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Abstract

One of the Ottoman scholars in the sixteenth century who opposed the view of the famous Sufi Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī was Chiwizâda Muḥyī al-Dīn Sheikh Meḥmed Efendi (d. 954/1547). He served as sheikh al-islām in the reign of Sulaymān the Magnificent for a short time. He stood out for his criticisms against some Sufis of his time and was even dismissed from the rank of sheikh al-islām because of these criticisms, according to some reports. In this paper, I will examine Chiwizâda’s criticisms of Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī, who was at the top of the Sufis he opposed, in terms of their historical-intellectual roots.
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Introduction

Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī (d. 638/1240) was one of the most influential Sufis. The issue of the attitude of Ottoman scholars toward the views and supporters of this great Sufi is important, not only because of the relations of scholars and central power to the Sufi circles but

* This paper is based on my PhD dissertation titled XVI. Yüzyıllın İlk Yarısında Osmanlı Toplumunun Dinî Meselelerine Mubalîf Bir Yaklaşım: Şeybülislâm Çivizâde Muhyiddin Meḥmed Efendi ve Fıkirleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme (Ankara: Gazi University, 2010).
also because of the different intellectual tendencies among these scholars. An examination of this issue with regard to its historical and intellectual aspects, especially in the context of the scholars who oppose the views of Ibn ‘Arabî, can provide crucial information about issues such as the formation of the Ottoman tradition of science and thought, its development, its changes (if any), the scholars belonging to it, the relations among these scholars, the interactions among them, and their attitudes, roles, and influences. Although Şükrû Özen’s study on this issue in terms of the fatwâs of sheikh al-islâms is not as comprehensive as Alexander D. Knysh’s study in the context of the Islamic world in the Middle Ages,¹ it provides a valuable perspective because it discusses the scholars who opposed the views of Ibn ‘Arabî among the Ottoman scholars of the classical period. This study is particularly important because it points to the fact that this opposing approach became visible after the conquest of Egypt by Sultan Selim I.²

There is no doubt that other interesting results may be achieved if more in-depth studies are conducted from this perspective. For example, the use of the “the net of relations” and “intellectual scouting” methods to examine the reasons Ottoman scholars in the sixteenth century opposed the views of Ibn ‘Arabî, the reasons they subsequently adopted this approach, and the source of their ideas would provide concrete and convincing proof. In fact, this issue has been discussed in broad strokes in studies by Mahmut Erol Kılıç and Şükrû Özen.³

³ Kılıç writes, “Upon the import of Ibn Taymiyya’s views, the type of scholars changed and these views gave rise to two types of scholars, i.e., Qâdîzâdalîs and Chivizâdalîs ….” With these words, he relates the opposition of the Ottoman scholars to Ibn ‘Arabî to the influence of Ibn Taymiyya’s views. See M. Erol Kılıç, “İbnü’l-Arabî, Muhyiddin,” Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA), XX,
Our study of Chiwizâda Muḥyī al-Dīn Sheikh Meḥmed Efendi (d. 954/1547), the famous Ottoman scholar of the sixteenth century who is known for his opposition to some mystics, mainly Ibn ʿArabī, has produced interesting results. In this article, I present the results that seem to answer the question of whom Chiwizâda followed in criticizing the views of Ibn ʿArabī. In other words, I examine the intellectual foundations of Chiwizâda’s critical approach to the thought of Ibn ʿArabī in the context of the historical opposition to Ibn ʿArabī. I will not address more general issues, such as Chiwizâda’s attitude toward and relations with Sufis and the determining factors in these issues. Within this framework, it is important to address the sources of data for this case because of some delicate aspects of our topic.

The Sources of Chiwizâda’s Ideas on Ibn ʿArabī

The most important source that presents Chiwizâda’s ideas on Ibn ʿArabī is undoubtedly Sheikh Bâlí al-Ṣofyawī’s (d. 960/1553) Risāla fi ḥall musbâkîlat al-Fuṣûṣ. In this interesting treatise, Sheikh Bâlí al-Ṣofyawī narrates some crucial information in order to refute found in a lost treatise of Chiwizâda.4 This treatise of Chiwizâda, which is ap-

4 In the first half of the XVIth century, there were two interesting controversies on some ideas of Ibn ʿArabī and the issue of the “cash waqf” between Chiwizâda Muḥyī al-Dīn Sheikh Meḥmed Efendi and Sheikh Bâlí al-Ṣofyawī. Chiwizâda served as mudarris in several madrasas, the judge of Egypt, the qâḍî ʿaskar of Anatolia, muftî/sheikh al-islâm, and qâḍî ʿaskar of Rumeli. Sheikh Bâlí al-Ṣofyawī was a Sufî who had a commentary on Fuṣûṣ al-bikam and a disciple of Qâsim Chalâbî who was a sheikh of the Khalwatiyya Order. These controversies became known with al-Ṣofyawī’s criticisms toward Chiwizâda in the form of treatises and letters. It seems that Chiwizâda’s negative ideas had a strict scientific approach; thus, al-Ṣofyawī’s aim of defending his own circle, which was the target of these negative ideas, fed these controversies. For brief biographies of Chiwizâda and al-Ṣofyawī, see Mehmet İpşirli, “Çivizâde Muḥyiddin Mehmed Efendi,” Türkiye Diyanet Vakfî İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA), VIII, 348-349; Mustafa Kara, “Bâlí Efendi, Sofyalı,” Türkiye Diyanet Vakfî İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA), V, 20-21.
parently about Ibn ‘Arabî and his *Fuṣūs al-ḥikam*, is lost. When the Ottoman atmosphere in the XVI\textsuperscript{th} century is considered in the context of the relations among the central power, scholars, and Sufis,\(^5\) there is a possibility that the treatise was swept away deliberately or was not yet discovered. In other words, this short treatise of al-Ṣofyawî is the most fundamental source for us because it indirectly enables us to access Chiwizâda’s lost treatise.

Let us present the relation of *Risāla fi ḥall mushkilât al-Fuṣūs* to Chiwizâda’s treatise and ideas because the former has such an important function. For instance, the title page of one of the manuscripts of this treatise in Süleymaniye Library states, “Sheikh Bâlî al-Ṣofyawî has written this treatise to refute Mullâ Chiwizâda in terms of the problems in *al-Fuṣūs*.”\(^6\) Moreover, in the introduction of the treatise regarding this issue, Sheikh Bâlî al-Ṣofyawî states,

… Some people were ignorant about the style of *al-Fuṣūs* (which is self-explanatory) since they did not have a total grasp of it. Although that person did not know anything about this discipline (*‘ilm*), he only looked at the half of the speech and those aspects which are clear, the people of knowledge became contradictory/ambiguous to him. For that reason, he wrote a treatise to deal with these ambiguous issues and denounced the author of *al-Fuṣūs* as an unbeliever. However, the person who he denounced as an unbeliever is “the son of the sister of his own aunt” [meaning “he just denounced himself”] ...

