

The Influence of Transoxiana Ulama on the Formation of Ottoman Kalam Thought

Rıdvan Özdiñ*

1. Introduction

The formation period of Ottoman thought is usually dated as the 15th century. However, it is possible to argue that since the establishment of the Ottoman state, the Ottoman scientific circles had been interacting with various other circles. The prevalent view is that the Ottoman intellectual world entered its founding phase in the aftermath of the Battle of Angora. There is a tendency to perceive this change as a consequence of transformation in the Ottoman political mindset due to historical outcomes of the Battle of Angora. However, it is necessary to consider other factors that led to this transition. For example, with reference to the development of the *kalam* thought, the methodological change in Islamic thought should be mentioned as a factor that coincided with this period.

Indeed, it is possible to talk about a substantial level of mobility, especially among the *ulama* (Islamic scholars) in the pre-Ottoman Islamic world. The exchanges were quite lively because of the social-political events, the *ulama-umera* (scholar-administrator) relations, the scientific education and other reasons. Especially the biographies of the *ulama* reflect this mobility more clearly. Invasions by the Mongols and Timur or the Safavid threat were the most important reasons for migration to Anatolia and the Ottoman Empire. Another reason affecting this migration was the interest and respect shown to the *ulama* by the Ottoman political mindset. It is obvious that the Ottoman Empire, a rising power, was a center of attraction. Thus, those who came to the Ottoman Empire from different geographies brought to the Ottoman Empire

* Istanbul University, Turkey.

the knowledge of the scientific centers they belonged to or received education from. Along with the scientific centers such as Damascus-Aleppo and Egypt, it is necessary to include at the top of the list those coming from the Transoxiana-Khorasan line. It is seen that important figures of Ottoman religious thought received education in these centers. For example, we know that Sheikh Edebali and Molla Hattab al-Karahisari, who were among the *ulama* who first appeared during the reign of Osman Gazi, had received education in Damascus. Similarly, Davud-i Kayseri, who was accepted as the founder of the Ottoman *madrakah* system, was a scholar who had travelled to Egypt and then to Iran.

The influence of the scientific accumulation of Seljuks on the accumulation inherited by the Ottomans is undeniable. One of the two great known students of Sirajeddin al-Urmevi, a follower of Fahreddin Razi, was Tajeddin al-Kurdi, who was appointed by Orhan Gazi to the Madrasah of Iznik. Alaeddin Ali Esved, aka Kara Hodja, and Kadizade-i Rumi were among those who went to and came back from *Ajam* (*Acem* in Turkish) during this period. On the other hand, there were prominent figures who attracted others with a demand for knowledge to Anatolia. Chief among them is Jamaliddin Aksarayi, who was Razi's fourth-generation grandson. Sayyid Sherif Jurjani came to Anatolia to take lessons from him, but when he learned of Aksarayi's death, he traveled to Egypt with Molla Fanari, who was Aksarayi's student at that time. These developments were not limited to religious and natural sciences. For example, Geyikli Baba and Karaca Ahmed, two of the great Sufis of the Orhan Gazi period, came from *Ajam* and became active in the new state. Similarly, among the important Sufi figures of the reign of Murad I, we come across figures who came from the Khorasan-Iran line. Haji Bektash-i Wali came from Khorasan, and Muhammed al-Kusteri and Postin Push from Iran.

This paper tries to put forward the influence of the *ulama* coming from *Ajam* in the Ottoman scientific circles through analyzing both the teacher-student relations and the intertextual interaction between their works. Since looking at these contributions from both sides in opposite directions may enable one to identify the composition of the Ottoman thought, the second section of the paper examines both those who came directly from *Ajam* and those who traveled to *Ajam* for education. The third section focuses on

the identity and influence of the students trained by these figures, whereas the fourth part delves into the intertextual interaction between their works.

2. Those Who Came from *Ajam* to the Ottoman Lands

Of course, not all those who came from *Ajam*, have been concerned with the science of kalam. A leading figure of them was the *al-Kamus* writer Fīrūzābādī, who came to Anatolia from Shiraz. Mullah Abdulwajid bin Mehmed from Iran, a professor (*muderris*) at the Madrasah of Kutahya, was a scholar who composed works in fields such as astronomy and fiqh and wrote a commentary for Ibn Sina. The first figure that can be directly related to kalam was Burhaneddin Haydar Herevī (830/1426-7). Tashkoprižāde reports that he saw the *taliks* noted by Herevī, Teftazani's student, on his teacher's work titled *Hashiye ale'l-Keshshāf*. These consisted of the answers given to the objections by Sayyid Sherif Jurjānī to Teftāzānī.¹ Molla Fahreddin-i Ajamī can be mentioned as the second *kalam* scholar coming from *Ajam*. He was born in *Ajam*, studied there and took lessons from Sayyid Sharif Jurjānī. Ajamī, who came to Anatolia and became a devotee of Molla Fanari, had studied Bukhari and received approval from Molla Herevī, who had received approval from Teftāzānī. Molla Fahreddin-i Ajamī was accepted as one of the first *Sheikh al-Islams*, who prevented the Hurufis from being active during the reign of Murad II.

