Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī and his *ʿIqd al-Laʾālī*: The Reception of Ibn Sīnā in Early Modern Ottoman Empire

Mykhaylo M. Yakubovych*

Muhammed el-Akkirmânî ve "ʿİkdü'l-Leâlî" Adlı Eseri: Erken Modern Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda İbn Sina Alımlaması

Öz ■ Muhammed el-Akkirmânî (ö. 1174/1760) modern dönem tarihçiliğinde çalışılmayan önemli düşünürlerden birisidir. Bu makalenin konusu, filozofun önemli eserleri arasında yer alan ve hâlâ yayımlanmayan *ʿİkdü'l-Leâlî fî beyân ʿilmihî teʿâlâ bi-gayri'l-mütenâhî* adlı eseridir. Bu çalışma, eldeki bu metni temel alarak ünlü filozof İbn Sina'nın (ö. 1037) etkisi veya alımlanmasını çeşitli felsefî kaynaklar çerçevesinde incelemeyi hedeflemektedir. Diğer yazma nüshaları dikkate almakla birlikte Kral Suud Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi'nde (Riyad) bulunan yazma nüshayı temel alan bu makalede, Akkirmânî'nin entelektüel biyografisi ve Osmanlı ilim dünyasına katkıları ele alınacaktır. Son olarak Akkirmânî için akılcılığının anlamı ve sınırları tartışılacak ve onun erken modern dönemde Osmanlı felsefesi geleneğine özgü gelişimine katkıları vurgulanacaktır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Osmanlı Medreseleri, Felsefe ve İlâhiyat, İlahi Bilgi, Zaman, Küllîler ve Cüz'îler.

The representation of the early modern period of Islamic philosophy is quite controversial in contemporary Near Eastern Studies. Some authors claim that the period was one of deepening crisis in the Muslim lands. These explorations relate what may be called "the crisis of intellect" to the economic decline of the Islamic world or the growth of negative processes in social stratification.[1] In general, this

---

crisis is juxtaposed against the entire Islamic world. But some researchers, such as A. Allawi[2] and R. Bulliet,[3] recognize the roots of this crisis as manifestations of some aspects of Islamic culture, mainly associated with politics and features of the ideals of Islamic monarchy. These approaches are strictly supported by the classical view of Islamic modernity as a "Dark Age," followed, among others, by notable British orientalist Montgomery Watt. In his late work *Islamic Philosophy and Theology*, Watt called the era beginning at the dawn of the 16th century as the onset of congestion in "philosophical theology," referring to the last outstanding personality of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Dawwānī (d. 1502).[4] Exceptions to this rule may be found in the thought of Mullā Ṣadrā (d. 1640), who is recognized as "one of the most prominent figures of post-Avicennian Islamic philosophy."[5] There are also various attempts to explain the imagined "decline" of Muslim civilization on the basis of primary Islamic theories like those of Ibn Khaldūn (d. 1406).[6] It must be repeated, however, that such claim for a "Dark Age" in Islamic philosophy center mostly on the conditions within autochthonous Arabic centers of learning (like Cairo), without significant reference to the heritage of Ottoman Empire or afore-mentioned developments in the intellectual culture of Persia.

Other position is represented in the study of Michael Cook.[7] Mentioning few of Muslim authors from 17th – 18th centuries, he pays attention to the spread of formal logic (*'ilm al-manṭīq*) in traditional religious schools of the whole Islamic World. Cook's analysis seriously challenges the legacy of the myth of an Islamic "Dark Age.".

Some notable observations concerning the state of philosophical learning in 16th century Islam are represented in study of Khaled el-Rouayheb.[8] He argues that myth of a "Dark Age" (or, more literally, an age of "blind obedience", *taqlīd*) is merely

---

2   Ali Alawwa, *The Crisis of Islamic Civilization* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2009).

3   Richard W. Bulliet, The Crisis within Islam, *The Wilson Quarterly* 26 (2002): 11-19.

4   Montgomery W. Watt, *Islamic Philosophy and Theology* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1987), 33.

5   Ibrahim Kalin, *Knowledge in Later Islamic Philosophy: Mulla Sadra on Existence, Intellect, and Intuition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), xiv.

6   Mohammad R. Salama, *Islam, Orientalism, and Intellectual History: Modernity and the Politics of Exclusion since Ibn Khaldun* (London and New York: I. B Tauris, 2011).

7   Michael Cook, On Islam and comparative intellectual history, *IIAS Newsletter*, 43 (2007): 7.

8   Khaled El-Rouayheb, Opening the Gate of Verification: The Forgotten Arab-Islamic Florescence of the 17th Century, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 38 (2006): 263-281.

a construction of the 19ᵗʰ and 20ᵗʰ centuries by Islamic reformist movements. Its leaders doubted the continuity of previous traditions in regard to what they considered their original impact, *ijtihād*. But in reality, the widely accepted term of *taḥqīq* practice ("verification") and titles of scholars as *muḥaqqiqūn* ("verifiers", i.e. reliable scientists) attests the ideals of the purely rational method in this period.

This method flourished in Ottoman Empire as well. *Kalām* (using Watt's term, it can be rightly called "philosophical theology") maintained its high position in the Ottoman religious schools in 15th and 16th centuries. Although some Ottoman scholars opposed the study of *kalām* because of its philosophical content, it continued to be one of the major disciplines of Ottoman scholarship up through the works of Beyazizade Ahmed (d. 1687), Abdulkadir Arif (d. 1713), Yanyalı Esad (d. 1730) and Gelenbevi Ismail (d. 1791).[9] The latter Gelenbevi, for instance, was active not only in religious sciences: he is credited with introducing logarithms to the Empire.[10]

As Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu clearly states, the rational sciences were made an integral part of the teaching program of religious schools (*medreses*), as shown in the pre-Ottoman Anatolian medreses and in the Ottoman medreses from the time of Mehmet II (1451–1481) onwards.[11] Their interest was mainly concerned with systematic treatises on *kalām*, written by authors like Aḍud al-Dīn al-Ījī (d. 1355), Sa'd al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī (d. 1390), Sayyid Sharīf al-Jurjānī (d. 1413), the aforementioned Jalāl al-Dīn al-Dawwānī (d. 1502), Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 1210) and some other scholars.[12] Ibn Sīnā's (d. 1037) authoritative commentator, Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭusī (d. 1274), was taught in circles of Ottoman scientists as well.[13] Works of al-Ṭūsī "have attracted the interest of Ottoman scholars since the earliest days."[14]

---

9   M. Sait Ozervarlı, Alternative Approaches to Modernization in the Late Ottoman Period: Izmirli Ismail Hakki's Religious Thought Against Materialist Scientism, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 39 (2007): 77–102.

10 Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu, "Institutionalisation of Science in the Medreses of pre-Ottoman and Ottoman Turkey", in *Turkish Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science*, ed. Gürol Irzik, Güven Güzeldere (New York: Springer, 2005), 288.

11 Ibid, 281.

12 See general outline of Ottoman *kalām* in: Yazıcıoglu, Mustafa Sait. Le Kalam et son role dans la societe turco-ottomane aux XVe et XVIe siecles (Ankara: Editions Ministere de la culture, 1990).

13 Şerafeddin Yaltkaya, Türk Kelâmcıları, *Dârülfünûn İlâhiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 32 (İstanbul 1932), s. 15.