Sheikh Bâlî al-Ṣofyawî does not clearly state that the one who wrote the treatise against Ibn ‘Arabî, which includes the *takfîr* (de-


\(^{6}\) See Sheikh Bâlî al-Ṣofyawî, *Risāla fi ḥall mushkilât al-Fuṣūs* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Reisülküttab, 1166/8), 52a. For another study which states that this treatise of al-Ṣofyawî was written against Chiwizâda judging from another manuscript titled *Risāla fi ḥall mushkilât al-Fuṣūs* found in Istanbul Süleymaniye Library, Pertev Paşa, 621, 36a-38a; see Abdurrezzak Tek, “Fusûsu’l-Hikem’e Yönelik Bazı Tartışmalı Konulara Söylebi Bâlî Efendi’nin Bakışı,” *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 14/2 (2005), 108-109.

nouncing someone as an unbeliever), is Chiwizâda. However, in the following statements, he seems to identify Chiwizâda when he mentions that Chiwizâda served as muftî and was later dismissed from this position and that he was angry with the Sufis. He says,

... This kind of person does not fit into the position of fatwâ because (the position of) fatwâ signifies the dignity of the one who owns it. For that reason, he was left alone by God when he was dismissed from this very high and noble position ... We have written the meaning of the words stated by fatwâ giver in his treatise in our commentary on Fûsûş al-îkam in a thorough (taḥqîq) and detailed way ... This word came out of him because of his anger with abî Allâb (people of God) due to the lack of his reason. He did not know what he said because of his confusion ... The author of the treatise treated himself unjustly in two aspects. For that reason, he left the position of fatwâ (the post of sheikh al-islâm) in a true sense although he stayed in it officially ... The takfîr as such is not an issue (sha‘n) of fatwâ.8

A biographer of the XVIth-century Ottoman scholars, Maḥmûd ibn Sulaymân al-Kafawî (d. 990/1582), in his Katâ‘ib a‘lâm al-akhyâr min fuqabâ‘ madhbhab al-Nu‘mân al-mukhtâr, clearly states that Sheikh Bâlî al-Şofyawî defines Chiwizâda with these words. He also mentions that al-Şofyawî wrote a treatise against him (Risâla fi ḥall musbkiłat al-Fuṣûş). He says,

Sheikh Meḥmed, known as al-mawlâ al-fâdîl sheikh al-islâm Chiwizâda, wrote a treatise. In that treatise, there were criticisms (mu‘âkhdhadhât) leveled against al-Sheikh al-akbar, to the degree that the author denounced al-Sheikh al-akbar as an unbeliever because of some issues in Fûsûş al-îkam ... Some Şanafî scholars and Sufis (maskhbâyikh-i īqariqa) responded to that treatise. Al-Sheikh al-fâdîl wa-l-murshid al-kâmîl Sheikh Bâlî al-Şofyawî was among them. Furthermore, Sheikh Bâlî wrote a treatise in this issue and returned all criticisms back to their owner ...9

---


9 Al-Kafawî, Katâ‘ib, 248b. On this issue, see also 402a, 415b-416a.
At the time of Sheikh Bâli al-Şofyâwî, there is no other Ottoman scholar known to us besides Chiwizâda who served as a muftî and was later dismissed who held such negative opinions about Ibn ʿArabî to denounce him as an unbeliever. It is apparent that Chiwizâda wrote a treatise that “deserved” to be called “al-Risâla al-kufriyya” according to al-Şofyâwî, and Risâla fi ḥall muskîlât al-Fuṣûṣ was written against that treatise. Therefore, there is no doubt that the ideas attributed to “al-Risâla al-kufriyya” in al-Şofyâwî’s Risâla fi ḥall muskîlât al-Fuṣûṣ actually belonged to Chiwizâda. In this regard, this treatise is the most basic source for the issue we are addressing.

The second important source of Chiwizâda’s opinions about Ibn ʿArabî is the four fatwâs attributed to him. These fatwâs complete the above-mentioned treatise of al-Şofyâwî in a sense. In fact, three of these fatwâs are similar to the relationship between Sheikh Bâli al-Şofyâwî’s Risâla fi ḥall muskîlât al-Fuṣûṣ and the above-mentioned unknown treatise of Chiwizâda in terms of the quality of the collection in which they are found. These three fatwâs are not found in the collection of fatwâs compiled by Sayyid Aḥmad ibn Muṣṭafâ (d. 971/1563) known as Lâlî Aḥmad Chalâbî, who served as a “secretary of fatwâ” during the period when Chiwizâda was muftî, and by Ibn al-Adhamî al-Maghnisâwî, who held copies of Chiwizâda’s fatwâ and served as the “secretary of fatwâ” for Kamâlpashâzâda and Saʿdî Chalâbî. Instead, they are in a collection (majmûʿa) called Dafî al-Fuṣûṣ, which includes treatises and fatwâs against Ibn ʿArabî’s Fuṣûṣ...

10 Saʿdî Chalâbî (d. 945/1539), who was the muftî or sheikh al-islâm before Chiwizâda, takes a similar approach to Ibn ʿArabî. However, he cannot be the person Sheikh Bâli al-Şofyâwî describes because he was not dismissed from the position of muftî.

11 Al-Şofyâwî repeats this name in the above-mentioned treatise several times. The most striking expression he uses is as follows: “… He said so in his al-Risâla al-kufriyya. Thus this treatise deserves to be called so.” See al-Şofyâwî, Risâla fi ḥall muskîlât al-Fuṣûṣ, 52b.