Alaeddin Ali et-Tusi is one of the scholars who came from *Ajam* and left a serious impact on the Ottoman scientific life. It is reported that Tusi, who had worked as a professor first in Bursa and then in Istanbul, had Jurjānī's *Sherhu'l-Adud* read in front of Mehmed the Conqueror. The first thing comes to mind about Alaeddin Tūsī was undoubtedly his discussion of *Tehāfut*. By the order of Mehmed the Conqueror, Hodjazāde and Alaeddin Tūsī prepared works on Gazzali's *Tehāfut*, and this discussion led to the beginning of the tradition of *Tehāfut*. Although Mehmed the Conqueror liked both works, Alaeddin Tūsī was offended and returned to Iran because Mehmed the Conqueror gave Hodjazāde a special gift. Alaeddin Tūsī became one of the most important names of the Ottoman

¹ Tashkoprižāde Ahmed Efendi, *esh-Shekāiku'n-nu'maniyye fi ulemai'd-devleti'l-Osmaniyye* (Beirut: Dāru'l-Kitābi'l-Arabi, 1975), 37.

scientific tradition, due to the students he trained, the works he composed and his role in the discussions of *Tehāfut*.

Another figure who came to Anatolia is Seydāi Ali el-Ajamī el-Bursevī, known as Molla Ali el-Ajamī. Ali al-Ajamī was from Samarkand, and a student of Seyyid Sherif Jurjānī. He also had written annotations on Jurjānī's works. Another of these figures is Fathullah Shirvani, who had influences through both teaching and composing works. It is reported that he was a native of Shirvan and took lessons from several important scholars in the region. Among them was Sayyid Sherif Jurjānī.² Shirvani, who received lessons from Kadizāde-i Rumi in Samarkand and received close attention from Ulug Bey, first came to Kastamonu and then to Bursa in the first years of Mehmed the Conqueror's reign. Molla Mehmed Niksarī, uncle of Tashkoprizade, received *Sherhu'l-Mevākif* lessons from him.³ Shirvani had written an annotation to the theology section of *Sherhu'l-Mevākif*. He also had a *talik* written for the annotation by Kadizāde-i Rūmī for the theology sections. On the other hand, he also wrote a commentary on Teftāzānī's *Tehzibu'l-mantik ve'l-kelām*.

Ali Qushji, also known as Molla Qushjizade, was undoubtedly one of the names that should be primarily mentioned among those coming from *Ajam*. Ali Qushji's father was one of the servants of Ulug Bey. He first received education from the Samarkand *ulama*, then took lessons from Kadizāde-i Rūmī and Ulug Bey. Ali Qushji had gone to and received education in Kirman for a long time and wrote his *Tajrid* commentary there. Qushji wrote many works in the field of astronomy and mathematics, and was known to be sent to China by Ulug Bey. After the death of Ulug Bey, Qushji went to Uzun Hasan who sent him to Mehmed the Conqueror as an envoy. He came to Istanbul at the invitation of Mehmed the Conqueror and was greatly respected. He established close relations with Hodjazāde. He wrote his *esh-Sherhu'l-Jadīd ale't-Tajrid* for Nasīruddīn-i Tūsī's work titled *Tajridu'l-itikad*, and this commentary, which he titled as *Sherhu Tajridi'l-kelām*, became rather famous outside the Ottoman

² For explanations that this meeting would not be historically possible, see. Cemil Akpınar, "Fethullah esh-Shirvānī" *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1995).

³ Tashkoprizāde, *Shekākīk*, 65.

Empire.⁴ Jalāleddin ed-Devvānī and Sadreddīn-i Shīrāzī entered into a scientific discussion through the annotations they wrote on the above commentary, and for this reason, many other annotations and *taliks* were written.⁵ In addition, he has a *talik* on the discussion on praises in Sayyid Sherif Jurjānī's annotation on the *Metālī* commentary.

One of the figures who came to the Ottoman lands was Alaeddin Ali b. Muhammad al-Bistami also known as Musannifek. Musannifek, a descendant of Fahreddin Razi, was born in Bistām, one of the cities in Khorasan. He traveled to Herat for his education, and there he received education from Jalāleddin Yūsuf al-Avbahī, the student of Teftāzānī, and Qutbuddin Ahmed b. Muhammed al-Herevi. Afterwards, he came to Anatolia and worked as a professor in Konya. Karamānī Mehmed Pasha was among his students there, and he met Mehmed the Conqueror during the Pasha's time and worked as a professor in Bursa. He had an annotation on *Sherhu'l-Akaid*. Musannifek also wrote a commentary on Ali b. Osman al-Ushī's verse treatise *Emālī* and pioneered writing commentaries on the Māturīdiyye creed.

Although not exactly from Transoxiana, another name that came to the Ottoman lands from *Ajam* is Molla Sirajaddin Halebī. Molla Sirajaddin was originally from Aleppo, and Timur brought him to Transoxiana. After receiving lessons from the scholars of that region, he came to Anatolia in the time of Murad II and became Mehmed the Conqueror's teacher. He had an annotation titled *Havāshi alā Sherhi't-Tavāli'* for Sayyid Sherif Jurjānī's work. In addition, a work titled *el-Menheju's-Sedid ila Kelimeti't-Tevhid* is attributed to him. Sinanuddin Yusuf el-Ganjavi al-Ajamī, known as Molla Sinan-i Ajamī, was also among the ulama who came to the Ottoman lands. Molla Sinan was from Ganja, studied there and later came to Anatolia and became a professor. He wrote annotations to Jurjānī's *Sherhu'l-Mevākif* and the *Tajrid* annotation. He also wrote refutations for the annotations of the famous Ottoman scholar Hatibzade.

