

JOURNAL

OF

THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

ART. I.—*Emotional Religion in Islām as affected by Music and Singing.* Being a Translation of a Book of the *Ihyā ‘Ulūm ad-Dīn* of al-Ghazzālī with Analysis, Annotation, and Appendices. By DUNCAN B. MACDONALD, Hartford, Conn.

(Concluded from p. 748, October, 1901.)

WE have now given the rule of the first stage concerning understanding what is heard and applying it; and also the rule of the second stage concerning the ecstasy which is encountered in the heart; so let us now give what of it oozes to the outside, consisting of cries and weeping and movements and rending of clothes, etc. So we say

THE THIRD STAGE OF HEARING MUSIC AND SINGING.

We will give in it the laws of good conduct related to the hearing of music and singing internally and externally, and what of the traces of ecstasy is praised and what is blamed. The laws of good conduct are five. The first is showing regard for time, place, and company. Al-Junayd said, "Hearing has need of three things, and if they are not there, then do not hear; time, place, and company." His meaning is that there is no advantage in being occupied

with Hearing on an occasion when food is present, or on an occasion of discussion or of prayer, or of anything that turns away from emotion of the heart. This is the meaning of showing regard for time; the hearer shows regard for his condition of emptiness as to the heart. And as for place, sometimes it is the beaten highway or a place whose appearance is disliked or where there is some cause which distracts the heart; so he avoids that. And as for the company, its cause is that, whenever there is present one of a different nature, who dislikes Hearing, externally a devotee, poor in the subtleties of hearts, he is found burdensome to the assembly and the heart is occupied with him. And so, too, when there is present one of the people of this world who magnifies himself, of whom a care must be taken and to whom regard must be shown; or one of the people of Sūfiism who strains and feigns ecstasy, being hypocritical in ecstasy and in dancing and in tearing of clothes. All these things are disturbing, and it is fitter that the Hearing should be abandoned in the case of the lack of these three conditions.

The conditions just mentioned are to be considered by the listener; but the second law is a matter to be considered by those who are present. It is that the Shaykh, whenever beginners [*Murīds*] are around him whom Hearing hurts, ought not to listen in their presence, and if he listens, let him occupy them in some other way. The beginner who is hurt by singing is one of three. The lowest of them in rank is he who does not attain in the Path¹ except to external works, and who has no taste for Hearing. So his being occupied with Hearing is his being occupied with what he does not know. For he is not of the people of sport that he should sport, nor of the people of taste that he should enjoy himself in Hearing; so let him be occupied in praising and service, otherwise his time is wasted. The second is he who has taste for Hearing, but in him is a remainder of the fanciful desires [*huzūz*] and a turning to lusts and fleshly qualities, and he is not yet subdued

¹ *Tarīqa*; see note in *Life*, p. 89.

with such a subduing that there is safety from his wickednesses. Then, often, Hearing arouses in him a summoner to sport and lust; and so his path is cut off, and his way to perfection is barred. The third is that his lust should have been broken and there be safety from his wickedness, and his perception have been opened and the love of God Most High rule over his heart; but he be not wise in the external part of science, and does not know the names and the qualities of God Most High and what is allowable with regard to Him and what is impossible. Then, whenever the gate of Hearing is opened he applies what is heard to what is allowable and to what is not allowable with regard to God Most High; so his hurt from such thoughts as are unbelief is greater than his advantage from the Hearing. Sahl¹ said, "Every ecstasy to which the Book and the Sunna do not witness is false." And for such a one as this, Hearing is not good, nor for him whose heart is yet soiled with the love of this world and the love of praise and glory, nor for him who listens for the sake of the pleasure and to find delight in the impression. Then that becomes a custom to him and diverts him from his religious duties and from regard for his heart; and his path is cut off. So Hearing is a slippery place for the foot; from it the weak should be kept. Al-Junayd said: "I saw Iblis in sleep and said to him, 'Dost thou gain the mastery over any of our comrades in anything?' He said, 'Yes, on two occasions; on occasion of Hearing and on occasion of theological speculation [*naẓar*], for I go in to them thereat.'" Then said one of the Shaykhs, "If I had seen him I would have said to him, 'How foolish thou art! One who hears from Him when He hears, and speculates about Him when he speculates, how canst thou gain the mastery over him?'" Then said al-Junayd, "Thou hast spoken truth."

The third law is that he should be attentive to what the speaker says, present in heart, turning aside little, guarding himself from gazing upon the faces of those who are listening and upon what they exhibit of states of ecstasy,

¹ Sahl at-Tustarī; see note 1 on p. 252 (1901).

absorbed in himself and in the guarding of his own heart and in the treasuring of what God Most High opens to him of His mercy in his secret heart, keeping himself from a movement that would disturb the hearts of his comrades. He should be in external rest, still in his extremities, holding himself from coughing or yawning. And he should sit with bent head as he would sit in thought that absorbed his heart, restraining himself from hand-clapping and leaping and the rest of the movements used to work up the emotions and make a hypocritical show, silent in the intervals of the recitation from such conversation as can be avoided. Then if ecstasy overcome him and move him without his volition, he is excusable in regard to it and not blameworthy. But whenever volition returns to him let him return to his stillness and to his repose; it is not incumbent on him that he should seek to prolong his ecstasy out of shame, lest it should be said, "His ecstasy was soon cut short," nor that he should constrain himself to an ecstasy, out of fear, lest it should be said, "He is hard of heart, lacking in purity and softness." It is related that a youth used to accompany al-Junayd, and whenever he heard aught of the mention of God he would cry out. Then al-Junayd said to him, "If you do that another time, you shall not accompany me." And thereafter he kept putting pressure upon himself until from every hair of him there would drip a drop of water, and he did not cry out. And it is related that he choked one day through the force of the pressure upon him and sobbed a single sob, and his heart broke and he died.

And it is related on tradition that Mūsā was telling traditional stories¹ among the Banū Isrā'īl, and one of them rent his dress or his shirt. And God Most High revealed to Mūsā, "Say to him, 'Rend for me thy heart and rend not thy dress.'"²

¹ *Qassa*; on the professional *qassās* and the practice of *qass*, see Goldziher in ZDMG., xxviii, p. 320.

² Joel, ii, 13; Moses is a bad shot even for a Muslim, but the whole thing is a good example of Oriental incuriosity.

