AN EXAMPLE OF THE MYSTICAL AVICENNISM IN OTTOMAN THOUGHT
Jamāl al-Khalwatī's Interpretation of Ibn Sīnā's *Risāla ilā Abī Saʿīd ibn Abī l-Khayr*

Veysel Kaya

Uludağ University, Bursa-Turkey

Abstract

In the face of growing scholarship on the classical period of Islamic thought, it is becoming more apparent that Ibn Sīnā owes much to the philosophical and theological traditions that precede him in matters that were once regarded as original stances of *al-Sheikh al-Raʾīs*. Undoubtedly, Ibn Sīnā still deserves to be regarded as a key figure who potentiated one of the turning points in Islamic thought. His influence is demonstrated by the fact that a time came, especially for Muslim theologians who represented the main theological tendencies in Muslim society, when they could not ignore his writings anymore. Al-Ghazālī's well-known *Incoherence of Philosophers* was a result of this inevitable case. In this regard, Ibn Sīnā's influential writings led the way to different interpretations of his ideas being incorporated within different traditions of Islamic thought, such as *falsafa*, *kalām*, and *taṣawwuf*. This article addresses a particular case in which some of his ideas, or to put it more correctly, ideas attributed to him, were conveyed in the Ottoman mystical environs, a situation that leads us to explore the concept of "mystical Avicennism." Rather than constructing an overall theory on the influence of Ibn Sīnā in Ottoman thought, this article is a modest attempt to make sense of a text written by one of the mystical figures of Ottoman times, a sample that can be addressed in the context of the Avicennian corpus.

Key Words: Ibn Sīnā, Ibn ʿArabī, Ottoman philosophy, *taṣawwuf*, attributes of God

I

The history of Ottoman thought is a history that portrays an eclectic and thus selective character in every aspect of its progress. The best known and the most available text on the genealogy of Ottoman scholars *al-Shaqāʾiq al-Nuʿmāniyya fī ʿulamāʾ al-Dawla al-ʿUthmāniyya* by Ṭāshkuprīzāda (d. 968/1561) presents ten generations (*ṭabaqāt*) of the Ottoman *elite*, all of which are categorized according to the particular reign of the Ottoman Sultans they lived during. The tone of the political concerns in the book is so powerful and immanent that the author himself, early in the book, acknowledges that he is compiling a biographical work and taking into consideration the Ottoman lineage of sultanate, as it was completed in the shadow (*fī ẓilāl*) of a state upon which God bestowed forceful (*qāhira*) rulers;[1] even he is inevitably in a position to gladly express these feelings. To understand the general character of Ottoman thought from the beginning, it is necessary to note that the Ottoman cultural atmosphere was always immersed with mystical tendencies under different names. This, of course, may give us clues as to why "mystical Avicennism," as I call it, endured through the ages in the Ottoman lands, together with the other aspects of the philosophy of *al-Sheikh al-Raʾīs*, i.e., Ibn Sīnā (d. 428/1037), and particularly in our example, in the form of the thought of another respected figure in the Ottoman times, i.e., Ibn ʿArabī (d. 638/1240).

The first lineage of the Ottoman scholars represented in *al-Shaqāʾiq* are, reasonably, nothing more than "founding father" personalities who undoubtedly played roles in shaping the scientific atmosphere of a new-born state. It is not until the second generation that we find scholars whose scientific activities can be considered to be within the scope of the traditional Islamic curricula. Among these first three generations, there are two figures that interest us because of their scientific mission to determine the basic tendencies in the history of Ottoman thought. One of them, Dāwūd al-Qayṣarī (d.

---

[1]   Abū l-Khayr ʿIṣām al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Muṣṭafā Ṭāshkuprīzāda, *al-Shaqāʾiq al-Nuʿmāniyya fī ʿulamāʾ al-Dawla al-ʿUthmāniyya* (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1975), 6.

751/1350), belongs to the second generation, i.e., from the time of Orkhān Ghāzī. The author of a commentary on Ibn ʿArabī's famous work, *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, Dāwūd al-Qayṣarī is known for being a loyal follower of Ibn ʿArabī's school of thought, especially after he personally met and spent time with ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Kāshānī (d. 736/1335).[2] One generation after al-Qayṣarī, Jamāl al-Dīn al-Aqsarāyī (d. 791/1388?) arises as an eminent personality, as evidenced by his being subject to the direct interest of the Sultan after he (al-Aqsarāyī) was commissioned to compile a work on morality (*Akhlāq-i Jamālī*)[3] and after he supplied an "authoritative environment" to some prominent scholars who are not pleased with the status quo in some madrasas.[4] The authority of him undoubtedly comes from as well, his blood relation to Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209), a polymath who was respected as "the leader" (*al-imām*) in any scholarly circle of Ottoman thought, so much so that the general character of Ottoman religious thought is often defined as "the school of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī" (tr. "Fahreddîn Râzî Mektebi").[5]

A descendent of Jamāl al-Dīn al-Aqsarāyī, the subject of the article, Jamāl al-Khalwatī (d. 899/1494?), comes to the fore as a typical Ottoman scholar who is not only trained in the Ottoman madrasa system in the traditional way, like his other Ottoman colleagues, but also has a strong mystical orientation. He is the founder of one of the main branches in the Khalwatiyya order, Jamāliyya. According to sources, Jamāl al-Khalwatī's appetite for the Sufi society developed when he

---

[2]   Cağfer Karadaş, "Dâvûd-i Kayserî ve Genel Hatlarıyla Düşüncesi [Dāwūd al-Qayṣarī and His Thoughts with Broad Strokes]," *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* [*The Review of the Faculty of Theology, Uludağ University*] 25/2 (2006), 5 ff.

[3]   Ḥājī Khalīfa Muṣṭafā ibn ʿAbd Allāh Kātib Chalabī, *Kashf al-ẓunūn ʿan asāmī l-kutub wa-l-funūn* (eds. M. Şerefettin Yaltkaya and Kilisli Rifat Bilge; vol. I, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1941), 36.

[4]   The first Ottoman Sheikh al-Islām Mullā Fanārī, during his education, took refuge in his circle, when he disliked ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn al-Aswad, who held the official chair in the Madrasa of Iznik [Nicaea], see Ṭāshkuprīzāda, *al-Shaqāʾiq*, 9.

[5]   İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devletinin İlmiye Teşkilatı* [*Educational Organization of Ottoman State*] (3rd edn., Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1988), 75-77. Uzunçarşılı adds that in the scientific circles of the 13th century, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī was being called *sheikh al-ʿulamāʾ* (the chief of the scholars) as well.

became bored studying the standard text of the madrasa curricula, *Mukhtaṣar al-Talkhīṣ*, a work written in the field of Arabic rhetoric as a commentary by Saʿd al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī on al-Qazwīnī's *Talkhīs al-Miftāḥ*.[6] In the biographical sources, al-Khalwatī is generally portrayed as a Turkish Sufi poet; however, the fact that he chose to write many of his works in Arabic might be interpreted as a desire to be regarded as a contributor to the Akbarī (related to Ibn ʿArabī) literature. This attitude, as shown in the example of his commentary on Ibn Sīnā's letter, may be regarded as his personal contribution to influencing Avicennian thought in Ottoman times and promoting its "political survival" in the guise of Islamic mysticism, a situation that allegorically reminds us of Ibn Sīnā's setting for Iṣfahān when he had political troubles and disguised himself in Sufi dress.[7]

II

There have always been discussions among researchers as to whether Ibn Sīnā has mystical inclinations in his writings. Although some categorically deny any mental or physical engagement between him and *taṣawwuf* or Sufi circles, there still remains the basic fact that at least some of Ibn Sīnā's major writings, such as *al-Ishārāt wa-l-tanbīhāt* (esp. the ninth *namaṭ* titled "Maqāmāt al-ʿārifīn"), have allusions to the Sufi vocabulary. Several manuscript collections of Ibn Sīnā we have today in different libraries, bear witness to correspondence between Ibn Sīnā and the contemporary Sufi, Abū Saʿīd ibn Abī l-Khayr (d. 440/1049) of Khurāsān. In this regard, it is not surprising to find some researchers who tend to label the correspondence as forgery,[8] as the correspondence would otherwise supply direct evi-

---

6   For details about the life of Jamāl al-Khalwatī, see Muharrem Çakmak, "Türk Mutasavvıf Şairi Aksaraylı Cemal Halvetî [A Turkish Sufi Poet Jamāl al-Khalwatī of Aksaray]," *EKEV Akademi Dergisi* [*EKEV Academy Journal*] 16/3 (2003), 181-196.