14 Salim Ayduz, Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī's Influence on Ottoman Scientific Literature (Mathematics, Astronomy and Natural Sciences), *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, 1 (17) (2011): 120.

The most popular school of *kalām* was centered around the teachings of al-Ash'arī (d. 935) and his followers; the other significant *madhhab*, that is of al-Māturīdī (d. 944), was also well-recognized.[15] However, after the comprehensive works of al-Jurjānī, Ottoman scholars were not engaged in distinguishing between these schools, so both teachings of al-Ash'arī and al-Māturīdī were frequently recognized as the same kind of *kalām*.[16]

Thus, *kalām* was mainly used as the very method of other sciences taught in religious schools.[17] Ottoman scholars were interested in formal logic (*manṭiq*), definitions of main theological terms (*ḥudūd*), arguments for the attributes of God (*īthbāt ṣifāt Allah*) and other problems, formulated and resolved in the works of aforementioned classical followers of *kalām*. Francis Robinson writes, that in "all the regions during the years 1400–1700 there was a vigorous industry of commentary."[18]Instead of asking for some principles (*uṣūl*, i.e. roots), the scholars who followed the legendary Molla Fanari (d. 1431) were trying to develop some "branches" of philosophical theology (*furū*). This resulted in the numbering of supra-commentaries and independent treaties devoted to the solutions of some problems developed in the course of works al-Rāzī, al-Ījī, al-Dawwānī, and other scholars of late Medieval Ages. Robinson also argues that by the end of the sixteenth century the balance between the rational and transmitted sciences "had been upset and the rational sciences were severely threatened."[19] However, this priority of transmitted sciences (*ʿulūm an-naqliyyah*) over the rational (*ʿulūm al-ʿaqliyyah*) was related with the curriculum of medreses, rather than to the interest of the Ottoman scholars in general.

One of the Ottoman scholars of the early modern period whose heritage includes not only "transmitted", but "rational" sciences seems to have been neglected in the majority of studies on early modern Islam. That is, Muḥammad b. Muṣṭafā al-Aqkirmānī (or Mehmet Akkirmani in Turkish sources), who left more than sixty treatises and commentaries on various topics of Qur'an and Sunnah,

---

15 Huseyin Atay, *Osmanlilarda Yuksek Din Egitimi* (Istanbul: Dergah Yayinlari, 1983), 167.

16 Omer Aydin, "Kalam between Tradition and Change: The Emphasis on Understanding of Classical Islamic Theology in Relation to Western Intellectual Effects", in *Change and essence: dialectical relations between change and continuity in the Turkish intellectual tradition*, ed. Sinasi Gündüz, Cafer S. Yaran (Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 2005), 105.

17 Ibid.

18 Francis Robinson, *Ottomans-Safavids-Mughals: Shared knowledge and connective systems*, Journal of Islamic Studies 8 (2) (1997): 155.

19 Ibid.

Islamic law, philosophical theology, and even medicine. Due to his outstanding interest in rational sciences, in some sources al-Aqkirmānī even called as "philosopher" (*faylasūf*).

In general, existing studies present only an introductory outline of his scholarly interest or analysis of some of his works,[20] that is, works written in Turkish such as "Risâle-i Teavvüz"[21] and "İklîlü't-Terâcim,"[22] and some Arabic treatises on *kalām* like the "Risâle Fi'l-Kelâm" and "Dürerü'l-Akaid."[23] These last two works were analyzed in an unpublished BA thesis of Ahmet Bozyiğit (Ankara University, 2006). There are also some old prints of al-Aqkirmānī works, such as the Arabic commentary on "Forty ḥadīths of al-Birgiwī", published in Istanbul at 1905.

Notwithstanding these notable contributions, an absolute majority of the works of al-Aqkirmānī remain unedited and exist only in manuscripts. His treatises and commentaries are to be found in Süleymaniye Library (Istanbul),[24] Library of King Saud University (Riyadh).[25] King Abdalla Library of Umm al-Qura University (Makkah),[26] al-Qasimiyyah Library (Bu-Saada, Algeria),[27] the Library of the University of Leiden (Leiden),[28] and other places. A significant part of his theological heritage has not been studied at all.

Within the unedited corpus of al-Aqkirmānī's works that is dedicated to philosophical theology, is one extremely interesting work, given its association with the influence of Ibn Sīnā and his followers: i.e., *'Iqd al-La'ālī fī bayān 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī* ("The pearl necklace in exploration of unlimited knowledge

---

20 Mehmet Vural, Osmanlı'da Felsefe ve Akkirmânî'nin Felsefî Düşünceleri, *Söz ve Adalet* 1(6-7) (2008): 115-120.

21 Bekir Tatlı, Şeytanın Hileleri ve Korunma Yolları Hakkında Bir Çalışma: Risâle-i Teavvüz – Kaynak Tahlil ve Tahkiki, *Çukurova Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 2 (6) (2006): 123-169.

22 Neslihan Dağ, *Muhammed b. Mustafa Akkirmani'nin İklilü't-Teracim adlı eserinde felsefî kavramlar* (yüksek lisans tezi) (Elâzığ: Fırat Üniversitesi, 2006).

23 Ahmet Bozyiğit, *Akkirmânî'nin Felsefî Görüşleri* (yüksek lisans tezi) (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, 2006).

24 See detailed al-Aqkirmānī's manuscripts existing in this famous library: Ahmet Bozyiğit, *Akkirmânî'nin Felsefî Görüşleri*, 16-24.

25 King Saud University Library, *'Iqd al-La'ālī fī 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, ff. 1-20; KSUL, *Al-'Arba'īn Ḥadīthā*, 892/1, ff. 1-163.

26 King Abdallah Library, *Ḥāshiyyah 'alā sharḥ risālah al-isti'ārah li-l-Mullā 'Iṣām*, 4-1965, ff. 1-32.

27 Al-Qasimiyyah Library, *'Iqd al-La'ālī fī 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 437.

28 Library of the University of Leiden, *Risālah fī firaq aḍ-ḍāllah,* Or. 12425, ff. 35b-55b.

of the all-highest"), which is mentioned by biographer Ismail Pasha (d. 1920).[29] This work has been preserved in at least three copies (manuscripts in Süleymaniye Library,[30] King Saud University Library[31] and al-Qasimiyah Library[32]). Using the well-preserved copy of ‘*Iqd al-La’ālī* from Riyad as our primary source, our study will provide a detailed observation of the influences of ibn Sīnā and his commentators on al-Aqkirmānī, which can be found in ‘*Iqd al-La’ālī*. Our aim is to show that al-Aqkirmānī tried to reinterpret not only the "branches" of transmitted and rational sciences (as did many of his contemporaries), but also some more fundamental questions related to various aspects of Ibn Sīnā's philosophy. Finally, the significance of al-Aqkirmānī's rationality may provide a new horizon to emphasize the development of original philosophical traditions in early modern Ottoman Empire and to refute the myth of "the dark ages" in Islamic philosophy.

