

ATEBE

Dinî Arařtırmalar Dergisi
Journal for Religious Studies
e-ISSN: 2757-5616

ATEBE Dergisi | Journal of ATEBE

Sayı: 9 (Haziran / June 2023), 27-43

Khōdjā-Zāde's Tahāfut and Its Place in Ottoman Thought

Hocazāde'nin Tehāfüt'ü ve Osmanlı Düşüncesindeki Yeri

Luay Hatem Yaqoob

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Ankara Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi,
İlahiyat Fakültesi, Temel İslam Bilimleri Bölümü
Assistant Professor Dr., Social Sciences University
of Ankara, Faculty of Theology, Department of
Basic Islamic Sciences

Ankara, Türkiye

luay.hatem@asbu.edu.tr

orcid.org/0000-0002-8518-0148

<https://ror.org/025y36b60>

Muhammet Caner Ilgaroğlu

Doç. Dr., Düzce Üniversitesi, İlahiyat Fakültesi,
Felsefe ve Din Bilimleri Bölümü
Associate Professor, Düzce University, Faculty of
Theology, Department of Philosophy and Religious
Studies

Düzce, Türkiye

muhammetcanerilgaroglu@duzce.edu.tr

orcid.org/0000-0001-5712-9401

<https://ror.org/04175wc52>

Makale Bilgisi / Article Information

Makale Türü / Article Types: Arařtırma Makalesi / Research Article

Geliř Tarihi / Date Received: 06 Mart / March 2023

Kabul Tarihi / Date Accepted: 03 Haziran / June 2023

Yayın Tarihi / Date Published: 30 Haziran / June 2023

Yayın Sezonu / Pub Date Season: Haziran/ June

Atıf / Cite as: Luay Hatem Yaqoob – Ilgaroğlu, Muhammet Caner. “Khōdjā-Zāde's Tahāfut and Its Place in Ottoman Thought”. *ATEBE* 9 (Haziran 2023), 27-43. <https://doi.org/10.51575/atebe.1206252>

İntihal / Plagiarism: Bu makale, iTenticate yazılımınca taranmıştır. İntihal tespit edilmemiştir/This article has been scanned by iTenticate. No plagiarism detected.

Etik Beyan/Ethical Statement: Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur/It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited (**Luay Hatem YAQOOB– Muhammet Caner ILGAROĞLU**).

Yazar Katkıları: Çalışmanın Tasarlanması: LY (%50), MCI (%50)

Veri Toplanması: LY (%50), MCI (%50)

Veri Analizi: LY (%50), MCI (%50)

Makale Yazımı: LY (%50), MCI (50)

Makale Gönderimi ve Revizyonu: LY (%50), MCI (%50)

Yayıncı / Published by: Ankara Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi / Social Sciences University of Ankara.

Bu makale Creative Commons Atıf-GayriTicari 4.0 Uluslararası Lisans (CC BY-NC) ile lisanslanmıştır. This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC).

Khōdjā-Zāde's Tahāfut and Its Place in Ottoman Thought

Abstract

In the tradition of Islamic philosophy, *mashhā'iyūn* have been subjected to serious criticism in Ghazālī's (d. 1111) work *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa*, with the claim that their philosophical views are incoherent. *Tahāfut*, which pioneered the structural transformation of Islamic philosophy, is also the source of the tradition of Tahāfut in Islamic thought. Islamic philosophy in the Ottoman period presents a multidisciplinary structure in which the disciplines of *ilm al-kalām*, philosophy and *taṣawwuf* converge in terms of subject, purpose, and method. Besides, it is the continuation of a tradition in which Ghazālī's thought is dominant in general. philosophy gained momentum with a competition for a work that Fatih Sultan Mehmed wanted to be written on Ghazālī's *Tahāfut*. In this competition, Khōdjā-Zāde's (d. 1488) *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa* and Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī al-Ṭūsī's (d. 1482) *Kitāb al-Zuhr* competed and Khōdjā-Zāde's work won the competition with major praise. This work of Khōdjā-Zāde entitled *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa* has an exceptional place in terms of its contribution to both the Islamic philosophy tradition and the tradition of tahāfut. This work, in terms of its theoretical approach, which has a feature that offers insight and method of addressing the issues systematically, is a typical example to the Islamic philosophy of the Ottoman period and gained a considerable reputation at that time. The original name of Khōdjā-Zāde's work is *Kitāb al-Tahāfut fi'l-Muhākama Bayna'l Ghazālī wa'l Falāsifa*. The work consists of twenty philosophical issues. Khōdjā-Zāde explained his views on all philosophical issues in these twenty-two issues, and also discussed the issues on which Ghazālī conflicted with the philosophers. Three issues that have become important in the tradition of thought after al-Ghazālī denounced the philosophers constitute the main subject of the work. The instructions and annotations written on this work made a great contribution to the development of philosophy in the tradition of Ottoman thought, and moreover, in a sense, it provided the revival of the dusty volume of tahāfut discussions. In this article, by using literature and data analysis methods, the tradition of tahāfut reflecting the course of Islamic philosophy in the Ottoman period and the place and importance of Khōdjā-Zāde's tahāfut in this tradition will be revealed. Another aim of this study is the possible relations between Khōdjā-Zāde's intellectual personality and the structural features of the Ottoman thought tradition.

Keywords: Islamic Philosophy, Ottoman Thought, Tradition of Tahāfut, Khōdjā-Zāde, Tahāfut al-Falāsifa.

