

The Influence of Avicenna's Philosophy on the Establishment of the Philosophical Tradition in Anatolia During the Seljuk Period: Commentaries, Criticisms, Proponents, Discussions

Mustafa Demirci | ORCID: 0000-0002-2214-3796 | mustdemirci@hotmail.com

Selçuk University, Faculty of Letters, Department of History, Konya, Türkiye

ROR ID: <https://ror.org/045hgzm75>

Abstract

Avicenna ushered in a new era in Islamic thought with his ideas and debates. Without understanding his ideas, Islamic thought cannot be fully mastered. However, in our time, Muslims have focused mainly on his works on medicine. However, as science is constantly evolving, old knowledge is rapidly aging. There is nothing like it in Aristotle's book of physics today, but it is still new to philosophy. The same is true for Avicenna's works: medical knowledge has now become a subject of history, but his philosophy is still alive. In this article, we follow the traces of Avicenna's philosophical research in Seljuk Anatolia. Since this work is a study of history, the change in content of the philosophy of Avicennain 13th century Anatolia is not the main problem of this article. These problematics can be revealed and discussed by the studies in the field of philosophy written in Anatolia by philosophers. However, I must say that during this period, serious criticisms against Avicennadrew attention since he was thought to have religiousized the philosophical tradition and disrupted philosophy. This article aims to reveal the development and influence of this philosophy through the commentaries, criticisms and discussions around his thoughts on Avicenna's works.

Keywords

Avicenna, Seljuks, Anatolia, Islamic Philosophy, Isharat Tradition

Citation

Demirci, Mustafa. “The Influence of Avicenna’s Philosophy on the Establishment of the Philosophical Tradition in Anatolia During the Seljuk Period: Commentaries, Criticisms, Proponents, Discussions”. *Journal of Seljuk Studies* 22 (June 2025), 1-22.

<https://doi.org/10.23897/usad.1648635>

Date of Submission	28.02.2025
Date of Acceptance	30.06.2025
Date of Publication	30.06.2025
Peer-Review	Double anonymized - Two External
Ethical Statement	It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited.
Plagiarism Checks	Yes - Turnitin
Conflicts of Interest	The author(s) has no conflict of interest to declare.
Complaints	usad@selcuk.edu.tr
Grant Support	The author(s) acknowledge that they received no external funding in support of this research.
Copyright & License	Authors publishing with the journal retain the copyright to their work licensed under the CC BY-NC 4.0 .

Selçuklu Dönemi Anadolu'da Felsefe Geleneğinin Oluşumunda İbn Sînâ Felsefesinin Etkisi: Yorumlar, Eleştiriler, Taraftarlar, Tartışmalar

Mustafa Demirci | ORCID: 0000-0002-2214-3796 | mustdemirci@hotmail.com

Selçuk Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü, Konya, Türkiye

ROR ID: <https://ror.org/045hgzm75>

Öz

İbn Sînâ, fikirleri ve tartışmalarıyla İslam düşüncesinde yeni bir çağ açmıştır. Onun fikirleri anlaşılmadan İslam düşüncesi tam anlamıyla kavranamaz. Ancak zamanımızda Müslümanlar daha çok onun tıp alanındaki eserlerine odaklanmışlardır. Ancak bilim sürekli geliştiği için eski bilgiler hızla eskimektedir. Bugün Aristoteles'in fizik kitabında buna benzer bir şey yoktur ama felsefe için hala yenidir. Aynı şey İbn Sînâ'nın eserleri için de geçerlidir: Tıp bilgisi artık tarihin konusu olmuştur ama felsefesi hala canlıdır. Bu yazıda İbn Sînâ'nın Selçuklu Anadolu'sundaki felsefi araştırmalarının izlerini takip ediyoruz. Bu eser bir tarih çalışması olduğu için 13. yüzyıl Anadolu'sunda İbn Sînâ felsefesinin içeriğindeki değişim bu makalenin temel problemi değildir. Bu sorunsallar, filozofların Anadolu'da felsefe alanında yazdıkları çalışmalarla ortaya çıkarılabilir ve tartışılabilir. Ancak bu dönemde İbn Sînâ'nın felsefi geleneği dinselileştirdiği ve felsefeyi bozduğu düşünüldüğünden kendisine yönelik ciddi eleştirilerin dikkat çektiğini söylemeliyim. Bu makale, İbn Sînâ'nın eserleri hakkındaki düşünceleri etrafında yapılan yorum, eleştiri ve tartışmalar aracılığıyla bu felsefenin gelişimini ve etkisini ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler

İbn Sînâ, Selçuklular, Anadolu, İslam Felsefesi, İşarat Geleneği

Atıf Bilgisi

Demirci, Mustafa. “Selçuklu Dönemi Anadolu’da Felsefe Geleneğinin Oluşumunda İbn Sînâ Felsefesinin Etkisi: Yorumlar, Eleştiriler, Taraftarlar, Tartışmalar”. *Selçuklu Araştırmaları Dergisi* 22 (Haziran 2025), 1-22.

<https://doi.org/10.23897/usad.1648635>

Geliş Tarihi	28.02.2025
Kabul Tarihi	30.06.2025
Yayın Tarihi	30.06.2025
Değerlendirme	İki Dış Hakem / Çift Taraflı Körleme

Etik Beyan	Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur.
Benzerlik Taraması	Yapıldı – Turnitin
Etik Bildirim	usad@selcuk.edu.tr
Çıkar Çatışması	Çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir.
Finansman	Bu araştırmayı desteklemek için dış fon kullanılmamıştır.
Telif Hakkı & Lisans	Yazarlar dergide yayınlanan çalışmalarının telif hakkına sahiptirler ve çalışmaları CC BY-NC 4.0 lisansı altında yayımlanmaktadır.

Introduction

1. The Introduction of Avicenna's Philosophy to Anatolia

In XVII. century, Katip Çelebi wrote, *"In Asia Minor, the philosophical sciences flourished during the period starts from the conquest of Islam to the middle term of the Ottoman Empire"*. Dimitri Gutas said, *"the heirs of Avicenna's views in the Seljuk and Ottoman periods in Asia Minor were not sufficiently studied."* If we discuss the works of Avicenna, we can see that this period was very productive and creative.

Before the development of scientific and intellectual life in the Anatolian Seljuks, Islamic science and philosophy had great thinkers such as Ghazzali, Ibn Rushd, Sistani and Fakhr al-Din al-Razi and heated discussions took place. It is seen that the philosophical tradition in the Anatolian Seljuks started during the foundation years. The information Ibn al-Athir gave about Qutalmish confirms this: *"It is surprising that Qutalmish was very well versed in the science of astronomy, although he was a Turk. He also knew the sciences related to the philosophical tradition. After him, his sons and his followers continued to learn the sciences that came from the philosophical tradition. And they took the scientists who are renowned in this field under their auspices. This situation caused trouble in their religious beliefs..."*. (İbnü'l-Esir, 1966, Vol. X, pp. 36-37).