7   See William E. Gohlman, *The Life of Ibn Sīnā* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1974), 63.

8   See, especially, observations by David C. Reisman in his notable study on Avicenna research: David C. Reisman, "A New Standard for Avicenna Studies," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122/3 (2002), 567 ff. At first instance, he states that the correspondence "consists of some *authentic* Avicennian letters to Bahmanyār and Ibn Zayla related in different ways to … *Mubāḥathāt* and outright *forgeries* that emerged from the hagiographical tradition connected to Abū Saʿīd ibn Abī l-Khayr begun in the seventh/thirteenth century…" (p. 567, the ital-

dence for Ibn Sīnā's actual contact with mystics. In this article, I am not in a position to delve into the authentication of this correspondence. Given that the title proposes nothing but a general concept called "Avicennism," the fact that it was taken as a work belonging to the Ibn Sīnā corpus by Ottomans and by others as well, is adequate for us to evaluate it in a context that aims at describing the impact of Ibn Sīnā's scholarly heritage.

The letters that i have selected as the subject of our article display an intriguing and brief correspondence (**Text I**). The first letter by Abū Saʿīd, which may not be regarded as a conventional letter because of its brevity, consists of a single appeal by Abū Saʿīd to Ibn Sīnā. In essence, it consists of the phrase *arshidnī* ("guide me!," in some MSs, "show me the evidence!"). Ibn Sīnā's answer to that appeal seemingly reveals tempting aspects of his overall theological stance, as even the message is not totally clear to readers like us who want to interfere in the correspondence between two great "mystics." As the overall meaning in the *Risāla* indicates, according to Ibn Sīnā, to enter the literal unbelief (*kufr*) and quit the figurative belief (*islām*), one must only look beyond "the three personalities" (i.e., *muslim* [*muʾmin*], *kāfir*, and *mushrik*). If someone is beyond (*warāʾ*) this, there is not any label such as "believer" or "unbeliever" therein; but if under (*taḥt*) this, then he/she is a polytheist (*mushrik*) and a believer at the same time. Aside from these two positions described as *beyond* and *under*, if someone is totally ignorant, then he/she has no way other than to be excluded from the two existences, and thus, be-

---

ics are ours), thus setting aside the question as to which of these letters should be avoided as forgeries and on what grounds. However, later he concludes that all correspondence can be regarded as forgeries, probably products of a later Sufi or Ishrāqī tradition, by stating that he has "good evidence for arguing against the authenticity…" (p. 568). Our main approach here is not to impose any essentialist understanding either to a polymathic figure like Ibn Sīnā or to Abū Saʿīd ibn Abī l-Khayr, whose personality is unfairly seen by Reisman as belonging to a "tradition that sought to make of Abū Saʿīd an intellectual that he most likely was not…" (p. 574). Cf. idem., *The Making of the Avicennan Tradition: The Transmission, Contents, and Structure of Ibn Sīnā's* al-Mubāḥaṯāt *(The Discussions)* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2002), 138 ff.

comes priceless.⁹

Now, if the whole Avicennian corpus is taken into consideration, it is very unusual to come across such vocabulary as "believer" and "unbeliever" in their religious sense in his writings. In a way, this can be explained by the fact that Ibn Sīnā avoided using terms that related to the juridical/theological area in the classical Islamic literature that was called "names and judgments" (*al-asmā' wa-l-aḥkām*). This area, which addresses what basic religious nominations such as *muslim, kāfir,* and *fāsiq* theologically and socially mean, is not a concern of a philosopher in its true meaning, namely, one who is after universal truth. This brings to the question whether Ibn Sīnā, as a *Muslim* philosopher, wrote any work on Muslim catechism (*ʿaqīda*), which might satisfy his contemporaries by defending his true religion, as expected from someone who adheres to Islam. The closest to that among his works is his *al-Risāla al-ʿarshiyya*,¹⁰ a work written in

---

9   For a translation and a different evaluation of the correspondence in comparison with al-Ghazālī's thoughts, see Frank Griffel, *Al-Ghazālī's Philosophical Theology* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2009), 84-85.

10   Reisman, again, raises his doubt about the authenticity of *al-Risāla al-ʿarshiyya* and comments that the *Risāla* should be added to the pseudo-Avicennian works; Reisman, "Stealing Avicenna's Books: A Study of the Historical Sources for the Life and Times of Avicenna," in Reisman and Ahmed H. Al-Rahim (eds.), *Before and After Avicenna: Proceedings of the First Conference of the Avicenna Study Group* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 125 (n. 102). However, I see no reason to exclude the *Risāla* from the Avicenna corpus since the ideas demonstrated therein perfectly coincide with the general philosophical attitudes of Ibn Sīnā in his other works. Furthermore, after some specific studies of the *Risāla* in the framework of my ongoing PhD thesis (*Ibn Sīnā's Influence on Islamic Theology*), my hunch is that the *Risāla* is suitable to be linked to the proper *kalāmic* background of Ibn Sīnā's established oppositions, as is seen in his other writings such as *al-Najāt* and *al-Shifā'*. Yet, I am totally aware that this cannot be established without elaborate examination of all items, a task that exceeds the limits of this article.

However, this does not mean that the printed editions of the *Risāla* do not have some serious problems. For instance, the printed versions attributed to him naming the Muʿtazila as *Ṣifātiyya*, although it is utterly strange and unusual to refer to Muʿtazila in this way (see Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ibn Sīnā, *al-Risāla al-ʿarshiyya* [ed. Ibrāhīm Hilāl; Cairo: Jāmiʿat al-Azhar, 1980], 23; idem., *al-Risāla al-ʿarshiyya fī tawḥīdihⁱ taʿālā wa-ṣifātihⁱ*, in *Majmūʿ rasāʾil al-Sheikh al-Raʾīs* [Hyderabad: Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUthmāniyya, 1354 H], 7). This would have only been interpreted by the grave ignorance of either the author (Ibn Sīnā) or the editors about the general history of Islamic theology. Thankfully, it is determined

accordance with one of his followers' wishes to learn the realities (*ḥaqāʾiq*) of the science of God's unity (*ʿilm al-tawḥīd*).[11] Nevertheless, the overall methodological viewpoint drawn therein by Ibn Sīnā is but a perfect summary of his philosophical stance, which derives its framework from the dichotomy of necessary and possible beings and the distinction between existence and essence. Thus, the *ʿArshiyya* does not offer any criterion for judging what makes a believer or an unbeliever or for what final case awaits these two persons in the hereafter.

