

**A SIXTEENTH-CENTURY OTTOMAN SCHOLAR IN THE FOOT-
STEPS OF IBN TAYMIYYA AND AN OPPONENT OF IBN ʿARABĪ:
CHIWİZĀDA MUḤYĪ AL-DĪN SHEIKH MEḤMED EFENDĪ***

Mehmet Gel

Bartın University, Bartın-Turkey

Abstract

One of the Ottoman scholars in the sixteenth century who opposed the view of the famous Sufi MuḤyī al-Dīn Ibn ʿArabī was Chiwizāda MuḤyī al-Dīn Sheikh MeḤmed Efendī (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 Chiwizāda's criticisms of MuḤyī al-Dīn Ibn ʿArabī, who was at the top of the Sufis he opposed, in terms of their historical-intellectual roots.

Key Words: Chiwizāda, Ibn ʿArabī, Ibn Taymiyya, Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī, *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*

Introduction

MuḤyī al-Dīn Ibn ʿArabī (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. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Osmanlı Toplumunun Dinî Meselelerine Mubalif Bir Yaklaşım: Şeybülislam Çiwizāde Muhyiddin Mehmed Efendi ve Fikirleri 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 ‘Arabī, 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 Şükrü Özen’s study on this issue in terms of the *fatwās* of sheikh al-islāms 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 ‘Arabī 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 Selīm 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 ‘Arabī, 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 Şükrü Özen.³

¹ Knysh addresses the approaches of such scholars as Ibn Taymiyya, al-Taftāzānī, Ibn Khaldūn, and al-Biqā‘ī toward Ibn ‘Arabī, see Alexander D. Knysh, *Ibn ‘Arabī in the Later Islamic Tradition: The Making of a Polemical Image in Medieval Islam* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1999).

² Şükrü Özen, “Ottoman ‘Ulamā’ Debating Sufism: Settling the Conflict on the Ibn al-‘Arabī’s Legacy by *Fatwās*,” *El Sufismo y las normas del Islam: Trabajos del IV Congreso Internacional de Estudios Jurídicos Islámicos: Derecho y Sufismo, Murcia, 7-10 Mayo 2003* (ed. Alfonso Carmona; Murcia: Editora Regional de Murcia Colección Ibn Arabi, 2006), 309-341.

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., Qāḍizādalis and Chiwizādalis” With these words, he relates the opposition of the Ottoman scholars to Ibn ‘Arabī 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 Chiwizāda Muḥyī al-Dīn Sheikh Meḥmed Efendī (d. 954/1547), the famous Ottoman scholar of the sixteenth century who is known for his opposition to some mystics, mainly Ibn ‘Arabī, has produced interesting results. In this article, I present the results that seem to answer the question of whom Chiwizāda followed in criticizing the views of Ibn ‘Arabī. In other words, I examine the intellectual foundations of Chiwizāda’s critical approach to the thought of Ibn ‘Arabī in the context of the historical opposition to Ibn ‘Arabī. I will not address more general issues, such as Chiwizāda’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 Chiwizāda’s Ideas on Ibn ‘Arabī

The most important source that presents Chiwizāda’s ideas on Ibn ‘Arabī is undoubtedly Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī’s (d. 960/1553) *Risāla fī ḥall musbkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*. In this interesting treatise, Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī narrates some crucial information in order to refute found in a lost treatise of Chiwizāda.⁴ This treatise of Chiwizāda, which is ap-

514. Özen explains the issue by noting the fact that a negative approach to the views of Ibn ‘Arabī, which was common among Arab scholars, began to spread among the preachers of Anatolia and Istanbul after the conquest of Egypt. He says, “As Knysh pointed out, when they defended or refuted the teaching of the Greatest Master in their native tongue, Turkish or even in Arabic, they relied heavily on their Arabophone predecessors for arguments.” See Özen, “Ottoman ‘Ulamā’ Debating Sufism,” 322-323, 334.

⁴ In the first half of the XVIth century, there were two interesting controversies on some ideas of Ibn ‘Arabī and the issue of the “cash *waqf*” between Chiwizāda Muḥyī al-Dīn Sheikh Meḥmed Efendī and Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī. Chiwizāda served as *mudarris* in several *madrasas*, the judge of Egypt, the *qāḍī ‘askar* of Anatolia, *muftī*/sheikh al-islām, and *qāḍī ‘askar* of Rumeli. Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī was a Sufi who had a commentary on *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam* and a disciple of Qāsim Chalabī who was a sheikh of the Khalwatiyya Order. These controversies became known with al-Şofyawī’s criticisms toward Chiwizāda in the form of treatises and letters. It seems that Chiwizāda’s negative ideas had a strict scientific approach; thus, al-Şofyawī’s aim of defending his own circle, which was the target of these negative ideas, fed these controversies. For brief biographies of Chiwizāda and al-Şofyawī, see Mehmet İpşirli, “Çivizāde Muhyiddin Mehmed Efendi,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, VIII, 348-349; Mustafa Kara, “Bālī Efendi, Sofyalı,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, V, 20-21.

parently about Ibn ‘Arabī and his *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, is lost. When the Ottoman atmosphere in the XVIth 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-Şofyawī is the most fundamental source for us because it indirectly enables us to access Chiwizāda’s lost treatise.