These statements show that there has been a philosophical tradition since the time of Suleiman ibn Qutalmish and his father, the founder of the Anatolian Seljuks. However, according to the famous Seljuk historian Mikail Bayram, the growing number of Seljuk organizations in Türkiye brought the philosophical and scientific tradition to Anatolia. For example, the famous statesman 'Ali Taylu and the Minister of the Great Seljuk's Künduri's men headed towards Anatolia and laid the foundations of the scientific and philosophical tradition there. According to Bayram, both men belonged to the Mu'tazila sect that naturally inclined to philosophy and other mental sciences. Because The Mu'tazilites had their own philosophical views at that time when scientific life was taking shape in Asia Minor. As a result, under the Danishmends dynasty emerged a religious-scientific concept with a rational philosophical dimension in the early twelfth century in Asia Minor. (Bayram, 2001, pp. 1-11).

On the other hand, the Danishmendid Dynasty, which was established in Anatolia just after the Battle of Manzikert, and his Kayseri city guard Ilyas b. Ahmad who was as famous as İbn al-Kamal presented an astronomy treatise called "Kashf al-Aqaba" to Danishmend's son Danishmend Ahmad Ghazi. In the preface

of this book, it was written: *“Many philosophers and virtuous people and intellectuals (ahl-i ‘ukul) from all over the world have turned to that great person and each of them has their knowledge and experience from that sea of generosity.”* (Fatih Süleymaniye Lib. no. 5426, fol. 250a) During this period, Omer b. Mohammed b. ‘Ali as-Savî came to Anatolia and settled in Kayseri, and wrote the book named *“‘Aka'id-i Ahl-i Sunna”* and stated the following in the preface of his book: *“I came to the Anatolian Seljuk country (Bilad-i Rum). I saw that everyone is dealing with and interested in ‘Ilm-i Nujum (Astronomy), but they are aware of religious sciences ...”* For this reason, he says that he wrote his book to meet the need for religious sciences in the Seljuk state (no. 5426, fol. 193a).

2. The Philosophy of Avicenna in the Anatolian Seljuk Sultans and Palace Environments

The tendency of achieving knowledge went neither unnoticed nor limited by the Seljuk sultans in Asia Minor, and as a result, the sultans also became interested in philosophy and science. The Assyrian historian Mikail, who was close to the Anatolian Seljuk sultan Kilich Arslan (1154 – 1182), reports that the Sultan was interested in philosophical issues and participated in the scientific debates on these issues. In the second half of the twelfth century, philosophical views led to a conflict between the Seljuk sultan Kilich Arslan II and Salah al-Din al-Ayyubi. Even Salah al-Din al Ayyubi accused the Seljuk sultan of heresy and called for his repentance. Shortly after this incident, in the same way, Kilich Arslan II's son Rukn al-Din Sulayman Shah I (601/1204), who succeeded him to the throne, was also for his interest in (Turan, 1971, pp. 230-233) philosophical sciences (İbn Bibi, 1956, p. 25) Ibn al-‘Asir said about this sultan: *“People used to say that the sultan was strongly attached to philosophical views, that his faith was corrupted, and that even people in this sect worshiped him and sought his help. Only because he was a wise sultan, he did not reveal his sect and belief so that there is no division between society according to sects and philosophical views and to avoid sectarian separation...”* (İbnü'l-Esir, Vol. XII, p. 196). His sons ‘Izz al-Din Kaykaus (1212–1221) and ‘Ala’ al-Din Kayqubad (1221–1237), who succeeded Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw I (1204–1212) to the Seljuk throne after his death, were also poetic, curious and philosophical. As sultans who loved debate, with these qualities they considered the actions of the people around them.

The philosophy of Avicenna was brought to Anatolia by the Mu‘tazilites, who were supported by the Vizier Künduri, whom we mentioned above. The second came with Shihab al-Din Suhrawardi (d. 1191), the founder of “Ishraq” philosophy, who did his scientific activities in Anatolia for a while and participated in

educational activities here. We know that Suhrevardi had a close relationship with both the Danishmendids and the Seljuk palace environment. This strengthens the possibility that Avicenna's thoughts came through the channel of Shihabeddin Suhrevardi.

Written by Shihabeddin Suhrevardî in the line of Messhai philosophy, his Works such as *Kitab al-Talvihât al-Lavhiyya wa-l-Arshîyya*, *Kitab al-Mulk*, *al-Mashari' wa-l- Mutarahat* (Şihabuddin, 1993, I/10, 34, 69, 195; Id, 1993, Vol. II, pp. 274-275). He not only deals with the issues of Messhai philosophy, but also discusses in detail the thoughts of Avicenna, such as Bahmanyar (d. 1066), Abu al-'Abbas Lavkari (d. 1109), 'Umar Savi (d. 1169). Some concepts and chapters in Avicenna's book *al-Isarat* and *Tenbihat* had the same effect on Suhrevardî. "Maqamat al-'Arifîn""Hikmat al- Mashriqiyya", which Avicennaincluded in his work "*al-Isarat wa-l-Tanbihat*", "*Hikmat al Mashriqiyya*", concepts such as active mind, intuition, love, symbols and thoughts and similar approaches. They are the counterparts of Suhrevardî in the world of ideas and exactly overlap with the concepts he used (Ibn Sînâ, 2005, pp. 113-114, 183-186,187). His separation of Avicenna from these criticisms shows that he is an Avicennian, although he is directed towards criticisms of the Messhai philosophers. Ishrak philosophy was able to develop on the ground established by Avicenna. The unfinished "Mashriqi Hikmat" project of Avicenna, Suhrevardi, was developed by melting theology, philosophy and mysticism in a pot, under the name of philosophy of Islam. Suhrevardi wrote some of these books during the eight years he stayed in Anatolian cities such as Konya, Tokat and Sivas during the Seljuk period. He also went to Aleppo, where he was executed, from Anatolia (Kutluer, 2011, pp. 92-97; Bekiryazıcı, vol: 50/1, pp. 123-139). According to the information provided by Ibn Ekfânî (d. 1348), Suhrevardi's works were both taught in Seljuk madrasahs and circulated among scholars. In the second half of the twelfth century in Anatolia, Suhrevardi was the first person to bring and teach the philosophy of Avicennain an early period when a serious scientific atmosphere did not begin yet (Mecmua-i Musennefat-i Sheikh Ishrak Shihabuddin ibn Yahya Sühreverdî, ed. Najafkâli Habibi, Vol. I, Tehran 1380). In my opinion, in the twelfth century, the influence of Avicennian philosophy on the Seljuk palace circles and sultans was due to the influence of Suhrevardi and his students. The fact that the subject of philosophy-creed mentioned above between the Ayyubids who executed Suhrevardi later and the Seljuks was a matter of diplomatic crisis also strengthens our prediction.

Anatolia is the most productive area in terms of science and philosophical movements in the thirteenth century. The Mongolian invasion that started in the first quarter of this century devastated the cities, especially in Turkistan and Iran. Consequently, scholars, philosophers, and other people in these cities migrated to the west to save their lives. During this destruction, the followers and works of Avicenna, who were in a new revival, were destroyed. Those who could be escaped from the Mongol massacre took shelter in Seljuk Anatolia. It is possible to see this situation in the prosopography of science, art and culture of men who came to Anatolia during the time of Sultan 'Ala' al-Din Kayqubad, when the Mongolian invasion started in the Eastern Islamic-Turkish countries. Most of the scholars who came to Anatolia were not from Arab countries. They were mostly among the Eastern countries where Turks were concentrated, such as Turkistan, Khwarezm, Khorasan, Iran and Azerbaijan, which were destroyed by the Mongol invasion. Regions outside Anatolia such as Iraq, Syria and Egypt belonged to the Arabi-Ash'ari-Shafi'i sect and did not adopt the philosophical tradition anyway. In this respect, the thirteenth century of the Seljuk Anatolian was the last refuge of Avicennian tradition. For this reason, the Seljuk Anatolian requires special attention and concentration.