13 As Laʿlî or Laʿlî in some manuscripts.

al-ḥikam. In other words, the fact that these three fatwās are not found in the primary source for Chiwizāda’s fatwās (i.e., the collections of Lālī and Ibn al-Adhamī) but are found in a collection called Dafṣ al-Fuṣūṣ suggests that they may not belong to Chiwizāda.\textsuperscript{15}

This idea might seem reasonable if the problematic and complex structure of the world of manuscripts is considered. Nonetheless, I think that there is no harm in accepting that these fatwās belong to Chiwizāda, as attributed in Dafṣ al-Fuṣūṣ. Strong proofs, such as the writing style of these fatwās and the signature “al-Sheikh Meḥmed,” suggest that the contents of these fatwās are in harmony with the information provided by other sources about Chiwizāda’s stance on Ibn ‘Arabī\textsuperscript{16} and the information provided by Sheikh Bālī al-Ṣofyawī in his Risāla fi ḥall musbkišt al-Fuṣūṣ support the fact that these fatwās belong to Chiwizāda rather than casting doubt on them because they are not found in the above-mentioned collections. Moreover, the issue was very sensitive at that time in terms of the relations among the political power, scholars, and the Sufi environment. This idea can be disproved by the reasonable explanation that these fatwās were not included in the collections of Lālī and Ibn al-Adhamī

\textsuperscript{15} Another problem with the attribution of these fatwās to Chiwizāda, which are recorded in Dafṣ al-Fuṣūṣ under the name “Chiwizāda, Fatāwā ʿalā l-Fuṣūṣ,” is the note on the folio in the same chapter. This note reads, “The death of Chiwizāda, year: 995.” Thus, the fatwās are attributed to Chiwizāda’s son, who became famous with the same nickname as his father and served as sheikh al-īslām. However, in addition to other fatwās recorded there, the three fatwās appear to belong to the father Chiwizāda Muhīy al-Dīn Sheikh Meḥmed Efendi (d. 954/1547), not his son Chiwizāda (d. 995/1586-87), after examination of their form and contents. See Chiwizāda, Fatāwā ʿalā l-Fuṣūṣ, in Dafṣ al-Fuṣūṣ (MS Ankara: Ankara University Faculty of Theology Library, 37208), 36b-41b.

\textsuperscript{16} There is an issue of the harmony between the harsh criticism against Ibn ‘Arabī in the fatwās attributed to Chiwizāda and the historical image of Chiwizāda. In this context, let me limit myself to pointing to a narration of Walī ibn Yagān, the mu-rattib of the fatwās of Abū l-Suʿūd Efendi. According to the narration recorded by Walī ibn Yagān, upon his return from pilgrimage after he was dismissed from the muṣṭfi position, Chiwizāda said to Sulaymān the Magnificent, “Sheikh-i Akbar ‘Arabī is a heretic and unbeliever. It is due to the Islamic law that his bones should be removed from his grave and burned.” He suggested that the Sultan should open his grave and burn his remaining bones. See Fatāwā-yi Abū l-Suʿūd (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, İsmihan Sultan, 226), 168b-169a. For this narration, see also Özen, “Ottoman ’Ulamā’ Debating Sufism,” 329.
due to inconsistencies in them. This situation is similar to that of the “al-Risâla al-kufriyya,” which is attributed to Chiwizâda by al-Şofyawi, and is now lost. Hence, it is quite meaningful that these fatwâs were recorded in Dafî al-Fuṣûs, which is suitable for their content, rather than in any other collection of fatwâs. Thus, there is no harm in using these three fatwâs as sources in the context of the historical base of Chiwizâda’s ideas on Ibn ʿArabî.

The Historical Base of Chiwizâda’s Ideas on Ibn ʿArabî

Let me first state that Chiwizâda takes a negative/critical approach towards Ibn ʿArabî, which is known by the records in biographical and historical sources. Here, we begin to examine the issue of the historical base of Chiwizâda’s opposition to Ibn ʿArabî without mentioning this issue separately. This examination will also function as a depiction of Chiwizâda’s ideas on Ibn ʿArabî.

The most important source for Chiwizâda’s criticism toward Ibn ʿArabî is Sheikh Bâli al-Şofyawi’s Risâla fi ḥall mushkilât al-Fuṣûs. When we read this, we see that Chiwizâda’s opposition to Ibn ʿArabî seems to depend considerably on the ideas of Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) in terms of Chiwizâda’s reasons for his criticism, including Ibn ʿArabî’s ideas (on which Chiwizâda bases his criticism), the style of the evaluation of Ibn ʿArabî’s ideas, and the conclusions. In other words, an examination of the information in the above-mentioned source in terms of its historical bases suggests that most of Chiwizâda’s ideas about Ibn ʿArabî are rooted in Ibn Taymiyya. The proofs that lead to this idea are important and must be addressed in detail. Let us now examine the issue to identify the reasons why Chiwizâda opposed Ibn ʿArabî.

First and foremost, the issues that Sheikh Bâli al-Šofyawî narrates and explains in *Risâla fi ḥall musbîlât al-Fuṣûş* with regard to Chiwizâda’s criticism toward Ibn ʿArabi are, in fact, the issues in *Fuṣûş al-ḥikam* that were once asked to Ibn Taymiyya, such as *waḥdat al-wujûd*, the finitude of torment in Hell, the belief of the Pharaoh, worshipping idols, and *tanzîḥ-tashbîḥ*. To state this fact in a more concrete way, all the reasons for Chiwizâda’s opposition to Ibn ʿArabî (as well as several additional ideas on the same topic) are to be found in this question directed to Ibn Taymiyya:

Question: I wonder, what do the respected scholars, great imâms, and the guides of Muslims say about a common book? The author of this book claims that he wrote that book and presented to people after he had seen the Prophet Muḥammad (pbuh) in his dream and received his permission. However, most of that book is contrary to the divine books revealed by God. Moreover, it is also in disagreement with the sayings of the prophets sent by God. For instance, this book says, “Adam was called human because, before God, he was in the position of the eyeball which enables the eye to see.” In another place, the book says, “the Ħaqq (God) which is purified (*munazzah*) is indeed people which are resembled (*mushabbah*). About the people of No-ah, the author says, “If they had quit worshipping the idols Wadd, Suwāʾ, Yaghūth, Yaʾūq, and Nasr, they would have become ignorant of God inasmuch as they quit these idols.” The author goes on, “This is because God has a face in everything that is worshipped. Those who know it know it, those who do not, do not. The one who has the knowledge is aware that who is worth of being worshipped and in which shapes God reveals Himself, thus being worshipped. This person knows that this difference and multiplicity are like organs in material bodies.” About the people of Hûd, he says, “… they became connected in term of closeness. Distance has gone away. For them, Hell ceased to exist. They achieved this position of closeness because they deserve this delightful and pleasing position, which was acquired for them as an obligation (*minna*). For that reason, they have achieved this rank because their natures deserve that, because of their good actions, and because they have been on the righteous path of

