



KIMIĀ-YE SA'ĀDAT

KIMIĀ-YE SA'ĀDAT (Alchemy of happiness), a composition (*taṣnif*) of Abu Ḥāmed Moḥammad Ġazālī (q.v.; 450-505/1058-1111), a scholar of the Shafī'ite school of law and a prominent Persian thinker of medieval Islam. The *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat* was written during Ġazālī's Khorasan period, after his return from his wanderings to his native Ṭus (see [ĠAZĀLĪ i. BIOGRAPHY](#)), and completed between 495-99/1102-6. The *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat* was one of Ġazālī's works composed in Persian during the period of the Saljuq sultanate, when Persian was the official language of its vast empire and was gradually becoming a lingua franca for Muslim scholars.

Literary historical context. Chronologically, the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat* is the fourth in a series of the pioneering systematic works that were written in Persian in various genres by Sufi authorities. The first three are as follows: *Šarḥ al-Ta'arrof le-maḏhab ahl al-taṣawwuf* (Commentary on "Acquaintance with the doctrine of the Sufis") compiled by Esmā'il al-Mostamli Boḳāri (d. 434/1043), in the genre of Persian commentary on an Arabic book of [Abu Bakr Kalābādi](#) (q.v.; d. between 380/990 and 385/995); *Kašf al-maḥjub le-arbāb al-qolub* (Unveiling the hidden at the lords of hearts; see [KAŠF AL-MAḤJUB](#) of Hojviri), treating systematically different Sufi doctrines and practices, and completed by the Ḥanafite Sufi [Abu'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. 'Oṭmān Hojviri](#) (q.v.; d. between 465/1072 and 469/1077) in about 450/1058; and the *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣuḥufiyya* (Grades of the Sufis), compiled in Persian in the genre of hagiographical anthology by the Ḥanbalite Sufi ['Abd-Allāh Anṣārī](#) (q.v.; 396-481/1006-89), who was inspired by an Arabic anthology of the Shafī'ite Sufi [Abu 'Abd-al-Raḥmān](#)



[Solami](#) (q.v.; 325-412/937-1021) to create his own book with the same title, which, in fact, complements the work of his predecessor.

In addition to the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat*, and with the use of it, there are a few other minor Persian works composed by Ġazālī without any doubts about his authorship (see [ĠAZĀLĪ iv. MINOR PERSIAN WORKS](#)).

The first is the *Zād-e āḳerat* (Provisions for the journey to the hereafter), a manual for the target audience of a “group of ordinary people” (*qawmi az 'awāmm*) and presumably non-Arabic disciples of Ġazālī's own circle at Ṭus. By his own admission in a letter addressed to [Aḥmad b. Neẓām-al-Molk](#) (q.v; d. 544/1149-50), the vizier of Sultan Moḥammad Tapar b. Malekšāh (r. 498-511/1105-18), their number by the end of Ġazālī's life was about 150 (*Makāteb*, p. 44; Khismatulin, 2017, pp. 216, 545). Being the most extensive text written in Persian after the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat*, the manual gives an opportunity to see Ġazālī's role as a translator and editor of his *Bedāyat al-hedāya* (The Beginning of guidance to the straight path), an Arabic handbook written by him earlier for the *madrasa* (q.v; [EDUCATION iv. THE MEDIEVAL MADRASA](#)) students. Having the latter as a model, Ġazālī nevertheless made noticeable additions (taken from the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat*) and changes to the *Zād-e āḳerat*'s structure and content which led to the appearance of this new title.

Another authentic work of Ġazālī is the so-called “first part” of the *Naṣiḥat al-moluk* (Counsel for kings), addressed to the Saljuqid ruler of Khorasan [Aḥmad b. Malekšāh Sanjar](#) (q.v.; r. 490-552/1097-1157). The text was written after an official reception at his court in 503/1109 and upon his request. Ġazālī was summoned to Sanjar because of the intrigues of his opponents and their criticism of his student's compilation in Arabic, *al-Manḳul men ta'liqat al-oṣul* (The sifted notes on the fundamentals), in addition to his refusal to continue teaching at the Neẓāmiya of Nishapur. After the reception, Ġazālī had, apparently, a private audience with Sanjar, during which he quoted a verse from the Qur'an 14:24: “Have you not seen how Allāh sets forth a parable of a beautiful phrase (being) like a beautiful tree, whose roots are firm and whose branches are in Heaven.” The genuine text of the *Naṣiḥat al-moluk*, which is actually an official epistle with a short explanatory note on *al-Manḳul* added on its frontispiece (*Makāteb*, pp. 11-12; Khismatulin, 2017, pp. 116-7, 484) and the title given to it later, discloses the verse image of the “beautiful tree” (*šajara ṭayyeba*) consisting of ten roots and ten branches (Crone, pp. 167-91; Purjavādi, pp. 413-24; Khismatulin, 2015, pp. 118-27; idem, 2017, pp. 89-114).



