

A Meticulous Evaluation:
Can We Really Think of Melayê Cizîrî as a Philosopher?

Titiz Bir Değerlendirme:
Melayê Cizîrî'yi Gerçekten Bir Filozof Olarak Düşünebilir miyiz?

Merve Arslan

Dr., Şırnak Üniversitesi/İlahiyat Fakültesi/Felsefe ve Din Bilimleri Bölümü, mervearslan@sirnak.edu.tr,
ORCID: 0009-0001-6218-6790

Article Information

Article Type
Research Article
Date Received
09.12.2025
Date Accepted
24.12.2025
Date Published
31 December 2025
Plagiarism Checks: Yes, Turnitin.
Ethical Statement
It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited.
(Merve Arslan)

Conflicts of Interest: The author(s) has no conflict of interest to declare.

Licensed under CC BY-NC 4.0 license.



CC BY-NC 4.0 lisansı ile lisanslanmıştır.

Cite As | Atif

Arslan, Merve (2025). A Meticulous Evaluation: Can We Really Think of Melayê Cizîrî as a Philosopher?. *Mebadi International Journal of Philosophy*, (2) 2, 54-67.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18080659>

Abstract

Melayê Cizîrî is one of the leading figures in 16th-century Sufi literature. Melayê Cizîrî's only known work, the *Diwan*, explores the concepts of Islamic Sufism from a literary perspective and in poetic language. The central theme of the *Diwan* is divine love. In connection with this central theme, the work also explores prophetic love in literary language. In exploring these themes, Melayê Cizîrî draws on sources of Sufi thought, such as Ibn Arabî, Mansur Al-Hallaj, and Jami. Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan* is currently being studied and interpreted from diverse perspectives in numerous fields, including history, philosophy, sociology, and astronomy. As Melayê Cizîrî uses philosophical concepts in his work, some commentaries also treat his *Diwan* as a philosophical work. How can we assess these interpretations?

With this motivation, this study approaches Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan* from a philosophical perspective. How and in what contexts does Melayê Cizîrî use philosophical concepts in the *Diwan*? How is the relationship of these concepts to the metaphysics of love established? Is Melayê Cizîrî's use of concepts consistent? In this case, how can we locate Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan* in the history of thought? Relying on these questions, this research aims to frame the philosophical concepts in Melayê Cizîrî's work and to reassess his place in the history of thought.

Keywords: History of Philosophy, Islamic Thought, Sufi Tradition, Melayê Cizîrî, *Diwan*

Öz

Melayê Cizîrî, 16. yüzyıl tasavvuf edebiyatının onde gelen isimlerinden biridir. Melayê Cizîrî'nin İslam tasavvuf kavramlarını edebi bir bakış açısıyla ve şîiisel bir dille ele aldığı bilinen tek eseri *Diwan*'dır. *Diwan*'ın ana teması ilahi aşktır. Eser, bu merkezi temayla bağlantılı olarak, peygamber aşkınu da edebi bir dille ele alır. Bu temaları ele alırken Melayê Cizîrî, İbn Arabî, Hallac-i Mansur ve Molla Cami gibi tasavvuf düşüncesinin kaynaklarından yararlanır. Melayê Cizîrî'nin *Diwan*'ı, günümüzde tarih, felsefe, sosyoloji ve astronomi de dahil olmak üzere birçok alanda farklı bakış açılarından incelenmekte ve yorumlanmaktadır. Melayê Cizîrî, eserinde bazı felsefi kavramlara yer verdiği gibi, bazı yorumlar da *Diwan*'ını felsefi bir eser olarak ele almaktadır. Bu yorumları nasıl değerlendirebiliriz?