Hocazāde'nin Tehāfut'ü ve Osmanlı Düşüncesindeki Yeri

Öz

İslam felsefesi geleneğinde Meşşâî filozoflar, görüşlerinin tutarsız olduğu iddiasıyla Gazzâlî (ö. 1111)'nin *Tehāfut* adlı eserinde ciddi bir eleştiriye maruz kalmışlardır. İslâm felsefesinin yapısal dönüşümüne ön ayak olan bu eser İslâm düşüncesinde tehāfut geleneğinin de kaynağı niteliğindedir. Osmanlı dönemi İslam felsefesi; kelâm, felsefe ve tasavvuf disiplinlerinin, konu, amaç ve metot bakımından yakınlığı multidisipliner bir yapı arz etmektedir. Bununla birlikte o, genel olarak Gazzâlî düşüncesinin baskın olduğu bir geleneğin devamıdır. Bu felsefe, Fatih Sultan Mehmed'in, Gazzâlî'nin *Tehāfut* adlı eserini daha anlaşılır kılacak bir eserin yazılmasını emrettiği bir yarışmayla ivme kazanmıştır. Söz konusu bu yarışmada Hocazāde'nin *Tehāfutü'l-felâsife*'si ile Ali et-Ṭūsî'nin (ö. 1482) *Kitābu'z-Zuhr*'u rekabet etmiş, sonuçta Hocazāde'nin eseri büyük beğeni toplayarak yarışmayı kazanmıştır. Hocazāde'nin *Tehāfutü'l-felâsife* adlı eseri gerek İslâm felsefe geleneğine ve gerekse tehāfut geleneğine yaptığı katkı açısından son derece

müstesna bir yere sahiptir. Söz konusu bu eser, teorik yaklaşımı, konuları sistemli bir şekilde ele alma yöntemi ve derinlikli bakış sunan özelliği bakımından, Osmanlı dönemi İslam felsefesine tipik bir örnek teşkil etmiş ve hatırı sayılır bir ün kazanmıştır. Hoca-zâde, Tehâfüt'ünde akli ve nakli birbirinin tamamlayıcısı olarak görmüştür. O, düşüncelerinin yerindeliği ile kelâm-felsefe tartışmalarının merkezinde yer almış ve tehâfüt geleneği içerisinde haklı bir konum elde ederek Osmanlı dönemi İslam felsefesinin önde gelen düşünürleri arasında yer almıştır. Hoca-zâde'nin eserinin orijinal adı "Kitâbû't Tehâfüt fi el-Muhâkeme beyne'l Gazzâlî ve'l-Felâsife"dir. Eser, yirmi iki felsefi meseleden oluşmaktadır. Hoca-zâde bu yirmi iki mesele içerisinde bütün felsefi konular hakkındaki görüşünü açıklamış, Gazzâlî'nin de filozoflar ile çatıştığı konuları karşılaştırmalı olarak ele almıştır. Gazzâlî'nin, filozofları tekfir etmesinden sonra düşünce geleneğinde önemli hale gelen üç mesele, eserin ana konusunu oluşturmaktadır. Düşünce ve metod bakımından Osmanlı Dönemi İslâm felsefesinin önemli temsilcilerinden biri olan Hoca-zâde, eserinde Gazzâlî ve diğer filozofların görüşlerine yer vermiş, görüşler arasında mutabakat sağlamaya çalışmış ve en iyi tercihi yapmaya gayret etmiştir. Bu eser üzerine yazılan talikat ve haşiyeler Osmanlı düşünce geleneğinde felsefenin gelişmesine büyük bir katkıda bulunmuş dahası bir anlamda tozlanmış ya da küllenmiş tehâfüt tartışmalarının yeniden canlanmasını, harlanmasını sağlamıştır. Bu makalede literatür ve veri analizi yöntemleri kullanılmak suretiyle Osmanlı dönemi İslam felsefesinin seyrini yansıtan tehâfüt geleneği ve bu gelenek içerisinde Hoca-zâde'nin tehâfüt adlı eserinin yeri ve önemi ortaya konacaktır. Bu çalışmayla amaçlanan bir diğer husus ise Hoca-zâde'nin entelektüel kişiliği ile Osmanlı düşünce geleneğinin yapısal özellikleri arasındaki muhtemel ilişkilerdir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İslam Felsefesi, Osmanlı Düşüncesi, Tehâfüt Geleneği, Hoca-zâde, Tehâfütü'l-felâsife.

Introduction

The existence of Islamic civilization has been continuing in Anatolia for nearly a thousand years. This entity, which started with the pioneering initiative of the Great Salḍjūk and Anatolian Salḍjūk states, reached its peak with 600 years of Ottoman rule that surrounded three continents. Under the influence of the Ottoman, tawhid, justice, mercy, and love, which are the basic theoretical and experiential elements of Islamic civilization, have brought historical transformations to all humanity. Undoubtedly, the Ottoman State, which had both ethnic and religious diversity, owed this success to its deep-rooted intellectual and cultural accumulation.

The expression the tradition of tahâfüt in the Ottoman refers to the philosophical side of the Islamic thought tradition, which emerged in the axis of the disciplines of ilm al-kalâm, philosophy and taşawwuf, and draws attention to the special appearance of this philosophical tradition in the Ottoman State. This tradition basically reflects the debate about whether aql or naql is important in understanding the truth. As a matter of fact, as the scholar who started the tradition of tahâfüt Ghazâlî, caused discussions on ilm al-kalâm and philosophy and started a comprehensive tradition of thought by including taşawwuf, and did not aim to destroy philosophical thought in Islam, as some claim. On the contrary, he aimed to distance Islamic philosophy, which is based on religion-philosophy reconciliation, led by Peripatetic philosophy,

from Platonist, Aristotelian and Neoplatonist roots. Thus, he wanted to include philosophy in ilm al-kalām. This situation gained momentum with Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 1210) after Ghazālī, and it was reflected in the thought system under the name of philosophical kalām in the Ottoman period.¹ The most obvious example of this is that Ottoman scholars referred to Rāzī as “imām” in their works.²

Ghazālī had great effects on Islamic thought in general and philosophy in particular. Especially, a new era has started in the relations between philosophy and kalām, and a new door has been opened in the understanding of philosophical problems with this work. Again, under the influence of Ghazālī, the mutakallims, who used logic as a method, were more interested in philosophical problems. Again, with the acceptance that the truth can be known through *kashf* (uncovering) and *ilhām* (inspiration), he opened the door of ilm al-kalām to taṣawwuf and this discipline has begun to take on an eclectic identity. Thus, from the twelfth century kalām and taṣawwuf took on a philosophical structure by following this path opened by him. In Islamic thought, a series of scientific, political, and religious approaches, which started with Ghazālī’s work entitled *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa*, which he wrote as a rejection of philosophical approaches in 1095, changed the course of Islamic philosophy tradition and the period of classical thought came to an end and the period of renewal has begun. This renewal period, which continued with the works written by Rāzī and his followers in the form of philosophical kalām, was systematized by Muḥyi’l-Dīn Ibn al-‘Arabī (d. 1240) and his student Sadr al-Dīn al-Ḳūnawī (d. 1274), who lived in the same century. Together with the philosophical taṣawwuf tradition called Akbariyya, it formed the foundations of Ottoman thought. Rāzī, the founding scholar of this theoretical tradition, which formed the framework of the Islamic thought tradition in the 13th century, combined the criticisms of Ibn Sīnā (1037) by many authors such as Ghazālī, Sahlān Sāvi (d. 1145), Abū al-Barakāt al-Baġdādī (d. 1152), and al-Shahrastānī (d. 1153) in his own works. The intellectual activity caused by these criticisms enabled Ibn Sīnā’s philosophy to both centralize in the tradition of Islamic thought and to produce ideas on different subjects in ilm al-kalām. Most of the post-twelfth-century Islamic theoretical traditions can be described through Avicennism or its critique. Ghazālī, al-Baġdādī, Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī (d. 1191) and Rāzī are the leading scholars who criticize Ibn Sīnā’s views.³