⁴ Mehmet Fatih Soysal, "Ali Kuşçu'nun Şerhu Tecridi'l-Kelam'ından Usul-i Selase Konularının Tahkiki ve İlahiyat Meselelerinin Tahlili" [Edition Critique of Subjects of Three Principles and Analysis of Theology Matters On Ali Qushji's Sharh-i Tajrid Al-Kalam"], (PhD Thesis, Marmara University, 2014), 29-30.

⁵ Bekir Topaloğlu, "Tecridu'l-İ'tikad," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2011).

At the end of the century, figures connected to Devvani came to the Ottoman lands, especially with the influence of Mueyyedzāde, Devvani's student. The most significant of these is Ali b. Mohammed al-Shirazi, known as Mullah Sheikh Muzafferuddin. He was born in Shiraz and received lessons from the two most famous scholars of that time, Mir Sadreddin Shirazi and Devvani. He married Devvani's daughter and in the absence of Devvani, he served as a professor. He came to Anatolia when Safavid strife broke out in Iran. Since he was Mueyyedzāde's classmate, he was introduced to Bayezid II and was made professor. He was known to be competent in *Tajrid* and *Sherhu'l-Metāli'* annotations of Muzafferuddin, who was an eminent name in *kalam* and logic. He had a commentary on Teftāzānī's *Tehzibu'l-Mantik ve'l-Kelam*. Another of Devvani's students who came to Anatolia was Molla Hakīm-shah Mehmed or Hakim Shah Mehmed Kazvini. After completing his education in the region, he settled in Mecca. When Mueyyedzāde mentioned to Beyazid II about Hakim-shah's reputation in science, he was invited to Istanbul by the sultan. In a short time, he found a place in the immediate vicinity of Bayezid II. Hakīm-shah, who was particularly competent in medicine, has annotations on Hodjazāde's *Tehafut* and Devvani's *Sherhu'l-Akaidi'l-Adudiyye*. It is also mentioned in the sources that Hakīm-shah, who wrote an annotation on Teftāzānī's *Sherhu'l-Akaid*, wrote an annotation on Jurjānī's *Sherhu'l-Mevākif*. Alāeddin Ali b. Yahyā es-Samarkandi came to Anatolia and settled in Karaman but that there is no clear information whether he had served in Ottoman madrasahs. The works titled *Hāshiye alā Sherhi'l-Metāli'* and *Hāshiye alā Sherhi'l-Mevākif* are attributed to Semerkandī, who was reported to have lived a long life and also has a *tafsir*.

On the other hand, both the interactions of the *ulama* who were born and raised in the Ottoman neighborhood or in the Anatolian geography and who went to the *Ajam* lands for various reasons such as education, teaching or Timur's forced removal, and the influence they made when they returned, played an important role in the shaping of Ottoman thought. First of all, this influence was the outcome of a view that accepted the *Ajam* geography, that is, the Transoxiana-Khorasan axis, as a reference point. It is necessary to mention Alaeddin Ali Esved, also known as Kara Hodja, as the first name among the Ottoman subjects who left for *Ajam*. Alaeddin Esved completed his education in Iran, later became a professor in the madrasah of Iznik following Tājaddin al-Kurdī during the reign

of Murad I. Molla Fanari, the famous Ottoman scholar, received classes from him.⁶ Halil el-Janderī was also his student.

Kadizāde-i Rūmī, the son of the judge (*qadi*) of Bursa, should be mentioned among those who went to *Ajam* from the Ottoman lands. Kadizāde-i Rūmī, one of the *ulama* of the reign of Murad I, first went to Khorasan and later to Transoxiana, to receive education from their *ulama* when the fame of the *Ajam* land in science increased. He received lessons from Sayyid Sherif Jurjānī, but seeing the inadequacy of Jurjānī especially in mathematics, a fact Jurjānī also accepted, he left the classes. He wrote an annotation for *Sherhu'l-Mevākif*, one of the bedside books of the Ottoman scientific circles. It is even reported that the *ulama* in *Ajam* tested their students from this annotation. Many students from Anatolia went to Kadizade-i Rumi, who also worked with Ulug Bey in the establishment of the Samarkand Observatory. Ibn al-Jazari went to *Ajam* because Timur forced him. Similarly, Sheikh Bedreddin went to Tabriz and from there to Timur's court and even acted as an arbitrator in his presence. Sheikh Bedreddin took lessons from Molla Mubarakshah al-Mantiki together with Jurjānī and he also became a student of Baberti.

Molla Alaeddin er-Rūmī Kochhisarī comes first among the important names who went to the *Ajam* land. He became a student of Jurjānī and Teftāzānī. He attended their lectures, followed their discussions with each other, and kept records of them. Afterwards, he went to Cairo and came to Anatolia several times and worked as a professor in some madrasahs. Kochhisarī, who wrote a commentary on Taftazani, has another work titled *Es'ile Alaeddin er-Rumī*. Molla Fenari's grandson Molla Ali Chalebi b. Fenarī was also among those who went to the land of *Ajam*. His real name was Alaeddin Ali and his father's name was Yusuf Bali. He went to Herat, Samarkand and Bukhara at a young age and took lessons from well-known scholars and worked as a professor for a while. Molla Ali Fenari, who returned to Bursa in the first years of the reign of Mehmed the Conqueror is said to have been an expert in *kalam*.⁷

⁶ Gelibolulu Mustafa Ālī, *Kunhu'l-ahbar: 4. rukn: Osmanli tarihi: tipkibasim [The Essence of Histories, 4th Pillar: Ottoman History: Facsimile]* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2009), 19.

