

and *Indian Mammals*, British Museum, London 1951; P. Grassé (ed.), *Traité de zoologie. Mammifères*, Paris 1955; Th. Haltenorth and W. Trense, *Das Grosswild der Erde*, Bonn-Munich-Vienna 1956; L. Joleaud, *Études de Géographie zoologique sur la Berbérie*, ii, les Bovidés, in *R.Afr.*, no. 295 (1918); Kobelt, *Die Säugethiere Nordafrikas*, in *Der Zool. Gart.*, 1886; L. Lavauden, *La chasse et la faune cynégétique en Tunisie*², Tunis 1924; idem, *Les Vertébrés du Sahara*, Tunis 1926; idem, *Les Gazelles du Sahara central*, in *Bull. Soc. d'Hist. Nat. de l'Afrique du Nord*, January 1926; idem, *Les grands animaux de chasse de l'Afrique française*, in *Faune des colonies françaises*, v/7, Paris 1934; Lydekker, *Catalogue of the Ungulate mammals in the British Museum*, London 1913-7; H. Lhote, *La chasse chez les Touaregs*, Paris 1951, 90-102; I. T. Sanderson, *Living mammals of the world*, Fr. trans.: *Les Mammifères vivants du monde*, Paris 1957; *Survey of Iraq fauna*, by members of the Mesopotamia Expeditionary Force, Bombay n.d.; R. Ward, *Record of Big Game*, London 1928.—Mention of gazelles is further to be found in the works of the Arab geographers, and in the many "accounts of journeys" of travellers, Arabic and European, in the regions where the animal is found.

(F. VIRÉ)

AL-GHAZĀL, YAḤYĀ B. ḤAKAM AL-BAKRĪ, a native of Jaén, was called by this name ('the gazelle') in his youth because of his slenderness and good looks. He became prominent, along with 'Abbās b. Firnās, at the court of al-Ḥakam I, who, on returning from his continual campaigns, liked to take part in the poetical tournaments of the little literary group which he had allowed to spring up round him. Al-Ghazāl was already 50 years old when his star shone even brighter at the court of 'Abd al-Rahmān II, who made him one of his favourite poets. In 225/840, after receiving with every honour the embassy of the Byzantine emperor Theophilus and being much flattered by this acknowledgement of his power, 'Abd al-Rahmān II caused the Constantinople ambassador, when he returned to his country, to be accompanied by two Muslim emissaries: the poet Yaḥyā al-Ghazāl and another Yaḥyā called *ṣāhib al-munayyila* ('the man with the little clock'). These two were charged with bearing the amir of Cordova's reply to Theophilus's letter, in which he had proposed an alliance against the 'Abbāsids of the East and their vassals the Aghlabids of Ifrīkiya because of their naval activities in Sicily. After delivering 'Abd al-Rahmān II's reply and presents to Theophilus in Constantinople al-Ghazāl caused a stir at the Byzantine court with his talent and sparks of sly wit which he demonstrated brilliantly before the Emperor himself, his wife Theodora, and the crown prince Michael. By his charming manners and notorious cupidity he obtained jewels for his daughters from the Empress, just as he had contrived, before embarking on his mission, that the Cordovan amir assign them a pension in case he should not return. His witty and sometimes coarse repartee was as famous as his avarice. He was a poet of mordant wit and greatly dreaded for his merciless satires. They were composed in a clear style devoid of rhetorical figures, which placed them within reach of the common people. Besides the personal gifts made to him by the court he brought back from his stay in Constantinople stocks of a variety of fig tree, of which the figs, called *doñegal*, are still known under the variant name *boñigar* given s.v. *higo* in the Dictionary of the Spanish Academy. During his time

