Before entering into a discussion about the Ottoman thought, it is necessary to find an answer to the question of what thought is.

Thought is a conscious and systematic movement of concepts, images, and ideas in people’s minds. In the broadest sense, it refers to the activities of all kinds in the mind including desiring and willing. In a narrower sense, it refers to the state of mind where people have an idea or a judgement. For example, being convinced that someone is wrong, or judging that the earth is stationary.

And in the absolute sense, thought is the mental and intellectual activity of all kinds. In this regard, Descartes (deceased in 1650) accepted hearing as a kind of thought just as much as understanding, willing, and imagining. By thought, he understood “everything that happens inside us of which we can be aware directly”.

For another definition, let us look how Seyyid Safi Cârânî, who was influential in both the Ottomans and the Islamic world, conceived of thought (zefkâtâr) in his work “Tarîqat” (The Descriptions):

It is the possession of the heart about the meanings of objects (gûs) to arrive in what is desired. It is the candle by which the heart sees good, evil, utility, and harm. Cârânî conceived the problem of thought as matters of both epistemology and ethics. And thus, in his definition of thought, he attributed a special place and importance to passions and irritations by employing the word heart (dalîl) instead of reason or mind. Besides he narrated some other qualifications about thought:

Thought is the key of experience, the garden of trees of the truth, the field of the truth, the end of the world, the scale of the life in the other world (ahmet).

Among these definitions, such qualifications as the network of the power of the philosophy ( İslam) and the key of the experience attract attention. Moreover, Cârânî defined the term “idea” (îflâ) as follows:

“It is to put the knowns into an order in order to arrive in the unknowns”. Both Descartes and Cârânî gave a place to consciousness (îlam) in their definitions. In this sense, it is possible to define thought as self-consciousness in terms of individual, as national-consciousness or a struggle for identity in terms of nationality, or as the consciousness of civilization in terms of humankind.

When looked from this point of view, it can clearly be seen that there was a complete consciousness of history, state, and society in the Ottomans. There was a world-view descending from both its pre- and post-Islamic history, an understanding of order (îzvâz), and a universal mission (sâzîfâz), and the Ottomans were quite conscious of this mission.

The most important problem in the philosophy of state is the origin of authority and the Ottomans were convinced of that the origin of authority was divine (islâ). They always wanted to legitimize the formation and activities of the state in this way. The histories of Apollonius and Kenelm of the Ottoman family-tree back into Yahya, one of the sons of the Prophet Noah and stated that the divine mission of the Ottomans descended from this holy origin. On the way to realize the ideal of allah (Kulunûlallah), spreading the name of God all around the world, in order to save the state from weakening, in order to save Islam and the Muslims to get harmed, even in order not to be subjected to the cruelties of
the infidels (da'if), the murdering the brethren was sanctified (He Kenal mentions this in the foreword of his history). It would be appropriate to interpret such actions as efforts to legitimize the state authority by relying on a divine origin. Human beings can perceive history, society, and nature within a unified framework, because the materials of their thought, that is all of their concepts and images, are concerned with the external world. There was such an understanding of unity in the views of the Ottomans about universal nature, society, and history. For this reason, the ideas and thoughts of the Ottomans were steeped within the climate of this understanding. In the process of shaping this world-view, religious beliefs, dasiyan (da'if) and fables (qiyas), the epic of esfya (tances), some dreams and their interpretations, and historical experience played leading roles.

With the influence of the Seljuk model, the Ottomans decided to become a world empire (Otherwise) even in the beginning. The famous dream, its interpretation, and some similar miracles make clear this tendency. This belief, which made up its mind from the beginning and took (Kash Elmi) or the ji Kelimud as its basis, shaped the form of the state and its administrative steps in accordance. It is normal that God was in the foreground in its thought system. Because it took the role of the spreader of a creed (Islam) as such. It claimed that it received the legitimacy of its power from this source. It declared that its cause of existence was to struggle against those who deny God, His last prophet, and the Koran and against immortal "infidels" (Kafir), who do not recognize the right to live to the Muslims.

This form of thought is known as "the thought of Prophet era" or "the thought of theological state." Yet, it should not be forgotten that, even among the Presidents of the United States of America, there is such a perception of entrance. Thus, there may be such legitimization made even in our modern times.

H. Ziya Ulken said that the most important features of the era of religious communities was its theological character. On the contrary, he added, the modern Western thought, which started with Descartes, carries an "actional" (amal) character more than any other and its aim is "the mundane action in its broadest sense." It is a kind of action called, "morality, politics, and technology" form Western thought's direct aims.

I wonder if the Ottoman state and the Ottoman thought, which aimed at becoming a great world state, did not esteem and overlook action?

Isn’t it an action towards the world to establish a world state, to get more than thirty religious and ethnic groups to taste the beauty of peace, justice, and the freedom of belief within that huge State, to save various religious communities from cruelty and oppression?

H. Ziya Ulken said that "thought, here (in the modern world), is for life, for society, for action," by narrating that "Whatever this Ottoman Dynasty does is in accordance with the law of ethics" in the eighth part of his history, Agha Daghazhi claims that the Ottomans had always expressed this notion of action which H. Ziya Ulken accepted as the most important feature of modern thought. Isn’t that politics (qiyas) so in the understandings of state and technology? Isn’t it action to spread such organizations, which had completely social purposes, as the long (İsmi), the brotherhood (esebih), İmamet, walch (sadhef) all around the country and to ensure the guilds (esebih) and other professional groups to keep their lives morally? Only in the last few years, it has been found that there were more than two thousand treaties (some of them are quite voluminous) written in the Ottoman times. There were already many şevhname and naşihatname (different names of the books written for the purpose of making advances to the policy-makers). Yet, the number of books about science and technology may not be too many. What Salomonoff and the like doctors (komeh) wrote and made were the most advanced ideas and applications of their times. Marmaros Nahir, Takiyyuddin, Hâfizgin Heyeri İmamdo and others represented the application of thought which signifies action toward practice and wants to arrive in practical aims. As a matter of the fact, was it possible for the Ottoman state to rise if morality, politics, science and technology were weak? Have anybody arrived to the technology of Minmar Siyan but the technological means of our times? The Ottomans with their rich life of thought was, perhaps, the most advanced state in the world in transferring its thoughts into practice.

In the process of establishing its education system, the Ottomans made use of the instances of Nifaniy Medrûs (Muslim theological schools) in Turkistan, Persia, and Egypt. However, it would be misleading to think that the Ottomans modelled the same of these schools which had been founded in 1070s with all their deficits and carried them into the Ottoman conditions of 250 years later.

After Ghaçalı wrote his "Takvîî (İI-İFATX) (The Paradoxes of Philosophers)," Kalâm (Islamic scholarly) started to be philosophers. Fakhrüddin-i Râzi (who deceased in 1200) almost completed the process of philosophizing the Kalâm by adopting the philosophical principles of Ibn Sina (Avicenna) and applying it to Kalâm. For this reason, there are researchers in our times who consider Fakhrüddin as a philosopher rather than a Kalâm scholar. Though philosophy had been an independent area, together with the influences of such works of Ibn Rûdî (Avicenna) as "Takvîî (İI-İFATX)" and "Fisîlî-î-Muhammedî" written for the purpose of a reply to Ghaçalı, a structural change occurred in Islamic thought. This structural change led to a transformation in which the Kalâm was philosophized or the problems was started to be examined together with the principles of creed (âlim). A similar transformation was lived in logic after Ghaçalı's books about the logic. The Ottomans was influenced deeply by these transformations. Because the first representatives of the classical age Ottomans thought such as Şehîh grubu (Râzi), Fakhrüddin-i Râzi, and others were the heirs of scholars who were from the tradition of Fakhrüddin-i Râzi.

