LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS


Feiz — Mub. Amin al-Astarabadi, al-Fawā'id al-mawāniyya, [Iran], 1321/1903.

G — Ibn al-Ghazzal’s Rijal, as cited in R.


K — al-Najafi, Rijal, Bombay, 1317/1899-1900.


—

DID AL-GHAZĀLĪ WRITE A MIRROR FOR PRINCES?
On the authorship of Nasīḥat al-mulūk∗

Patricia Crone

To Professor Kister on his seventieth birthday—
with apologies for having strayed from the Jihādiyya.

It is well-known that there is a large pseudo-Ghazalian literature, and that even authentic works by al-Ghazālī have attracted interpolations and additions by other hands.1 That the Nasīḥat al-mulūk, or ‘Book of Counsel for Kings’, should be classified as specimen of this literature rather than as an authentic work was suggested as far back as 1919 by Gardner,2 and the same opinion was fathered on Jurt Zaydān by Zaki Maṭārak in 1924.3 In 1938, however, Humādī responded to Mubārak’s aspersions on his national heritage with a vigorous defence of the authenticity of the work in its preface to the first edition of the Persian text;4 and since then all Western scholars have accepted its ascription to al-Ghazālī as correct.5 As will be

∗ I should like to thank John Ogden, Martin Hebrock and Fritz Zimmermann for helpful comments and criticisms. To John Ogden I am also indebted for making me think about the subject; and without Fleure Alavi Mughadas I would never have got into it.


3 Z. Mubārak, Al-ābdāy ‘ulāl-Ghazālī. Cairo 1924, p. 161. According to Mubārak, Zaydān expressed the opinion that ‘al-Ghazālī is the author of this work. But Zaydān says nothing of this kind in any of his works; and as noted by Humādī, he similarly fails to do so in the article on al-Ghazālī and elsewhere (cf. the following note). He does however query the authenticity of the Sīr al-dālima in the additions and corrections appended to vol. iv (J. Zaydān, Kitāb al-hadās al-azāhār, Cairo 1911-14, vol. iv, p.321); and this is presumably what lies behind Mubārak’s claim. Mubārak did not commit himself either way in the passage cited, but in practice he treated the work as apocryphal, cf. Alkha, pp. 85, 88.


seen, there is in fact no question of dismissing the entire work as pseudo-
epigraphic. It is nonetheless an odd idea that al-Ghazālī should have written
a Fürstenspiegel: a religious scholar and ascetic hardly makes an obvious
candidate for the authorship of a mirror, least of all for one which comple-
tely ignores the existence of the caliphate. And by 1727 Humā‘ī himself had
been seized by doubt. The Nasīḥat al-mulūk, as he noted in his preface to
the second edition of the Persian text, consists of two parts. 9 The first part
is not a mirror for princes, but rather an exposition of the faith written for
a prince; this part he held to be indisputably authentic. 9 But the second part
is a mirror, or more precisely a book of practical wisdom which pays
particular attention to the art of government; and this part he showed to
be so uncharacteristic of al-Ghazālī in certain respects that he hesitated to
accept the ascription, though accept it he did in the last resort. 7 In what
follows I shall argue that Humā‘ī was right to have doubts; the second part
of the Nasīḥat al-mulūk is unquestionably the work of somebody other than
its putative author.

The Nasīḥat al-mulūk (hereafter NM) is a Persian work composed for a
ruler identified in the Arabic tradition as Muḥammad b. Malīkshāh (died
1118), and in the Persian tradition (insofar as this tradition identifies him
at all) as Sanjar (d. 1157). 6 There are two accounts of how al-Ghazālī came
to write it. The first unambiguously envisages it as consisting of the first part
only (hereafter NM1), while the second account apparently envisages it as

9 According to an introduction appended to one Arabic and two Persian manuscripts of
NM, al-Ghazālī wrote it at the request of Sanjar after the two had spent the whole day
together in religious devotion. This clearly suggests that al-Ghazālī was asked to write a
religious treatise, and in fact the three manuscripts in question contain NM1 alone (NM2,
pp. 289, 291; cf. Humā‘ī’s introduction thereto, pp. 290–291; F. Meier, review of NM3,
Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 1939, pp. 403f). According to
the Fudūq al-anām, on the other hand, al-Ghazālī wrote it for an unnamed Sufi king after
a hostile encounter with some Ḥanbalī ‘ilamī. This also suggests that what he was
remembered as having written was a risāla-yī tāʿālī rather than a book of practical
wisdom (cf. Meier, review, p. 397; Humā‘ī’s introduction, p. 128; Bagley, Book of Coun-
sel, p. xviii).

10 NM was first translated into Arabic by ‘All b. (al-) Muḥturāb, a dignitary of Ilūd who
must have flourished in the second half of the twelfth century and whose patron, accord-
ing to some manuscripts, was an atabeg of Moḥāl who died in 595/1199 (cf. Bagley,
Book of Counsel, pp. xvi ff; the translator’s nephew has become his uncle at p. 415).

11 Al-Ghazālī, al-Tibr al-mulūk fi nasīḥat al-mulūk, Cairo 1317 (among numerous other
printings). For a concise analysis of the Tibr, see M. Aslān Pālānī, La spiritualité de

12 Cf. Humā‘ī’s introduction to NM3, pp. 55ff, 111ff (especially 117f).

13 Meier, review of NM4, p. 403 (three Istanbul manuscripts); Humā‘ī, introduction to
NM4, pp. 28ff (two of the same Istanbul manuscripts and one Caenīne one).

14 Bouyges, Chronologie, p. 105; Badawi, M. al-līfīfī, p. 179 (one Munich manuscript);
Meier, review of NM4, p. 403f (one Istanbul manuscript, without indication of title).

15 It has been printed in Cairo under this title (Bouyges, Chronologie, p. 105). This
printing was hardly based on the Munich manuscript mentioned in the previous note, though
Badawi seems to suggest as much (M. al-līfīfī, no. 128).

16 Al-Ghazālī refers to the Ṣiyāsī in that part of NM which is a Ṣiyāsī bī-l-qāʿāfīf (cf. below,
notes 40f), and the Ṣiyāsī was composed after Malīkshāh’s death in 1093 (cf. Bouyges,
Chronologie, pp. 41ff). Bouyges nonetheless seems to accept Aslān Pālānī’ date of this
30).
second part of NM (hereafter NM2 in Arabic as a work of its own, under the title of al-Farq bayna'l-sāliḥ wa-shayr al-sāliḥ. In fact, it is clear from the contents of the two parts that they cannot have originated together, and though both are ascribed to al-Ghazālī even as separate works, the attribution to him of the second part must be rejected.