3. Studies on the Philosophical Works of Avicennain the 13th Century in Seljukid's Anatolia

Due to the Crusader wars and internal conflicts that continued throughout the 12th century, scientific and civil life activities did not develop yet. Nevertheless, as we have shown above, it is very important and remarkable that some philosophical studies were able to be found around the Seljuk palace and sultans in the 12th century in Konya. However, scientific studies mainly spread and developed in the Seljuk Anatolia in the 13th century. According to the data mentioned above, since the foundation of the Seljuks in the last quarter of the eleventh century in Asia Minor there were sufficient conditions for the development of science and philosophy. This means that this scientific and philosophical tradition continued in Anatolia in the following periods. The earliest Avicennawork in the thirteenth century is seen at the time of 'Ala'ad-Din Kayqubad. Sultan 'Ala' ad-Din Kayqubad translated Avicenna's work "*al-Risala fi Nafsi Natiqa*" from Arabic to Persian by Ahi Evran who was also the founder of the Ahi Organization in Anatolia (Bayram, p. 184, 483). In the Anatolian Seljuk period, as indicated above, Messhai philosophy, that is, of course, was always considered in line with Avicenna. In the same way, one of the last and most perfect Works of

Avicenna's philosophical system on logic, physics and metaphysics and which is the summary of the philosophy of Avicenna, *al-Isharat wa-l-Tanbihat*, and an "al-Isharat commentary" tradition has occurred. Works and books belonging to this tradition, especially *al-Isharat wa-l-Tanbihat*, always were always taught and considered. Many commentaries were written on the works belonging to the philosophical tradition (İbn Sînâ, Vol. I-III, 1338). One of the traditions is 'the Tradition of Sharh al-Isharat', which have begun with al-Mas'udi's and Fakhr al-Din al-Razi's commentaries on *al-Isharat wa al-Tanbihat* which is one of the last and perfect works of the Avicennian thought.

The first major commentary on *al-Isharat* in this tradition is the *Sharh al-Isharat* written by Fakhr al-Din al-Razi (d. 606/1210). Râzî made a serious philosophical criticism in this work, which is also named as "cerh (wounding)" due to the criticisms he directed to Avicenna. Despite this, there is also a summary called *Lubab al-Isharat* in which he summarizes *al-Isharat*. Written by Nasir al-Din al-Tusi (d. 672/1274) in order to answer the criticisms of Avicenna's philosophy in the commentary of Râzî, *Hall al- Mushkilat al-Isharat wa-l-Tanbihat* is one of the biggest and most famous commentaries in this tradition. These two commentaries formed the basis and framework of the "*Isharat commentary tradition*" that would be formed later in Anatolia. Until now, it has been determined that about twenty commentaries and hashiya had been written on Avicenna's *al-Isharat*. Among them; *Kashf al-Tamvihat fî Sharh al-Isharat wa-l-Tanbihat* by Sayf al-Din Amidi (d. 631/1233), *Sharh al-Isharat* of Siraj al-Din Urmavi (d. 653/1255), Najm al-Din Ahmad b. Tecrî Makr al-Havashi wa-l-Ta'liqat al-Kitab al-Isharat of Muhammad al-Nakhjuvani (before 650/1253), Abhari (d. 1265)¹⁴ *Sharh al-Usul wa-l-Jumal* of al-Isharat wa-l-Tanbihat and Ibn Kammuna (d. 683/1284)¹. In this tradition of annotation, the last piece of Mutahhar el-Hillî (d. 726/1325) named *al- Muhakamat bayn al-Shurrah al-Isharat* can be mentioned among important scholars on this subject².

On the other hand, there have also been studies that oppose this intense interest in Avicenna's works and criticize his views. In this sense, one of the earliest criticisms of Avicennain Anatolia during the Seljuk period undoubtedly belongs to 'Abd al-Latif Baghdadi (d. 1231). The philosopher-physician 'Abd al-Latif Baghdadi, who wrote nearly 160 works in different fields in addition to medicine

1 M. Sami Baga, for an evaluation on the Isharat tradition, see. (Coar, 2013 p. 47-66).

2 For detailed information about Avicenna's commentary on *al-Isharat* and manuscripts in libraries, see. Katip Çelebi, 1941, I, 94-95; Brockelman, 1942, I, 597, 1956, I, 816; Anawati, 1950, 4-12.

and philosophy, lived in Erzincan, Erzurum, Kemah, Malatya and Besni under the auspices of the Mengücek Principality for a period of his life (Toorawa, 2004, p. 91-109.). Baghdadi harshly criticizes Avicenna's philosophy and his work *al-Qanun fi al-Tibb* in his book *Kitab al-Nasihatayn*³. Baghdadi, a pure Aristotelian and follower of the Farabi tradition analyses the philosophy of Avicenna's period and warns people about his works. At the beginning of his criticism, Baghdadi says that in a society "it is better not to have any philosophical thought than to spread a distorted philosophical thought" and criticizes Avicenna for it. According to him, the philosophical tradition of Avicenna was distorted by new themes that did not exist in the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle. 'Abd al-Latif Baghdadi criticizes Avicenna and his followers for distorting parts of Plato and Aristotle philosophy. In addition, after reading the works of Avicenna for many years, he finds the works of Iranian scholars on Avicenna insufficient. Despite the obvious truths of Aristotle's philosophy, people's orientation towards the works of Avicenna and the spread of his works everywhere led him to write a rejection of Avicenna's philosophy. Because the works of Avicenna do not contain any wisdom, and he did not use the "burhan" method correctly and completely like Farabi and Aristotle, considering the logic science as analogy (Taş, 2011; Id, 2016/1, pp. 74-95). On this issue, Baghdadi said the following: (Bursa İnebey Lib., Hüseyin Çelebi, no. 823, fol. 94^b 11-16) "*When it comes to the word "logic is a legal tool", it should have been said that logic itself is a tool, an art and a science. Because logic is science in terms of understanding the classes of beings, it is a tool in terms of its use, and art in terms of acting with itself. It is an art in terms of being a tool, not a science and a tool in terms of being an art ...*"

Baghdadi's criticism is not limited to philosophy and mathematics but also criticizes Avicenna's medical works. He makes the following determination by comparing Avicenna's definition of pulse in *al-Qanun fi al-Tibb* and Hunayn's definition of pulse in *Masa'il* (Bursa İnebey Lib., Hüseyin Çelebi, no. 823, fol. 94^a 4-6). Finally, Baghdadi states that there are reports from the followers of Avicenna that he drank alcohol, wrote books drunk, and committed sins. He says that they see these sins as a means of obtaining taste, a result of specialization and wisdom. However, according to Baghdadi, a person who has wisdom must have a virtuous creed. Wisdom should guide people towards righteous deeds. The wisdom of Avicenna and his followers is a bad wisdom that requires being caught up in taste and despising sharia and righteous deeds (Bursa İnebey Lib., Hüseyin Çelebi, no.