Al-Aqkirmānī as Ottoman scholar. The available data related to the life of al-Aqkirmānī is very limited. Existing studies provide only a general outline of his biography.[33] Undoubtedly, he was born in Akkerman (now Bilhorod-Dnistrovskyi in Odessa region, Ukraine). This is attested not only by his name, mentioned by biographers like Ismail Pasha, but also by some manuscripts. For instance, in a manuscript copy of his commentary to al-Birgīwī's (d. 1573) forty hadiths, "al-Aqkirmānī" is used to sign his "name by birth".[34] The city of Akkerman belonged to the Ottoman Empire between 1484 and 1812. Evliya Çelebi (d. 1682), who visited Akkerman at summer of 1657, wrote that its population mainly included warriors from Crimea and local merchants. Also, Çelebi noted the existence of seventeen primary schools. The known name of his father (Muṣṭafā Ḥāji Ḥamīd), mentioned in some sources, may clearly attest for Turkish or Tatarian origin of al-Aqkirmānī.[35]

29 Al-Bagdādī, Ismāʾīl Bāshā, *Hadiyyah al-’Ārifin* (Istanbul: Wakālah al-Maʾārif al-Jalīlah, 1951), III, 368.

30 Süleymaniye Library, Laleli, 3706, ff. 258-281.

31 KSUL, *Al-ʿArba’īn Ḥadīthā,* 892/1, f. 2.

32 Al-Qasimiyyah Library, *ʾIqd al-La’ālī fī ʿilmihi taʿālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 437.

33 See bibliography in: Akkirmânî Mehmed Efendi, *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Islâm Ansiklopedisi* (Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1986) II, 270.

34 KSUL ʿ*Iqd al-La’ālī fī ʿilmihi taʿālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 2.

35 See our study on the first period of his career: Mykhaylo Yakubovych, Maksymy rozuminnia w hermenevtychnomu metodi sunnits’kogo exegeta Muhammada b. Mustafy al-Aqkirmani, *Proceedings of the National University of Ostroh Academy* 9 (2011): 126-133.

The exact date of his birth is unknown. However, the copier of the mentioned commentary on al-Birgīwī's forthy hadith writes, that this work was finished by Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī in *jumādā l-ūlā* of 1150 hijri date (i.e. August or September of 1737).[36] At the very beginning of this work, al-Aqkirmānī tells us about the absence of free time for writing due to some "family" and "earthly" affairs and his illness; finally, he decided to write only on persistent request of some of his students.[37] His introduction gives the impression that at this time (i.e. 1737) al-Aqkirmānī was no longer a young man. Relying on this fact, we may suppose that he was born around 1700 or even before.

The other known fact about the life of al-Aqkirmānī is related to his activities as judge (*qaḍī*). According to some sources, as referenced by A. Bozyiğit, in 1753 al-Aqkirmānī became a *qaḍī* of Izmir and then left there to assume the same position in Egypt.[38]

The existing manuscripts also preserve the second *nisbah* of al-Aqkirmānī, i.e., al-Kafawī.[39] The only possible meaning of this surname can be ascribed to Kafah (Kefe) (now Feodosia in Crimea, Ukraine), one of the most important centers of learning in the Crimean Khanate which existed from 1441 until 1783. In 1475 the khanate became a protectorate of the Ottoman Empire. The city of Kafah was even called "the Crimean Istanbul" and gave to Islamic world a number of outstanding figures such as the author Sharaf al-Dīn al-Qirimī (d. 1440); Husayn al-Kafawī (d. 1601), who was a *qaḍī* al-Makkah; Abu al-Baqā' al-Kafawī (d. 1683), the author of widely known *al-Kulliyyāt* dictionary of scholarly terms; Sufi 'Abd al-Qādir al-Kafawī (d. 1823), and many others,[40] It may be supposed that al-Aqkirmānī received his education in Kafah or perhaps started his career there. Then, like many of his compatriots, he left Crimea for other parts of Ottoman Empire. Interestingly, one of his Arabic works (also unpublished), entitled *Adāb al-Kafawī,* contains rules of for disputation from the perspective of formal logic. If this work was written by al-Aqkirmānī in Kafa, his primary education must have taken place there. In 1657, Evliya Çelebi counted five schools and a number of Sufi institutions of learning in Kafa.[41]

---

36 KSUL, *Al-'Arba'īn Ḥadīthā,* 892/1, f. 162.

37 Ibid, f. 2.

38 Ahmet Bozyiğit, *Akkirmânî'nin Felsefî Görüşleri*, 13-15.

39 See, for instance, the aforementioned manuscript from Makkah: KAL, *Ḥāshiyyah 'alā sharḥ risālah al-isti'ārah li-l-Mullā 'Isām*, 4-1965, ff. 1-32.

40 See, for instance: Al-Bagdādī, Ismā'īl Bāshā, *Hadāyah al-'Ārifīn* I, 320.

41 Mykhaylo Yakubovych, Maksymy rozuminnia w hermenevtychnomu metodi sunnits'kogo exegeta Muhammada b. Mustafy al-Aqkirmani, 126-133.

In 1759 Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī was appointed Hanafi judge of Makkah.[42] His experience was not unique in this field: at least one scholar from the northern part of Ottoman Empire (i.e. Crimea) held this position before him (viz, Husayn al-Kafawī, mentioned by Ismail Pasha[43]). Makkah became a part of Ottoman Empire in 1519; since 1536 the appointment of the Hanafi judge here was reserved for the authorities in Istanbul. Finally, as ʿAbd al-Malik b. Duhaysh has noted, according to the supreme order issued in 1565, judges of all other law schools were oblidged to consult before Hanafi judge.[44] Thus, this position was very important in the Ottoman administration of Makkah and all the Hijaz.

Unfortunately, we know very little about al-Aqkirmānī's activities during this period. He served as judge for only a year. According to Ismail Pasha, Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī died during Muḥarram of 1174 hijri (August or September, 1760).[45] It is worth noting that the details of his biography require separate study, which might consider not only Turkish archives, but Arabic documents of this period as well.

***ʿIqd al-Laʾālī*, its sources and philosophical content.** The aforementioned philosophical work of al-Aqkirmānī is preserved in at least three manuscript copies. There are no doubts regarding its attribution to our author, since all the manuscripts indicate his name. In his *Hadiyyah al-ʿĀrifīn* Ismail Pasha calls it *ʿIqd al-Laʾālī fī bayān ʿilmihi taʾāla bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*;[46] i.e., precisely the same title preserved in the manuscript copy of Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi. However, in the title of copy from King Saud University Library, used for our study, the word *bayān* ("explanation") is omitted, notwithstanding it's being mentioned in the text of al-Aqkirmānī itself.[47]

The manuscript of *ʿIqd* from the King Saud University Library contains 21 folios (16 x 23 centimeters), written in very clear *naskh* script. The text is written in 21 lines for every folio. There are also some commentaries of small size by the same hand, located on the margins. The beginnings of separate chapters (*fuṣūl*) are red-coloured. The first page with title mentions another name, which, due to the illegible script of the inscription, can only be partly read: the unreadable

42 Ahmet Bozyiğit, *Akkirmânî'nin Felsefî Görüşleri*, 13.

43 Al-Bagdādī, Ismāʾīl Bāshā, *Hadiyyah al-ʿĀrifīn*, I, 321.

44 A. Al-Duhaysh, *al-Qaḍāʾ fī'l-Makkah al-Mukarramah qadīm-an wa ḥadīth-an* (Makkah: Jāmiʿa Umm al-Qurāʾ, 1426/2005), 132.