¹ Ömer Faruk Erdoğan, “Filozof Kimliği ile İbn Sīnā’nın Kelāmî ve Tasavvufî Düşünceye Etkisi”, *Bilimname* XLI (2020/1), 668-669.

² Enver Demirpolat, “Osmanlılarda Felsefenin Serüveni”, *Fırat Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 14/1 (2009), 107.

³ Eşref Altaş, “İbn Sīnā Sonrası Felsefî Gelenek: İbn Sīnâcılık ve İsrâkîlik”, *İslam Düşünce Atlası*, ed. İbrahim Halil Üçer (Konya: Konya Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2017), 2/617.

The works of kalām and philosophy in the renewal period of Islamic thought are mostly studies in the style of commentary, reasoning (muḥakamah), summation and ḥāshīya on Rāzī's works. As a matter of fact, his followers such as Sirāj al-Din Urmavī (d. 1283), Athīr al-din al Abharī (d. 1264), Daud al-Qaysari (d. 1350), Aḍud al-Dīn al-İd̄jī (d. 1355), al-Taftāzāni (d. 1390), Ḳuṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī (d. 1311), Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī (d. 1274) and al-Kātibi (d. 1277) reconsidered the issues of kalām and philosophy of the classical period until the 19th century. They pioneered the copyrighting of many classical works. Thanks to these works written by these thinkers in the fields of philosophy, kalām, taṣawwuf, logic and rhetoric, the 13th century has almost become the period of the history of works of the Islamic world.⁴ The leading kalām works of this period; Rāzī's al-Muhassal and al-Mabāhith al-Mashriqiyya, 'Amīdī's (d. 1233) *Abkār Al-Afkār*, Ṭūsī's *Tajrīd al-i'tiqād*, al-Bayḍāwī's (d. 1286) *Tawālī' al-Anwar*. Philosophical works are Suhrawardī's *Ḥikmat al-Ishrāk*, Rāzī's *Sharḥ al-Ishārāt*, Abharī's *Hidāyah al-Hikmah*. Again, in this period, the three important classics of taṣawwuf are Ibn al-ʿArabī's *Fusus al-Hikam* and *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyya* and al-Ḳūnawī's *Miftah al-Qayb*.⁵ The 13th century, which played a key role in the history of Islamic thought, is the end of the 11th and 12th centuries, and the beginning of the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries.

Since this new philosophy tradition, which emerged in the post-Ghazālī period, coincided with the foundation period of the Ottoman State, it also determined the founding philosophy of the state. Over time, this understanding has become a philosophy of life for the Ottoman society through scholars such as Farīd al-Dīn 'Aṭṭār (d. 1233), Sa'adī-e Shīrāzī (d. 1291), Mawlānā Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273), Yūnus Emre (d. 1320?), Ḥācī Bektāş Velī (d. 1337), Ḥācī Bayrām-ı Velī (d. 1430), Mollā Djāmī (d. 1492). The understanding of waḥdat al-wudjūd, which was developed especially by Ibn al-ʿArabī and Sadr al-Dīn al-Ḳūnawī, has come to a dominant position in almost all areas of the Ottoman State, from the administrative mechanisms to the madrasahs.⁶ As it can be understood from what has been said so far, the Islamic philosophy of the Ottoman period is a philosophy tradition in which the thought of Ghazālī is dominant. It is also a composite thought tradition in which philosophy, kalām and taṣawwuf are handled together.

The developments related to philosophical sciences in Ottoman madrasahs gained momentum especially after the conquest of Istanbul. In the light of the information conveyed by Kātīb Čelebi (d. 1657) about the scientific structure of the period, it can be said that the demand

⁴ Ömer Türker, "16. Yüzyılı İslām Felsefe Geleneğine Eklemlenmek", *Sahn-ı Semân'dan Darülfünûn'a Osmanlı'da İlim ve Fikir Dünyası Sempozyumu Bildiriler Kitabı*, ed. Ekrem Demirli et al. (İstanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2017), 25.

⁵ Ömer Türker, "Yenilenme Dönemi", *İslām Düşünce Atlası*, ed. İbrahim Halil Üçer (Konya: Konya Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2017), 2/498.

⁶ Bekir Karlığa, "Yirmisekiz Mehmet Čelebî'nin Yeni Bulunan Bir Fizik Kitabı Tercümesi ve Onsekizinci Yüzyılın Başında Osmanlı Düşüncesi", *Bilim-Felsefe-Tarih* (İstanbul: Hikmet Neşriyat, 1991), 291-292.

for philosophical sciences in the Ottoman State became widespread after the conquest and this development continued until the middle periods of the state. According to Kâtib Çelebi, names such as Mollâ Fanârî (d. 1431), Kâdî-zâde al-Rûmî (d. 1436), Khôdjâ-Zâde (d. 1488), Ali Kushju (d. 1474), Mu'ayyad-zâde (d. 1516), and Kinalizâde 'Alâ' al-dîn 'Alî Çelebi (d. 1572) can be counted among the scholars who came to the fore in the intellectual and transmission sciences during the reign of Sultan Fatih.⁷ Similarly, Altaş says the following about the transformation of Islamic philosophical thought into a tradition during the reign of Sultan Mehmed:

“In the fifteenth century, the efforts of “small harmony” (comparison and harmony of theology and philosophy) and great harmony (comparison and harmony of philosophy, kalâm and tasawwuf) within the framework of the reasoning project of Sultan Mehmed the Conqueror, and then the philosophical discussions during the reign of Sultan Bayezid II, simultaneously as a result, the debates between the Dawâni and the Dashtakî in Iran point to the birth of third period Avicennaism or the resurgence of philosophy. However, it should be noted that Avicennaism in this period perceived the philosophy of Ibn Sînâ as a perspective or as one of the intellectual traditions and diversification of thought. Scholars in this period were mutakallims who worked on the Jurjânî (d. 1413), Taftâzânî and Tûsî's texts and were affiliated with the Râzî school. They are also scholars who accept philosophers such as Ibn Sînâ and Suhrawardî as masters. Among the intellectuals who were related to each other in this period, the following names can be counted: Ali Kushju, Ali Tûsî, Khôdjâ-Zâde, Mollâ Lutfî, Mawlânâzâde, Khatibzâde, Neyrîzî, Sadr al-din Dashtakî, Dawani, Maybudî, Mu'ayyad-zâde, Kamalpashazâde, Khafrî, Qiyas al-din Dashtakî, Kamal al-din Ardabili, Tashkopruzâde, Lârî.”⁸

This scientific development during the reign of Sultan Mehmed the Conqueror, of course, stems from his intellectual personality. As a matter of fact, when he conquered Istanbul, he emphasized the hadith of the Prophet Muhammad by saying we have completed the small jihad, now it's time for the big jihad. In order to make the city of Istanbul, the most magnificent center of Christianity for a thousand years, the most exceptional center of Islam, he started inviting scholars there and opening madrasas. The Sahn-i Saman Madrasahs, built by Sultan Mehmed the Conqueror, provided great momentum for Islamic philosophy in the Ottoman period.

In this context, the tradition of Tahâfut, which is a part of the Islamic philosophy tradition and where some physics and metaphysical issues that are the subject of dispute between mutakallims and philosophers are systematically discussed, also found the opportunity to continue in the Ottoman period Islamic philosophy. This tradition, which started with Ghazâlî's work entitled Tahâfut al-Falâsifa, in which he wrote his criticisms of philosophers, indicated an

⁷ Hatice Toksöz, “Osmanlı'nın Klasik Döneminde Felsefe ve Değeri”, *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi* 5/13 (2007), 128.

⁸ Altaş, “İbn Sînâ Sonrası Felsefî Gelenek: İbn Sinâcılık ve İshrâkîlik”, 2/621-622.

important development towards becoming a systematic writing tradition with Ibn Rushd's work entitled *Tahāfut al-Tahāfut*, in which Ibn Rushd criticized the approach of partly philosophers and mostly mutakallims. Two more independent works were added to this tradition with the encouragement of Sultan Mehmed the Conqueror for the revival and continuation of this tradition. The first of these is Khōdjā-Zāde's *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa* and the second is Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī al-Ṭūsī's *Kitāb al-Zuhr*.⁹ The tradition of tahāfut was continued in the next century with a ḥāshiya written by Ibn Kamāl (d. 1536) to Khōdjā-Zāde's *Tahāfut* and a ta'līqah written by Qarabāghī to the same text. In the eighteenth century, Mahmad Âmin al-Uskudārī wrote a talkhīs on Khōdjā-Zāde's *Tahāfut*.¹⁰ While most of these written works defended Ghazālī's rightness, a few of them saw the philosophers as right. In general, if Ibn Rushd's *Tahāfut* is excluded due to some of its features, these works have taken their place in the life of thought as ḥāshiya, ta'līqas and talkhīs written especially on Khōdjā-Zāde's interpretation of Ghazālī, rather than bringing new interpretations to the issue.¹¹

1. Khōdjā-Zāde and the Revival of Islamic Philosophy through the Tradition of Tahāfut in the Ottoman Period

Sultans would choose their teachers from among the ulamā with high scientific ability. The sultan who had the most teachers among the Ottoman sultans was Mehmed the Conqueror. Sirajuddin Mehmed Halebī, Ibn Temjid, Mawlānā Ayas, Mollā Gūrānī, Sinan Pasha, Khōdjā-Zāde, Abd al-Qadir Isbartai, Hasan Samsoni, Wali ad-din-āde Ahmed Pasha, Khayr ad-din Efendi and Akshems al-Din are the teachers of Sultan Mehmed the Conqueror.¹²

One of Sultan Mehmed's teachers, Khōdjā-Zāde's full name is Muşliḥ al-Dīn Muşṭafā b. Yūsuf b. Salih al-Bursawī. He was born in 1434 in Bursa. His father is Hoja Sinan (Yusuf Efendi), one of the richest merchants of Bursa. Muşliḥ al-Dīn became famous as Khōdjā-Zāde, as those dealing with trade were called hodja at that time.¹³ Khōdjā-Zāde opposed his father who wanted him to do trade when he was younger, and turned to science education, made everyone accept his superiority in many sciences before he was a minor. For this reason, his teacher, Khidīr Čelebi, gave him the title of aql-e-salim. Khōdjā-Zāde, who gained respect of his teacher and those around him at a young age, was presented to Sultan Murad II by his teacher and was appointed as the mudarris (professor) of Esediyeh madrasah by the Sultan. Thus, Khōdjā-Zāde, who was officially

⁹ Ömer Faruk Erdoğan, "Osmanlı'da Kelam-Felsefe İlişkisi ve Tehāfüt Geleneği", *TALİD Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 14/28 (2016), 275.

¹⁰ Erdoğan, "Osmanlı'da Kelam-Felsefe İlişkisi ve Tehāfüt Geleneği", 275.

¹¹ Erdoğan, "Osmanlı'da Kelam-Felsefe İlişkisi ve Tehāfüt Geleneği", 275.

¹² İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin İlmiye Teşkilatı* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1965), 145.

¹³ Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin İlmiye Teşkilatı*, 145.

included in the ‘ilmiyye class, worked here as a mudarris for six years. *Khōdjā-Zāde* had a discussion with Mollā Zeyrek and Mollā Sayyidi Ali in the presence of Fatih Sultan Mehmed, proved his scientific ability with the answers he gave, and the Sultan appointed him as Khâce-i Sultani (teacher of padishah).¹⁴ *Khōdjā-Zāde*, who was respected by Fatih, gained a distinguished place among scholars with his humility. According to Namık Kemal’s statement, when Sultan Mehmed saw that any scholar was too proud, he would put him in a debate with *Khōdjā-Zāde* and put him in his place.¹⁵ Sultan Mehmed wanted *Khōdjā-Zāde* to argue with Mollā Zeyrek, who was proud of Sayyid al-Sharîf Djurdjānî. *Khōdjā-Zāde* proved himself once again in the presence of the Sultan and he was appointed as a mudarris to the Sahn-i Saman madrasah.