NM1: the treatise on the faith
NM1 is a treatise on the faith which opens and closes with an address to the "King of the East" (or 'King of East and West', 'King of the World', 'Sultan of the World'). It is a remarkably well written work. Faith is compared to a tree with ten roots and ten branches, and the exposition is ordered accordingly: it starts with a summary of the ten roots, i.e. the ten fundamental points of the Sunni creed, proceeds to a discussion of the ten branches, i.e. the ten major ways in which faith should show itself in action, more precisely in the action of a ruler, and concludes with a section on the two springs which water the tree of faith, i.e. insight into the nature of this world and awareness of death. The language is simple and lucid throughout, but the style varies somewhat. Whereas the summary of the creed is concise, the discussion of the behaviour of rulers is diffuse and aphoristic. Here much use is made of stories about Biblical figures and Muslim caliphs, scholars and ascetics; and numerous sayings attributed to them, and to the Prophet, are also added, though few of them canonical and none of them equipped with ʿoção. Even so, the author never loses his thread; and in the section on the transitory nature of human life the aphoristic mode of presentation is abandoned, the stories and sayings being replaced by striking parables. Poetry is absent throughout.

It is plain that the treatise was written by a professional theologian with a considerable gift for presenting his subject to laymen, and there is every reason to believe that the theologian in question was al-Ghazālī. The style is certainly his. As has been noted before, his authentic works are all well organized and lucidly written. The aphoristic style of the middle section may seem more uncharacteristic at first sight; but al-Ghazālī used precisely the same style in his discussion of precisely the same subject, i.e. the behaviour of rulers, in his Mustazhirīn, where many of the same anecdotes and sayings are cited too. His talent for striking parables is well known. And his use of uncanonical Hadith was commented on already by medieval Muslim scholars.

In terms of contents, there is likewise every reason to accept the ascription. Much of the work is based on other writings of his, the major source of NM1 being the Kāmilī-yi ʿaḍār; NM1 could in fact be characterized as a selection of passages from the Kāmilīya adapted for the use of sultans. And what it has to say about sultans is precisely what one would expect. As in the Mustazhirīn, the stress is overwhelmingly on the heavy responsibilities of rulers and the dire fate that awaits them if they fail to live up to them. Rulers are shepherds whom God will call to account; and though the exercise of power can in principle be a source of unsurpassed happiness, rulers do not in practice have anything but punishment in store. On the Day of Judgment they will all be placed on the Sūrat bridge and will all fall off, be they virtuous or wicked, because there will...
Did al-Ghazali write a Mirror for Princes?  

Ostensibly, NM2 is a practical complement to the spiritual advice given in NM1. In fact it is a work written for a different set of readers in a quite different style and spirit: arguments for the authenticity of NM invariably rest on NM1 alone.

On the turning to NM2 one is struck by the fact that author and addressees alike are suddenly referred to in a manner different from that of NM1. Al-Ghazali only refers to himself twice in NM1, on both occasions to say that he has dealt with the subject at greater length elsewhere, and on both occasions using the first person plural. But the author of NM2 frequently obstrudes, not in order to mention other works of his, but rather to explain why he has mentioned a particular point, devoted such and such length to it, or what opinion he has on the question; and though he too uses the first person plural, he also refers to himself as 'I', and his preferred devout 'ūlūma' 'who will instruct him in the way of justice and keep the danger of his role fresh in his mind.' All these recommendations are in perfect accordance with those of the Mustazhirī, because, as we are told in NM1, 'every 'ālim who meets kings should give this sort of advice, without suppressing the word of truth and without flattering their conceit so as to share in their tyranny.' Like the Mustazhirī, in short, NM2 is a typical piece of Fürstenmaching, not a Fürstenpiegel.

To this must be added that the author of NM1 actually identifies the Ḥiyādī as his own work, and also mentions a book in which he has described the nature of this world at greater length, a plausible reference to the Ḥiyādī of Kīmiyā. NM1, in other words, is a treatise written in al-Ghazali's style and spirit on the basis of al-Ghazali's works by someone who identified himself as the author of these works. It would thus be unreasonable not to conclude that the author of NM1 is indeed al-Ghazali.

NM2: the mirror

not be a single one who has not taken a bribe or given an unjust verdict. They will all be brought forth manacled, and only if they have acted righteousness will they be set free. Their chances are clearly slight: 'Woe to princes, woe to functionaries, woe to treasurers! These are the people on the day of resurrection will wish that they had been hanged from the sky by their own curls and that they had never held office,' as the Prophet is supposed to have said. 'Happy are you, O man', as 'Umar is said to have declared at a funeral, 'who never was a prince, overseer, scribe, bailiff or tax-collector.'

The ideal to which rulers should seek to conform is entirely Islamic in conception and illustrated with reference to Musulim and Biblical figures alone, no Sasanid kings (let alone Greek sages) being invoked in this part. The just ruler is someone who does not abuse his position and who makes sure that his soldiers, officials and other staff likewise refrain from doing so, for he will be held responsible for their conduct too. He gives verdict in strict accordance with the Shari'a, not more strictly and not more leniently, attaches great importance to the redress of grievances and supervises everything in person, all responsibility being ultimately his. To do this he must have justice inside him, that is self-control. He should live modestly, avoiding sumptuous food and clothing, and beware of all the flattery that will inevitably be heaped upon him. And he should surround himself with

---

28 NM1, p. 23 = 17; also text in Fadîlāb, p. 211.
30 NM1, loc. cit.; Fadîlāb, loc. cit.; compare also Fadîlāb, p. 'Syed's greeting to Harqem: 'als for so soft a hand unless it gets salvation from God' (NM1, p. 30 = 20; Fadîlāb, p. 214).
31 NM1, p. 20 = 16. 'Umar himself was questioned for no less than twelve years after his death (İbud., pp. 24f = 18; Fadîlāb, pp. 210). And David went on being reminded by Gabesd that he was living off the treasury: that is why God taught him the trade of armours (NM1, pp. 23f = 17; Fadîlāb, p. 211).
32 NM1, p. 36 = 23.
33 Ibid., pp. 22, 30f = 19, 31. The story at p. 22 is also cited in Fadîlāb, p. 211, where the implications are spelt out: 'in this hadîth it is made clear that we should not seek refuge in anything but the law, and that nothing is more important than knowledge of the rules of the law'.
34 NM1, pp. 37f = 29; Fadîlāb, p. 203.
35 Cf. the story about 'Umar and the king's sheep, NM1, p. 24 = 177; Fadîlāb, p. 211.
37 Ibid., pp. 40f = 29f; Fadîlāb, p. 203 (where the story cited in illustration involves 'Umar and Salam', not, as in NM1, 'Umar and a mullah in kitā'īn).  
38 NM1, p. 50 = 30 (where the Prophetic saying should read behtar in a'immar, not ummār, cf. Fadîlāb, p. 206).
mode of reference is the third person singular: 'the author of this book declares'... (khudavand-i kitab ghiyad), as he says on numerous occasions, usually to state his own opinion.46