45 Al-Bagdādī, Ismāʾīl Bāshā, *Hadiyyah al-ʾĀrifīn*, III, 368.

46 Ibid.

47 KSUL, *ʿIqd al-Laʾālī fī ʿilmihi taʿālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, ff. 1.

name and date, written in Arabic numbers (1206 hijri, i.e. 1791 C.E.) after *fī* (i.e. "at" before the date). The name of scribe and the exact date of copying remain unknown. It seems to have been written toward the end of eighteen century, as has been noted by the authors of King Saud University Library catalogue.

After the traditional introductory formulas with praise to God, the *'Iqd* mentions the name of its author. "This who in need [of God], Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī, says…".[48] Like in other works, al-Aqkirmānī tries to clarify his methods of research, explaining the structure of the whole work. His main goal is to solve "widespread problems", e.g.,whether divine knowledge of things is limited to the quantity of these things or if knowledge is unlimited at all. First, he attempts to present the problem itself, and then explore the proposed answers, critique them, and achieve some solution. Thus, the logical structure of the treatise seems to be quite simple, being compelled from thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.

The problem itself is formulated as follows. The quantity of breaths and meals eaten by those who will enter Paradise must either be known or unknown to God. In the first case (meaning if God knows them) this quantity must be finite, but this, says al-Aqkirmānī, contradicts the eternity of "the people of Paradise" and the corresponding verse of the Qur'an: "its food is everlasting" (*ukuluha da'imun*) (Qur'an, 13:35).[49] The second answer (i.e. that God knows them not) is unacceptable.[50] Interestingly, a note in the margin attributes this inquiry to a certain "Khwājah Zādah," meaning Muṣliḥ al-Dīn Muṣṭafa ibn Yūsuf Khwājah Zādah al-Burūsawī (d. 1488), known in Turkish as Hocazâde. Issues concerning divine knowledge (*'ilm*) as attribute were included in his commentary on the *Tahāfut al-Falāsifah* of al-Gazālī.[51]

Al-Aqkirmānī counts all the answers,corresponding to both cases provided by his forerunners. His own scholarly "canon" reflects these aforementioned authorities, all extremely popular in Ottoman philosophical theology. Thus, we see references to the *Kitāb al-Mawāqif* by al-Ījī, *Sharḥ al-Maqāṣid* by al-Taftāzānī, *Sharḥ 'Aqā'id al-'Aḍudiyyah* by al-Dawwānī, and commentary of al-Ṭūsī to *al-Ishārāt* of Ibn Sīnā. It should be noted that only al-Ṭūsī among the mentioned authorities is

---

48 Ibid, f. 2.

49 For all quotations from the Qur'an, translation by Mohammad Marmaduke Pickthall is used: *The Meaning of the Glorious Qur'an: Arabic Text with English Translation. Tr. by Mohammad Marmaduke Pickthall* (Delhi: Kitab Bhawan, 1996).

50 KSUL, *'Iqd al-La'ālī fī 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 3.

51 Riḍā Sa'ādah, *Mushkilah as-Ṣirā' bayn al-falsafah wa al-dīn mina al-Ghazzālī wa ibn Rushd ilā al-Ṭūsī wa Khwājah Zādah* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-'Arabī, 1990), 116.

named by al-Aqkirmānī as a *muḥaqqīq,* "the verifier,"[52] In the honorable style Ibn Sīnā (*shaykh*) is also mentioned.[53] This may attest to the fact that al-Aqkirmānī recognized all the referred authors merely as commentators on the early tradition associated with Ibn Sīnā. The only other authority named as "Sheikh" is Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī (d. 1191), the founder of Ishraqi school.[54] However, al-Suhrawardi was influenced by the philosophy of ibn Sīnā as well (particularly in onthology).

The first of the cited authorities is al-Ījī with his *Kitab al-Mawāqif.*[55] Al-Aqkirmānī borrowed his words from the chapter on divine knowledge, where al-Ījī provides five arguments to prove that knowledge of God encompasses all things "possible, necessary, and impossible," Then Al-Aqkirmānī mentions the arguments of al-Taftāzānī to show that the meaning of the phrase "divine knowledge is not limited" is related to the absence of any measure (*ḥadd*) of its perception. He also refers to "many of the Ash'aris," which argues that divine knowledge transcends "all time" (*azminah*) and covers all "individual events" (*ḥawādith al-juz'iyyah*).[56] This is true, for instance, for the Ashari scholar Abu Bakr al-Bāqillānī (d. 1013), who presents some aspects of this view in his book *al-Inṣāf.*[57]

In the pages that follow al-Aqkirmānī provides some "answers," closely related to philosophy. Referrring to *Sharḥ 'Aqā'id al-Aḍudiyyah* by al-Dawwānī, the author of '*Iqd* presents his words very accurately.[58] Whereas al-Dawwānī proposes the opinion of some "philosophers" who say that "God knows unlimited things by means of some general (*ijmālī*) knowledge," al-Aqkirmānī correctly gives us the view of al-Ṭusī as one of these "philosophers."[59]

It must be remembered that al-Ṭusī tried to present the philosophy of Ibn Sīnā in non-contradictory way, especially the very complicated issue of whether God knows particular things (*juz'iyyāt*) or whether His knowledge is limited to

---

52 KSUL, '*Iqd al-La'ālī fī 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 3.

53 Ibid, f. 8.

54 Ibid, f. 19.

55 Ibid, f. 3.

56 KSUL, '*Iqd al-La'ālī fī 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 3, 4.

57 Al-Baqillānī, Abu Bakr, *Kitāb al-Inṣāf*, ed. Muḥammad al-Kawtharī (Cairo: al-Maktabah al-Aẓhariyyah li-l-Turāth, 1421/2000), 33-38.

58 See gist of this polemics in commentary of Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afgānī to Sharḥ 'Aqā'id al-Aḍudiyyah by al-Dawwānī: Al-Sayyid Jamāl al-Dīn al-Husaynī al-Afgānī, Muḥammad 'Abduh, *Al-Ta'liqāt 'alā Sharḥ al-Dawwānī li-l-'Aqā'id al-Aḍudiyyah*, ed. Sīd Shāhī (Cairo: Maktabah Al-Shurūq al-Dawliyyah, 1422/2002) 349-415.

59 KSUL, '*Iqd al-La'ālī fī 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 4.

universalities only.[60] Keeping this problem in mind, al-Aqkirmānī tries to unify the later tradition of *kalām* and the primary view of ibn Sīnā. He mentions the neo-Platonic concept of divine knowledge, used by al-Ṭusī: "All the ideas (*ṣuur*) about things – being existent or non-existent, universal or particular – are presented near His [knowledge]. Even a single atom will not be able to hide from his knowledge."[61]

An opposing view (i.e. that God does not know unlimited things) is borrowed by al-Aqkirmānī from the *Kitāb al-Mawāqif* by al-Ījī,

[62] who ascribes it to some "philosophers." Interestingly, he does not refer here to Ibn Sīnā, who traditionally was accused of holding this controversial opinion.[63] Instead he refers to the name of Abu Hāsim, who argued that divine knowledge of infinite particular beings is possible only by way of "imitation" (*tashbīh*) without a real connection to "known" subject (*ma'lūm*).[64] By Abu Hāshim al-Aqkirmānī definitely means the well-known Basri Mutazilite Abu Hāshim al-Jubbā'ī (d. 933). This opinion of Basri Mutazilites is presented, for instance, in the doxography of *Maqālāt* by al-Ash'ārī.[65] al-Aqkirmānī most likely borrowed it from the works of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 1210), who frequently used the inheritance of quoted Mutazilites in his works.

