

THE CHRONOLOGY OF GHAZĀLĪ'S WRITINGS

GEORGE F. HOURANI

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

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

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

Ghazālī's career, and not containing discussion of doubtful points. Moreover, Watt's groups are not purely chronological, but are defined by the topics and doctrines of the works. While the four groups correspond roughly with four periods in Ghazālī's life, there may be some overlap in time between particular works in different groups.

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

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

¹ *Recueil de textes inédits concernant l'histoire de la mystique au pays d'Islam* (Paris, 1929), p. 93; repeated by C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, Supplementband I (Leiden, 1937), 744.

² *Die Streitschrift des Ghazālī gegen die Bāṭiniyya-Sekte* (Leiden, 1916), pp. 25-29.

³ *La Espiritualidad de Algazel*, I (Madrid, 1935), 35-36.

⁴ "The Authenticity of the Works Attributed to al-Ghazālī," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1952), pp. 24-45, including brief "Notes on Chronology" (pp. 43-44).

⁵ Sources are given in D. B. Macdonald, "The Life of al-Ghazzālī," *JAOS*, 20 (1899), 71-132; "Al-Ghazzālī," *Shorter 'Encyclopaedia of Islam'* (Leiden, 1953), pp. 111-14; and F. Jabre, "La biographie et l'œuvre de Ghazālī reconsidérées à la lumière des *Ṭabaqāt* de Sobkī," *Mélanges de l'Institut Dominicain d'Études Orientales*, 1 (Cairo, 1954), 73-102.

⁶ Nothing need be said about the special complications for dating by content created by the existence of esoteric works by Ghazālī and of spurious works attributed to him. These complications do not arise within the limits of method set in this article.

488 (1095). This may be called the early period of teaching. The date of his arrival at Nishāpūr as a student cannot be determined; it was presumably before his twentieth year in 470 (1077/8), but the date matters little in the present context, for there is no record or probability of his having written any of the surviving books for several years. All we know is that he started teaching and writing at Nishāpūr during the life-time of Imām al-Ḥaramayn.⁷ After the Imām's death in 478 (1085/6) Ghazālī went to the camp-court (*ma'askar*) of Nizām al-Mulk, where he enjoyed high favor and remained until 484 (1091/2). During the next four years, 484-88 (1091/2-1095) he was occupying the chair of Shafī'ite law at the Nizāmīya College in Baghdad, and this was a time of prolific literary production as will be seen from the list.

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

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

In the following lists, a number is given to every work which is anchored at both ends, i. e. known to be after another work and before a third. Where two works fall between the same anchors, but the order of these two relative to each other is not known, they are given the same number with the addition of letters: thus, 15a and 15b both come

between 14 and 16, but the letters a and b have no significance for order. Where a work is anchored at one end, i. e. by a *terminus post quem* or a *terminus ante quem*, it is listed as "after x" or "before y." It is then placed in the position that the evidence warrants, which in some cases may be considerably after or before its anchor.

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

AUTHENTIC DETERMINABLE WORKS

In *Mustaşfā* I, 3 Ghazālī says: "In the prime of my youth . . . I composed many books on the particulars and principles of law (*fi furū'i l-fiqhī wa uşūlihi*); then I came to the science of the way of the after-life and acquaintance with the inner secrets of religion." In *Munqidh* 79 ff. he specifies the order of his studies in Baghdad more exactly, as theology (*ilm al-kalām*), philosophy, Ta'limism and Sufism; and in 85 he says that he worked on philosophy "in my spare time between writing and lecturing on the scriptural sciences (*al-ulum ash-shar'iya*)"—i. e. *kalām* and *fiqh*. These assertions justify us in placing works of *fiqh* in the earliest period of Ghazālī's career as an author, unless there is evidence to the contrary. One of them can be assigned to the years of youth at Nishāpūr; for the others there is no clue to whether they belong to Nishāpūr, the camp-court or Baghdad.

Before 15b. *AL-MANKHŪL FĪ UŞŪL AL-FIQH*, in MS.

Mentioned in *Mustaşfā* I, 3 as a concise work on law. Subkī says Ghazālī wrote it during the lifetime of his teacher Imām al-Ḥaramayn, i. e. before 478 (1085/6).¹⁰ *Mankhūl*¹¹ means "sifted" and points to a summary.