The addressee is no longer a specific ruler. There is no mention of the 'King of the East'. One would have expected some expression of good wishes for his success at the end of the treatise, on a par with those which come at the end of NM1; but NM2 simply peters out with a poem. It offers advice to a 'king', 'kings' and 'the kings of the present age'; and as in NM1, the king is sometimes addressed as 'you'.47 But whereas NM1 sometimes adds 'O King',48 or 'O Sultan of the world', NM2 never does, though once it has 'O Sultan of Islam',49 and it addresses the king as 'you' precisely where NM1 avoids doing so.50 What is more, it also addresses secretaries as 'you'.51 In fact, the author of NM2 frequently makes clear that 'you' could be anyone: 'in case any person should find difficulty in un-

the second edition); 'we have mentioned this story for the purpose of demonstrating that... (duvarim, NM2, p. 251 = 151); the first edition has mar. duvarim, p. 139); 'in our opinion this is wrong, because we have found and verified that... (fi-nazadik-i ma, poiylard kardan, baz namadim, NM1, p. 54 = 62; missing in NM?).

NM1, pp. 101 (missing in NM1), 104, 162, 183, 258, 261, 267, 281, 285 = 58, 98, 111, 157, 158, 161, 170, 172. This was also noted by Humā’i’s introduction to NM, p. 79.

The king must follow the precepts and methods... (NM2, p. 112 = 63); 'the king should never entrust his business to unworthy persons... (ibid., p. 143 = 86); cf. 'it is incumbent upon the sultan when... (ibid., 147 = 101). 'It is the duty of wise and noble kings...

1 ibid., p. 762 = 98; 'the kings of this present age have even more reason to do so' (ibid., p. 112 = 63).

46 Cf. below, note 51.

47 NM1, pp. 1, 3, 5, 13 = 3, 4, 6, 12 (‘O King’). This form of direct address disappears in the discussion of the branches where rulers are spoken of as addressed in the third person singular (e.g. 'the holder of authority should not be demisssed by pride...', ibid., p. 39 = 25; 'the king should not be satisfied with...', ibid., p. 36 = 23; cf. NM1, p. 18, where the parochial king is explicit). The direct address is resumed in the discussion of the springs ('you should know that...'), but invariably without 'O King' or similar invocations in the first edition. The second edition, however, systematically adds 'O Sultan of the world' (NM2, pp. 52, 54, 581). Given the change of time, it is hard not to take this is as an interpolation.

48 'You should also instruct your fiscal governors. (Informa)'; such is the situation and you should know it (ta dastan-i bimshi jah baidar in NM1, p. 61), NM2, p. 121f = 698).

The author of NM1 invariably uses the third person singular for this type of advice, cf. above, note 49.

52 'When you have written the letter, read through what you have included in it before you fold it up... (ehlun namık nihayeh, NM2, pp. 195f = 118).

understanding this... (agur kastirı mushtılı shavo’d);53 'the above story has been quoted in order that the wise may understand... (ta khudarandand bidā’and),54 'we have mentioned this in order that whoever reads it may know... (ta har keh har khudand... bidā’and). At one point the author even exclaims 'understand therefore, O brother.'55 One Arabic version of NM is appropriately entitled Kitāb nasīhat al-mulik wa-kull ghani wa-su’ūl, ‘The Book of Counsel for Kings and Every Rich Man and Beggar.’56 NM2 is wisdom for everyone.

It is thus clear that NM1 and NM2 cannot have been conceived as parts of the same work. In principle, of course, both could still be authentic works by al-Ghazalī, but this possibility can be ruled out on other grounds.

First, the stylistic contrast between the two parts of NM is glaring. Where NM1 is a well-organized treatise, NM2 is a rambling compilation of anecdotes, aphorisms and poetry loosely strung together in no particular order and adding up to no particular point.57 It is true that al-Ghazalī himself adopts an aphoristic style in the middle section of NM1. But for one thing, he cites no poetry there; and, as Humā’i noted with some concern, he nowhere cites Persian poetry on the scale of NM2.58 For another thing, the anecdotes and aphorisms of NM1 are added in illustration of ten fundamental points, i.e. the ten rules of royal behaviour: there is an overall argument behind the selection of the material. But the stories and sayings of NM2 are simply such pieces of wisdom as the author happened to know and like on the subject, with the result that they are often contradictory, even when they are not contradictory, they do not add up to a coherent argument. It is for this reason that the author has to indicate his own opinion by interpersing his 'the author of this book declares...'. As Humā’i pointed out, this is not a formula which al-Ghazalī uses elsewhere,59
evidently because his manner of presentation makes it quite superfluous. There is accordingly no question of explaining the disorderly nature of NM2 with reference to the assumption that it was composed in a hurry.\textsuperscript{61} NM1 and NM2 exemplify two quite different methods of work. In fact, such evidence as we have suggests that it was the first part of NM which was composed in a hurry,\textsuperscript{62} and this might explain why so much of it is lifted from the \textit{Kimiy}:\textsuperscript{63} pressed for time, in other words, al-Ghazali would respond by recycling earlier arguments, formulations and illustrations, not by throwing everything together in a messy compilation. The method of work exemplified by NM2 simply is not his. Where, as Montgomery Watt notes, 'we find works that are a cento of varied materials, put together without any clear principle...we can say at once 'these were not put together by al-Ghazali.'\textsuperscript{64}

Secondly, NM2 in no way reflects the preoccupations and convictions of al-Ghazali, still less his intellectual stature. Thus it completely omits discussion of the imamate, an oddity which has been noted before, but never satisfactorily explained. Mirrors did of course usually ignore the question, but the genre did not preclude discussion of it: and at all events, as Bagley notes, 'even though a "Mirror for Princes" cannot be expected to contain legal discussion, it nevertheless seems remarkable that \textit{Nuzhat al-mdlak} should not give to the Sultan a single word of advice to respect and honour the Caliph.'\textsuperscript{65} Laoust infers that al-Ghazali saw himself as a practical man and defender of the sultan in NM, whereas he was a theoretician and defender of the caliph in the \textit{Mustazhir} and other works in which he dealt with the imamate at length.\textsuperscript{66} But if al-Ghazali had wished to defend the sultan, he would have done so by sorting out his legal position vis-à-vis the caliph, not by ignoring the problem altogether; and if he had wished to be a practical man, he would have done so by writing a lucid summary of the Muslim laws of taxation, war, treatment of \textit{dhimmis} and so forth, not by dilating on subjects such as the art of cutting the pen, the aphorisms of the sages, or the good and bad points of women.\textsuperscript{67} NM2 evidently is not a particularly practical work at all. It does not even have a chapter on the army.