Apart from these texts, there are also more than thirty Persian-language letters by Ġazālī. Intermittently covering about the last fifteen years of his life, they were addressed to different people and were collected by an unnamed descendant of Ġazālī in a medieval collection of his correspondence entitled the *Faḏā'el al-anām men rasā'el Hojjat al-Eslām* (The Virtues of people [drawn] from the epistles of the Proof of Islam). The *Faḏā'el* was first published by al-Ṣamad al-Sayyed al-Aḥmad as a lithographic edition in 1310/1892 and based on a manuscript copy of the collection consisting of 38 letters. Later, the collection was published in two independent editions by 'Abbās Eqbāl Āštiāni (q.v.; *Makāteb*, 1954) and 'Ali Mo'ayyad Tābeti (*Faḏā'el*, 1954). Afterwards, the text was first translated into Arabic by Nur-al-Din Āl 'Ali and published under the same title with useful comments (*Faḏā'el*, 1972); this text was later translated into some European languages as well.

Additionally, a few short verdicts (*fatwā* [q.v.]) on various subjects and a rather short treatise known as the *Ḥamāqat-e ahl-e ebāḥat* (Foolishness of the free-thinkers) (Purjavādi, pp. 146-210) came down to us from the authentic Persian-language oeuvre of Ġazālī. The majority of other Persian texts, ascribed to him with the use of his fame and authority, especially in the genre of Mirrors for Princes, are either deliberate forgeries fabricated with different purposes or compilations falsely attributed to him (Khismatulin, 2019, p. 324).

The most famous among them is *Ay farzand* (O Child!). This is undoubtedly a literary forgery fabricated in Persian one or two generations after Ġazālī's death. The sources used for the forgery consist of two genuine letters by Ġazālī (number 4, in part, and number 33, totally); both appear in the *Faḏā'el al-anām* (*Makāteb*, pp. 13-23, 83-85; Khismatulin, 2017, pp. 185-96, 257-60). Another source is a letter known as 'Ayniya and written by Moḥammad's younger brother Majd-al-Din Aḥmad Ġazālī (q.v.; d. 520/1126) to his famous disciple 'Ayn-al-Qoḏāt Hamadāni (q.v.; 492-526/1098-1131); the letter was published in the *Majmu 'a-ye ātār-e fārsi-e Aḥmad-e Ġazālī* (Collection of the Persian writings of Aḥmad Ġazālī) (*Majmu 'a*, pp. 191-238). The other is 'Ayn-al-Qoḏāt's own letter, published in the *Nāmahā-ye 'Ayn-al-Qoḏāt Hamadāni* (Letters by 'Ayn-al-Qoḏāt Hamadāni) (*Nāmahā*, II, p.103, no 73). These sources clearly indicate combination of two different approaches to Sufism done by an unknown forger—the intellectual and esoteric of Moḥammad Ġazālī's and the ecstatic and practical of Aḥmad Ġazālī's—with a particular emphasis on the latter (Khismatulin, 2017, pp. 266-326).

Later, *Ay farzand* was translated into Arabic and became famous as *Ayyohā al-*



walad, the Arabic equivalent of the Persian title. The earliest manuscripts with the Arabic translation date from the second half of the 16th and most of the others from the 17th century (Scherer, p. 27). The earliest known secondary translation from Arabic into Ottoman Turkish was done in 983/1575 (Ülken, p. 61). In modern times, the text was translated from Arabic into many European languages and published innumerable times in Turkey as *Eyyühe'l-Veled* or *Ey Oğul* (Günaydin, pp. 70-73).

A less famous *Pand-nāma* (Book of counsel) also written in the genre of advice literature is a very late compilatory letter of an unknown author formally addressed to some ruler and falsely attributed to Ġazālī, obviously because it consists of many fragments borrowed mostly from various parts of the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat* (Purjavādi, pp. 425-49; Khismatulin, 2017, pp. 339-54).

Manuscripts. The statistics from the world's manuscript repositories show that the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat* significantly surpasses all the works listed above in popularity. Apart from many copies with some fragments of the book, any major manuscript collection contains at least two or three complete copies of it. For example, there are two copies in the British Library (Rieu, I, pp. 36-38); three copies in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts in St. Petersburg (*Persidskie i tadzhikskie rukopisi*, I, p. 463); nine copies in the collection of the India Office (Ethé, I, pp. 976-78); eleven copies in the National Library of Egypt (*Fehres*, II, pp. 75-79); and twenty-five copies in the Abu Rayhan Biruni Institute of Oriental Studies in Tashkent (*Sobranie*, III, pp. 94-98; IX, 395-406).

The oldest copies known are represented by fragments held in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts (the complete second pillar (*rokn*), paleographically dated 1120-50 [B 4612]) and in the National Library of Egypt (the third and fourth pillars dated 576/1180; *Fehres*, II, p. 79, no. 1869). A complete manuscript of the *Kimiā*, dated 605/1208, is kept at the Malek National Library in Tehran (Afšār and Danešpažuh, IV, p. 691, no. 4273).

Leaving aside the numerous 19th century lithographs and modern printed editions, the dates of transcription provided by the main manuscript catalogues for the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat* copies and taken together indicate a constant demand for this book throughout the centuries (Khismatulin, 1998, pp. 205-7; Sāket, 2019, p. 453). This demand had arisen on the Persian intellectual market during the 12th century and has continued to the present time. In other words, the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat* has confidently stood the test of time.



Textual studies. Until recently, due to the lack of a complete translation of the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat* into any European language, many scholars mistakenly considered this work to be Ġazālī's abridged version of his Arabic magnum opus the *Eḥyā' 'olūm al-dīn* (The Revival of the religious sciences; see [ĠAZĀLĪ ii.](#)). This view seems to have first arisen at the end of the 19th century in the description of one of the earliest complete copies of the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat*, held at the British Museum and dated 672/1274 (Rieu, I, p. 37, Add. 25,026). Since then, this view has made its way from one catalogue to another (e.g. Ethé, I, p. 976; *Sobranie*, III, p. 97; etc.), appearing also in some contemporary research studies.

