like the accusation against Ibn Rushd himself that he taught that the planet Venus was a divinity (Renan, p. 22). For example, Ibn Rushd alleges (trans. p. 67) that al-Ghazzālī said in his Jawādūr that the positions of his Tahāfut were purely dialectic, while he had laid down the truth in his Mağūbīn. When we consider that in the Tahāfut there is no attempt to establish anything at all, but only to destroy the positions of the philosophers, we can easily see how al-Ghazzālī came to express himself so.

But the weight of the whole accusation is founded on the book entitled Al-maḍānuṯ bili 'aḍā ḡhayrī 'aḥliki, "That which is to be reserved from those who are not worthy of it." Its existence is certain; there are MSS. of it, and it has even been printed in Cairo, 1303. [Along with it is printed the Naḍkh wa-t-tauūrīya spoken of by Ibn at-Tūfayl, and I agree with him in being unable to translate it, and hence unable to put my views on it.] The first chapter of the Book of the Soul, which appears to be a quotation from it, is also ascribed to al-Ghazzālī in the Muṣāfīl. The book contains a direct repudiation of the soul, but there are no long extracts, so far as I know, from this book or the Muṣāfīl. But as long as these MSS. are not published, it is impossible to be sure that they are not spurious. For if they are genuine, they are certainly direct and direct repudiations of the soul. Ibn Rushd, therefore, speaks with such certainty of the existence of this book or the Muṣāfīl as to make it seem that they are genuine, and the whole of the alleged works of al-Ghazzālī are looked upon as repudiations of the soul. The existence of such books, if they exist, is a matter of doubt, and their alleged teachings are a matter of conjecture. Therefore Ibn Rushd, who is not an interpreter of the works of al-Ghazzālī, should not be listened to, and his statements should be treated with caution.

1 On these different types of syllogism see the Risāla Shamāyiya, edit. Sprenger, pp. 27 ff. In Müller's translation the point is left unexplained, and the passage is thus very puzzling. Without doubt, this is because he did not live to publish the translation himself.
to find in that any points of heresy.] The title has been a stumbling-block to many European writers, but, after what has been said above, it should be clear that it may mean only a further development for professional students of doctrines known and admitted. But many Oriental writers assert specifically that in it he taught the eternity of the world, that God does not know particulars, and that existence in the next world will not be physical—all in flat contradiction to his position elsewhere. It is not specially surprising that his opponents should have spread this assertion—controversy among Muslims, as among ourselves, is sometimes conducted very curiously; but I do not understand how the SM., who knew the Muḥānān, accepts, as he does, what is said of it. On pp. 43 f., after the list of al-Ghazzālī’s genuine works, he adds four which, he says, are ascribed to him, but falsely. They are (1) Al-ṣārīr al-muḥākta fi awrār al-amānī, some ascribe this work to Fakhr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī; (2) Thawāq al-ṣawā’ir, Ibn ‘Arabī (d. 638) rejected al-Ghazzālī’s authorship; (3) Anwār al-sākh wa-ṣalāhīt; (4) Al-Muḥānān, Ibn as-Sukkī said that Ibn as-Salih (d. 643) mentioned its being assigned to al-Ghazzālī, but that he rejected it himself; in it, according to the SM. who had a copy, the eternal pre-existence of the world and the denial that God knows particulars, are taught. Ibn ‘Arabī assigned the book to ‘Ali b. Khalīl as-Sībī, a contemporary of his own, to whom he also assigned the Ḥiṣab al-‘ibādīn; and Abu Bakr Muhammad al-Malāqī (d. 750) wrote a reply to it. If the Muḥānān spoken of by these is our printed Muḥānān, I cannot understand their position. In it, on p. 3, he expressly teaches the creation (khulūd) of the substance (‘muṣṭaṣṣ) of the world. On pp. 32 ff. and 38 ff. he teaches the return of souls (awrāh) to bodies (‘abādān) at the resurrection, treating it as a second creation (mosh’ā‘), and that the pleasures and pains of the next world will be physical (hassā‘i, e. c. schmatic) as well as imaginative (khurāṣī) and rational (ṣadīq). The book is dedicated to his brother Ahmad (pp. 2 and 45), and is intended to be read by theologians fitted to understand and follow it. There is no suggestion of anything to contradict his other teaching; he only goes into more detail in the way of proof and to show the reasonableness of the several doctrines; he deals also with knotty questions that would only occur to a professional student. On God’s knowledge of particulars I can find nothing direct, but the whole tone of the passages in which the Qualities (ṣūfīṭ) are spoken of implies that he has such knowledge.

Of course it is quite possible and in accordance with the rules of Muslim polemic that there should also have been in circulation a false Muḥānān teaching these heretical doctrines. Many such cases occur. A book against the belief in saints was ascribed to Abu Bakr ar-Rāzī (d. cir. 290–320), and, it was suspected, falsely, in order to bring him into discredit. The same thing happened to ash-Sha’rānī. One of his enemies obtained a copy of his Al-ḥār al-mawṣūd, left out parts, and inserted others of a heretical nature, and then spread it as the original work. In defence ash-Sha’rānī was compelled to lay before the Ulāma of Cairo his original copy signed by himself, and so demonstrate the spuriousness of the other. Again, ash-Sha’rānī had to defend Ibn ‘Arabī against a similar injury. Some hostile theologians interpolated his Fathāt with heresy. Even Fakhr ad-Dīn ar-Rāzī suffered from this; and there were enough such cases for ‘Ali b. Muhammad al-Miṣrī to make up a list of them. So we need not be at all surprised if this befall al-Ghazzālī also; Goldziher (loc. cit.) indeed says that it did.