⁷ Tashkoprižade, *Shekākīk*, 112.

Another influential name in the Ottoman scientific world, who went to *Ajam*, was Molla Abdurrahman b. Ali al-Amasi, also known as Mueyyedzāde, who was Devvānī's student and pioneered the recognition of Devvānī in the Ottoman scientific world. The sources point to Mehmed the Conqueror's wrath as the reason for the departure of Mueyyedzāde, whose lineage was attributed to the region. Mueyyedzāde, who was said to have drawn the anger of Mehmed the Conqueror because of his closeness to Bayezid II, first fled to Aleppo and then went to Shiraz when he heard of Devvani's fame. He stayed with Devvani for 7 years and received his approval. He married the daughter of the great scholar Kastalani and pioneered the spread of Devvani's works and ideas. Names such as Kemalshazāde and Ebussuūd Efendi are among his students. Besides his works such as *Risāle fī ta'zīmī'n-Nebī*, *Risāle fī'l-mevjūdātī'l-hārijīyye*, *Risale fī İsbati İlmīhi Teala ala usūli'l-Felāsīfe* and *Risāle fī halli'sh-shubuhātī'l-āmmē*, he wrote an annotation for Jurjānī's *Sherhu'l-Mevākif*.

It is seen that the Ottoman *ulama's* orientation towards the region for scientific education at the beginning of the 15th century gradually decreased towards the end of the century. Both the weakening of the scientific accumulation as a result of the changes that took place in the region after Timur and the constant arrival of the *ulama* in Anatolia seems to have been effective in this decrease. In addition, the close relations of the Ottoman neighborhood with the region since the beginning of the century and the production of scientific knowledge in this region in addition to the inherited scientific knowledge are another factor. Both the Ottoman *madrasahs*, which trained their own scholars and bureaucrats, and Anatolia, which had enough trained personnel, began to lose their charm for the outsiders. On the other hand, on one side of the mobilization at the end of the century and at the beginning of the 16th century was the decline of the Akkoyunlus and the growing Safavid danger.

3. Students Trained by Those Who Came from Persia

Almost all of those who came from *Ajam* took on many duties in the Ottoman Empire, especially as a professor, and performed administrative duties. Among them, there were those who performed duties such as *shaykh al-islam*, *qadi 'asker*, and *qadi*. Both their students and those who grew up in their circles made great contributions to the development of Ottoman thought in general and

the science of *kalam* in particular. Among these stands Molla Fanārī as a leading figure. Both himself and his descendants, “Fenārīs” or “Fenārīzādes” constitute an important link of the Ottoman scientific tradition. Molla Fanari was the student of Alaeddin el-Esved, who traveled to *Ajam*. Afterwards, he took lessons from Jamaladdin Aksarayī and went to Egypt after his death. There he studied with Jurjānī and received approval from Babertī. Among his students were important figures who have excelled in different fields of Islamic thought, such as his son Mehmed Shah Fanari, Shehābeddin Ibn Arabshah, Kadizāde Rumi, Kutbuddinzāde İznikī, al-Kāfiyeji, Emir Sultan, Molla Yegān and Ibn Hajar el-Askalānī.

Molla Hasan Pasha, one of the scholars of this period, was the son and student of Alaeddin el-Esved. Hasan Pasha took lessons from Fenārī and Aksarayī, had works on the Arabic language in which he taught many students. Again, Ibn al-Bezzazi, who came from the Harizm region and had authority especially in substantive law (*furu fiqh*), was a scholar from whom Ibn Arabshah, Kadi Sa’deddin Ibnu’d-Deyrī and Muhyiddin al-Kāfiyeji took lessons. Muhyiddin al-Kāfiyeji, who was born in Bergama and first went to Iran and the Tatar land, and then to Cairo, took lessons from Molla Fanari, Burhaneddin Haydar Herevī, Sheikh Vajid, Ibn Ferishte and El-Bezzāzī. He went to Cairo and took the Office of Shaykh al-islām (*meshihat*) after Ibn Humam. He has a commentary on Teftāzānī’s *Tehzibu’l-mantik ve’l-kelem*. Molla Hizir Shah Menteshēvī, who wrote a refutation (*reddiye*) to Molla Husrev on the wala issue, went to Egypt but returned to Anatolia after 10 years of education upon finding out that Tūsī went to Anatolia and stayed with him.

Molla Husrev, who received education in Edirne from Burhaneddin Haydar al-Herevī, one of the students of Sa’deddin et-Teftāzānī, who also came from *Ajam* was among the scholars whose name should be mentioned in this list. There are two *Sherhu’l-Mevākifs* reported to have been written by Molla Husrev, whom Mehmed the Conqueror praised as “He is the Ebu Hanife of the age”.⁸ He received approval from the the Judge of Bursa Yusuf Bālī, the son of Molla Fanari, and received education from Ottoman scholars such as Molla Yegān and Sheyh Hamza. Hayālī, one of the top names of the Ottoman *kalam* thought, was both a student and a follower of Hizir Bey. He

⁸ Tashkoprižāde, *Shekākik*, 71.

completed his primary education under his father and later became a student of Alaeddin et-Tusi. Hayalî had composed important texts such as *Kaside-i Nûniyye* commentary and *Sherhu'l-Akaid* annotation.