Abū-l-Qāsim an-Naṣrābādī¹ said to Abū 'Amr b. Najīd,² "I say that whenever the people gather together, and there is with them a reciter of poems who recites, it is better for them than that they should talk slander." Then said Abū 'Amr, "Hypocrisy in regard to Hearing—and it is that you should show in yourself a state that is not in you—is worse than that you should talk slander thirty years or thereabouts."

And if you should say, "Is the more excellent he whom Hearing does not move and upon whom it does not make an impression or he upon whom it appears?" Then know that the lack of external appearance is at one time on account of weakness of the visitant [*wārid*] that springs from Hearing, and that is defeat; and at another time it is in spite of strength of ecstasy, but motion does not appear on account of perfect strength in control of the limbs, and that is perfection. And, at another time, it is on account of the state of ecstasy inhering in and being part of all the states. Then an increase of impression does not show itself on occasion of Hearing, and that is the utmost degree of perfection. For the ecstasy of him who has ecstasy in most states does not last, but he who is in a lasting ecstasy is applying himself assiduously and constantly to the Truth, and is clinging to the essence of Witnessing. Then such a one the occurrence of the states does not change. And it is reasonable to suppose that what is pointed to in the saying of aṣ-Ṣiddīq, "We were like you; then our hearts became hardened," is our hearts became powerful and were strengthened, and became able to cling constantly to ecstasy in all states while we are hearing the thoughts of the Qur'ān continually; and the Qur'ān is not new with regard to us nor fresh upon us so that we should be affected by it. So, then, the force of ecstasy moves the external manifestations, and the force of reason and self-restraint controls them, and sometimes the

¹ Abū-l-Qāsim Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad an-Naṣrābādī; d. 369. Al-Qush., p. 36; *Lawāqih*, i, p. 97.

² Abū 'Amr Ismā'īl b. Najīd; d. 366. Al-Qush., p. 36.

one of them overcomes the other either on account of the vehemence of its force or on account of the weakness of what opposes it, and it is defeat or perfection in accordance with that. Then think not that he who throws himself upon the ground in agitation is more perfect as to ecstasy than he who is still and does not agitate himself; yea, often he who is still is more perfect as to ecstasy than he who is in agitation. Al-Junayd, in his novitiate, was wont to be moved through Hearing; then he came not to be moved, and people spoke to him about that. He said, "*And thou seest the hills, thou thinkest them firm, but they shall pass away even as the clouds pass away—a work of God who hath made everything perfect*" [Qur., xxvii, 90]. This points to the fact that the heart may be agitated, circling in the invisible world [*malakūt*], and the limbs externally well disciplined and at rest. And Abū-l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Aḥmad¹ said—he was in al-Baṣra—"I companied with Sahl b. 'Abd Allāh sixty years, and I never saw him change at a thing which he heard of mention of God or from the Qur'ān. And when he was at the end of his life a man recited before him, *And on this day there shall not be taken a ransom from you* [Qur., lvii, 14], and the rest of the verse. Then I saw him tremble and almost fall. And when he returned to himself I asked him about that. And he said, 'Yes, my beloved, we have grown weak.' And so, too, one time he heard the saying of Him Most High, *The kingdom on that day shall verily belong to the Compassionate One* [Qur., xxv, 28]; then he was agitated. And Ibn Sālim,² one of his companions, questioned him, and he said, 'I have grown weak.' Then they said to him, 'If this springs from weakness, what is strength of state?' He said, 'That there should not come upon one a visitant [*wārid*] without his meeting it with the strength of his state; then the visitants do not change him, although they are powerful.'" And the cause of that strength in controlling

¹ Abū-l-Ḥusayn (so the SM.) Muḥammad b. Aḥmad; d. 387. See Ibn Khall., iii, pp. 21 f.

² Ibn Sālim; see note 3 on p. 203 (April, 1901).

the external parts in spite of the presence of ecstasy, is equality of the states in constant clinging to witnessing; as it has been related concerning Sahl that he said, "My condition before prayer and after it is one"; for he was a regarder of the heart, present in recollection with God Most High in every state. And thus he was before Hearing, and after it, since his ecstasy was abiding and his thirst enduring and his drinking continuous, inasmuch as Hearing had no effect in increasing his ecstasy, like as it is related that Mimshādh ad-Dīnawarī came upon a company, among whom was a reciter of poems, and they became silent. But he said, "Return to what you were about, for even though you gathered all the musical instruments of the world in my ears, my meditation would not be disturbed, nor would aught appear of what is in me." And al-Junayd said, "Defect of ecstasy does not hurt when there is abundance of science, and abundance of science is more powerful than abundance of ecstasy." But if you say, "Why does such a one as this attend Hearing?" know that some of these abandoned Hearing in the perfection of their strength, and were wont to attend only occasionally in order to assist one of the brethren and to cause joy to enter his heart. And often he would attend that the people might perceive the completeness of his power and know that completeness is not in external ecstasy; then that they might learn from him the control of the external through application, though they might be unable to imitate him in his becoming a model to them. And if their being present fell with other than people of this kind, they were with them with their bodies, but distant from them with their hearts and what is within; just as they might sit, apart from Hearing, with other than their kind for accidental causes which required such sitting with them. Then some copied from these the abandoning of Hearing, thinking that the cause of their abandoning it was that they were able to do without it through what we have mentioned. And some of them belonged to the ascetics, and had no spiritual part [*ḥaẓẓ rūḥānī*] in Hearing, and were not of

the people of sport, and so abandoned it that they might not be distracted through what did not concern them.¹ And some abandoned it for lack of brethren. It was said to one, "Why do you not Hear?" He said, "From whom and with whom?"

The fourth law is that he should not rise up or raise his voice in weeping while he is able to restrain himself. Yet if he dance or force weeping, that is allowable whenever he does not intend hypocrisy by it; for forcing weeping induces grief and dancing is a cause of joy and liveliness. And the moving of every allowable joy is permissible; if it were unlawful 'Ā'isha would not have looked on at the Abyssinians with the Apostle of God while they were 'kicking out.'² That is 'Ā'isha's expression in some traditions, and it has been handed down from a number of the Companions that they hopped when a joy befell them which called for that. It is in the story of Ibna Ḥamza³ when there disputed about her 'Alī b. Abī Tālib and his brother Ja'far⁴ and Zayd b. Ḥāritha, and they contended together jealously as to her rearing. Then the Prophet said to 'Alī, "Thou art of me and I am of thee," and 'Alī hopped; and he said to Ja'far, "Thou resemblest me outwardly and inwardly," and he hopped behind the hopping of 'Alī; and he said to Zayd, "Thou art our brother and our freedman," and he hopped behind the hopping of Ja'far. Then the Prophet said, "She belongs to Ja'far, for her maternal aunt is his wife, and the maternal aunt is the same as the mother." And in

¹ Here al-Ghazzālī and those like him appear to be opposed to simple ascetics. Such ascetics are incapable of higher spiritual life and gain nothing by music and singing; they do not belong to "the people of the heart." Further, they are opposed to recreation and light things generally; not seeing what may be got from them, they consider them vain.