Let us present the relation of *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ* to Chiwizāda’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 Bālī al-Şofyawī has written this treatise to refute Mullā Chiwizāda in terms of the problems in *al-Fuṣūṣ*.”⁶ Moreover, in the introduction of the treatise regarding this issue, Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī states,

... Some people were ignorant about the style of *al-Fuṣūṣ* (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-Fuṣūṣ* 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”] ...⁷

Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī does not clearly state that the one who wrote the treatise against Ibn ‘Arabī, which includes the *takfir* (de-

⁵ On this subject, especially see Michel Chodkiewicz, “İbn Arabî'nin Öğretisinin Osmanlı Dünyasında Karşılığı,” in Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (ed.), *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf ve Sufiler: Kaynaklar, Doktrin, Ayin ve Erkan, Tarikatlar, Edebiyat, Mimari, İkonografi, Modernizm* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2005), 89-111.

⁶ See Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī, *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Reisülküttab, 1166/8), 52a. For another study which states that this treatise of al-Şofyawī was written against Chiwizāda judging from another manuscript titled *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ* found in Istanbul Süleymaniye Library, Pertev Paşa, 621, 36a-38a; see Abdurrezzak Tek, “Fusûsu'l-Hikem'e Yönelik Bazı Tartışmalı Konulara Sofyalı Bālî Efendi'nin Bakışı,” *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 14/2 (2005), 108-109.

⁷ Al-Şofyawī, *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*, 52a. Cf. Tek, *ibid.*, 131.

nouncing someone as an unbeliever), is Chiwizāda. However, in the following statements, he seems to identify Chiwizāda when he mentions that Chiwizāda served as *muftī* 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 *fatwā* because (the position of) *fatwā* 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 *fatwā* giver in his treatise in our commentary on *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam* in a thorough (*taḥqīq*) and detailed way ... This word came out of him because of his anger with *abl Allāb* (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 *fatwā* (the post of sheikh al-islām) in a true sense although he stayed in it officially ... The *takfīr* as such is not an issue (*shaʿn*) of *fatwā*.⁸

A biographer of the XVIth-century Ottoman scholars, Maḥmūd ibn Sulaymān al-Kafawī (d. 990/1582), in his *Katāʾib aʿlām al-akbyār min fuqabāʾ madbbab al-Nuʿmān al-mukbtār*, clearly states that Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī defines Chiwizāda with these words. He also mentions that al-Şofyawī wrote a treatise against him (*Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*). He says,

Sheikh Meḥmed, known as al-mawlā al-fāḍil sheikh al-islām Chiwizāda, wrote a treatise. In that treatise, there were criticisms (*muʾākkadbāt*) 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 *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam* ... Some Ḥanafī scholars and Sufis (*maskbāyikh-i ṭarīqa*) responded to that treatise. Al-Sheikh al-fāḍil wa-l-murshid al-kāmil Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī was among them. Furthermore, Sheikh Bālī wrote a treatise in this issue and returned all criticisms back to their owner ...⁹

⁸ Al-Şofyawī, *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*, 52a-54b. Cf. Tek, “Fusūsu’l-Hikem’e Yönelik ...,” 131-133. Quoting from the treatise of Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī, al-Kafawī states this sentence as follows: “This *takfīr* is not one of the official duties (*ādāb*) of *muftī*.” See Maḥmūd ibn Sulaymān al-Kafawī, *Katāʾib aʿlām al-akbyār min fuqabāʾ madbbab al-Nuʿmān al-mukbtār* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Reisülküttab, 690), 249a. Cf. Tek, *ibid.*, 133.

⁹ Al-Kafawī, *Katāʾib*, 248b. On this issue, see also 402a, 415b-416a.

At the time of Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī, there is no other Ottoman scholar known to us besides Chiwizāda who served as a *muftī* and was later dismissed who held such negative opinions about Ibn ‘Arabī to denounce him as an unbeliever.¹⁰ It is apparent that Chiwizāda wrote a treatise that “deserved” to be called “al-Risāla al-kufriyya” according to al-Şofyawī,¹¹ and *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ* was written against that treatise. Therefore, there is no doubt that the ideas attributed to “al-Risāla al-kufriyya” in al-Şofyawī’s *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ* actually belonged to Chiwizāda. In this regard, this treatise is the most basic source for the issue we are addressing.

The second important source of Chiwizāda’s opinions about Ibn ‘Arabī is the four *fatwās* attributed to him. These *fatwās* complete the above-mentioned treatise of al-Şofyawī in a sense. In fact, three of these *fatwās* are similar to the relationship between Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī’s *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ* and the above-mentioned unknown treatise of Chiwizāda in terms of the quality of the collection in which they are found. These three *fatwās* are not found in the collection of *fatwās*¹² compiled by Sayyid Aḥmad ibn Muṣṭafā (d. 971/1563) known as Lālī Aḥmad Chalabī,¹³ who served as a “secretary of *fatwā*” during the period when Chiwizāda was muftī, and by Ibn al-Adhamī al-Maghnisāwī,¹⁴ who held copies of Chiwizāda’s *fatwā* and served as the “secretary of *fatwā*” for Kamālpashazāda and Sa‘dī Chalabī. Instead, they are in a collection (*majmū‘a*) called *Daḥḥ al-Fuṣūṣ*, which includes treatises and *fatwās* against Ibn ‘Arabī’s *Fuṣūṣ*

¹⁰ Sa‘dī Chalabī (d. 945/1539), who was the *muftī* or sheikh al-islām before Chiwizāda, takes a similar approach to Ibn ‘Arabī. However, he cannot be the person Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī describes because he was not dismissed from the position of *muftī*.

¹¹ Al-Şofyawī 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-Risāla al-kufriyya*. Thus this treatise deserves to be called so.” See al-Şofyawī, *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*, 52b.