Be that as it may, in an epistle called *al-Aḍḥawiyya fī l-maʿād*, which intentionally uses the religious vocabulary, Ibn Sīnā more clearly emphasizes the belief matters (*al-umūr al-iʿtiqādiyya*) in the theological sense and asserts that, from the religious perspective (*sharʿ*), one must express (*iqrār*) that the creator is one and that far from any material attributes insofar as to fulfill the Islamic creed (*ʿaqīda*), God has no partners with Him.[12] Ibn Sīnā also reports that, according to some of those who believe in the hereafter, there are three types of people: (1) the good-doing believer, whose rewards will be endless, (2) the sinful believer, whose final fate is in the hands of God, and (3) the unbeliever, whose punishment is endless.[13] In general, Ibn Sīnā attributes only the conventional meanings of "believer," "unbeliever," etc., to religious nominations as they are fun-

---

that it is due to a misreading because there is no such word as *Ṣifātiyya* in the well-known MSs of the Ibn Sīnā's epistles. Cf. *al-Risāla al-ʿarshiyya* (MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Nuruosmaniye, 4894), 446a; (MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya, 4849), 35a.

[11] It must be noted here that Ibn Sīnā undeniably sees an essential overlap between the subject matters of metaphysics and theology. Accordingly, it is tempting to note that the major issues he enumerates as being dealt within the science of metaphysics, such as the demonstration of the existence of God, the unity of God, and the attributes of God, were also the preliminary topics the contemporary *kalām* aims at: idem., *Fī aqsām al-ʿulūm al-ʿaqliyya*, in *Tisʿ rasāʾil fī l-ḥikma wa-l-ṭabīʿiyyāt* (2nd ed., Cairo: Dār al-ʿArab, n.d.), 112-113. In doing so, Ibn Sīnā is following his predecessor al-Fārābī, as it can be seen in the latter's *Iḥṣāʾ al-ʿulūm* (see the section on "ʿIlm al-Kalām"). Therefore, later theologians' distinctive effort to equalize *kalām* and *falsafa* in terms of their scopes, has interestingly its roots in the works of these prominent Muslim philosophers.

[12] Ibn Sīnā, *al-Aḍḥawiyya fī l-maʿād* (ed. Ḥasan ʿĀṣī; Beirut: al-Muʾassasa al-Jāmiʿiyya, 1987), 97-98.

[13] *Ibid.*, 92.

damental to the Islamic disciplines. Furthermore, in another less-known epistle of Ibn Sīnā (**Text IV**), where interestingly, he searches for the answers to major philosophical questions such as "What is the reason of man's existence in this world?" Ibn Sīnā explains that this world, as it pertains to human beings, can be regarded as the place of deeds, while the hereafter is the place of God's judgment, thus making an ontological distinction between "this world (*hādhā l-ʿālam*)" and "that world (*dhālika l-ʿālam*)." Accordingly, the eschatological circle for a believer (*muʾmin*) operates as "Heaven-That World-This World-*Barzakh*-That World-Heaven," consequently, ending in the rewards of God, whereas the circle is inevitably broken for the unbelievers, thus they face the punishment of God. Referencing a saying attributed to the Prophet "the world life is jail for the believer," Ibn Sīnā strikingly summarizes his position that man was forcibly brought into the world, he is forcibly being kept in the world and he will forcibly be taken out of the world. Consequently, from that perspective, there is no other way to gain the eternal salvation – one must believe.

Accordingly, Ibn Sīnā himself sees no harm in occasionally applying the traditional Islamic names such as *muslim, kāfir*, etc. and relates them to the issue of the eternal salvation. With respect to this particular point, our epistle adds another aspect, because as understood from the text, it praises what it calls the literal unbelief (*al-kufr al-ḥaqīqī*) while criticizing what it calls the figurative belief (*al-islām al-majāzī*). In this case, the consequence may be that while Ibn Sīnā still adheres to the major tenet for accepting the eternal bliss of the believers, he takes the liberty to deviate from the "al-sawād al-aʿẓam"[14] and re-defines religious categories such as *muslim* and *kāfir*. Thus, it is highly conceivable that one may find some Ismāʿīlī/Bāṭinī roots, thus giving ground to Ibn Sīnā's stance. Regardless, what escapes doubt is that it is this Avicennian aspect that some commentators wanted to see, as in the example of the Ottoman scholars such as Jamāl al-Khalwatī.

III

Ibn ʿArabī is certainly one of the most exceptional figures the Islamic world has ever seen. The works he produced were so well-received by his followers that we come across some efforts which

---

[14]   Ibn Sīnā himself uses this term to render the majority of believers. See *ibid.*, 91.

strive to perceive Islamic heritage from the viewpoint that he adopted and the terminology that he introduced. Obvious enough to be dealt with in a specific study, the epitome of this situation is evidenced in Majd al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Yaʿqūb al-Fīrūzābādī's (d. 817/1415) attempt to write a voluminous commentary on major religious sources such as *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī, which drew upon the many quotations from Ibn ʿArabī's *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyya*.[15] Hence, Jamāl al-Khalwatī's gloss on the correspondence evidently belongs to this genre, as it additionally proposes an amalgamation of the Avicennian influence into Ibn ʿArabī literature.

We know that in addition to al-Khalwatī, there are other attempts to solve the puzzle regarding the correspondence, one of which is from a certain Saʿd al-Dīn al-Kālūnī (?) (**Text III**). This particular interpretation is worth dealing with in a special study due to its interesting references, although it does not restrict its scope to an Ibn ʿArabian framework. Jamāl al-Khalwatī's short gloss has two direct references to Ibn ʿArabī's works[16] (one without mentioning the book), *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, a foremost text particularly in the Ottoman tradition.[17] The reader of this interpretation is not in a position to miss the vocabulary of Ibn ʿArabī, which is noticeably evident in the explanations of al-Khalwatī. These include very apparent terms such as *al-insāniyya*,[18] *tajallī l-dhāt*,[19] *ẓuhūr al-asmāʾ*,[20] *aḥadiyyat al-jamʿ*,[21] among others.

---

[15] Kātib Chalabī, *Kashf al-ẓunūn*, I, 550.

[16] For the first one "qāla l-Sheikh fī l-*Fuṣūṣ* al-ilāh al-muqayyad …" cf. Muḥyī al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad Ibn ʿArabī, *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam* (ed. Abū l-ʿAlā ʿAfīfī; Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1946), 226; for the second "qāla l-Sheikh inna Ṣāḥiba …" cf. *ibid.*, 226.

[17] There is a tradition of writing commentaries on Ibn ʿArabī's *Fuṣūṣ*. This mainly starts with the first *mudarris* in the first official Ottoman university (the Madrasa of Iznik), Dāwūd al-Qayṣarī and intriguingly continues with some "enemy of the state" personalities such as Badr al-Dīn Ibn Qāḍī Samāwnā.

[18] This is a very common term which Ibn ʿArabī generally uses as an adjective. However, there are some occasions when he refers to it as an independent entity. See for example *Fuṣūṣ*, 97: "we know that Zayd is the same with ʿAmr in humanness (*al-insāniyya*) …".

[19] Ibn ʿArabī, *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyya* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 2004), II, 667.

