



Essai de chronologie des oeuvres de al-Ghazali (Algazel)

Review Author[s]:
F. Rahman

Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, Vol. 24, No. 3 (1961), 585-587.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0041-977X%281961%2924%3A3%3C585%3AEDCDOD%3E2.0.CO%3B2-G>

Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London is currently published by School of Oriental and African Studies.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/soas.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of New Testament papyri has been amplified and clarified, whilst a very useful account of the nomenclature applied to New Testament manuscripts has been added.

Professor Finegan displays, in general, sound judgment in the relative prominence he bestows on the different sections of the vast field he sets out to cover, and on controversial matters he states with fairness the various views current. Both points are exemplified in the treatment of the Dead Sea Scrolls, where Professor Finegan gives within a compass reasonably related to the size of his book a useful and balanced résumé of the main theories concerning these documents. Possibly less well balanced is the treatment of the Christian period, since Christianity for Professor Finegan appears to mean primarily Christianity at Rome. In addition to 12 pages on the topography of Rome, 69 pages are devoted to the catacombs and the history of the ancient churches of Rome, bringing the account of the latter in some cases up to the present century. By contrast, the account of all the ancient churches of Syria, Egypt, and Iraq amounts only to 16 pages, and no reference at all is made to the churches and monasteries (sixth century onwards) of eastern Syria, Iraq, and south-eastern Turkey listed by H. Pognon in *Inscriptions sémitiques de la Syrie*.

Professor Finegan claims to deal with the literature up to the beginning of 1959, and in general he has brought his book up to date. Inevitably, however, there are omissions. Thus on p. 227 f. one would have expected some reference to C. J. Gadd's publication (*Anatolian Studies*, VIII, 1958, 35-92) of the inscriptions of Nabonidus excavated by D. S. Rice at Harran. On p. 203 f. there is mention of M. E. L. Mallowan's post-war excavations at Nimrud (which here and elsewhere inexplicably appears as Nimrod), with no indication that anything has been done at the site since 1950.

Where so much is offered it is perhaps ungracious to ask for more, but in view of the sub-title one might reasonably expect something to be said of the religious milieu in which Christianity had its historical origin. Thus some more extensive account of Roman paganism and of Mithraism (for the monuments of the latter see now M. J. Vermaseren, *Corpus inscriptionum et monumentorum religionis Mithriacae*, 2 vols., 1956, 1960) would have been welcome. For the earlier period the three pages on Ras Shamra (171-4) might usefully have been amplified to give a more adequate account of pre-Israelite Semitic religion in Palestine and Syria.

MAURICE BOUYGES: *Essai de chronologie des œuvres de al-Ghazālī (Algazel)*, édité et mis à jour par Michel Allard. (Recherches publiées sous la direction de l'Institut de Lettres Orientales de Beyrouth, Tom. XIV.) xxiii, 205 pp. Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, [1959].

This is the first systematic and exhaustive treatment of works attributed to al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111), genuinely or spuriously, from the point of view of chronology. The general order of al-Ghazālī's major works has been well known among scholars for some time and important contributions towards a closer chronological arrangement have been made by the comments of Massignon, Goldziher, Asin Palacios, and Montgomery Watt. A more systematic and excellent, though partial attempt has been made by Dr. G. Hourani in his article on the subject in the *JAOS*, LXXIX, 4, 1959. Compared to Dr. Hourani's valuable comments on 47 items, however, M. Bouyges' present work was prepared by early 1924 (its preface was written in January 1924) but for some reason it saw the light of day only through the editorial action of M. Allard, who has also added some valuable notes in the light of subsequent research, especially by Dr. Montgomery Watt.

The main contours of the vicissitudinous mental development of al-Ghazālī are, as observed above, well known and so is the approximate order or chronology of many of his works. Matters are also facilitated in the case of these works by the happy fact that al-Ghazālī gives cross-references to and in these works fairly frequently. Much uncertainty reigns, however, about many works that he wrote, or is alleged to have written, during the period of his 'retreat' and afterwards. The basic ground of this uncertainty is not merely related to the placing of his works in an order, but essentially to determining which of the works attributed to him are genuine and which are not. Here the criteria of internal criticism, based on consistency and coherence, become paramount. But herein precisely lie the baffling difficulties and hazards, viz. what criteria shall serve as the basis of such a criticism? For the procedure seems to beg the very question it seeks to solve. Two illustrations will make this clear. The work *al-Maḍnūn bihī 'alā ghayri ahlihī* was judged spurious by several eminent Muslim authorities on the grounds of its unorthodox doctrines, but external evidence makes the authenticity of the work certain. Again, Dr. Watt places al-Ghazālī's dogmatic work *Iljām al-'awāmm* relatively early on the ground that it is purely dogmatic and not

mystical and therefore should belong to the pre-mystic period. But the evidence of a MS (No. 1712) in the Library of Shahid 'Ali Pasha, Constantinople, quoted both by Bouyges and Hourani, shows it to be the last work of al-Ghazālī, written only a few days before his death.