The latest attempt to prove a secret teaching on the part of al-Ghazzālī is by Dr. Heinrich Malter in his Abhandlung des Abu Ḥamīd al-Ghazzālī. Antworts auf Fragen die an ihn gerichtet wurden. (Frankfurt a. M., 1896). Dr. Malter has evidently read the printed Muḥānān, and sees that it can form no basis for a charge of heresy. Instead, he falls back on the little tractate which he has here edited. It exists only in Hebrew, but has been translated apparently from Arabic. In its MSS, it is ascribed to al-Ghazzālī, as also in a commentary by Moses Narbonnensis on a Hebrew translation of the Magāṣīd. Otherwise it is unknown to the biographers of al-Ghazzālī, Eastern and Western. Dr. Malter (p. xv, note 1) suggests that this lack of mention is of no force, as we know many books of al-Ghazzālī which are unknown to the native bibliographers. In saying this he can hardly have reckoned with the list in Wüstenfeld’s Academien or with the still fuller and more careful one in the SM. i. pp. 41–44. Schmöders, on whom Dr. Malter relies, had a very incomplete acquaintance with this bibliography.

The tractate is made up of extracts from the Magāṣīd and the Astronomy of al-Farghānī (d. circ. A. D. 839), and in it the

1. Goldziher, Muḥām. Studies, ii. 373, note 5; ZDMG. xx. 2, and 4, xxxviii. 681.
eternal pre-existence of matter and time is distinctly taught (pp. 24 ff.). These extracts are put together very clumsily (see especially pp. 7 and 16), and this alone, to my mind, would prevent the ascription of the book to al-Ghazzâlî; I doubt, even, if it were ever current among Muslims. Certainly if he, after writing the Tahâfut, had wished, even in a secret tractate to draw back from the position there assumed, he would have taken a little more care in what he wrote, and not simply thrown together passages from one of his former works and extracts from a handbook of astronomy. The opinion of the commentator Narbûnî is worth nothing critically, as every one who has studied such questions knows. The other points brought forward by Dr. Malter are of little weight. The form of treatment in the treatise is common to the time, and the saying ascribed to 'Ali b. Abi 'Ṭâlib, "Speak to the people according to their understanding," was quoted by all—a very large number, including as we have seen Ibn Rushd—who held that different methods must be used in approaching different grades of intelligence. Dr. Malter's description (p. xii) of al-Ghazzâlî as a man who tried to keep on good terms with all parties, though based on Ibn Rushd, is singularly opposed to the facts of the case. Rather, he got himself into trouble with all parties. He had a combative nature, especially in his earlier life, and later it took much grace and discipline to keep it down.

If the charge of a secret doctrine is to be proved against al-Ghazzâlî, it must be on other and better evidence than that which is now before us.

1 Delitzsch in Cut. evahl. hebr. bild. Lips., No. 20. Narbûnî, like Ibn Rushd, exhibits a personal hatred of al-Ghazzâlî which shows how hard a blow the latter had struck.
2 In the Imlâ, margin of SM. i. pp. 133 and 225, it is ascribed to the Prophet himself.

[The name of al-Ghazzâlî is now generally written with single 'z, al-Ghazzâlî. My reasons for adhering to the older spelling will be given at length elsewhere.—D. B. M.]

The Life of al-Ghazzâlî, with special reference to his religious experiences and opinions.—By Duncan B. Macdonald, Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

In the history of the development of Muslim theology two names stand out conspicuously, each marking a great point of departure. They are those of al-Ashârî and al-Ghazzâlî. The former was the principal founder of scholastic theology in Islam; it was under the hands of the latter that that theology took its final form, and the Church of Muhammad owes it to his strange experiences in personal religion and in the emotional life that the form was not even harder and more unyielding than we find it now. What rigidity of grasp the hand of Islam would have exercised but for the influence of al-Ghazzâlî might be hard to tell; he saved it from scholastic decrepitude, opened before the orthodox Muslim the possibility of a life hid in God, was persecuted in his life as a heretic, and now ranks as the greatest doctor of the Muslim Church.

Of al-Ashârî I do not purpose to say anything here. On scholastic theology as al-Ghazzâlî found it, I shall let him speak for himself; the strife of dogmatists so far removed from us in time and interest sounds hollow on our ears. Al-Ashârî died about A. H. 320, with a curse of heretics as the last murmur on his lips. Al-Ghazzâlî, who knew what it meant to be cursed himself, was slow to curse others, and is memorable among the theologians of Islam in that he, over his formal signature, forbade to curse Yazîd, the slayer of Al-Humayn the well-beloved. It is necessary to make mention of al-Ashârî, if only to show the...