[20] *Ibid.*, I, 125: "Man is … the place where the divine names occur." For the importance of divine names in the philosophy of Ibn ʿArabī, see a very helpful

According to al-Khalwatī's interpretation, Abū Saʿīd ibn Abī l-Khayr's request, "guide me!," is in fact an inquiry about the reality of the secret of humanness, a reality that, as he states, is the very reason for the purpose of the creation of the world. Thus, "entering the real unbelief" provides someone with the explanation of this reality. The terms "belief" and "unbelief" are no more than different manifestations (*tajallī*) of the divine attributes, in accordance with the mystic's personal states. Al-Khalwatī has two definitions for the term *kufr*, both of which have positive connotations in contradiction to the orthodox perception. Although the general character of the letter fully bears Ibn ʿArabī's tone, his interpretation regarding the key term of the letter, "three persons (*al-shukhūṣ al-thalātha*)," is hopefully one of the instances where he comes close to Ibn Sīnā's philosophy. In one alternative explanation, he holds that the three persons mentioned in the letter represent the three stages of God's unity: the unity in His actions, the unity in His attributes, and the unity in His essence.

At this particular point, it is appropriate to deal with al-Khalwatī's stance with respect to one of the most complex problems in classical Islamic theology, i.e., whether the attributes of God are identical to his Essence or different from his Essence, in a context that can be called "Avicennian." First, "the orthodox point of view" on God's unity, as represented in a standard text of the Ottoman madrasa curricula,[22] *Matn al-ʿaqāʾid* by ʿUmar al-Nasafī and its commentary by al-Taftāzānī is as follows: The attributes are neither identical to, nor different from Him (*lā huwa wa-lā ghayruhū*).[23] According to the Sunnī perspective, because the Muʿtazilites hold that any identity besides God would lead to the multitude of eternal beings (*taʿaddud al-*

---

chapter in Ekrem Demirli, *İslam Metafiziğinde Tanrı ve İnsan: İbnü'l-Arabi ve Vahdet-i Vücud Geleneği* [*God and Man in Islamic Metaphysics: Ibn ʿArabī and the Waḥdat al-Wujūd Tradition*] (Istanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi, 2009), 123 ff.

[21] *Ibid.*, III, 81: "the unity (*aḥadiyya*) of the imām is the unity of *jamʿ* ..."

[22] For the importance of the text in the Ottoman education system, see for example: Mefail Hızlı, "Osmanlı Medreselerinde Okutulan Dersler ve Eserler [Courses and Textbooks in Ottoman Madrasas]," *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* [*The Review of the Faculty of Theology, Uludağ University*] 17/1 (2008), 39. As stated in the article, along with al-Taftāzānī's work, Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī's *Tajrīd al-ʿaqāʾid* must surely be included in the standard texts of the Ottoman curricula.

[23] Abū Ḥafṣ Najm al-Dīn ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad al-Nasafī, *al-ʿAqāʾid* (with *Sharḥ al-ʿAqāʾid* by al-Taftāzānī) (Istanbul: Ḥājī Muḥarram Efendī Maṭbaʿasi, 1288 H), 149.

qudamā) – a notion contrary to the Islamic creed of the unity of God – they are labeled as the deniers of God's attributes.[24] In fact, this placed them in a very dangerous position from a religious standpoint because in the classical *fatwā* collections, the verdict for those who hold that God is the knower without the attribute of knowledge, namely the position of Muʿtazila, is to strip them of the name of Muslim.[25]

It is tempting to argue that Ibn ʿArabian notion of God's attributes deviated from the orthodox theory, while such intense opposition from the Sunnī/Ḥanafī side still aroused hostility against any unorthodox ideas regarding the issue. According to ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Jāmī's (d. 898/1492) *al-Durra al-fākhira*, a work that was written at the request of the Ottoman Emperor Meḥmed II, to contrast the tenets of the three major groups (philosophers, theologians, and mystics) with respect to the basic theological issues, Ibn ʿArabī, when defending his position on the attributes of God, goes so far as to argue that the idea that "God's attributes are different from his Essence" is tantamount to pure disbelief and polytheism.[26] Not surprisingly, Ibn ʿArabī's Ottoman followers preserved this general stance of their *al-Sheikh al-Akbar*, in spite of the fact that some nuances were likely to be found from one author to another.[27] In his commentary on Ibn

---

[24] Abū Muḥammad Nūr al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Maḥmūd ibn Abī Bakr al-Ṣābūnī, *al-Kifāya fī uṣūl al-dīn* (MS Bursa, İnebey Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Hüseyin Çelebi, 579), 20b.

[25] Aḥmad Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn al-Gumushkhānawī, *Jāmiʿ al-mutūn* (Istanbul: Dār al-Ṭibāʿa al-ʿĀmira, 1856), 32 (on the margin). According to an excerpt from the famous *fatwā* collection *Tātārkhāniyya* "those who say that God is knower without the attribute of knowledge, and they are Muʿtazilites and philosophers, since they hold that all attributes of God is identical to Him (*ʿayn dhātih*), must be denounced as unbelievers (*yuḥkam bi-kufrihim*)."

[26] Abū l-Barakāt Nūr al-Dīn Mullā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Aḥmad al-Jāmī, *al-Durra al-fākhira*, in Fakhr al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar al-Rāzī, *Asās al-taqdīs* (Cairo: Maṭbaʿat Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1935), 208.

[27] One might argue that there is the issue of how one can make sense of the era (i.e., the Ottoman period) in which the legal Sunnī stances were strictly applied on the one hand, and the followers of mystic tendencies that departed from the Sunnī view accepted on official grounds on the other hand. Maybe, the fact that Ottoman atmosphere was a melting pot of different authoritative discourses based on the different religious fields in Islamic culture, mainly *fiqh*, *kalām*, and *taṣawwuf* can be taken as a starting point for an easy yet insufficient explanation.

ʿArabī's *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, Dāwūd al-Qayṣarī meticulously applies the terminology of the Ibn ʿArabī to the issue of attributes. There are two levels (*martaba*) with regard to the essence of God. At the level of *aḥadiyya*, there is but the essence and entity of God, without any attributes or names. The level of *wāḥidiyya* talks about the attributes and the names of God. However, there is one condition, which is that the distinction between *ṣifa* (attribute) and *mawṣūf* (attributed) only occurs in the human mind. In reality, there is nothing but One Existent. In this regard, *Amīr al-muʾminīn* ʿAlī said, "The perfect devotion to God is to negate all attributes attached to his Essence."[28]

Hence, the deviation of Ibn ʿArabī and his followers from the Sunnī understanding of attributes was to serve the ultimate goal of preserving the unity of God (*tawḥīd, waḥda*), a notion that fully coincides with Ibn Sīnā's ideas. While it surely has its background in the Sufi literature, al-Khalwatī's three-fold understanding of God's oneness, as mentioned herein, is also a philosophical stance that is adapted by Ibn Sīnā as well.[29] In another instance, al-Khalwatī comments on the Qurʾānic chapter *al-Ikhlāṣ* (**Text IV**) and once again mentions this three-fold unity in the identical terms, providing more clues about his understanding of God's attributes such that the attributes of God must be identical to His essence, not distinct from it (*ṣifāt al-dhāt ʿayn dhātihī laysat bi-zāʾida*); only in this way does He gains the true meaning of unity.

It is also of interest that al-Khalwatī's clear philosophical position particularly came under his commentary on *sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ*, since, in his commentary on the chapter *al-Ikhlāṣ*, Ibn Sīnā himself took the chance to stress his neo-Platonist idea of God's absolute unity in a tone that much resembles that of the Sufis. In the first place, a careful reader would not miss some of the central vocabulary that Ibn Sīnā used, especially *wāḥidiyya*[30] and *aḥadiyya*,[31] considering how much

---

[28]   Sharaf al-Dīn Dāwūd ibn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad al-Qayṣarī, *Matlaʿ khuṣūṣ al-kalim fī maʿānī Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam* (revised by Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Sāʿidī; n.p.: Manshūrāt Anwār al-Hudā, 1416 H), I, 27-28.