¹² See Sayyid Lālī Aḥmad Chalabī ibn Muṣṭafā al-Şārukhānī, *Majma‘ al-masā‘il al-sbar‘iyya fī l-‘ulūm al-diniyya* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Şehid Ali Paşa, 1066), 1a-179b.

¹³ As La‘lī or La’ālī in some manuscripts.

¹⁴ See Ibn al-Adhamī Sa‘īd ibn Ḥusām al-Dīn al-Maghnisāwī, *Majmū‘at al-fatāwā* (MS Istanbul: Âtuf Efendi Library, Âtuf Efendi, 2835), 1b-70b.

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 *Dafʿ al-Fuṣūṣ* suggests that they may not belong to Chiwizāda.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 *Dafʿ 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 ‘Arabī¹⁶ and the information provided by Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī in his *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt 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

¹⁵ Another problem with the attribution of these *fatwās* to Chiwizāda, which are recorded in *Dafʿ al-Fuṣūṣ* under the name “Chiwizāda, *Fatāwā ‘alā 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-islām. However, in addition to other *fatwās* recorded there, the three *fatwās* appear to belong to the father Chiwizāda Muḥyī al-Dīn Sheikh Meḥmed Efendī (d. 954/1547), not his son Chiwizāda (d. 995/1586-87), after examination of their form and contents. See Chiwizāda, *Fatāwā ‘alā l-Fuṣūṣ*, in *Dafʿ al-Fuṣūṣ* (MS Ankara: Ankara University Faculty of Theology Library, 37208), 36b-41b.

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-Su‘ūd Efendī. According to the narration recorded by Walī ibn Yagān, upon his return from pilgrimage after he was dismissed from the *muftī* 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-Su‘ūd* (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-Risāla al-kufriyya,” which is attributed to Chiwizāda by al-Şofyawī, and is now lost. Hence, it is quite meaningful that these *fatwās* were recorded in *Dafʿ al-Fuṣūṣ*, which is suitable for their content, rather than in any other collection of *fatwās*. Thus, there is no harm in using these three *fatwās* as sources in the context of the historical base of Chiwizāda’s ideas on Ibn ‘Arabī.

The Historical Base of Chiwizāda’s Ideas on Ibn ‘Arabī

Let me first state that Chiwizāda takes a negative/critical approach towards Ibn ‘Arabī, which is known by the records in biographical and historical sources.¹⁷ Here, we begin to examine the issue of the historical base of Chiwizāda’s opposition to Ibn ‘Arabī without mentioning this issue separately. This examination will also function as a depiction of Chiwizāda’s ideas on Ibn ‘Arabī.

The most important source for Chiwizāda’s criticism toward Ibn ‘Arabī is Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī’s *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*. When we read this, we see that Chiwizāda’s opposition to Ibn ‘Arabī seems to depend considerably on the ideas of Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) in terms of Chiwizāda’s reasons for his criticism, including Ibn ‘Arabī’s ideas (on which Chiwizāda bases his criticism), the style of the evaluation of Ibn ‘Arabī’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 Chiwizāda’s ideas about Ibn ‘Arabī 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 Chiwizāda opposed Ibn ‘Arabī.

¹⁷ For instance, see Abū l-Faql Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad Ibn Ṭūlūn al-Şaliḥī al-Dimashqī, *Ḥawādith Dimashq al-yawmiyya: Ghadāt al-ghazw al-‘Uṭmānī li-l-Shām, 926-951 H.: Şafaḥāt mafqūda tunshar li-l-marra al-ülā min kitāb* Mufākahat al-khillān fī ḥawādith al-zamān *li-Ibn Ṭūlūn al-Dimashqī* (ed. Aḥmad İbīsh; Damascus: Dār al-Awā’il, 2002), 341-342; al-Kafawī, *Katā’ib*, 415b-416a; Gelibolulu Muştafā ‘Ālī Efendī, *Kunb al-akbbār* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Hamidiye, 914), 341a; Ḥāji Khalifa Muştafā ibn ‘Abd Allāh Kātib Chalabī, *Kashf al-zunūn ‘an asāmi l-kutub wa-l-funūn* (eds. M. Şerefeddin Yaltkaya and Kilisli Rifat Bilge; Istanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1943), II, 1264; Abū l-Makārim Najm al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Ghazzī, *al-Kawākib al-sā’ira bi-a’yān al-mi’a al-‘āshira* (ed. Jabrā’īl Sulaymān Jabbūr; 2nd edn., Beirut: Dār al-Āfāq al-Jadida, 1979), II, 28.

First and foremost, the issues that Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī narrates and explains in *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ* with regard to Chiwizāda's criticism toward Ibn ʿArabī are, in fact, the issues in *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam* that were once asked to Ibn Taymiyya, such as *waḥdat al-wujūd*, the finitude of torment in Hell, the belief of the Pharaoh, worshipping idols, and *tanzīh-tashbīh*.¹⁸ To state this fact in a more concrete way, all the reasons for Chiwizāda's opposition to Ibn ʿArabī (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 imāms, 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 *Haqq* (God) which is purified (*munazzah*) is indeed people which are resembled (*mushabbah*). About the people of Noah, the author says, "If they had quit worshipping the idols Wadd, Suwāʿ, Yaghūth, Yaʿūq, 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 Hūd, 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