Before 6b. *SHIFĀ' AL-'ALİL FĪ UŞŪL AL-FIQH*, lost.

Mentioned in *Mustazhirī* fol. 79a under this

⁷ Ibn 'Asākir, *Tabyin kadhb al-muftarī*, ed. A. F. Mehren in "Exposé de la réforme de l'Islamisme," *3rd International Congress of Orientalists, Transactions* II (Leiden, 1879), 322.

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

⁹ See below, under *Radd* and *Ihyā'*, for more details on this period.

¹⁰ *Tabaqāt ash-Shāfi'iya al-kubrā* (Cairo, 1324 = 1906/7), IV, 116. Confirmed by Yāfi'i, *Mir'āt al-janān*, fol. 257b, quoted by M. Smith, *Al-Ghazālī's Life and Personality* (London, 1944), p. 16.

¹¹ As in *Mustaşfā* and Subkī; better than *Manhūl*, "emaciated," as Macdonald, "Life," pp. 105-6, and Asín, *Espiritualidad* I, 29, n. 1.

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

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

- Before 7a.** 1. *MA'KHADH AL-KHILĀF*
2. *LUBĀB AN-NAẒAR*
3. *TAḤSĪN AL-MA'ĀKHIDH*
4. *AL-MABĀDĪ WAL-GHĀYĀT*

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

Mentioned in *Iḥyā'* I, 30. The *Mukhtaṣar* was by Ismā'īl al-Muzanī, an early Shafī'ite lawyer (d. 877). This is a resumé of it; perhaps Ghazālī made it as a text-book for students.

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

Before 11. *AL-BASĪṬ*, in MSS.

Mentioned in *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān* 22 as a work of *fiqh* of his earlier life. A summary of Imām al-Ḥaramayn's *Nihāyat al-maṭlab*, perhaps made as a text-book for students.

Before 11. *AL-WASĪṬ*, in MSS.

Mentioned in *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān* 22 as a work of *fiqh* of his earlier life. A summary of *al-Basīṭ*.

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

Mentioned in *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān* 22. i, 296, mentions *al-Basīṭ* and *al-Wasīṭ*. A summary of Shafī'ite law, perhaps made as a text-book for students.

Before 15b. *TAHDHĪB AL-UṢŪL*, lost.

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

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

As it was written in Baghdad (*Munqidh* 85), it could not have been started earlier than 484 (1091/2). *Maqāṣid* i, 2-3 and iii, 77, as well as *Munqidh* 84-85, make it plain that the book was written as a background to *Tahāfut*, which means it was completed hardly later than 486 (ended

Jan. 20, 1094), in view of the evidence on the dates of *Tahāfut* and *Mustaḥṣiri*. It must have been written during the "less than two years" when Ghazālī was studying philosophy in his spare time with the primary aim of understanding it (*Munqidh* 85).

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

After *Maqāṣid* (*Maqāṣid* i, 2-3 and iii, 77; *Munqidh* 84-85). MS. *Fātiḥ* 2921 (Istanbul) records that the writing of *Tahāfut* was completed on Muḥarram 11, 488 = January 21, 1095;¹² this sets the writing of it probably most in 487 (1094). In *Munqidh* 85 Ghazālī says he spent "nearly a year" in critical reflection on philosophy, after the less than two years spent in understanding it.

Mustaḥṣiri overlaps with *Tahāfut*—see 6b.

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

6b. *AL-MUSTAẖHIRĪ—FADĀ'IH AL-BĀṬINĪYA WA FADĀ'IL AL-MUSTAẖHIRĪYA*, selections, ed. I. Goldziher, *Streitschrift des Ghazālī gegen die Bāṭiniyya-Sekte* (Leiden, 1916).