Sultan Mehmed, who gave importance to science and supported the ulamā, also showed great interest in the subject of Tahāfut, which became a tradition after Ghazālî. In order to reveal the truth on this subject and to revive the tradition, he commissioned two scholars he trusted to examine and evaluate Ghazālî’s work and to write a work on this subject.¹⁶ The first of these is *Khōdjā-Zāde*, and the second is Alā’ al-Dîn ‘Alî al-Ṭūsî. *Khōdjā-Zāde* completed his work in four months and ‘Alî al- Ṭūsî in six months and presented it to the Sultan.¹⁷

Although *Khōdjā-Zāde*’s was more valuable in these two works, the Sultan rewarded each of the authors with ten thousand dirhams and gave *Khōdjā-Zāde* a magnificent robe.¹⁸ This work of *Khōdjā-Zāde* named Tahāfut al-Falāsifa has an exceptional place in terms of its contribution to both the Islamic philosophy tradition and the tradition of tahāfut.

As it is known, Ghazālî tried to determine the aims of Islamic philosophers with his work entitled Maḳāşid al-falāsifa (The Aims of the Philosophers). With his work entitled Tahāfut al-Falāsifa, he criticized Maşshā’î philosophy in order to settle accounts with Greek philosophy in the person of al-Fārābî (d. 950) and Ibn Sînâ. In this work, Ghazālî touched on twenty subjects and opposed and criticized philosophers in general and Muslim philosophers such as al-Fārābî and Ibn Sînâ in particular. Ghazālî states that Ibn Sînâ and his followers have erred in seventeen points (each one of which he addresses in detail in a chapter, for a total of seventeen chapters) by committing heresy (bid‘a). However, in three other chapters, he accuses them of being utterly irreligious (takfîr). Among the charges that he leveled against the philosophers is their inability to prove the existence of God and inability to prove the impossibility of the existence of two Gods. Ghazālî denounces philosophers on three issues; a. eternity of universe, b. that Allah only know

¹⁴ Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti’nin İlmiye Teşkilatı*,145.

¹⁵ Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti’nin İlmiye Teşkilatı*,145.

¹⁶ Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti’nin İlmiye Teşkilatı*, 145.

¹⁷ This book was published entitled “Tehâfütü'l Felâsife”.

¹⁸ This book was published entitled “Tehâfütü'l Felâsife”.

the general aspects of the nature, not the particular, and c. that the reward and punishment in the afterlife only spiritually, not physical.¹⁹

Ibn Rushd wrote another work, titled Tahāfut al-Tahāfut (The Incoherence of the Incoherence) against him, in a manner similar to Ghazālī's book Tahāfut al-Falāsifa. Along with this work, Ibn Rushd criticized Ghazālī's views in his work *Fasl al-Maqal fi ma bayn al-Hikma wa al-Shariah min Ittisal* and proved with evidence that it was wrong for him to accuse Islamic philosophers of takfir and bid'a. In fact, Ibn Rushd says at the end of his work "Undoubtedly, this man -Ghazālī- made mistakes in terms of wisdom as well as in terms of *Shari'a*."²⁰ These two works gave birth to a tradition of thought called tahāfut in the history of Islamic philosophy, in which some physical and metaphysical issues that were the subject of controversy between mutakallims and philosophers were systematically discussed.

After Ibn Rushd, the subject of tahāfut gained importance in Islamic philosophy, and scholars began to write articles and books on the subject. While some supported the views of Ibn Rushd, others supported the views of Ghazālī.

2. Khōdjā-Zāde's Tahāfut and Its Content

The original name of Khōdjā-Zāde's work is *Kitāb al-Tahāfut fi'l-Muhakama bayn al-Ghazālī va Ibn Rushd*. The work consists of twenty-two philosophical issues. Khōdjā-Zāde explained his views on all in these twenty-two issues, and also discussed the issues that Ghazālī conflicted with the philosophers comparatively. Khōdjā-Zāde, who is one of the important representatives of Islamic philosophy in the Ottoman Period in terms of thought and method, discussed the views of Ghazālī and other philosophers in his work, tried to reach agreement between the views and tried to make the best choice. Therefore, while he was writing his work, he followed a moderate path and stayed away from excess and understatement. With this work, he represents the essence of moderate Islamic philosophy. Three issues that have become important in the history of thought after Ghazālī denounced the philosophers in his work constitute the subject of the work. In fact, after Ghazālī's Tahāfut, there was a coldness towards philosophy among people, and this situation continued until Ibn Rushd, who came a century later and wrote Tahāfut al-Tahāfut. Khōdjā-Zāde clarifies the issues in his work by making commentaries and comparisons. The topics covered in the work are clearly expressed without any ambiguity. The work, in terms of its style and method,

¹⁹ Ebu Hâmid bin Muhammed bin Ahmed el-Gazzâlî, *Tehâfütü-l Felâsife*, Simplifier. Adil Abdulmunim Ebu Abbas (Kahire: Dar'ut Telaih, 2011), 173.

²⁰ Abu al-Velîd Muhammed Ibn Rushd, *Tahāfut al-Tahāfut* (Kahire: Mektebet İbn Sinâ, 2011), 299; See Id, *Fasl al-Maqal fi ma bayn al-Hikma wa al-Shariah min Ittisal*, Simplifier. Mohammed Ammarah (Kahire: Dar'ul Maarife, no date), 36.

is an example to the Islamic philosophy of the Ottoman period and gained a considerable reputation at that time.