[29]   Ibn Sīnā's outline in his *al-Risāla al-ʿarshiyya* relies on the unity of the essence, attributes, and actions of God. See especially (Ibrāhīm Hilāl's edition), 36.

[30]   Ibn Sīnā, *Fī tafsīr al-ṣamadiyya*, in his *Jāmiʿ al-badāyiʿ* (ed. Muḥyī al-Dīn Ṣabrī al-Kurdī; Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Saʿāda, 1335 H), 19.

[31]   *Ibid.*, 23.

Ibn ʿArabī and his followers rely on these two terms when explaining the unity of God and His attributes.[32] It would be anachronistic to assume that Ibn Sīnā utilized these terms to render the same notions in the school of Ibn ʿArabī. However, there is no doubt that Ibn Sīnā's whole point in the commentary is the absolute unity of God's essence (*dhāt*) and that there is not any sign of plurality (*kathra*) in Him. With that in mind, there is no way to know his Essence except through negations (*sulūb*) and nominal additions (*iḍāfāt*).

IV

In what sense do we talk about Avicennism in Ottoman thought in general? There is no doubt that Ottoman scholars are well aware of the philosophy and the thought of Ibn Sīnā as they are loyal disciples of the school of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī and his followers, such as Quṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī al-Taḥtānī, Sirāj al-Dīn al-Urmawī, Saʿd al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī, Jalāl al-Dīn al-Dawānī, and al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī, all of whom were "immersed" in the Avicennian corpus as adherents to a period called "the later *kalām.*" It must be noted, however, that the early encounters of the Ottoman circles with Ibn Sīnā were mainly through the works of the followers of Ibn ʿArabī, not through works of the major theologians listed above. If we take the example of a monumental figure of the early Ottoman times, i.e., Mullā Fanārī, who was seen as a towering personality of his time for representing the "true" stance in religious sciences,[33] it can be observed that his "Avicennism" is coming from such Akbarian tendencies, mainly from Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī (d. 672/1273).[34] In the meantime, there is the thought-provoking fact that it is rare to come across any separate commentary on one of Ibn Sīnā's major works, such as *al-Shifāʾ*, *al-*

---

[32]   To follow the two terms in Badr al-Dīn Ibn Qāḍī Samāwnā, see his *al-Wāridāt* (MS Bursa, İnebey Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Ulucami, 1698, dated 920 H), 18a.

[33]   Ṭāshkuprīzāda, *Mawsūʿat muṣṭalaḥāt miftāḥ al-saʿāda wa-miṣbāḥ al-siyāda fī mawḍūʿāt al-ʿulūm* (ed. ʿAlī Daḥrūj; Beirut: Maktabat Lubnān Nāshirūn, 1998), 251 (article: "*al-ʿilm al-ilāhī*").

[34]   See Janssens's relevant evaluations in terms of the theory of emanation: Jules Janssens, "Elements of Avicennian Influence in al-Fanārī's Theory of Emanation," in Tevfik Yücedoğru et al (eds.), *Uluslararası Molla Fenârî Sempozyumu (4-6 Aralık 2009 Bursa) – Bildiriler – (International Symposium on Molla Fanārī [4-6 December 2009 Bursa] – Proceedings –)* (Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, 2010), 315 ff.

Isḥārāt wa-l-tanbīhāt,[35] or *al-Najāt*. One can argue that this situation is meaningful, if we consider the fact that we are talking about a period in Islamic thought in which any philosophical or theological stance was being developed in the form of commentaries and glosses on some major works. However, Jamāl al-Khalwatī's commentary on Ibn Sīnā's letter can still be regarded as a rare example of commentaries on Ibn Sīnā's own works.

Notes on the Arabic Texts

Text I

As for the correspondence between Ibn Sīnā and Abū Saʿīd ibn Abī l-Khayr, I took the MS Bursa, İnebey Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Genel, 1460, 14b-15a (ب) as the base text, for it has the interpretation of al-Khalwatī as well. Other versions of the correspondence include: ʿAbd al-Amīr Shams al-Dīn, *al-Madhhab al-tarbawī ʿinda Ibn Sīnā min khilāl falsafatih¹ l-ʿilmiyya* (Beirut: al-Sharika al-ʿĀlamiyya li-l-Kitāb, 1988), 398 (ش); MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Nuruosmaniye, 4894, 247a, (under the heading "Kalām li-l-Sheikh Abī ʿAlī Ibn Sīnā ʿalā ṭarīqat al-taṣawwuf") (ن). The editing begins with Ibn Sīnā's response.

Text II

The interpretation of Jamāl al-Khalwatī on the correspondence: MS Bursa, İnebey Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Genel, 1460, 14b-15a.

Text III

The interpretation of Saʿd al-Dīn al-Kālūnī (?) on the correspondence: MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Nuruosmaniye, 4894, 247a.

Text IV

Jamāl al-Khalwatī's commentary on the "sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ," MS Bursa, İnebey Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Genel, 1460, 59b-60a.

---

[35]   One exception is Kamālpashazāda's *Sharḥ al-Isḥārāt wa-l-tanbīhāt*.

Text V

Ibn Sīnā, *Risāla fī l-mabdaʾ wa-l-maʿād*, MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Nuruosmaniye, 4894, 435b-436a (ن); MS Nevşehir, Hacıbektaş İlçe Halk Kütüphanesi, 236, 79a-79b (under the heading "Min kalām al-Sheikh al-Raʾīs Abī ʿAlī Ibn Sīnā") (و).

Text I

بسم اللّه الرحمن الرحيم و به نستعين. و صلى اللّه على سيدنا محمد و آله أجمعين.

كتب الشيخ أبو سعيد بن أبي الخير قدس سره العزيز إلى الشيخ الرئيس أبي علي بن عبد اللّه بن سينا. فقال في كتابه إنه :"أرشدني". [36] فكتب الرئيس في جوابه: "الدخول في الكفر الحقيقي و الخروج عن الإسلام المجازي أن لا تلتفت إلا إلى[37]ما وراء[38] الشخوص الثلاثة حتى تكون[39] مسلما و[40] كافرا، و إن كنت وراء هذا فلست مؤمنا و لا كافرا، و إن كنت تحت هذا فأنت مشرك[41] و[42] مسلم،[43] وإن كنت جاهلا[44] فأنت[45] تعلم أنك[46] لا قيمة[47] لك و لا تعدّ[48] من جملة الوجودين".[49] فلما وصل جوابه إلى الشيخ أبي سعيد استحسنه حتى ذكر في كتابه المسمى *بالمصباح*[50]: "أوصلني هذه الكلمات إلى ما أوصله إليه[51] ألف سنة من العبادة".

Text II

قوله "أرشدني" طلب عن بيان حقيقة سر الإنسانية و هو مقصود أصلي من إيجاد العالم. قوله الرئيس "الدخول في الكفر الحقيقي و الخروج عن الإسلام المجازي" بيان عن هذه الحقيقة. و الكفر عبارة عن تجلي[52] الذات بطريق الصفات الجلالية، و هو إما على طريق النزول، و هو خفاء الذات بظهور الأسماء على مظاهرها بحسب استعداداتهم

---

[36] ن: "دلني على الدليل"

[37] ب، ش: - إلى

[38] ب، ش: بما وراء

[39] ب: يكون

[40] ن: - و

[41] ن: مسلم

[42] ش، ن: - و

[43] ن: مشرك

[44] ن: + بجميع هذا

[45] ن: فإنك

[46] ش، ن: أن

[47] ب: همة

[48] ب: نقد + لك ن: + لك

[49] ش: الموجودين

[50] ن: المصابيح

[51] ب: + ما

[52] في الأصل: تجلية

و قابلياتهم. و إما على طريق العروج و هو ظهور الذات باستهلاك (ال)تعينات الكونية[53] و العلمية عن مظاهرها بحسب المراتب. و الإسلام هو التجلي الذاتي بصفته الجمالية، و هو إما بعد الجمع أو[54] قبل الجمع. و المراد بالدخول فى الكفر الحقيقي، أي الاتصاف بالكفر، و هو شهود سريان أحدية الذات إلى المظاهر مع استهلال النظر الى الغير.