¹⁸ For some remarks that state that these issues are crucial for Ibn Taymiyya's negative attitude toward Ibn ʿArabī, see Mustafa Kara, "İbn Teymiye'nin İbn Arabî'ye ve Vahdet-i Vücuda Bakışı," in his *Dervişin Hayatı Süfînin Kelâmı: Hal Tercümelere/Tarikatlar/Istılablar* (Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2005), 173-188.

their God.” Moreover, he denies the judgment of the *wa‘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 *fatwā* ...¹⁹

There is an intriguing overlap between these issues. The above-mentioned ideas of Ibn ‘Arabī 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 Chiwizāda and Ibn Taymiyya. Moreover, an interesting *fatwā* with almost the same meaning, which is attributed to Chiwizāda, might be taken as proof:

The author of *al-Fuṣūṣ* says in *al-Fuṣūṣ*, “in their deception they say, ‘Do not abandon your gods, neither Wadd, Suwā‘, Yaghūth 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’.”²⁰ 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,”²¹ 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

¹⁹ Abū l-‘Abbās Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥalīm Ibn Taymiyya, *İbn Teymiye Külliyyatı* (vol. II: translated into Turkish by Yusuf Işıcık, Ahmet Önkal, Sait Şimşek, and İ. Hakkı Sezer; İstanbul: Tevhid Yayınları, 1987), 147-148.

²⁰ Ibn ‘Arabī [as Ibn Al‘Arabī], *The Bezels of Wisdom [= Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam]* (translated into English by Ralph W. J. Austin; Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1980), 78.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 78.

performing their deeds they are, nevertheless, on the Path of their Lord ...”²² 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 ...”²³ 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.²⁴

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-Şofyawī, Chiwizāda had criticized Ibn ‘Arabī for the first time because of the latter’s words about *waḥdat 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 ...”²⁵ 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 *Ḥaqq* (God) which is purified (*munazzab*) is indeed the created which is resembled (*mushabbah*).”²⁶ With regard to *waḥdat al-wujūd*, again, in Ibn ‘Arabī’s words, “... the *Ḥaqq* (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.

²⁵ Ibn ‘Arabī, *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, 26.

²⁶ See al-Şofyawī, *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*, 52a.

These are all the same realities...²⁷ 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 ..."²⁸ are interpreted by Chiwizāda as meaning that "God is the same as the world and He is qualified with the attributes of the created beings (*muḥdathāt*)."²⁹ Furthermore, "God has, according to them, the all qualities that the creatures have, such as *ḥusn* (beauty), *qubḥ* (ugliness), *madḥ* (praise), and *dhamm* (blaim)."³⁰ Hence, these are all against true belief (*shar‘i i‘tiqād*); thus, he denounced Ibn ‘Arabī as an unbeliever.³¹

Responding the question above, Ibn Taymiyya, who had evaluated Ibn ‘Arabī’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 ‘Arabī’s second sentence "the *Ḥaqq* (God) which is purified (*munazzab*) is indeed the created which is resembled (*mushabbab*)" 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 (*kathra*) ..." 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 *muḥdathāt* (the created beings) and de-

²⁷ Ibn ‘Arabī, *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, 75-76.

²⁸ Ibn Taymiyya, *İbn Teymiye Külliyyatı*, II, 149. For another translation of Ibn ‘Arabī’s words in "Faṣṣ Idrīs", see Ibn ‘Arabī, *Fuṣūṣu’l-bikem* [= *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*] (translated into Turkish by Nuri Gençosman; İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1992), 75.

²⁹ See al-Şofyawī, *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*, 52b.

³⁰ See *ibid.*, 53a.

³¹ See *ibid.*, 52b.

scribes Himself by these with the qualities of incompleteness and blame (*dhamm*).” (...) These people are called “the people of *waḥdat al-wujūd*” and they claim truth (*taḥqīq*) 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 (*kbāliq*) and different from Him.³²

These statements, if Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī 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 *waḥdat al-wujūd*, God has the same qualities as the created beings” are repeated by Chiwizāda as “Adam is a part (*juzʿ*),” “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 *musbriks* (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, *İbn Teymiye Külliyyatı*, II, 148-150.

with regard to man, and the faculties of soul with regard to the soul.³³

Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī 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 ...”³⁴ Then, al-Şofyawī 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.”³⁵ One should notice that this phrase, which al-Şofyawī attributes to Chiwizāda, is a combination of two of Ibn Taymiyya’s sentences. 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 *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 *taḥqīq* (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,

³³ *Ibid.*, II, 154-155.

³⁴ Ibn ‘Arabī, *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, 66.

³⁵ See al-Şofyawī, *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*, 53b-54a.

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

According to Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī's account, Ibn 'Arabī's words "... Thus, God took his soul when he was clean and purified, free from any evil or ugliness ..." ³⁷ were objected to by Chiwizāda because "this word indicates that Pharaoh was a monotheist Muslim like other Muslims."³⁸ He attributed to "the great mystics" (*mashāyikh-i kibār*) 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 (*muḥaqqiq*)." ³⁹ Chiwizāda seems to follow Ibn Taymiyya in his statement that Ibn 'Arabī'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 Bālī al-Şofyawī's information in *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*, Chiwizāda criticized Ibn 'Arabī's ideas on *tanzīh-tashbīh* and "the finitude of the torment in Hell" in the question asked to Ibn Taymiyya. Nonetheless, al-Şofyawī does not follow the reflection of Chiwizāda'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 *tanzīh-tashbīh* without mentioning Chiwizāda, only quoting Ibn 'Arabī's sentences⁴⁰ "neither is *tanzīh* distinguished from *tashbīh*, nor is *tashbīh* free from *tanzīh*"⁴¹ and "the knower (*'ārif*), who is competent in his knowledge, is the one who combine *tashbīh* with *tanzīh* at the same time in the issue of the knowledge of God (*ma'rifat Allāb*)." ⁴² Similar-

³⁶ Ibn Taymiyya, *İbn Teymiye Külliyyatı*, II, 150-151.