3 The work is available in Bursa İnebey Manuscript Library Hüseyin Çelebi Baghdâdî section at 823 number.

823, fol. 96^a 16-96^b 1). In my opinion, Baghdadi makes unfounded accusations about Avicennain his last accusation, acting with some sensations. The evidence that he used alcohol is very weak and inadequate (Taş, pp. 91-93).

When we follow the chronological development, one of the earliest names who developed Avicennain Anatolia is undoubtedly Sayf al-Din Amidi (d. 1233). Its presence in Anatolia is not known for sure. However, he influenced many students from Anatolia with the lectures he gave while he was in Damascus and Hama (Yüksel, Vol. III, 1991, pp. 57-58). The author, better known for his theologian identity, is essentially an ideal representative of the “Philosophical Kalam” period with his works. He criticizes both the Avicennian line and Fakhr al-Din Razi with his unique theological approach in his work on the philosophy of Avicennanamed “*Kashf al-Tamvihat fi Sharh al-Tanbihat*”⁴. In this respect, it appears as a different voice among Seljuk thinkers. At the beginning of his work, he clearly states that he wrote this book to answer the criticisms made to Avicenna's views. Therefore, the work is an answer to Fahreddin Razi's criticisms rather than annotation. Therefore his work has the feature of “AvicennaDefence” written against the criticisms of Razi (Endress, 2006, pp. 408-410). As a matter of fact, the name of his work clearly shows the purpose of its writing: *Kashf al-Tamvihat fi Sharh al-Isharat wa-l-Tanbihat* on *al-Isharat wa-l-Tanbihat*. Since Amidi's ideas and views were written in his maturity period, this work reflected all his philosophical accumulation and was able to reveal his own opinion on controversial issues with great skill. He says that the mistakes he saw in Râzi's *Sharh al-Isharat* led him to answer. He states that his original intention to write this book, he wants Avicennaand philosophical sciences to be understood correctly and wrong ideas to be eliminated (Coşar, pp. 54-55). Amidi's knowledge in philosophy enables him to easily understand and explain some of the closed expressions of Avicenna. However, this commentary of his is not as systematic as the Commentary of *el-Ishârât* by Tusî, who also defends Avicenna. Despite this, it is important in terms of being a ring of the “*Isharat Sharh tradition*.” Since his philosophical works did not receive the necessary attention, they were rarely copied, so some of his books were lost or not reached today (Özvarlı, 2009, pp. 323-330).

One of the most successful representatives of Fârâbî and Avicenna's philosophical traditions in Anatolia was Asir al-Din Abhari (d. 1265) (Ebherî, 1998, p. 31.). Ebherî spent most of his life in Anatolia. In his philosophical works, Ebheri

4 On the manuscripts of the work, see. Süleymaniye Lib. Laleli no. 2519, 340 fol.; Carullah Efendi no. 1313 243 fol.; Berlin no. 5048 135 fol.

took the traditional trinity classification of Avicenna's works named *al-Isharat wa-l-Tanbihat* and *al-Najat* and classified his work as logic, physics and metaphysics. He took as an example the traditional triad classification of logic, physics and metaphysics in Avicenna's works named *al-Isharat wa-l-Tanbihat* and *al-Najat*. Especially his work named *Hidayat al-Hikma* is a summary of his encyclopaedic Works that deal with the philosophy of Avicenna. In addition, Ebheri in his book named "*Hidayat al-Hikma*", made a summary of Avicenna's book named Healing, which is an encyclopaedia of philosophy (Alper, 2014, p. 24). This work, besides being taught as a textbook in Ottoman madrasas for centuries, has many commentaries written on it (Kılıç, 2014, pp. 425-440; Bingöl, Vol. X, 75-76). Ebheri also wrote other works such as *Kashf al-Haqa'iq fi Tahrir al-Daqa'iq* (Ayasofya, no. 2453.) and *Zubdat al-Asrar* (Millet Lib., Feyzullah Efendi, no. 1210), in which the philosophy of Avicennawas examined in detail. Ebheri, as a philosopher who walked along the line of Avicenna, also wrote a commentary on Euclides's work named *Usul al-Handasa wa-l-Hisab* called "*Kitab Islah al-Ustukussat fi al- Handasa li Iqlidis*" (Bingöl, Vol. X, 1994, pp. 75-76).

Another prominent figure that draws attention in studies on Avicennain Seljuk Anatolia is Siraj al-Din Urmavi⁵. Siraj al-Din Urmavi, who came to Malatya in Anatolia for the first time during the time of 'Ala' al-Din Kayqubad, and then later went back and stayed in Egypt in the last period of the Ayyubids. After the destruction of the Ayyubids and the death of his teacher Huneci, he came back to Anatolia and stayed in Konya, the capital of the Seljuks⁶. In the introduction of *al-*

5 We have enough information about Urmevi's arrival in Anatolia and his life there. Siraceddin Urmevi, who came to Anatolia for the first time during the time of Ala ad-Din Kayqubad, then returned to Malatya, remained in Egypt in the last period of the Ayyubils, and after the collapse of the Ayyubils and the death of his teacher Huneci, he came to Anatolia, the capital of the Seljuks, Konya at the end of the year 655 [/ 1257] Urmevi say in the introduction of his work named Letâif. He says that Keykavus II (d. 677/1278-79) has arrived (be-hazret-i... resîdem). His work named Letaif also presented to Izzettin Keykavus II of Seljuk Sultan and served as a judge for a while. It is understood from here that he was in Konya in 1257. In 1258, the year when Hülagü invaded Baghdad, he was sent to him as an ambassador. On the other hand, we see Urmevi in Konya during the "Cimri incident" in 1277. Mevlevi sources report that he was in close relationship with Mevlânâ Celaledin-i Rûmî (604 – 672 / 1207 – 1273) and other Sufis during his stay in Konya for about twenty years. See. bn Bîbî, 1996, p. 212; *Menakıb-ı Evhadüddîn Hâmid b. Ebî'l-Fahr-i Kirmânî*, 1347/1969, p. 91-92). Eflâkî, 1953, Vol. I, 3/37, 3/83, 3/185, 3/251, 3/268, 3/286, 3/301, 3/480, 3/547; Çağrıç, 2009, p. 262.

6 Sirâceddîn al-Urmevî's real name is Mahmud, his father's name is Abu Bakr and his grandfather's name is Ahmed. His tag is Ebü's-Senâ and his nickname is Sirâcüddîn, which means the lantern and lamp of the religion. He was born in 1198/594 in the city of Urmia (Urmiye, today Iran's Rizaiye) in Azerbaijan. He died in 1283/682 in Konya. For detailed information about the life of Urmevi See. Sübkî, 1413/1993), Vol. 8, p. 371; İbn Şühbe, 1407/1986), Vol. 2, p. 202; Çağrıç, 2009, 37 p. 262.