Bu çalışma, Melayê Cizîrî'nin *Diwan*'ına felsefi bir bakış açısıyla yaklaşmaktadır. Melayê Cizîrî, *Diwan*'ında felsefi kavramları nasıl ve hangi bağamlarda kullanmıştır? Bu kavramların aşk metafiziğiyle ilişkisi nasıl kurulmuştur? Melayê Cizîrî'nin kavram kullanımını tutarlı midir? Bu durumda, Melayê Cizîrî'nin *Diwan*'ını düşünce tarihinde nasıl konumlandırabiliz? Bu araştırma, bu sorulardan yola çıkarak Melayê Cizîrî'nin eserindeki felsefi kavramları çerçevelemeyi ve düşünce tarihindeki yerini yeniden değerlendirmeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Felsefe Tarihi, İslam Düşüncesi, Sufi Gelenek, Melayê Cizîrî, *Diwan*

1. Introduction

This article discusses whether Melayê Cizîrî is a philosopher, focusing on his work *Diwan*. Melayê Cizîrî is a prominent figure of the 16th or 17th centuries, contributing to Sufi literature. The exact time period during which he lived is unclear because the available evidence is sufficient on this point. However, according to the indications of various writers and religious scholars who lived after him and left their works to us today, it can be understood that he lived between the 16th and 17th centuries. Considering the social and intellectual world in which he lived, it can be said that he grew up in an environment that focused on explaining and practicing Islam (Öz, 2023, p. 39).

In this context, Melayê Cizîrî's place can be considered within Islamic thought. As evidence for this, one can take his masterpiece. His only known work is *Diwan*, which explores the concepts of Islamic Sufism through poetic language. *Diwan* is structured according to the literary conventions of couplets and various compositional styles. In fact, the work had not previously existed as a single book. That is why Melayê Cizîrî's words were preserved in the form memorized in madrasahs and through couplets recited by the public. In 1904, German researcher Martin Hartmann pioneered the compilation and unification of *Diwan* in Berlin. Therefore, *Diwan* in our hands today is based on the 1904 manuscript compiled.

The main topic of the *Diwan* is divine love. In connection with this central theme, the work also explores prophetic love in a literal sense. From a Sufi perspective, divine love in the work stands out as the most fundamental concept that explains the creation and meaning of all existence. The life and meaning are grounded in the existence of the 'One' or God (Allah). The notion of divine love reflects this central theme.

In framing the central theme in *Diwan*, for example, Nesim Doru, Abdurrahim Alkış, and Ruhullah Öz provide profound analyses. To be more specific, Nesim Doru has conducted meticulous studies regarding Melayê Cizîrî's place in Islamic thought. (Doru, 2012) Abdurrahim Alkış has analysed the Sufi concepts in Melayê Cizîrî's *Dîvân* (Alkış, 2014). Last but not least, from the discipline of *kalâm*, Ruhullah Öz provides a detailed analysis of Melayê Cizîrî's thoughts on divine love, *marifah*, and ontology (Öz, 2019; 2023; 2024). These studies are the core examinations of Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan* and its central theme in the literature.

As a valuable resource in Islamic thought, the *Diwan* is studied at the intersections of various disciplines, including religion, ontology, epistemology, philosophy, sociology, morality, history, cosmology, and astronomy today. It is

because *Diwan* covers applicable concepts in the axes of Islamic studies, Sufi tradition, *kalām*, and other social sciences. There are also some philosophical concepts used in relation to the main topic in *Diwan*.

Indeed, it can be thought that Melayê Cizîrî is aware of philosophical notions and attempts to use them to explain divine love in his book. What are these notions? To what extent are they appropriate to support describing the central theme within the text? Perhaps, it could be helpful to engage in philosophical notions and approaches when explaining certain religious concepts or topics. Yet, even if the usage of philosophical terms works for delivering the ideas and issues in a study, how can we claim that this work is a philosophical work in general?

In recent years, there have been numerous interpretations on Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan*. Among those connected to philosophy, some interpretations argue that *Diwan* is a philosophical work and that, in turn, Melayê Cizîrî is a philosopher. It may be said that Melayê Cizîrî's aim in *Diwan* is to express the divine love clearly for those who follow the Sufi tradition. He can use philosophical terms, figures, and approaches to achieve this aim. However, relying on this fact merely, how can we accept that Melayê Cizîrî is indeed a philosopher? With this central question, this paper seeks to relocate Melayê Cizîrî's place in the literature by highlighting his significance in the history of Islamic thought.