³⁷ Ibn 'Arabī, *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, 221.

³⁸ al-Şofyawī, *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*, 53a.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 53b.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 54a.

⁴¹ Ibn 'Arabī, *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, 200.

⁴² Ibn 'Arabī's words that were quoted by al-Şofyawī must be taken from these parts in The Chapter of/on Noah (Faṣṣ Nūḥ): "If you combine two things, that is, *tashbīh* and *tanzīh*, you find the true path and become one of imāms and sayyids in the divine knowledge ...;" "The one who combines *tanzīh* and *tashbīh* in the path of knowing God and describes Him with two characters (*al-Zābir* 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-Şofyawī'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-Şofyawī's relevant record.

Regarding the criticism of Chiwizāda on the issue of the "finitude of the torment in Hell," Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī 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."⁴³ According to al-Şofyawī, with regard to such words, there is no reason to think badly (*sū'-i zann*) of al-Sheikh [Ibn 'Arabī] and *other people of God*.⁴⁴ 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.⁴⁵

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

Bāṭin), 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.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 113-114.

⁴⁴ Al-Şofyawī, *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*, 53a.

⁴⁵ 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 unbelievers than Jews and Christians.⁴⁶

In terms of the issues addressed by Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī in *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*, Chiwizāda's reasons for his opposition to Ibn ʿArabī 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 ʿArabī's opinion about the concept *kbātam al-awliyā'* (the seal of God's friends), a subject that is criticized by Ibn Taymiyya and Chiwizāda but is not mentioned in the question asked to Ibn Taymiyya or in Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī's *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*. In my opinion, this issue could also be interpreted as evidence that Chiwizāda follows Ibn Taymiyya when he opposes Ibn ʿArabī. It is not coincidence that this issue is not found in the question asked to Ibn Taymiyya or in Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī's *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*. On the contrary, Chiwizāda might have written the treatise in which he denounced Ibn ʿArabī as an unbeliever by following the answer given by Ibn Taymiyya in response to a question asked to him, as we have attempted to prove above. Thus, Chiwizāda did not address the issue of *kbātam al-awliyā'*, which is not found in that answer. Naturally, Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī must have followed a similar path in his refutation to Chiwizāda. Therefore, the fact that the issue of *kbātam al-awliyā'* was not addressed by al-Şofyawī is a meaningful parallelism for the relationship between Chiwizāda and Ibn Taymiyya.

Furthermore, Chiwizāda's statements in one of his *fatwās* parallel to Ibn Taymiyya's ideas. Upon reviewing Ibn ʿArabī's views on the concept of *kbātam al-awliyā'*, Ibn Taymiyya regards them as "unbelief" and "heterodoxy:"

... Thus Ibn ʿArabī regarded *kbātam al-awliyā'* as more knowledgeable of God than all prophets (*nabīs* and *rasūls*). He held that proph-

⁴⁶ Ibn Taymiyya, *İbn Teymiye Külliyyatı*, II, 155-156.

ets can see the knowledge about God in the light of *kbātam al-awliyā'* ... 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 'Arabī's ideas that there is a *kbātam al-awliyā'* 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 *kbātam al-anbiyā'* (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, Chiwizāda concluded that the holder of these views is an unbeliever:

Question: What is the religious verdict of those people who know that al-Sheikh Muḥyī al-Dīn 'Arabī stated in his *al-Fuṣūṣ* that *kbātam al-awliyā'* is better than *kbātam al-rusul* and in his *al-Futūḥāt* that "I am the *kbātam al-awliyā'*," who says that Ibn 'Arabī'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.

Chiwizāda.⁴⁸

The second issue that we need to note is that Chiwizāda's judgments about the teachings of Ibn 'Arabī in his *fatwās* are in parallel to those of Ibn Taymiyya. For instance, regarding the leaders of *waḥdat al-wujūd*, Ibn Taymiyya states that they must be (*wājib*) killed and that their repentances should not be accepted when they are seized:

The situation of these people of *waḥdat al-wujūd* 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 *fatwās*, one of which is quoted above and the other about the believers in the truthfulness of Ibn 'Arabī's

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 232-234.

⁴⁸ Lālī, *Majma'*, 12b-13a. For this *fatwā* see also MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Reşid Efendi, 1036, 129b. As stated by Özen (see "Ottoman '*Ulamā'*' Debating Sufism," 336), Ibn al-Adhamī wrongly attributed this *fatwā* to Kamālpaşazāda. See Ibn al-Adhamī, *Majmū'a*, 12a.