The imamate is absent from NM2 for the simple reason that the author had no interest in it: he displays no interest in Islamic law at all, he is constitutional or other, as he would inevitably have done if he had been al-Ghazali. There is a brief reference to the Shari'a in the discussion of the ruler's religion,\textsuperscript{68} but none in the definition of perfect justice,\textsuperscript{69} and the exhortations to observe the law characteristic of the \textit{Muqaddimah} and NM1 are completely absent from NM2.\textsuperscript{70} Indeed, where NM1 warns the ruler not to drink wine,\textsuperscript{71} NM2 takes it for granted that rulers drink and merely exhorts them not to get drunk, citing a poem on the question.\textsuperscript{72} There is no reference to the ruler's duty to conduct \textit{jihad},\textsuperscript{73} nor are there any warnings against the collection of uncanonical taxes, a subject on which al-Ghazali had written in uncompromising terms in the \textit{Ihya}.'\textsuperscript{74} Such advice as NM2 has to offer on the subject of taxation is given in a completely non-legal vein, unlawful behaviour being disapproved of on the ground that it is \textit{imansqasib}.\textsuperscript{75} The claim that 'Umar killed his own son

\textsuperscript{61} Cf. Laoust, above, note 58.

\textsuperscript{62} According to the introduction to NM\textsuperscript{2}, as a treatise of its own, al-Ghazali promised to send Sanjar the work he had requested as soon as Sanjar reached home (NM\textsuperscript{1}, p. 291; cf. above, note 9).

\textsuperscript{63} 'Thus Hume's introduction to NM\textsuperscript{2}, p. 71.

\textsuperscript{64} Watt, "Authenticity", p. 28.

\textsuperscript{65} Bagley, \textit{Book of Counsel}, p. 116. Bagley suggests that maybe the loyalty of the Seljuk ruler in question could be taken for granted.

\textsuperscript{66} Laoust, \textit{Politique}, p. 146 (where the second 'historiens' must be dialectic for 'practiciens'). The explanation suggested by Lambton, \textit{State and Government}, p. 117, is similar. In Lambton, \textit{"Theory of Kingship"}, pp. 49f, the absence of the imamate is explained with reference to the contemporary situation: after Malikshah, the sultans only endeavoured to obtain the caliph's recognition in order to strengthen their position vis-à-vis their rivals. Why this should make al-Ghazali drop the subject is not entirely clear.
in the course of inflicting hadd-punishment on him is made by way of illustration of the excellent discipline that 'Umar maintained, not with a view to stressing the importance of observance of the law, but the story of the law-suit between a Magian and Yahya al-Barmaki is told from a Shafi'i point of view: whoever the author of NM2 may have been, he had neither professional knowledge of the Shafi'i nor a strong commitment to it.  

In fact, it is clear that the author of NM2 was not an 'ulamā at all, still less a thinker. No religious scholar worth the name would have been able unselfconsciously to refer to a Būyid ruler by the blasphemous title of Shāhid al-Shāh, nor would he have been so ignorant as to claim that 'Umar killed a son of his own. No thinker, least of all al-Ghazālī, would have been capable of dealing with the subject of intelligence by citing a string of entertaining stories and platitudinous sayings ascribed to Sāsānīd and other sages, or of compiling a whole chapter of such platitudes ascribed, inter alia, to the Greek philosophers whose real views al-Ghazālī knew and rejected as infidel, still less would he have been so naive as to tell a story in which God sends down a letter from heaven saying, 'This is a warrant from God, al-Arz, to 'Umar b. ʿAbd al-Azīz: We have exempted ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Azīz from hell-fire.' Al-Ghazālī was a thinker who popularized by making things lucid and simple, not by being factious, naive or commonplace; and he was a religious scholar in everything he wrote. The author of NM2, by contrast, was a compiler who delighted in elegant, witty and otherwise memorable formulations of commonplace sentiments; of Islamic learning he had little, and of systematic thought there is no trace at all.

The same point can be made by a comparison of what al-Ghazālī and the author of NM2 have to say about women. Al-Ghazālī wrote extensively on the subject in the Ḩiyā and, in abbreviated form, the Kitāb, setting out his views in his typically systematic and lucid fashion in both works. The author of NM2 by contrast offers a jumble of anecdotes, poetry and non-sens. The author of NM2 does not refer to the fact that he has dealt with the subject at greater length elsewhere, as he would have done if he had been al-Ghazālī, and he does not draw his material from al-Ghazālī either. He shares with him sentiments such as that one should feel compassion for women because of their feeble intelligence, and that one should act contrary to their advice (though on this point he also says the opposite), but these are commonplace views, and there is nothing to indicate dependence. Two sayings do occur in both al-Ghazālī’s works and NM2; but they occur in different forms, and one of them is ascribed to different authorities as well. The classifications of women adopted in the Ḩiyā and NM2 are different. The author of NM2 counsels against