Structurally, the paper has some subsections to discuss the main thesis. Firstly, it examines the intellectual background of Melayê Cizîrî, including his *Diwan*. After taking into account these grounds, the paper delves into the philosophical notions in *Diwan*. In the study, the central philosophical concepts are chosen as life, creation, the one, reason (wisdom), and knowledge. For each concept, the paper provides indications from *Diwan* and later attempts to compare these expressions with their traditional philosophical usage.

A Closer analysis reveals that *Diwan* does not engage in traditional philosophy beyond a brief mention of its concepts. For this reason, in the discussion part, the paper raises the question: Can we really claim Melayê Cizîrî as a philosopher? To discuss that inquiry, some general attitudes in the traditional understandings of philosophy will be referred to. At the end of the discussion, it will be pointed out that Melayê Cizîrî's work is not a philosophical study, nor is Melayê Cizîrî a philosopher. This questioning underscores the importance of redefining Melayê Cizîrî's place in the history of Islamic thought for further studies on his work.

2. Framing the Intellectual Background of Melayê Cizîrî and *Diwan*

This part aims to grasp the intellectual bases of Melayê Cizîrî and his *Diwan*. If we generally understand Melayê Cizîrî's intellectual roots, it could help us discuss more clearly whether he is truly a philosopher in the next step. With this purpose, let us begin by considering the intellectual background of Melayê Cizîrî by means of *Diwan*. After checking Melayê Cizîrî's primary resources, we will outline the bases of his book.

First and foremost, during Melayê Cizîrî's lifetime, between the 16th and 17th centuries, significant intellectual movements take place worldwide. Following the Age of Discovery, the Renaissance marks the rise of humanism. Then, all of this leads to transformations and reforms in religious understanding. In this period, Anatolia is under the rule of Ottoman Empire. However, while keeping pace with global developments, the primary focus of the Ottoman education system is on Islamic studies at that time.

In the Ottoman education system, madrasas (religious schools) serve as fundamental educational institutions, focusing on religious studies and providing university-level education (Demir, 2013). Among the madrasas, the Red Madrasa (Medresa Sor), where Melayê Cizîrî has an association, stands out as a vital center in the Southeast part of Anatolia. This is because the Cizre district, including the Red Madrasa, is part of Anatolia but also a crossroads of Iran, Iraq, and Syria. Therefore, Cizre has a special intellectual environment open to all kinds of interactions in the fields of science, culture, art, and literature.

According to the general resources, Melayê Cizîrî appears to be quite interested in teaching religion and religious sciences in Cizre. He has a deep education in religious studies. In accordance with this, he works as a teacher at different madrasas, especially in the Southeast part of Anatolia. Until his death, Melayê Cizîrî teaches religious sciences at the Red Madrasa. As a teacher, he is very interested in natural and social sciences, such as math, geometry, philosophy, and logic (Öz, 2023, p. 42).

In addition to being a teacher at a madrasa, Melayê Cizîrî is also connected to the Sufi tradition. When describing the divine love, he is influenced by the thoughts of Ibn Arabi, Mansur Al-Hallaj, Ibn Sina, Suhrawardi, and the poems or mystic expressions of Hafez-i Shirazi and Jami. For example, there is an enormous effect of Ibn Arabi with his theory of wahdat al-wujud (unity of being) in *Diwan*. In attempting to explain the systematic unity that describes the relationship among God, the universe, and humanity, Melayê Cizîrî draws heavily on Ibn Arabi. In addition to Ibn Arabi, Melayê Cizîrî draws on the thoughts and mystical expressions of various Islamic and Sufi thinkers in his *Diwan* (Öz, 2023, pp. 42-43).

Melayê Cizîrî, as a figure in this intellectual environment, combines his ideas about divine love in a literary style, in the form of a collection of poems. The divine love is a sort of unity between all loves on the earth. In addition to his education in religious studies and schools, Melayê Cizîrî draws on his readings in philosophy and logic to express what he grasps through the divine love. In doing this, literature helps him to describe the words as much as he can. By using different styles in his poems, he creates unity around the central theme in the *Diwan*. To give an example of his writing:

“Eşkâl û xetêñ daîreê nuqteê ‘ilm in
Ev neqş û mîsalêñ di xeyalatê ‘edem da” (Cizîrî, 2021, p.282).