the musician Ziryāb [q.v.] introduced the game of chess to Cordova, where it had a great success. But it was not approved by al-Ghazāl, for in a poem addressed to a nephew of his who was a keen chess-player he declared it to be sinful and an invention of the devil. Al-Ghazāl's unusual diplomatic mission and the memory of Viking incursions gave rise to the legend invented in the 12th or 13th century by the Valencian Ibn Dihya (*Muṭrib*, Khartoum 1954, 130 f.) according to which 'Abd al-Rahmān II, satisfied with the way in which al-Ghazāl and his companion had carried out their mission, entrusted to them in later years another embassy to the North with the aim of dissuading the king of the Vikings from attempting a fresh landing in Andalusia. According to this story the poet and his companion fulfilled their task in northern Europe and returned to Cordova after a dangerous voyage of nine months in Atlantic waters. The falseness of this is obvious at a glance. The more or less marvellous elements of which it is formed are copied for the most part from episodes attributed in the 10th century to al-Ghazāl's journey to the Greek emperor. No doubt the unusual activity of the Byzantine emperor in Cordova and the daring landing of the Vikings on Spanish territory, enriched with romantic details, finally amalgamated in the popular beliefs of Andalusia and so gave rise to a combined legend which little by little distorted the historical reality.

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, *Un échange d'ambassades entre Cordoue et Byzance au IX^e siècle*, in *Byzantion*, xii (1937), 1-24 (republished in *Islam d'Occident*, i, 79-107); idem, *Hist. Esp. Mus.*, i, 251-4; on al-Ghazāl's alleged embassy to northern Europe, G. Jacob, *Arabische Berichte von Gesandten an germanischen Fürstenthöfe aus dem 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, Berlin and Leipzig 1927, 35; E. Dubler, *La crónica árabe-bizantina del 741*, in *Andalus*, xi (1946), 342; Arne Melvinger, *Les premières incursions des Vikings en Occident . . .*, Uppsala 1955, 58 ff. and index; D. M. Dunlop, *The British Isles according to medieval Arabic authors*, in *IQ*, iv (1957), 12-4; W. E. D. Allen, *The poet and the spae-wife*, Dublin 1960. See also Dozy, *Recherches*², ii, 267-78; E. García Gómez, *Sobre agricultura árabe-andaluza*, in *Andalus*, x (1945), 134; F. M. Pareja, *Libro del ajedrez, de sus problemas y sutilezas*, de autor árabe desconocido, Madrid-Granada 1935; Pons Boigues, 281-3, no. 238.

(A. HUICI MIRANDA)

AL-GHAZĀLĪ, ABŪ ḤAMĪD MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD AL-ṬŪSĪ (450/1058-505/1111), outstanding theologian, jurist, original thinker, mystic and religious reformer. There has been much discussion since ancient times whether his *nisba* should be Ghazālī or Ghazzālī; cf. Brockelmann, *SI*, 744; the former is to be preferred in accordance with the principle of *difficilior lectio potius*.

1. Life

He was born at Ṭūs in Khurāsān, near the modern Meshhed, in 450/1058. He and his brother Aḥmad were left orphans at an early age. Their education was begun in Ṭūs. Then al-Ghazālī went to *Djurdjān* and, after a further period in Ṭūs, to Naysābūr, where he was a pupil of al-Diwaynī Imām al-Ḥaramayn [q.v.] until the latter's death in 478/1085. Several other teachers are mentioned, mostly obscure, the best known being Abū 'Alī al-Fārmadhī. From Naysābūr in 478/1085 al-Ghazālī went to the "camp" of Niẓām al-Mulk [q.v.] who had attracted