It is claimed that the Ottoman Kalâm scholars adopted the views of the Aristotelian school from the influence of Fakhrüddin-i Râzi. This is the same step as was taken in the Aristotelian schools of the West. Nevertheless, it is arguable that Fakhrüddin was a true Aristotelian. Because it would be misleading to label a person as a true Aristotelian who was a man of idea influenced more by Ibn Sina. In addition, it is known that the rould of Şehîh grubu, who had been raised by the same teachers, was completely different.

Besides, as far as we are concerned today, "Kasîdi-i Nasiriyê" of Heyet Bây, "Mifidîn-xâide" of Taşgîrîdî, and "Takvîî (İI-İFATX)" by Askarîxîrî and İbni-î-Islam" of Abdalâliî Hârbi were written in accordance with the principles of Mu'tarîbî state. Moreover, one of the last Ottomans scholar, Nure Nasîhî Bâhînî, was also known as from the same category! Although the scholars used to know well the Kalâm of Aristoteles, the public believed in the principles of Mu'tarîbî creed. As an evidence, the origin of Sâhedîxîrî, caught in the maddens, was a scholastic book written in terms of Mu'tarîbî creed.

Though the researchers were few and inadequate, it is known that there was a very lively field of thought and discussion in the Ottomans in the 15th and 16th centuries. Scholars were arguing about social, moral, and other issues by writing treatises. Nevertheless, the influence of pre-Ottoman tradition should not be ignored. Among this tradition, there were imitators thinkers as well as important others like Sadrudînxîrî who was regarded as the "Ghaçalî of his times."

In the thought and scientific life of pre-Ottoman times, the inaccuracies which resulted from the wars of cross (the Holy War), from the Mongol invasion which turned the Anatolia into a place of consolidation, from various defects, and from resultant political, economical, social, and moral collapses, left deep influences. In spite of all these negative developments, such great thinkers as Ayi Evren, Mevlana, Sadrudîn Kerner, Haji Uskug could nine in Anatalia. Wars, political inconveniences may influence and direct the conditions of thought in a positive way as well as in a negative way. Thus, after the large scale material and spiritual destructions of the First and the Second World War, the world of thought and science kept giving their fruits and, especially in Germany where the collapse was the biggest, great philosophers came into existence. Some of these thinkers were the existentialist philosophers.

There had to be a freedom of thought in order for the life of Ottoman thought to develop. I wonder if the worries about the life of Ottoman thought were not connected to such a situation because, from time to time, a set of beliefs and attitudes emerged and they were not interesting so long as they started to disturb social life. In fact, the
Ottomans never permitted the actions he advocated or norms that inclined towards social and political aims and the breakdown of social peace. It tolerated hereti-
cism and its movements as far as they remained within a theo-
retical framework. Because the Ottomans never saw such creeds as a religious but a political problem. About the free-
edom of thought, we can extract these words of Goethe:

"The Muslims were starting to teach philosophy with this principle: there is nothing whose opposite can’t be uttered. They got the students to think in this way. This principle fell the students into suspicion in their quest to truth. The search after the suspicion would lead them to truth and they relaxed."

Likewise, Mehmed II the Conqueror were inviting the people who were experts in the philosophy of Aristotle, or old Greek philosophy, he was lis-
tening, asking questions and discussing with them in or-
der to improve the scientific and philosophical discus-
sions in his time. Nevertheless, in spite of all these activi-
s, did a very bright life of thought come into being? It is easy to reply as "No" to this question. But in order to say "Yes", long-term and wide-range group researches should be done.

Social and political instabilities and material distur-
bances were overwhelmed during the rising period of the Ottomans. Again in this period they gave the material resources and support to the life of science and thought, according to the evaluations of our times, it said that the Ottomans could not enable to achieve the expected rise. (Yes, in Turkey since the Tanzimat for the last one-hun-
dred and fifty years, especially in the period of the Repub-
lic, the secular science and philosophy have been completely supported, we could not raise a philosopher reknown in the West)

We shall point to these two issues about the life of the Ottoman thought:

There are some people who have been claiming that there was no life of thought and science in the Ottomans. Some of them try to demonstrate this idea by putting forward the claim that "since Ottomans were kapikulis (servants of the Palace), there could not be a life of tho-
ght." How could this person think of the philosophers as a servant who were subjects of the King of France or

England, or the Emperor of the Prussians? Weren’t Leibniz, who was in the Palace during all of his life, and Hegel, who are the formal philosopher of the state, kapikulis?

Liévi Pasha, who was a sadis-atam (Grand Vizier), in the first parts of his book Ateşime, advises to the policy-
makers, states that "a grand vizier should say the word of the public to the Padishah without hesitation. He should call on them to witness to Allah (God)."

Did Zembil Ali Efendi do the servitude of Padishah while he was opposing to a rigorous Padishah like Yezdi and saved 400 people from being executed or while he was opposing to Kemal and prevented the public of Belgrade from being put to the sword? Or did he make his administrative, moral and social duties?

Another claim is that:

"In the Anatolian Turkish society, there was no sub-
ject figure who put the truth in its front as an object of
knowledge, and who made its own decision about the
truth as well as a theoretical tendency to the world was out of question."

There are few times where the ideas in the above statements would be true and valid in the Seljuklu and the Ottomans, but most of those times, they were inva-
 lid. Because that people do not incline to the world of objects means that they are devoid of scientific knowled-
ge. It is impossible for a society and a state to continue, or even to rise within such a state of affairs. It is also im-
 possible for this social and political entities to defend against the trends which lead to exterminate them. That Medici, astronomy, and so on were superior both in the Seljuklu and the Ottomans (until the XVIIth century) in comparison to the West points to the fact that people in the Ottomans directed toward the objects as a subject matter of knowledge. There were a great deal of individ-
ual instances of comprehending the universe in a the-
ocritical way.

Does the determinations of the unit human depend on the separation of spirit and nature, subject and object, or not? It depends on cooperation in terms of the unity of human but it depends on its separation of body-soul, spirit-nature (object) for human being to know its body, that is the external world, nature, universe, and its spiri-
tual aspects. Because here, there is the danger of percep-

It is suitable to remember that: While the Ottoman science and thought was rising from the XIVth to XVIIth centuries, there was no such a life and philosophy in the West. Descartes (died 1650) who was regarded as the father of modern philosophy, came out after the rise of the Ottoman thought. Some scholars regard even him as the continuation of Medieval age Christian philo-
sophy. However, the Ottomans was the unique authority in its rising period. Often, she did not feel the necessity to look around carefully. Because it was the world who looked at her.

Thus, it is unjust to evaluate the Ottomans in terms of a thinking style that emerged in the West in a peculiar time period. Besides no great philosopher was raised in Italy where the Renaissance movement first emerged. The situation was not different in Spain, Belgi-

um, Denmark, and others which were western countries. Great philosophers emerged in France, England, and Germany (including Austria). There is none in Hungary. For this reason, it can be confidently claimed that there has always been a thought system in the Ottomans which looks at the matters from a different angle. This system of thought is a rational and practical style of thinking which looks for solutions toward the continuity of the state and the peace of the public.

THOUGHT DOMAINS IN THE OTTOMANS

Ottoman thought domains were of various sorts and varied. They can be classified as following:

Scientific Thought

THOUGHTS ABOUT TECHNOLOGY

Technology is the application, methodology, classi-
fication, and structure of science. Examination of tho-
ught on technology stemming from the knowledge of mathematics, astronomy, medicine, so on and their appli-
cation.

As instances of this category, the thought that will come out by the examination of such discover, explore scientists and thinkers as Maturin Narkas, Taiyüberim, Sa-
limbaş, Hasan Hüsnü Efendi.
THOUGHTS ABOUT ECONOMY

The discovery of thoughts of those who wrote and thought on Ottoman economics, financial structures, or matters about general economy. Examination of the value of the thoughts in the works and evaluations of Kafi Bay and the like about the Ottoman Finance.