Obviously, in this chapter of the *'Iqd* al-Aqkirmānī tries to explain the essence of the discussion concerning divine knowledge. However, he recognizes the absence of clarity in these "answers" and continues to interpret their meaning in the next chapter.

Explaining some of the arguments used by al-Ījī and al-Taftāzānī, al-Aqkirmānī notes that divine knowledge cannot be compared to that of created beings (*mumkināt*), because "this is an analogy between the hidden (*ghā'ib*) and the obvious (*shāhid*) and is a wholly incorrect proof. This statement is not directed at the core of the proof, but is related to the proof in that it falsifies it in some way (*ma'a innahu kalām 'alā as-sanad*)."[66] The same argument defending philosophy

---

60 Ibn Sīnā, *al-Ishārāt wa al-Tanbhāt ma'a sharḥ al-Ṭūsī*, ed. Sulaymān Dunya (Cairo: Dār al-Ma'āruf, 1969), III, 295-301.

61 KSUL, *'Iqd al-La'ālī fī 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 4.

62 See al-Ījī, *Kitab al-Mawāqif* (Beirut: Ālam al-Kutub, n.d.), 287-230.

63 KSUL, *'Iqd al-La'ālī fī 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 4.

64 Ibid, f. 6-7.

65 Al-Ash'ārī, *Maqālāt al-Islāmīyīn wa-ikhtilāf al-muṣallīn*, ed. M. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd (Cairo: Maktabat al-Nahḍah al-Miṣriyyah, 1969), I, 372.

66 KSUL, *'Iqd al-La'ālī fī 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 7.

against the refutations of al-Ghazālī (d. 1111) was used by ibn Rushd (d. 1198) in his brief treatise, attached to both *Faṣl al-Maqāl* and *Tahāfut al-Tahāfut*.[67]

In general, the responses from al-Ījī, al-Taftāzānī, and the Ash'arites seem insufficient for al-Aqkirmānī, because he identifies them as holding the opinion that divine knowledge is not related to "the non-existent" (*ma'dūm*). According to this logic, if someone supposes that divine knowledge is an "additional attribute" only (ṣifah iḍafiyyah), he must accept that God knows only those things which exist. This knowledge is a kind of "actual" and appears at the same moment when thing or event come into existence. This is why al-Taftāzānī and others speak of the absence of definite measures (ḥudūd) in divine knowledge, trying to relate it only to actual, i.e., existing beings.

So the next "answer," given by "many Ash'arites," is analyzed by al-Aqkirmānī in an even more detailed way. He establishes some parallels between the concept of the independence of divine knowledge of the period and some ideas of Ibn Sīnā. Al-Aqkirmānī refers to *al-Ishārāt* and cites the words of the *shaykh*: "The knowledge of particulars by the Almighty must be the sacred one ('alā wajh al-muqaddas)."[68] Ibn Sīnā's original text says: "His knowledge of particulars must be the sacred one and must be clarified completely ('an az-zamān wa d-dahr)."[69] Taking this quotation as a starting point that we use to defend Ibn Sīnā against accusation of heresy (i.e., that God does not necessarily know the details), al-Aqkirmānī tries to support it, examining al-Ṭusī 's objections . For example, al-Aqkirmānī mentions al-Ṭusī 's formula that "the knowledge of a cause makes necessary the knowledge of effect" and borrows all the explanations from his commentary on *al-Ishārāt*.[70] Thus, some points, detailed by Ibn Sīnā, should not be taken literally.

Moreover, al-Aqkirmānī was also informed about the contrary opinion on the interpretation of Ibn Sīnā, presented in the works of *Ṣāḥib al-Muḥākamāt*, i.e., the other authoritative commentator of *al-Ishārāt*, Qutb al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 1365). The author of *al-Muḥākamāt*, trying to outline the correct views of al-Ṭusī and Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, recognized "the sacred" (*muqaddas*) in relation to knowledge as "independent of time, in contrast to the knowledge of created

---

67 Ibn Rushd, "Ḍamīmah fi 'ilm al-kalām", in *Faṣl al-Maqāl*, ed. M. al-Jābirī (Beirut: Markaz Dīrasāt al-Waḥdah al-'Arabiyyah, 2007), 129.

68 KSUL, *'Iqd al-La'ālī fi 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 8.

69 Ibn Sīnā, *al-Ishārāt wa al-Tanbhāt ma'a sharḥ al-Ṭūsī*, ed. Sulaymān Dunya (Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1969), II, 296.

70 Ibid.

beings (*mumkināt*)."[71] Al-Aqkirmānī mentions the summary (*khulaṣah*) of the words of Quṭb al-Dīn to refute the position of al-Ṭusī in his understanding of divine knowledge as the general one. Al-Aqkirmānī also appeals to the text of Ibn Sīnā from *al-Ishārāt* to support the opinion of Quṭb al-Dīn: "sacred" means that this knowledge is "transcends time", but not "the general," as is assumed by al-Ṭusī. Hovewer, the author of the *'Iqd* still presents the opinion of al-Ṭūsī from his commentary to *al-Ishārāt* that divine knowledge cannot be compared to the corporeal perception of man.[72] It seems that for al-Aqkirmānī al-Ṭusī remained the most important authority to understand the words of *shaykh* Ibn Sīnā.

The "answers" are mostly associated with al-Dawwānī. Al-Aqkirmānī uses his logic to prove that divine knowledge, even if we define it as "general," must be actual, in contrast to the position of some "philosophers" who suppose it to be potential only. The author of the *'Iqd* even goes further and, relying on al-Dawwānī, proposes the concept of the "general" (*ijmālī*) as "the root" (*aṣl*) and the "particular" as "the branch" (*furū*).[73] According to this solution, in its perception of particular things divine knowledge moves from the potential to the actual. Here al-Aqkirmānī, based on the opinion of his forerunners, uses the traditional and autochtonous logic of Islamic philosophy, which has inherited the idea of "roots" and "branches" from the very beginnings of Islamic law (*fiqh*).

In his attempt to explain the proof for the absence of any limits to divine knowledge, al-Aqkirmānī cites additional sources, referring to them as to *al-Ṭawāli.*"[74] The only possible meaning for this is that he speaks about *Ṭawāli' al-Anwār* of the well-known Persian scholar al-Bayḍāwī (p. 1286). This book, which presents a systematic view on *kalām*, was widely used in the late medieval and early modern Ottoman Empire. *Al-Ṭawāli'* became a subject of various commentaries like that of Shams al-Din al-Iṣfahānī (d. 1348) along with the aforementioned al-Dawwānī and Khwājah Zādah.[75]

Al-Aqkirmānī uses the words of al-Bayḍāwī (probably through the commentary of al-Dawwānī) to argue that divine knowledge encompasses all the unlimited

---

71 KSUL, '*Iqd al-La'ālī fī 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 8.

72 Ibid, f. 9.

73 Ibid.

74 Ibid, f. 11.

75 Al-Bayḍāwī, *Ṭawālī' al-Anwār*, ed. 'Abbās Sulaymān (Beirut-Cairo: Dār al-Jīl – al-Maktabah al-Aẓhariyyah li-l-Turāth, 1411/1991), 23-26.

things "by count" and must be presented as concept (*'ilm al-taṣawwūrī*).[76] In his *al-Ṭawāli'*, al-Bayḍāwī provides similar concepts and even supports possibility of presence of some "platonic ideas" in the divine mind.[77] Following these thoughts, al-Aqkirmānī states that the unlimited cannot be understood by assertive knowledge (*'ilm al-taṣdīqī*), in contrast to the conceptive one (*'ilm al-taṣawwūrī*). Usage of these two widely used logical terms (*taṣawwūr* and *taṣdīq*) was obligatory for analyzing the real nature of divine knowledge with respect to unaccountable things.