Indeed, the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat*'s structure is outwardly similar to that of the *Eḥyā' 'olūm al-dīn*. Both were written in the form of *taṣnīf* (Khismatulin, 2020, pp. 475-87), and both share the common illustrative and evidentiary base consisting of: (a) quotations from the Qur'an (if any); (b) the pertinent sayings (*ḥ ad iṭs*, see [HADITH](#)) of the Prophet Moḥammad (and pre-Islamic prophets), his companions and followers; (c) statements of Sufi authorities; (d) allegorical stories and vivid images from everyday life; (e) conclusions of Ġazālī.

However, these books have quite different target readership. It was the target readership that determined how Ġazālī saw the content of his books, how simple or complicated language he used, and what illustrative and evidentiary base he resorted to. Having vast experience of teaching at different levels and communicating with people of various education backgrounds and mentality, Ġazālī always conducted a dialogue with the target reader in a common language, taking into account the reader's knowledge and often quoting a famous maxim which is sometimes considered a Prophetic saying: "Speak to men according to their mind's capacity" (*Makāteb*, p. 14; *Eḥyā'*, I, pp. 54, 92; *Kimiā*, ed. Kaḍiv Jam, I, p. 88). In all of this, the *Eḥyā' 'olūm al-dīn* and the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat* are different from each other.

The intended audience for the *Eḥyā'* included the highest-ranking Islamic scholars, Ġazālī's colleagues, and serious opponents. In contrast to the *Eḥyā'*, the *Kimiā*'s target readership represents people who did not have a full command of Arabic and did not belong to academia at all. The author himself describes it as follows: "Our book is intended for ordinary people (*'awamm-e k alq*), who have begged for [comprehension of] this matter in Persian. And the speech cannot go beyond the limit of their understanding" (*Kimiā*, ed. Kaḍiv Jam, I, p. 9). As in the case of the *Zād-e āḳerat*, "ordinary people" does not mean here people with low social status. Any careless person, who has a



nonchalant attitude towards religion and is satisfied with blind conformity (*taql i d*) in religious duties, can be ranked among “ordinary people,” in contrast to the “elite” (*kāṣṣ*) and the “elite of the elite” (*kāṣṣ al- k̄ aw āṣṣ*)—the people of inner vision and true perception. This tripartite division of believers is defined by Ġazālī himself in his letters (*Makāteb*, pp. 13-16, no 4; p. 27, no 5; pp. 42-43, no 13; Brown, pp. 89-113). With so specific a target readership in mind, Ġazālī substantially simplified the content of the *Kimiā* in comparison with that of the *Ehyā'*. However, simplification steps were taken by him in several directions and naturally resulted in the appearance of a new text and a title in another language. These steps were as follows:

1. Recomposing material. Taking into account the inexperienced Muslim laity, very often the text needed to be rearranged and reworked. An illustrative example is the four “heads” or “tops” of Islamic religion (*‘onw ā n-e mosalm ā n i*). They are located after a foreword to the book which is completely different from the foreword to the *Ehyā'*. These four *‘onw ā ns* are: “On self-knowledge”; “On the knowledge of the Most High”; “On the mystical knowledge of the world”; “On the mystical knowledge of the Hereafter.” They are absent from the *Ehyā'*, but the ideas discussed in them are scattered throughout it. The text selected for the *‘onw ā ns* is, as a rule, a combination of short quotations from the Qur’an, allegorical stories and vivid examples from everyday life, which are emotionally colored and simple for the reader’s imagination, thus having a stronger effect on him. In addition to these *‘onw ā ns*, there are some other places with significant revisions undertaken by the author.

2. Renaming designations for headings and subheadings. The *‘onw ā ns* are followed by four main chapters which are eponymous in both texts: “On religious duties (*‘ebādāt*)”; “On social customs (*‘ādāt*), or behaviors (*mo‘āmalāt*)”; “On the mortal vices (*mohlekāt*)”; “On the virtues leading to salvation (*monjiyāt*).” However, if each of these chapters is named “quarter” (*rob*) in the *Ehyā'*, then it is “pillar” (*rokn*) in the *Kimiā*. If every quarter in the former is divided into ten “books” (*ketāb*), then each pillar in the latter contains ten “bases” (*aṣl*). The same relates to the designations of a number of smaller subheadings. Thus, the whole mental image of the *Kimiā* can vividly be visualized and memorized by the reader as the four pillars of religion, each built on ten bases and capped with a pillar top.

3. Abridgment. Approximate statistics of characters in the eponymous quarters of the *Ehyā'* and the pillars of the *Kimiā* give the following ratios: for



the first quarter 1.0: 5.6; for the second 1.0: 2.9; for the third 1.0: 3.2; for the fourth 1.0: 3.8. Hence, compared with the *Ehyā'* quarters, the content of the *Kimiā* pillars was abridged by an average of 3.9 times. The abridgment touched upon the independent introductions to nearly all of the forty books of the *Ehyā'*. Each introduction begins with a glorification of God, goes on to briefly reveal the concepts to be discussed in the main text, and concludes with a glorification of the Prophet. It reveals these concepts in the form of a rhymed prose (*saj'*) representing a multidimensional text. In the *Kimiā*, a similarly structured text is explicitly found only once at the very beginning of the book (Khismatulin, 2005, pp. 239-51). In addition, the authorial abridgment mainly affected the illustrative and evidentiary base as well as details on some specific issues.