many scholars, and there he was received with honour and respect. At a date which he does not specify but which cannot be much later than his move to Baghdād and which may have been earlier, al-Ghazālī passed through a phase of scepticism, and emerged to begin an energetic search for a more satisfying intellectual position and practical way of life. In 484/1091 he was sent by Nizām al-Mulk to be professor at the *madrasa* he had founded in Baghdād, the Nizāmiyyā. Al-Ghazālī was one of the most prominent men in Baghdād, and for four years lectured to an audience of over three hundred students. At the same time he vigorously pursued the study of philosophy by private reading, and wrote several books. In 488/1095, however, he suffered from a nervous illness which made it physically impossible for him to lecture. After some months he left Baghdād on the pretext of making the pilgrimage, but in reality he was abandoning his professorship and his whole career as a jurist and theologian. The motives for this renunciation have been much discussed from the contemporary period until the present day. He himself says he was afraid that he was going to Hell, and he has many criticisms of the corruption of the 'ulamā' of his time (e.g., *Iḥyā'*, i); so it may well be that he felt that the whole organized legal profession in which he was involved was so corrupt that the only way of leading an upright life, as he conceived it, was to leave the profession completely. The recent suggestion (F. Jabre, in *MIDEO*, i (1954), 73-102) that he was chiefly afraid of the Ismā'īlīs (Assassins) who had murdered Nizām al-Mulk in 485/1092, and whom he had attacked in his writings, places too much emphasis on what can at most have been one factor. Another suggestion is that of D. B. Macdonald (in *EI*) that contemporary political events may have made al-Ghazālī apprehensive; shortly before he left Baghdād the Saljūqīd sultan Barkiyārūk [q.v.] executed his uncle Tutuṣh, who had been supported by the caliph and presumably al-Ghazālī; and it was soon after the death of Barkiyārūk in 498/1105 that al-Ghazālī returned to teaching.

From al-Ghazālī's abandonment of his professorship in Baghdād to his return to teaching at Naysābūr in 499/1106 is a period of eleven years, and it is sometimes said, even in early Muslim biographical notices, that al-Ghazālī spent ten years of this in Syria. Careful reading of his own words in the *Munqidh* (see below), and attention to numerous small details in other sources, makes it certain that he was only "about two years" in Syria. On his departure from Baghdād in Dhu 'l-Ka'da 488/November 1095 he spent some time in Damascus, then went by Jerusalem and Hebron to Medina and Mecca to take part in the Pilgrimage of 489/November-December 1096. He then went back for a short time to Damascus, but his own phrase of "nearly two years there" (*Munqidh*, 130) must be taken loosely. He is reported to have been seen in Baghdād in Djumādā II 490/May-June 1097 (Jabre, *op. cit.*, 87; cf. Bouyges, *Chronologie*, 3), but this can only have been a brief stay in the course of his journey to his home, Tūs. It is sometimes said that al-Ghazālī visited Alexandria, but scholars are now inclined to reject this report; if he did go to Egypt it can only have been for a short time.

In this period of retirement at Damascus and Tūs al-Ghazālī lived as a poor ṣūfī, often in solitude, spending his time in meditation and other spiritual exercises. It was at this period that he composed his greatest work, *Iḥyā' 'ulūm al-dīn* ("The Revival

of the Religious Sciences"), and he may have lectured on its contents to select audiences. By the end of the period he had advanced far along the mystic path, and was convinced that it was the highest way of life for man.

In the course of the year 499/1105-6 Fakhr al-Mulk, son of Nizām al-Mulk and vizier of Sandjār, the Saljūqīd ruler of Khurāsān, pressed al-Ghazālī to return to academic work. He yielded to the pressure, partly moved by the belief that he was destined to be the reviver of religion (*muḥjaddid*) at the beginning of the new century, in accordance with a well-known Tradition. In Dhu 'l-Ka'da 499/July-August 1106 he began to lecture at the Nizāmiyya in Naysābūr and not long afterwards wrote the autobiographical work *al-Munqidh min al-dalāl* ("Deliverance from Error"). Before his death, however, in Djumādā II 505/December 1111, he had once again abandoned teaching and retired to Tūs. Here he had established, probably before he went to Naysābūr, a *khānqāh* or hermitage, where he trained young disciples in the theory and practice of the ṣūfī life. Several names are known of men who were his pupils at Tūs (cf. Bouyges, *Chronologie*, 4 n.).