⁴⁹ Ibn Taymiyya, *İbn Teymiye Külliyyatı*, II, 157.

ideas in *Fuṣūṣ 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 (*zindīq*) 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 ilāh^a illā llāh?* They walk down the streets of market places. They completely understand the words written in the book *al-Fuṣūṣ* 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-Fuṣūṣ* is Ibn ‘Arabī. This book includes many things from *kufṛ*, *ilḥād*, 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 ‘alā l-Fuṣūṣ*, 40a-b.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 41a. In this regard, we must touch upon another interesting issue stated by Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī. According to al-Şofyawī, at the end of his treatise, Chiwizāda stated that some scholars had refuted *Fuṣūṣ*, including “al-Sheikh Badr al-Dīn, Sheikh al-muḥaddithīn, Imām al-Shāfi‘iyya, and Qāḍī Sa‘d al-Dīn.” These names mentioned by Chiwizāda gain importance for the question of whom he followed in his opposition to Ibn ‘Arabī. 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 Sa‘d al-Dīn” might be the famous Sa‘d al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī, who is known as a dissident of Ibn ‘Arabī. Thus, for now, I will not provide further examination of this important question. The original of al-Şofyawī’s record is as follows: ثم قال في آخر رسالته وقد رد على الفصوص جماعة من العلماء منهم الشيخ بدر الدين شيخ المحدثين وإمام الشافعية والقاضي سعد الدين آه. See al-Şofyawī, *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*, 54a; see also al-Kafawī, *Katā‘ib*, 248b. In this issue, see also Tek, “Fusūsu’l-Hikem’e Yönelik ...,” 132. Apart from this record, one might ask, “Why did al-Şofyawī not mention Ibn Taymiyya against Chiwizāda’s criticisms toward Ibn ‘Arabī and the fact that he had followed Ibn Taymiyya?” I would answer this question as follows. Al-Şofyawī 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.⁵² According to the writings of XVIth-century biographers such as Taqī al-Dīn al-Tamīmī (d. 1005/1596-97) and ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Sha‘rānī (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-Laḡānī al-Mālikī (d. 958/1551), al-Sheikh al-‘Allāma Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭablāwī al-Shāfi‘ī, Shihāb al-Dīn Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Sunbātī, Ibn al-Ḥalabī, al-Ghazzī, Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad Shihāb al-Dīn al-Ramlī al-Anṣārī (d. 957/1550), al-Barhamtūshī,⁵³ and ‘Alī Nūr al-Dīn al-Ṭarābulusī. Chiwizāda’s relationships with these scholars were sometimes positive and sometimes negative.⁵⁴ Moreover, Chiwizāda got *ijāza* in ḥadīth from the Egyptian Shāfi‘ī scholar al-Sayyid al-Sharīf ‘Abd al-Raḥīm al-‘Abbāsī (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-Ṣofyawī lists those scholars who supported his claim, such as Fakhr al-Rāzī, al-Qāḍī al-Bayḍāwī, Mawlānā al-Fanārī, Mawlānā al-‘Arab, Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Ibn al-Afḍal, ‘Alī Chalabī, Kamālpashazāda, and Ibn Bahā’ 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-Ṣofyawī, *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*, 54b; see also Tek, “Fusūsu’l-Hikem’e Yönelik ...,” 132-133.

⁵² See Naw‘izāda ‘Aṭā’ Allāh Efendi ‘Aṭā’ī, *Ḥadā’iq al-ḥaqā’iq fī takmilat al-Shaqā’iq*, in *Şakaik-ı Nu‘maniye ve Zeyilleri* (vol. II: ed. Abdülkadir Özcan; Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989), 137; Taqī al-Dīn ibn ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Tamīmī, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-saniyya fī tarājim al-Ḥanafīyya* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Süleymaniye, 829), 366a.

⁵³ Al-Tamīmī, *ibid.*, 366a.

⁵⁴ Michael Winter, *Society and Religion in Early Ottoman Egypt: Studies in the Writings of ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Sha‘rānī* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1982), 226.

(d. 949/1542-43), who was “from the last Arabic speaking Ḥanbalī chief-judges of Egypt” and was “a dissident of Sufism in his early times.”⁵⁵ Additionally, in Istanbul, he was in contact with the famous Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī (d. 956/1549-50), the author of *Ni‘mat al-dbarī‘a fī nuṣrat al-sbarī‘a*, who seems to have played an important role in the formation of the opposition to Ibn ‘Arabī in the Ottoman capital in the XVIth century.⁵⁶ Therefore, it is not incorrect to assume that Chiwizāda might have seen the works of many scholars belonging to different traditions who opposed Ibn ‘Arabī, including Ibn Taymiyya. Chiwizāda might have been influenced by these scholars when forming his critical views of Ibn ‘Arabī.

At this point, we must note an intriguing difference between Chiwizāda and the scholars who were critics of Ibn ‘Arabī in Istanbul. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī and Sheikh al-islām Sa‘dī Chalabī (d. 945/1539) were important scholars who opposed Ibn ‘Arabī 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 ‘Arabī. In his *Ni‘mat al-dbarī‘a fī nuṣrat al-sbarī‘a*, he mostly attacks the idea of *waḥdat al-wujūd* and describes Ibn ‘Arabī as a heretic (*zindīq* and *mulḥid*).⁵⁷ As the contemporary Saudi Arabian researcher Abū 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 Aḥmad al-Futūḥī (d. 949/1542-43), who was one of the most important Ḥanbalī scholars in the first half of the XVIth century and was known as Ibn al-Najjār (based on ‘Abd 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 Aḥmad al-Futūḥī, was later appointed as Ḥanbalī *qāḍī l-quḍāt* of Egypt. See Ferhat Koca, “İbnü’n-Neccâr el-Fütûhî,” *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 ‘Arabī’s ideas (Özen, “Ottoman ‘Ulamā’ Debating Sufism,” 326). For these forewords, see Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī, *Ni‘mat al-dbarī‘a fī nuṣrat al-sbarī‘a* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Laleli, 2453), 1a. For a short biography of Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī, see Şükrü Selim Has, “Halebî, İbrâhim b. Muhammed,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XV, 231-232.