According to medieval Shafi'ite scholars, such as 'Abd-al-Raḥim 'Erāqī (d. 806/1403) and his disciple Ebn Ḥajar 'Asqalānī (d. 852/1449), Ḡazālī quoted in the *Ehyā'* about 4,250 sayings of the Prophet Moḥammad to establish his illustrative and evidentiary base. The figure does not include the statements of religious and Sufi authorities as well as hidden quotations. In the *Kimiā*, Ḡazālī significantly reduces the number of these sayings on top of giving only the shortest of them in the Arabic original. In all other cases, he proposes semantic Persian translation of them, sometimes combining several independent sayings on a similar topic into one in the same way as it was applied by many other scholars via joining together independent Qur'anic citations related to one topic. Taking this approach, Ḡazālī became one of the first Muslim scholars (if not the first one) to practice translation of the Prophet's sayings into Persian. Moreover, in view of the low religious status of the intended audience and, apparently, in an effort to avoid overloading the *Kimiā* with these sayings, Ḡazālī sometimes paraphrases them with no indication of their true origins. The same approach was taken by him in the *Zād-e āḳerat*, whose target audience was his non-Arabic disciples.

In case the curious and concerned reader wants to get more detailed information, Ḡazālī gives references to the titles of his previously written books in Arabic, such as the *Ehyā'* itself (*Kimiā*, ed. Ḳadiv Jam, I, pp. 9, 232, 262, 273, 279, 366, 376; II, pp. 329, 379, 499, 535, 630); the *Jawāher al-Qor'ān* (Gems of the Qur'an) (*Kimiā*, ed. Ḳadiv Jam, I, pp. 9, 275); *al-Maqṣad al-asnā fī šarḥ asmā' Allāh al-ḥosnā* (The highest objective in explaining Allah's most beautiful names) (*Kimiā*, ed. Ḳadiv Jam, I, p. 35); the *Meškāt al-anwār wa meṣfāt al-asrār* (The niche for lights and filter for secrets) (*Kimiā*, ed. Ḳadiv

Jam, I, p. 58); and the *Bedāyat al-hedāya* (*Kimiā*, ed. ʔadiv Jam, I, pp. 262, 271), as well as some books on logic and jurisprudence (*Kimiā*, ed. ʔadiv Jam, I, p. 328). Referring the reader to these books, ʔazālī frequently notices in the *Kimiā* that he is not going to repeat the details already discussed by him, but will focus on some other aspects of the related questions, mostly of spiritual nature.

4. Introducing new source material. Sometimes a text appears in the *Kimiā* that is absent in the *Ehyā'*. For example, the tenth basis (*aṣl*), entitled “On how to possess the subjects and manage governance” of the *Kimiā*’s second pillar, has no analogues in the *Ehyā'* (Hillenbrand, 2004, pp. 593-601). About ten years before composing the *Kimiā*, the same material was used by ʔazālī in the *Fazā'eḥ al-Bāṭeniya wa fażā'el al-Mostazheriya* (The Infamies of the Batenites and the virtues of the Mostazherites), a rather small Arabic-language essay addressed to the 28th 'Abbasid caliph, al-Mostazher (487-512/1094-1118), who was only 16 years old at that time. ʔazālī wrote this essay in the Baghdad period, prior to his spiritual crisis that led to his departure from Baghdad in 488/1095.

The final (tenth) chapter of the *Fazā'eḥ*, after a slight reduction in the illustrative and evidentiary base (from 84 to 64 *ḥ ad iṭs*), in its new arrangement and translation into Persian, formed the tenth basis of the second pillar of the *Kimiā* years later. From there, the content again, in a revised order, migrated to the authentic, first part of the *Naṣiḥat al-moluk* compiled for Sanjar in 503/1109. Thus, neither in the *Fazā'eḥ*, nor in the *Kimiā*, nor in the genuine part of the *Naṣiḥat*, was anything fundamentally new added to the illustrative and evidentiary base from non-Islamic sources as was done in the inauthentic part of the *Naṣiḥat*. The latter had already been attached to the genuine text, intentionally or involuntarily, by the beginning of the 13th century, when it had first been translated into Arabic.

Stated differently, in 1094, before his spiritual crisis, ʔazālī advised the teenage caliph the same things about government that he also advised the unsophisticated Muslim believers of the *Kimiā* in the period between 1102 and 1106 and the young Sanjar in 1109. Therefore, it is absolutely groundless to say that ʔazālī’s views on state administration in the pre-crisis Baghdad period were *qad i m* (“old”), while in the post-crisis Khorasan period they became *jad i d* (“new”). This is not confirmed by anything: “There is a considerable degree of consistency in al-Ghazali’s view on government” (Hillenbrand, 1988, p. 92). Very often, the authenticity of many texts that are



falsely attributed to Ġazālī, or are outright forgeries, is justified only by Ġazālī's post-crisis revision views without providing stronger arguments (Khismatulin, 2015, pp. 118-27; 2017, pp. 89-114).