2. Works and doctrines

(a) *Questions of authenticity and esotericism.* A great difficulty in the study of al-Ghazālī's thought is that, while he undoubtedly wrote many books, some have been attributed to him which he did not write. Bouyges in his *Essai de Chronologie* (composed before 1924 but only published posthumously in 1959 with additional notes on subsequent publications by M. Allard) lists 404 titles. Many of these are taken from lists of his works and no copies are known to exist. In other cases the same book appears under different titles, and a great deal of work has still to be done on manuscripts before scholars know exactly what is extant and what is not. Further, at least from the time of Muḥyi 'l-Dīn b. al-'Arabī (d. 638/1240) allegations have been made that books have been falsely attributed to al-Ghazālī (cf. Montgomery Watt, *A forgery in al-Ghazālī's Mishkāt?*, in *JRAS* 1949, 5-22; idem, *The authenticity of the works attributed to al-Ghazālī*, in *JRAS*, 1952, 24-45). The works whose authenticity has been doubted are mostly works expressing advanced ṣūfistic and philosophical views which are at variance with the teaching of al-Ghazālī in the works generally accepted as authentic. There are difficulties, owing to the richness of his thought, in establishing conclusively the existence of contradictions. Ibn Ṭufayl (d. 581/1185), however, who called attention to contradictions, also suggested that al-Ghazālī wrote differently for ordinary men and for the élite, or, in other words, that he had esoteric views which were not divulged to everyone (*Ḥayy b. Yaḥyā*, Damascus, 1358/1939, 69-72). This complicates the problem of authenticity: but there is no reason for thinking that, even if al-Ghazālī had different levels of teaching for different audiences, he ever in the "higher" levels directly contradicted what he maintained at the lower levels. An alternative supposition, that he adopted extreme philosophical forms of ṣūfism in his last years, seems to be excluded by the discovery that *Idrām al-'awāmm*, in which he holds a position similar to that of the *Iḥyā'*, was completed only a few days before his death (Bouyges, *Chronologie*, 80 f.; G. F. Hourani, *The chronology of Ghazālī's writings*, in *JAOS*, lxxix (1959), 225-33). In the present state of scholarship the soundest methodology is to concentrate on the main works

of undoubted authenticity and to accept other works only in so far as the views expressed are not incompatible with those in the former (cf. Montgomery Watt, *The study of al-Ghazālī*, in *Oriens*, xiii-xiv (1961), 121-31).

(b) *Personal*. A year or two before his death al-Ghazālī wrote *al-Munqidh min al-dalāl*, an account of the development of his religious opinions, but not exactly an autobiography, since it is arranged schematically not chronologically; e.g., he knew something of *ṣūfism* before the stage of development at which he describes it in the book. Most of the details about his life given above are derived from the *Munqidh*. He is also concerned to defend himself against the accusations and criticism that had been brought against his conduct and the views he had expressed. A small work answering criticisms of the *Ihyāʾ* is the *Imlāʾ*.

(c) *Legal*. Al-Ghazālī's early training was as a jurist, and it was probably only under al-Djuwaynī that he devoted special attention to *kalām* or dogmatic theology. Some of his earliest writings were in the sphere of *fiqh*, notably the *Basīṭ* and the *Wasīṭ*, but he apparently continued to be interested in the subject and to write about it, for a work called the *Waḍiʿ* is dated 495/1101, while the *Mustasfā* was written during his period of teaching at Naysābūr in 503/1109 (Bouyges, *Chronologie*, 49, 73). The latter deals with the sources of law (*uṣūl al-fiqh*) in a manner which shows the influence of his earlier philosophical studies but is entirely within the juristic tradition. It is reported in biographical notices that at the time of his death al-Ghazālī was engaged in deepening his knowledge of Tradition.

(d) *Philosophy and logic*. After the period of scepticism described in the *Munqidh*, al-Ghazālī in his quest for certainty made a thorough study of philosophy, a subject to which he had been introduced by al-Djuwaynī. This occupied all the earlier part of the Baghdad period. What he studied was chiefly the Arabic Neoplatonism of al-Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā. Though his final aim was to show in what respects their doctrines were incompatible with Sunnī Islam, he first wrote an exposition of their philosophy without any criticism, *Maḥāṣid al-falāsifa*, which was much appreciated in Spain and the rest of Europe in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. This he followed by a criticism of the doctrines entitled *Tahāfut al-falāsifa*, "The incoherence (or inconsistency) of the philosophers"; this was finished at the beginning of 488/1095 (Bouyges, *Chronologie*, 23). In it he noted twenty points on which the philosophers' views were objectionable to Sunnīs or inconsistent with their own claims; in respect of three of these they were to be adjudged unbelievers. In the *Tahāfut* al-Ghazālī concentrates on demonstrating the inconsistencies of the philosophers and does not argue for any positive views of his own. Because of this he has been accused of having remained something of a sceptic. This accusation fails to notice that the *Tahāfut* was written just before the crisis which caused him to leave Baghdad; it is therefore possible that at the time he was somewhat uncertain of his positive beliefs, but a few years later when he was writing the *Ihyāʾ* he was in no doubt about what he believed. What impressed al-Ghazālī most of the various branches of philosophical studies was logic, and in particular the Aristotelian syllogism. For the sake of Sunnī jurists and theologians to whom philosophical books were not easily accessible or, because of their technical language, not readily understandable, he