The *Mustaḥṣiri* can be closely dated by its references to two caliphs. It refers to the 'Abbasid *Mustaḥṣir* as holding his office, (fols. 3b-4a), and his accession was on Muḥarram 15, 487 (February 4, 1094); and to the Fatimid *Mustaḥṣir* as still alive (fol. 18a), and he died on Dhūl-Ḥijja 17, 487 (December 29, 1094). Thus the book must have been at least begun before *Tahāfut* was completed. On the other hand it is shown by *Munqidh*, 79 and 109, that Ghazālī worked on Ta'limism (*al-Bāṭiniyya*) after philosophy. (Goldziher saw an allusion to *Tahāfut* in *Mustaḥṣiri* fol. 19b, where Ghazālī mentions a philosophic doctrine which he had refuted *fīl-kalām*.¹³ In *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān* 21 he does refer to his *Tahāfut* as a work of *kalām*). The fact is that there is

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

¹³ *Streitschrift*, p. 28.

nothing unusual about an author writing a new book before the last one has been revised or copied.

Before 11. *HUJJAT AL-ḤAQQ*, lost.

Mentioned in *Jawāhir al-Qurʾān* 21. Described in *Munqidh* 119 as a reply to criticisms by the Taʿlīmīs made against him in Baghdad. This does not prove that he wrote it in Baghdad, but it suggests that he was there, or had been there recently. Macdonald thought "perhaps during his second residence there,"¹⁴ but there is no way to decide.

7a. *MIYĀR AL-ʿILM FĪ FANN AL-MANTIQ*, ed. M. S. Kurdī (Cairo, 1329 = 1911).

Tahāfut, 17 and 20, anticipates it as an appendix, and *Tahāfut* 213 refers to it as *Madārik al-ʿuqūl*, and implies that it has already been written (*ṣannaḥnāhu*). *Mīyār* justifies itself (22) partly on the ground that it explains the technical terms in *Tahāfut*. Thus the relation of the two works is close. Mentioned in several later books: e. g. *Iqtisād* 9.

7b. *MIḤAKK AN-NAZAR FĪL-MANTIQ*, ed. M. Ḥalabī and M. Qabbānī (Cairo, n. d., Adabiya Press).

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

8. *AL-IQTISĀD FĪL-IʿTIQĀD*, ed. M. Qabbānī (Cairo, n. d., Adabiya Press; reprinted with same pagination by Tijārīya Press).

Mentions *Mīyār* and *Miḥakk* (9), and *Mustaẓhiri* (107); so cannot be earlier than 487 (1094/5). There is probably a forward reference to it in *Tahāfut* 78, though the title given there is *Qawā'id al-ʿaqā'id*. He says there that after finishing *Tahāfut* he hopes to write a constructive work on dogma, as the present one is destructive. Such an intention seems fulfilled more specifically in *Iqtisād* than in the actual *Qawā'id al-ʿaqā'id*, which is later and is but a part of *Ihyā'*.¹⁵

¹⁴ "Life," p. 88.

¹⁵ The text of *Tahāfut* 78 should not, however, be emended, as is done by S. Van den Bergh in his translation of Ibn Rushd's *Tahāfut at-tahāfut* (London, 1954), I, 68 = Bouyges' *TT* 116. There is no textual authority for any reading but *Qawā'id al-ʿaqā'id*. Ghazālī may well have changed his mind about the title of a book (cf. 6a and 7a, on *Mīyār*).

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

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

After 7a. *MIZĀN AL-ʿAMAL*, ed. M. S. Kurdī and M. S. Nuʾaymī (Cairo, 1328 = 1909/10).

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

Comparing Ghazālī's plan of work at the end of *Mīyār* with the order of his studies given in *Munqidh* 78 ff., we find the same progression in both: from the study of philosophy and logic to that of Sufism, which was primarily a practical "path." It is very likely that he set out to write a *Mizān al-ʿamal* in Baghdad in 488 (1095), and that it was by way of preliminary studies for this work that he became so deeply involved in reflection on the Sūfī practice. This reflection convinced him that he was himself in need of such a practice, not of further knowledge alone, and contributed to the crisis of that year (*Munqidh* 122-28). The writing of *Mizān*, therefore, was probably postponed at this time. That it was written after he had become a Sūfī is confirmed by the fact that it expounds Sūfī doctrine (in parts not judged spurious by Watt).¹⁶

To fix the time of *Mizān* any more closely will require a careful study of its contents and their relation to other works of Ghazālī, and that will be a complicated process. To illustrate the pitfalls of such a study we may consider the argument for a late date of *Mizān* put forward by H. Hāshim