THOUGHTS ABOUT LAW

Examination of fehd (Islamic law), and i-l fehd (methodology of law), Oufi i-fehd (canonical law) and Human- name (law) in terms of thought.

THOUGHT ABOUT HISTORY

The form of thought that will emerge as a result of research on the Ottoman Historians’ look at the history, understanding of history, evaluations of historical events. From Aybapayazade to Kemalpayazade, to Hocq Sanci, to Namu, to Cumdu Pasha Ibn Haldojum and other philosophies of history should be studied.

Philosophical Thought

THOUGHTS ON LOGIC

Ottoman scholars very sensitive and emphasized the importance of this more important branch of philosophy. Though most of the works related to logic were written in the form of a commentary to Isagigia, many of them contained original ideas. As Hilimi Ziya Ulken stated, Turkish thought has spent very much energy in the field of classical logic. When their works are compared with their counterparts in the West, it can be seen that, on many points, the Ottoman logicians were more sensitive and delicate.11

A part of Turkish logicians were also interested in epistemology, ontology, and the philosophy of language. All these should be examined separately. Even, it is possible to add those who studied the methodology of law (avl-i fehd) into this category. One of the last Ottoman logicians, Ali Sivas (deceased in 1812), in his work “Mizan‘ul Usl”, examined the algebraic logic, which was about to develop in his times, and defended the classical logic by concluding that algebraic logic was in a dead-end. Twenty five years later than him, the delusions of al-gebraic logic in the West were discovered.

The analytical thought of some grammarians, logicians, and methodologists should also be shown. For example, Mahbubullah Kafiz (deceased in 1474) was a language and grammar scholar who always teach rhyme. His analyses of propositions can be compared with those of Wittgenstein (deceased in 1951).

It is possible to extend this line. Yes, the fields within this scheme that include almost all branches of philosophy can be brought into light by a long-term research programme. The instances of skeptic and heretic thought can be included into this list.

EXAMPLES OF THINKERS

Let us give some short examples of the representatives of the life of the Ottoman thought in the classical age:

Davud-i Kayseri (deceased in 1350)

He was the first teacher of a theological school in the Ottoman state. He was also the first person who clarified the understanding of Vedahat-i Vahid with philosophical content. He put forward original ideas related to the philosophy of nature. He held that everything in the nature was composed of atoms and molecules (vak and mukhabbat). What determined the physical quality and quantity of these individual things were atoms and molecules. In fact, nature had nothing but energy. The manifestations and properties of energy were its being light, heat, and fire. He based this idea to the woed of “allah” in the eleventh verse of al safaat Passali. Dukhan is a state of energy which had no shape. As the time wore on, this shapeless energy had turned into such elements as water, air, fire, and earth which determined the shape of all entities. Davud-i Kayseri was the first who claimed that atoms were full of energy and qualified waters as “white atoms” and “the secret of life”. Moreover, he emphasized the importance of static and dynamic energy inherent in water.

Davud-i Kayseri characterized the nature as the general util energy. In his work “Nihabat-ul-Bayan fi Ieskabul-ul Za- man”, he criticized both Aritme’s and his critic Ebed-ul-Reh- moh Bajjali’s understanding of time, and he maintained a new understanding of time in their word.

In Aristotle, time was the number of movement in terms of priority and posteriority. In contrast to this, according
to Ebet-Bekiro Rjligdaha. Time was the number and duration of being. Yet, Danu-d Kayani thought, time was the duration and measure of the relationship of the objects in the entities with each other. All these ideas were original in the strictest sense of the term.15

In fact, Danu-d Kayani did not belong to the classical times. Yet, I wanted to point to these ideas in order to show that how original ideas were developed even in the beginning.

Skheikh Bedreddin (deceased in 1420)

The works about the personality and ideas of Skheikh Bedreddin Sunni are varied. Since he rebelled against the status quo, some people envenomed him and wrote false charges against him. And some others exalted him and they still keep doing this.

It is certain that he was a great scholar and idealist. He had profound knowledge about the methodology of fikh (Islamic law), fikh, and sunnah. It is said that his two voluminous work about the methodology of law “Cara’ al-Fawyds” had a great value.

It is said that what attracted the attention and curents upon him was as his communist ideas. However, there are no such ideas in the work “Vasat” attributed to Skheikh Badreddin.

Jami’s Nuzum al-Nu’umani holds that Skheikh Badreddin was a vigorous communist and he wanted to make a communal revolution. Dasgupta also says that Skheikh Badreddin had such ideas as the abolition of private property and as turning the Islamic human (forbidden acts) into halal (sanctioned acts). However, Dasgupta does not give more detail about Skheikh Badreddin’s works on a communist.16

For this reason it is sufficient here to note his ideas in Vasat.

Some people bring many evidence that Vasat could not belong to Skheikh Badreddin.17 It is said that the book was completed by editing the notes kept in the lectures, after the death of Skheikh. Many Ottoman scholars and skheikhs respected and wrote comments to this work. One of the last Syeds/Leem Kusam Efnadi transcribed Vasat into Turkish.18 Later, Hidemil Zeyd Ulker, Besmi Nurot Kagarmal and some others also transcribed it. Even, the father of Ebet-Bekiro Rjligdaha wrote a commentary of 238 pages.19 Skheikh Tanzi praised him as the “bright moon of religions” and as the “sun of wise”.

Though the work is small, it contains important ideas. Skheikh Badreddin thought that he could solve the problem by means of Valad-i Vizad. However, he could not explain away some of the paradoxes in his comments. Nevertheless, it is possible to meet many paradoxes in the explanations of Spinosa, who was the greatest representative of pantheism in the West, and Hegel.

The origin of the problem, descended from Aristotle and before, was the dichotomy of potentiality-unactuality or matter-spirit. The solution was not to see one element of this dichotomy, e.g., spirit, superior over the other but rather to blend or produce a reconciliation between both. In fact, the ultimate purpose was to solve the problem of “becoming”. For this reason, it can easily be said that Skheikh Badreddin was very forced, and in some of his ideas, he got very close to Spinosa and Hegel.

For example, it is wrong for him to suppose that human beings have their own wills, acts and beings; he said that this looks like that a carpeter attributes one of his tools to the tool that he himself made before. This reminds us the trick of reason of Hegel. For a person who does not act does not have nothing to do but to accept that act entrusted him himself. He said that what is referred by will is just that. This idea is the same of Spinosa’s underscoring of necessity and freedom. Skheikh Badreddin also thought that God create apparent acts and he tied this to the necessity of his very being. This idea also reminds the idea of Hegel by which everything shrouds itself in opposites.20 As can be seen, whoever the author, the work, called Vasat, consists of many valuable philosophical ideas.

It is strange that a scholar like Skheikh Tanzi made his commentaries in a normal way without making any blame against some ideas in Vasat that seems inconsistent with Islamic beliefs. Moreover, this wide post-face of Skheikh Tanzi also includes very valuable philosophical ideas. The philosophical ideas in this work should also be widely analyzed and criticized.

Molla Huseyn Melhi Efenadi (deceased in 1480)

The name of the most important work of Molla Huseyn is “nabul-i Efenji fi Redd-ul-Vizat” (the Critic of Ideas and the Rejection of Thoughts). Here, we shall mention about the content of this work about some problems in logic. Molla Huseyn assuaged the last sixth part of the work in some problems of logic. In this part, he got three persons to discuss ten separate problem within ten sub-chapters. The first and the accord of three persons were named as “Melhi-i-sadi” and “Molla-i-Munifi”. The last discordant, whose name was “Fudahi”, was Molla Huseyn himself.21 We shall not talk about this ten problem. But we wanted to remark that there was a strong tradition of criticism and discussion among those.