و قوله "و الخروج عن الإسلام المجازي" أي تنزيه الذات عن التجليات الخاصة كما قال الشيخ فى *الفصوص* الإله المقيد المعتقدات تأخذ الحدود و هو الإله الذي وسعه قلب عبده. فإن الإله المطلق لا يسعه شيء.

و قوله "ان لا تلتفت" اي لا تصل إلى هذا السر إلا بالتجريد عن الشخوص الثلاثة اي توحيد الأفعال[55] و الصفات و الذات. و في هذه الجمعية كان الإنسان سر الله و بالماوراء الرد إلى الحضرة العبودية لأن الله تعالى سر للعبد فيه.

قوله "حتى تكون مسلما" اي (١٥أ) وافقا على سر التجليات و هي شهود أحدية الجمع بين الأسماء كلها.

قوله "و كافرا" اي لا ترى فى كل شيء غير الله.

قوله "و إن كنت وراء هذا" اي و إن كنت مستويا في هذا و لست مؤمنا و لا كافرا، لأن الاعتبارات مسقوطة فيه، كما قيل "إذا تم الفقر فهو الله".

قوله "و إن كنت تحت هذا" اي و إن كنت مقيدا فأنت مشرك، لأن عبد الله ليس بعبد الرحيم، كما قال الشيخ إن صاحب هذا المعبود الخاص جاهل بلا شك.

قوله "و إن كنت جاهلا الخ" اي و إن لم يكن استعدادك فى العلم لم يوجد فى الغير، و يجوز أن يراد بالشخوص، السير إلى الله من منازل النفس إلى نهاية مقام القلب، والسير مع الله بالاتصاف بصفاته و التحقق بأسمائه، و السير فى الله و هو عين الجمع و نهاية الولاية و بالماوراء السير بالله عن الله و هو مقام البقاء بعد الفناء و الله يقول الحق و هو يهدي السبيل. تم بعون الله الملك الجليل.

Text III

(٢٤٧أ) ... هذا و قد حل الإمام العلامة سعد الدين الكالوني كلمات الشيخ الرئيس فقال: و ما توفيقي إلا بالله، عليه توكلت و إليه أنيب. اعلم أيها الحائض في لجج هذه الحجج أنه لا يتيسر(؟) لك هذه الطريقة إلا بالدخول في الكفر الحقيقي المشار إليه بقوله

---

[53] في الأصل: الكونين

[54] في الأصل: و

[55] في الأصل: التوحيد الأفعال

"و لكن قولوا أسلمنا" (الحجرات ٤٩:١٤)، فمن يكفر بالطاغوت (البقرة ٢٥٦:٢)، و هو الإعراض عما سوى الله تعالى بالكلية، و الخروج عن الإسلام المجازي المشار إليه بقوله "و لكن قولوا أسلمنا". و يؤكد ما قلنا قول أبي المغيث الحسن بن منصور الحلاج: كفرت بدين الله و الكفر واجب لدي و عند المسلمين قبيح. و قصر الالتفات على ما وراء الشخوص الثلاثة أي أصحاب الجنة و أصحاب الأعراف و أصحاب النار حتى تصير بذلك من أهل الله و خاصته و يكون مسلما لله و كافرا بما سواه. ثم بعد الالتفات إن كنت وراء هذا مرتب من إطلاق اللفظين، و إن كنت تحت هذا أي في مراتب الشخوص الثلاثة فأنت مسلم باعتبار الانقياد مشرك باعتبار الالتفات إلى الغير. و إن كنت جاهلا من جميع هذا فاعلم أنه لا قيمة لك و لا تعدّ من جملة الوجودين[56] أي تفصيل النشأتين و تحصيل السعادتين. قال الله تعالى "أولئك الذين كفروا بآيات ربهم و لقائه فحبطت أعمالهم فلا نقيم لهم يوم القيامة وزنا" (الكهف ١٠٥:١٨). هذا ما حج له الوقت و حاد به الحال. و الله المستعان.

Text IV

(٥٩ب)... سورة الإخلاص بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم. "قل هو الله أحد" قل أمر من عين الجمع وارد على مظهر التفاصيل عند أهل الله تعالى، هو عبارة عن الحقيقة الأحدية المحصنة أي الذات من حيث هي بلا اعتبار صفة لا يعرفها إلا هو. "الله" بدل منه و هو اسم الذات المستجمع بجميع الصفات و علم من كونه بدلا أن صفات الله عين ذاته ليست بزائدة بل هي عينه، لا فرق إلا بالاعتبار العقلي. و لهذا سميت سورة الإخلاص. لأن الإخلاص تمحيض الحقيقة الأحدية عن شائبة الكثرة، كما قال أمير المؤمنين علي رضي الله عنه: كمال الإخلاص نفي الصفات بشهادة كل صفة أنها غير موصوف بشهادة موصوف غير صفة. "أحد" خبر المبتدأ و الفرق بين الأحد و الواحد ظاهر. لأن الأحد هو الذات بلا اعتبار الصفات و الواحد هو الذات مع جميع الصفات و هي الحضرة الأسمائية. "الله الصمد" أي الملجأ المطلق لكل الأشياء لافتقارها في وجوداتها و ما يتعلق بها و ذات[57] الله تعالى غني عن العالمين "لم يلد" أي لا شريك له في ذاته "و لم يولد" أي لم يكن لصفاته احتياج إلى شيء في الوجود "و لم يكن له كفوا أحد" أي منزه عن النظير.

و يجوز أن يراد من قوله تعالى "قل هو" أنه رد لمن أنكر وجود الحق و قال إنه ليس بموجود و قوله تعالى "أحد" أنه رد لمن قال إن الخالق إثنان أي خالق النور غير خالق الظلمة، و قوله تعالى "الله الصمد" أنه رد لمن قال إنه يأكل و يشرب، و قوله "لم يلد و لم يولد" أنه رد لمن قال إن الملائكة بنات الله تعالى و عزير ابن الله، و قوله "و لم يكن له

---

[56] في الأصل: لا قيمة له و لا لك من جميع الوجودين

[57] في الأصل: ذوات

كفوا أحد" أنه رد لقول المشبهة و المجسمة سبحانه و تعالى عما يقول الظالمون علوا كبيرا.

و يجوز أن يراد من قوله "قل هو الله أحد" التوحيد الذاتي و قوله (٦٠أ) "الله الصمد" التوحيد الصفاتي، و قوله "لم يلد و لم يولد و لم يكن له كفوا أحد" التوحيد الأفعالي.

و اعلم أن في قوله "هو" إشارة إلى أن أول الموجودات هو و آخرها هو، لأن الهاء من أقصى الخلق و منتهى المخارج فافهم.

و يؤيده أن وقوع لفظة الله تعالى بين الإسمين، لأن "هو" و "الأحد" يدلان على الجمال (الإجمال؟) و ما وقع بينهما يدل على التفصيل.