“These patterns and examples that appear in the realm of nothingness
Are each a point of knowledge from your eternal divine knowledge.”¹

As can be seen, Melayê Cizîrî writes his words in Kurdish. This is an important indicator of his style. Compared to the other Sufi representatives of his time, he chose to write his poems in Kurdish. Typically, in madrasas, Sufis write their scientific works in Arabic and their literary studies in Persian as a general practice at that time (Öz, 2023, pp. 47-48). Despite Persian culture's dominant influence, Melayê Cizîrî's preference for writing in Kurdish is a critical detail. It signifies his desire to preserve cultural heritage by telling the story of the divine love in their own language.

For the framing of the intellectual atmosphere that was influential during the century in which Melayê Cizîrî lived, an attempt has been made to understand which views influenced him. Generally, it can be said that Melayê Cizîrî is firmly committed to Islamic sciences, gives lectures in this vein, and is influenced by madrasa culture. However, it can also be assumed that, as a representative of the Sufi tradition, Melayê Cizîrî follows and tries to understand those who had attempted to describe the divine love before him. In this case, how does Melayê Cizîrî reflect this intellectual background in his *Diwan*? Is he able to put forward ideas sufficient to conduct philosophical analyses? The following section will examine the philosophical concepts used in the *Diwan* and their role in answering this question.

3. Philosophical Concepts in the *Diwan*

In *Diwan*, one might clearly grasp that there are some philosophical concepts. Melayê Cizîrî uses these concepts to narrate his understanding of divine love. In this regard, he notes life, creation, the one, reason/wisdom, and

¹ The author makes the translations of the couplets in this paper. The Turkish translation is considered. Alongside the original couplets, their English versions are provided.

knowledge in *Diwan*. Primarily, one can suppose that his usage of those concepts shows his ability to be on the way to philosophical thinking. However, when we analyse the book as a whole, we can conclude that Melayê Cizîrî aims to use these concepts solely to express his understanding of theological love. To discuss this point further, we need to examine the philosophical terms in *Diwan*. In doing this, we will frame their content in Melayê Cizîrî's thoughts. We shall begin considering the main philosophical terms.

Firstly, one of the frequently encountered concepts in *Diwan* that can be considered related to philosophy is 'life'. Melayê Cizîrî includes many expressions regarding the meaning and creation of life in his masterpiece. In fact, how life arose in the universe and what the meaning of life is have been among the most fascinating topics throughout human history. Almost every human being has been part of this inquiry and has sought meaning. When Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan* is read holistically, it becomes clear that he attempts to explain the origin and meaning of life through divine love. With his words:

"Teqada weh dikir hikmet ku çerx û lewleb û bab in
Huwe'l fe'alu la texter bi esbabin we alati

Ezel 'eynî ebed yek an di deyyûmî di qeyyûmî
Tenezzul tête tefsîlê bi anatin we ewqati" (Cizîrî, 2021, pp.282-84).

"The divine wisdom decrees that the wheel of fortune turns like this
He is the one who does it; do not be deceived by the tools and causes

In time and space, in eternity and infinity, in His one essence
His knowledge is visible every moment in every detail of the universe"

As can be clearly seen, for Melayê Cizîrî, every detail of life depends on the existence of God. He is the cause of life, the things, time, and space. Connected with life, the second concept related to philosophy in the *Diwan* is 'creation'. The term creation, which can be considered alongside life, is one of the fundamental concepts that helps us discuss how the universe and life may have come into being, whether they were created or not, and how living and non-living things came into existence. In philosophy, the idea of creation is addressed by many philosophers and is frequently examined in fields such as the philosophy of religion and the philosophy of art (Laan, 2022).

As a concept, creation is evaluated in a general sense in the philosophy of religion. From the perspective of the philosophy of religion, creation is not examined based on any particular religion or specific scientific explanation. This can be addressed by researchers who specialize in the theology of a religion. For example, the concept of creation can be examined from an Islamic or Christian theological perspective. In fact, the concept of creation in Melayê Cizîrî's thought

is evaluated from the standpoint of Islamic theology and explained by establishing connections with concepts such as *sudûr*, *hudûs*, etc., in the Sufi tradition. This theological framing indicates that Melayê Cizîrî can be evaluated within the Islamic Sufi approach.