² √ZFN. It means in the first instance 'to kick or push with the leg,' and there is a tradition of Fātima that she used to do this to al-Ḥasan in the sense of 'dance to him.' The tradition runs, *Kōnat tazjīnu lil-Ḥasan*; and Lane, *Lexicon*, 1237c, so translates it. But in the *Lisan*, xvii, p. 58, l. 13, it is explained with *turraqiqūhu*, i.e. 'she would dandle him,' that is, make him dance or leap (*nazzathu*) in her lap. See on this latter sense of ZFN Goldziher in the *Wiener Zeitschrift*, ii, 164 ff.; he there equates *raqqasa* with *zaffana* (in the II stem), but I cannot find in the lexicons anything but the I.

³ Ibna Ḥamza b. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib; see an-Naw., p. 867, and Ibn Qut., p. 60, l. 14.

⁴ For Ja'far see an-Naw., pp. 192 ff., and note 7 on p. 203; and for Zayd, p. 260 ff.

a tradition it is said that he said to 'Ā'isha, "Wouldst thou like to look at the kicking out?" and 'kicking out' and 'hopping' are dancing. And that takes place on account of a pleasure or a yearning, and the law applicable to it is the law applicable to that which rouses it. If the pleasure which causes dancing is praiseworthy, and the dancing increases and strengthens it, then the dancing is praiseworthy. And if the one is permissible, then the other is permissible, and if blameworthy, blameworthy. Yet it is true that the practice of dancing does not befit the station of notable people or people who set an example, because, for the most part, it springs from sport and play, and that which has the aspect of play and sport in the eyes of the people should be avoided by him whose actions are imitated in order that he may not become small in the eyes of the people and they should leave off imitating him.

And as to the tearing up of garments, there is no indulgence for it except when the matter passes beyond the control of volition. It is reasonable to suppose that ecstasy may overcome one so that he will tear his garment and yet not know it from the force of the intoxication of ecstasy which is on him. Or he may know it, but he is like one who is constrained and unable to control himself. Then he presents the appearance of one who is forced to do a thing though disliking it; since there is for him in moving or tearing a means of taking breath, and he is forced to it as a sick man is forced to groan. And though he were to impose patience upon himself as to it, he would not be able to control it in spite of its being a free-will action. For man is not able to abandon every action whose occurrence depends upon intention; taking breath is an action whose occurrence depends upon intention, but if a man imposed upon himself that he would hold breath he would be compelled from within him to will taking breath. So, too, is crying out; and tearing of garments sometimes happens in this way; then it is not to be described as forbidden. They spoke in the presence of as-Sarī of the occurrence of extreme overwhelming ecstasy, and he said, "Yes, the face

of one may be struck with a sword and he not know it." Then they disputed with him about it and found it strange that ecstasy should reach such a point, but he persisted and would not abandon his view that in some states this point was sometimes reached by some individuals.

And if you ask, "Then what do you say as to the tearing of new garments on the part of Sūfis after the ecstasy has subsided and the Hearing is over, for they tear them in little pieces and distribute them to the people and call them *khirqa*?"¹ Know that that is permissible whenever it is torn into square pieces useful to patch garments and prayer-carpet for the *kirbās*² is torn up that the *qamīṣ* may be sewn together from it. And that is not waste, for it is tearing for a purpose. So, too, the patching of garments is only possible by means of little pieces, and that is an object; and the dividing to the multitude that the benefit may be general is an allowable object. Every king is required to divide his *kirbās* into one hundred pieces and give to one hundred poor people,³ but it is necessary that the pieces shall be such that they can be made useful in patching. And in Hearing we prevent only that tearing which spoils the garment, destroying part of it so that it does not remain capable of use. That is pure waste, and is not lawful when it happens by free will.

The fifth law of good breeding is agreement of the people

¹ The *khirqa* means first a rag or scrap of cloth, and secondly the mantle of a darwish. It seems to be applied to the mantle as made up of such shreds patched together. The tearing up and distributing is to distribute the blessing that is supposed to cleave to them from having been worn by someone in an especially blessed state. So the garments of saints acquire miraculous powers; compare Elijah's mantle.

² The SM. describes the *kirbās* as a rough thick garment. But that is not at all suitable here, and the other and common meaning of *kirbās*, a piece of cotton cloth, is much better. See Lane, *sub voce*, and especially the *Lisān*, viii, pp. 78 f., where a tradition is quoted speaking of a *qamīṣ*, or shirt, made of *karābis*, the plural of *kirbās*.

³ As a garment the *kirbās* is Persian, and we have probably here a Persian custom. I know nothing of it, and the SM., of course, gives no explanation. But compare the seizing, tearing to pieces, and distribution of the pieces of the *jubba* of the *khaṭīb* who pronounces the *khutba* at the Mi'raj festival in modern Mecca. It is described by Snouck-Hurgrouje in his *Mecca*, ii, pp. 71 f. He refers to the Berlin *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, 1888, p. 112, where it is described how the Riff Arabs similarly tear to pieces the *burnūs* of the Sultān.

in rising up when one of them rises up in a true ecstasy without hypocrisy and strives; or rises up by choice without exhibiting ecstasy, and the company rises up to him. For there must be agreement because agreement belongs to the laws of comradeship. So, too, if it is the custom of a party to throw off the turban in agreement with him who is in ecstasy whenever his turban falls off, or to pull off garments whenever his garment has fallen off him through tearing, then agreement in these things belongs to good comradeship and social intercourse, since disagreement is churlishness and every people has a usage of its own. We must "consort with people according to their qualities"—as has come down in the tradition—especially when they are qualities containing good-fellowship and courteous treatment and soothing of the heart with help. And someone may say, "Lo, that is an innovation [*bid'ā*]; the Companions did not do so." But everything judged allowable is not derived from the Companions. What is to be guarded against is committing an innovation which abandons a Sunna handed down from one to another; but forbidding a thing is not to be deduced from this. Rising up on the entrance of anyone was not a custom of the Arabs; yea, the Companions did not rise up for the Apostle of God under some conditions, as Anas has narrated.¹ But since there is not established a general prohibition of it, we do not see any harm in it in those countries where it is a custom to honour him who enters by standing up; for its object is to show respect and to honour and to soothe the heart. So, too, it is with the other kinds of help when they have as object to soothe the heart and are adopted as usage by a company of people. Then there is no harm in their helping in these; yea, the best of things is help, except in a thing with regard to which there has come down a direct prohibition, insusceptible of explanation [*ta'wīl*].