wrote two books on Aristotelian logic, *Miʿyār al-ʿilm* and *Mihakk al-naẓar*. A justification of the use of this logic in religious matters is contained in *al-Ḳisās al-mustaḳīm*, apparently written for some comparatively simple-minded believers who were attracted by Bāṭinī (Ismāʿīlī) doctrines. While full of enthusiasm for philosophy al-Ghazālī wrote a work on ethics, *Mizān al-ʿamal*, though whether the whole of the extant text is authentic has been questioned (JRAS, 1952, 38-40, 45). Since al-Ghazālī does not appear to refer to the *Mizān* in his later works, and since he became very critical of philosophical ethics (*Munqidh*, 99 ff.), it is possible that, as his enthusiasm waned, he rejected much of what he had written in this work.

(e) *Dogmatic theology*. His chief work of dogmatics is *al-Ikhtisād fi ʿl-iʿtikād*, probably composed shortly before or shortly after his departure from Baghdad (Bouyges, 34). This book deals with roughly the same topics as the *Irshād* of al-Djuwaynī, but it makes full use of Aristotelian logic, including the syllogism. In this respect Ibn Ḳhaldūn (iii, 41) is correct in making al-Ghazālī the founder of a new tendency in theology, although there is no striking novelty in his dogmatic views. In *Kitāb al-Arbaʿīn*, (Cairo 1344, 24), written after the *Ihyāʾ*, al-Ghazālī says that the *Ikhtisād* is more likely to prepare for the gnosis (*maʿrifa*) of the *ṣūfī* than the usual works of dogmatics; and this continuing approval strengthens the view that al-Ghazālī never ceased to be an *Ashʿarī* in dogmatics, even though he came to hold that intellectual discussions in religion should range far beyond the limited field of dogmatics, and that detailed discussions in dogmatics had no practical value. To dogmatic theology might also be assigned *Fayṣal al-tafriqa bayn al-Islām wa-l-zandaqa*. This is partly directed against the Bāṭiniyya, but is mainly a defence of his own views on the extent to which *taʾwīl* is justified, and on the relative places of *tawātur* and *iḍmāʿ* as sources of religious knowledge. *Ilḍiām al-ʿawāmm ʿan ʿilm al-kalām*, which appears to be his last work, warns of the dangers in the study of *kalām* for those with little education.

(f) *Polemics*. The *Mustaḥṣiri*, edited in abridged form by Goldziher as *Streitschrift des Gazālī gegen die Bāṭinijja-Sekte* (1916), is a searching theological critique of the Nizārī Ismāʿīlīs or Assassins. A Persian work, edited by O. Pretzl as *Die Streitschrift des Gasālī gegen die Ibāḥijja* (1933), attacks the antinomianism of certain mystics. The authenticity of a work of anti-Christian polemic, *al-Radd al-djamil ʿalā sarīḥ al-indjīl* (ed. and tr. R. Chidiac, Paris 1939), is doubted by Bouyges (126), but defended by Louis Massignon (in *REI*, 1932, 491-536).