70 NM2, p. 114 = 65.
71 Ibid., pp. 170 = 90. A Magian brought a claim against Yahya al-Barmaki, but had no witnesses. Abu Yusuf made Yahya swear (on an oath of denial), boasting that he had placed Yahya and the Magian on an equal footing in accordance with the Shafiʿis. Baglay describes this as a sworn and 'authentically Qadiani oath of sincerity' in which Abu Yusuf gives the Magian sole control of the process of the latter's sworn declaration, which strictly speaking this was contrary to the law (Book of Counsel, pp. 1, 104a). But away from the fact that a story identifying a non-Shafiʿi procedure as Shafiʿi could not be authentically Qadiani, it is Yahya who swears the oath. (This is unclear in NM1, p. 93, but Baglay himself identifies him as the oath-taker in his translation.) The fact that non-Muslims cannot act as witnesses against Muslims does not mean that they cannot be witnesses against each other. The point of the story is that Abu Yusuf submits Yahya to the indignity of swearing an oath of rebuttal in place of accordance with Islamic law instead of dismissing the claim (as he could have done). Good Muslims are decoyed to Zoroastrianism. It is the author's failure to adduce a specific Shafiʿi injunction on the treatment of shirk which shows that he is not a lawyer.
72 NM2, p. 191 = 115.
73 Cf. above, note 76.
74 NM, ch. 6. It did cross Baglay's mind that this chapter might not be authentic (Book of Counsel, p. 13).
75 NM, ch. 5. This was another problem for Baglay (Book of Counsel, p. 13a).
76 NM2, p. 120 = 66. The translation given here reflects the wording of NM1, p. 60.
78 NM, ch. 7.
80 Ḩiyā, vol. ii, p. 35 = 72; Kīmiyā, vol. i, p. 282; NM2, pp. 285f = 171; for the opposite view, see ibid., pp. 266f = 161.
81 Thūs al-Ghazālī cites the Prophet as saying that the best women are the most beautiful of face and the most moderate in terms of dower (Ḫiyā, vol. ii, p. 32 = 62; Kīmiyā, vol. i, p. 279); but NM inserts 'the most prolific in children,' before the other two characteristics (NM2, p. 261 = 158). Similarity, al-Ghazālī cites 'All as saying that three vices in men are virtues in women (Ḫiyā, vol. ii, p. 31 = 58); but NM omits one of the vices and ascribes the saying to a clever woman (NM2, p. 290 = 663).
82 Al-Ghazālī cites a list of six types of women that one should not marry, and another of four that one should equally avoid (Ḫiyā, vol. ii, p. 30ff = 71f). But NM gives a quite different list of ten (mainly undesirable) types, each one characterized by affinity with a certain animal (NM2, pp. 273ff = 1650).
marrying for nobility, a possibility that did not preoccupy al-Ghazālī and he blames all evils of this world on women (saying nicer things about them too), which al-Ghazālī does not. Conversely, al-Ghazālī evaluates marriage in terms of its capacity to promote or impede a religious life, a line of thought which is alien to the author of NM2. In short, al-Ghazālī and the author of NM2 have little in common; and here as elsewhere it is clear that the latter was not a religious scholar.

Thirdly, the author of NM2 voices a wide variety of opinions which are completely at odds with those of al-Ghazālī. He does, it is true, share some views with him. Thus he has one reference to the concept of rulers as shepherds accountable to God for their flocks, and one saying stressing the temporary nature of human life (but put into the mouth of Alexander), two sayings enjoining avoidance of rulers, and a fairly lengthy section on ‘Umar I, ‘Umar II and other Muslim figures who are elsewhere exemplary virtues such as modesty and humility, scrupulous respect for public money and insistence on personal supervision. But for the rest NM2 is expressive of an altogether different ethos. It fails to reflect the preoccupations of al-Ghazālī because its author has preoccupations of his own, and these preoccupations are as thoroughly Persian as those of al-Ghazālī are Islamic.

Thus NM2 opens with the statement that ‘God on High chose two classes of men and endowed them with superiority over the rest, one of them being prophets, and the other kings’, and proceeds to inform us that since kingship and divine effulgence (farr-i izzāt) have been granted to them by God, they must be loved and obeyed by ‘everyone to whom God has given religion’. Where al-Ghazālī refuses to flatter rulers, the author of NM2 happily elevates them to a status of parity with prophets; and where al-Ghazālī reminds them of their future punishment, the author of NM2 by contrast singles them out as God’s favourites, stressing that as such they are entitled not just to obedience, but also to positive love from their subjects. The moral position of the Muslim king is here as unproblematic as that of his Sasanid predecessor; and whereas Sasanid kings are absent from both the Mustazhāf and NM1, they are invoked time and again in NM2.

A high appreciation of kingship goes with a high appreciation of royal service. It is thus somewhat inconsistent of the author of NM2 to cite sayings such as ‘who will enter the house of one who is afflicted with association with kings; for he will have no friends, no kinsmen, no sons, no servants and no sympathy’. But as might be expected, he also has a view of government service as a privilege rather than a calamity, and this privilege, we are told, should be reserved for those of noble birth: ‘the king should never entrust his business to unworthy persons, but to men of noble birth’. Indeed, as a qualification for government service, nobility is more important than piety and universal-likeliness. The author thus finds himself in agreement with Ibn al-Muqaffa’, who had voiced similar ideas to al-Mastur. He does not find himself in agreement with al-Ghazālī or other Muslim ‘ulama’.

Nobility is a concept which looms large in the author’s mind. One aspect of it, we are told, is magnanimity: a behavioural pattern found in kings and high-ranking persons (muhtariān). Where NM1 enjoins sternness and non-attachment to this world, NM2 thus recommends lavish generosity and expenditure. No king thinks in terms of less than a

97 Compare the passages from the Dānkhār cited by M. Mohi, Culte, mythe et cosmologie de l’Iran ancien, Paris 1963, pp. 38, 44: the best of people are the good, sovereign and wise king and the religious leader of the age... the origin of good kingship is the grant of kingship by God.
98 This was one of the points that worried Hurni’s introduction to NM1 (p. 74). Lambton also found the prominence of the Sasanid tradition surprising in a work by al-Ghazālī (“Theory of Kingship”, p. 48, cf. p. 50).
99 NM1, p. 145 = 87. (In accordance with the first edition, Bagley has ‘service of the sultan’ for ‘association with kings’ and ‘respect’ for ‘servants’.)
100 NM1, p. 143 = 86.
101 NM2, p. 143 = 85f.
103 Also noted by Bagley, Book of Counsel, pp. 14, xii.
104 NM2, p. 197; cf. NM1, p. 197, where the high-ranking persons have been omitted.
105 This contrast was also noted by Bagley, Book of Counsel, p. xii.
thousand.\(^{106}\) No gift should be worth less than the income from a town. Al-Maʿarīn excluded his son al-ʿAbbas from succession on hearing him talk of half a dirham.\(^{107}\) Kings should not detract from their good name by worrying about dirhams and dīnings after the fashion of merchants,\(^{108}\) just as noblemen should not jeopardize their rank and dignity for the sake of a mere estate.\(^{109}\) Even ʿUmar, elsewhere invoked for his scrupulous attitude to public money, is here made to say that nothing is more degrading than mean-mindedness.\(^{110}\)

Naturally, the author of NM2 requires the king to be not only magnanimous, but also just, and as mentioned already, this is a subject on which he has something in common with al-Ghazālī. But in addition to adding ʿUmar I, ʿUmar II and other Muslim rulers as embodiments of justice, he also refers to a great deal to Ṣaḥīḥ al-Nāṣirid kings, and the concept of justice which they personify is a quite different one. Their justice was something intimately linked with prosperity. Thus it was through justice that the Magians developed the universe,\(^{111}\) and through justice that Anushirvān made everything prosperous: he even resorted to stratagems to ascertain whether there were any ruined places in his kingdom which he needed to repair and repopulate.\(^{112}\) The kings before Anushirvān all showed concern for prosperity and justice: They founded villages, excavated irrigation tunnels and brought out all the hidden waters.\(^{113}\) It was because of their justice that the Magians endured for 4000 years, for though sovereignty will endure with unbelief, it will not endure without justice.\(^{114}\) Where injustice and oppression are present, the people have no foothold; the cities and localities go to ruin, the inhabitants flee and move to other territories, the cultivated lands are abandoned, the kingdom falls into decay...\(^{116}\)