And it belongs to good breeding that no one should arise

¹ On not rising to meet visitors as a *sunna*, cf. the life of 'Alī b. Maymūn in ZDMG., xxviii, p. 300. 'Alī refused to rise to meet anyone, as he was a zealous upholder of *sunna* in all details.

to dance with people if his dancing is considered sluggish and inert, lest he should disturb their states for them. For dancing without ecstasy is allowable, and a striver to show ecstasy is one in whom the trace of straining is evident to the company. And in the case of him who rises up in sincerity, whom you would not think sluggish and inert in nature, the hearts of those present, if they are possessors of hearts, are a touchstone of sincerity and of straining. One of them was asked concerning sound ecstasy, and he said, "Its soundness is the acceptance of it by the hearts of those present when they are likes and not opposites."¹

Then if you say, "But what about that disposition which turns aside from dancing, does it rush erroneously to its opinion that dancing is lying, vain, and contrary to the Faith, while he that is vehement in the Faith never sees dancing without blaming it?" then know that there is no vehemence that is greater than the vehemence of the Apostle of God, and he saw the Abyssinians kicking out in the Mosque and did not blame what they were doing, because it was at a suitable time, that is, a time of Festival, and on the part of suitable individuals, that is, Abyssinians. It is true that some dispositions turn aside from it, because it is seen for the most part in combination with vanity and play, and vanity and play are allowable, but only for the common people of the Zanj and Abyssinians and their like, while they are disliked in those who are notable people because they do not befit them. But it is not lawful to describe as forbidden what is disliked because it does not befit the position of a person of note. If one asked a poor man for something, and he gave him a cake of bread, that would be a praiseworthy gift; but if he asked a king and he gave him a cake of bread or two cakes of bread, that would be blameworthy in the sight of all men and would be written

¹ The sense apparently is that the dancer in an ecstasy (*wajd*) is light and brisk in his movements, but he who is trying to bring on an ecstasy (*mutawājid*) is heavy and clumsy. The sincerity of the *mutawājid* can only be judged by the insight of those present.

in books of history as of the number of his evil deeds, and his posterity and adherents would be upbraided with it. But, in spite of that, it is not lawful that what he did should be forbidden, since he, inasmuch as he gave bread to the poor man, was beneficent, but inasmuch as, in relation to his position, it was like refusing in relation to the poor man, his action is to be considered vile. So, too, it is with dancing and the class of permissible things that follow the same rule. "The permissible deeds of common people are the evil deeds of pious people, and the good deeds of pious people are the evil deeds of archangels."¹ But this is when we take account of relationship to different positions, and whenever the thing is looked at as it is in itself, the sentence must be passed that in it, as it is in itself, there is nothing forbidden—and God knows best.²

It follows from all that has preceded, sectionwise, that listening to Music and Singing is sometimes absolutely forbidden and sometimes permissible and sometimes disliked and sometimes to be loved. It is forbidden to the most of mankind, consisting of youths and those whom the lust of this world controls so that Music and Singing arouse in them only that which has control of their hearts, consisting of blameworthy qualities. And it is disliked with reference to him who, it is true, does not apply it to the form of created things, but in whose case a habit which he has leads him on most occasions on the path of vain sport. And it is allowed with reference to him who has no delight in it except the taking pleasure in beautiful sounds. And it is loved with reference to him whom the love of God Most High controls and in whom Music and Singing arouse only praiseworthy qualities. The Praise belongeth to God alone, and His Benediction be upon Muḥammad and his Family!

¹ The often quoted saying of Abū Sa'īd al-Kharrāz; see on him note 2: on p. 713 (1901).

² This phrase generally implies some grain of doubt in the mind of its user as to the correctness of what he has just said. But the SM. notes that here it is used *lit-tabarruk*, for the sake of gaining a blessing, i.e., al-Ghazzālī had no doubt as to the truth of his conclusion, but added the formula on general principles.

APPENDIX I.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

In the following table the life of al-Ghazzālī is exhibited in outline as a part of the history of his time. For a fuller statement of his life and views, I would refer to my article in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. xx, 1899, pp. 71-132. The sketch which I give here can only be suggestive, but its suggestiveness can hardly be exaggerated. A year before the birth of this man, who was to be the restorer of faith in his age, died Abū-l-'Alā al-Ma'arrī, the great and only poet of scepticism in Arabic literature. In the year itself of his birth died al-Māwardī, the master of constitutional law; in his lifetime al-Ghazzālī was to see the empire of the Seljuqs shrivel up and the Khālifate move nearer to its end. When he was fifteen died al-Qushayrī, who had done so much to formulate Šūfiism; he was to carry on his work. In his earliest youth had fallen the momentous exile of Abū-l-Ma'ālī at Mecca, and the death of the same in 478 was a turning-point in his life. A year later, while he was with Nizām al-Mulk, the battle of az-Zalāqa in Spain marked an epoch in the history of the Muslim West. Again, two years later, Nāšir b. Khusrū died, poet, traveller, philosopher; he stands beside al-Qushayrī and 'Umar Khayyām for different phases of the mysticism and thought of the time. But a little later again—al-Ghazzālī was still with Nizām al-Mulk—Islām received two great blows; Hasan b. aṣ-Šabbāh seized Alamūt, and the power of the Assassins stood firm for a century and a half until the Mongol wave under Hūlāgū swept unchecked to the Mediterranean; in the same year Malta was taken by the Normans, never to be held again by Islām. Now events crowd on, in all of which al-Ghazzālī had some part or with which he had some

