

## The Hajj as Justifiable Self-Exile: Šehzade Korkud's *Wasīlat al-aḥbāb* (915–916/1509–1510)<sup>1</sup>

NABIL AL-TIKRITI

**ABSTRACT** *In the spring of 915/1509 an Ottoman prince named Korkud (ca. 1468–1513) abandoned his Antalya post and headed by sea to Mamlūk Egypt. Since such princes were absolutely not allowed to leave their assigned postings, by his actions Korkud risked provoking a civil war and opened himself up to allegations of betrayal. In an attempt to counter such accusations, Korkud sent his father Bayezid (886–918/1481–1512) an autobiographical treatise presented as an individual testimony to the religious significance of the ḥajj ritual and a comprehensive defence of his actions. However, as Korkud was the main royal backer of several sea ghāzī captains, there is reason to believe that his motivation for leaving Antalya extended beyond personal piety. Whatever his real intentions, Korkud's insistence on a believer's right to embark on the pilgrimage provided a powerful argument to justify his 14-month self-exile at a personally and politically sensitive time.*

**Keywords:** *Pilgrimage – Islamic; Islam – pilgrimage; Korkud, Ottoman prince; Ottoman empire – religious life; Exile*

In the spring of 915/1509, perhaps sensing that the odds in a long-anticipated succession struggle would be stacked against him, an Ottoman prince named Korkud (ca. 1468–1513)<sup>2</sup> abandoned his Antalya post and headed by sea to Mamlūk Egypt.<sup>3</sup> Due to their public role as royalty and their potential for disrupting imperial stability from exile, as well as the fact that flight usually signified either the ruler's death or the commencement of a rebellion, princes were absolutely not allowed to leave their assigned postings – particularly for locations outside the empire.<sup>4</sup> By violating such expectations, Korkud risked provoking a civil war and opened himself up to allegations of betrayal.

In an attempt to counter such accusations, Korkud left behind a remarkable explanation of the motivations behind his actions. Intended as an individual testimony to the religious significance of the ḥajj ritual and a comprehensive defence of his actions, the prince sent his father Bayezid a uniquely autobiographical treatise entitled *Wasīlat al-aḥbāb bi'l-ḥajj, ta'rif walad ḥarrakahu l-shawq ilā l-arḍ al-Ḥijāz* (The Means of the Beloved for Authorization, Composed by a Son whom Desire has Driven to the Land of the Ḥijāz).<sup>5</sup> Although Korkud's pilgrimage justification

was unassailable, there is reason to believe that his motivation for leaving Antalya extended beyond personal piety.

Following a dream in which the prophet Muḥammad requested a visit to his tomb,<sup>6</sup> Korkud wrote his father several times requesting permission for pilgrimage and tomb visitation. Korkud, plausibly enough, interpreted Bayezid's silence on the matter as a rejection of his request.<sup>7</sup> That Bayezid failed to respond is not at all surprising, considering the dilemma which such a request presented under Ottoman norms of succession and family rule. Permitting Korkud to go on the *ḥajj* would have provided a dangerous precedent of allowing male royalty to leave their posts – and the reach of imperial sovereignty – for reasons of personal religious belief.<sup>8</sup> At the same time, denying Korkud's request would amount to forbidding a Muslim from fulfilling his individual religious duties, and would be seen as unacceptably tyrannical in an Islamic context. In the event, in late April or early May 1509 – after several months awaiting a reply – Korkud left without prior notification, sending his father a letter explaining that his conscience had dictated his departure for the *ḥajj*, and promising that he would return to his post upon completion of his pilgrimage.<sup>9</sup>

In order to prevent the inevitable chaos which would have resulted from an Ottoman prince abruptly abandoning his post, Korkud left Antalya only after some preparation.<sup>10</sup> It appears that Korkud brought along a minimum of professional *kul* officials, instead relying on contracted crews, sympathetic subjects, and personally-purchased slaves to bring him to Egypt on his own privately owned ships.<sup>11</sup> By thus separating personal resources and supporters from those loyal to the dynasty as a whole, Korkud had arranged matters in such a way that both plausibly supported his claims to have temporarily retired from active service – and made it more difficult for imperial officials to order his execution.