To sum up, the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat* is neither a Persian translation nor an abridgment of a particular Arabic work of Ġazālī's. This book presents an independent "summation rather than merely a summary of al-Ghazali's thought" (Hillenbrand, 2013, p. 66), expressed by him in his native language and in a manner accessible to a general Persian-speaking audience. Thus, the audience could grasp many complex philosophical, theological, and Sufi questions treated by Ġazālī in his many other works written in Arabic.

Impact on Sufism . The main purpose set by Ġazālī in the *Kimiā*, is to show the straight path from the "lowest of the low" to the "highest of the high," that is, the genuine Sufism within the framework of the Islamic religious law and as the highest point of Islamic religion. With this purpose in mind, Ġazālī tries to motivate the reader to analyze impalpable variations in his spiritual impulses and to change behaviors in terms of their sincerity towards religion and obligatory acts of worship. Such analysis is expected to result in a transmutation of the reader's soul and lead him to eternal happiness. This is one of the crucial reasons why the book has always been popular throughout the centuries, attracting the attention of many believers and ideally suited for educational purposes in Sufism.

Another reason for its popularity is the proposal of a practical way to lead the Sufi life at the advanced stages. By Ġazālī's lifetime, this way of life was already widespread in Khorasan and Transoxania (see MĀ WARĀ' AL-NAHR) by the adherents of the Malāmatiyya movement, with its influential Nishapur school of mystical piety. In his *Ehyā'*, Ġazālī discusses its principles of everyday practice, borrowing freely from the Arabic works of his predecessors mostly in Ṭus and Nishapur as well as of those from other religious schools whose works won general acceptance in Sufism (Purjavādi, pp. 213-78; Khismatulin, 2005, p. 259), translating the borrowings into Persian in the *Kimiā*, and transmitting his own spiritual experience, gained by him in communication with Abu 'Alī Faḏl b. Moḥammad Fārmādī Ṭusī (d. 477/1084-85) (*Kimiā*, ed. Kadiv Jam, II, pp. 34, 156)—a prominent Sufi and preacher of his time (Gozashteh and Negahban, pp. 468-9). Names of this Sufi master and his teacher and father-in-law Abu-al-Qāsem 'Abd-Allāh b. 'Alī Gorgāni/Korrakāni Ṭusī (d. 450/1058 or 469/1077) are mentioned by Ġazālī with the use of the conventional title of respect K̄vāja ("lord," "mister") and



applied to the Ḳvājagān of Ṭus (*Kimiā*, ed. Kādiv Jam, I, p. 453). Both names are also presented in the chain of spiritual adherence (*selsela*) of the Ḳvājagān-Naqšbandiya Sufi order. This order appeared in 14th century Transoxania and became famous with its own principles of everyday practice formulated in Persian, which are very similar to those described by Ġazālī in Arabic terms for the Malāmātiya in his *Ehyā'* and *Kimiā* (Khismatulin, 1998, pp. 208-15; idem, 2005, pp. 252-62).

Hence, the “official” Ḳvājagān-Naqšbandiya Sufi order of Bukhara, which later spread throughout the Muslim world, is in fact a Transoxanian offspring of the Malāmātiya Sufi movement related to the Nishapur and Ṭus Shafi'ite school of law to which Ġazālī belonged. This is explicitly confirmed by the Ḳvājagān-Naqšbandiya “ideologist” and Islamic law scholar (*faqih*) Moḥammad Pārsā Bokāri (d. 822/1420) in his *Fa ṣl al- keṭ āb* (The Final Decision): “Thus, what was mentioned [in the book] about the states of the people of blame (*ahl-e malāmat*), explains the states of the Ḳvājagān family” (Pārsā, p. 699).

Translations . The active process of translating Ġazālī's texts, both Arabic and Persian, into other languages began with Ottoman Turkish from the early 16th century onwards. To judge from descriptions in some manuscript catalogues, there were three categories of the Turkish translations of the *Kimiā*: (a) the first four ' *onw ā ns* only; (b) the full text; (c) the full text with comments on it (*tedbir-e eksir*) made by different medieval scholars (e.g., *Fehres*, I, pp. 71-72, 92-93). In the lithographic period, priority was given to the first category as the most popular and commercially profitable for publication. In the 19th century, the first four ' *onw ā ns* were translated several times by a number of translators and lithographed in Istanbul numerous times (Ülken, pp. 60-61, 69, 71-72, 79). This tendency has continued in the 20th century. However, from 1969 onwards, several Turkish translations of the complete text (*tam metin*) were also published by different translators (Günaydin, pp. 75-76).

In addition to the Ottoman Turkish translations, there are also known at least three different translations into Central Asian Turkic languages, which were preserved in the 19th century manuscripts. Two translations were done in Ḳvārazm (CHORASMIA) of the four ' *onw ā ns* only, later lithographed in Tashkent (1904), and of the complete text. One more full translation was undertaken in Khotan (q.v.), obviously into Uyghur (Madraimov, pp. 13-20).

The earliest translation of the complete text into Urdu as *Eks i r-e hed ā yat* seems to have been made by Faḳr-al-Din Aḥmad and published



lithographically by Munshi Nawal Kishor (d. 1895) in 1885. From then onwards, several Urdu translations under the book's original title were published by different translators.