connection. Nizām al-Mulk and Mālik Shāh fall under the dagger; the Assassins are showing their teeth. The unending civil war that marks the decadence of a Muslim state appears; Bargiyāruq becomes Great Seljuq. Jerusalem is lost, first to the Fātimids, and by them to the Crusaders; the first Crusade has begun. In the year of its fall passes away, too, that hammer of Islām and Christendom alike, El Cid Campeador. In 504 dies al-Kiyā, an old fellow-pupil, and, in the eyes of many of his time, a greater scholar; a year more and al-Ghazzālī himself ends his short and troubled life: posterity has long since settled what place each shall hold. He had seen the star of the Murābiṭ empire rise and wax; if he had lived out the ordinary life of man he might have seen it wane. Nineteen years after him died Ibn Tūmart, the Mahdī of the Muwaḥḥids. Another fourteen years and az-Zamakhsharī went his way, often and wrongly called the last of the Mu'tazilites; their creed in differing forms survived for many a long year the polemic of al-Ghazzālī. In the field of letters he had as contemporaries, more or less, al-Jawāliqī the lexicographer, Nāšir b. Khusrū and 'Umar Khayyām, al-Bakrī the geographer, aṭ-Ṭughrā'ī the learned scribe, wazīr, and *soi-disant* poet (has not his *Lāmiyatu-l-'Ajam* enjoyed more European editions than any other piece of Arabic verse?), al-Ḥarīrī, the master of ornate prose and artificial verse, and al-Maydānī of the proverbs. But a little after him died al-Baghawī, who first redacted the Tradition Books of the Six into practical and edifying form, and ash-Shāhrastānī, who has laid before us with rare objectivity the religious world of his day and horizon. It was an age of summing up; of compendiums and systems. Meanwhile, in Europe, Hastings is lost and won when al-Ghazzālī has seen eight years; Hildebrand is running his great career and nourishing his vast dreams; he loves righteousness and hates iniquity, and dies in exile in the same year that the Imām al-Ḥaramayn passes tranquilly away in the circle of his disciples. Berengerius and Lanfranc confront one another while al-Ghazzālī is wrestling with the theology of the schools and raising the clouds that

are to overshadow his faith. But as he passes from under the shadow a new life springs in Europe as well. Anselm, the father of scholasticism, has died, and the university of Bologna is founded; Abelard teaches at Paris; we pass from the *Cur Deus Homo* to the *Sic et Non*. In Abelard there is much to remind us of al-Ghazzālī—his keen questioning and sceptical mind; but there is more in his great opponent, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, with his faith, his yearnings upward, and his raptures. If we can conceive of an Abelard developing into a Bernard, we have the life of al-Ghazzālī. Such was the Europe of which the Muslim knew nothing; he could have known Christendom only under shield on the plains of Syria.

449. Abū-l-‘Alā al-Ma‘arrī d.

450. *Al-Ghazzālī* born at *Ṭūs*: al-Qā‘im being Khalifa; Tughril Beg, Great Seljuq; al-Mustanshir, Fāṭimid Khalifa. Abū-ṭ-Tayyib at-Ṭabarī d. al-Māwardī d.

452. Abū Ishāq ash-Shīrāzī d.

Exile of Imām al-Ḥaramayn at Mecca; lasted till 456.

455 (5).

[458. Battle of Hastings, A.D. 1066.]

460 (10).

465 (15). 465–485. Mālik Shāh, Great Seljuq; al-Qushayrī d.; al-Jawāliqī d. *Al-Gh.* at *Ṭūs*, *Jurjān*, *Ṭūs*, *Naysābūr* till 478.

467. Al-Muqtadī Khalifa.

[Submission to Pope at Canossa, A.D. 1076.]

Investigation of theological differences began when he was under 20; broke with taqlīd from earliest youth.

470 (20).

[Berengerius and Lanfranc.]

475 (25).

477. Al-Fārmadī, pupil of al-Qushayrī and teacher of al-Gh. in *Ṣūfīism*, d.

478. Imām al-Ḥaramayn d. Rab. ii; *al-Gh.* goes to attend *Nizām al-Mulk*. [Hildebrand d. A.D. 1085.]

479. Battle of az-Zalāqa in Spain.

480 (30). 480–500. Yūsuf b. Tāshfin al-Murābiṭ.

481. Nāṣir b. Khusrū d.

Scepticism?

Studied theology?

483. Ḥasan b. aṣ-Ṣabbāh seizes Alamūt.

[Malta taken by the Normans, A.D. 1091.]

484. *Appointed to teach in Madrasa at Baghdād. Almost three years studying philosophy; beginning 483 to beginning 487?*

485 (35). Nizām al-Mulk assassinated Ramaḍān 10. Thirty-five days thereafter Mālik Shāh assassinated.

487. Al-Mustazhir Khalifa Muḥ. 15; Bargiyāruq Great Seljuq; al-Musta‘li Fāṭimid Khalifa; *al-Gh.* studied *Ta‘līmītes* and wrote the *Mustazhirī*; al-Bakrī, the geographer, d.

488. *Left Baghdād in Dhū-l-Qa‘da after delay of six months, i.e. from Rajab.*

In Syria almost two years, i.e. to end of 490; Damascus, Jerusalem, Hebron, Mecca, Medina.

490 (40). Sinjar Governor of Khurāsān for his brother Bargiyāruq; Abū-l-Faṭh Naṣr al-Maqdisī d.

491. Capture of Antioch by Crusaders; Jerusalem taken by Fāṭimids from Seljuqs.

492. Sha‘bān, capture of Jerusalem by Crusaders. [Death of the Cid, A.D. 1099.]

495 (45). *Ten years passed in retreat at different places; wrote Iḥyā and other books; was preacher at Baghdād and taught Iḥyā; al-Āmir Fāṭimid Khalifa.*

498. Bargiyāruq d. Rab. ii.

499. *Al-Gh.* returns to active life at *Naysābūr* in *Dhū-l-Qa‘da*.

500 (50). 500–537. ‘Alī b. Yūsuf al-Murābiṭ; Fakhr al-Mulk assassinated, Muḥ. 10; al-Khawāfi d.; *al-Gh.* writes *Munqidh* after 500.

[University of Bologna?]

[Anselm d. A.D. 1109.]