---

For some remarks that state that these issues are crucial for Ibn Taymiyya’s negative attitude toward Ibn ʿArabî, see Mustafa Kara, “Ibn Teymiye’nin Ibn Arabî’ye ve Vahdet-i Vücuda Bakışı,” in his *Dervişin Hayatı Sûfinin Kelâmı: Hal Tercümeleri/Tarikatlar/Istilâlar* (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2005), 173-188.
their God.” Moreover, he denies the judgment of the *wa'ā'id* of God, i.e., His threatening, for people who deserve to be punished. Now, should those who agree with all these ideas of that man be denounced as unbelievers or not? Or, should one consent to all these statements or not? Should one be regarded as a sinner if he does not reject these ideas with his tongue or his heart upon hearing them? Please give us a clear *fatwâ* …  

There is an intriguing overlap between these issues. The above-mentioned ideas of Ibn ‘Arabî were criticized by many scholars. There is also the possibility that the text in question was circulated in the Ottoman scholarly circles. Thus, the situation might be that it does not have any “special meaning” in establishing the relationship between Chiwizâda and Ibn Taymiyya. Moreover, an interesting *fatwâ* with almost the same meaning, which is attributed to Chiwizâda, might be taken as proof:

The author of *al-Fuṣûş* says in *al-Fuṣûş*, “in their deception they say, ‘Do not abandon your gods, neither Wadd, Suwâ‘, Yaghûth nor Ya‘ūq, nor Nasr. If they had abandoned them they would have become ignorant of the Reality, to the extent that they deserted them’.”  

And he also says, “for in every object of worship there is reflection of the Reality whether it be recognized or not (…) The one who knows, knows Who is worshipped and in what form He is manifest to be worshipped. He also knows that the distinction and multiplicity [of forms] are merely like parts of sensible form or the powers of a spiritual image,” and he also says, “Since it is He [their Lord] Who drives them to this abode, they [in truth] attain nearness [to Him], all distance and notion of Hell ceasing for them. Thus they attain [in reality] the blessing of nearness [to Him] in respect of what they have merited [in their eternal essences] being [eternally] wrongdoers; nor does He grant them this pleasurable station as a freely given gift because it is they themselves who adopt it according as their essential realities have merited eternally by their deeds [thus determined]. Indeed in

---


performing their deeds they are, nevertheless, on the Path of their Lord . . .”  

and he also says, “The Reality is at once the created Creator and the creating creature. All this is One Essence, at once Unique and Many . . .” If anyone who reads these sentences, understands them, believes in them as truths, and insists on them, what must be the religious verdict of that person? May God give you reward if you respond to our question.

Answer: He is an unbeliever and heretic. He must be killed. If he repents after he is captured, he will not escape the death penalty. Written by Sheikh Meḥmed.

However, the idea that the overlap in the mentioned issues may not have a “special meaning” does not seem correct. This is because, I believe, Chiwizāda’s style of evaluating Ibn ‘Arabī’s ideas (in the question asked to Ibn Taymiyya), including Chiwizāda’s answer in this fatwā, strongly supports the idea that he might be influenced by Ibn Taymiyya, and the above-mentioned text might be a part of this influence.

The explanation is as follows. According to the information given by Sheikh Bālī al-Šofyawī, Chiwizāda had criticized Ibn ‘Arabī for the first time because of the latter’s words about wahdat al-wujūd in Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam: “Before God, the human was in the position of the eyeball which enables the eye to see; this is why he was called ‘human.’ This is because God looks at His creatures through him and has mercy on them . . .” and also because of Ibn ‘Arabī’s claim that “this situation entails Adam to be a ‘part’ of God.” In addition to this criticism, he stated that this second sentence makes the above-mentioned claim appropriate judging from Ibn ‘Arabī’s sentence, “the Haqq (God) which is purified (munazzab) is indeed the created which is resembled (mushabbah).” With regard to wahdat al-wujūd, again, in Ibn ‘Arabī’s words, “… the Haqq (God) which is purified (munazzab) is indeed the created which is resembled (mushabbah). Thus, the creator is (in a sense) the created, and the created is the Creator.

---

22 Ibid., 131.
23 Ibid., 87.
24 Chiwizāda, Fatāwā ‘alā l-Fuṣūṣ, 40a-b.
26 See al-Šofyawī, Risāla fi ḥall muskīlat al-Fuṣūṣ, 52a.
These are all the same realities..." and “... thus the Noble Being by virtue of himself (...) is the perfect being which encompasses all things which exist with Him and everything which is attributed to non-existence ...” are interpreted by Chiwizâda as meaning that “God is the same as the world and He is qualified with the attributes of the created beings (muḥḍathāt).” Furthermore, “God has, according to them, the all qualities that the creatures have, such as ḥusn (beauty), qubḥ (ugliness), madḥ (praise), and dhamm (blaim).” Hence, these are all against true belief (sbarʿī iʿtiqād); thus, he denounced Ibn ʿArabī as an unbeliever.

Responding the question above, Ibn Taymiyya, who had evaluated Ibn ʿArabī’s ideas three centuries ago, states,

If someone says that “For God, Adam is in the position of the eyeball which enables the eye to see,” it entails that Adam be a part of God the Exalted and a division of Him. Furthermore, Adam will be the most precious part and division in God. Now, this idea is the base of the school supported by these people. This is what is understood from their words. Hence, Ibn ʿArabī’s second sentence “the Ḥaqq (God) which is purified (munazzah) is indeed the created which is resembled (mushabbah)” is completely in accordance with that. For that reason he goes on to say, “The creator (khāliq) is indeed the created (makhlūq), and the created is indeed the Creator. These are all from the same being. No! No! He is even the same being. He is the beings which are in the state of multiplicity (kathrā) ...” He also says: “… Thus the Noble Being by virtue of himself, no matter he be praised in terms of custom, reason, and religion, or blamed, is the perfect being which encompasses all things which exist with Him and everything which is attributed to non-existence. This is only relevant for the being which we call Allah ... Do not you see that God reveals Himself with the attributes of muḥḍathāt (the created beings) and de-

27 Ibn ʿArabī, Fusūṣ al-ḥikam, 75-76.
28 Ibid., 149. For another translation of Ibn ʿArabī’s words in “Faṣṣ Idrīs”, see Ibn ʿArabī, Fusūṣu'l-hikem [= Fusūṣ al-ḥikam] (translated into Turkish by Nuri Gençosman; Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1992), 75.
29 See al-Šofyawī, Risāla fi ḥall mushkīlāt al-Fuṣūṣ, 52b.
30 See ibid., 53a.
31 See ibid., 52b.
scribes Himself by these with the qualities of incompleteness and blame (dbamm).” (...) These people are called “the people of wubdat al-wujūd” and they claim truth (tabqiq) and wisdom (‘irfān). They regard the existence of God as equal to the existence of the created beings. According to these people, God is subject to all qualities which are found in the created beings such as beauty, ugliness, praise, and blame. Moreover, the Creator does not have a different existence from creatures in any sense. In this world, nothing is apart from the Creator (khāliq) and different from Him.32