Muhyiddin Mehmed Efendi, also known as Hatibzade, who took lessons from Alaeddin et-Tusi and Hizir Bey, was one of the important links of the Ottoman scientific tradition. Hatibzade trained many students, such as Kemal-pashazade Tâjizade Jafar Chalabi and Mehmed Shah Fanari. Hatibzade's father was a student of Molla Yegan. Mullah Abdulkerim, who is known to have written the *Telvîh* annotation, also took lessons from Alaeddin et-Tūsî and Sinân-i Ajamî. We can add Sinan Pasha, the son of Hizir Bey, among these names as well. It is reported that he sent Molla Lutfi to Ali Qushji and had him tell what he had learned. Sinan Pasha, who was given a professorship in Edirne during the reign of Bayezid II, wrote there an annotation to *Sherhu'l-Mevâkif*. He was among the students of later era *ulama* such as Molla Lutfi and Mîrim Chalabi. It would be appropriate to mention Molla Abdulkadir, who was among the students of Alaeddin et-Tusi and also Mehmed the Conqueror's teacher. Molla Hasan Chalabi Mahshi, son of Molla Mehmed Shah Fenari, also took lessons from well-known scholars such as Fahreddin-i Ajamî, Alaeddin et-Tūsî and Molla Husrev. Hasan Chalabi, who went to Egypt to study *Mughni'l-lebib*, wrote an annotation on *Sherhu'l-Mevakif*. Molla Husameddin Huseyin bin Hasan Hamid et-Tabrizî of *Acemzadehs*, aka Molla Ummu Veled, also received education in the circle of Molla Fahreddin al-Ajamî. Similarly, Molla Alaeddin Ali Fenari also took lessons from Alaeddin et-Tusi.

Molla Niksari, one of the *ulama* of the reign of Bayezid II, also received lessons from Fethullah Shirvani, one of the students of Kadizade-i Rumi. *Emâlî* commentary and *Sherhu Umdeti'l-akaid* are his important works. Molla Lutfi, on the other hand, studied logic, philosophy and *kalam* under Sinan Pasha and, with his guidance, learned mathematics from Ali Qushji. Among his students were Kemal-pashazade, Hayâlî-i Evvel, Abdurrahman Chalabi, son of Molla Halebî, the teacher of Mehmed the Conqueror, and Kara Davud. Shujaeddin İlyas Rumî, known as Molla Shuja Rumi, was also a devotee of Alaeddin et-Tusî. He had annotations for Jurjânî and Teftâzânî.

The relations within the *ulama* circles and their interaction within the bureaucracy which were becoming increasingly evident, are important in terms of locating the change and transformation of the Ottoman scientific tradition. The interaction, which is only examined here through the teacher-student relationship, had a multi-layered structure. The students who were educated by those who came from *Ajam* or who traveled to *Ajam* constituted one of the most vibrant veins of the Ottoman scientific tradition.

4. Ongoing Interaction Through the Works

The other factor that had a dominant role in shaping the thought as much as the incoming and outgoing *ulama* was the works written. There are several ways to assess the impact of these works. The first of these is the extent to which the students benefit from these works during their education, and the other is the writing activities carried out based on these works.

The first area where we can see interaction through texts is hidden in the information about the references made to these works during the educational activities. Especially in the field of kalam, Teftāzānī's *Sherhu'l-Akaid*, Seyyid Sherif Jurjānī's *Sherhu'l-Mevākif* and *Hashiye-i Tajrid* and Beyzavi's *Tevāli* have been widely taught with the Isfahani commentary. Tashkopriẓade reports in *Shakāik* a remarkable anecdote about the spread of Teftāzānī's works. Molla Fanari added Monday to the students' rest day, which had been Tuesday and Friday. The reason was that since there were not many copies of Teftāzānī's works, the students had to reproduce them manually. Although they wanted to read, they had to spare more time for copying these works because there were not many copies. When the two-day holiday was not enough, Monday was added for this purpose.⁹

It is possible to identify several figures who themselves did not go to *Ajam* for education, but contributed to the development of thought by taking lessons from *Ajam* teachers or by directly producing works based on the works of the authors of the *Ajam* land. Looking at the most common texts in the field of *kalam* and the studies conducted on these works enables tracing the interaction. The first of these works

⁹ Tashkopriẓade, *Shekāik*, 20.

Molla Selaheddin, who was the teacher of Bayezid II, had the prince read *Sherhu'l-akaid* and wrote an annotation.