For this type of justice, we are told, the king needs orthodoxy, for religion and kingship are like brothers.\(^{117}\) But if the king is orthodox and just, then so are his subjects, for the subjects take after their kings, a view which the author presents several times and defends with some passion.\(^{118}\)

These ideas are all Iranian. According to the Denkart, good kingship manifests itself, among other things, in justice, prosperity and happiness, whereas evil kingship manifests itself in injustice, unhappiness and destruction;\(^{119}\) and here as there, the personal virtues of the king play a crucial role in the moral and material welfare of the world. 'Every time orthodoxy and good kingship are united in... the person of the good and orthodox king, the world finds itself well-ordered and illustrious; vices decrease, virtues increase... the good are happy and powerful, the evil ones terrified and powerless; the world becomes prosperous and the entire creation happy.'\(^{120}\) The Iranian origin of the tag that religion and kingship are (like brothers) (or twins) is well known.\(^{121}\) But these are not al-Ghazālī's ideas. He did subscribe to the view that religion and kingship are brothers, but he cites the tag in a different form.\(^{122}\) There are no references in the

---

\(^{106}\) NM2, p. 198 = 119.
\(^{107}\) Ibid., pp. 198ff = 120.
\(^{108}\) Ibid., pp. 196ff = 121.
\(^{109}\) Ibid., p. 200 = 121.
\(^{110}\) Ibid., p. 197 = 119.
\(^{111}\) Ibid., p. 82 = 46.
\(^{112}\) Ibid., p. 99 = 55.
\(^{113}\) Ibid., pp. 99ff = 55f.
\(^{114}\) Ibid., p. 99 = 55. (Following the first edition, Bagley has all the waters that were being wanted to give life to the land.)
\(^{115}\) Ibid., p. 82 = 46.
\(^{116}\) Ibid., p. 100 = 56.
Mustazhiri to the importance of digging irrigation channels; and the idea that the piety, morality and happiness of a Muslim population depends on the character of its ruler runs counter to everything that an ‘ulm believes. Here, as in so many places, the author of NM2 declares himself committed to Iranian ideas which had not been absorbed into mainstream Islam.

Thus the author of NM2 also subscribes to un-Islamic ideas in respect of fame. Where al-Ghazâlî is concerned with the ruler’s prospect of gaining salvation in the next world, the author of NM2 is much more interested in the name which he will leave behind in this one: the righteous ruler will gain eternal renown. The kings of pre-Islamic Iran, we are told, have all passed away, ‘but their names endure — for deeds such as we have enumerated. You should know for certain that men leave behind a memorial in what gets said about them; if a man is virtuous, he will be remembered for his virtue; if wicked, for his wickedness.’ People still talk about Anûshirvan because of his justice. You can still see the remains of the buildings of his predecessors. ‘There is a saying that the memory which noble men (əzâdâdâran) leave behind them is their second life in this world.’ Not only kings, but everyone should therefore shun vices so as not to leave behind a bad name: ‘after you, only talk of you will last — take good care that such talk be of the best’. But kings in particular should cultivate virtue so as not to be remembered for their wickedness.

The memorial left behind by the righteous ruler constitutes an example which should be studied and followed. ‘The king must follow the precepts and methods of these kings who preceded him, and govern righteously like them. He must also read the books of good counsel. . . just as Anûshirvan . . . used to read the books of former kings, ask for stories about them and follow their ways.’ Divine effulgence, we are told, expresses itself among other things in frequent reading of the reports (of the pious ancestors), constant attention to the biographies of kings and enqui-

123 NM2, p. 96 = 53. The first edition has ərâdə az ərmən dər šədər-i ərmən (NM2, p. 46), whence Bagly’s different translation.
124 NM2, p. 99 = 55. Compare p. 113 = 64: the kings of old strove to make their realms prosperous ‘with the result that their good reputation (nəmət-i nəkə) endures’.
125 NM2, p. 99 = 55.
126 Ibid., pp. 96f. = 53f.
127 Ibid., p. 112 = 63.

ry into the kings of old, because the present world is a continuation of the empire of the forerunners, who reigned and departed, each leaving a memorial to his name . . .’

This idea of living on in one’s name, writing a memorial to oneself and at the same time an example to future generations by one’s good behaviour, is well attested for pre-Islamic Iran. Thus Kātib, a famous Sassanid priest, boasts in an inscription with the modesty typical of cultures appreciating fame that ‘the great goodness’ of his own name has often been written in a variety of official documents, that future users of these documents will know that he was the Kātib who held such and such high office under such and such kings, that he has established a record ‘such that by it I make known the path to heaven and hell’, and that his example should be followed: ‘Whoever may see and examine this inscription, let him be pious and upright for the gods and lords, and for his own soul.’ In much the same spirit Xerxes had set an example to future generations in the inscription recording his eradicating of daīv worship. ‘Where the daīvas have previously been worshipped there did I worship Ahura Mazda in accordance with Truth and using the proper rites. . . O thou who shalt come after me, if thou wouldst be happy when alive and blessed when dead, have respect for the law which Ahura Mazda has established and worship Ahura Mazda in accordance with Truth and using the proper rites.’

128 NM1, pp. 65f. = 74; NM2, pp. 127f. (where the šaṛḥ-i šāhī have dropped out). Compare also NM1, pp. 118f. = 67: ‘If you wish to understand why justice, piety and equitable rule are what the sultan with a good name (nəkəshnəmən) should be, you should read the reports about ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Aswāz.’
130 Frye, ‘Inscriptions’, pp. 215f. 224 (I have changed Frye’s writing (nənaw) to ‘inscription’); cf. also Chaumont, L’Inscription, p. 345 = 349 (line 18).
with zeal,' as Shahpūr echoes in the Naqšt-i Rustam inscription. And as zavālamānādār who had contributed to the prosperity of the world by building a bridge similarly recorded his good deed inscriptationally, at the same time asking ‘whoever has come on the road’ to give blessings to himself and his sons. It is within this tradition that Amūshirvān drinks in NM2 to ‘the brave men who will come after us,’ hoping that ‘they will remember us just as we remember those who were before us.’