¹⁶ *JRAS* (1952).

in the introduction to his French translation.¹⁷ Hāshim's argument rests on the book's denial of a bodily resurrection, contrasted with Ghazālī's condemnation of such denial in his other works and as late as *Munqidh*. He concludes that Ghazālī must have changed his views after *Munqidh* and that *Mizān* belongs to this very late time. Such an argument ignores two other explanations of apparent inconsistencies which must also be kept in mind in considering the works of Ghazālī. (a) It is possible that the doctrine in question occurs in a pseudo-Ghazalian text. There are many spurious writings, and Watt considers that parts of *Mizān* are so. If this is true it removes the evidence for date altogether. (b) The work may be esoteric. Ghazālī strongly advocates in many places the practice of not revealing advanced thought in widely published works, and certainly he wrote at least one esoteric work, the *Maḍnūn* (see below). Now according to medieval Islamic convention an esoteric work may expound a doctrine that is inconsistent with that of the same writer's exoteric works.

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

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

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

c. 492 (1099). AR-RADD AL-JAMĪL LI-ILĀHĪYĀT 'ĪSĀ BI-ṢARĪḤ AL-INJĪL, ed. R. Chidiac in *Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études: Sciences religieuses*, 54 (Paris, 1939).

Ghazālī's polemic against Christian theology cannot be related directly to other works, but it can be dated approximately. Its editor has shown that it is genuine, and that it was composed in

Egypt, for there is constant reference to Christianity in its Coptic, Monophysite form, including a sentence in the Coptic language (47*). Indeed the book is a good part of the evidence that Ghazālī really visited Egypt. Subkī says that after leaving Damascus (the second time) Ghazālī went to Cairo and Alexandria where he stayed awhile.¹⁹ If time is allowed for nearly two years in Damascus, a visit to Jerusalem and the pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina, the visit to Egypt can hardly have been before 492 (1099).

9. IḤYĀ' 'ULŪM AD-DĪN, 'Irāqī ed., 16 vols. (Cairo, 1356/57 = 1937-39).

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

Mentioned in most later works; among the earlier of these, it is referred to in *Bidāya* 14, 28, 33, 34, 39; 34 refers to sins of the heart which are dealt with in the third quarter of *Ihyā'*. *Maqṣad* 63 refers to *Ihyā'*, "Book" xxxvi.

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

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

¹⁷ *Critère de l'action* (Paris, 1945), pp. xii-xv.

¹⁸ Parallels with *Ihyā'* occur in parts which Watt considers probably spurious. Even if these were genuine it would still have to be decided which of the two sets of parallel passages was prior.

¹⁹ *Tabaqāt*, IV, 105. F. Jabre, "La biographie et l'œuvre de Ghazālī," *MIDEO* 1, 97, does not think the evidence sufficient to outweigh the silence of other reliable sources on an Egyptian sojourn. But I find it hard to explain otherwise the internal evidence noted by Chidiac.

²⁰ See Jabre, pp. 94-97, for a tabulation of statements of the sources and a tentative reconstruction.

travels to the Holy Cities of Arabia and back to Khurāsān. But the biographers give a different picture. According to the quite circumstantial account composed by Subkī from various sources, Ghazālī went to Jerusalem in 489 after a first stay of only a few days in Damascus.²¹ After leaving Jerusalem he returned to Damascus for a longer stay²² and, as we shall see, the biographers have him write *Iḥyā'* there.

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

But the biographers and historians take us back to a much earlier date of completion. Subkī reports that Ghazālī recited *Iḥyā'* on his return to Baghdad, after his wanderings in the Arab countries and before his return to Khurāsān.²⁴ His assertion is confirmed by an early source not used by Subkī, a certain Abū Bakr Ibn al-'Arabī, who writes that he personally heard Ghazālī read *Iḥyā'* in Baghdad.²⁵ It is further claimed by Ibn

al-Athīr in his brief notice on Ghazālī that he recited *Iḥyā'* in Damascus.²⁶ Ibn 'Asākir is vaguer, merely saying that he began *Iḥyā'* during the period of his wanderings "in those lands," before returning to Tūs.²⁷

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

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

After 9. *KITĀB AL-ḤIKMA FĪ MAKHLŪ-QĀT ALLĀH*, ed. M. Qabbānī (Cairo, 1321 = 1903/4).