Another philosophical concept in Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan* is the 'one'. Melayê Cizîrî attempts to grasp the 'one' through related Sufi terms such as unity, wholeness, parts, and multiplicity in the universe. Drawing on the Sufi thought, Melayê Cizîrî defines the 'one' through the profound relationship between unity and multiplicity in existence. When reading the related parts, including the concept of the 'one' in *Diwan*, one can sense that he actually possesses philosophical knowledge, for instance, knowing how Plato, Plotinus, and thinkers from the Islamic intellectual tradition interpreted the 'one'.

Fourth, Melayê Cizîrî frequently mentions 'reason' in *Diwan*. It is one of the main concepts of philosophy. The ancient philosophers use the term 'reason' when describing philosophy. Reasoning is accepted as the central part of making philosophy, for example. On that point, logical reasoning is quite essential. A wise person can think and discuss something consistently and logically. In a nutshell, in the traditional philosophy, reason or reasoning is a tool for thinking (Stewart and Kissel, 2025).

When we examine Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan*, we may see that he takes reason in terms of the Sufi tradition. He thinks that reason is not enough to grasp the meaning of time, space, direction, boundary, measure, meaning, spirit, and body. For Melayê Cizîrî, our mind is insufficient to understand those. In this case, reason remains ineffective (Cizîrî, 2021, pp. 112-113). It is because reason cannot grasp the unknown in depth. To Melayê Cizîrî and many Sufi thinkers, only insight can grasp the unknown in existence. In this case, reason is insufficient to realize the deep meaning of the one. Therefore, although the importance of reasoning in the history of thought, Melayê Cizîrî accepts the limited capacity of human reason in line with Sufi tradition (Aminrazavi, 2021).

Lastly, the concept of 'knowledge' can be considered as a philosophical term in Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan*. Knowledge is a central issue in traditional philosophy. Especially with epistemology, knowledge becomes more critical. Such questions arise around epistemology: What is knowledge? What can be the source of it? In the history of philosophy, many philosophers have defined knowledge in various ways or aimed to describe different kinds of knowledge (Steup and Ram, 2025). Considering Melayê Cizîrî's thoughts in *Diwan*, one may realize that he seeks knowledge connected with the divine love. To him, knowledge derives from the divine; it manifests the one, or it is the result of the divine love.

As a consequence, when we analyse Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan*, we may discover that it contains philosophical concepts. The main concepts can be seen as life, creation, the one, reason, and knowledge. However, their sense is already bound to the Sufi tradition. Even though he seems to use philosophical terms in his ideas, he does not further articulate them or explore new aspects. All his ideas are rooted in the very nature of Islamic thought. In conclusion, their content and sense ultimately rely on the Sufi tradition.

If we return to the article's main problem, we need to underscore one point. In recent years, research on Melayê Cizîrî in Türkiye has gained momentum. In addition to different symposiums at different academic institutions, we may see many articles in the literature. Undoubtedly, they are valuable works attempting to determine Melayê Cizîrî's value in the scholarly literature. Yet, when examining some comments on Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan*, it becomes apparent that these comments aim to connect it to the history of classical philosophy.

Melayê Cizîrî is a madrasa teacher well-versed in philosophical knowledge and a Sufi thinker. His work, the *Diwan*, can be examined in terms of Sufism, *kalâm*, and philosophy. Comparisons can also be made, particularly with the approaches of some thinkers from the Islamic tradition. Nevertheless, to relate his work to the history of philosophy in the classical sense and to claim that Melayê Cizîrî is a philosopher is a much more serious matter.

That is why this article takes a position. It aims to show that Melayê Cizîrî cannot be considered a philosopher, and that, while his work can be examined in philosophical terms, it must be understood in relation to the Islamic tradition. Returning to the primary objective of this study, we can now discuss why we cannot consider Melayê Cizîrî a classical philosopher. At this point, the following section attempts to justify why Melayê Cizîrî cannot be characterized as a philosopher in the classical sense.