The author of NM2 also subscribes to completely un-Islamic ideas in respect of fate. In the last resort, he thinks, life is dominated by ‘fortune’ (dāvālat) or the ‘misfortunes of time’ (ajātā-ya zamāneh), or in other words by an impersonal fate which has little to do with the divine predestination of Muslim theology. It is in this spirit that he cites a well-known Zoroastrian statement to the effect that five aspects of life are predetermined (by fate), i.e. wife, children, money, kingship and lifespan, whereas others depend on effort, temperament and so forth. More strikingly, he declares as his own opinion that ‘the wheel does not pause at any point in its rotation, that good fortune cannot be relied on, and that the decree of heaven (qādā-ya asmani) cannot be held back by armies and treasuries, but that when fortune’s rope swings back, all these things will lose significance, and remorse then becomes useless’; and he illustrates this point with a story about Marwān II, who knew that ‘when time is up (chun mudāt biqizard)’, this equipment will be useless, and when doom (qādā) comes, this army, huge though it is, will look small. In much the same way a Zoroastrian book asks, ‘is it possible to strive against fate with wisdom and knowledge or not?’ the answer being that it is not: ‘Though (one be arrived) with the valour and strength of wisdom and knowledge, yet it is not possible to strive against fate. For once a thing is fatal and comes true, whether for good or the reverse, the wise man goes astray in his work, and the man of wrong knowledge becomes clever in his work; the coward becomes brave, and the brave man cowardly; the energetic man becomes a sluggard, and the sluggard energetic. For, for everything that has been fatalized, a fit occasion arises which sweeps away all other things.’ And the Zoroastrian literature also reassures us that remorse is useless: ‘Anxiety is not to be suffered for this reason.’

It is because the author thinks in such completely Iranian terms that he takes wine-drinking, chess-playing, ball-games and the like for granted, finds the title of Shahāmshāh unobjectionable, and gives a glowing account of the Nawruz celebrations of the Sassanid kings, for all that al-Ghazālī had condemned these celebrations as pagan rites deserving of extirpation. There clearly is no question of explaining these and other features with reference to the possibility that al-Ghazālī may not have been a wholly consistent thinker, or that the mirror genre imposed certain restraints on him; in NM2 we find ourselves in a completely different world of thought.

What then can we say about the author? He was certainly an Iranian, more precisely an Iranian nationalist. Thus he takes pride in the fact that the Magiaste held power for 4000 years and readily explains that this was because their religious system. i.e., Zoroastrianism, did not permit injustices.
tice or oppression. 145 It is with a view to persuading sceptics that no
oppression was committed for 4000 years that he gives his long account of
the kings of Iran from Kayumarth to the Muslim conquest (in which,
naturally, he contradicts himself by classifying several kings as tyrants).
146 Zoroastrians are warmly presented throughout; 147 and as for the
Iranian kings, their virtues were such that God Himself instructed David not
to let his people speak ill of the ‘ajami. 148
He does not betray any knowledge of Middle Persian, and none of
his material seems to come directly from Zoroastrian books, though Zoroas-
trian literature was clearly the ultimate source of most of what he had to
say. 149 But he writes in the same remorselessly antithetical style as the
authors of these books (the best is... the worst) 150 and has the same

145 NM, p. 82 = 46. The author’s Shu‘ubī tendencies were also noted by Huma‘i (introduc-
tion to NM, p. 74).
146 NM, pp. 83ff = 47ff. That this account is untypical of al-Ghazālī was also noted by
Huma‘i (introduction to NM, p. 74).
147 For the law-suit between the Magian and Yahyā al-Barmaki, see above, note 77. A chief
moted told al-Ma‘mūn that the kings of Persia had three virtues which he lacked; it was
for this reason that al-Ma‘mūn opened Anzalihrān’s tomb (NM, pp. 137f = 81f; noted
by Huma‘i, introduction to NM, p. 74); and the chief moted is an embodiment of
justice in the account of the pre-Islamic mawṣūr celebrations (NM, pp. 167f = 102f).
148 NM, pp. 82f = 46.
149 The direct sources are discussed by Huma‘i, introduction to NM, p. 85ff; Bagley, Book
of Counsel, pp. 1ff. For the Sassanids and origins of the division of this world’s activities
into twenty-five kinds, see above, note 137; and cf. the following note on Anzalihrān’s inter-
national symposium. Similarly, when Buzurgmehr tells Anzalihrān that ‘ruining that
which has been developed is easier than developing that which has been ruined; breaking
goblets is easier than mending them’ (NM, p. 223 = 135), he is echoing the Dāsit-i
dīdik, according to which a proverb says that it is easier to teach learning already taught
and easier to repair than to build (from the start) (E.W. West [tr.], The Dāsit-i Dīdik;
In Pahlavi Texts, part II [Sacred Books of the East, vol. xviii], Oxford 1882, p. 80). The
story of the clever woman and the rastip also has a Stasanid counterpart: an ‘Aid at
Samarqand saw a pretty woman pass by and dragged her in; she asked him whether the
child would be an ‘Aid or not, and, on receiving an affirmative reply, said, ‘but no
genuine ‘Aid would do what you are about to do’ (NM, p. 276f = 167). Compare J.M.
Urvada (ed. and tr.), Der Pahlavi Text ‘Der König Hwsor und sein Knabe’, Vienna
1937, §§ 11ff: a noble page made an indecent proposal to a woman; she asked him
whether he would let her tave all his good deeds in return for her sins (the good deeds
of the nobleman equaling the merits of ‘Aid descent). Like the ‘Aid, he was abashed
and thought better of it.
150 The best king is he who... the worst king is he who... (NM, p. 159 = 96); ‘four things
you must always keep with you... four things you must never have with you...’ (ibid.,
p. 139 = 83); ‘what are the bitterest things in the world and what are the sweeter?’ (ibid.,
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pp. 229f = 139; ‘which women are the best... which women are the worst?’ (ibid., p. 269
= 163). Compare ‘the best of men are the good, sovereign and wise... and the worst
of men the bad, tyrannical sovereign’; ‘factors leading to a better existence are... those
which lead to a worse existence are...’; ‘the foundations of good kingship... the
foundations of evil sovereignty are...’; ‘the source of the good religion is the following
proposition... the fundamental proposition of the evil religion is...’ (Molt, Culte, pp. 38f,
44, 50, 54, citing the Dinškard). ‘Be very diligent with regard to these three things... turn
away strongly from these three things...’ (Shaked, Dinškard VI, p. 38 = 39). ‘Four kings
which is the one thing more advantageous and which the more injurious?’ (E.W. West
xxiv, Oxford 1885, p. 50) Compare also NM, pp. 113f = 64f, where Anzalihrān discuss-
es which is best in the world with the kings of Byzantium, China and India (plus the
Khaṣān, according to the first edition). I.P. Amsuast, ‘Einige Bemerkungen zur
sasanisdnen Handz-führung’ in Atti sul convegno internazionale sul tema: In Persia
del medioevo, Academia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rome 1971, pp. 275f, where a Byzantine
and Indian sage similarly discuss with Aṣūḥāt which is best, which is worst.
151 NM, pp. 221f, 226, 229 = 134, 137, 139. Most of the aphorisms cited in ch. 5 are of
this or the antithetical kind. Compare ‘people are of low kinds... people are of three
types... these ten things are most similar (to each other)... these four faults are present
in the hostility of people... there are three kinds of kettics... the material world is
governed by these six things... these three things are nearest in men...’ (Shaked, Dinškard VI,
p. 70, 78, 94, 176, 202, 71 = 79, 97, 175, 203). Note also the profusion of (non-antithetical)
questions such as ‘what is wealth... what is love... which friend is the most faithful... what
things among men are great?...’ (NM, pp. 230, 236 = 139, 134). Compare ‘What is
pretty? What is attractive? What is truthfulness? What is immorality? What is resurrec-
tion?’ (Shaked, Dinškard VI, p. 104 = 105); ‘Who is the most patient, who is the most
powerful, who is the most sharp, who is the most joyful, who is the most miserable,
who is the most hopeful?’ (Mithr-i khwst in Zaman, Zaman, p. 39f; cf. the same type of
questions cited ibid., p. 397); Bailey, Zoroastrian Problems, p. 50). In Urvada, Hwser
and sein Knabe, the king tests the young man’s knowledge by asking a whole barrage of
such questions: ‘which dish is the finest... which flower is the sweetest-smelling... which
woman is best?’ (§§ 19, 68, 95), and so forth.
152 A‘īl is referred to as anūr al-ma‘imin (NM, p. 148), but so is ‘Umar, who is referred
to far more often (cf. ibid. and elsewhere). Abu Yūsuf is the only lawyer invoked (above,
note 77).
153 Anūr bāb-i darbī sukkhan-i bīsārāt ast (NM, p. 196 = 118; Bagley takes this to mean
that much has been said on the subject of secretaries).
used for the writing of a particular language, the way in which they should be cut, and so forth;\textsuperscript{119} and it is in addressing secretaries that he lapses into the use of ‘you’, otherwise reserved for kings and the general reader.\textsuperscript{120}