Molla Fenari (deceased in 1431)

His real name was Muhammad hus Hama for Muhammad Husan-Fenari e-Rami. He was a known scientist and man of idea. He was completely cognizant of the sciences both based on revelation and reason. He was taught by representatives of the school of Fakhrud-din-Razi and he got the thought to settle in the Ottoman sultan’s (school) system. The person who introduced Aristotle in the Ottomans was his. He wrote a commentary whose name was “Fenari’s Fenari” in which he could complete his book “Fenari-fi Iskandar u Fadil-i Fenari” on the methodology of law in thirty years. He also spread the philosophy of Valad-i Vizad in Anatolia after Danu-d Kayani. He left important works about fikhs, fikhs, valads, mazah, and fadil commentary in Kurnic.22

Molla Fenari was very interested in Valad-i Vizad and wrote two books about this issue called “Risale fi Ahrar Vizad-i Valad-i Vizad” and “Risale fi Ta’zirat”. It may be surprising that Molla Fenari was interested in philosophy so closely because he was also very interested in mathematics, astronomy, philosophy, logic and he wrote numerous books about these subjects. He advised his pupils to go to Turkey and learn mathematics and astronomy there. Because he, like the other Ottoman thinkers, valued the sciences that explain life, the sciences that explain life, and the people that make explanation about life as a whole. Molla Fenari handled many problems in his treatise on Valad-i Vizad. Most of these arguments were repeats of the earlier. Nevertheless, since there is no comparative study, it is quite difficult to determine the extent of the repeats. Nevertheless, he employed some different concepts in the parts he explained the creation when the things are addressed the command “a” (be). For example, instead of no-being (malay), he used the term “sy’ya” (thingness), thus he got “sy’ya” to acquire an existence before the command “a”. He named “sy’ya” before the command “be” as “sy’ya’-i-mad’-t’-sad”. After the command “be” as “sy’ya’-i-mad’-sad”. Molla Fenari also argued whether God’s knowledge is dependent on occurrences. That is, since because of the fact that when the objects and events are changed, the knowledge about these will also change, he argued whether God’s knowledge will change in consistent with these changes.

Besides, Molla Fenari tried to provide a solution about the problem of human acts and freedom in terms of the understanding of Valad-i Vizad as different from Mavata and Fadil in.23

Ali Tusi (deceased in 1482)

His real name was Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Sakhi al-Tusi al-Hamili. Ali Tusi was born and origin. He participated in the Meherun II the Conqueror’s competition of Tefla and when his work was not selected the first, he returned his home.

Though Ali Tusi belonged to the tradition of kalams, he was a thinker who dealt with the philosophy in the strictest sense of the term, within the climate of Islamic culture of which he was a part. The relationship between philosophy and religion has occupied the interest of both Western and Eastern world for centuries. It would not be wrong to say that the first scholars who were interested in this relationship of philosophy and religion were kind, Farabi, and Ibn Sina (Avicenna). Yet, it is certain that the person, who took this issue and turned into an issue of polemics, was Ghezai. When Meherun II the Conqueror took upon the matter, a tradition of Tefla in the Ottomans emerged. And Ali Tusi was one of the first representatives of this tradition.

The principle sin of Ali Tusi in his Tefla called “Kisak-i-i-Tefla” was as follows: philosophers extracted inferences from the axioms they mentioned themselves. They claimed that these inferences were based on “certain evidence”. Ali Tusi wanted to show that these inferences from these axioms were not necessary and the claim of necessity here had no base. Generally in this work, Ali Tusi questioned the basis of philosophers’ knowledge and claims. (Ghezai, too, had been doing in such). Ali Tusi excepted that philosophers had reached certain knowledge that is devoted to suspicion by means of pure reason and thought in such sciences as mathematics, geometry, astronomy, physics, and logic.

However, Ali Tusi held, whenever the philosophers told outside of these realms was not necessarily true. That is, there may be people among the philosophers who were not right. Here, Ali Tusi put the most acumen of his prin
ciples: "the opposite of that necessitates by reason is impossible."

On the Companions’ order, Ali Tai tried to find out the keliš (conviction), ifkāl (nullity), kari (perception), and weakness in the bases of the First two nāshah (of Ghiṣ-
naid and Averroes). While he was doing this, he compiled with Ghiṣnaid’s method, but he wrote everything by explo-
loring, not by instruction. He believed in the use of disac-
sing with the philosophers and did not avoid starting
their problematic ideas. He also believed that when the
philosophers were made silent by means of force, that
would give no harm to their thoughts with firm bases and
the truth would always remain in its same place.

All of his manneres were philosophical. Besides, he stated
four principles before writing the book and stuck to these
principles during the process of writing. This attitude shows the necessity to regard him as a philosopher.

1) I will not mention those things whose truth is not clear.

2) I will not argue against anything that is suspicion and unproblematic.

3) I will not comply with the desire for a conservative at-
titude that forces me to trust exclusively.

4) I will not deviate from the way of conciseness while I
will be saying that which is necessarily revealed.

As can be seen, Ali Tai tried to approach the problem as unbiased as possible and it can be said that he achieved this at least practically.

Hocazade Mustihiddin Mustafa
(deceased in 1488)

As we saw above, Mehmed II the Companions undertook two
scholars to write a nihāfī in the style of Ghiṣnaid. One of
these scholars was Hocazade (the other was Ali Tai). When
his nihāfī received an acceptance, he became very famous.
Ghiṣnaid took up twenty matters in his nihāfī, Hocazade
took up twenty-two matters. He got Hocazade to acquire a
great respect that his nihāfī was liked by the scholars of his
times. In this work, Hocazade opposed Ghiṣnaid on a
number of points.

Hocazade divided the problem of God’s being makāran bū-
naat (He does His work as a necessity of His essence) from
the problem of the status of the universe. Moreover, he to-
ok up the problem of the properties of God as two separa-
tate matters, thus the number of the problems in the nihāfī
increased to twenty-two. However, Hocazade was not as
systematic as Ali Tai. Through he exhibited the superi-
ority of his intelligence in his comprehension of some
matters, he did not refrain from opposing Ghiṣnaid and
the other authorities in kalām. This demonstrates that he
could think autonomously. One of the reason that his nihāfī was esteemed might be this attitude.

Hocazade wrote a set of other works, commentaries, and
post-dates about matters related to kalām.

The criticism of Hocazade was suitable for the philosophy to flourish, but since the tradition of kalām had more
influence, it seems that deepening of criticisms was preven-
ted.

Hocazade did not consider himself as bound up with a par-
ticular view. This attitude of Hocazade can be criticized;
but this attitude is a philosophical attitude. Besides, the
statements he put in the front of his nihāfī that “if, in so-
me statements, some points are found that refer to the lib-
ty of Ghiṣnaid’s pen, you know that this is not to over-
look or belie him … but to show the state of rejection
and recognition, paradox and certainty that have been sha-
ped in my understanding and reason” demonstrate his
philosophical manners more clearly. He provided valuable
contributions to our life of thought by following an autono-
mous line of thinking.

Molla Lutfi (deceased in 1494)

Molla Lutfi had a subtle, sharp intelligence and a wide
knowledge. His manners were witty, critic, questioning,
and active. For this reason, nevertheless, he attained the
status of some jealous scholars and prepared his own end in
such a way.

He was accused of heresy but he, himself, denied these
blames. He pronounced the formulas “there is no God
but God, Mohammed is the apostle of God” many times
and stated that his creed was clear and he was away from
heresy or polytheism. Molla Arzū told him that “Most of
your knowledge in philosophy. You know nothing about
religion and ašār sciences.” To this point that the fact
that Molla Lutfi was very concerned with philosophy.

Molla Lutfi wrote works about philosophy, balaq (eleg-
cence), mathematics, logic, and ašār (kihkit). His books
“Aṣār al-Ulim (the Subject of Sciences) and Aṣār
al-Ulim fiwār (Commentary to Aṣār al-Ulim) are
important.