Khōdjā-Zāde in his work, sees aql and naql as complementary to each other. His thoughts are seen among the leading values of philosophical thought in the Ottoman period. Khōdjā-Zāde praised Ghazālī in his introduction and described him as Ḥujjat al-Islām (The proof of Islam). Regarding the philosophers, he said, “although they made few mistakes in the natural sciences, they were wrong in most of the kalām”. Khōdjā-Zāde said that the main purpose of writing this work in his book was to refute the views of philosophers on ‘ilm al-ṭabī‘a and ‘as complemen.²¹

Khōdjā-Zāde used some of the arguments that Ghazālī and Rāzī used to answer the philosophers. Against the philosophers, he agrees with Ghazālī on the three most important philosophical issues. However, Khōdjā-Zāde developed a more detailed and explanatory style than Ghazālī in explaining and answering the arguments of philosophers. Khōdjā-Zāde wrote in a clear philosophical language that is not mysterious. It is observed that he was more selective than Ghazālī in choosing the appropriate wording. In addition, he avoided using expressions about philosophers accusing them of takfīr and accusing them of hypocrisy and bid’atism. Khōdjā-Zāde, in his work, did not comment on Ghazālī’s takfīr of philosophers on three famous issues. He did not make a statement as to whether he agreed with Ghazālī’s view or not. He was content only with the sentences in the preface of the book stating that the philosophers were wrong in issues of ‘ilm al-kalām.

Khōdjā-Zāde’s views on these three issues are briefly as follows;

2.1. Eternity of the Universe

Khōdjā-Zāde says in the introduction of his book: “the most important thing that people compete with each other to obtain is the knowledge of the mabda', the ma‘ād and the knowledge between them.”²² Khōdjā-Zāde says that the views about the issue of eternity of the universe are divided into three parts; the universe is hādīth, the universe is ḳadīm, it is meaningless to say anything about whether the universe is ḳadīm or hadīth. The basis of the debate and disagreement on this subject are questions such as whether the universe comes out of Allah through himself or the elder, whether Allah’s precedence over the universe is due to the existence of time and rank, or whether it is not with time but with personality and rank. In this issue, it is seen that the philosophers are trying to reach a suitable solution and they are divided into three groups. Khōdjā-Zāde, following Ghazālī, preferred the first view from these three views, which states that

²¹ Muşliḥ al-Dīn Muşṭafā b. Yūsuf Khōdjā-Zāde, *et-Tehâfüt Fi'l-Muhâkeme Beyne'l Gazzâlî ve'l Felâsife*, Critical ed. Luay Hatem Yaqoob (Beirut: Er-Risale el-Alemiyye, 2018), 18.

²² Khōdjā-Zāde, *et-Tehâfüt Fi'l-Muhâkeme Beyne'l Gazzâlî ve'l-Felâsife*, 23.

the universe came into being and was created by Allah.²³ According to Khōdjā-Zāde, when the universe did not exist, it was created by the influence of Allah's attribute of will. This principle in question is the *hudūth* principle defended by Ghazālī and earlier classical mutakallims, which Khōdjā-Zāde defends.

Khōdjā-Zāde says that it is not possible to accept the views of philosophers regarding the creation of the universe by Allah, "If the universe came into existence in eternity, its creation (its will) must have been in eternity".²⁴ According to Khōdjā-Zāde, the fact that a *fā'il* who can choose and allocate has a will that he can use whenever he wants without needing anyone, refutes the claims of the philosophers.

According to Khōdjā-Zāde, neither the universe prioritizes time nor time it can be said that came before the universe. The *hudūth* of time has been possible only with the *hudūth* of the universe. Because time is the amount of movement of the biggest *falak*.

Again, according to him, the succession in the events that occur daily is the succession of the successive events and is not impossible. However, the consolation seen in the existence of the universe is the constellation of events that come together and organized in existence, which is impossible.²⁵

Khōdjā-Zāde clarifies the issue with another argument. If we say that Allah's creation of the universe took place in pre-eternity, but the universe did not exist in pre-eternity due to the possibility of its being eternal, we must state that there is such a choice even though there is no reason for the choice (*murajjih*). If the universe had come into existence a certain amount before it came into being, it would not have been eternal. It is possible for the universe to come into being before the time it came into being.²⁶

As it can be understood, Khōdjā-Zāde put forward four different arguments against the philosophers' claims that the universe is eternal. One of these arguments is about will, one is about time, one is about daily events and the other is about causality.

2.2. Allah's Knowledge of Particulars

Khōdjā-Zāde divides the opinions on this subject into three; Allah knows only himself; Allah knows his essence and everything other than him in a general way, Allah absolutely knows

²³ Khōdjā-Zāde, *et-Tehāfut Fi'l-Muhākeme Beyne'l Gazzālī ve'l-Felāsife*, 23.

²⁴ Muhammet Caner Ilgaroğlu-Luay Hatem Yaqoob, "Âlemin Ezeliliği Meselesi: İbn Sinâ, Gazzâlî ve Hocazâde'nin Görüşlerinin Karşılaştırılması", *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 32 (2019), 328.

²⁵ Khōdjā-Zāde, *et-Tehāfut Fi'l-Muhākeme Beyne'l Gazzālī ve'l-Felāsife*, 23.

²⁶ Khōdjā-Zāde, *et-Tehāfut Fi'l-Muhākeme Beyne'l Gazzālī ve'l Felāsife*, 89.

everything, general and partial. The origin of the disagreement on this subject is the question of how it is possible for Allah to know the formed and changing parts without the attainment of change and ignorance in Himself. This is a problem that philosophers are trying to solve by trying to find a suitable starting point for it. Philosophers are divided into three views on this issue.

Ibn Sīnā preferred the view that Allah knows everything not in part, but in general, that his knowledge does not correspond to time, and that the knowledge of particulars necessitates change in the person of the knower. With this, about Ibn Sīnā's view on Allah's knowing the particulars, we find it useful to quote Rahim Acar's evaluations in his article titled "Who Else Knows the Particulars, If Not the Creator? Avicenna on God's Knowledge of Particulars."

Scientists have contradictory interpretations. Although Ibn Sīnā emphasized that Allah knows particulars, it is remarkable that many of his readers and commentators did not find this convincing... Sometimes Ibn Sīnā's statements such as Allah knows everything are ignored, and sometimes it is claimed that he is actually trying to hide his true views while using these statements. In short, the claim that Allah does not know the particulars, especially those that are subject to formation and decay, is a widely accepted interpretation of Ibn Sīnā's view... Ibn Sīnā's view on divine knowledge regarding particulars should be examined by taking into account his vision of divine knowledge and the role he gave to this knowledge in the existence of things. For, according to Ibn Sīnā, Allah's knowledge of things is the only condition for the existence of things. Everything that exists in the manner and under conditions that Allah knows it to exist, because Allah knows it to exist. Otherwise, nothing would exist.²⁷

Khōdjā-Zāde and Ghazālī, on the other hand, preferred the third view, the view that Allah knows all particular and universal beings with absolute knowledge, despite the differences in argument and style and the change in the method of proof.²⁸

Ibn Rushd, on the other hand, touched upon the issue of the particulars and the universals in his work *Fasl al-Maqal* and stated the following: Undoubtedly, Allah's knowledge is beyond being described as partial or universal. Therefore, there is no point in arguing in this matter.²⁹

2.3. The Issue of Ma'ād

The main problem of the issue is shaped around whether the ma'ād and the hereafter life will be with the soul or with both the soul and the body. It is seen that Khōdjā-Zāde, Rāzī and

²⁷ Rahim Acar, "Yaratan Bilmezse Kim Bilir? İbn Sīnā'ya Göre Allah'ın Cüz'leri Bilmesi", *İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi* 13 (2005), 1-2.