Early publications of the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat* in European languages are presented by the secondary translations. They were undertaken neither from the original Persian nor from any of the *Kimiā*'s complete translations listed above. The text was first translated into English by Henry A. Homes (1873) from an abridged translation into Ottoman Turkish published in Istanbul (1260/1845). Homes noticed in his "Introduction" that "the Turkish edition itself is but a portion of the original work" (p. 11). Both Turkish and English translations contain just the four 'onw ā ns of religions supplemented with a short text (On the love of God) that does not seem to belong to Ġazālī.

The second English translation done by Claud Field (1910) from an Urdu abridgement is a little bit larger than that of Homes. It consists of the four 'onw ā ns, two chapters from the second pillar, and two chapters from the fourth one. However, some of these chapters were substantially abbreviated, obviously by an Urdu translator. In 1991, the translation was revised and significantly annotated by Elton L. Daniel. Nevertheless, it still constitutes a small portion of the *Kimiā*'s original size and definitely cannot provide an adequate sense of its content.

A less abridged version of the *Kimiā*, but heavily mixed with comments of an unidentified author, was rendered into English and published in Pakistan in 2001. It is not clear from the publisher's note which text was used for this rendition, but it seems to have been some Urdu translation of the *Kimiā*. This might have been one of the reasons why, in 2005, the same publisher printed a two-volume complete English translation by Jay R. Crook (Muhammad Nur).

Hellmut Ritter's (q.v.; 1892-1971) German translation (1923) contains only the first 'onw ā n and one short part from the second pillar of the *Kimiā*. The rest are passages abridged by Ritter himself and drawn from the *Ehyā*' (Ritter, p. 3). The second edition of his translation (1989) was later updated with a new foreword by Annemarie Schimmel (q.v.; 1922-2003).

In Russia, the four 'onw ā ns of the *Kimiā* were first translated by Alexey Khismatulin and published with a parallel Persian text in a series of the textbooks for students "Culture and Ideology of the Medieval Muslim Orient" (2001). These 'onw ā ns together with the first pillar and the second pillar were



then published in two separate volumes (2002, 2007), based on MS B 928 (dated 1495) from the collection of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts in St. Petersburg. In 2018, a four-volume complete Russian translation was published, of which the third and fourth pillars were translated by Ismagil Gibadullin.

Editions. Publication of the full Persian text of the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat* began with its numerous lithographic editions in 19th century India (see [LITHOGRAPHY ii. IN INDIA](#)) whose publishers met the general needs of the Persian-speaking reader far beyond the country's borders. The first lithograph of the book seems to have been produced in Calcutta in 1252/1836 (Nowšāhi, I, p. 283), then republished by the famous publisher Munshi Nawal Kishor in Lucknow (1279/1862). His example has been later followed by many Indian publishers (Shcheglova, pp. 38, 52, 87, 114, 121, 126, 227).

In Iran, a lithograph of the *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat* seems to have first been published in 1253/1837 (Mošār, II, p. 2703; Sāket, 2019, p. 453); however, this information requires additional verification in terms of both the publication date and completeness of the published text (see [LITHOGRAPHY i. IN PERSIA](#)).

After the lithographic period, two Persian editions were printed, thanks to Aḥmad Ārām (1940) and Ḥosayn Kādiv Jam (1982). The latter edition is considered by modern scholarship more accurate than the former. However, both editions are uncritical with no indication of the editing principles. That is why contemporary Iranian scholars intend to prepare a critical edition of the text, with variant readings based on the most reliable copies (Sāket et al., pp. 29-55). This may result in a need for revision of the *Kimiā's* translations already published to date.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Iraj Afšār and Moḥammad Taqī Dānešpažuh, *Fehrest-e noskakhā-ye kaṭṭi-e ketābkāna-ye melli-e Malek IV*, ed. Moḥammad Bāqer Ḥojjati and Aḥmad Monzawī, Tehran, 1985.

Jonathan Brown, "The Last Days of al-Ghazzālī and the Tripartite Division of the Sufi World: Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazzālī's Letter to the Seljuq Vizier and



Commentary," *The Muslim World* 96, 2006, pp. 89-113.

Patricia Crone, "Did al-Ghazali Write a Mirror for Princes? On the Authorship of 'Nasihāt al-muluk'," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 10, 1987, pp. 167-91.

Carl Hermann Ethé, *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1903-37.

Faẓā'el al-anām men rasā'el Ḥojjat al-Eslām, ed. al-Ṣamad al-Sayyed al-Aḥmad, Akbarābād, 1310/1892; *Makāteb-e fārsi-ye Ġazālī ba nām-e Faẓā'el al-anām men rasā'el Ḥojjat al-Eslām*, ed. 'Abbās Eqbāl Āštiāni, Tehran, 1954; ed. 'Ali Mo'ayyad Tābeti, Tehran, 1954; tr. into German by Dorothea Krawulsky as *Briefe und Reden des Abū Hāmīd Muhammad al-Gazzālī*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1971; tr. into Arabic by Nur al-Dīn Āl 'Ali as *Faẓā'el al-anām men rasā'el Ḥojjat al-Eslām*, Tunis, 1972; rendered into English from an unknown manuscript by Abdul Qayyum as *Letters of al-Ghazzali*, Lahore, 1976; tr. into Arabic by Yusof 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Faraj, 'Abd al-Ḥamid Madkur and Moḥammad 'Alā' al-Dīn Maṣṣūr as *Faẓā'el al-anām men rasā'el Ḥojjat al-Eslām*, Cairo, 2005; tr. into Russian by Alexey Khismatulin as *Dostoinstva lyudei iz poslanii Dovoda islama*, in Khismatulin, *Sochineniya*, pp. 155-264, provided with the Persian original based on 'A. Eqbāl Āštiāni's edition, in Khismatulin, *Sochineniya*, pp. 509-83.