These statements, if Sheikh Bālī al-Ṣofyawī does not misguide us, reveal us that Chiwizāda follows Ibn Taymiyya’s words line by line. Regarding Ibn Taymiyya’s words “Adam is a part of God” or “a division of God,” “the second sentence is completely in accordance with that,” “God is equal to the created beings,” and “according to the people of wubdat al-wujūd, God has the same qualities as the created beings” are repeated by Chiwizāda as “Adam is a part (juz’),” “the second sentence (word) makes appropriate the first,” “God is the same as the world,” and “according to them, God has the same attributes as all the attributes that the created beings have,” sentence by sentence and with the same concepts. Therefore, this situation leads us to conclude that Chiwizāda followed Ibn Taymiyya on this issue.

The interpretation of Ibn ‘Arabī’s words about worshipping idols, which is narrated in the question asked to Ibn Taymiyya and repeated by Chiwizāda in the same manner, is another striking example of this influence. In response to that question, Ibn Taymiyya’s statements are as follows:

Those who say that “if the worshippers of idols had left their idols, they would have become ignorant of God inasmuch as they quit these idols” are in more unbelief than Jews and Christians. If someone does not regard those people as unbelievers, they are even in more unbelief than Jews and Christians. This is because Jews and Christians regard idol-worshippers as unbelievers ... Indeed, these people are in more unbelief than musḥriks (idol-worshippers). This is because they see the idol-worshipper as the one who worships God, not something else. They make the idols with regard to God as the organs of man

32 Ibn Taymiyya, Ḳbn Teymiye Külliyyati, II, 148-150.
with regard to man, and the faculties of soul with regard to the soul.\textsuperscript{33}

Sheikh Bālī al-Ṣofyawī briefly narrates Ibn ‘Arabī’s statements as follows: “… if they had quit the gods they worship, they would become ignorant about God as much as they quit worshipping …”\textsuperscript{34} Then, al-Ṣofyawī provides some additional remarks and says, “This is his [Chiwizāda’s] word.” About the same statements, Chiwizāda seems to have used this expression: “The one who holds that is more unbeliever than Jews and Christians, even than idol-worshippers.”\textsuperscript{35} One should notice that this phrase, which al-Ṣofyawī attributes to Chiwizāda, is a combination of two of Ibn Taymiyya’s statements. This is another proof that seems to show that Chiwizāda followed Ibn Taymiyya when opposing Ibn ‘Arabī.

In my opinion, Chiwizāda’s remarks on the issue of the “belief of Pharaoh” exhibit the same influence, that is, the influence of Ibn Taymiyya. Some of Ibn Taymiyya’s words about the issue of the belief of Pharaoh are as follows:

These people also say that “everything is but God” … For that reason, the author of \textit{al-Fuṣūṣ} saw those who worship the calf as truthful. He further stated that Moses criticized and refuted Aaron’s preventing these people from worshipping the calf, and said: “… The knower indeed sees God in everything and even knows God as identical to everything.” As a result, these people see Pharaoh as one of the dignitaries of knowers and the people of \textit{tabqīq} (truth) and regard him right in his claim for deity … To understand that these people are in unbelief, it is enough to say that their easiest statement is as follows: “Pharaoh died as a believer, free from all his sins.” Thus, Ibn ‘Arabī says: “Moses became the light of Pharaoh’s eye because of the belief granted by God at the time of drowning. Thus, God took his soul when he was clean and purified, free from any evil or ugliness. This is because God took his soul just at the time of his belief, when he did not have a chance to be sinful. (As regards his previous sins) Islam extinguishes all previous sins.” However, as is necessarily known by Muslims,

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Ibid.}, II, 154-155.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibn ‘Arabī, \textit{Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam}, 66.

Jews, Christians, and the people of other religions as well, Pharaoh is one of the people who denied God most.36

According to Sheikh Bâli al-Şofyawi’s account, Ibn ‘Arabi’s words “… Thus, God took his soul when he was clean and purified, free from any evil or ugliness …” were objected to by Chiwizâda because “this word indicates that Pharaoh was a monotheist Muslim like other Muslims.”38 He attributed to “the great mystics” (mashâyikh-i kibâr) the phrase “the knower is the one who sees God in everything, he even sees (God) as identical to everything.” He said, “This is why he regarded Pharaoh as one of the great followers of truth (muḥaqqaqîq).”39 Chiwizâda seems to follow Ibn Taymiyya in his statement that Ibn ‘Arabi’s words would mean that Pharaoh was a believer; in his statement “the knower is the one who sees God in everything,” which he attributes to “the great mystics;” and in his statement, “Pharaoh is regarded as one of the greatest followers of truth.”

As stated above, according to Sheikh Bâli al-Şofyawi’s information in Risâla fi ḡall mushkilât al-Fuṣûṣ, Chiwizâda criticized Ibn ‘Arabi’s ideas on tanzîb-tashbîh and “the finitude of the torment in Hell” in the question asked to Ibn Taymiyya. Nonetheless, al-Şofyawi does not follow the reflection of Chiwizâda’s criticism and does not literally narrate some of his words, as in the case of three issues we have addressed. For instance, he explains the issue of tanzîb-tashbîh without mentioning Chiwizâda, only quoting Ibn ‘Arabi’s sentences40 “neither is tanzîb distinguished from tashbîh, nor is tashbîh free from tanzîb”41 and “the knower (‘ârîf), who is competent in his knowledge, is the one who combine tashbîh with tanzîb at the same time in the issue of the knowledge of God (ma’rifat Allâh).”42 Similar-

37 Ibn ‘Arabi, Fuṣûṣ al-ḥikam, 221.
38 al-Şofyawi, Risâla fi ḡall mushkilât al-Fuṣûṣ, 53a.
39 Ibid., 53b.
40 Ibid., 54a.
41 Ibn ‘Arabi, Fuṣûṣ al-ḥikam, 200.
42 Ibn ‘Arabi’s words that were quoted by al-Şofyawi must be taken from these parts in The Chapter of/on Noah (Faṣṣ Nûḥ): “If you combine two things, that is, tashbîb and tanzîb, you find the true path and become one of imâms and sayyids in the divine knowledge …;” “The one who combines tanzîb and tashbîb in the path of knowing God and describes Him with two characters (al-Żâbir and al-
ly, he mentions Chiwizāda’s criticism on the issue of the “finitude of the torment in Hell” only in broad strokes. Therefore, al-Ṣofyawī’s records are not enough to define the nature of Chiwizāda’s criticisms and their relation to the ideas of Ibn Taymiyya. However, Chiwizāda’s fatwā about the last issue, which I found during my studies, seems to resolve the problem when considered with regard to al-Ṣofyawī’s relevant record.