The truth is that al-Ghazālī's recourse to esoteric writing renders him an enigma. Once a person resorts to this stratagem, it is obvious that he is living a double spiritual life. There is no charge of heresy implied here or of heretical hypocrisy. For should al-Ghazālī have decided that in his 'public' works he was not speaking the truth, it is hard to believe that a man of his moral calibre and integrity would not have renounced orthodox Islam and written exoteric works about his 'real' spiritual doctrine. The conclusion inevitably imposes itself that al-Ghazālī sincerely adopted doctrines both of orthodox Islam and of philosophy and that his mysticism, far from being an eradication and a displacement of these, rather supervened on them, combining them in varying proportions. Thus, he did not reject the *content* of the Kalām theology but its formally logical method: he advocated an experiential method. But this is not all. He seems to have a similar approach to philosophy. When he rejects the philosophers in the *Tahāfut*, he is primarily rejecting their logical arguments rather than their theses (e.g. on the spirituality and the immortality of the soul, the existence of God, etc.) although he does seem to imply that if the purely rationalistic method is abandoned the *content* of philosophy will be modified, e.g. the doctrine of the eternity of the world would disappear.

It thus appears that even al-Ghazālī's mysticism is a complicated affair. The ethical-religious mysticism, born out of the experienced verities of the Kalām, is related more directly to his life, and experience. This is his 'personal' mysticism. But in it also a definite philosophical legacy shares, e.g. the dualism between mind and body. But, besides this, there is the intellectual or philosophic mysticism as expressed in a work like *al-Maḍnūn*. The two are not, in fact, quite separate in his mind. But if this is true, it is highly questionable whether al-Ghazālī ever discarded rationalism, for, otherwise, how is philosophic mysticism possible?

The upshot of all this is that in judging the genuineness of works attributed to al-Ghazālī, a more inclusive rather than an exclusive approach is called for. The doctrine that when he studied philosophy, he gave up Kalām and when he adopted the mystic way he rejected philosophy, turns out to be a myth. His spiritual career was not a simple succession of different states and phases but grew more and

more complex by the absorption of elements partly integrated and partly juxtaposed.

M. Bouyges' work falls into the main body of the text (itself subdivided into five periods of al-Ghazālī's literary career) and nine appendixes, treating altogether of 383 titles. To this the editor has added 21 more titles, including the *Masā'il su'ila 'anhā . . . al-Ghazālī* and 20 others that Brockelmann has added since 1924, thus bringing the total to 404. The main text contains 64 titles of works, including a few spurious ones and others of uncertain authenticity. Most of these works are the same as those listed by Dr. Hourani who has treated of 47 titles. In the majority of cases Dr. Hourani and M. Bouyges agree pretty well in order and chronology although M. Bouyges' work is much fuller in details. On several points, a comparison of the two would be interesting although we cannot deal with all these details here. It is interesting, for example, to note that the celebrated *Mishkāt al-anwār*, which was thought by W. Gairdner, its translator, and others to belong to the last period of al-Ghazālī, is placed by M. Bouyges, for plausible reasons, just *before* the second period of al-Ghazālī's teaching at Nishāpūr.

The dating of the great *Ihyā'* is still problematic and must await further study. M. Bouyges conjectures that its composition occurred between A.H. 489 and 495. Dr. Hourani makes al-Ghazālī begin his *magnum opus* not before 491. Both the date of beginning and finishing the *Ihyā'* are, actually, quite uncertain. The argument used both by M. Bouyges and Dr. Hourani, viz. that al-Ghazālī could not have been in Jerusalem in 492 because otherwise he would have surely mentioned the sensational event of Jerusalem's capture that year by the Crusaders, seems not to carry much weight. For, even if al-Ghazālī was not in Jerusalem, he could scarcely have failed to be informed of the event, say, while in Baghdad. But there is no mention of it in any of his later works either.

M. Bouyges also rejects the idea of al-Ghazālī's having been in Egypt while Dr. Hourani accepts it. This affects their attitude towards the work *al-Radd al-jamāl li-ṣāḥibāt-i-'isā bi-ṣarīḥ al-Injīl* which Dr. Hourani regards as genuine and in fact as proof of al-Ghazālī's having visited Egypt. M. Bouyges has put the work in his appendix VI among 'doubtful works'.