Lata'if al-Hikma, Urmevî writes; “At the end of the year 655 [/ 1257] (d. 677/1278-79) came to Konya the capital city of Seljuk and presented his work titled *Letaif* to Izzettin Keykavus II (be-hazret-i... resîdem) and was a judge for a while” (Füruzanfer, 1347/1969), pp. 91-92). It is understood from here that he was in Konya after 1257. In the year 1258, when Hülagü invaded Baghdad, we learned that the Seljuk Sultan sent him to Hülagü as an ambassador. On the other hand, we see Urmavi in the Jimri incident, in Konya in 1277 (Çağrıçı, p. 262). The period when Urmevî was the head judge of Seljuks, coincides with the term when Anatolia was invaded by the Mongols. He maintained the title of chief judge until his death (İbn-i Bibi, 1996, 2/212). Mevlevi sources report that he was in close relationship with Mavlana Jalal al-Din Rumi (604 – 672/ 1207 – 1273) and other Sufis during his stay in Konya for about twenty years. On this occasion, some information about his life was reflected in the Mevlevi sources (Eflâkî, Vol. I, 3/37, 3/83, 3/185, 3/251, 3/268, 3/286, 3/301, 3/480, 3/547.). Aksarayî, one of the local sources of Seljuk, saying “*The scholar of science, the sea of virtues, the sun of the sky of Sharia, the center of the ocean of truth and sect; surpassing World scholars in intellectual and transmitting sciences*” (Aksarayî, pp. 69, 93-94). According to Nighdeli Qadi Ahmad, Siraj al-Din Urmavi is “*the sultan of the impudent, the judge of the judges, the Shafii of the later ones and the ruler of Konya ...*” (Niğdeli Kadı Ahmed, Vol. I, p. 335.)

Siraceddin Urmevî wrote a commentary on Avicenna's book named (Katip Çelebi, Vol. I, 95; H. Zirikî, VIII, 42.) *Sharhal-Isharat wa-l-Tanbihat*. In addition, his book written in Persian named “*Lata'if al-Hikma*” (Ed. Gulâm Hüseyin Yûsufî, Tahran 1340), which is accepted as his main work, is based on the philosophy of Avicennaby filtering Ghazali and Fahreddin Razi (Kaya, “Bir Filozof Olarak Sirâceddîn el-Urmevî (v. 1283/682): 17/33, 2012, 1-45). Although the work consists of two main parts as “*Hikmat-i 'ilmi / teorical*” and “*Hikmat-i 'amali / practical*”, it consists of a kind of “mixture” of theology and philosophy. In this respect, it represents the “*Philosophical- Kalam*” period (1-45.).

The Avicennian thought was formulated in Qazvini's works titled *al-Shamsiyya fî al-Mantiq* and Urmevî's *Matali' al-Anvar fî al-Hikma wa-l-Mantiq*. These two works of logic were “retailed” by “*Shaykh al-Mantiqiyyin*” by Qutb al-Din Razî, a student of Qutb al-Din Shirazi, who taught in the cities such as Kayseri, Konya, Sivas and Malatya during the Ilkhanid period. After the 13th century, during the period of Principalities (beylikler) and the Ottoman period, Avicenna's philosophy

and logic were developed in detail with the works written by many philosophers-logicians (Fazlıoğlu, 2006, Vol. I, pp. 413-427). Efdalüddin Huneci is a scholar in the fields of rational sciences, especially medicine and logic, as well as the real sciences recorded as a relative (karib) or teacher of Urmevî. Hûnecî was sent to the Seljuk Sultan Ghiyath ad-Din Kaykhusraw II (slt. 634-644/1237-1246) by the Ayyubid Sultan Melik Kamil in 634/1237. However, Hûneci, who received the news of the death of Melik Kamil on the way back, returned to Anatolia and remained in Anatolia until the Kösedağ War (641/1243), when the Seljuks were defeated by the Mongols, and was appointed as a judge by Kaykhusraw II. The famous medical history writer İbn Ebi Usaybia says that he read the part “Kulliyat” of al-Qânûn by Avicenna from Huneci. İbn Usaybia gives us the name of a treatise of Huneci named *Sharu mâkâletü'r-Re'îs İbn Sînâ fî'n-nabz* (Usaybia, pp. 586-587). However, we know that he gave lectures in madrasahs besides the judge (Çağrıçı, Vol. XVIII, 1998, p. 375). Another noteworthy name who made scientific studies on Avicennais Shams al-Din Samarqandi (d. 702/1303), about whose life we have little information. As can be understood from his shore, it is known that he was born in Samarkand, later came to Anatolia and stayed in the capital city of Mardin during the Artukid period⁷. Although it is not known exactly why he came to Anatolia, it is thought that he may have escaped from the Mongol invasion or internal disturbances in the region where he lived. Considering the names of his works in different fields, it is understood that he was a competent scholar in both Islamic sciences, philosophy and natural sciences⁸. Philosophy occupies an important place among Samarqandi's works. He wrote a wide commentary on Avicenna's work named “*al-Isharat wa-l- Tanbihat*” with the name “*Basharat al-Isharat*”. Al-Isharat is considered an essence and summary of Avicenna's last great work and philosophy. Samarqandi presented this work to Artuqid Emir Fakhr al-Din Karaaslan (1260-1292)⁹. In this work, Semerkandî applied to the authorities such as Fârâbî (d.

7 There is not enough information about the life and works of Samarqandî in his that works see. Yörük, 1991, p. 8-14.

8 That is why he is referred as “Muhakkik”, “Hakim”, “Allame” in the sources. His works include Eşkâlüt Tesîs in the field of geometry, Adâbül-Bahs, Kistâsü'l-efkâr fî tahkiki'l-esrâr (and Şerhu'l-Kistâs), el-Mu'tekadât, el-Envârü'lilâhiyye and his work titled Risâle fî âdâbi'l-bahs was taught in madrasahs for a long time in the periods after him. In addition to these, he became famous with his work named as-Sahâ'if in the field of teologi(kalam).For the works done on Samarqandi's, see. Gökçe, 1996, p. 21-25; Sinanoğlu, 2006, p. 32.; Kutluer, 2009, Vol. 36, p. 476-477; Miller, 2019, p. 65-68; Pehlivan & Ceylan & Ensar, 2020, p. 115-207.

9 There are four manuscripts of this book in Türkiye's Manuscript Library. See. Ayasofya no. 2418, 269 fol., 19 line. There are seals of Bayezid II and Mahmud I on the book. Second copy Köprülü Fazıl Ahmet Paşa library, no. 879, 165 fol., 23-25 line. The text will be annotated in this copy is not completely quoted. The

339/950), Ibn Sînâ, Gazzâlî (d. 505/1111), Râzî (d. 606/1210), and did not hesitate to take a critical attitude against the approaches of the scholars mentioned. He analyzed and explained their ideas in the light of evidence. Based on the ideas he put forward, Samarkandî's comments mostly show that Imam Mâtûrîdî (d. 333/944) had a world of ideas parallel to the Sunni theology and other Mavarannahr scholars. In this respect, we can say that this commentary is a Maturid interpretation of Avicenna (Semerkandî 2020, p. 20). Samarkandî, in the introduction of the commentary, complains that some of the al-Isharat annotations made before him unnecessarily prolong the subject and some keep it short.