²⁸ Muhammet Caner Ilgaroğlu-Luay Hatem Yaqoob, "Allah'ın Cüz'leri (Tikeller) Bilmesi Meselesi: İbn Sīnā, Gazzālī ve Hoca Zāde'nin Görüşlerinin Karşılaştırılması", *Manas Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 8 (2019), 946.

²⁹ See İbn Rushd, *Fasl al-Maqal fi ma bayn al-Hikma wa al-Shariah min Ittisal*, 41.

Ghazālī have an agreed view that the soul and body will be resurrected together. Khōdjā-Zāde revealed the basic approaches in philosophy and kalām tradition related to the issue of ma'ād in the twenty-second chapter of his work and stated that these approaches did not exceed five, when we compare Khōdjā-Zāde with the philosophers in the issue of ma'ād, it is seen that they adopt diametrically opposite views on the following two discussions.³⁰

- a. Evidence of spiritual ma'ād.
- b. Denial of bodily/material ma'ād.

Khōdjā-Zāde included eight evidence used by philosophers on the denial of bodily ma'ād and answered each of these arguments in the style used by philosophers. The issue of ma'ād has been an issue agreed upon by all sects in Islamic thought. However, the conflict between the sects is about its nature rather than its existence.³¹

Khōdjā-Zāde did not oppose the philosophers because of their thoughts about the spiritual realization of the ma'ād and that the soul's pleasure is greater than that of the body. However, he criticized the claims of philosophers that ma'ād is unique to the soul and that the body will not be resurrected, and he opposed them at this point.

Conclusion

The philosophical debates in the tradition of Islamic thought continued not only in the classical period, but also in the Ottoman period. However, the Islamic philosophy of the Ottoman period is a structurally transformed philosophy, in which philosophy, kalām and tasawwuf converged around the same problems. Especially after Ghazālī's criticism of Mashshā'i philosophy, Islamic philosophy has undergone a structural change since the 12th century. As a result of this process, the boundaries between philosophy, kalām and tasawwuf disappeared, and the subjects of these three fields were discussed together. The general characteristic of Ottoman Turkish thought is similar. In this respect, this structural transformation should be taken into account when trying to understand the attitude of Ottoman scholars towards philosophical problems. In other words, understanding the Islamic philosophy of the Ottoman period is possible by examining the works related to these three fields. Because Ottoman scholars, following the tradition of philosophy that reached them, were interested in philosophical problems by writing works in which philosophy-kalām and tasawwuf were discussed together. In addition, they discussed theological-philosophical problems through the writing of tahāfut, which started with Ghazālī and became a tradition with many other scholars. On the other hand, Ottoman sultans

³⁰ Khōdjā-Zāde, *et-Tehāfūt Fi'l-Muhākeme Beyne'l Gazzālī ve'l Felāsife*, 96.

³¹ Muhammet Caner Ilgaroğlu-Luay Hatem Yaqoob, "Fârâbî ve Hocazâde'nin Görüşleri Bağlamında Meâd Meselesi", *MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 8/4 (Ekim 2019), 3098.

showed particular interest in philosophical sciences. They have provided talented scholars in this field with opportunities to think and write freely. In this regard, the efforts of Sultan Mehmed and Suleiman the Magnificent draw attention.

The importance given to philosophical thought in the Ottoman period can be understood both from the activities of Ottoman scholars and from the free thought environment and support provided by the Sultans to the scholars. The tradition of *tahāfut*, which Ghazālī started with his *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa*, continued with Ibn Rushd in the classical period, and with the encouragement of Sultan Mehmed, this tradition of thought in the Ottoman period was revived with the works of *Khōdjā-Zāde* and Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī al- Ṭūsī. Notedly, *Khōdjā-Zāde* stated his thoughts, which he identified with religion, as truths that should be defended by supporting the views of Ghazālī and on the other hand, he underlined the views of philosophers that needed to be corrected, refuted or rejected. Although *Khōdjā-Zāde* preserved the boundaries of al-Ghazālī's work, unlike him, he displayed a cautious attitude towards open *takfīr* of philosophers. Again, unlike Ghazālī, he included two different issues in his work and increased the number of issues on which he criticized philosophers to twenty-two. He also criticizes Ghazālī, from time to time in his work. *Khōdjā-Zāde*, similar to Ghazālī, considers that the issues related to *kalām* can be known not by *aql*, but by religious teachings, therefore, these issues can only be resolved on the basis of *naql*. He also says that philosophers go to extremes in this regard. On the other hand, according to him, philosophers have reached the truth in sciences such as calculation and logic. *Khōdjā-Zāde*'s aim is not to oppose pre-Ghazālī *mutakallims* or the philosophers' thoughts on natural philosophy and theology. On the contrary, he compares these two groups within the framework of the views of previous *mutakallims* and philosophers. He wanted to reveal his own thoughts about them. In this context, it can be stated that *Khōdjā-Zāde* rejected many principles of previous *mutakallims* and abandoned their theses, but accepted the principles and theses of philosophers.

Khōdjā-Zāde has produced many works with various qualities together with *tahāfut* while writing his works, he especially emphasized the relationship between philosophy and *ilm al-kalām*, which came to the fore in his period. Because *Khōdjā-Zāde*'s works enter the period of philosophical *kalām* and contain the features that emerged with the philosophization of the *kalam*. After him, the tradition of *tahāfut* continued in the Ottoman, and a corpus of *tahāfuts* written in the form of summation, *ta'liqa* and *ḥāshiya* on *Khōdjā-Zāde*'s work was formed. This place of *Khōdjā-Zāde* in the tradition of *tahāfut* makes him an original and typical scholar of Islamic philosophy of the Ottoman period. He almost becomes the name at the center of the *kalām*-philosophy debates in Ottoman thought.