⁵⁷ See al-Ḥalabī, *Ni‘mat al-dbarī‘a*, 1b-72b. This treatise is translated into Turkish. See *Vahdet-i Vucud* (translated into Turkish by Ahmet Dündar; Istanbul: Tevhid Yayınları, 1999), 1-199.

dealing with the disease.”⁵⁸ In other words, al-Qūnawī holds that Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī did not follow Ibn Taymiyya when he criticized Ibn ‘Arabī. Alexander Knysh provides some information about the issue, referring to ‘Uthmān Yaḥyā, the publisher of Ibn ‘Arabī’s works. According to him, in the mentioned treatise, al-Ḥalabī followed al-Taftāzānī’s treatise/thesis on the subject.⁵⁹ This means that Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī followed al-Taftāzānī, not Ibn Taymiyya, in his criticism of Ibn ‘Arabī.

Sheikh al-islām Sa‘dī Chalabī was in close contact and “cooperation” with Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī. He was asked to issue a *fatwā*⁶⁰ about Ibn ‘Arabī’s ideas in *Fuṣūṣ 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 (*munazzab*) and people are resembled (*mushabbab*), and the torment in Hell (*wa‘īd*). According to the findings of Şükrü Özen, the question part (*mas’alā*) of the *fatwā* is identical to the question asked to the Mamluk scholars.⁶¹ In this *fatwā*, Sa‘dī Chalabī responds that some of these views of Ibn ‘Arabī 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.⁶² The expressions in this response of Sa‘dī Chalabī do not have intriguing similarities in style to those of Ibn Taymiyya. Thus, it is not probable that Sa‘dī Chalabī followed the path of Ibn Taymiyya when he criticized Ibn ‘Arabī.

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

⁵⁸ Al-Ḥalabī, *Vabdet-i Vucud*, 7-8.

⁵⁹ Knysh, *Ibn ‘Arabī in the Later Islamic Tradition*, 164.

⁶⁰ Sa‘d al-Dīn Sa‘dī Chalabī ibn ‘Īsā al-Qaṣṣāmūnī, *Şūrat-i Fatwā Sheikh al-islām Sa‘dī Efendi* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, 2680), 71a-b.

⁶¹ Özen, “Ottoman ‘Ulamā’ Debating Sufism,” 325-326.

⁶² Sa‘dī Chalabī, *ibid.*, 71a-b. See also Özen, “Ottoman ‘Ulamā’ Debating Sufism,” 325-326.

Ḥalabī and Sa‘dī Chalabī, at least in terms of al-Şofyawī’s account. This position cannot only be explained by the fact that Ibn Taymiyya’s ideas about Ibn ‘Arabī became “anonymous” in time and thus affected Chiwizāda. We also cannot also explain it with a common “breeze of Ibn Taymiyya” that is found in every anti-Ibn ‘Arabī stance.

Conclusion

Chiwizāda’s criticisms toward Ibn ‘Arabī especially those found in Sheikh Bālī al-Şofyawī’s *Risāla fī ḥall mushkilāt al-Fuṣūṣ*, in my opinion, are rooted in the Salafī scholar Ibn Taymiyya, who was at the top of the critics of Ibn ‘Arabī. This is because these criticisms of Chiwizāda 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, Chiwizāda seems to level his criticisms toward Ibn ‘Arabī, literally following the ideas/statements that are found in the text belonging to Ibn Taymiyya. Historically, there is the probability that Chiwizāda is aware of Ibn Taymiyya’s ideas, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, Chiwizāda 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 ‘Arabī 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 Salafī thought on the Ottoman scientific tradition.

REFERENCES

- Abū l- Su‘ūd, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Muṣṭafā al-‘Imādī, *Fatāwā-yi Abū l-Su‘ūd* (compiled by Walī ibn Yagān; MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, İsmihan Sultan, 226).
- Chodkiewicz, Michel, “İbn Arabî’nin Öğretisinin Osmanlı Dünyasında Karşılanişı,” in Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (ed.), *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf ve Sufiler: Kaynaklar, Doktrin, Ayin ve Erkan, Tarikatlar, Edebiyat, Mimari, İkonografi, Modernizm* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2005), 89-111.
- Chiwizāda, Muḥyī al-Dīn Sheikh Meḥmed Efendī, *Fatāwā ‘alā l-Fuṣūṣ*, in *Daḥḥ al-Fuṣūṣ* (MS Ankara: Ankara University Faculty of Theology Library, 37208), 36b-41b.