He must have flourished after Nizām al-Mulk (d. 1092), possibly in the time of the latter’s sons, inasmuch as he mentions the vizierate of Nizām al-Mulk’s family in glowing terms;\textsuperscript{121} and he must have written before 1199, the latest date for the Arabic translation.\textsuperscript{122} He would thus seem to have been a younger contemporary of al-Ghazālī, and in linguistic terms there is little to tell the two apart.\textsuperscript{123} His work must have come to be attributed to al-Ghazālī within a short period of the latter’s death, as is true of other pseudo-Ghazalian literature too,\textsuperscript{124} but there is nothing to suggest that he himself was a forger. Admittedly, NM2 lacks a formal incipit, which could be taken to mean that it was written with NM1 in mind; but it also lacks a formal explicit, and the author makes no attempt to impersonate al-Ghazālī by writing in his style, quoting him or referring to his works. Whoever put the two works together presumably felt that

\textsuperscript{119} NM2, p. 192 = 115.
\textsuperscript{120} Above, note 52.
\textsuperscript{121} NM2, pp. 183f; cf. Huma’i, introduction to NM3, pp. 122ff. NM1 only mentions the vizierate of Nizām al-Mulk (p. 100 = 111); but inasmuch as the Arabic translation says that the Seljuqs brought them to the level of the viziers of old and that everybody benefited from their bounty, the family (as) was presumably in the original (cf. Tibr, p. 89; Bagley, Book of Counsel, p. 111ff).
\textsuperscript{122} Cf. above, note 10.
\textsuperscript{123} Cf. Huma’i, introduction to NM2, pp. 72, 145ff. Most of the archaisms are from NM2, but then it is the longer work. The archaic language of NM as a whole has been somewhat exaggerated by Bagley. Thus he claims that it uses the pleonastic ṭa’ after the prepositions bār-i and az bāh-e (Book of Counsel, p. xxv), but neither NM1 nor NM2 does anything of the kind (cf. NM3, pp. 371, 37, 38, 39, 40, 51, 50; NM1, p. 152 (bār-i); NM3, pp. 38, 45, 104, 121, 124, 248, 265, 267 and frequently elsewhere (az bāh-e, much preferred to bāh-e in NM2). Huma’i merely claimed that he used this ṭa’ after bāh-e, adding one example which, as he later admitted, was a false one (Huma’i, introduction to NM1, p. yw, with reference to NM1, p. 71; id., introduction to NM2, p. 148, with reference to NM2, p. 136; Meier also misunderstood him, cf. review of NM3, p. 396). It is likewise an exaggeration to say that NM frequently places cardinal numbers after their nouns (Bagley, Book of Counsel, p. xxv). NM1 never does. NM2 does once in the old edition (NM1, p. 111; not in NM1); and once in the new edition (NM3, p. 157; not in NM3); but given the proliferation of cardinal numbers in NM2, this is not impressive.
\textsuperscript{124} A. J. Araven-Yaftah, Studies, p. 256 (already Ibn Tulun, d. 1185, was familiar with some of it).

the creed for a prince needed a practical complement: from the point of view of salesmanship he was certainly right.

But whoever put the two together must certainly also have contributed his share to al-Ghazālī’s torments in the grave: the imam cannot have taken well to his posthumous fame as the author of so un-Islamic a book.\textsuperscript{140} NM2 is in fact yet another testimony to the survival of pre-Islamic values in Seljuq Iran. It is also a good illustration of Gibb’s dictum that the Sāsānīd tradition constituted a kernel of derangement in Islam, being ‘never wholly assimilated yet never wholly rejected’;\textsuperscript{141} Iranians and Islamic notions are presented side by side in this book with only the most superficial attempts at the hopeless task of harmonization. But from the point of NM2 itself Gibb’s dictum should be reversed: it is the Sasanian tradition which is coherent here and Islam which causes the derangement, having failed to be assimilated, let alone rejected.

\textsuperscript{140} And Goldziher’s conjecture that Turbašt (d. 1126 or 1131) wrote his Sirāj al-mulk with the idea of emulating al-Ghazālī must clearly be dropped (cf. Streitschrift, p. 100).