At the end of this chapter al-Aqkirmānī tries to refute some views of the Mutazilites. He repeats the Sunni belief that God knows all things in eternity and any claims that He must know them only in the time of their appearance are false. The last of the criticized answers is "explicated from the words of Abu Hāshim." Abu Hāshim argued that divine knowledge may encompass the impossible, but it cannot be defined as something "known" (*ma'lūm*). However, al-Aqkirmānī here sees a contradiction, since "negation of the known means the negation of knowledge." He even expresses his amazement at the occasion when the author of *al-Mawāqif* ventured to support the opinion of Abu Hāshim.[78] Al-Ījī really provides thoughts like that of Abu Hāshim, leaving them without detailed answer.[79] The author of the *'Iqd* definitely recognized his solutions as insufficient. The same is true of the words of Sayf al-Dīn al-Amidī (d. 1233), who wrote only that impossible cannot be "known" (*ma'lūm*).[80]

The last two chapters of the *'Iqd,* where al-Aqkirmānī tries to present his own solution, offer great interest. Here we may see his personal and original thoughts in more obvious way than before.

Referring to his forerunners, al-Aqkirmānī writes: "I say – as it has been mentioned by al-Dawwānī – that knowledge of unlimited things by God is the one, simple, and general knowledge. This is the answer, chosen by intellect, since it was verified that general knowledge is actual and no one may imagine corruption in this divine attribute."[81] Thus, al-Aqkirmānī explains his own position with the support of al-Dawwānī's works. In general, this idea seems to be borrowed from *al-Ishārāt* of Ibn Sīnā and developed by al-Ṭusī along with some later authorities.

---

76 KSUL, *'Iqd al-La'ālī fī 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 11-12.

77 Al-Bayḍāwī, *Ṭawāliʿ al-Anwār*, p. 183.

78 KSUL, *'Iqd al-La'ālī fī 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 13.

79 Al-Ījī, *Kitab al-Mawāqif* (Beirut: ʿĀlam al-Kutub, n.d.), 288.

80 KSUL, *'Iqd al-La'ālī fī 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 13.

81 Ibid, f. 14.

Notwithstanding the answer mentioned above, the problem still remains to be opened and needs further solutions. May we argue that God also knows something impossible (*mustaḥīl*)? If one says that divine knowledge encompasses it, he should signify *mustaḥīl* as *maʿlūm* ("the known"). In this case, the "known" must be either asserted or conceptualized. But as something actually non-existent, *mustaḥīl* as it is cannot be asserted or conceptualized. If someone will provide a negative response (i.e. that God knows it not), he may be accused of heresy, because Muslims are obliged to believe that every attribute of God is perfect.

In response to this problem al-Aqkirmānī mentions the words of Nūr al-Dīn al-Ṣabūnī (d. 1184). This prolific scholar writes that even if impossible comes into existence, God will know the time of its appearance and the state in which it appears. This argument is supported by a verse from the Qur'an: "And if they were sent back they would return unto that which they are forbidden" (Qur'an, 6:28). Supporting this remark, al-Aqkirmānī compares the "impossible" with the "universal" (*kullī*): "the impossible is similar to the universal in its relation to real (*khārijī*) existence: the universal also does not exist in reality."[82] So, "the impossible" has the same ontological status as "the universal": neither exists in external reality. Since nobody doubts divine knowledge of "the universal," the same rule is attributed to "the impossible," Reality includes only individual things, and universals are the products of the mind. Al-Aqkirmānī finds support in the view of Najm al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī al-Kātibī (d. 1276), the author of *Ḥikmah al-ʿAyn* and the notable follower of ibn Sīnā: "every external existence is identified."[83] In the original text of *Ḥikmah al-ʿAyn* the term *khārij* (i.e. "external", or real) is absent; instead, al-Kātibī used *ʿayān* ("essences," "beings").[84] Al-Aqkirmānī changes this term to the more general *khārij*, using it in the context of his other explanations, based on the thoughts of al-Dawwānī. Thus, al-Aqkirmānī agrees with position of his forerunner al-Dawwānī, trying to support it by statements of other authoritative scholars (al-Kātibī, al-Ṣabūnī and others).

Despite the final solutions found, al-Aqkirmānī continues to examine other opinions regarding these issues, presenting them as "answers." Is it possible to reach a "correspondence" (*taṭbīq*) between the infinite continuum of individual essences and actual divine knowledge? Some formulas, proposed here by al-Aqkirmānī, include the problem of infinity as it actually is, supposedly borrowed

---

82 Ibid.

83 Ibid.

84 Al-Kātibī, *Ḥikmah al-ʾAyn*, ed. Ṣāliḥ at-Turkī (n.p., 2002), 6.

from the words of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī in *Mabāḥith al-Mashriqiyyah*.[85] However, even recognizing the "highest and honorable" position of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, al-Aqkirmānī criticizes him for "making the answer too difficult."[86]

The first of the answers, proposed by "some honorable scholar" (unfortunately, his name on margins is illegibly written) is as follows: a quantity of benevolences in Paradise must be either odd or even. If we take one from the odd, the rest becomes even. Thus, this infinite number can be divided into two separate and finite parts. But the addition of one part to the other will result in a finite quantity. Thus, the number of benevolences in Paradise will become a finite quantity. However, "someone" may say that non-finite numbers cannot be divided, "so think about it," advises al-Aqkirmānī.[87] According to a text on the margin, this refutation is borrowed from the *Ḥāshiyah ʿalā Risālah Ithbāt al-Wājib* of al-Dawwānī by Mīrzājān (d. 1585).

The second answer, which seems to be borrowed from some unmentioned source, is based on similar logic. Since the quantity of benevolences in Paradise is merely a continuum of numbers, every next particular may be added to the previous and, finally, some finite quantity must be reached. Refuting this proof, al-Aqkirmānī speaks of a "whole" (*jumlah*) that includes individuals, but not numbers, and thus cannot be counted at all. "The same is true about the unexistent things."[88]

The third answer is named as "the argument of correlativity." If we take one of benevolences from the infinite continuum, their order will change. Thus, the quantity of "preceding" (*sābiqiyyāt*) benevolences may overcome the quantity of those "which were preceded" (*masbūqiyyāt*). In this case "two correlatives (*mutaḍayyāfān*) will not be equal in being." The same contradiction, says al-Aqkirmānī, appears when this proof is used in relation to celestial spheres.[89]

The fourth answer, named as "the proof of the throne" (*burhān al-ʿarshī*) reflects similar ideas. In the case of listing infinite things in some order, the relation between the first of them (*mabdā*) and others will become the relation between

---

85 KSUL, *ʿIqd al-Laʿālī fī ʿilmihi taʿālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 15-17. See detailed discussion of this issue in related place of *Mabāḥith al-Mashriqiyyah*: Al-Rāzī, Fakhr al-Dīn, *Mabāḥith al-Mashriqiyyah* (Haydarābād: Maṭbaʿa Majlis Dāʾirah al-Maʿārif al-Niẓāmiyyah, 1343/[1924]) II, 475-493.