In his appendix II M. Bouyges has put those works for which he has insufficient evidence for dating and whose authenticity also is to be investigated. The *Ma'arīj al-Quḍs* (No. 76) and the *Mi'raj al-sālikīn* (No. 77) are included in this category. Dr. Watt has rejected both as unauthentic. As for the former, it is professedly esoteric and both in the preface and at the end

contains the phrase *al-Maḍnūn bihā 'alā ghayri ahlihā* (Cairo edition, 1927). It may be the case that someone, inspired by al-Ghazālī's *al-Maḍnūn*, fathered it upon him, although in my *Prophecy in Islam* (London, 1958), I treated it as genuine. There is, however, no positive proof of its spuriousness. In the above work, I pointed out (pp. 95–8) that the author both integrates and juxtaposes the orthodox point of view with the philosophical one. This, in my view, would argue for its genuineness. The style also seems to me to be that of al-Ghazālī. As for the *Mi'rāj al-sālikīn* (Cairo, A.H. 1344), it says on p. 74 'This Islamic Sharī'a is five hundred years old'. Al-Ghazālī says the same thing in his *Ihyā'* (VII, 157). In my book, referred to above, I treated it also as genuine. This work also cites the *Mishkāt al-anwār* (p. 70). I find no evidence to justify its rejection either. The most serious argument offered by Dr. Watt against its authenticity is that it expresses a belief, in several places, in the primacy of reason. This criterion seems to me highly questionable in view of what I have said before, viz. that al-Ghazālī's intuitionism does not reject reason and that his rejection of reason has specific application. If we pursued such criteria very strictly, we should be in great difficulties with al-Ghazālī. In his *Tahāfut*, for example, he makes a clear distinction between religious and natural sciences and divides his book accordingly. But in his *Munqidh* he declares that also natural sciences like medicine, etc., are based on revelation and religious intuition.

M. Bouyges' work marks the first full-scale serious attempt at settling the order and chronology of al-Ghazālī's works. Further progress will require years of intensive study of these works, although it is very improbable that the question of the whole range of the works will be ever completely solved. We are indebted to the editor for bringing the book to light.

F. RAHMAN

HANS EBERHARD MAYER: *Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*. xxxii, 270 pp. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1960. DM. 36.

This book is considerably more than its title indicates. In his introduction (p. xix) the author tells us that the period covered extends to 1453, except for the Knights of Rhodes, for whom the terminal date is 1522. These are not unreasonable dates for a history of the Crusades, though by the fifteenth century Papal exhortations were less concerned with the recovery of the Holy Land than with con-

taining the expansion of the Ottoman Turks, a task inherited by the Habsburgs and one which endured well into the seventeenth century. We are not, however, given a *terminus a quo* in the introduction and, upon opening the book, we discover that it is not simply a bibliography for a history of the Crusades but for a history of the relations between Islam and Christendom from the Arab expansion to the Protestant Reformation. In choosing so vast a subject the author has inevitably ensured that his work falls far short of anything approaching a thorough treatment of it, though it must be admitted that any bibliography containing 5,362 entries is bound to include much useful material. The book is divided into three major sections, containing general aids for historical scholarship, the sources, and finally, secondary works based upon the sources. In general the items on topography (nos. 147–477) appear to be most complete, while among those on Arabic epigraphy (nos. 681–91) one regrets the absence of Sauvaget's work, on chronology (nos. 126–31) the useful tables compiled by Cattenoz, and among the etymological dictionaries (nos. 5224–28) that of Lammens. Moreover, mention ought to have been made of Taurin's edition of the Papal Bulls (nos. 1347–79), the French edition of the new *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (no. 11), and Boyle's translation of Juvaini (no. 1332). The author's practice of listing European travellers' accounts of the Levant by their first names (e.g. no. 1070, Johannes Schiltberger; no. 1086, Marco Polo), even in the index, is troublesome, especially since he is not consistent (e.g. no. 1029, Mignanelli, B. de). In no. 1303 Qalqashandī's work is inaccurately cited, and it might be added that Björkman's *Staatskanzlei* is not even a partial translation of it. Further, Gaudefroy-Demombynes' *La Syrie* could have been included here, or at least a cross-reference to its appearance under no. 214. In no. 1314, Quatremère's *Histoire des sultans mamelouks* is not a translation of Maqrizi's work cited there, but of his *Kitāb al-sulūk* which, unhappily, is not mentioned. It is in this section incidentally that Zettersteen's edition of the anonymous Mamluk chronicle ought to have been included, rather than curiously isolated under no. 820. In no. 325 *Kretschmer* should read *Kretschmer*, and in no. 4511 *Scottas* ought to be *Sottas*, errors which can make a bibliography almost useless.

It is to be expected that many of the omissions in this collection will be made up in supplements which the author hopes to publish (introduction, p. xx). He has expressed a wish that readers should contribute to this project; we might begin by suggesting A. Saporī's excellent bibliography for at least one aspect