

CONTENTS

ARTICLES		
Rusmir Mahmutćehajić	The Meaning of the <i>Miḥrāb</i> – From the Perspective of Perennial Philosophy –	149
Mustafa Öztürk	The Different Stances of al-Shahrastānī – A Study of the Sectarian Identity of Abū l-Faṭḥ al-Shahrastānī in Relation to His Qurʾānic Commentary, <i>Mafātīḥ al-</i> <i>asrār</i> –	195
Mehmet Fatih Birgöl	Discussion of Causality Based on the Conceptions of Nature of Ibn Rushd and al-Ghazālī	241
BOOK REVIEWS		
Reuven Firestone	<i>The Jews as a Chosen People: Tradition and Transformation</i> , by S. Leyla Gürkan	260
M. Cüneyt Kaya	<i>Mutezile'nin Felsefe Eleştirisi: Harezmlî Mutezilî İbnü'l-Melâhimî'nin Felsefeye Reddiyesi [Muʿtazila's Critique of Phi- losophy: Muʿtazilî Theologian Ibn al- Malâḥimî of Khwârazm's Refutation of Philosophy]</i> , by Orhan Şener Koloğlu	264

Saadet Maydaer *The Historic Hammams of Bursa*, by Elif Şehitoğlu 267

Todd Lawson *An Anthology of Qur'anic Commentaries: Volume 1: On the Nature of the Divine*, by Feras Hamza and Sajjad Rizvi with Farhana Mayer (eds.) 269

Muhammet Tarakçı *İbn Hazm: Uluslararası Katılımlı İbn Hazm Sempozyumu – Bildiri ve Müzakereler Metinleri – [Ibn Ḥazm: Proceedings of International Symposium on Ibn Ḥazm]*, by Süleyman Sayar and Muhammet Tarakçı (eds.) 273

CONFERENCE REPORTS

L. W. C. van Lit *International Symposium on Kbo-jazāda* (October 22-24, 2010) 278

Tuba Işık-Yiğit *IV International Congress on Islamic Feminism* (October 21-24, 2010) 282

International Symposium on Khojazāda, 22-24 October 2010,
organized by the Faculty of Theology, Uludağ University & Bursa
Metropolitan Municipality, Bursa-Turkey

After a successful symposium on Mullā Fanārī in 2009, the Theology Faculty of Uludağ University and the Bursa Metropolitan Municipality organized a symposium on the Ottoman intellectual Khojazāda (d. 893/1488) from 22 to 24 October 2010.

The first day was opened by Prof. M. Kara and Prof. A. Arslan. Kara discussed the Sufi environment of Khojazāda's days. Arslan (well known for his study of Kamāl Pāshā Zāda's commentary on Khojazāda's *Tabāfut al-falāsifa*) introduced the general philosophical environment of Khojazāda, emphasizing the inclusion of an increasing number of philosophical arguments within the *kalām* discourse.

The first session was mainly concerned with Khojazāda's life. The first presentation was by Prof. A. K. Cihan and concerned the general scientific environment during the time of Khojazāda (in particular, under the patronage of Sultan Mehmed II). In the Ottoman environment, the Ḥanafī school was dominant in Religious Law and al-Jurjānī and al-Taftāzānī shaped and influenced to a large extent the agenda of the philosophical and theological investigations. Especially under the rule of Mehmed II, who conquered Constantinople in 1453, intellectual circles experienced an upsurge. As a simple example of this upsurge, Cihan showed that in *al-Shaqā'iq al-Nu'māniyya* (a biobibliographical dictionary of Ottoman intellectuals), 89 scholars are recorded during the reign of Mehmed II, whereas only 40 are recorded during the reign of the previous sultan, Murad II. Cihan also discussed the different intellectual centers such as Edirne, Bursa, and Istanbul.

Subsequently, the life of Khojazāda was discussed into detail in presentations by Prof. M. Hızlı and Prof. S. Köse. Bearing the full name Muşliḥ al-Dīn Muşṭafā b. Yūsuf b. Şāliḥ al-Būrsawī, Khojazāda was raised by a father who was a rich businessman. His birth date is not explicitly recorded, although Köse argued for a birth year of 838/1434. Living his whole life in the Ottoman Empire, Khojazāda became a well-known scholar in his own days and remained well known as the various glosses on his books testify. After he had studied for some time, he entered the service of Ibn Qāḍī Ayāthlūgh. In

the Aghrās Madrasa, he studied Arabic, the principles of law and religion, and the linguistic sciences of meanings and metaphors with Ibn Qāḍī Ayāthlūgh. Then, Khojazāda entered the service of Khidr Bek Ibn Jalāl. Khojazāda held positions as a *mudarris* (multiple times in Bursa and Istanbul and once in Iznik; he also served as a private teacher of the sultan) and a qāḍī (in Kestel, Edirne, Istanbul, and Iznik and for the army), and he held strong connections throughout his life with all three Sultans under whom he served. He died in Bursa in 893/1488.

Khojazāda was also buried in Bursa, and his grave was the subject of the talk by Dr. H. Gülgen. Contextualizing the gravestone within the Ottoman environment, Gülgen showed how Khojazāda's gravestone is a fine example of a 'Bursa-style' gravestone. The elaborate writings and decorations are unique for its time and could indicate that the gravestone was made based on a specific request, according to Gülgen.