86 Ibid.

87 KSUL, *ʿIqd al-Laʿālī fī ʿilmihi taʿālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 18.

88 Ibid.

89 Ibid.

finite things. This proof, first used by *shaykh* Shihāb al-Dīn al-Maqtūl (i.e. al-Suhrawardī, d. 1191), related to "intuition" (*ḥads*) only.[90] Al-Aqkirmānī does not accept this answer and compares it with older insufficient arguments. It seems that reference to the non-rational and abstractive method was also a good reason for the author of the *'Iqd* to criticize this solution. He even goes further and says that "intuitive proof cannot be used against the opponent, just as intuitive cognitions, experimental knowledge and collectively transmitted knowledge."[91] These words show al-Aqkirmānī's devotion to purely rational knowledge, which, in the case of proper usage, cannot contradict the principles of belief.

Conclusions. The traditional history of Islamic philosophy mostly covers the period of Middle Ages. Classical studies like the widely known *History of Islamic Philosophy* (ed. by M.M. Sharif) close with figures like Ibn Khaldūn (d. 1406), al-Dawwānī (d. 1502), and Mullā Ṣadrā (d. 1640). With respect to the Ottoman Empire, book begins with the reformer Ziya Gökalp (d. 1924).[92] The same source links "Pre-Nineteenth Century" philosophy with Sufism only.[93] However, as we have shown in the present study, one must not ignore the significant heritage of *kalām*, a tradition generally independent from Sufi circles.

Sometimes philosophy in the Ottoman Empire was represented not as a self-sufficient system of doctrines, but as a scientific method. For instance, Ottoman scholars showed an outstanding interest in the encyclopedic heritage of ibn Khaldūn, mostly neglected in the Arabic lands. His *Muqaddimah* was even translated into Turkish in 1725.[94] The same can be attributed to some Turkish scholars, who used philosophy as a method of gaining knowledge, such as the famous Katip Çelebi (d. 1657).

The thought of al-Aqkirmānī goes even further. Here philosophy, used to support *kalām*, resulted in a continuation of the previous philosophical theology, based on rational presuppositions. *'Iqd al-La'ālī*, one of the most "philosophical" works of this scholar, appears partly as a scientific study of the history of philosophy. In many places the author simply tries to find a logical truth, using argued positions rather than widely accepted opinions. In this course al-Aqkirmānī was

---

90 Ibid, f. 19.

91 KSUL, '*Iqd al-La'ālī fī 'ilmihi ta'ālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, 2301, f. 20.

92 *History of Islamic Philosophy*, ed. M. M. Sharif (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1966), II, 1513-1523.

93 Ibid.

94 Allen James Fromherz, *Ibn Khaldun, Life and Times* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), 155.

not afraid to criticize authorities like al-Ījī (d. 1355), Quṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 1364), al-Taftāzānī (d. 1390), or improve on the arguments of recognized scholars such as al-Ṭūsī (d. 1274) or al-Dawwānī (d. 1502). The only scholar who was beyond his critique is the philosopher Ibn Sīnā.

The particular interest of al-Aqkirmānī for Ibn Sīnā is obvious. First, all the above-mentioned scholars (particularly al-Ṭūsī, al-Kātibī and al-Ījī) were influenced by Ibn Sīnā's ontology and other fields of his philosophy. Relying on this heritage, al-Aqkirmānī takes *al-Ishārāt* of Ibn Sīnā as a starting point of discussion, viewing subsequent authors in the context of his philosophy. Second, he prefers those ideas that are explicated in the works of Ibn Sīnā (divine knowledge as *ijmālī*, its relation to time, etc.). Only these teachings, along with the religious belief in the infinitude of benevolence in Paradise, play a role in the basic presuppositions of the *'Iqd*. Third, Ibn Sīnā and his commentators are regarded as a unified and generally non-contradictory school, which may explain the principles of belief correctly. It can be said that Al-Aqkirmānī viewed Ibn Sīnā as a forerunner of the entire intellectual tradition of Islam. The significant influence of this great philosopher can be observed in other extant works of al-Aqkirmānī as well.[95]

The presence of various influences and an occasionally very literal reading of the works of his forerunners cannot be used as a proof against the originality of al-Aqkirmānī as an independent scholar of philosophical theology. Despite the outstanding popularity of the commentary genre, the *'Iqd* reflects the independent efforts of its author. Al-Aqkirmānī wrote his text without any significant reference to the schools of al-Māturīdī, al-Ash'arī, or any other theological tradition. Final "answers", obligatory for solving problems of *kalām*, were provided from the position of philosophy. Al-Aqkirmānī demonstrates a very interesting course of thought, arguing that parallels between the infinite, "the impossible," and "the universal" exist primarily in mind. In this context al-Aqkirmānī even refuses to accept answers based on intuitive knowledge, proposing instead a purely rational method of arguing.

These significant achievements were possible not only due to the personal interests of al-Aqkirmānī, but also to good education. The only thing we know about this education is that it relates to Kafah (Kefe) (now Feodosia in Ukraine). Al-Aqkirmānī might have studied at the Zincirli medrese, founded in central Crimea ca. 1500. Later studies were likely conducted in other parts of the Ottoman Empire. A very successful career as a judge (his *fatwas* have survived) also shows the highest recognition of Al-Aqkirmānī by his contemporaries. Some of

---

95 Ahmet Bozyiğit, *Akkirmânî'nin Felsefî Görüşleri*, 85-89.

his books were already published by *Matbaa-i Amire* (the governmental press, located in Istanbul and Egyptian Bulaq) in the middle of nineteenth century.[96]

The outstanding personality of al-Aqkirmānī requires further study. But even a single analysis of the *ʿIqd,* written under the influence of Ibn Sīnā and his followers, reflects the popularity of the rational method in the Ottoman Empire. This may seriously stress the traditional stereotype of the "dark ages" in philosophical theology in early modern Islam, which is still popular in some academic circles.

Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī and his ʿIqd al-Laʾālī: the Reception of Ibn Sīnā in Early Modern Ottoman Empire

Abstract ■ Muḥammad al-Aqkirmānī (d. 1174/1760) seems to be a rather understudied figure in modern history. One of the most important (but still unedited) works of this philosopher is entitled "Pearl Necklace in the Exploration that Knowledge of the All-Highest is Unlimited" *ʿIqd al-Laʾālī fī ʿilmihi taʿālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī.* This work was written on the basis of various philosophical sources, mainly associated with the influence of famous Islamic philosopher Ibn Sīnā (d. 1037).

Using the well-preserved copy of this treatise from the King Saud University Library (Riyadh, Saudi Arabia) as our primary source along with some other manuscripts of al-Aqkirmani, our study provides an outline of his scholarly biography and a detailed observation of his influences in the context of Ottoman science. Finally, our article states the significance of al-Aqkirmānī's rationality and new horizons to emphasize the development of original philosophical traditions in Early Modern Ottoman Empire.

Keywords: Ottoman medreses, philosophical theology, divine knowledge, time, universals and particulars.

Bibliography

Al-Afgānī, Al-Sayyid Jamāl al-Dīn al-Husaynī, ʿAbduh, Muḥammad: *Al-Taʿlīqāt ʿalā Sharḥ al-Dawwānī li-l-ʿAqāʾid al-Aḍudiyyah*, ed. Sīd Shāhī, Cairo: Maktabah Al-Shurūq al-Dawliyyah 1422/2002.