is *Sherhu'l-Akaid*, which is Teftāzānī's commentary on Omar Neseфі's *Akaid* text. Molla al-Krimī, Hizir Shah b. Abdullatif el-Menteshevi and Molla İbn Manyas had annotations on *Sherhu'l-Akaid*. The most famous among these is Hayālī's *Hashiye alā Sherhi'l-Akaidi'n-Nesefiyye*. On this annotation, which was usually taught together with *Sherhu'l-Akaid* in Ottoman *madrasahs*, Molla Kara Kemal, who also took lessons from Hayālī, Molla Hasan Chalabi Mahshi and Shujaeddin Ilyas Rumī, who were scholars of this period, also wrote annotations. This annotation of Hayālī became very popular in the following period, and many scholars, especially Bihishti Ramazan Efendi, Siyālqūti, İsmāil Gelenbevī and Hadimi, wrote annotations and *taliks*. Another famous work among the *Sherhu'l-Akaid* annotations was composed by Kestelli (Molla Kestelani). Molla Alaeddin al-Arabi, a student of Molla Gurani, is also one of those who wrote annotations for *Sherhu'l-Akaid*. Molla Salaheddin taught Bayezid II *Sherhu'l-Akaid* and also wrote annotations for this book for the prince. Molla Yaraluja, who was also the teacher of Bayezid II, had an annotation titled *Hashiye alā'l-Akaidi'n-Nesefiyye*. An annotation is attributed in the sources to Shemseddin Karaca Ahmed b. Bayezid Saruhani, known as Molla Karaca Ahmed, and Molla Niksari, who took lessons from Fethullah Shirvani. Tashkopruzade reports the information that Molla Sheyh Sinan, nicknamed Yusuf Hamidī, wrote an annotation for *Sherhu'l-Akaid*, but also states that he had not seen the work.¹⁰ Molla Hakīm-shah Mehmed, one of Devvani's students, should be mentioned as the last person in this period who wrote a commentary for Teftāzānī.

Ottoman *ulama* wrote annotations not only on Teftāzānī's *Sherhu'l-Akaid*, but also on the more voluminous *Sherhu'l-Makasid*, which better reflects Teftāzānī's system on *kalam*. Of these, Molla Ilyas Sinobi comes first. Hayālī, who also wrote an annotation for *Sherhu'l-Akaid*, wrote an annotation for the fifth "purpose" of Teftāzānī's *Sherhu'l-Makasid*. It is also referred to as *Hāshiye alā Sherhi'l-Makasid* or *Ta'likatu Molla Hayālī alā Mevādi min Sherhi'l-Makasid*. To this annotation of Hayālī, an annotation was written again by Kul Ahmed b. Muhammed Hizir.

Why was *Sherhu'l-Akaid*, one of the basic textbooks of *madrasahs* for nearly five centuries, preferred in Ottoman *madrasahs*? First

¹⁰ Tashkopruzāde, *Shekākīk*, 196.

of all, this text is a commentary written on the treatise (*risale*) of a Maturidi author. In other words, the author of the main text belongs to the Maturidi order. The name who wrote a commentary on this text, despite being Esh'ari, was an author who studied the period of philosophical *kalam*.¹¹ Hence the author's adherence to this tradition came before his Esh'ari conviction. In addition, the author of the text is also the most important carrier of a legacy inherited by Ottoman *fiqh*-law thought and a person who wrote *Telvîh*, one of the most important *fiqh* texts of the Hanafi tradition.

One of the reference books of the Ottoman *madrasahs* was Sayyid Sherif Jurjānī's *Sherhu'l-Mevākif*. Its prevalence and degree of influence can be better understood if we state that Hodjazāde memorized *Sherhu'l-Mevākif* during his professorship at the Esediyeye Madrasah.¹² Kadizāde, who was also a student of Jurjānī for a while, wrote an annotation for *Sherhu'l-Mevākif* with notes. Molla Fenari, who went to Egypt with Sayyid Sherif and was his classmate, praised but also criticized *Sherhu'l-Mevākif*. He could not put these criticisms in writing, which remained in draft form. In the sources, a work called *Talikat alā Sherhi'l-Mevākif* is attributed to him.

When Bayezid II ordered him to write an annotation on *Sherhu'l-Mevākif*, Hodjazāde asked for his forgiveness and said that what he said about *Sherhu'l-Mevākif* was written by Molla Hasan Chalabi in his own annotation. Hodjazāde, who started the *Sherhu'l-Mevākif* annotation in his old age with the insistence of the Sultan, was able to come to the section on existence but later passed away. Hayalī also wrote an annotation on the second section of *Sherhu'l-Mevākif*, that is, on the issue of public matters (*al-umūr al-āmmah*). Kestelī (Molla Kastalanī) also wrote a treatise explaining the seven difficult topics of Jurjānī's commentary. Ibnu'l-Hatīb Muhammed also wrote a commentary on this treatise, titled *Risale fī Ishkālāti Sherhi'l-Mevākif* or *Ajviba an Mughlakati's-Seb'a*. While Hatibzade wrote an annotation on the first chapters of *Sherhu'l-Mevākif*, Hizir Bey's son Sinan Pasha wrote an annotation on the discussions about *javhar* (substance) and directed several questions at Jurjānī. In addition,

¹¹ For a study that evaluates the issue from the point of view of Asharism-Maturidism relationships, see. Mehmet Kalayci, "Osmanlı'da Eşarilik-Maturidilik İlişkinine Genel Bir Bakış" ["A General Outlook on the Asharism-Maturidism Relationship in the Ottomans"], *İlahiyat Akademi*, 5 (2017): 115.

¹² Hoca Sâdeddin, *Tâcu't-Tevârih*, (İstanbul: Tabhane-i Âmire, 1279), 469.

he wrote a response with the title *Risāle fī Jawābi Kestelī ammā Isteshkelehū min Sherhi'l-Mevākif* about an issue that he found difficult in *Sherhu'l-Mevākif*. Yakub Pasha, the other son of Hizir Bey, also wrote a work on *Sherhu'l-Mevākif*. Most of Molla Hasan Chalabi's annotations were taken from him. Molla Hasan Chalabi Mahshi's work *Hāshiye alā Sherhi'l-Mevākif* caused a polemic with Hodjazāde. It is mentioned in the sources that he borrowed from Hodjazāde the copy of *Sherhu'l-Mevākif* with Hodjazāde's annotations written on but copied and used them in his own annotation.