Fehres al-makṭuṭāt al-fāresiya allati toqtanihā Dār al-kotob ḥattā 'ām 1963 M., 2 vols., Cairo, 1966-67.

Abu Ḥāmed Moḥammad Ġazālī, *Eḥyā' 'olūm al-dīn*, 4 vols., Cairo, 1302/1885; repr., 1358/1939; ed. 'A. Kāledi, 5 vols., Beirut, 1998; tr. (IV/1-6); Richard Gramlich as *Muhammad al-Ġazzālīs Lehre von den Stufen zur Gottesliebe*, Wiesbaden, 1984.

Idem, *Faẓā'eḥ al-Bāṭeniya wa faẓā'el al-Mostazheriya*, ed. 'Abd-al-Raḥman Badawi, Cairo, 1964; tr. into German by Ignác Goldziher as *Streitschrift des Ġazālī gegen die Bāṭinijja-sekte*, Leiden, 1916; repr. Leiden, 1956.

Idem, *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat*, ed. Aḥmad Ārām, 2 vols., Tehran, 1940; ed. Ḥosayn Kādiv Jam, 2 vols., Tehran, 1982; tr. into English by Henry A. Homes as *The Alchemy of Happiness, by Mohammed al-Ghazzali*, Albany, NY, 1873; tr. Claud Field as *The Alchemy of Happiness*, London, 1910, revised and annotated by Elton L. Daniel, New York, 1991; tr. Jay R. Crook as *The Alchemy of Happiness*, 2



vols., Chicago, 2005; tr. into German by Hellmut Ritter as *Das Elixier der Glückseligkeit*, Jena, 1923; repr. Düsseldorf-Köln, 1989 (2nd ed. with a new foreword by A. Schimmel); tr. into modern Turkish by A. Faruk Meyan, Istanbul, 1969; tr. Mehmed A. Müftüoğlu, Istanbul, 1980; tr. Ali Arslan as *Mutluluğun Formülü*, Istanbul, 2004; tr. into Russian by A. Khismatulin as *Elixir Schast'ya*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 2002; vol. II, St. Petersburg, 2007; tr. A. Khismatulin, (vols. I-II) and I. Gibadullin (vols. III-IV), St. Petersburg-Qazan, 2018.

Idem, *Naṣīḥat al-muluk*, lithograph, Bombay, n.d.; ed. Jalāl Homā'i, 2nd ed., Tehran, 1972; tr. into English by F. R. C. Bagley as *Ghazālī's Book of Counsel for Kings (Nasihat al-muluk)*, London, 1964; pt. 1 (genuine), ed. A. Khismatulin in *Sochineniya*, pp. 483-508, and tr. into Russian as *Sovet vlad'ykam*, *ibid.*, pp. 89-154.

Idem, *Pand-nāma*, Tehran, 1932; ed. Naṣr-Allāh Purjavādi (Pourjavady) in *Do mojadded: paṣuḥeshā-yi dar bāra-ye Moḥammad Ġazālī va Faḳr Rāzi*, pp. 425-49; ed. A. Khismatulin in *Sochineniya* (as a text falsely attributed to Ġazālī), pp. 603-15 and tr. into Russian as *Pis'mo s sovetami*, *ibid.*, pp. 339-54.

Idem, *Zād-e āḳerat*, lithograph, Hyderabād, 1276/1859; ed. Morād Awrang, Tehran, 1973; ed. A. Khismatulin in *Sochineniya*, pp. 437-82, and tr. into Russian as *Putevoi pripas dlya gryadushchei zhizni*, *ibid.*, pp. 13-88; ed. Salmān Sāket, Qom, 2019.

Naser Gozashteh and Farzin Negahban, "Abū 'Alī al-Fārmadī," W. Madelung and F. Daftary, eds., *Encyclopaedia Islamica*, 16 vols., Leiden, 2008-..., I, pp. 468-69.

Yu.-T. Günaydin, "Gazālī tercümeleri: Osmanlı devri ve 1928 sonrası için bir bibliyografya denemesi," *Dîvân: Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi* 16, 2011, pp. 63-90.

Carole Hillenbrand, "Islamic Orthodoxy or Realpolitik? Al-Ghazali's Views on Government" *Iran: Journal of the British Institute of Persian Studies* 26 (1988), pp. 91-94.

Idem, "A Little-Known Mirror for Princes by al-Ghazali," in Rüdiger Arnzen and Jörn Thielmann, eds., *Words, Texts and Concepts Cruising the Mediterranean Sea: Studies on the Sources, Contents and Influences of Islamic Civilization and Arabic Philosophy and Science: Dedicated to Gerhard Endress*



on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday, Leuven, 2004, pp. 593-601.

Idem, "The *Kimiya-yi sa'adat* (The Alchemy of Happiness) of al-Ghazali: a Misunderstood Work?" in Robert Hillendrand, A. C. S. Peacock, and F. Abdullaeva, eds., *Ferdowsi, the Mongols and the History of Iran: Art, Literature and Culture from Early Islam to Qajar Persia: Studies in Honour of Charles Melville*, New York, 2013, pp. 59-69.