Iḥyā' promises this work, in iv, 90.²⁸

After 9. *AR-RISĀLA AL-WA'ZĪYA*, in *Al-Jawāhir al-ghawālī min rasā'il al-imām ḥujjat al-Islām al-Ghazālī* (Cairo, 1353 = 1934).

155, mentions *Iḥyā'*.

Before Imlā'. *MARĀQĪ AZ-ZULFĀ*, lost.

Mentioned in *Imlā'*.²⁹ May be earlier than

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

²⁶ *Al-Kāmil fit-ta'rikh*, sub anno 488 (1095), (Cairo, 18—), Part 10, p. 87.

²⁷ In Mehren, "Exposé," p. 323. As Ibn 'Asākir allots "about ten years" to the wanderings, the statement about *Iḥyā'* is of little help. In any case ten years in the Arab countries is much too long in view of other evidence, and is probably a distortion of Ghazālī's figures for his total retirement, including Tūs, before his return to Nishāpūr: "about ten years" (*Munqidh* 144), "eleven years" (*Munqidh* 153, mentioning the months of beginning and ending).

²⁸ Asín, *Espiritualidad*, IV, 80, gives this reference, which may be to the Cairo edition of 1316 (1898/9) in 4 vols. I have been unable to locate it in the 'Irāqī edition.

²⁹ In the margin of Sayyid Murtaḍā az-Zabīdī's *Ithāf as-sāda* (Cairo, 1311 = 1893/4), IV, 397.

²¹ *Ṭabaqāt*, IV, 104.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Espiritualidad*, I, 35, n. 1.

²⁴ *Ṭabaqāt*, IV, 105.

²⁵ *Al-'Awāṣim min al-qawāsim*, fol. 7 of MS. 22031 B, Dār al-kutub, Cairo, which is dated 536 (1141/2). See Jabre, pp. 87-88. The writer gives as the date of his meeting with Ghazālī Jumādā II, 490 (May, 1097, not February as Jabre); but this date is too early to allow for Ghazālī's previous travels as related in *Munqidh* 130-31, and deserves less confidence because in the same passage the writer asserts that Ghazālī began the Sūfī life in 486 (1093/4), which is certainly incorrect. Ghazālī cannot have reached Baghdad before 492 (1099), for the reason given. Nor can he have arrived there later than that year, because he must surely have been

Ihyā', but is conveniently placed here because of the connection with *Imlā'*.

After 9. *AL-IMLĀ' FĪ ISHKĀLĀT AL-IḤYĀ'*, after *Ihyā'* in the 'Irāqī edition, XVI.

2, mentions criticisms by ignorant readers, and banning of *Ihyā'* somewhere. If this refers to the banning of his books in the Maghrib by the Almoravid amir 'Alī Ibn Yūsuf,³⁰ that would date *Imlā'* well after 500 (1106/7), when 'Alī's reign began. Even if this is not so an interval must be allowed after the publication of *Ihyā'* for the public reactions which gave cause for *Imlā'*.

After 9. *AYYUHĀ AL-WALAD*, ed. T. Šab-bāgh (Beirut, 1951), with introduction by G. H. Scherer.

29 and 59, mentions *Ihyā'*.

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

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

Mentions *Ihyā'* in several places; 34 mentions the fourth quarter, on "Things leading to salvation." Mentioned in *Arba'in* 29.

10b. *AL-MADNŪN BIHI 'ALĀ GHAYR AHLIHI* (Cairo, 1309 = 1891/2).

30, mentions *Ihyā'*, as the only other book of

his to date containing these truths. Mentioned in *Arba'in* 25.

10c. *AL-MAQṢAD AL-ASNĀ FĪ MA'ĀNĪ ASMĀ' ALLĀH AL-ḤUSNĀ* (Cairo, 1324 = 1906, Sharafiya Press).

56, 63, 81 mentions *Ihyā'*; 63 refers to "Book" xxxvi. Mentioned in *Arba'in* 13, 25.