(g) *Ṣūfistic practice*. Al-Ghazālī's greatest work, both in size and in the importance of its contents is *Ihyāʾ ʿulūm al-dīn*, "The revival of the religious sciences", in four volumes. This is divided into four "quarters", dealing with *ʿibādāt* (cult practices), *ʿādāt* (social customs), *muhlikāt* (vices, or faults of character leading to perdition), *munḍijyāt* (virtues, or qualities leading to salvation). Each "quarter" has ten books. The *Ihyāʾ* is thus a complete guide for the devout Muslim to every aspect of the religious life—worship and devotional practices, conduct in daily life, the purification of the heart, and advance along the mystic way. The first two books deal with the necessary minimum of intellectual knowledge. This whole stupendous undertaking arises from al-Ghazālī's feeling that in the hands of the *ʿulamāʾ* of his day religious knowledge had become a means of worldly advancement, whereas it was his deep conviction

that it was essentially for the attainment of salvation in the world to come. He therefore, while describing the prescriptions of the *Sharīʿa* in some detail, tries to show how they contribute to a man's final salvation. *Bidāyat al-hidāya* is a brief statement of a rule of daily life for the devout Muslim, together with counsel on the avoidance of sins. *K. al-Arbaʿīn* is a short summary of the *Iḥyāʾ*, though its forty sections do not altogether correspond to the forty books. *Al-Maḥṣad al-asnā* discusses in what sense men may imitate the names or attributes of God. *Kimīyāʾ al-saʿāda* is in the main an abridgement in Persian of the *Iḥyāʾ* (also translated in whole or in part into Urdu, Arabic, etc.), but there are some differences which have not been fully investigated.

(h) *Ṣūfistic theory*. It is in this field that most of the cases of false or dubious authenticity occur. *Mishkāṭ al-anwār* ("The niche for lights", tr. W. H. T. Gairdner, London 1924; cf. idem, in *Isl.*, v (1914), 121-53) is genuine, except possibly the last section (*JRAS*, 1949, 5-22). *Al-Risāla al-laduniyya* deals with the nature of knowledge of divine things, and its authenticity has been doubted because of its closeness to a work of Ibn al-ʿArabī and because of its Neoplatonism (cf. Bouyges, 124 f.). There are numerous other works in the same category, of which the most important is *Minḥādī al-ʿabidīn*. These works are of interest to students of mysticism, and their false attribution to al-Ghazālī, if it can be proved, does not destroy their value as illustrations of some branches of ṣūfistic thought during the lifetime of al-Ghazālī and the subsequent half-century.

3. His influence

A balanced account of the influence of al-Ghazālī will probably not be possible until there has been much more study of various religious movements during the subsequent centuries. The following assessments are therefore to some extent provisional.

(a) His criticism of the *Bāṭiniyya* may have helped to reduce the intellectual attractiveness of the movement, but its comparative failure, after its success in capturing Alamūt, is due to many other factors.

(b) After his criticism of the philosophers there are no further great names in the philosophical movement in the Islamic east, but it is not clear how far the decline of philosophy is due to al-Ghazālī's criticisms and how far to other causes. Its continuance in the Islamic west, where the *Tahāfut* was also known, suggests that the other causes are also important.

(c) Al-Ghazālī's studies in philosophy led to the incorporation of certain aspects of philosophy, notably logic, into Islamic theology. In course of time theologians came to devote much more time and space to the philosophical preliminaries than to the theology proper. On the other hand, his speculations about the nature of man's knowledge of the divine realm and his conviction that the upright and devout man could attain to an intuition (or direct experience — *dhawq*) of divine things comparable to that of the worldliness of the 'ulamā' does not seem to have led to any radical changes.

(d) He undoubtedly performed a great service for devout Muslims of every level of education by presenting obedience to the prescriptions of the *Sharīʿa* as a meaningful way of life. His *khānqāh* at Tūs, where he and his disciples lived together, was not unlike a Christian monastery; and it may be that he gave an impetus to the movement out of which

came the dervish orders (but this requires further investigation).

(e) His example may have encouraged those forms of ṣūfism which were close to Sunnism or entirely Sunnī. Before him, however, there had been much more ṣūfism among Sunnī 'ulamā' than is commonly realized. His influence on the ṣūfī movement in general, however, requires further careful study.