504. Al-Kiyā d.

- 505 (55). *Al-Gh. d. Monday, 14 Jumādā II.*
 507. Abū Bakr ash-Shāshī d.
 [Abelard at Paris, A.D. 1115.]
 510. Ash-Shāhrastānī in Baghdād.
 511-552. Sinjar Great Seljuq.
 512. Al-Mustarshid Khalifa.
 [Order of Knights of the Temple founded, A.D. 1118.]
 515. ‘Umar al-Khayyām d.; aṭ-Ṭughrā’ī d.
 516. Al-Ḥarirī d.; al-Baghawī d.
 518. Ḥasan b. aṣ-Ṣabbāḥ d.; al-Maydānī d.
 520. Aḥmad al-Ghazzālī d.; aṭ-Tartūshī d.
 524. Al-Ḥāfiḡ Fāṭimid Khalifa; Ibn Tūmart d.
 525. [Bernard of Clairvaux flourished.]
 528. Ash-Shāhrastānī d.
 529. Ar-Rāshid Khalifa; ‘Abd al-Ghāfir d.
 530. Al-Muqtafi Khalifa.
 533. As-Salmī d.
 538. Az-Zamakhsharī d.

APPENDIX II.

THE NAME AL-GHAZZĀLĪ.

The name is at present usually written in the East, al-Ghazzālī; but since the publication of Ibn Khallikān’s biographical dictionary, in which (vol. i, p. 80, of de Slane’s translation) it seems to be asserted that Ibn as-Sam‘ānī in his *Ansāb* wrote al-Ghazālī, Western Arabists have inclined to follow his authority. Added to this there was other evidence, stray references, notes on the margin of manuscripts, and the like; see Flügel in ZDMG., xvi, 691; Fleischer’s notes in *Cat. codd. MSS. orr. bibl. reg. Dresd.*, p. 94, and *Cat. libb. MSS. bibl. sen. Lips.*, p. 366. The publication of the *Tāj al-‘Arūs* by the Sayyid Murtaḡā, and of his commentary on

the *Ihyā*, has, however, added much to the evidence, and somewhat changed its bearing.

In the *Tāj* (vol. viii, p. 44, ll. 19 ff.) the SM. writes:—“Ghazāla is one of the villages of Ṭūs, it is said. And to it is referred the *nisba* of the Imām Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazzālī, according to an-Nawawī’s statement in the *Tibyān*. But Ibn al-Athīr said that the form with *takhfif* is not the known form, and he approved of *tashdid* in it. And it is referred as a *nisba* to *ghazzāl*, a seller of spun yarn; or it is related to *al-ghazzāl* according to the usage of the people of Khwārizm and Jurjān, as *al-‘aṣṣārī* is related to *al-‘aṣṣār*. As-Subkī and Ibn Khallikān and Ibn Shuhba spread that view.”

Here there is no mention of Ibn as-Sam‘ānī. An-Nawawī (d. 676) spells with one *z*, and refers to this asserted village. Ibn al-Athīr (‘Izz ad-Dīn, the author of the *Lubāb*, the basis of as-Suyūṭī’s *Lubb al-lubāb*, d. 630), on the other hand, prefers *tashdid*. Then Ibn as-Subkī (the author of the *Ṭabaqāt*, d. 771), Ibn Khallikān (d. 681), and Ibn Shuhba (Taqī ad-Dīn Abū Bakr, d. 850) spread the view that *ghazzālī* was to be explained by the custom of the people of Khwārizm and Jurjān to use the measure *fa‘‘ālī* instead of *fa‘‘āl*. Evidently in the SM.’s copy of Ibn Khallikān there was no mention of as-Sam‘ānī; it is only in the autograph manuscript, and there as a marginal note.

In the introduction to the commentary on the *Ihyā* (vol. i, p. 18) there is a section on this *nisba*:—“The author of the *Tuhfa al-Irshād* says, deriving from an-Nawawī in the *Daqā‘iq ar-Rawda*, ‘*Tashdid* in al-Ghazzālī is the known form which Ibn al-Athīr mentioned, but it has reached us that he (i.e. an-Nawawī) said that it was a *nisba* to Ghazāla with *takhfif*, one of the villages of Ṭūs.’ I (the SM.) say that so an-Nawawī mentions it also in the *Tibyān*. And adh-Dhababī (d. 748) said in the *Ibar*, and Ibn Khallikān in the *Tārīkh*, that it was a custom of the people of Khwārizm and Jurjān to say *al-qaṣṣārī* and *al-ḥabbārī* with *ya* in both; so they referred the *nisba* to *ghazl*, and said *al-ghazzālī*, and like that is *ash-shahhāmī*. Ibn as-Sam‘ānī (d. 562) also pointed

to that and denied the *takhfif*, and said, 'I asked the people of Ṭūs concerning this village and they denied its existence; the addition of the *ya*, they said, was for strengthening.' And according to the annotation of some of our shaykhs it is to distinguish between a *nisba* referring to the trade itself and a *nisba* referring to someone whose trade it was. This is plain in the case of al-Ghazzālī, for he was not of those who span wool and sold it; that was only the trade of his father and grandfather. But in the *Miṣbāḥ* (finished 734) of al-Fayyūmī is a statement that defends *takhfif* and involves that Ghazāla is a village in Ṭūs, and that the *nisba* of the Imām Abū Hāmid refers to it. He says, 'That was related to me by the shaykh Majd ad-Dīn b. Muḥammad b. Abī-ṭ-Ṭāhir Sharwānshān b. Abī-l-Faḍā'il Fakhrāwar b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Sitt al-Munā (?) bint Abī Hāmid al-Ghazālī at Baghdād in the year 710. He said to me, "The people have erred in writing our ancestor's name with *tashdād*; it is *mukhaffaf* only.'" And ash-Shihāb al-Khafājī said at the end of the *sharḥ* on the *Shifā*, 'It is said that the *nisba* refers to Ghazāla, daughter of Ka'b al-Aḥbār.' If this is sound there is no escaping it. But the opinion generally depended upon now among the later writers of history and the genealogists is that Ibn al-Athīr is in the right, i.e. that it is with *tashdād*."

At last the question was settled as questions are apt to be settled in Islām. Al-Aydarūs, a shaykh of the SM., drew attention to the fact that the Prophet, seen in a dream, had pronounced the name with double *z*. The SM. only alludes to this story here, but in the tractate of al-Aydarūs referred to elsewhere (*Life*, p. 109) it is given on the margin of SM., i, p. 29. It was the shaykh Abū-l-Ḥasan ash-Shādhilī¹ who saw the Prophet boasting of al-Ghazzālī to Mūsā and 'Isā, and asking them if there was his like as a doctor in their flocks. After that there could be no more doubt; compare the story of the head of al-Ḥusayn given by Lane in *The Modern Egyptians* (chap. ix) and Lane's remark.

¹ D. 656: ZDMG., vii, 13 ff.: lii, 557, note. He was a native of Shādhilīya in North Africa, and founded the Shādhilīya order of darwishes.