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

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

Before 11. *QAWĀṢIM AL-BĀṬINIYA*, lost.

Mentioned in *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān* 21; and *Qistās* 174, as referring to the Ta'limīs. Presumably this is the work listed as *Mawāhim al-Bāṭiniya* in the printed edition of Subkī.³¹

Before 11. *JAWĀB MUFAṢṢAL AL-KHILĀF*, lost.

Mentioned with *Qawāsim* in *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān* 21, and *Qistās* 174, as referring to the Ta'limīs. Munqidh 119 describes it as a reply to criticisms made against Ghazālī in Hamadān, and a refutation of the Ta'limīs. It is not known whether or when Ghazālī was in Hamadān. Watt in his translation of *Munqidh*³² equates this work with *Fayṣal at-tafrīqa*; this is improbable, chronologically if for no other reason, because *Fayṣal* refers to *Qistās*, while *Qistās* refers to the present work.

11. *JAWĀHIR AL-QUR'ĀN* (Cairo, 1352 = 1933, Raḥmāniya Press).

24, mentions the forty "books" of *Ihyā'*. This book is placed after *Bidāya*, *Maḍnūn* and *Maqṣad* because these are mentioned in its companion volume *Arba'in*. 6, refers to *Arba'in* as a sequel to itself.

Mentioned in *Qistās* 177, etc.

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

12. *AL-ARBA'ĪN FĪ UṢŪL AD-DĪN* (Cairo, 1344 = 1925, Istiqāma Press).

29, mentions *Bidāya*; 25, mentions *Maḍnūn*; 13, 25, mentions *Maqṣad*.

³⁰ 'Abd al-Wāḥid al-Marrākushī, *Al-Mu'jib fī talkhīṣ akhbār al-Maghrib*, ed. M. S. al-'Arayān and M. A. al-'Alamī (Cairo, 1368 = 1949), p. 173 = 2nd ed. M. Dozy (Leiden, 1881), p. 123.

³¹ *Tabaqāt* IV, 116.

³² *The faith and practice of al-Ghazālī* (London, 1953).

305, says it is a sequel to *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān*.

Placed before *Qistās* because that work mentions the companion volume, *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān*. See 11.

13. AL-QISTĀS AL-MUSTAQĪM, in *Al-Jawāhir al-ghawālī* (Cairo, 1353 = 1934).

177, etc., mentions *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān*.

Mentioned in *Fayṣal* 88.

14. FAYṢAL AT-TAFRIQA BAYN AL-ISLĀM WAZ-ZANDAQA, in *Al-Jawāhir al-ghawālī* (Cairo, 1353 = 1934).

88 and 96, mentions *Qistās*.

Mentioned in *Munqidh* 99.

Goldziher³³ mentions a reference to *Fayṣal* in *Mustafā* I, 185, but this refers to an old edition, and I could not find the reference in the 1937 edition.

Before 15a. KITĀB AD-DARJ, lost.

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

Before 15a. "Die Streitschrift des Ḡazālī gegen die Ibāḥīja," Persian text and German translation O. Pretzl, *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosophisch-historische Abteilung 1933, Heft 7 (Munich, 1933).

As *Ibāḥīya* is written in Persian it is likely to be later than Ghazālī's return from the Arab countries.

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

Pretzl judges that *Munqidh* shows fairly certainly that the book was written at the Niẓāmiya

College in Nishāpūr after 499 (1106).³⁴ He does not give reasons, but it is likely that he relies on *Munqidh* 151, where Ghazālī says he was ordered by the Sultān to hasten to Nishāpūr to tackle the problem of religious indifference. The preceding pages of *Munqidh*, however, show that he was already delving into this problem intellectually in his previous retirement, so he may also have been writing about it then. Thus the book cannot be assigned certainly to before or after 499.

Before 15a and 15b. KĪMIYĀ-YI SA'ĀDAT, Eng. tr. of eight chapters of the Urdu version by C. Field, *The Alchemy of Happiness* (London, 1910).

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

Mentioned in *Mustafā* I, 3, as before the return to teaching (Dhūl-Qa'da, 499 = July, 1106).