Bibliography: (a) *Life, General*. P. Bouyges, *Essai de chronologie des œuvres de al-Ghazālī*, ed. M. Allard, Beirut 1959 (pp. 1-6 contain very full references to the main biographical sources); D. B. Macdonald, *The life of al-Ghazālī*, in *JAOS*, xx (1899), 71-132 (still useful but requires to be supplemented and corrected); Margaret Smith, *Al-Ghazālī the mystic*, London 1944 (contains large biographical section, also chapter on his influence); W. Montgomery Watt, *Muslim intellectual*, Edinburgh 1963; W. R. W. Gardner, *An account of al-Ghazālī's life and works*, Madras 1919; S. M. Zwemer, *A Moslem seeker after God*, London 1920.

(b) *Works*. Brockelmann, I, 535-46; S I, 744-56; Bouyges, *Chronologie* (as above). In *ZDMG*, xciii, 395-408, Fr. Meier gives information about the Persian *Naṣīhat al-mulūk* and its Arabic translation *al-Tibr al-masbūk*; English tr. by F. R. C. Bagley, *Ghazālī's book of counsel for Kings*, London 1964. Translations and studies later than Brockelmann: W. Montgomery Watt, *The faith and practice of al-Ghazālī*, London 1953 (*Munkidh*, *Bidāyat al-hidāya*); G.-H. Bousquet, *Iḥyāʾ ou Vivification des sciences de la foi, analyse et index*, Paris 1955; *Iḥyāʾ*, xi, Ger. tr. H. Kindermann, Leiden 1962; xii, Fr. tr. G.-H. Bousquet, Paris 1953; xxxi, Susanna Wilzer, *Untersuchungen, in Isl.*, xxxii, 237-309, xxxiii, 51-120, xxxiv, 128-37; xxxiii, Eng. tr. W. McKane, Leiden 1962; *Tahāfut*, Eng. tr. S. A. Kamali, Lahore 1958; Fr. trs. of *Kisfās* by V. Chelhot in *BÉt.Or.*, xv, 7-98; and of *Munkidh* by F. Jabre, Beirut.

(c) *Doctrines*. M. Asín Palacios, *La espiritualidad de Algazel y su sentido cristiano*, Madrid 1935, etc.; J. Obermann, *Der philosophische und religiöse Subjektivismus Ghazalis*, Vienna and Leipzig 1921; A. J. Wensinck, *La pensée de Ghazālī*, Paris 1940; Farid Jabre, *La notion de certitude selon Ghazālī*, Paris 1958; idem, *La notion de la Ma'rifa chez Ghazālī*, Beirut 1958; M. Smith, *al-Ghazālī the Mystic* (as above); Roger Arnaldez, *Controverses théologiques chez Ibn Hazm de Cordoue et Ghazālī*, in *Les Mardis de Dar el-Salam*, Sommaire, 1953, Paris 1956, 207-48. (W. MONTGOMERY WATT)

AL-GHAZĀLĪ, Aḥmad B. Muḥammad, brother of the more renowned Muḥammad Ghazālī, the Ṣūfī and popular preacher, made his way via Hama-dān to Baghdād, and took his brother's place when the latter retired from teaching at the Niẓāmiyya. He died in 520/1126 in Ḳazwīn. He wrote an abridged version of the *K. al-Iḥyāʾ* of his brother, which has not survived; an exposition in sermon form of his confession of faith, *al-Tadīrid fī kalimat al-tawḥīd* (Turkish translation by M. Fewzī, *el-Teḥrīd fī terdjemet el-Teḥrīd*, Istanbul 1285); a discussion of the admissibility of *samāʿ* (Ṣūfī music and dancing), *Bawāriḳ al-ilmāʿ fī 'l-radd 'alā man yuharrimu 'l-samāʿ*, ed. J. Robson in *Tracts on listening to music* (Or. Transl. Fund, NS v), London 1938; a subtle psychology of love, *Sawāniḥ*, ed. H. Ritter (Bibl. Islamica, xv) 1942; (probably) the *Risālat al-Ṭayr*, which was the inspiration for the *Manṭiq al-ṭayr* of Farid al-Dīn 'Aṭṭār (see H. Ritter, *Das Meer der Seele*, 8-10); and other minor writings which have not yet