From this point of view, he wrote his annotation by stating that a commentary was needed, "encompassing all details, but excluding irrelevant elements". It is the most important commentary written not only on certain parts of Basharat al-Isharat Avicenna's work named al-İşarât ve't-Tenbîhât, but on the whole¹⁰. In this commentary, Samarkandî prioritized the text of Avicenna rather than putting his own ideas to the foreground and wrote with an anxiety that prioritized understanding of his views. Samarkandî has annotated all parts of the work by staying with to the plan of the work. In accordance with the plan of Avicenna, the commentary continues with the sections of Tabî'iyya and İlahiyyat, which are intertwined with the Logic section. Although the commentary of Samarkandî was overshadowed by great commentaries such as Razi and Tusi, it also found a certain place in the tradition of Isharat during the Ottoman period, and studies were carried out on it (Coşar, 2013 (43), p. 59-61). Samarkandî's Avicennastudies were not limited to al-Isharat commentary. His work titled 'İlm al-Afaq wa-l-Anfus, like Avicenna's al-Shifa, was written on logic, natural philosophy, geography, meteorology, mineralogy, psychology, botany, biology, mathematics, geometry, arithmetic, music, astronomy and it includes theology topics. Although this similarity is in terms of content and style, Semerkandî never moved away from the theological line. Just as Avicenna followed Aristotle in logic and divinity, Euclides in geometry (330-275 BC), Ptolemy (AD 85 and 165) in geography, Samarkandî followed the same scholars in geometry and geography. Although he came to

third copy is Süleymaniye library. Carullah 1308, nesih 153 fol., 25 line. Last manuscript in Süleymaniye Library, Fatih no. 3195, 81 fol., 25 line.

10 Recently, many academic studies have been conducted on the different parts of this comprehensive commentary written by Samarkandî in Türkiye. See on these studies. Baga, 2008; Korkmaz, 2009; Yılmaz, 2010; Arsan, 2015.

different results, he made maximum use of Aristotle's ideas. He made quotations from Euclides' Elements, and also used the commentary on Ptolemy's work in the relevant chapters in his work. In addition, the spiritual and bodily structure of mankind, who is considered to be the highest of creatures and the perfect one, is explained in a rather Neo-Platonic style in the fourth altar. The general explanation of what the soul is, the features of the body and the soul-body dualism have been made. We also see a brief summary of the understanding of course, which is necessary for the evolution of the soul, in our author who opened the door to Sufism. This part is almost like the summary of the section called "The Authority of the Arifs" in Avicenna's work named *al-Isharat wa-l-Tanbihat* (Semerkandî, 2020, p. 31, 36).

Sadr al-Din Konavi (d.1274), the most important representative of Sufism philosophy, developed by Ibn Arabi, the most prominent thinker of the Anatolian Seljuk world in the second half of the 13th century, considered the results achieved by the apparent philosophy, which limits it to what can be achieved with reason, as well as what discovery has achieved. He seeks to reconcile the results of wise philosophy (*tawfiq*) and a reconciliation. He clearly expressed this intention in his second letter to Nasir al-Din Tusi (d. 1273) (Konevî, 2007, pp. 71-77.). In the correspondence (*Murasalat*) between Sadr al-Din Konavi and Nasir al-Din Tusi, Konevi was very in-depth and superior in the most discussed topics of Avicennian philosophy such as the relationship between God and the universe, the first being and the arrival of the first being in the body, God's knowledge of the universal and the particular. We see that he has a level of fundamental argument. The content of the philosophical debate reflected in the letters also shows how much Konevi dominated Avicenna's philosophy. In addition, these discussion topics, style and point of view, held in the second half of the 13th century, draw attention in terms of revealing the height of scientific and philosophical joy in Anatolia and the influence of the philosophy of Avicennain the world of thought (Kaya, 2012, pp. 27-38; Demirkol, Vol. 2, 2010, pp. 83-102; Demirli, 2005). It is meaningful that Konawî used Avicenna's (d. 1037) *al-Ta'liqat* to realize this association and advised Tusi to read it. It is also noteworthy as it shows the place of Avicenna's encompassing discourse in the reconciliation process¹¹.

11 *el-Murasalat*, 2002, p. 72-77; *Miftahu'l-Gayb*: 2002. About the content of the discussion here: see.. Kaya, 2012, Vol. 37, pp. 27-38.

As a result, the works of Avicenna's followers in the Seljuk period were shaped especially in the axis of his work named *al-Isharat wa-l-Tanbihat*, which is a summary of the philosophy encyclopaedia called *al-Shifa* (the Healing) and the last great work of the philosophy of Avicenna. Avicenna's philosophy mostly influenced madrasahs and philosophical discussions with the following commentaries on *al-Isharat*. A tradition that can be defined as the tradition of sign annotation was formed and continued in the following centuries. Since the commentaries are mostly the product of the philosophical theological period, they have been shaped around the basic discussion topics of philosophy and *kalam*. A lively intellectual and philosophical atmosphere was experienced where different views were defended and opposing views were criticized. In these commentaries and discussions, Avicennian tradition in Anatolia passed through the filter of Ghazzali and the criticisms of Fakhr al-Din Razi, and Najm al-Din Katib al-Qazvini (d. 1276) and Qadi Siraj al-Din Urmavi's (d. 1283) "*Matali' al-Anvar fi al-Hikma*" and *al-Mantiq*. Qutb al-Din Razi (d. 1365), wrote a commentary on both works. A tradition started with Asir al-Din Abhari (d. 1265)-Shams al-Din Samarqandi (d. 1302) – Najm al-Din Qazvini – Siraj al-Din Urmavi – Qutb al-Din Razi. Later, this tradition was developed in the Ottoman period with the works written by many philosopher-logicians, including Sayyid Sharif Jurjani – Mulla Fanari, Sain al-Din Türki – Muhammad Amin Shirvani – Mehmed Darendevis – Isma'il Gelenbevis – Abd al-Nafi Afandi. This tradition, which continued during the Seljuk and later Ottoman periods, left a rich legacy of Avicennian literature. Today, the richest manuscripts of Avicenna are in the manuscript libraries in Türkiye.

Kaynakça

A) Manuscripts

- Amidi, S. *Keşf el-temvihat fi şerh el-tenbihat*. Süleymaniye Library. Berlin, 5048; Süleymaniye Library. Carullah Efendi,1313; Süleymaniye Library. Laleli, 2519.
- Bağdadi, A. *Kitabul Celi ve Hisab*. Afyon Gedik Ahmed Paşa Library.17211.
- Bağdadi, A. *Kitabu'n-Nasihateyn*. Bursa İnebey Library. Hüseyin Çelebi, 823.
- Ebheri, E. *Keşf el-hekaik fi tahrir al-dekaik*. Ayasofya Library.2453.
- Ebheri, E. *Zubdet al-esrar*. Ayasofya Library. 2418.
- İbn Kemal, İlyas b. Ahmed. *Keşfu'l-Akabe*. Fatih Süleymaniye Library.5426.
- Nahcuvani, E. *Şerhu'l-İşarat ve't Tenbihat*. Köprülü Library. 875; Nûruosmâniye Library.2689.
- Sadruşşerî'a. *Şerhu Ta'dili'l-'Ulüm*. Süleymaniye Library.Antalya Tekelioğlu,798.
- Semerkandî, Ş. *Besaretu'l-Isharat*. Köprülü Fazıl Ahmet Paşa Library.879; Süleymaniye Library.Carullah, 1308; Süleymaniye Library. Fatih,3195.