Korkud's departure drew immediate attention at home, as seen in a note sent by Sir Andrea Foscolo from Istanbul on 18 June. This Venetian envoy attributed Korkud's flight to anger over being passed over for succession primacy. Foscolo did not know where Korkud was headed, but reported court rumours speculating that the prince had either headed to Mecca or to the "Sofi" [i.e., Shāh Ismā'il (907–930/1501–1524)]. In his account, Korkud was said to have departed with twelve ships in all – four ships (*nave*), four light vessels (*fuste*), and four brigantines (*brigantini*).<sup>12</sup>

Why did Korkud choose to leave when he did? The fact that Korkud left Antalya the month after that year's *ḥajj* ritual had *ended* suggests either that he intended to spend an entire year on the pilgrimage, or that his timing was tied more to worldly concerns. During the same month that Korkud left Antalya, a rumour surfaced in Cairo that Bayezid had died – news taken sufficiently seriously that funeral prayers were said at the al-Azhar Mosque in Bayezid's name on the occasion of his passing away.<sup>13</sup> Since the Ottoman imperial *divān* – particularly the grand vizier Hādım Ali Paşa – did not favour his candidacy, Korkud certainly had reason to fear for his life in the anticipated succession struggle. At the same time, the prince may have hoped to gain Mamlūk backing and financial support for his succession bid. Korkud's stated justification – that he had previously resigned his role as potential heir to the throne and now wished to go on the pilgrimage as was his right as a believer – does not exclude such competing motives.

Korkud's trip was widely seen as parallel to his uncle Cem's (d. 901/1495) exile to Egypt following his failed succession bid against Bayezid.<sup>14</sup> During Cem's

886–887/1481–82 sojourn, he successfully performed the *hajj* at Mecca – the only pre-modern Ottoman prince to make the trip.<sup>15</sup> It is highly unlikely that Cem's experience could have been far from his mind, considering that Korkud followed in his uncle's footsteps both when he travelled to Egypt and when he later considered fleeing to the Knights of St. John at Rhodes.<sup>16</sup> In either an indication of changing Ottoman-Mamlūk power dynamics within a decade of the final Mamlūk collapse, or of the difference in status between a defeated prince and a potential future successor, or perhaps simply the difference between an invited guest and an uninvited refugee, the Mamlūk sultan Qānsawh al-Ghawrī (907–922/1501–1516) reportedly treated Korkud far better than the earlier sultan, Qaytbay (873–902/1468–1496), had treated Cem in 886–887/1481–1482.<sup>17</sup>

Korkud's flotilla reached Damietta on the Egyptian coast in the last week of May.<sup>18</sup> The Mamlūk governor, Sudon, did not initially treat Korkud's delegation particularly warmly. Judging from their treatment of Korkud's expedition, it appears likely that Sudon and his staff were not informed about any prior arrangements – and the unannounced arrival of an Ottoman prince in a sizeable flotilla would have constituted at least a sensitive situation, if not a severe breach of protocol. According to Mustafa 'Ālī (d. 1008/1599), customs officials initially thought that they were dealing with merchants and demanded tax payments on the cargo, until the fleet's captain Akbaş informed them that the cargo was the private property of an Ottoman prince going on the *hajj*.<sup>19</sup> Their requests to tax the cargo suggest that the ships were carrying taxable items – perhaps wood and other naval supplies intended for use against the Portuguese in the Indian Ocean.<sup>20</sup>

Upon arrival, Korkud refused to disembark without express guarantees from al-Ghawrī.<sup>21</sup> Meanwhile, according to the Venetian consul in Alexandria, Ottoman messengers had already arrived and were urging Korkud to return.<sup>22</sup> Having packed his retinue with personal supporters, Korkud likely feared the potential consequences for his own safety were he to disembark without such guarantees from the Mamlūk sultan. Considering the presence of Ottoman messengers and his initial treatment by Sudon's men, Korkud had good reason not to disembark prematurely.<sup>23</sup>

In Mustafa 'Ālī's account, Sudon rushed off a letter to Cairo explaining the situation. The letter reportedly created quite a stir in the Mamlūk *dīvān*: upon reading the letter, the vizier's expression changed noticeably, and al-Ghawrī demanded that the letter be read out loud. Korkud's statements that he would not disembark without the sultan's permission and that he would not meet any officials without his permission were said to have pleased the Mamlūk court.<sup>24</sup> Through such statements, Korkud signalled that he recognised Mamlūk sovereignty, had no hostile intentions, and would act only with the sultan's express approval.