Text V

(٤٣٥ب)... *رسالة في المبدأ و المعاد* للشيخ الرئيس أبي علي بن سينا. بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم. الحمد لله حمد الشاكرين و صلواته على سيد الأولين و الآخرين محمد و آله الطيبين الطاهرين من كلام الشيخ رحمه الله.

المسألة الأولى: أنا من أيّ موضع جئنا إلى هذا العالم؟ الجواب: اعلم أنا من ذلك العالم جئنا إلى هذا العالم، و حد هذا العالم من فوق فلك البروج تحت الفلك المستقيم إلى هذه الأرض. و حد ذلك العالم [58] من فوق الفلك المستقيم إلى تحت مرتبة القلم الذي هو العقل الأول. و مجيئنا من ذلك العالم إنما هو من جنة الله تعالى هي خضرة القدس التي بها قدس المقدسون، و تلك هي فوق [59] ذلك العالم و هذا العالم. فأما هذا العالم فهو دار عمل [60] و ذلك العالم دار حساب [61] و الجنة هي [62] دار جزاء المحسنين. و إنا جئنا من الجنة إلى ذلك العالم و من ذلك العالم جئنا إلى هذا العالم، و من هذا العالم نذهب إلى البرزخ، و من البرزخ نرجع إلى ذلك العالم [63] الذي هو موضع الحساب، و من موضع الحساب يرجع من حسن عمله إلى جنة الله تعالى، و يبقى من ساء عمله تحت الطبع و الطبيعة في جهنم أبدا ما دامت السماوات و الأرض إلا ما شاء ربك إن ربك فعال لما يريد. و احتاجوا إلى العمل بغير إرادة منهم ليصلوا إلى الصور الموافقة

---

[58] و: – و حد هذا العالم من فوق فلك البروج تحت الفلك المستقيم إلى هذه الأرض. و حد ذلك العالم

[59] و: – هي فوق + من

[60] و: العمل

[61] و: الحساب

[62] ن: – هي

[63] و: – و من ذلك العالم جئنا إلى هذا العالم، و من هذا العالم نذهب إلى البرزخ، و من البرزخ نرجع إلى ذلك العالم

لأزواجهم من الجنة، و هم⁶⁴ ينالون من تلك الصور التى هي في الطعام و الشراب لذة، و يجدون سكونا إلى الدنيا تحت الطبع و الطبيعة و كذلك يكونون⁶⁵ في قيد الطبيعة يدخلون كارهين من غير إرادة تحت قيد العقل الذي يدره (؟) العمل العقلي الذي جاء به الرسل عليهم السلام مما يشهد به شرائعهم حتى تأنس النفس و تطمئن بتلك الصور العلمية و يجد بها قرارا، لأن أصلها هو أيضا من جنة الله تعالى، و بتلك الاستفادة يضيء لها طريق الصراط وقت ذهابها إلى معادها و يخف حسابها و تثقل موازينها. فقد بين الآن أن البشر بتقدير الابتداء فوق العقل و الطبع لكنهم اليوم محبوسون تحت الطبع و مقيدون بالعقل، و خلاصهم يكون حين يطلقون من قيد العقل و ليس يطلقون من قيد العقل إلا حين يخرجون من سجن الطبع و الطبيعة. و هذه معان مغلقة⁶⁶ يفتحها الشرح للمستحقين إن شاء الله تعالى.

المسألة الثانية: لأي سبب جئنا إلى هذا العالم؟ الجواب: اعلم أن مجيئنا إلى هذا العالم لم يكن باختيارنا و إرادتنا لكن بالقهر جيء بنا و بالقهر نمسك و بالقهر نخرج، و إنما جيء بنا للتمحيص و التطهير "ليمحص الله الذين آمنوا و يمحق الكافرين" (آل عمران ٣:١٤١)، و طهارة النفس إنما تكون بالعمل الشرعي و العلم الإلهي و بهذين يتم الطهارة و التوجه إلى المعاد. و كما أن طهارة الجسد من أنجاسه إنما تكون بالماء أو بالتراب عند عدم الماء، كذلك طهارة النفس بالعلم الذي هو بمنزلة الماء أو بالتراب⁶⁷ الذي هو بمنزلة العمل فقد تبين أن كل من أتى بالعمل الشرعي حتى يصل به إلى العلم الإلهي، فيعلم حقيقته و يقينه⁶⁸ فإنه تخلص عند مفارقة هذه الدنيا التي هي سجن المؤمن، فاعرفه إن شاء الله.

المسألة الثالثة: أنا حين نخرج من هذا العالم إلى أين مرجعنا؟ الجواب: اعلم أن كل إنسان يخرج من هذا العالم تلقاه ملائكة (٤٣٦أ) الرحمة أو ملائكة العذاب فيحملونه⁶⁹ إلى البرزخ، و البرزخ هو قبر النفس⁷⁰ فإن كانت مؤمنة فتح لها باب من الجنة و إن كانت كافرة⁷¹ فتح لها باب من النار إلى ذلك القبر الذي هي فيه، و حد سفل البرزخ علو هذا

---

⁶⁴ و: ‐ هم
⁶⁵ و: يكون
⁶⁶ و: ‐ مغلقة
⁶⁷ و: التراب
⁶⁸ و: تعينه
⁶⁹ ن: يحملونه
⁷⁰ و: ٧٩ب
⁷¹ و: كافرا

العالم و حد سفل ذلك العالم علو[72] البرزخ، و قوة شرائع الأنبياء عليهم السلام هي أن يحمل الإنسان من دار العمل فتوصله إلى البرزخ و بالقوة السابعة يكون حركته في البرزخ، و بالقوة الثامنة يفارق البرزخ، و بالقوة التاسعة يحاسب و بالقوة العاشرة يصل إلى معاده أي إلى جنة الله تعالى التي فيها[73] خلق آدم عليه السلام و أولاده. و هذه أسرار عجيبة تحتها معان كثيرة في شرحها على الحقيقة يكون النجاة و في تحريفها الهلاك، نعوذ بالله من سخته.

المسألة الرابعة: أن ما يكون حالنا بعد مفارقتنا عن[74] الدنيا عند حصولنا في البرزخ. الجواب: اعلم أنا نكون في البرزخ أيقاظا واجدين اللذات الروحانية و الصور التي نستنضجها من هذا العالم من العلم و العمل في الخير و الشر تصير فينا محكمة ذاتية مفرعة[75] مثمرة،[76] و بالجملة إنا نكون في البرزخ كالنطفة في الرحم و البدن في الأرض و يثمر على ما في أصلها التي جائت به[77] من ظهر أبيها حتى إذا اتصلت بها القوة السابعة صار حالها و حكمها إلى لون آخر، و كما يكون المؤمن مستيقظا لوجود الذات و معاينتها،[78] كذلك يجد الكافر عذابا بمعاينة الصور المنكرة المكروهة على ما يوافق علمه و عمله في هذا العالم.[79]

تمت المسائل بجواباتها و الحمد لله أولا و آخرا و صلواته على خير من دب و درج محمد و على آله الطيبين و هو حسبي و نعم الحسيب.

---

[72] و: على

[73] و: - التي فيها

[74] ن: - عن

[75] و: متفرقة

[76] و: مستمرة

[77] و: - به

[78] و: معانيها

[79] و: + و السلام على من اتبع الهدى

REFERENCES

Çakmak, Muharrem, "Türk Mutasavvıf Şairi Aksaraylı Cemal Halvetî [A Turkish Sufi Poet Jamāl al-Khalwatī of Aksaray]," *EKEV Akademi Dergisi* [*EKEV Academy Journal*] 16/3 (2003), 181-196.