4. Can We Truly Claim Melayê Cizîrî as a Philosopher?

After having a brief examination of the prominent philosophical terms in *Diwan*, one may ask these questions rightly: Can we assume that Melayê Cizîrî has a philosophical study indeed? Or, in other words, can we accept that Melayê Cizîrî does philosophy? On that point, our paper takes a counter standpoint to reassess some earlier interpretations of Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan*. It is because, before considering Melayê Cizîrî as a philosopher, one needs first to question what he does in his work.

To begin with our analysis, we must clarify that there is only one original study of Melayê Cizîrî in the literature. *Diwan* is a collection of poetic reflections on love and divinity. Its language is quite intense and full of different, also deep

Sufi expressions, metaphors, and analogies. That is why one may need to double-read the couplets to make them meaningful for themselves. The depth of the study can be appropriate for a Sufi study, perhaps.

When compared to the classical studies by Aristotle, Plato, or Augustinus, can we acknowledge that Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan* is a sort of philosophical study? This is the point where our inquiry takes another turn. This is because one may rightly ask: What makes a work philosophy? Perhaps, to answer this, it would be beneficial to consider what philosophy is and the kinds of work philosophers do.

It may be difficult to answer what philosophy means. However, we may point out that philosophy is an activity; it is a way of thinking about certain sorts of questions in detail. As Nigel Warburton puts it, its most distinctive feature is its use of logical argumentation in this questioning. Philosophers engage in the arguments in their philosophical activity. They also examine concepts that the human mind accepts. Yet, again, it seems challenging to answer what philosophy means by looking at what philosophers do (Warburton, 2013, pp. 1-2). On that point, it may be helpful to take some questions of the philosophers as examples:

“The main concern of philosophy is to question and understand very common ideas that all of us use every day without thinking about them. A historian may ask what happened at some time in the past, but a philosopher will ask, ‘What is time?’ A mathematician may investigate the relations among numbers, but a philosopher will ask, ‘What is a number?’ A physicist will ask what atoms are made of or what explains gravity, but a philosopher will ask how we can know there is anything outside of our own minds. A psychologist may investigate how children learn a language, but a philosopher will ask, ‘What makes a word mean anything?’” (Nagel, 1987, p.5)

As we have tried to illustrate above, intellectual activity in philosophy follows a kind of logical inquiry, consistency, and flow. In addition, queries about life, meaning, and aspects unique to humanity are prominent. However, when we examine Melayê Cizîrî's approach and writings on these matters, we find that he already affirmed his way of explaining the universe created by God. The reason is utterly insufficient in understanding this universe. Because a person who tries to comprehend it can only do so with the heart.

Traditionally, philosophy has been divided into some main areas: metaphysics, epistemology, logic, ethics, and aesthetics, for instance. When systematically researching a philosopher, we may observe that they engage in many philosophical activities in their works. For instance, Aristotle has phil-

osophical questions about existence, logic, mind, knowledge, ethics, cosmology, etc. Given his thorough analyses of these matters, we may conclude that Aristotle is a systematic philosopher. Aristotle has a system for his studies.

Nevertheless, in Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan*, the entire system is permeated by the existence of God from the beginning to the end. It gives Melayê Cizîrî only one room to explain what he understands from this existence. In that case, there is no exploration of the different worlds, meanings, questions, and discussions in a classical sense in his expressions. From that reality, how can we insist that Melayê Cizîrî is a philosopher classically?

As we mentioned earlier, there are some recent interpretations on Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan*. For example, Arvas has two comments on Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan* to understand his ideas on ontology and epistemology. Within the context of *kalâm*, he attempts to uncover the anti-sophist, anti-pantheist, and anti-deist ideas found in the *Diwan* (Öz, 2024, p. 458) In another comment, Arvas examines *Diwan* on the threshold of the dualities of agnosticism-dogmatism, rationalism-empiricism, and idealism-realism (Özdemir, 2025, pp. 51-52). Although Arvas attempts to interpret Melayê Cizîrî's couplets within the framework of classical philosophical understanding, he later accepts that Melayê Cizîrî's understanding of knowledge is based on mystical knowledge and that he created his work through divine love and surrender (Özdemir, 2025, p. 55).