Alexey Khismatulin, "O sochinenii 'Elixir schast'ya' Abu Hamida al-Ghazali al-Tusi" (About the 'Elixir of Happiness' by Abu Ḥāmed al-Ġazālī al-Ṭusi), *Strany i narody Vostoka* XXX, 1998, pp. 204-28.

Idem, " 'The Alchemy of Happiness': Al-Ghazālī's *Kīmīyā* and the Origins of the Khwājagān-Naqshbandiyya Principles," in S. Günther, ed., *Ideas, Images, and Methods of Portrayal: Insights into Classical Arabic Literature and Islam*, Leiden-Boston, 2005, pp. 227-71.

Idem, "Two Mirrors for Princes Fabricated at the Seljuq Court: Nizām al-Mulk's *Siyar al-mulūk* and al-Ghazālī's *Nasīhat al-mulūk*," in Edmund Herzig and Sarah Stewart, eds., *The Age of the Seljuqs, The Idea of Iran* 6, London, 2015, pp. 94-130.

Idem, *Sochineniya imama al-Ghazali* (The Writings of Imam al-Ghazali), Nazidatel'naya literatura epokhi Saljukidov na persidskom yazyke: Originaly i poddelki/The Persian Mirrors for Princes Written in the Saljuq Period: Originals and Fabrications 2, St. Petersburg-Moscow, 2017 (in Russian and Persian).

Idem, "The Persian Mirrors for Princes Written in the Saljuq Period: The Book Series," *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University: Asian and African Studies* 11/3, 2019, pp. 321-44.

Idem, "Islamic Education Reflected in the Forms of Medieval Scholarly Literature: *Jam'*, *Tā'līf*, and *Taṣnīf* in Classical Islam," in S. Günther, ed., *Knowledge and Education in Classical Islam: Religious Learning between Continuity and Change*, 2 vols., Leiden-Boston, 2020, I, pp. 475-87.

Hindol Madraimov, *Kīmīyā-yi sa'ādat Abu Hamida Ghazali i ego perevody na tyurki* (*Kimiya-yi sa'adat* of Abu Ḥāmid Ḡazālī and its translations into Turkic; a synopsis of the unpublished Ph.D. diss.), Tashkent, 2000.



Majmu'a-ye ātār-e fārsi-e Aḥmad-e Ġazālī, ed. A. Mojāhed, Tehran, 1979, 2nd ed., Tehran, 1991 (editions of all the Persian texts with critical apparatus).

Ḳānbābā Mošār, *Fehrest-e ketābhā-ye čāpi-e fārsi az āgāz tā ākar-e sāl-e 1345 bar asās-e fehrest-e Ḳānbābā va fahāres-e anjoman-e ketāb*, 3 vols., Tehran, 1973.

Nāmahā-ye 'Ayn-al-Qożāt Hamadāni (Letters by 'Ayn-al-Qożāt Hamadāni), ed. 'Ali Naqī Monzawi and 'Afif 'Osayrān, 2 vols., Tehran, 1983.

'Āref Nowšāhi, *Ketābšenāsi-e āsār-e fārsi-e čāpšoda dar šebh-e qāra (Hend, Pakistan, Bangladesh)*, 4 vols., Tehran, 2012.

Moḥammad Pārsā, *Fa šl al- k e t ā b*, ed. Jalil Mesgarnežād, Tehran, 2002.

Persidskie i tadzhikskie rukopisi Instituta narodov Azii Akademii Nauk SSSR (kratkii alfavitnyi katalog) (Persian and Tajik Manuscripts of the Institute of Asian Peoples of the USSR Academy of Sciences [A concise alphabetic catalogue]), ed. Nikolai D. Miklukho-Maklai, 2 vols., Moscow, 1964.

Naṣr-Allāh Purjavādi, *Do mojadded: pažuhešhā-yi dar bāra-ye Moḥammad Ġazālī wa Faḳr Rāzī*, Tehran, 2002.

Charles Rieu, *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 3 vols., London, 1879-1895.

Salmān Sāket, "Kimiā-ye sa'ādat," *Dānešnāma-ye zabān va adab-e fārsi* V, ed. Esmā'il Sa'ādat, Tehran, 2019, pp. 450-53.

Salmān Sāket, Moḥammad-Ja'far Yāḥaqqi, Moḥammad-Rezā Rāšed Moḥaṣel, Maḥmud 'Ābedi, "Žarurat-e taṣḥiḥ-e dobāra-ye *Kimiā-ye sa'ādat*," *Jost ā rh ā -ye nowin-e adab i 178*, 2012, pp. 29-55.

George Henry Scherer, "Al-Ghazali's Ayyuha'l-walad," Ph.D. diss., Chicago University, 1930; Beirut, 1933.

Olimpiada P. Shcheglova, *Persoyazychnaya litografirovannaya kniga indiiskogo proizvodstva (XIX v.)* (Persian-language lithographed book of Indian production [19th century]), St. Petersburg, 2001.

Sobranie vostochnykh rukopisei Akademii nauk Uzbekskoi SSR (Collection of Oriental manuscripts of the Uzbek SSR Academy of Sciences), ed. A. A.



Semenov et al., I-XIV, Tashkent, 1952-2000.

Hilmi Ziya Ülken, "Gazali'nin bazı eserlerinin Türkçe tercümeleri / Les traductions en Turc de certains livres d'al-Ghazali," *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 9/1, 1961, pp. 59-79.