In this work, Molla Lutfi made a classification of sciences.
In his book “Aṣār al-Ulim fiwār taḥzi‘a‘ al-Malā‘i‘, the effect of
such philosophers as Avicenna is clear. He did not conceal
the existence of this influence and even said that “my at-
tachment to my past led me to realize the right one and to con-
form the truth”. This would also explain his method. In
this work, he took up the problem of whether being can be
possible.

Molla Lutfi, moreover, dealt with various branches of phi-
sosophy in politics, economics, and ethics. Related to these
branches, he stated his ideas about such issues as
mānāšed, that is security and municipality organization,
taking care of the rights of both subjects and client,
communicating of good, guarding from evil, social organiza-
tion (civilization), tazkī, the assignment and protection of
the properties of general (qawāṣ) and hāzn (restrictions). It
attracts attention that in his qualification of hāzn, he wanted
the hāzn to have “a philosophical character”.

Kemal Paşazade (deceased in 1534)

Kemal Paşazade occupied a very important place in the
Oto-
man thought and administration as a great statesman, a
historian, a jurist, a hāzim, a philosopher, a language
scholar, and a literary man. In the time he was the
Seyhülislam, he played a directive and determining role in
the internal and foreign policies of the state.

Though he was very busy with administrative duties and
laws, he wrote more than three hundred books and treatises in
the fields of logic, ašār, kalām, philosophy, law, language
and so on.

Of his ten volume work “Tanzim-i Ârif Osman” (The His-
tories of Ottoman Dynasty), the volumes that had been
published. It can be said that, first time in the Ottoman
writers, a detailed historical events in the relationship of a cause-effect. As a historian, Kemal Paşa-
azzade was very sensitive in picking and evaluating his refer-
ences. Thus, he could explain, with reasonable accounts, the
problem that the Ottomans developed so rapidly. While
he was writing the history of Ottoman state, he did not prefer
it to cite the events as they had been described in the
original texts, instead he examined the information and
created a novel, synthesized text. Though he was fur-
thermore interested in writing the history of Ottoman dynasty,
his critic made him to criticize the events from time to
time. His Kemal considered the history in its totality and
tried to argue for the authority of the Ottomans since he
knew that Ottomans had responsibilities as a world state.

His Kemal was also original as a man of kalām. He took
up the problems where kalām and philosophy interming-
led, and tried to solve them by means of one or two connec-
tions. Most of these problems were discarded from Fānsı and
Avicenna but Kemal tried to make a different so-
lution. For example, he divided the knowledge in mind into three
categories: “salf bīnā‘ bīlī” (pure present knowledge),
“salf bīnā‘ bīlī” (pure impressionistic knowledge),
and “aśār bīnā‘ bīlī” (doubled-sided knowledge). Here, the
concepts of impressionistic knowledge and doubled-sided
knowledge and the distinction may be original.

Kemal Paşazade attributed to “possibility” (askı) the mean-
ing of “being at equal distances from existence and non-
existence”. He recognized the possibility as the necessity of
reality. What happens when it remains undecided at the
equal distance to existence and non-existence? Then, there
occurs a need to an intervention which French philosop-
her Émile Boutroux (distinguished in 1921) called “Supérén Interinence”. This superior intervenion may be both human and
God.

Kemal Paşazade looked at the concept of possibility from
another aspect in his “Tanzim-i Fatih”. Here, rather than
theoretical accounts, he made a practical exposition and
described “possible being” with reference to its property
of being in need to others in both of the worlds.

As he understood from these short accounts, Kemal Paşazade thought deeply about various problems. He was
a thinker or contemporaneous of philosophers as Avesta Avas-
be. He laid the principle “The man, who mists an obie-
tion to an idea, doesn’t need to go to comply with his own idea in
his own objection”. Thus, this principle made him an open-minded thinker.

Alsıkırurralıade Ahmet Efendi
(deceased in 1561)

Ahmet lamdikindin Efendi gave important works about
such various realms as ašār, kalām, education, literature,
biology (bimah-i haliay). He believed in the importance of
science and thought. Science and thought were possible
not only through Aristotelian teaching. For this reason, he
stated his ideas about the quality of both teacher and pup-
el in education.

According to Alsıkırurralıade, heart lives by means of scien-
tce. The life of science depends on will. The influence of
will is weak, it should be strengthened by means of scho-
als and argumentations. It emerges with discussion and
becomes continuous through action (mustaf).
The terms argumentation and discussion used in the above statements give clues to the education method in those times and in determining the education understanding of Takiyyeddin. Because mind is formed and developed by discussing the certainty of knowledge, rather than analyzing empty information.

Takiyyeddin divided sciences into two categories: (1) religious and (2) non-religious. The second group were the sciences that could be judged by means of reason. He gave importance to philosophy (falsafah), thought that mathematics should be taught before logic, and tackled the problem of the relationship between philosophy and religion. For him, the philosophical sciences, that is, metaphysics, mathematics, logic, and natural sciences, were incompatible with religion. These were not in conflict. When both were examined deeply, it could be seen that there were inseparable friends. He accepted the role as master. He saw logic as the origin of all sciences and a measure of morals. This view is in complete disagreement with the positivist understanding which results in a conflict between science and religion.

Lütfi Paşa (deceased in 1563)

Lütfi Paşa was a statesman who was acquainted in various positions and was one of the heads of the government of Suleiman (Great Vizier). He wrote this long speech with the state in a small book called Amarefe. This book is a kind of "Nazihat-ud-Milah" (Advices to the Administrators).

Like other writers of his age, Lütfi Paşa also turned to theory from practice, and generalisation from experience by taking his personal political experience. We met in his work, with views suitable for application, an important characteristic of Turkish thought. In contrast to Yousif Mardhari, the writer of Kavadebi Bulğ, Lütfi Paşa did not deal with the legitimacy of power. As we said above, the basic problem in political philosophy is to find a reply to the question of the origin of authority. Since this answer was clear in the practice, Lütfi Paşa did not feel a need to tackle this important problem.

What is important here is to find the ways to stay in power and how the relationship with the public would be. He also thought how the behaviors, acts, and morality of a statesman (grand vizier) should be. Moreover, he took up the matters related to war and finance. In the last part, he wrote about the measures concerning with naya (public).

Grand Vizier should not refrain from saying the right thing, stating the truth and be afraid of being dismissed.

He should say that "Your Excellence, I got rid of the border and say the truth; after this give me in reply in the Doomsday". Lütfi Paşa, who drew an esteemed type of sobriety, took up sensitively the matter of how the moral life of a great vizier should be. He attributed a different meaning to vizier and said that "the meaning of vizier is the proved doctor". In this way, he assigned a different function over the statesman. A great vizier should "strengthen those who were suffering poverty". In this way, he pointed to the way to approach the public.

Marrakci Nasuh

Marrakci Nasuh was a renowned engineer of the times of Kanuni. He was a multi-sided thinker. He was an artist and a thinker. He set up a military game called "sura", wrote an in-flight book, taught it to the soldiers, and this game was applied.

Marrakci Nasuh discovered or produced arms as an engineer. He participated in Mehem and two-Baghdad voyages of Kanuni. He made the picture of all cities where the army bided or passed by. Three city paintings he drew during the voyages were published by Turkish History Institution.

Marrakci Nasuh is being compared with Leonardo da Vinci. Some foreigner prepared a documentary about him and this film was published by Turkish Radio and Television in 1979.

Takiyyeddin (deceased in 1584)

Takiyyeddin was a mathematician, astronomer, and physicist. He built an observatory in Istanbul in 1572. There were many tools in that observatory some of which were not found in Tycho Brahe's the most developed observatory of Europe of the time. He invented those tools himself.

The measurements and calculations of Takiyyeddin show little differences from the measurements and calculations of our times.