Regarding the criticism of Chiwizāda on the issue of the “finitude of the torment in Hell,” Sheikh Bālí al-Ṣofyawī quotes and interprets Ibn ‘Arabī’s statements, “… (they) are found in the very closeness. In this case, distance ceases to exist and the thing called ‘Hell’ perishes for them. Thus, they achieve the profit of closeness in terms of acquisition.” According to al-Ṣofyawī, with regard to such words, there is no reason to think badly (sū’-i ẓann) of al-Sheikh [Ibn ‘Arabī] and other people of God. It is understood from these statements that Chiwizāda had thought badly about Ibn ‘Arabī for the latter’s statements mentioned above. According to a fatwā that I found during my studies, Chiwizāda regards Ibn ‘Arabī’s sentences as “heresy.” According to Chiwizāda, those who hold such views must be subject to the judgments applied to heretics. The fatwā is as follows:

(Question) A sheikh says that the natures of the people of unbelief change to the nature of fire after they are tormented for one or two days in Hell. Thus, they are not affected by the pain of torment. They take a walk in Hell as they do in the world. What would be the verdict of this sheikh? May God bless you upon your answer!

Answer: He is a heretic. The verdicts about heretics must be applied. Written by el-faqīr Sheikh Meḥmed.

When we look at the views of Ibn Taymiyya, we notice a similar verdict:

Hence Ibn ‘Arabī shows the people of ‘Ād and other unbelievers as they are on the righteous path. He regards them as intertwined with

Bāṭtin), knows himself universally, not in details. He can also understand God universally, not with the details of His names and attributes ....” See Ibn ‘Arabī, Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam, 56, 54.

Ibid., 113-114.

Al-Ṣofyawī, Risāla fi ḥall musbkiyat al-Fuṣūṣ, 53a.

Chiwizāda, Fatāwā ‘alā l-Fuṣūṣ, 41a.
closeness. He holds that the people of Hell find pleasure in Hell like
the people of the Heaven do in Heaven. The religion of Islam clearly
reports that the people of ʿĀd and Thamūd, Pharaoh and his people,
and other unbelievers whose stories are told by God are the enemies
of God. These people will be tormented in Hell. God cursed them
and is angry with them. So, those who praise them, regard them as
the good people of God and see their place in Heaven are more un-
believers than Jews and Christians.⁴⁶

In terms of the issues addressed by Sheikh Bâli al-Ṣofyawî in
*Risâla fi ḥall musbkitât al-Fuṣûṣ*, Chiwizâda’s reasons for his opposi-
tion to Ibn ʿArabî are mentioned above. Furthermore, we need to
note two more issues that are of crucial importance because they
show that he follows Ibn Taymiyya in his opposition. The first of
these issues is Ibn ʿArabî’s opinion about the concept *kbâtam al-
awlîyâ* (the seal of God’s friends), a subject that is criticized by Ibn
Taymiyya and Chiwizâda but is not mentioned in the question asked
to Ibn Taymiyya or in Sheikh Bâli al-Ṣofyawî’s *Risâla fi ḥall musbkitât
al-Fuṣûṣ*. In my opinion, this issue could also be interpreted as evi-
dence that Chiwizâda follows Ibn Taymiyya when he opposes Ibn
ʿArabî. It is not coincidence that this issue is not found in the question
asked to Ibn Taymiyya or in Sheikh Bâli al-Ṣofyawî’s *Risâla fi ḥall musbkitât
al-Fuṣûṣ*. On the contrary, Chiwizâda might have written
the treatise in which he denounced Ibn ʿArabî as an unbeliever by
following the answer given by Ibn Taymiyya in response to a ques-
tion asked to him, as we have attempted to prove above. Thus,
Chiwizâda did not address the issue of *kbâtam al-awlîyâ*, which is
not found in that answer. Naturally, Sheikh Bâli al-Ṣofyawî must have
followed a similar path in his refutation to Chiwizâda. Therefore, the
fact that the issue of *kbâtam al-awlîyâ* was not addressed by al-
Ṣofyawî is a meaningful parallelism for the relationship between
Chiwizâda and Ibn Taymiyya.

Furthermore, Chiwizâda’s statements in one of his fatwâs parallel
to Ibn Taymiyya’s ideas. Upon reviewing Ibn ʿArabî’s views on the
concept of *kbâtam al-awlîyâ*, Ibn Taymiyya regards them as “unbe-
belief” and “heterodoxy:”

… Thus Ibn ʿArabî regarded *kbâtam al-awlîyâ* as more knowledge-
able of God than all prophets (nabîs and rasûls). He held that proph-

ets can see the knowledge about God in the light of *khâtama al-awliya*’… He said so because it was not possible to accept any *nabīs* and *rasūls* after the Prophet (pbuh). This is pure unbelief … In addition, Ibn ‘Arabi’s ideas that there is a *khâtama al-awliya* who comes to the earth at the end of time, that he is superior to all sages who lived before him, that he is in the position of *khâtama al-anbiya* (the seal of the prophets) among other sages in comparison to other prophets are clearly heretical views.47

Similar to Ibn Taymiyya when he was asked about the same issue, Chiwizada concluded that the holder of these views is an unbeliever:

Question: What is the religious verdict of those people who know that al-Sheikh Muhýý al-Dîn ‘Arabi stated in his *al-Fuṣûṣ* that *khâtama al-awliya* is better than *khâtama al-rusul* and in his *al-Futûhât* that “I am the *khâtama al-awliya*,” who says that Ibn ‘Arabi’s words are right so believe in them accordingly or see them as possible to be true?

Answer: He becomes an unbeliever, may Allah protect us from falling in that.