Çıkar Çatışması: Yazarlardan Luay Hatem Yaqoob ATEBE dergisi editör kurulunda görevlidir. Ancak yazarın makalesinin yayınlandığı bu sayıda görevi askıya alınmış ve editör yetkileri kaldırılmıştır. Bu bağlamda çift taraflı kör hakemlik ilkelerine uyulmuştur.

References

- Acar, Rahim. “Yaratan Bilmezse Kim Bilir? İbn Sînâ’ya Göre Allah’ın Cüz’leri Bilmesi”. *İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi* 13 (2005), 1-23.
- Altaş, Eşref. “İbn Sînâ Sonrası Felsefi Gelenek: İbn Sinâcılık ve İshrâkîlik”. *İslâm Düşünce Atlası*. Ed. İbrahim Halil Üçer, 2/610-622. Konya: Konya Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 1. Press, 2017.
- Demirpolat, Enver. “Osmanlılarda Felsefenin Serüveni”. *Fırat Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 14/1 (2009), 105-118.
- Erdoğan, Ömer Faruk. “Filozof Kimliği ile İbn Sînâ’nın Kelâmî ve Tasavvufî Düşünceye Etkisi”. *Bilimname* 41 (2020/1), 663-690.
- Erdoğan, Ömer Faruk. “Osmanlı’da Kelam-Felsefe İlişkisi ve Tehâfüt Geleneği”. *TALİD Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 14/28 (2016), 273-326.
- Gazzâlî, Ebu Hamid bin Muhammed bin Ahmed. *Tehâfütü-l Felâsife*. Simplifier. Adil Abdulmunim Ebu Abbas. Kahire: Dar’ut Telaih, 2011.
- Haj Khalifa, Mustafa bin Abdullah el-Kostantini. *Keşfu’l Dunun an Esami’l Kutup ve’l Funun*. Bağdat: Dar’ul Musanna, 1941.
- Haj Khalifa, Mustafa bin Abdullah el-Kostantini. *Sullemu’l-Vusul İla Tabakâti’l Fuhul*. İstanbul: Arsika Yayınevi, 2010.
- Ibn Rushd, Abu al-Velid Muhammed bin Ahmed. *Fasl al-Maqal fi ma bayn al-Hikma wa al-Shariah min Ittisal*. Simplifier. Mohammed Ammarah. Kahire: Dar’ul Maarife, No date.
- Ibn Rushd, Abu al-Velid Muhammed bin Ahmed. *Tahâfut al-Tahâfut*. Kahire: Mektebet Ibn Sina, 2011.
- Ilgaroğlu, Muhammet Caner-Yaqoob, Luay Hatem. “Âlemin Ezeliliği Meselesi: İbn Sinâ, Gazzâlî ve Hocazâde’nin Görüşlerinin Karşılaştırılması”. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 32 (2019), 318-340.
- Ilgaroğlu, Muhammet Caner-Yaqoob, Luay Hatem. “Allah’ın Cüz’leri (Tikeller) Bilmesi Meselesi: İbn Sinâ, Gazzâlî ve Hocazâde’nin Görüşlerinin Karşılaştırılması”. *Manas Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 8 (2019), 940-950.
- Ilgaroğlu, Muhammet Caner-Yaqoob, Luay Hatem. “Fârâbî ve Hocazâde’nin Görüşleri Bağlamında Meâd Meselesi”. *MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 8/4 (2019), 3085-3100.
- Karlığa, Bekir. “Yirmisekiz Mehmet Çelebi’nin Yeni Bulunan Bir Fizik Kitabı Tercümesi ve Onsekizinci Yüzyılın Başında Osmanlı Düşüncesi”. *Bilim-Felsefe-Tarih* (1991), 277-331.
- Kayalık, Murat. “Mohammed: Perspectieven op de Profeet’ Kitabı Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme”. *Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 9/1 (Haziran 2023), 114-119.
- Khōdjā-Zāde, Muşliḥ al-Dīn Muşṭafā b. Yūsuf. *et-Tehâfüt Fi’l-Muhâkeme Beyne’l Gazzâlî ve’l Felâsife*. Critical ed. Luay Hatem Yaqoob, Beyrut: er-Risale el-Alemiyye, 2018.
- Kılıç, Muhammet Fatih. “Hocazâde’nin Tehâfüt’ünün Sebeplilik Bölümü Üzerine Bir İnceleme”. *Nazariyat Journal for the History of Islamic Philosophy and Sciences* 3/1 (2016), 45-78.

- Köse, Saffet. "Bursa'nın Hocazâde'si-Hayatı ve İlmî Kişiliği". *Uluslararası Hocazâde Sempozyumu Bildiriler Kitabı*. Ed. Tefik Yücedoğru et al., 101-127. Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi, 2011.
- Köse, Saffet. "Hocazâde Muslihuddin Efendi". *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. 18/207-209. İstanbul: TDV Yayınları, 1998.
- Lange, Christian. *Mohammed: Perspectieven op de Profeet*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017, 78-86.
- Mahmad Amin al-Uskudārī. *Talkhīs Tahāfut al-Hukemā*. Trans. and Ed. Kamuran Gökdağ, Ankara: Yazma Eserler Müdürlüğü, 2014.
- Taşköprüzâde, Ebu'l Hayr Isameddin. *eş-Şekâikü'l Nomanıye fi Ulemai'd-Devlet'til-Osmaniye*. Beyrut: Dar'ul Kitâbu'l Arabi, 1975.
- Toksöz, Hatice. "Osmanlı'nın Klasik Döneminde Felsefe ve Değeri". *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi* 5/13 (2007), 123-154.
- Türker, Ömer. "16. Yüzyılı İslâm Felsefe Geleneğine Eklemlenmek". *Sahn-ı Semân'dan Darülfünûn'a Osmanlı'da İlim ve Fikir Dünyası Sempozyumu Bildiriler Kitabı*. Editör: Ekrem Demirli et al., 25-29. İstanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2017.
- Türker, Ömer. "Yenilenme Dönemi". *İslâm Düşünce Atlası*. 2/495-501. İstanbul: Konya Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2017.
- Uzunçarşılı, İsmail Hakkı. *Osmanlı Devleti'nin İlmiye Teşkilatı*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1965.