His book about optics "Kitha u Nasr u Hadithedd el-Binur" or "Nasr u Hadithedd el-Binur" were translated into Turkish. In the west, modern optics era were started with the object of color. Kepler was unsuccessful about this problem. His ideas about color are accepted in wrong. Nevertheless, Takiyyeddin's views on color and light overlap with those of Huygens in the middle of the XVII. century. It was Takiyyeddin who stated the density of the spread of light into a[cid]vidence knowledge. It became possible with Takiyyeddin that a rare evaluation of color was made in the Islamic world.

What is basic, according to him, was the light. The formation of colors were dependent on light and colors come out into being when the light was broken.

In the last part of his book, Takiyyeddin said that he invented an optic which showed closer the ships for away when it was attached in the front of a tube. This must be the telescope. Telescope was invented in Europe in 1609, however, Takiyyeddin made this invention in 1574.

Takiyyeddin dealt with algebra and followed arithmetical methods in solving the second-level equations. He knew the tenth fractions and used it before Simon Stevin (deceased in 1620). He mentioned about weight for the first time and used that weight for observation.

Some of his scientific works were not understood in his time. And what a pity, a valuable and modern observation was destroyed by cannon fires in 1580.

Cebbar Kula

The identity of Cebbar Kula is not known. In fact, there is no serious knowledge about him. He learnt no science from anybody. However, he made use of the progress of Veyrol Kanuni, Sultanu Farsis, Hiz Ali and Muhammad the prophet. He became a ninety though he had been a boy before. It is guessed that he lived in the XVI century. Cebbar Kula met with educated men of tervans by discussing, directly or indirectly, a fictitious dialogue between the four Khaliphs, great sultans (victors) and some prophets.

The first part of his book "Hekimo Hekimo Ahmet" (This is the most beautiful book), he dealt with prophet, tervan, Maruf, and Hakkar. In this part, Cebbar Kula asked about various concepts in Veyrol Kanuni, Hiz Ali, and Muhammad the prophet and made them explain these concepts.

Time to time, Cebbar Kula made water, column, the persons who play drums, earth, stones, sand, fruits, waves, clouds, sugar, and so on talk. For example, Muhammad the prophet asks the stone:

- How do you feel?
- How can one who repiled from the dreghul feel?
- Tell me how you are...
- Tree is something in me, that is self...
- What is your origin?
- Sand...
- Which the earth is self why are you so hard...
- Because of pride (self-loving)

There are very interesting dialogues in the book. He got knowledge from Allah by means of Muhammad the prophet. From whom must have Allah created the uqil (intelligence) he gave to Abu (Adam) asks Hz. Ali. And Muhammad the prophet asks this question to Allah and Allah replies:

- I created a part of intelligence from the sun (light) of my bounty and the other part of it from some of my majesty.

And he asks again:

- My President! Which form did you create intelligence?

By this dialogue of question-answer, Cebbar Kula tried to explain why and how people go astray. He asks Allah by what he created the heart, and why, he why he created greed. He talked about everything with Allah. As Cebbar Kula questioned Him. In this way, he gave replies of the questions that were of interest to public.

Cebbar Kula tried to direct people to work, good deeds and actions. He tried to determine the boundaries of the universe. He made the Prophet explain the meanings of reading:

- It is to accumulate a little for munereuse activities.
- It is to learn science, to improve body.
- It is to live in terms of knowledge.

Thus, Cebbar Kula was a renegade, nationalist, modern thinker who gave much importance to knowledge, cruel and their applications. This thinker had a personality who was not restrained from questioning everything.

Ebuussalih Efezdi (deceased in 1574)

His father was the pupil of famous mathematician Ali Kaga and his mother was the niece of Ali Kaga. That is, both his father and mother belonged to希望能够 (the social group that deals with science).

He was very famous in the realm of literature, Islamic law and of all around the Islamic world. Some beggars wanted to burn Hafiz's Imam but Ebuussalih Efezdi prevented by discriminating a fine. For this reason, Goethe commended him in one of his poems. Since his ability in law, he was called as "The second Elle Harif" (Ismail's Aasi) and as "Mafzal-uds-Salih" (the scholar who gives justice to humans and djinns).

He continuously studied, made opinions among many social and political problems, in this way extracted many judicial conclusions, and settled many problems. He made everybody recognize that he was a great authority about this matter. Kanuni did also esteem and always supported CEBBAR KULA
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him. Since Kavunisi Sadık Sälimiyan did not play within community, Ebnusweed Ebnis did not accept his testimony in a maula case. He worked as the şeykhulislam for thirty years and all scholars accepted that he was always very careful and able in his fatawa during this time. To those who were poets to ask for a fatawa, he gave fatawa in the form of a poem; likewise, to those who asked for fatawa in the languages of Arabic, Persian, or Turkish, he replied in the same language. He was careful to the conditions of his times, social change and progress, and he took care of the public mores and traditions while he was giving a fatawa. In this regard, though there had been a fatawa that prohibited the think of cattle, he gave another fatawa in favor of decorating it. Likewise, he gave a fatawa that permit to watch Karatig or sit in eya (some forms of theatre) with the condition of looking at them in order to get a lesson. He had to struggle against other closed-minded jurists.

Ebnusweed Ebnis made a reconciliation between sectarian and religious matters. The decisions as to marz and mawz (two forms of fiqh) were based upon his fatawa. The codes of Karsali were also prepared by Ebnusweed Ebnis. Among them, there were the codes of Bâdâr, Üskûcû, and Saçnisa. His sayr "İlah ve Ahle-i Seyr" was known all around the Islamic world. This is still taught in Faculties of Divinity in Egypt, Iraq, and the like countries from time to time.

In his sayr, Ebnusweed Ebnis could make comments that are applicable even today. In his commentary of the verse that the universe was created within six days, he opposed those who commented, here, a day as rising of the sun twice successively. He said that "In a time when there was no sky and earth and the creation was still continuing, you cannot talk about a day." He found such comments as opposed to science and logic and stated that in a time where there is no world, it was wrong to understand that a day corresponds to two rising and one setting of the sun. 500 years earlier, the atomist did not develop yet. Gutiérrez (deceased in 1662) was condemned in inquisition for he said that the world was round. Thus, this opinion of Ebnusweed Ebnis is quite progressive in those times.

There were scholars in the Islamic world who claimed that the world is round. Yet, the number of those, who supported the idea that it was not running, was more. While he was commenting about the verse "Allah redded the earth a bed for you", he said that this does not necessarily mean that the world is plain like a ray. Instead, he said, since the world is a too big round thing, it is appropriate to lie it on a bed.44 This about this matter, he thought differently from his contemporaries. He told that there were many other worlds like this, drew attention explicitly to the balance and attraction between heavenly bodies. His scientific manner and open-mindedness got his work to acquire esteem.

Ebnusweed Ebnis was one of the pioneering Ottoman thinkers in judicial and religious thought. He also found out solutions thousands of social problems. He did not struggle with such people as Bircan Mehmet Efendi who wrote a book against Ebnusweed Ebnis. This points to the fact that he was a peaceful, tolerant and a good administrator.

Kanalizade Ali Celebi (deceased in 1572)

His emniyet Allahin ali his Emirullah. Kinalizade wrote a lot of books. The most famous of these was his "Ah- lab-i Alezi". Since the work was submitted to Syria Relebeysi (the governor) Ali Paşa, it was named in Alebi-i Alezi. This work was the first serious moral philosophy written in Turkish. Until the collapse of the Ottomans, Alebi-i Alezi was the most taught book and its influe- nced many of the social rules. This work was written by making use of former books on ethics. However, it had its own originalities. The manuscript was spread to various libraries of the world, and some of its parts were transla- ted by Venetian Giovanni Mochu. This might point to the fact that the effect field of the work was very wide and people gave much importance to it.

Kanalizade Ali Celebi wanted his work to be extensively ex- amined by writing: "A Turkish work include self of practical phi- losophy (dâvûsî-avârîzî)." It seems that he maintained what he aimed. He saw that Turkish people who did not care public any other language could not read the books about ethics which were written in Arabic, Persian, or in another lan- guage; for this reason, in order to meet this need, he wro- te his work in Turkish.