Al-Aqkirmānī, Muḥammad: ʿ*Iqd al-Laʾālī fī ʿilmihi taʿālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, King Saud University Library, 2301.

Al-Aqkirmānī, Muḥammad: *ʿIqd al-Laʾālī fī ʿilmihi taʿālā bi-ghayr al-mutanāhī*, Al-Qasimiyyah Library, 437.

Al-Aqkirmānī, Muḥammad: *Al-ʿArbaʾīn Ḥadīthā,* King Saud University Library, 892/1.

---

96 Ibid, 23.

Al-Aqkirmānī, Muḥammad: *Ḥāshiyyah ʿalā sharḥ risālah al-istiʾārah li-l-Mullā ʿIsām*, King Abdullah Library, 4-1965.

Al-Aqkirmānī, Muḥammad: *Risālah fī firaq aḍ-ḍāllah,* Library of the University of Leiden, Or. 12425.

Al-Ashʿārī: *Maqālāt al-Islāmīyīn wa-ikhtilāf al-muṣalliīn*, ed. M. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, Cairo: Maktabat al-Nahḍah al-Miṣriyyah 1969.

Alawwa, Ali: *The Crisis of Islamic Civilization*, Yale: Yale University Press 2009.

Al-Bagdādī, Ismāʾīl Bāshā: *Hadiyyah al-ʾĀrifīn*, Istanbul: Wakālah al-Maʾārif al-Jalīlah 1951.

Al-Baqillānī, Abu Bakr: *Kitāb al-Inṣāf*, ed. Muḥammad al-Kawtharī, Cairo: al-Maktabah al-Azhariyyah li-l-Turāth 1421/2000.

Al-Bayḍāwī: *Ṭawālīʿ al-Anwār*, ed. ʿAbbās Sulaymān, Beirut-Cairo: Dār al-Jīl – al-Maktabah al-Azhariyyah li-l-Turāth 1411/1991.

Al-Duhaysh, Abd al-Malik: *Al-Qaḍāʾ fī l-Makkah al-Mukarramah qadīm-an wa ḥadīth-an*, Makkah: Jāmiʿa Umm al-Qurāʾ 1426/2005.

Al-Ījī, *Kitab al-Mawāqif*, Beirut: ʿĀlām al-Kutub n.d..

Al-Kātibī: *Ḥikmah al-ʾAyn*, ed. Ṣāliḥ at-Turkī, N.p. 2002.

Al-Rāzī, Fakhr al-Dīn: *Mabāḥith al-Mashriqiyyah*, Haydarābād: Maṭbaʿa Majlis Dāʾirah al-Maʾārif al-Niẓāmiyyah 1343/[1924].

Atay, Hüseyin: *Osmanlılarda Yüksek Din Eğitimi*, İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları 1983.

Aydın, Ömer: "Kalam between Tradition and Change: The Emphasis on Understanding of Classical Islamic Theology in Relation to Western Intellectual Effects", *Change and essence: dialectical relations between change and continuity in the Turkish intellectual tradition*, ed. Şinasi Gündüz, Cafer S. Yaran, Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy 2005, p. 103-121.

Ayduz, Salim: "Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī's Influence on Ottoman Scientific Literature (Mathematics, Astronomy and Natural Sciences)", *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, 1 (17) (2011), p. 99-125.

Bozyiğit, Ahmet: Akkirmânî'nin Felsefî Görüşleri (yüksek lisans tezi), Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi 2006.

Bulliet, Richard: The Crisis within Islam, *The Wilson Quarterly* 26 (2002), p. 11-19.

Dağ, Neslihan: Muhammed B. Mustafa Akkirmani'nin *İklilü't-Teracim* adlı eserinde felsefi kavramlar (yüksek lisans tezi), Elazığ: Fırat Üniversitesi 2006.

Fromherz, Allen James: *Ibn Khaldun, Life and Times*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press 2010.

Ibn Rushd, "Ḍamīmah fi ʿilm al-kalām", *Faṣl al-Maqāl*, ed. M. al-Jābirī, Beirut: Markaz Dīrasāt al-Waḥdah al-ʿArabiyyah 2007, p. 127-130.

Ibn Sīnā: *Al-Ishārāt wa al-Tanbhāt ma'a sharḥ al-Ṭūsī*, ed. Sulaymān Dunya, Cairo: Dār al-Ma'āruf 1969.

İhsanoğlu, Ekmeleddin: "Institutionalisation of Science in the Medreses of pre-Ottoman and Ottoman Turkey", Gürol Irzık, Güven Güzeldere (Ed.), *Turkish Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science*, New York: Springer 2005, p. 265-283.

Kuran, Timur: "The Islamic Commercial Crisis: Institutional Roots of Economic Underdevelopment in the Middle East", *The Journal of Economic History* 63, (2003), p. 414-446.

M. M. Sharif (Ed.): *History of Islamic Philosophy*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz 1966.

Özervarlı, M. Sait: "Alternative Approaches to Modernization in the Late Ottoman Period: Izmirli Ismail Hakki's Religious Thought Against Materialist Scientism", *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 39 (2007), p. 77-102.

Robinson, Francis: "Ottomans-Safavids-Mughals: Shared knowledge and connective systems", *Journal of Islamic Studies* 8 (2) (1997), p. 151-184.

El-Rouayheb, Khaled: "Opening the Gate of Verification: The Forgotten Arab-Islamic Florescence of the 17th Century", *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 38 (2006), p. 263-281.

Sa'ādah, Riḍā: *Mushkilah as-Sirā' bayn al-falsafah wa al-dīn mina al-Ghazzālī wa ibn Rushd ilā al-Ṭūsī wa Khwājah Zādah*, Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-'Arabī 1990.

Salama, Mohammad: *Islam, Orientalism, and Intellectual History: Modernity and the Politics of Exclusion since Ibn Khaldun*, London and New York: I. B Tauris 2011.

Tatlı, Bekir: "Şeytanın Hileleri ve Korunma Yolları Hakkında Bir Çalışma: Risâle-i Teavvüz – Kaynak Tahlil ve Tahkiki", *Çukurova Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 2 (6) (Çukurova 2006), p. 123-169.

The Meaning of the Glorious Qur'an: Arabic Text with English Translation. Tr. by Mohammad Marmaduke Pickthall, Delhi: Kitab Bhawan 1996.

Vural, Mehmet: "Osmanlı'da Felsefe ve Akkirmânî'nin Felsefî Düşünceleri", *Söz ve Adalet* 1 (6-7) (2008), p. 115-120.

Watt, Montgomery: *Islamic Philosophy and Theology*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press 1987.

Yakubovych, Mykhaylo, "Maksymy rozuminnia w hermenevtychnomu metodi sunnits'kogo exegeta Muhammada b. Mustafy al-Aqkirmani", *Proceeding of the National University of Ostroh Academy* 9 (Ostroh 2011), p. 126-133.

Yaltkaya, Şerafeddin: "Türk Kelâmcıları *Dârülfünûn İlâhiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 32 (Istanbul 1932), p. 7-23.

Yazıcıoğlu, Mustafa Sait: *Le Kalam et son role dans la societe turco-ottomane aux XVe et XVIe siecles*, Ankara: Editions Ministere de la culture 1990.