Chiwizada.48

The second issue that we need to note is that Chiwizada’s judgments about the teachings of Ibn ‘Arabi in his *fatwâs* are in parallel to those of Ibn Taymiyya. For instance, regarding the leaders of *wahdat al-wujûd*, Ibn Taymiyya states that they must be (*wâjib*) killed and that their repentances should not be accepted when they are seized:

The situation of these people of *wahdat al-wujûd* is the same. Their leaders are the pioneers of unbelief and they must be killed. When they are seized at the time they have not repented yet, their repentances are not accepted anymore.49

Like Ibn Taymiyya, in his *fatwâs*, one of which is quoted above and the other about the believers in the truthfulness of Ibn ‘Arabi’s


ideas in *Fușüş al-ḥikam*, Chiwizāda stated that those people must be killed and that their repentances are not accepted upon their seizure:

**Answer:** He is a heretic (*ziṅdiq*) and must be killed. He cannot escape the death penalty upon seizure, even if he repents.

Written by al-Sheikh Meḥmed.⁵⁰

(Question:) There is a group called “Malāmiyya.” These people hang “çeke” around their necks and say *lā ilāhā ʾilla ilāh*? They walk down the streets of market places. They completely understand the words written in the book *al-Fușuş* and believe in them as truth. They insist on such beliefs. They contaminate the beliefs of common people with words which are contrary to the noble religion and misguide them. What is the verdict on those people?

**Answer:** The author of the book called *al-Fușuş* is Ibn ʿArabī. This book includes many things from *kufr*, *iłâd*, and *zandaqa*. There is no doubt that the one who understands it and holds it true is a heretic. He must be killed and cannot escape death after he repents upon his seizure. He is not like other unbelievers.

Written by el-faqīr Sheikh Meḥmed.⁵¹

---

⁵⁰ Chiwizāda, *Fatāwā ʿalā l-Fușuş*, 40a-b.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 41a. In this regard, we must touch upon another interesting issue stated by Sheikh Bālí al-Šofyawī. According to al-Šofyawī, at the end of his treatise, Chiwizāda stated that some scholars had refuted *Fușuş*, including “al-Sheikh Badr al-Dīn, Sheikh al-muḥaddithīn, Imām al-Shāfīʿīyya, and Qāḍī Saʿd al-Dīn.” These names mentioned by Chiwizāda gain importance for the question of whom he followed in his opposition to Ibn ʿArabī. This is because these names, when they are examined in terms of the environment to which they belong, whether they include Ibn Taymiyya, and what this means in the context of the parallelism/relationship among the texts analyzed above, might provide some clues. Let me state clearly that I have not reached any conclusion about the identification of these names. The person known as “Qāḍī Saʿd al-Dīn” might be the famous Saʿd al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī, who is known as a dissident of Ibn ʿArabī. Thus, for now, I will not provide further examination of this important question. The original of al-Šofyawī’s record is as follows: 

"... ثم قال في آخر رسالته وقد رد على الفصول جماعة من العلماء منهم الشيخ بدر الدين شيخ المحدثين و إمام الشافعية و القاضي سعد الدين آه." See al-Šofyawī, *Risālah fi bālī mustakbūl al-Fușuş*, 54a; see also al-Kafawi, *Katāʿib*, 248b. In this issue, see also Tek, “Fusûsu’l-Hikem’e Yönelik ...,” 132. Apart from this record, one might ask, “Why did al-Šofyawī not mention Ibn Taymiyya against Chiwizāda’s criticisms toward Ibn ʿArabī and the fact that he had followed Ibn Taymiyya?” I would answer this question as follows. Al-Šofyawī was not aware of
Lastly, I would like to briefly address the issue of the historical ground and possibility of the above-mentioned intellectual parallelism/relationship between Chiwizāda and Ibn Taymiyya. First, let me state that, regardless of the context of the opposition to Ibn ‘Arabī or in any other issue, Chiwizāda had the opportunity to be directly or indirectly informed of or influenced by the views of Ibn Taymiyya. Chiwizāda went to Cairo during his career in the Ottoman scholarly environment – most likely in 937/1530-31 – after he was appointed the judge of Egypt. He served as judge there until 944/1537, about six years.  

According to the writings of XVIth-century biographers such as Taqī al-Dīn al-Tamīmī (d. 1005/1596-97) and ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Shaʿrānī (d. 973/1565), Chiwizāda settled relationships in this period with scholars belonging to different schools and environments, such as al-Imām al-Allāma Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Laqānī al-Mālikī (d. 958/1551), al-Sheikh al-Allāma Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭablawī al-Shāfiʿī, Shihāb al-Dīn Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-Sunbāṭī, Ibn al-Ḥalabī, al-Ghazzī, Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad Shihāb al-Dīn al-Ramlī al-Anṣārī (d. 957/1550), al-Barhamtūshī, and ‘Alī Nūr al-Dīn al-Ṭarābulusī. Chiwizāda’s relationships with these scholars were sometimes positive and sometimes negative. Moreover, Chiwizāda got ḥijāza in ḥadith from the Egyptian Shāfiʿī scholar al-Sayyid al-Sharīf ʿAbd al-Raḥīm al-ʿAbbāsī (d. 963/1555-56), who lived sometime in Istanbul, and from Ibn al-Najjār

---

this situation when he wrote his treatise, in which he quoted from Chiwizāda. Even if he was aware, he could not have mentioned it as an anti-“accusation.” Furthermore, in comparison with the scholars who refuted Fuṣūṣ, as stated by Chiwizāda, al-Ṣufyāwī lists those scholars who supported his claim, such as Fakhr al-Rāzī, al-Qāḍī al-Bayḍāwī, Mawlānā al-Fanārī, Mawlānā al-ʿArab, Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Ibn al-Afdal, ‘Alī Chalabī, Kamālpashazāda, and Ibn Bahāʾ al-Dīn. In terms of the differences among the scientific views of scholars, this can be taken as another clue to support our case. For this record, see al-Ṣufyāwī, Risāla fi ḥall musbhīlat al-Fuṣūṣ, 54b; see also Tek, “Fusūṣu’l-Hikem’e Yönelik …,” 132-133.


Al-Tamīmī, ibid., 360a.

(d. 949/1542-43), who was “from the last Arabic speaking Ḥanbali chief-judges of Egypt” and was “a dissident of Sufism in his early times.” Additionally, in Istanbul, he was in contact with the famous Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī (d. 956/1549-50), the author of Ni‘mat al-dbari‘a fī nuṣrat al-sbari‘a, who seems to have played an important role in the formation of the opposition to Ibn ʿArabī in the Ottoman capital in the XVIth century.

Therefore, it is not incorrect to assume that Chiwizāda might have seen the works of many scholars belonging to different traditions who opposed Ibn ʿArabī, including Ibn Taymiyya. Chiwizāda might have been influenced by these scholars when forming his critical views of Ibn ʿArabī.