Molla Kirmasti also wrote an annotation. Molla Lutfi, on the other hand, wrote an annotation on the first section of Jurjānī's commentary. Molla Izari also has an annotation about theology discussions. Mueyyedzāde, one of Devvanī's students, also wrote an annotation titled *Hashiye alā Sherhi'l-Mevākif*. Tashkoprizade reports that Molla Kara Sayyidi had questions about *Sherhu'l-Mevākif*. In the sources, Molla Hakim Shah Mehmed was also reported to have written an annotation. The last annotation of this period is Molla Kara Kemal's *Hashiye alā Sherhi'l-Mevākif li's-Seyyid*.

As well-known, *Sherhu'l-Mevākif* is a commentary written by Sayyid Sherif Jurjānī, on the work titled *al-Mevākif*, written by Adududdin Ījī. *Sherhu'l-Mevākif* complements the tradition developed by Razi, Āmidī and Kadi Beyzavi within the context of *kalam*-philosophy relations and in which logic was applied to *kalam*. When we look at the annotations and *taliks* on *Sherhu'l-Mevākif*, we can see why this text was taught so much and how central it was in Ottoman *madrasahs*. The works written by the Ottoman *ulama* on *Sherhu'l-Mevākif* were mostly directly related to the theoretical discussions within the work, that is, discussion on the methodology of Islamic thought through public matters (*al-umūr al-āmmah*) which cover about two-thirds of the book. The focus was sometimes the whole section, at other times only one part of the section. The annotations that cover the whole section, gave weight to the public matters (*al-umūr al-āmmah*), not to the issues of the three methods (*al-Usul al-Thalatha*). In other words, the first aim in choosing and teaching *Sherhu'l-Mevākif* is the methodological issues in theoretical discussions. As a matter of fact, there are anecdotes in some *ulama* biographies that the introductory part of *Sherhu'l-Mevākif* was read.

Shemseddin el-Isfahānī wrote a commentary on Nasuriddin Tūsī's *Tajridu'l-Itikad*. An annotation written for this commentary by

Sayyid Sherīf al-Jurjānī was taught as a text of specialization in Ottoman *madrasahs* for a long time. Thus, *Hashiye-i Tajrid* was one of the basic texts of the *madrasah*. Although a commentary is attributed to Hizir Bey in the sources, it is certain that Molla Mehmed Shah Fanarizāde, son of Molla Fenari, wrote an annotation titled *Hashiye alā Hashiyeti's-Sayyid li-Sherhi't-Tajrid*. Husameddin Tokadī had an annotation in the form of a treatise (*talikat*). There is also a treatise (*risale*) written by Hoczāde to clarify the cause-effect issue (*illet-malul*) in *Tajridu'l-itikad*. Hayālī's *Hashiye alā Sherhi Tecrīdi'l-Akaid* is an annotation about the first part of Jurjānī's annotation. Hatibzade contributed to the literature with an annotation on *Tajrid* and Sinan Pasha with a *talikat*. Molla Ahawayn also had an annotation on *Sherhu't-Tajrid*. In addition, Molla Samsunizāde also wrote an annotation. Mullah Shuja Rumi, who favored Jurjānī over Teftāzānī, also wrote an annotation for the *Tajrid* annotation. Moreover, Molla Hasan Halaabi Mahshi has an annotation titled *Hashiye alā dībājati'sh-Sherhi'l-Jadīd li't-Tajrid* on the introductory part of Ali Qushji's commentary on *Tajridu'l-itikad*.

When we look at the content of *Hashiye-i Tajrid* to identify why it was so widely taught in Ottoman *madrasahs*, we encounter a reason similar to that of *Sherhu'l-Mevākif*. The interest in *Hashiye-i Tajrid* was mostly due to the interest towards the philosophical *kalam* tradition. As it is known, Tusi was an important commentator of Ibn Sina and the issues he dealt with were related to the relations between theology and philosophy. The annotation on *Tajrid*, just because of this feature, attracted the attention of the Ottoman *ulama*. On the other hand, the students learned the philosophical interpretation of Mu'tazila *kalam* through this text. Nasiruddin Tūsī was a Shiite and Mu'tazili *kalam* had gradually been mixed with Shiite *kalam* particularly after the 5th century AH. As a result, Shiite *kalam* had almost become subsumed by Mu'tazili *kalam* except for the issue of imamate. Nasiruddin Tūsī was the one who brought this *kalam* approach to the field of philosophical *kalam*. While his claims of Shiite imamate in the text were rejected through some of the commentaries, the students also had the chance to learn the answers given to the philosophical interpretation of the Mu'tazila *kalam*.

Similarly, Shemseddin el-Isfahānī's commentary titled *Metāli 'u'l-enzār alā Tavāli 'i'l-envār* on Kadi Beyzavī's *Tavāli 'u'l-Envār* was among the works that were of interest to the Ottoman *ulama*, who wrote

annotations to it or conducted studies on the extant annotations. ;In this work, Kadi Beyzavi, used the structure which started with Razi and that was based on the philosophical system of *kalam*, and the natural and theological approaches of philosophy were included in *kalam*. This novelty attracted the attention of the Ottoman *ulama* and they wrote annotations and commentaries on this work. Likewise, *Sherhu'l-Akaidi'l-Adudiyye* by Devvānī, who lived in Shiraz under Akkoyunlu rule, was among the works appreciated by the Ottoman *ulama*. Annotations and commentaries have been written on this work, which had a great influence on *kalam* system, especially in terms of its relationship with the philosophical Sufi tradition.