Demirli, Ekrem, *İslam Metafiziğinde Tanrı ve İnsan: İbnü'l-Arabi ve Vahdet-i Vücud Geleneği* [*God and Man in Islamic Metaphysics: Ibn ʿArabī and the Waḥdat al-Wujūd Tradition*] (Istanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi, 2009).

Gohlman, William E., *The Life of Ibn Sīnā* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1974).

Griffel, Frank, *Al-Ghazālī's Philosophical Theology* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2009), http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331622.001.0001.

al-Gumushkhānawī, Aḥmad Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn, *Jāmiʿ al-mutūn* (Istanbul: Dār al-Ṭibāʿa al-ʿĀmira, 1856).

Hızlı, Mefail, "Osmanlı Medreselerinde Okutulan Dersler ve Eserler [Courses and Textbooks in Ottoman Madrasas]," *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* [*The Review of the Faculty of Theology, Uludağ University*] 17/1 (2008), 25-46.

Ibn ʿArabī, Muḥyī al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad, *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam* (ed. Abū l-ʿAlā ʿAfīfī; Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1946).

_____ *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyya*, 4 vols., (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 2004).

Ibn Qāḍī Samāwnā, Sheikh Badr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, *al-Wāridāt* (MS Bursa, İnebey Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Ulucami, 1698, dated 920 H).

Ibn Sīnā, Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAbd Allāh, *al-Aḍḥawiyya fī l-maʿād* (ed. Ḥasan ʿĀṣī; Beirut: al-Muʾassasa al-Jāmiʿiyya, 1987).

_____ *Fī aqsām al-ʿulūm al-ʿaqliyya*, in *Tisʿ rasāʾil fī l-ḥikma wa-l-ṭabīʿiyyāt* (2nd ed., Cairo: Dār al-ʿArab, n.d.).

_____ *Fī tafsīr al-ṣamadiyya*, in his *Jāmiʿ al-badāyiʿ* (ed. Muḥyī al-Dīn Ṣabrī al-Kurdī; Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Saʿāda, 1335 H).

_____ *al-Risāla al-ʿarshiyya* (MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Nuruosmaniye, 4894), 445a-449a.

_____ *al-Risāla al-ʿarshiyya* (MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Aya-sofya, 4849), 32b-39b.

_____ *al-Risāla al-ʿarshiyya fī tawḥīdihī taʿālā wa-ṣifātihī*, in *Majmūʿ rasāʾil al-Sheikh al-Raʾīs* (Hyderabad: Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUthmāniyya, 1354 H).

_____ *al-Risāla al-ʿarshiyya* (ed. Ibrāhīm Hilāl; Cairo: Jāmiʿat al-Azhar, 1980).

_____ *Risāla fī l-mabdaʾ wa-l-maʿād* (MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüpha-nesi, Nuruosmaniye, 4894), 435b-436a.

_____ *Min kalām al-Sheikh al-Raʾīs Abī ʿAlī Ibn Sīnā (=Risāla fī l-mabdaʾ wa-l-maʿād)* (MS Nevşehir, Hacıbektaş İlçe Halk Kütüphanesi, 236), 79a-79b.

_____ *Kalām li-l-Sheikh Abī ʿAlī Ibn Sīnā ʿalā ṭarīqat al-taṣawwuf* (MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Nuruosmaniye, 4894), 247a.

Janssens, Jules, "Elements of Avicennian Influence in al-Fanārī's Theory of Emanation," in Tevfik Yücedoğru et al (eds.), *Uluslararası Molla Fenârî Sempozyumu (4-6 Aralık 2009 Bursa) – Bildiriler – (Interna-tional Symposium on Molla Fanārī [4-6 December 2009 Bursa] – Pro-ceedings –)* (Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, 2010).

al-Kālūnī (?), Saʿd al-Dīn, *? (The Interpretation of Saʿd al-Dīn al-Kālūnī on the Correspondence between Ibn Sīnā and Abū Saʿīd ibn Abī l-Khayr)* (MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Nuruosmaniye, 4894), 247a.

Karadaş, Cağfer, "Dâvûd-i Kayserî ve Genel Hatlarıyla Düşüncesi [Dāwūd al-Qayṣarī and His Thoughts with Broad Strokes]," *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* [*The Review of the Faculty of Theology, Uludağ University*] 25/2 (2006), 1-17.

Kātib Chalabī, Ḥājī Khalīfa Muṣṭafā ibn ʿAbd Allāh, *Kashf al-ẓunūn ʿan asāmī l-kutub wa-l-funūn* (eds. M. Şerefettin Yaltkaya and Kilisli Rifat Bilge; vol. I, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 1941).

al-Khalwatī, Jamāl, *Tafsīr al-Fātiḥa wa-min sūrat al-Ḍuḥā ilā ākhir al-Qurʾān* (MS Bursa, İnebey Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Genel, 1460), 47b-61a.

_____ *Sharḥ kalām Ibn Sīnā* (MS Bursa, İnebey Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Genel, 1460), 14b-15a.

Mullā al-Jāmī, Abū l-Barakāt Nūr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Aḥmad, *al-Durra al-fākhira*, in Fakhr al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar al-Rāzī, *Asās al-taqdīs* (Cairo: Maṭbaʿat Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1935).

al-Nasafī, Abū Ḥafṣ Najm al-Dīn ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad, *al-ʿAqāʾid* (with *Sharḥ al-ʿAqāʾid* by al-Taftāzānī) (Istanbul: Ḥājī Muḥarram Efendī Maṭbaʿasi, 1288 H).

al-Qayṣarī, Sharaf al-Dīn Dāwūd ibn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad, *Maṭlaʿ khuṣūṣ al-kalim fī maʿānī Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, 2 vols., (revised by Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Sāʿidī; n.p.: Manshūrāt Anwār al-Hudā, 1416 H).

Reisman, David C., *The Making of the Avicennan Tradition: The Transmission, Contents, and Structure of Ibn Sīnā's* al-Mubāḥathāt *(The Discussions)* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2002).

_____ "A New Standard for Avicenna Studies," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122/3 (2002), 562-577, http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3087524.

_____ "Stealing Avicenna's Books: A Study of the Historical Sources for the Life and Times of Avicenna," in David C. Reisman and Ahmed H. Al-Rahim (eds.), *Before and After Avicenna: Proceedings of the First Conference of the Avicenna Study Group* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

al-Ṣābūnī, Abū Muḥammad Nūr al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Maḥmūd ibn Abī Bakr, *al-Kifāya fī uṣūl al-dīn* (MS Bursa, İnebey Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Hüseyin Çelebi, 579).

Shams al-Dīn, ʿAbd al-Amīr, *al-Madhhab al-tarbawī ʿinda Ibn Sīnā min khilāl falsafatihⁱ l-ʿilmiyya* (Beirut: al-Sharika al-ʿĀlamiyya li-l-Kitāb, 1988).

Ṭāshkuprīzāda, Abū l-Khayr ʿIṣām al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Muṣṭafā, *al-Shaqāʾiq al-Nuʿmāniyya fī ʿulamāʾ al-Dawla al-ʿUthmāniyya* (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1975).

_____ *Mawsūʿat muṣṭalaḥāt miftāḥ al-saʿāda wa-miṣbāḥ al-siyāda fī mawḍūʿāt al-ʿulūm* (ed. ʿAlī Daḥrūj; Beirut: Maktabat Lubnān Nāshirūn, 1998).

Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı, *Osmanlı Devletinin İlmiye Teşkilatı* [*Educational Organization of Ottoman State*] (3rd edn., Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1988).