B) Main Sources and Research

- Alper, Ö. M. (2014). VII/XIII. yüzyılda İbn Sînâcı gelenek: tenkit ve terkip arasında. *Uluslararası 13. Yüzyılda Felsefe Sempozyumu Bildirileri içinde*, Ankara: YBÜ Publications.
- Anawati, G. C. (1950). *Müellefâtü İbn Sînâ*. Kahire: Dârü'l-Maârif.
- Arslan, H. (2006). *İbni Sînâ ve Mevlânâ'nın Aşk Felsefelerinin Karşılaştırılması* (Unpublished Master Thesis). Fırat Üniversitesi, Elazığ.
- Baga, M. S. (2008). *Şemsüddin Semerkandî ve Beşârâtü'l-İşârât Adlı Eserinin Tabîyyât Bölümü: Tahkik, Tercüme ve Değerlendirme* (Unpublished Master Thesis). Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya.
- Bayat, A. H. (1988). Mevlânâ'nın dostlarından Tabib Ekmeleddîn Müeyyed el-Nahcuvanî. *Selçuk Üniversitesi III. Milli Mevlânâ Kongresi Tebliğler Kitabı içinde* (231-247). Konya.
- Bayram, M. (2001).Türkiye Selçukluları döneminde bilimsel ortam ve Ahiliğin doğuşuna etkisi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1-11.
- Bedevî, A. (2002) *Batı düşüncesinin oluşumunda İslam'ın rolü* (Tan, M. Trans.). İstanbul: İz Publications.
- Bekiryazıcı, E. (2014). İbn Sînâ Düşüncesi İshrâkîliğe zemin hazırlamış mıdır? *Diyanet İlmî Dergi*, 50, 123-138.
- Beyâzî, K. A. (1994). *İşârâtü'l-Merâm min İbârâtü'l-İmâm*. İstanbul.
- Bingöl, A. (1994). Ebherî, Essirüddin. *İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 10, p. 75-76). İstanbul:

- Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Publications.
- Brockelman, C. (1942). *GAL*. Leiden: Brill Press.
- Çağrı, M. (1998). *Hüncü. İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 18, p. 375). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Publications.
- Çağrı, M. (2009). *Sirâceddin el-Urmevî. İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 37, p. 262). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Publications..
- Çoşar, H. (2013). İslam düşüncesinde günümüzde az bilinen bir gelenek İşâret (şerhleri) geleneği. *Dini Araştırmalar*, 16, 47-66.
- Demirkol, M. (2010). İbn Sînâ'nın varlık felsefesi üzerinde Nasîreddin Tûsî ile Sadreddin Konevî arasında geçen tartışmalar. *Şarkiyat İslami Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2, 83-102.
- Demirli, E. (2005). *Sadreddin Konevî'de bilgi ve varlık*. İstanbul: İz Publications.
- Ebherî. (1998). *İsagucî mantığa giriş metin-çeviri-inceleme* (Sarioğlu, H. Çev.). İstanbul.
- Endress, G. (2006). Reading Avicenna in the madrasa: Intellectual genealogies and chains of transmission of philosophy and the sciences in the Islamic East. James E. Montgomery (Ed.), *Arabic Theologi, Arabic Philosophy: From the Meny to One: Essays in Celebration of Richard M. Frank* (pp. 420-427) Leuven.
- Eflâkî, A. (1973). *Âriflerin menkıbeleri* (Vol. I-II) (Yazıcı, T. Trans.). İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı Publications.
- Gökçe, M. C. (1996). *Muhammed b. Eşref es-Semerkindî ve Kelâm İlmindeki Yeri* (Unpublished Master Thesis). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- İbn Ebi Usaybia, Ebu'l Abbas Ahmed. (1965). *'Uyunu'l-Enba Fi Tabakat-ı Etibba* (Riza, N. Thk.). Beyrût: Menşûrâtü Dâri Mektebeti'l Hayât.
- İbn Şühbe. (1986). *Tabakâtü'sşâfiyye* (Hân, H. A. Thk.). Beyrût: Âlemü'l-kütüb.
- İbni Bîbî. (1956). *el-Evâmirü'l-Alâ'iyye fi'l-Umûri'l-Alâ'iyye* (Erzi, A. S. Neşr.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Publications.
- İbni Bîbî. (1996). *el-Evâmirü'l-alâ'iyye fi'l-umûri'l-alâ'iyye (Selçuk-Name)* (C. 1-2) (Öztürk, M. Trans.). Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Publications.
- İbnü'l-Esir, Ali b. Muahmmed. (1966). *el-Kâmil fi't-tarih* (C. 1-12). Beyrut.
- İbn Sînâ. (2005). *İşaretler ve tembihler* (Durusoy, A. vd. Trans). İstanbul: Litera Publications.
- İbn Sînâ. (1383). *el-İşarat ve el-Tenbihat*. Kum.
- İzgi, C. (1998). Hubeyş et-Tiflisî. *İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 18, p. 268-270). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Publications.
- İzgi, C. (1994). Ekmelüddîn en-Nahcuvânî. *İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 10, p. 548-549).

- İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Publications.
- Mevlânâ Celâleddin. (1963). *Mektuplar* (Gölpınarlı, A.Trans.). İstanbul.
- Katip Çelebi. (1941), *Keşfu'z-Zunûn* (C. 1-2). Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Publications.
- Kaya, M. (1988). “Abdüllatîf el-Bağdadî. *İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 1, p. 254-255). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Publications.
- Kaya, M. C. (2012). Bir filozof olarak Sirâceddîn el-Urmevî (v. 1283/682): Letâifu'l-hikme bağlamında bir tahlil denemesi. *Divan Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi*. 17/33, 1-45.
- Kaya, M. C. (2012). Sadreddin Konevî'nin metafizik eleştirisi: İbn Sînâ'da zorunlu varlık'ın cüzîleri bilmesi sorunu. *Felsefe Arkivi*, 37, 27-38.
- Keleş, M. R. (2008). *Kutbüddin Şirazî (1236-1311)'nin Hayatı Eserleri ve Ortaçağ İslam Kültüründeki Yeri* (Unpublished Master Thesis). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Keleş, M. R. (2014). Kutbüddin eş-Şirâzî'nin Anadolu'daki faaliyetleri ve Sadreddin Konevî ile ilişkisi. *Tarih Okulu Dergisi (TOD)*, XIX, 329-345.
- Kılıç C. (2013). İbn Sînâcî Bir Filozof: Esirüddin el-Ebherî ve Osmanlı düşüncesine etkileri. *Uluslararası 13. Yüzyılda Felsefe Sempozyumu Bildirileri içinde* (pp. 425-440). Ankara: YBÜ Publications.
- Kılıç C. & H. Arslan. (2014). İslam Düşüncesinde aşk metafiziği (İbn Sînâ ve Mevlâna'da aşk felsefeleri. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 2, 321-351.
- Kirmani, E. (1347/1969). *Menakıb-ı Evhadüddîn Hâmid b. Ebi'l-Fahr-i Kirmânî* (Füruzanfer, B. Ed.). Tahran: Bünyâd-ı Terceme ve Neşr-i Kitâb.
- Korkmaz, Z. (2009). Şemsüddin Muhammed b. Eşref el-Hüseynî es-Semerkindî'nin Beşârâtü'l-İşârât Adlı Eserinin Tabiat Bölümü Sekizinci ve Dokuzuncu Bölümlerinin Edisyonu ve İncelenmesi (Unpublished Master Thesis). Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya.
- Köker, A. H. (1992). Selçuklu Gevher Nesibe Sultan Tıp Fakültesi: 1206. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Gevher Nesibe Tıp Tarihi*, Kayseri.
- Kutluer, İ. (2011). *Yitirilmiş Hikmeti Ararken*. İstanbul: İz Publications,
- Kutluer, İ. (2009). “Muhammed b. Eşref es-Semerkindî. *İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 36, p. 476-477). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Publications.
- Miller, L. B. (2019). Shams al-Dîn al-Samarqandî (d. 1322). Khaled al-Rouayheb (Ed.), *The Development of Arabic Logic (1200-1800)* (pp. 65-68). Basel: Schwabe Verlag.
- Özvarlı, S. (2009). Amidi'nin iki yazma eseri ışığında felsefe ve kelam ilişkisi. A. Erkol & Abdurrahman Adak & İbrahim Bor (Ed.), *Uluslararası Amidi Sempozyumu*

- Bildirileri içinde* (pp. 323-330), İstanbul.
- Pehlivan, N. C. & Ensar, H. (2020). Şemseddin Muhammed b. Eşref es-Semer kand el-Hüseynî et-Türkî'ye ait iki yeni eser: Şerhu Menşe'i'n-Nazar ve Şerhu'n-Nikât. *Nazariyat*, 6/1, 115-207.
- Rapoport, M. A. (2019). Kutbüddin er-Râzî et-Tahtânî Sünnî miydi Şîî miydi? biyobibliyografik kaynaklar üzerine bir araştırma. *Nazariyat*, 5/2, 113-137.
- Konevî, S. (2002). *Miftahu'l-Gayb: Tasavvuf Metafiziği* (Demirli, E. Trans.). İstanbul.
- Konevî, S. (2007). *Yazışmalar (el-Mürâselât)* (Demirli, E. Trans.). İstanbul: İz Publications.
- Sarioğlu, H. (2007). Razi Kutbüddin, *İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 34, p. 485-487). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Publications.
- Sinanoğlu, M. (2006). "Burhaneddin en-Nesefî. *İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 32, p. 566-567). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Publications.
- Semer kandî, Ş. (2020). *Âlem ve İnsan, İlmü'l-Âfâk ve'l-Enfûs* (Okşar, Y. & Yörük, İ. Trans.). İstanbul.
- Sübkî. (1413/1993). *Tabakâtü's-şâfiyyeti'l-kübrâ* (Tanâhî, M. M. & el-Hulv, A. M. Thk.). Kahire: Hicr li't-tibâati ve'n-neşri ve't-tevzî.
- Sühreverdî, Ş. (1993). *Kitabü't-Telviâtü'l-Levhiyye ve'l-Arşîyye* (Vol. 1) Corbin, H. Thk.). Mecmû'a-i Musannefâtü Şeyhi'l-İşrâk içinde, Tahran.
- Sühreverdî, Ş. (1380). *Kitâbu't-Telviâtü'l-Levhiyye ve'l-Arşîyye* (Vol. 1) N. Kali Habibi (Ed.). *Mecmua-i Musannefat-i Şeyh İşrak Şihabuddin Yahya Sühreverdî* içinde, Tahran.
- Sühreverdî, Ş. (1993). *Kitabu'l-Meşari ve'l- Mutarahat* (Vol. 1). (Corbin, H. Thk.). *Mecmû'a-i Musannefâtü Şeyhi'l-İşrâk* içinde, Tahran.
- Sühreverdî, Ş. (1993). *Kıssatu Gurbeti'l-Garbiyye* (Vol. 2), H. Corbin (Ed.). *Mecmuatu Musannefati Şeyhi'l-İşrâk* içinde, Tahran.
- Şeşen, R. (1982). *Nevâdirü'l-mahtûtâtü'l-'Arabiyye fî Mektebâti Türkiyâ* (C. 3). Beyrut.
- Şerbetçi, A. (2002). Kutbüddin Şîrâzî. *İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (Vol. 26, p. 488-489). İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Publications.
- Şeyhzâde, Abdurrahîm b. Ali. (1317). *Nazmü'l-Ferâ'id ve Cemü'l-Fevâ'id*. Mısır.
- Taher, A. (2015). *es-Semer kandî'nin Beşaratü'l-İşarat Adlı Eserinin İlahiyat Bölümünün Tahkik ve Tahlili* (Unpublished Master Thesis) Erciyes Üniversitesi, Kayseri.
- Taş, E. (2011). *Abdüllatif el-Bağdâdî'nin Kitâbü'n-nasihatayn Adlı Eseri: Tahkikli Neşir ve Muhteva Analizi* (Unpublished Master Thesis) Uludağ Üniversitesi, Bursa.
- Taş, E. (2016). *Kitâbü'n-nasihatayn bağlamında Abdüllatif el-Bağdâdî'nin İbn Sînâ*

- Eleştirisi. *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25/1, 73-96.
- et-Teftazânî, Sa'düddin Mesud b. Ömer. (1277). *Şerhü'l-Mekâsîd* (Vol. 1), İstanbul.
- Toorawa, S. (2004). A Portrait of Abd al-Latif al-Baghdadi's education and instruction. Joseph E. Lowry&Devin J. Stewart & Shawkat M. Toorawa (Ed.), *law and education in Medieval Islam* (pp. 91-109). Gibb Memorial Trust, Oxford.
- Turan, O. (1971). *Selçuklular Zamanında Türkiye*. İstanbul: Turan Neşriyat Yurdu Publications.
- Uzluk, Ş. (1987). Mevlânâ'nın tabibleri, Ekmeleddîn Müeyyet-Beyhekim ve Gazanfer. *Selçuk Üniversitesi I. Milletlerarası Mevlânâ Kongresi Tebliğler Kitabı* içinde (pp. 211-219), Konya: Selçuk Üniversitesi Publications.
- Ünver, S. (1940). *Selçuk Tabâbeti*. Ankara.
- Walbridge, J. (1992). *The science of mystic lights Qutb al-dîn and the illuminationist tradition in Islamic philosophy*. Cambridge.
- Wisnovsky, R. (2014). towards a genealogy of Avicennism. *Oriens* 42/3-4, 358.
- Yemenli, İ. (2001). Bir İbn Sînâ şârihi, Ekmeleddîn en-Nahcuvânî ve varlık anlayışı. *Divan: Disiplinlerarası Çalışmalar Dergisi*, 10, 99-143.