In fact, there is no sign in *Diwan* that Melayê Cizîrî points to the classical philosophy. We may feel that he knows some philosophy and that he uses notions in his couplets to describe his approach to divine love. We may conclude this through our analysis of the concepts as well. In the realm of the concepts Melayê Cizîrî uses, life, creation, the one, reason, and knowledge can be considered philosophical terms. However, the content of these words does not address philosophical discussions at all.

Melayê Cizîrî does not philosophically question life itself. The process of creation, just like the source of life, is attempted to be explained through the divine love, that is, through God's existence, unity, and qualities such as emanation and manifestation in beings. In other words, the concepts he discusses are seen as tools for expressing divine love. On the other hand, reason, or intellect, is quite helpless in the face of intuition and heartfelt understanding. For reason is initially characterized as inadequate for understanding the supreme being, which can only be grasped through the heart. Finally, when Melayê Cizîrî's ideas on knowledge are examined, it becomes clear that while what is meant is knowledge of existence, it is more often knowledge of the divine.

Melayê Cizîrî interprets all the concepts we have touched upon so far from the perspective of the Sufi tradition and Islamic understanding. While these philosophical concepts discussed in the work lack the depth to be directly related to established traditions in the history of philosophy, such as realism or idealism, they are highly amenable to analysis in light of the Sufi tradition's conceptual framework, core representatives, and approaches.

Of course, one may compare Melayê Cizîrî with philosophers or sociologists in an academic manner. Nevertheless, Melayê Cizîrî should not be taken as a philosopher in the end. For example, one study can focus on the comparison between Melayê Cizîrî and Erich Fromm regarding their views on human beings. However, when it comes to a deep discussion of this comparison, one may feel that Melayê Cizîrî has a clear understanding of Sufi tradition from the beginning. It is because, when assessed in terms of classical philosophy, *Diwan* seems to lack questioning, argumentation, and logical thinking. The notion of the human being also remains within the borders of the Sufi thought.

On the grounds of our discussion so far, it can be said that Melayê Cizîrî's ideas, including ontology, epistemology, wisdom, and cosmology, are clearly connected with the Sufi tradition. They cannot be comprehended with the history of philosophy in a classical sense. In conclusion, we could say that Melayê Cizîrî's descriptions in the couplets relate to Islamic thought with the Sufi tradition. Perhaps, it would be meaningful to remind ourselves of Nesim Doru's depiction of Melayê Cizîrî. Doru thinks that Melayê Cizîrî, as a devoted follower of Sufi philosophy and especially the doctrine of *wahdat al-wujud* (unity of existence), elaborates on the fundamental principles of Sufi metaphysics and, consequently, Sufi cosmology in his work (Doru, 2014).

As we stated at the beginning of the article, Melayê Cizîrî's approach to divine love, his poetic-literary style, and the way he reflects the Sufi tradition, shaped in the social memory of the region's people and expressed in his own language, Kurdish, are quite significant. Therefore, Melayê Cizîrî's *Diwan*, as a valuable work, should be studied from many angles and gain more prominence in the literature. Yet, as we have tried to point out in our article, classifying Melayê Cizîrî as a philosopher by approaching his work in a classical sense, as in the history of philosophy, does not seem to be a very accurate interpretation. For this reason, to position Melayê Cizîrî more firmly in the literature, we can suggest studying his connection to the Sufi tradition and offering richer interpretations from the different perspectives.

Conclusion

This article discusses whether Melayê Cizîrî can be characterized as a philosopher, based on his work, the *Diwan*. Melayê Cizîrî is known as one of the most important scholars in Southeastern Anatolia, active between the 16th and 17th centuries. Only his work, the *Diwan*, has survived to the present day. Although a product of the Sufi tradition, the work is a literary collection of writings laden with profound meanings.

In recent years, *Diwan* has been interpreted from many disciplines, and attempts have been made to enhance its value. However, when examining texts that attempt to analyse *Diwan* from a philosophical perspective and establish its connection to the history of philosophy, it becomes apparent that these texts often try to detach *Diwan* from the Sufi tradition in which it originated and force interpretations. However, *Diwan* itself represents a tradition, and for it to receive the value it deserves, it must not be detached from its context.