Here the oldest evidence is that of as-Sam'ānī, who also knew the ground at first-hand. It is evident that in his time the two forms were current, and that the two explanations were: (1) that it was from *ghazl* on the measure *fa'ālī* used by the people of Khwārizm and Jurjān for *fa'āl*; and (2) that it was from Ghazāla, a village of Ṭūs. As-Sam'ānī, however, working on the spot, could find no trace or recollection of such a village; and it should be remembered that he died only fifty-seven years after al-Ghazzālī. Nor can I find in the geographers the slightest reference to such a Ghazāla. It is true that Ṭūs consisted of a complex of villages, and that the name of one might have been little prominent; but still it could hardly have escaped as-Sam'ānī's researches. But that it referred to this village, Ghazāla, was also the tradition in the family of Abū Hāmid. This is a very important fact and is unexceptionally vouched for. Further, we have seen that the grand-uncle was also known under the same *nisba*. Is it possible that the *nisba* to a village Ghazāla was introduced into the family several generations back and continued in use after the village had disappeared, and that the origin of the *nisba* was forgotten except by those best informed? Then people may have begun to pronounce the name with *tashdād*, and explain it as a case of the measure *fa'ālī* for *fa'āl*. In any case it is to be noticed that while as-Sam'ānī shows that the pronunciation with one *z* existed in his day, he cannot be quoted as approving of it. In Ibn Khallikān the passage which is supposed to involve that is a marginal insertion in the autograph, and runs literally: *lakinna hādha qālahu-s-Sam'āniyu fi kitābi-l-ansāb wa-llāhu a'lam*; apparently it has been inserted in the wrong place.

But the question is again complicated by the fact that there are several others with the same *nisba* as our family of Ṭūs. The SM. says (i, p. 19) that it was the general opinion that there were no others, but that he had himself found two and then a third. One of them was 'Abd al-Bāqī b. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Wāhid, the faqīh, Abū-l-Manṣūr al-Ghazzālī. He studied *Fiqh* with al-Kiyā, and traditions

are handed down from him by the ḥāfiẓ Abū-ṭ-Ṭāhir as-Salafī. He died 513. The second was 'Alī b. Ma'sūm b. Abī Dharr Abū-l-Ḥasan al-Ghazzālī. He was a Maghribite and a Shāfi'ite, was born in 496, and died in Isfarāin in 555. The third was of later date, al-'Alā 'Alī b. Aḥmad al-Ghazzālī, the author of the *Mizān al-istiḡāma li-ahli-l-qurb wal-karāma*. He died 721. Further, I find that some have alleged the existence of a Maḥmūd al-Ghazzālī, a Mu'tazilite, who was author of the *Manḥūl* instead of Abū Ḥāmid; this, because of the railing accusations brought against Abū Ḥanīfa in the *Manḥūl*.¹ It seems hard to believe that all these sprang from this vanished village of Ṭūs.

Such are the facts so far as I can find them, but they do not guide me to any certain result. I have, therefore, used the form al-Ghazzālī as that which eventually won its way to universal acceptance in the East.

¹ *Al-khayrāt al-ḥisān fī manāqib al-Imām Abī Ḥanīfa*, by Ibn Hajar al-Haytamī, p. 4 of ed. of Cairo, 1304. See also *Life*, p. 106.

ANALYSIS.

Title of Book. Ascription of praise to God as the enchainers of the hearts of His Saints and Blessing on Muḥammad. Statement that Music and Singing are a means of eliciting what is truly present in the heart; under their influence the heart reveals itself and what it contains. This book will be in two chapters—(I) The lawfulness of listening to Music and Singing, and (II) Their laws and effects on the heart and body (pp. 198–200).¹

CHAPTER I.

§ 1 (pp. 200–207).

Statements of the learned opining that such listening is unlawful (pp. 200–202), and, on the contrary, that it is lawful (pp. 202–207). But these openly contradict one another. It is plain that thus, through attaching ourselves to authority, we can get no certainty. We must examine, rather, the legal sources of prohibition and permission (p. 207).

§ 2 (pp. 207–244).

A proof that listening to Music and Singing is allowable. A proof that it is unlawful must base on statute, i.e. what Muḥammad said or did, or on analogy from statute. But it will be shown that no such statute or analogy exists, and that statute and analogy rather indicate allowableness (pp. 207–208).

Listening to Music and Singing is hearing a sound, pleasant, measured, with a meaning, moving the heart. But hearing a pleasant sound is not unlawful (pp. 208–210);

¹ Up to the middle of p. 27 the page references are to this Journal for 1901.

nor is it if measure be added (pp. 210-211). Yet certain instruments are expressly excepted by statute because they have been associated with drinking customs. So, too, if any one especially connects Singing and Music with drinking, and is through them led astray, listening is unlawful for him. Thus a distinction is to be made between some musical instruments and others; and those that are forbidden are not forbidden because they give pleasure but because of association (pp. 211-215). Nor can the addition of a meaning to the pleasing, measured sound make it unlawful, always presupposing that the meaning itself is lawful (p. 215). There are many traditions that the Prophet listened to poetry (pp. 215-217). Strange effect on the mind of simple Music apart from words bearing a meaning (p. 218); story of camels (pp. 219 f.). Nature of impression varies with circumstances and persons. Seven purposes for which Singing can be used—(1) To incite to pilgrimage (p. 220). But it is not lawful to incite to go on pilgrimage those for whom pilgrimage is unlawful (p. 221). (2) To urge to warfare under the same conditions of lawfulness (pp. 221-222). (3) To excite courage on the day of battle (p. 222). (4) To rouse to lamentation or sorrow, blameworthy or praiseworthy according to the sorrow (pp. 222-223). (5) To arouse joy. Many traditions that the Prophet regarded that as allowable (pp. 223-228). (6) To arouse love and longing—conditions when Music and Singing for this purpose are allowable (pp. 228-229). (7) To arouse the love of God. Then are aroused States, i.e. Revelations and Caressings, unknowable except by experience. These bring after them further Visions, but how that happens is the secret of God (pp. 229-230). How love and passionate love (*‘ishq*) can be felt for God. How great is His perfection and how great should be the passion for Him! The love of God the only true love, and the term ‘passion’ only applicable to Him (pp. 231-234).