5. Conclusion

Khorasan-Transoxiana line was the horizon that the Ottomans looked at not only in the field of *kalam*, but also in religious fields such as *fiqh* and mysticism, as well as in philosophy, logic and science. It is the origin of the prominent figures and the reference works in these fields. This region is one of the most important places where the *ulama* came from or the students traveled to for education. Especially Teftāzānī and Sayyid Sherif Jurjānī were important benchmarks for the Ottoman *ilmīye* tradition. Thus, the measure of the prestige and rise of the *ulama* was sought in their relations to the figures and works from this region. Teftāzānī and Sayyid Sherif Jurjānī were seen as standards for comparison by the Ottoman scientific world. In fact, some of them, who were students and friends of Seyyid Sherif Jurjānī and Teftāzānī, gave a special importance to both their works and their personality, and considered them as embodiment of the highest level of knowledge, ideals in the path to reach moral and intellectual excellence.

The first criteria for prestige and acceptance in the Ottoman land was Hanafism. Looking at the works written in the field of *fiqh*-law, it is seen that the works on Hanafi method and substantive law (*furu fiqh*) written in this region, had the highest regard. This appreciation was not limited to *fiqh*. Indeed, the *akaid-kalam* texts respected by the Ottomans were directly or indirectly related to Hanafism. Teftāzānī, who wrote the most known *kalam* work, *Sherhu'l-Akaid*, was also the commentator of *Sadrushsheria* and the *kalam* text he wrote on belonged to a Hanafī-Maturīdī author. Sayyid Sherif Jurjānī, the author of the other famous work, while Esh'ari in creed, was Hanafi

in practice, and is one of the names who wrote annotations and commentaries on the Hanafi method tradition in *fiqh*. In addition, both of them produced works under the protection of Timur in an environment based on Hanafism. For this reason, the point of view where the Ottoman *ulama* looked at these texts was quite unique. Just because the author was Esh'ari, did not mean their work was Esh'ari. Moreover, the Ottoman *ulama* made use of these texts according to the needs of the students in the *madrasahs*. They picked Teftazani's as a text that could help students see Maturidism and Esh'arism together. The problem with locating the reason for popularity of a text based on the identity of the author can best be seen through the *Tajrid* annotation. Tūsi, the author of *Tajrid*, was Shiite, yet his text was taught in *madrasahs* for a long time. Therefore, the reason behind the preferences of the *ulama* for works was not the sect of the author, but the quality of the work.

The theological accumulation that the Ottoman scholars held in high regard was the philosophical *kalam* tradition, which Gazzālī pointed out, Razi started to implement, Amidī and Beyzavi developed and Teftāzānī and Seyyid Sherif Jurjānī finally accomplished. The lessons taught, the commentaries and annotations written were within the framework of this tradition. Whether the text contributed to the above tradition was the main point that the Ottoman mindset paid attention to rather than the author's sectarian creed. The main characteristic in the formation of philosophical *kalam* was application of logic to *kalam*. As such, we are faced with a selectivity that considers the gradual development of this practice. Ottoman *ulama* have always chosen the works and references to be taught based on this distinction evident in the selection of the works taught and studied with annotations, commentaries and *taliks* in the Ottoman circles. The philosophical *kalam* tradition emerged in the Transoxiana-Khorasan axis with reference to the names mentioned above.

In conclusion, the great texts in the fields of science, art, logic, philosophy, theology (*kalam*), *fiqh* and politics, which brought Islamic thought to its peak, emerged in this geography and reached perfection in the Ottoman climate. Transoxiana-Khorasan axis was a geography that the Ottomans always focused on and considered as a part of their own heritage.

References

- Akpınar, Cemil. "Fethullah esh-Shirvānī," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 12., İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1995.
- Gelibolulu Mustafa Ālī. *Kunhu'l-ahbar: 4. rukn: Osmanlı tarihi: tipkibasım* [*The Essence of Histories, 4th Pillar: Ottoman History: Facsimile*]. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2009.
- Hoca Sādeddin. *Tācu't-tevārīh*. Vol. 2., İstanbul: Tabhane-i Āmire, 1279.
- Kalaycı, Mehmet. "Osmanlı'da Eşarilik-Maturidilik İlişmesine Genel Bir Bakış" ["A General Outlook on the Asharism-Maturidism Relationship in the Ottoman Empire"]. *İlahiyat Akademi* 5, (2017): 113-127.
- Soysal, Mehmet Fatih. "Ali Kuşçu'nun Şerhu Tecridi'l-Kelam'ından Usul-i Selase Konularının Tahkiki ve İlahiyat Meselelerinin Tahlili" ["Edition Critique of Subjects of Three Principles and Analysis of Theology Matters on Ali Qushji's Sharh-i Tajrid Al-Kalam"]. PhD Thesis, Marmara University, 2014.
- Tashkopriẓāde Ahmed Efendi. *esh-Shekaiku'n-nu'maniyye fī ulemai'd-devleti'l-Osmaniyye*, Beirut. Dāru'l-Kitābi'l-Arabi, 1975.
- Topaloğlu, Bekir. "Tecridu'l-İ'tikad," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslām Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 40. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1995. TDV.