Moving on to this aim, our article first attempts to outline Melayê Cizîrî's intellectual background, drawing on his *Diwan*. At the end of the research, it becomes clear that Melayê Cizîrî is deeply rooted in Islamic thought. Then, the article undertakes a content analysis of the philosophical concepts in *Diwan*. It first lists these concepts and then attempts to understand their contexts. The purpose is to accept that Melayê Cizîrî possessed philosophical knowledge, but at the same time, to point out that he could not have been a philosopher.

After working on the concepts, an attempt is made to justify why Melayê Cizîrî could not have been a philosopher in the classical sense. Accordingly, philosophy is the product of intellectual activity, of questioning. However, when we examine Melayê Cizîrî's couplets, we see that, rather than engaging in questioning or intellectual activity, he sets out to describe divine love itself, drawing on concepts from the Sufi tradition. Furthermore, we cannot consider Melayê Cizîrî as a system thinker in the classical sense, or that his ideas contain multi-dimensional concepts capable of opening new horizons.

In conclusion, we face the challenge of repositioning Melayê Cizîrî's style and ideas within the history of thought by his *Diwan*. While we cannot call Melayê Cizîrî a philosopher, we can clarify his place in the literature, particularly within the field of Islamic studies, by stating that he was a mufti of love, faithful to the Sufi understanding within the Islamic intellectual tradition. Such an approach could help build a stronger foundation for future studies on Melayê Cizîrî.

References

1. Aminrazavi, M. (2021). Mysticism in Arabic and Islamic Philosophy. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2021 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), Stanford University: Metaphysics Research Lab.
2. Alkış, A. (2014). *Melaye Cizîrî'nin Dîvânında Tasavvufî Mazmunlar*. İstanbul: Nûbihar.
3. Cizîrî, M. A. (2021). *Dîwan*. Trans. İlhami Sidar, İstanbul: Ayrıntı.
4. Demir, H. (2013). The Islamic madrasas as educational institution. *Journal of Turkish Studies*, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.4627>
5. Doru, N. (2012). *Melaye Cizîrî Felsefi ve Tasavvufî Görüşleri*. İstanbul: Nûbihar.
6. (2014). *Molla Ahmed El-Cezerî (Melaye Cizîrî)'nın Varlık Düşüncesinde İnsanın Ontik Değeri*. Türk Dünyası Bilgeler Zirvesi: Gönül Sultanları Buluşması. Eskişehir: Türk Dünyası Kültür Başkenti Ajansı (TDKB).
7. İbn Arabî, M. (2006). *Fusûsü'l-Hikem*. İstanbul: Kabalcı.
8. Nagel, T. (1987) *What Does It All Mean?: A Very Short Introduction to Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
9. Öz, R. (2019). *Sufînin Akidesi (Molla Ahmed El-Cizîrî Örneği)*. Mardin: Şırnak University Press.
10. Öz, R. (2023). *Aşkin Müftüsü Mela: Molla Ahmed El-Cezerî'nin Hayatı ve Görüşleri*. Ankara: Ajans Düş Pınarı.
11. Öz, R. (2024). *Tevhid Aşığı Mela: Melaye Cizîrî'nin Varlık Düşüncesi*. Şırnak: Şırnak University Press.
12. Özdemir, A. (2025). *Hakikat Aşığı Mela: Melaye Cizîrî'nin Bilgi Anlayışı*. Van: Özgür Publishers.
13. Steup, M. & Ram, N. (2025). Epistemology. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2025 Edition), Edward N. Zalta & Uri Nodelman (eds.),, Stanford University: Metaphysics Research Lab.
14. Stewart S. & Kissel T. K. (2025). Classical Logic. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2025 Edition), Edward N. Zalta & Uri Nodelman (eds.), Stanford University: Metaphysics Research Lab.
15. Vander Laan, D. (2022). Creation and Conservation. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2022 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), Stanford University: Metaphysics Research Lab.
16. Warburton, N. (2013). *Philosophy: The Basics*. Fifth Edition. London and New York: Routledge.