At this point, we must note an intriguing difference between Chiwizāda and the scholars who were critics of Ibn ʿArabī in Istanbul. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī and Sheikh al-islām Sa‘dī Chalabī (d. 945/1539) were important scholars who opposed Ibn ʿArabī in the Ottoman capital in Chiwizāda’s time. Theoretically, these two could be the ones who influenced Chiwizāda. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī may have been more influential because he wrote two different works against Ibn ʿArabī. In his Ni‘mat al-dbari‘a fī nuṣrat al-sbari‘a, he mostly attacks the idea of waḥdat al-wujūd and describes Ibn ʿArabī as a heretic (zindiq and mulḥid).

As the contemporary Saudi Arabian researcher ʿAbū l-Faḍl Muḥammad al-Qūnawī states, he takes into account “the principle which Ibn Taymiyya and other scholars had considered in

---

55 Al-Tamīmī, *ibid.*, 366b. For Shihāb al-Dīn ʿĀḥmad al-Futūḥī (d. 949/1542-43), who was one of the most important Ḥanbali scholars in the first half of the XVIth century and was known as Ibn al-Najjār (based on ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Sha‘rānī), see Winter, *ibid.*, 227, 244. Ibn al-Najjār al-Futūḥī who was also known as Ibn al-Najjār, like Shihāb al-Dīn ʿĀḥmad al-Futūḥī, was later appointed as Ḥanbali qādī l-ṣūdāt of Egypt. See Ferhat Koca, “İbnü’n-Neccâr el-Fütühî,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (DİA), XXI, 170-171.

56 As stated by Özen, Chiwizāda (and Sheikh al-islām Sa‘dī Chalabī) wrote forewords (appreciation) for the work of Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī in which he refuted Ibn ʿArabī’s ideas (Özen, “Ottoman ʿUlamāʾ Debating Sufism,” 326). For these forewords, see Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī, Ni‘mat al-dbari‘a fī nuṣrat al-sbari‘a (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Laleli, 2453), 1a. For a short biography of Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī, see Şükrü Selim Has, “Halebî, İbrâhîm b. Muḥammad,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (DİA), XV, 231-232.

57 See al-Ḥalabī, *Ni‘mat al-dbari‘a*, 1b-72b. This treatise is translated into Turkish. See *Vabdet-i Vucud* (translated into Turkish by Ahmet Dündar; Istanbul: Tevhid Yayınları, 1999), 1-199.
dealing with the disease.” In other words, al-Qūnawī holds that Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī did not follow Ibn ʿArabī. Alexander Knysh provides some information about the issue, referring to ʿUthmān Yaḥyā, the publisher of Ibn ʿArabī’s works. According to him, in the mentioned treatise, al-Ḥalabī followed al-Taftāzānī’s treatise/thesis on the subject. This means that Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī followed al-Taftāzānī, not Ibn Taymiyya, in his criticism of Ibn ʿArabī.

Sheikh al-islām Saʿdī Chalabī was in close contact and “cooperation” with Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī. He was asked to issue a fatwā about Ibn ʿArabī’s ideas in Fūṣūṣ al-ḥikam, such as the idea that the human is like the eyeball of God, the meaning of worshipping idols, the idea that God is purified (munazzāḥ) and people are resembled (mushabbah), and the torment in Hell (waʾid). According to the findings of Şükrü Özen, the question part (maṣʿalā) of the fatwā is identical to the question asked to the Mamluk scholars. In this fatwā, Saʿdī Chalabī responds that some of these views of Ibn ʿArabī are sophistry, some of them are heresy (zandaqa, ilḥād), and some are a “denial of the basic religious principles” and that anyone who affirms them or is hesitant about them becomes an unbeliever. Furthermore, supporters of these views, if they do not repent, are to be killed with “the sword of religious law,” and those who hear these views should deny them. The expressions in this response of Saʿdī Chalabī do not have intriguing similarities in style to those of Ibn Taymiyya. Thus, it is not probable that Saʿdī Chalabī followed the path of Ibn Taymiyya when he criticized Ibn ʿArabī.

However, as I attempt to prove, especially according to the information narrated by Sheikh Bālī al-Ṣofyāwī, Chiwizāda repeats some words of Ibn Taymiyya when he criticizes Ibn ʿArabī. From this point of view, Chiwizāda is in a different position from that of Ibrāhīm al-

58 Al-Ḥalabī, Vahdet-i Vucud, 7-8.
59 Knysh, Ibn ʿArabī in the Later Islamic Tradition, 164.
60 Saʿd al-Dīn Saʿdī Chalabī ibn ʿĪsā al-Qaṣṭāmūnī, Šarāt-i Fatwā Sheikh al-islām Saʿdī Efendī (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Haci Mahmud Efendi, 2680), 71a-b.
62 Saʿdī Chalabī, ibid., 71a-b. See also Özen, “Ottoman Ulamas’ Debating Sufism,” 325-326.
Halabî and Sa‘di Chalabî, at least in terms of al-Šofyawî’s account. This position cannot only be explained by the fact that Ibn Taymiyya’s ideas about Ibn ʿArabî became “anonymous” in time and thus affected Chiwizâda. We also cannot also explain it with a common “breeze of Ibn Taymiyya” that is found in every anti-Ibn ʿArabî stance.

Conclusion

Chiwizâda’s criticisms toward Ibn ʿArabî especially those found in Sheikh Bâlî al-Šofyawî’s Risāla fi ḫall musbkalāt al-Fuṣūṣ, in my opinion, are rooted in the Salafî scholar Ibn Taymiyya, who was at the top of the critics of Ibn ʿArabî. This is because these criticisms of Chiwizâda have interesting similarities, both in content and style, to the text which includes a question asked to Ibn Taymiyya about Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam and his answer. In other words, Chiwizâda seems to level his criticisms toward Ibn ʿArabî, literally following the ideas/statements that are found in the text belonging to Ibn Taymiyya. Historically, there is the probability that Chiwizâda is aware of Ibn Taymiyya’s ideas, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, Chiwizâda must have been influenced, either deliberately or unknowingly, by Ibn Taymiyya’s views. The possibility that scholars who belong to different traditions might have arrived at the same criticisms toward Ibn ʿArabî is weak. If the available, if scarce, information and its analysis do not lead us to a serious mistake, the above-mentioned situation is very meaningful in terms of discussions about the influence of Salafî thought on the Ottoman scientific tradition.
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