- Gel, Mehmet, XVI. Yüzyılın İlk Yarısında Osmanlı Toplumunun Dinî Meselelerine Mubalîf Bir Yaklaşım: Şeybülislam Çivizâde Muhyiddin Mehmed Efendi ve Fikirleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme (PhD dissertation; Ankara: Gazi University, 2010).
- Gelibolulu Muştafâ ‘Âlî Efendî, *Kunb al-akbbâr* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Hamidiye, 914).
- al-Ghazzî, Abû l-Makârim Najm al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad, *al-Kawâkib al-sâ’ira bi-a’yân al-mi’a al-‘âsbira*, 3 vols., (ed. Jabrâ’îl Sulaymân Jabbûr; 2nd edn., Beirut: Dâr al-Āfâq al-Jadida, 1979).
- al-Ḥalabî, Ibrâhîm ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrâhîm, *Ni‘mat al-dbarî‘a fî nuşrat al-sbarî‘a* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Laleli, 2453).
- _____ *Vahdet-i Vucud* (translated into Turkish by Ahmet DüNDAR; Istanbul: Tevhid Yayınları, 1999).
- Has, Şükrü Selim, “Halebî, İbrâhîm b. Muhammed,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XV, 231-232.
- Ibn al-Adhamî al-Maghnisâwî, Sa‘îd ibn Ḥusâm al-Dîn, *Majmû‘at al-fatâwâ* (MS Istanbul: Âtuf Efendi Library, Âtuf Efendi, 2835), 1b-70b.
- Ibn ‘Arabî, Abû ‘Abd Allâh Muḥyi al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alî, *Fusûsu’l-bikem* [= *Fuşûş al-ḥikam*] (translated into Turkish by Nuri Gençosman; Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1992).
- _____ [as Ibn Al‘Arabî], *The Bezels of Wisdom* [= *Fuşûş al-ḥikam*] (translated into English by Ralph W. J. Austin; Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1980).
- Ibn Taymiyya, Abû l-‘Abbâs Taqî al-Dîn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥalîm, *İbn Teymiyye Külliyyatı*, 9 vols., (vol. II: translated into Turkish by Yusuf Işıcık, Ahmet Önkâl, Sait Şimşek, and İ. Hakkı Sezer; Istanbul: Tevhid Yayınları, 1987).
- Ibn Ṭülûn, Abû l-Faḥl Shams al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alî ibn Aḥmad al-Şalîhî al-Dimashqî, *Hawâdith Dimashq al-yawmiyya: Gbadât al-ghazw al-Uthmânî li-l-Shâm, 926-951 H.: Şafahât mafqûda tunşbar li-l-marra al-ülâ min kitâb Mufâkahat al-khillân fî ḥawâdith al-zamân li-Ibn Ṭülûn al-Dimashqî* (ed. Aḥmad İbîş; Damascus: Dâr al-Awâ’îl, 2002).
- İpşirli, Mehmet, “Çivizâde Muhyiddin Mehmed Efendi,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, VIII, 348-349.
- al-Kafawî, Maḥmûd ibn Sulaymân, *Katâ’ib a’lâm al-akbyâr min fuqabâ’ madhhab al-Nu‘mân al-mukbtâr* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Reisükkütâb, 690).

- Kara, Mustafa, "Bâlî Efendi, Sofyalı," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, V, 20-21.
- _____ "İbn Teymiye'nin İbn Arabî'ye ve Vahdet-i Vücuda Bakışı," in his *Dervişin Hayatı Sûfînin Kelâmı: Hal Tercümelere/Tarikatlar/Istılablar* (Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2005), 173-188.
- Kâtib Chalabî, Hâjî Khalîfa Muştafâ ibn 'Abd Allâh, *Kashf al-zunûn 'an asâmi l-kutub wa-l-funûn*, 2 vols., (ed. M. Şerefeddin Yaltkaya and Kilisli Rifat Bilge; Istanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1941-1943).
- Kılıç, M. Erol, "İbnü'l-Arabî, Muhyiddin," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XX, 493-516.
- Knysh, Alexander D., *Ibn 'Arabî in the Later Islamic Tradition: The Making of a Polemical Image in Medieval Islam* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1999).
- Koca, Ferhat, "İbnü'n-Neccâr el-Fütûhî," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXI, 170-171.
- Lâlî, Sayyid Aḥmad Chalabî ibn Muştafâ al-Şârukhânî, *Majma' al-masâ'il al-sbar'iyya fî 'ulûm al-dîniyya* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Şehid Ali Paşa, 1066), 1a-179b.
- Naw'izâda 'Aṭâ' Allâh Efendi 'Aṭâ'î, *Ḥadâ'iq al-ḥaqâ'iq fî takmilat al-Shaqâ'iq* (in *Şakaik-ı Nu'maniye ve Zeyilleri*, vol. II: ed. Abdülkadir Özcan; Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989).
- Özen, Şükrü, "Ottoman 'Ulamâ' Debating Sufism: Settling the Conflict on the Ibn al-'Arabî's Legacy by *Fatwâs*," *El Sufismo y las normas del Islam: Trabajos del IV Congreso Internacional de Estudios Jurídicos Islámicos: Derecho y Sufismo, Murcia, 7-10 Mayo 2003* (ed. Alfonso Carmona; Murcia: Editora Regional de Murcia Colection Ibn Arabi, 2006), 309-341.
- Sa'dî Chalabî, Sa'd al-Dîn ibn 'Îsâ al-Qaştamûnî, *Şûrat-i Fatwâ Sheikh al-islâm Sa'dî Efendi* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, 2680), 71a-b.
- al-Şofyawî, Sheikh Bâlî, *Risâla fî ḥall mushkilat al-Fuşûş* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Pertev Paşa, 621), 36a-38a.
- _____ *Risâla fî ḥall mushkilât al-Fuşûş* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Reisülküttab, 1166/8), 52a-54b.
- al-Tamîmî, Taqî al-Dîn ibn 'Abd al-Qâdir, *al-Ṭabaqât al-saniyya fî tarâjim al-Ḥanafîyya* (MS Istanbul: Süleymaniye Library, Süleymaniye, 829).

-
- Tek, Abdurrezzak, "Fusûsu'l-Hikem'e Yönelik Bazı Tartışmalı Konulara Sosyal Bâli Efendi'nin Bakışı," *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 14/2 (2005), 107-133.
- Winter, Michael, *Society and Religion in Early Ottoman Egypt: Studies in the Writings of 'Abd al-Wahhâb al-Sha'arânî* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1982).