Thus *Kimīyā* can be assigned with some confidence to the years at the *zāwiya* at Ṭūs, before the return to Nishāpūr.

15a. AL-MUNQIDH MIN AḌ-ḌALĀL WAL-MŪṢIL ILĀ DHĪL-IZZĀ WAL-JALĀL, ed. J. Ṣalībā and K. 'Ayyād (Damascus, 1939).

67, Ghazālī gives his age as "over 50," i. e. after Muḥarram 1, 500 = Sept. 2, 1106, at the earliest.

153, mentions the month of his return to Nishāpūr, Dhūl-Qa'da, 499 = July, 1106. 99, mentions *Fayṣal*.

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

15b. AL-MUSTAṢFĀ MIN 'ILM AL-UṢŪL (Cairo, 1356 = 1937, Tiġāriya Press).

I, 3, mentions the return to teaching at Nishāpūr, i. e. after Dhūl-Qa'da, 499 = July, 1106; also mentions *Jawāhir al-Qur'ān* and *Kimīyā*.

There is no evidence for its temporal relation to *Munqidh*.

Before 16. AT-TIBR AL-MASBŪK FĪ NA-ṢIḤAT AL-MULŪK (Cairo, 1317 = 1899/1900).

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

³³ *Streitschrift*, p. 27, n. 3.

³⁴ *Sitzungsberichte* (1933), p. 16.

16. *ILJĀM AL-ʿAWĀMM ʿAN ʿILM AL-KALĀM* (Cairo, 1309 = 1891/2, Mayminiya Press).

There has fortunately come to light a manuscript dated 507 (1113), which gives the date of completion of the work as "the first days of Jumādā II, 505."³⁵ Ghazālī died on the 14th of that month (December 18, 1111).

44, mentions *Qistās*.

* * *

INDETERMINABLE OR SPURIOUS WORKS

There are many other works attributed to Ghazālī. Some are probably genuine, but contain no indications of date or have been inaccessible, existing only in manuscript, or known only by title from references in later Arabic writers. Others are probably spurious, including some which have been printed. A number of the spurious works contain references to *Iḥyāʾ* alone of the genuine works. This fact, far from indicating authenticity or date, actually arouses suspicion, for it is usually a clumsy means used by forgers to suggest genuineness, as a person who knows little of Shakespeare might refer to *Hamlet*. There is no point here in listing these works or attempting to separate the genuine from the spurious, a task which would go far beyond the present undertaking. But it may be

³⁵ MS. Shahīd ʿAlī 1/1712, Istanbul; listed as *Tawḥīd* No. 34 in F. Sayyid, *Fihrist al-makḥṭūʿāt al-muṣawwara* (Cairo, 1954: Arab League Cultural Commission).

useful to make a comment on the claim of *Minhāj al-ābidīn* to be the latest work of Ghazālī. This work, ed. I. Ibn Ḥasan al-Anbābī (Cairo, 1919), was suspected by Muḥyī ad-dīn Ibn ʿArabī and is now rejected by Watt on several grounds.³⁶ On p. 2 it claims to have been dictated to ʿAbd al-Malik Ibn ʿAbdallāh and to be "the last book he wrote." The latter assertion is now contradicted by the manuscript evidence on *Iljām*, mentioned above. This is an additional reason for rejecting the book as spurious.

* * *

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

³⁶ *JRAS* (1952).

MĀNAVA-DHARMAŚĀSTRA VERSES IN CĀṆAKYA'S COMPENDIA¹

LUDWIK STERNBACH

NEW YORK

I. Introductory Note

1. Aphorisms and maxims found in Cāṇakya's compendia are very numerous. The author has been able to collect 2433 different aphorisms and maxims which he found in 171 editions and manuscripts.² This large number of aphorisms and

maxims suggests that it could not have been possible for one man—Cāṇakya—to compose all of them.

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

¹ This is number 27 of the author's series "Juridical Studies in Ancient Indian Law." The earlier studies are quoted in *JAOS*, 76, 115. Cf. *Indo-Iranian Monograph Series* V.

² L. Sternbach, "Cāṇakya's Various Versions of Aphorisms with a *pratīka* Index of aphorisms attributed to Cāṇakya. (An attempt at a revised analysis.)"