In what cases is listening to Music and Singing unlawful? Five cases: (1) If the producer of Music be a woman under certain conditions (pp. 235-236). (2) The instruments

used: some are expressly prohibited (p. 237). (3) The content of what is sung: is satire allowable? is love-poetry allowable? (pp. 237-238). How the heart applies the expressions heard to God and to intercourse with Him: examples (pp. 238-239). To him who loves God and can thus apply what he hears, listening to Music and Singing is recommended (p. 239). (4) If lust have control over the listener, listening is unlawful for him (pp. 239-240). (5) If anyone love listening to Music for its own sake and give too much time to it, that is unlawful for him. For its own sake it is allowable only as a recreation (pp. 240-241). Thus Music and Singing are generally lawful, but unlawful under certain conditions (pp. 241-242). The school of ash-Shāfi‘ī does not pronounce them unlawful; it only pronounces professionalism unlawful (pp. 242-244).

§ 3 (pp. 244-252).

The arguments of those who pronounce against Music and Singing and the answer to them. Passages from the Qur‘ān and tradition so alleged and their true explanation (pp. 244-250). A general defence of play as a rest and recreation (pp. 251-252).

CHAPTER II.

Effects of Music and Singing and Laws of Polite Conduct with regard to them. There are three stages: understanding what is heard and applying it; ecstasy; movements of members of the body (p. 705). Stage I. Understanding and applying (pp. 705-718). (1) Simple physical hearing as that of an animal is allowable (p. 705). (2) Hearing and applying to the form of a creature, unallowable (p. 705). (3) Hearing of the *Mawūd*. He, especially as a beginner, hears and tries to get experiential knowledge of God in his hearing. He takes over and applies to his intercourse with God the expressions which he hears without considering what the poet had meant (pp. 706-707). Examples of this

and of the ecstasy that it excites (pp. 707-709). To do this safely he must know well the law of the knowledge of God. Otherwise he is in danger of ascribing things to God which are impossible and of being an unbeliever (pp. 709-710). Some in hearing Music and Singing go so far as to blame God for His distribution of ecstasy and His treatment of creatures in His predestining them; this is a great danger (pp. 710-712). Listeners vary in their understanding of the same verses, and all the ways of understanding them may be equally right: examples (pp. 712-715). Hearing on the part of him who is oblivious to himself and only conscious of God. Description of his state. Only comes in flashes; its consequences sometimes death from the agitation involved (pp. 715-717). This is the highest degree. The nature of the heart in the spiritual sense and how it perceives. From this degree develop the errors of Pantheistic Sūfis and Trinitarians (p. 718). Stage II. Ecstasy (pp. 719-748). Its nature as given in various sayings of the Sūfis (pp. 719-721), also in statements of philosophers (pp. 721-722). An attempt at a definition of ecstasy as the result produced in the soul by hearing Music and Singing. It may be by way either of knowledge or of feeling. If it expresses itself outwardly it is ecstasy, and varies in force in itself and in proportion to the self-control of him who is hearing (pp. 722-723). It produces purity of heart and alacrity. How truth may be communicated to a pure heart—by a Hātif, by dreams, by al-Khaḍir, by angels to prophets (pp. 723-725). Insight produced by this purity of heart: anecdotes (pp. 725-727). The result of ecstasy divides into what can be expressed in language and what can not. This is not strange: we all know ideas and states of feeling which we cannot express in words—especially the feelings excited by instrumental music (pp. 728-730). The difference between ecstasy and the affecting of ecstasy. The latter blame-worthy or praiseworthy (p. 730). The path to ecstasy lies often through effort and application (p. 731), or by companionship (p. 732). But why should poetry be used to excite

ecstasy and not the Qur'ān? (p. 732). The Qur'ān does excite it: examples (pp. 733-737). But Singing is more powerful for seven reasons (p. 738):—(1) All verses of the Qur'ān do not suit the state of the listener, e.g. legislative verses. Some can be affected by such verses, but that is rare (pp. 738-740). (2) The Qur'ān is known too well, and what is heard for the first time makes a heavier impression (pp. 740-741). (3) Poetry has the advantage of measure (pp. 741-742). (4) The Qur'ān must be recited simply and distinctly without varying to make measure, etc. (p. 742). (5) It is unallowable to accompany the Qur'ān with instrumental music: in other ways also the Qur'ān has to be guarded against profanation (pp. 742-744). (6) If the sense of a verse of the Qur'ān does not fit the hearer, he must either pervert its sense or reject it—both are sins (pp. 744-745). (7) The Qur'ān is the uncreated word of God, and has no link of connection with humanity; therefore poetry makes a stronger impression on the sensuous nature. Thus poetry affects men when the Qur'ān cannot. It is in accord with our human nature, and the Qur'ān is not. Therefore men can write poetry, but cannot produce another Qur'ān: It is a miracle (pp. 745-748). Stage III. What shows itself externally of ecstasy and of the laws of good conduct in ecstasy (pp. 1-13). The laws are five:—(1) Regard for time, place, and company (pp. 1-2). (2) The Shaykh should not hear in presence of *Murīds* whom it hurts (p. 2). These are of three classes: (a) Those who attain to external works only. (b) Those who have still some passions and lusts. (c) Those who are ignorant of theology and therefore apply wrongly (pp. 2-3). (3) Attention to what the speaker says and avoidance of distraction (p. 3). The hearer should put pressure on himself and only give way to ecstasy when he cannot help it (p. 4). Lack of external ecstasy may be weakness of ecstasy, but may also be strength on the part of the hearer: examples of such self-restraint. He who is always beholding God does not yield to external ecstasy (pp. 5-7). Why do those who are thus perfect attend assemblies to listen

to Music and Singing? In order to give an example and encouragement to others (pp. 7-8). (4) Not to rise and weep if restraint is possible. Yet if that will increase the emotion it is allowable: traditions in example (pp. 8-9). Garment-tearing only allowable when self-restraint is lost (p. 9). The tearing of new garments after ecstasy and distribution of the pieces only allowable when the pieces may be useful (p. 10). (5) If one rises or throws off his garment or his turban, the others should aid him in a spirit of comradeship and courtesy. Yet that, like all social usages, depends on the usage of the country (pp. 10-11). No one should dance whose dancing is sluggish and inert (p. 11). The test of the genuineness of ecstasy is its acceptance by the hearts of the onlookers (p. 12). The suitability of dancing generally depends on circumstances and the dancer. An allowable thing to one man may not be allowable to another. Legally, dancing is not forbidden (pp. 12-13).

Recapitulation: Listening to Music and Singing is sometimes forbidden, sometimes disliked, sometimes loved. All depends on him who listens (p. 13).