The second session of the first day discussed Khojazāda's philosophical and theological writings. Prof. A. Shihadeh began the session with a discussion of some of Khojazāda's glosses on al-Jurjānī's *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*. After some remarks on the use of commentaries (sing. *sharḥ*) and glosses (sing. *ḥāshiyā*) in the time of Khojazāda, Shihadeh examined some problems regarding the nature of *kalām* as a discipline and of theological knowledge and enquiry. He argued that Khojazāda is generally more critical of the later Ash'arīs (e.g., Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, al-Abharī, and al-Jurjānī) than he is of the earlier, classical Ash'arīs (e.g., al-Ash'arī, al-Bāqillānī, and al-Juwaynī). As for the core theological doctrine of Ash'arism (e.g., the omnipotence of God), Khojazāda appears to favor the positions of earlier schools over the position of later schools, which were often contradictory.

The second presentation was given by Prof. C. Karadaş. A technical-philosophical discussion on causality was delivered. It mainly focused on the concept of secondary causality and its role within the Peripatetic philosophical framework. The presentation then problematized this scheme from within a religious outlook and surveyed al-Ghazālī's synthesis, which predominantly draws from the idea of God's custom (*ʿāda*).

A similar technical-philosophical discussion was undertaken by L. W. C. van Lit. In his presentation, he discussed Khojazāda's and 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī's chapters on God's knowledge from their studies on al-Ghazālī's *Tabāfut al-falāsifa*. While surveying their arguments, van

Lit pointed out that Khojazāda's text in particular reveals a great degree of reliance on earlier texts, such as the previously mentioned al-Jurjānī's *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*. Though 'Alā' al-Dīn does not explicitly use many citations, his text relies on almost exactly the same texts as Khojazāda's text does. Overall, Khojazāda seems to favor Quṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī's solution (particulars are known by their unique bundle of universals), while 'Alā' al-Dīn seems to emphasize Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's idea of knowledge as a relation.

Although a fourth paper – on Khojazāda's exposition of the Liar Paradox – was announced, it was not presented. The third session suffered from similar issues. A paper on 'Tabāfut in terms of Eternity of Creation' was not presented; another one on 'the eternal speech of God' was read on behalf of the author. The session began with a stimulating presentation by Dr. Ö. Türker. He tried to assess the success of the *Tabāfut*-studies of Khojazāda and 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī by explicating the philosophy-theology relation in the Islamic tradition. Türker invoked the technical term of 'disputation' (*jadāl*) to establish a twofold discourse for theologians (*mutakallimūn*). On the one hand, there is the discourse between Islamic and non-Islamic intellectuals, and on the other hand, there is the discourse between intellectuals of different Islamic denominations. His claim is that, before al-Ghazālī, 'the philosophers' (*al-falāsifa*) were considered non-Islamic intellectuals by Muslim theologians, whereas after al-Ghazālī, 'the philosophers' were accepted as intellectuals of a different Islamic denomination, inducing a far greater commitment to philosophy (in the Peripatetic sense of the word) by the theologians. As such, Türker claims, the revivification of the *Tabāfut* discussion could not establish itself as an enduring tradition because the *Tabāfut* discussion betrays a commitment to the first type of discourse. The second paper was presented on behalf of Dr. A. Belhaj. He edited and discussed a treatise of Khojazāda entitled 'Epistle on the Eternal Speech of God' (*Risāla fī anna kalām Allāh qadīm*).

On Saturday, sessions four and five were undertaken. The fourth session was opened by Prof. Y. Michot. He contributed a paper on the division of the sciences, as it is given by Khojazāda in his introduction to his *Tabāfut al-falāsifa*. By and large, Khojazāda's division resembles Ibn Sīnā's division of the sciences. Michot's historical analysis also brought to light the solution to the obscure "*ālāt juz'iyya*," which is faithfully reproduced in every edition of Ibn Sīnā's treatise, even though it is unclear what exactly 'particular instruments'

is supposed to mean. Using Ibn al-Akfānī's division of the sciences, Michot proposes to emendate it to "*ālāt ḥarbiyya*" (war instruments).

The two other presentations of this session were given by Dr. T. Yücedoğru and V. Kaya, and both dealt with philosophical discussions concerning cosmology. Yücedoğru highlighted the differences between Khojazāda's view (close to the mainstream *kalām* view) and alternatives such as Sufi and philosophical views. Kaya's paper focused on one issue of cosmology, namely whether or not the universe is eternal. Primarily using Khojazāda's *Tabāfut al-falāsifa*, he showed that Khojazāda argues for a strict creation of the universe. The presentation also offered a good sample of the style of the *Tabāfut al-falāsifa*, of which the fierce criticism on al-Ghazālī is most noteworthy.

The fifth and final session was devoted to Khojazāda's scientific writings. Prof. İ. Fazlıoğlu opened with a fascinating paper on a treatise concerning the question of whether the universe has a center. This question was raised by Sultan Mehmed II and was addressed by fifteen respondents, of which Khojazāda was one. To answer the question, Khojazāda transformed the cosmological problem into a mathematical problem.

The second speaker, Dr. A. Akbar Ziaee, discussed Khojazāda's treatise on rainbows. He referred to the cultural significance of the rainbow and to the scientific ventures to explain the phenomenon in the most satisfying way. Conceptually, Khojazāda's treatise is in line with those of previous scientists within the Islamic world, such as Ibn Sīnā, according to Akbar Ziaee.

The final speaker was K. Şenel. She offered an in-depth discussion of celestial bodies (Ar. sing. *falak*) using Khojazāda's *Tabāfut al-falāsifa*. By discussing aspects such as soul (*nafs*) and will (*irāda*) in connection to celestial bodies, she both raised classical issues in natural philosophy and metaphysics and showed how Khojazāda's critique on "the philosophers" questions the tenability of theorems.

In all, this symposium proved to be thought provoking. In itself a great contribution to a better understanding of the intellectual history of the Ottoman Empire, this symposium will hopefully lead to more attention being paid to Khojazāda and the intellectual history of the Ottoman Empire in the years to come.

L. W. C. van Lit

McGill University, Montreal, Quebec-Canada