Kanalizade first narrated the philosophical ideas of great scholars and thinkers. Then, he announced his own views by adding what he knew and heard.

The work was composed by three books. The subject of the first book was virtue, vice, spiritual diseases and thei- re treatments. Kanalizade Ali Celebi characterized ethics in "evâh- niyâzî" (spiritual medicine). He started with the principle that "bâhî" (mood) was changeable. He pointed out that Greek philosophy, as its essence, had been depen- dent on a materialist understanding, for this reason it is free from the effect of gold (material self) and desires.

In this year, which belonged to "Ilm-i Ahluk" (The Scien- ce of Ethics), he stressed such times as individual moral, kinds of moods, spiritual diseases that hinder the acqui- sition of virtues and their treatments, and the training of language.

In the second book, Kinalizade pointed out such issues as the structure of family, child-rearing, reciprocal duties and re- sponsibilities in the family, the conditions by which the family achieve unity with the larger society. He explained the raising in family by means of examples. He gave great in- terest to family. Since he was afraid of that it wo- uld break the order, peace, and unity of family, he opposed polygamy by saying that "there is not a single soul in two bodies, it is suitable that there is one man for two ho- uses". This work carries originality for it touched on im- portant points about Turkish-Islamic family and social li- fe, understanding of education, and its application. The third book (Ulus-i Ta’dîlî-i Malaiki) was about politics. Like it had been the case in Kasgadolu Bûlûg, it took justice and love as its basis. Without justice, the order of state, so- ciety, and family cannot be set and preserved. Neverthe- less, love, is superior. What love produces is unity and na- tural will. However, there is force in justice; justice is na- tural law. The origin of the word imam is wa-yal (call) and this means calling up half of something to others. Howev- er, there is no such dividing in love.

While he was talking about forms of government, Kinali- zade made a division as fazîl pilh (city of virtue) and fazîl ahbave pilh (city of love) in a result of Fâzîlî’s influence. He qualified the administrations of Europe and Russia, in those times, as “cities based on heretic deviation”. He also qualified the Ottoman cities and their governments as good and virtuous cities and government.46

Alebi-i Alezi’s stressed the importance of education of children for it is assumed that human mind is like a tabula rasa suitable for education.

Kanalizade Ali Celebi, by this work, gave one of the best examples of moral thought. Imply of this, thousands of books and treatises on ethics were written. Especially, af- ter the Second Magna Carta, such works as civilized ethics, religious ethics were written.

Fazulî (deceased in 1556)

There were also the most beautiful examples of literary thought in the Ottomans. Famous literary men and poets also had deep moral thoughts. Mevlûd of Sâlimiyan Çelebi included many anomalous problems. He was more to in

Mehmetşah. The life of literary thought should be exam- ined separately and the Divans (books of great poets) should be examined minutely. It can be thought that what others there would be apart from his very pretty lyric poems in such a great poet like Fazulî of the time of Kansu. by saying that, there is nothing but love in the universe and the universe is just a songwriting.

Fazulî saw that, above all, everything, all beings in the universe were consisted of just love. He tried to tie the sourc- ing of love that is felt to Allah.

Fazulî’s small book named "Matbat-ül-vehdî lâ if-rafi’s- lâ Mobîlî-~, the author describes the extent he was cognizant of the problems of philosophy and halal. As implied in its title, in this work, Fazulî examined the problem of akbe (beginning) and end (death). Thus, in this work, he looked for the answer of such questions as “from where did we ca- me?”, “to where we go?”, which occupied a central place in philosophy and human mind. For him, on ahûl (a thinking person) thinks about his creation, about his begin- ning and end. There was no difference between people apart from knowledge. Fazulî held that all businesses were re- lated to reason, when the reason judged in face of evil, people needed to avoid it.

Fazulî stated the kinds and sources of knowledge. Moreover, he dealt with the issue of the ways of acquiring knowl- edge from these sources. At the beginning, he made a short account on the ideas of men halal and philosoph- ers, and when necessary he added his own criticisms. For example, he narrated the ideas of Democritus shortly, later he refuted them with a few statements. Fazulî saw his ide- as as a foil.45

Fazulî divided humanbeings into three groups. He made this classification in terms of the answers that were given when Allah asked: “Am I not your Lord? in the universe of spirits. When Allah asked for the first time, some of the spirits said “yes” and some other said “no”. When Allah asked the second time, a part of those who said “yes” re- lied said “no”, and a part of those who said “no” reli- lied said “yes”. Those who said “no” both times were from class of “heretics”; those who said “yes” in the first time and de- nied in the second time were from class of “hypocrites” (munafik); and those who said “yes” both titles belonged to the class of “kâfirîn” (believer). Fazulî specially noted that that day had a great importance. In his classification of people, he did not ignore that the belief in jumu- ah (mucnabat) was also erroneous. He rejected Mâhâh
lives and debates (materialism). It can be said that he was influenced much by Avicenna about these matters.

In addition, he took up the problems of beauty-ugliness and good-evil. He first mentioned the idea of Avicenna, the use of iṣnaq and mā'ānī in art, and then his own views. He touched the problem of ‘alā’ al-imāra (supremacy), miracle, and the superiority of Hū. Prophet. He completed his work by mentioning the matters of leadership (political, presidential of the state), iṣra’ (awakening after death), the state of spirit after death, iṣra’ (calculations) and iṣnaq (Bible).

Fatih took up the matters of, great interest to people, philosophically. This points to his knowledge about the problems of philosophy and kalâm.

Kaṭîb Čelebi (deceased in 1657)

Kaṭîb Čelebi is considered one of the last representatives of the classical age. Even if it would be more appropriate to consider him as the bridge between classical and modern times. Kaṭîb Čelebi was the first Ottoman thinker who wrote a book by making use of Western sources. He raised himself by taking Latin lessons. Thus, he was not directed by the influence of a specific school and a teacher, rather he found his way on his own. He took interest in mathematics, geometry, and astronomy. And he wrote various books about such issues as philosophy, astronomy, hadith (the words and acts of the Prophet), iṣra’ (geography, politics, and society).

He had profound knowledge in sciences of nature and revelation. He learnt mathematics, geometry, and calculation. He dealt with medicine. According to Kaṭîb Čelebi, making (science of nature, philosophy and science) and names (religious sciences) were like two wings; or sciences and religions were like two wings.61 With his own words, his method was as follows:

"The way this poor person led was to enter all multiplicity from the side of unity and, by comprehending the total, to obtain the essence. Thus, Kaṭîb Čelebi followed a deductive method which advances from total to detail. Because it was considered of a waste of time to deal with "al-kīyār" (science)."62

Most of Kaṭîb Čelebi’s works were edited. And some others were original. His book ‘Kiyāl-żābin’ was a great book of bibliology. It always preserve its value as source of reference.

The last book Kaṭîb Čelebi wrote was ‘Muṣārāt al-Majd fi Abī Sayyār al-Dākhilī.’ In this book, he took up many social problems, questioned various currents, personalities of his time, and criticized them when necessary.

He tried to settle many of the problems of his time and wanted to get the conflicting parties (of which there were some of his teachers) reconciled. He wanted to solve the conflicting problems, not by being in the side of one party, but impartially with his ability. His works were very influential after him. ‘Muṣārāt al-Majd’ was translated into English and French.

In “Dīnārāl-Aṣāṣ” there was a scheme on philosophy of history that was based on biological philosophy of society. Finally, the term is "gathering of people together on traditions." In the first part of this book, Kaṭîb Čelebi examined social classes as social souls of Islamic state. There were classes, military, traders, and farmers. Kaṭîb Čelebi’s classification of sciences was not different from Aristotle and Avicenna, but what is important is his striving, novel, and critic manner against the mentality of his time. With the eye of a sociologist, he told that it would be foolish to struggle against completely corrected beliefs (mores and beliefs not Islamic in origin) and to forbid them. He held that the statesmen who did not know public beliefs and mores, led to the occurrence of many rebellions and belief struggles. He also stated that everybody should be free in their conscience and people should not be forced for the difference of beliefs, mores, and traditions. Moreover, Kaṭîb Čelebi wanted sūras and hadiths (though made in the Monops) to be delivered in Turkish.

In addition, in order to spread religion into public and make religious education into Turkish, he had very important ideas. He advised his students to follow his own method, to learn the sciences that have use (that is, technical education), not to have unnecessary knowledge.63

THE TEHAFUT AMBITION IN THE OTTOMANS

The Tehafut tradition in the Ottomans, as we said above, was started by Mehmed II the Conqueror. He was interested in philosophy and philosophical matters. He was a king who liked conversations with people who were recognized of philosophers’ systems.64

At the end of the competition, the Conqueror opened, two books came out: ‘Kıtāb-ı Zuhur’ of Ali Tusi and ‘Tehafut-ı Falesef’ of Husseini. Of these, the second was liked, and saw esteem from the scholars. Though Kıtāb-ı Zuhur was also esteemed, it was not at the level of Husseini’s book.

Later, Kema‘ Pasha wrote his ‘Porfesçe tehafut’ which was a flat-face by taking up fifteen of the twenty-two matters of Husseini’s Tehafut. After this, Karşı Hoja Mehmed Efendi (deceased in 1536) wrote a treatise on Husseini’s Tehafut. In this work, twelve matters were taken up. In addition, though the Tehafut of Neşet Efendi (deceased in 1599) and Mecid pasa Ambayrı are mentioned,65 there is no study about them. Moreover, “El-Malik ez-zul’ Hafizgir Beyrül-Mahkūmeln ve’s-İhlâm” (The Conversational Matters Between Men of Kalâm and Philosophy) of Mustafa Abdallah Efendi (deceased in 1736) can be taken as a Tehafut.66 There may be other Tehafuts that have not been reached yet. At the end of the XIX. century, Sultan Abdulhamid II got Süleyman Hadi Efendi to translate Ghiyath’s Tehafut.

Thus, there seems to have been seven Tehafuts composed in the Ottomans.

Why were the Ottomans so interested in Tehafuts?67

Before answering this question, let us point to the meanings attached to the term "tehafut".

Tehafut has been used for such meanings as collapse, destruction, severely without thinking, thoughtless result, unseasibility, inconsistency, and opposition. Asin Palace held that its basic meaning was "throw oneself to the front", and this meaning existed in Ghazali’s usage. While Ş. Günaltay said that it meant to "spread out on the ground", I. Hakki Uzunçarşı said that it was to "pursit in something with a severe desire", and Hilmi Gungor said that it meant to "fall on something successively, to bump".68

Let us also look at the problems taken up in the Tehafuts:

1. Problems related to the group of Tehafuts:
   A- The Problem of Miracles
   B- Problems related to Human

1) Human soul is self-sufficient and an incorporeal essence.
2) Human soul is eternal.
3) Awakening of the corpses

II. Problems related to the group of divinity
   A- Problems related to Allah himself
      1) Allah is one.
      2) The description of Allah is impossible.
      3) Allah is simple.
      4) Allah is not object.
      5) The attributes of Allah.
      6) Allah knows everything.
      7) Allah knows himself.
      8) Allah does not know the particulars.
   B- Problems related to Universe
      1) Universe has no beginning.
      2) Universe is eternal.
      3) About the maker (artist) of the universe
      4) Is there a maker of universe?
      5) Is there a cause of universe?
  C- Problems related to Human
      1) Human is alive.
      2) The purpose in heaven’s movement.
      3) The science of heaven’s spirits

When we look at these problems, we see that the first four problems, the five problems related to the universe, and the three problems related to heaven are problems which are concerned with the philosophy of nature. The problems related to the universe are indirectly connected with the problems related to Allah. Thus, the problems that are concerned with Allah’s existence, oneness, and knowledge are not only problems related to divinity, but also matters of philosophy. The problems that are related to human and nature are already essential matters of philosophy. In the works of Aristotle, Descartes, Spinoza, Hegel, and many other great philosophers, the existence and the attributes of God occupies the most important place. Thus, in the problem of the relationship between philosophy and religion, regarding those ideas as unphilosophical, for they give a place and importance to revelation, means that philosophy is just consisted of atheism. And the fallacy of this idea is apparent. The philosophical values and the contributions to philosophy of Tehafuts cannot be denied.

Now, let us turn to main question: Why did the Ottomans thinkers exhibit so much interest to Tehafuts?
There might be various answers. It seems that "persisting in something" meaning of Tekâfi explains the Tekâfi ambition of the Ottomans; anyway such reasons may be put forward:

1) The Safavids played a role in promoting the development of free thought and in exciting the existing dissidence. Especially such Safavids as the Compurers, Yoruz and Kamand commonly promoted the life of science and thought, and they saw heterodoxy as a political tool.

2) There was a desire to continue the tradition emerged from the intermingling of philosophy and there was a desire to continue the tradition emerged from the intermingling of philosophy and kalâm.

3) There was a desire to produce novel ideas and solutions devoid of animating.

4) There was a desire to show that philosophy and religion could always exist side by side in support of each other. The free thought that exhibited the ability to develop in the schools as a result of the influence of fikr might want to prevent the opposition against philosophy.

5) There was a desire to prevent the disagreements between sects of creed from getting solidified and fraud by approaching the groups above with the wide tolerance of philosophical thought.

6) There was a desire to re-base the creed differently in a rationalistic way.

7) Scholars wanted to check the level of rightness, truth, and justice in the critiques of Ghaatâzâlidi directed to the Muqâbil philosophers.

8) There was a desire to put into effect the understanding of free thought in Islam.

9) The scholars wanted claim themselves against the different opinions of scientists and philosophers who resided into Istanbul from various provinces of the Ottoman state which spread across three mainlands.

10) The Ottomans scholars, science and thought life wanted to exist separately.

11) There was a desire to develop the development of philosophical criticism and to open different thinking grounds.

12) There was a desire to cope with different thoughts that emerged with the translation of foreign works.

13) There was a desire to produce thought against Godârîâ-î Fâla, Barbaizâ, and Adhramî.

14) Scholars wanted to contribute to the cultural dissemination.

15) Scholars wanted to add a different color to thought by developing the knowing and thinking capacity of men.

16) Scholars wanted to save the youth from animating and ensure them to catch truth and originality.

In the commentary of a "Cübb-i Vâlidî" treatise, written in the early XVII. century (in 1614), the author Kârî Halef Elfishî said that he wrote that treatise to be useful to the students. He characterized the qualities of those students as follows:

1) They are aplicants of right and truth, that is, explorers.

2) They derive from the way of obstinacy (bigotry).

3) They avoid animating.

4) They are directed to the province of truth.

5) Their aim is to obtain clear and certain truths.

It can be said that if the students could acquire these characteristics in the early XVII. century, the critical situation, opened by Tekâfiş, served its purpose well.

The Ottoman thought in the classical age, as Hilmi Ziya Ülken said, carries the general characteristics of Turkish thought:

1) Rationality and rationalization. Turkish thought is rationalist, even in such suff as Yavuz Enns and Mardinâ. For example, we see that Yavuz, in his work "Risâla-i Nasbîye", got reason to talk in the form of a man and to win over men's passions.

2) Practicality. That is, nothing therapy of thinking and taking pains with producing practical and applicable knowledge. With these characteristics, the Ottoman thought has occupied an important place as rings of chain in the life of our thought. Yet, this colorful and rich life of thought has been waiting for the zeal of all researchers -let them like the Ottomans or not.

10) Desverges, Amedee Ibérie (Principes de Philosophie), Tram. M. Kamaz, (Istanbul), pp. 30-31,
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