The Mamlūk *dīvān* immediately dispatched an official letter of greeting and a high-ranking delegation to receive Korkud with full ceremonial honours at Damietta.<sup>25</sup> In the presence of the military, diplomatic and financial officials who came to welcome him, a whole range of issues could have been negotiated prior to any decision to disembark and proceed to Cairo. To welcome Korkud's expedition, the Mamlūk delegation exhibited an opulent display of wealth, prosperity and hospitality.<sup>26</sup> Having received the requisite guarantees – and the appropriate welcome for a guest of his stature – Korkud disembarked, mounted a prize horse, witnessed a grand procession devoted to his welcome, and entered a ceremonial tent for the first of many communal feasts to celebrate his visit. The next day the

joint delegation boarded river vessels for the procession to Cairo, with Korkud riding the lead vessel.<sup>27</sup>

### ***Wasīlat al-aḥbāb***

Considering that the manuscript was completed on 15 Safar 915/4 June 1509, three days before Korkud's arrival in Cairo,<sup>28</sup> it appears likely that Korkud sent *Wasīlat al-aḥbāb* to Istanbul towards the conclusion of his Damietta welcome. In probable reference to this reception, Korkud reported that his initial treatment as a guest of al-Ghawrī had been excellent.<sup>29</sup>

*Wasīlat al-aḥbāb* was a hastily penned, intensely personal, and rather sloppy Arabic treatise addressed directly from son to father.<sup>30</sup> Intended as a direct appeal to Bayezid for pardon after abandoning his post in order to go on the *ḥajj*, most of the text consists of reflections on the religious importance of pilgrimage for one's salvation. Filled with references to the negotiations, diplomacy and motivations surrounding his decision, *Wasīlat al-aḥbāb* constituted a comprehensive defence of Korkud's controversial trip to Egypt.

Korkud sent *Wasīlat al-aḥbāb* with a scholar named Shaykh 'Abd al-Salām.<sup>31</sup> This individual, identified as one of Korkud's scribes, appears to have played a significant role in the prince's scholarly, political and diplomatic activities. Described by Korkud as an exceptional scholar, a custodian of all disciplines, one of the great al-Azhar scholars from whom Korkud had sought knowledge, and a legist affiliated with one of al-Ghawrī's commanders,<sup>32</sup> this Shaykh 'Abd al-Salām was probably 'Abd al-Salām [Ibn?] Muḥammad al-Anṣārī, the copyist – and possible ghost writer – of the draft version of Korkud's *Da'wat al-naḥs al-ṭāliḥa*.<sup>33</sup> Such a description of 'Abd al-Salām's virtues suggests that he played an intermediary role between the Mamlūk sultan's and the Ottoman prince's courts.

According to Korkud, the Mamlūk sultan had sent him a personal invitation to visit Egypt and perform the *ḥajj* – and had even offered to join him on the pilgrimage.<sup>34</sup> Referring to al-Ghawrī as “absolutely a lover of the Ottoman dynasty, who is himself prepared to be one of their sons on account of the greatness of his love”,<sup>35</sup> Korkud portrayed his relationship with the Mamlūk sultan as an innocent friendship based on mutual respect and a shared piety. Although ostensibly meant to reassure Bayezid of his intentions, Korkud's choice of envoy and disclosure of prior correspondence with the Mamlūk sultan might also have been interpreted as a veiled threat.

Following the invocation,<sup>36</sup> Korkud explained his motivations for abandoning his post. As he put it, once craving had moved him to visit Muḥammad, a vision of the prophet appeared to him repeatedly in his dreams, calling on him to go that year. Having no doubt in – and maintaining no secrecy about – the righteousness of his desires following such dream visions, his determination grew so much that the very “sight of my clan and people was rendered decidedly hateful to my gaze”.<sup>37</sup> Neglecting his palaces, camps and provinces, he abandoned kingdom and all companionship in order to pursue his pious calling.<sup>38</sup>

After extolling the experiential virtues of – and his own excitement for – the *ḥajj* ritual, Korkud presented an extended prayer begging God's intercession and protection while clarifying that his sole intent was to go on the pilgrimage. Having promised to return to his post upon completion of the trip, Korkud urged patience and acceptance upon his father – even as he accepted that God had made it his

destiny to disobey his father in this matter. In order to confirm his dynastic loyalty, Korkud promised that while en route he would pray for his father's increased happiness both in this world and the next, victory over his infidel and profligate enemies, and elevation of his authority throughout the Islamic world. Thus, while admitting that abandoning his post constituted disobedience to both parent and ruler, Korkud claimed that such disobedience was inevitable since Bayezid's refusal to permit the pilgrimage countered God's command that each capable believer must participate in the *hajj* – one of the five pillars of Islamic belief.<sup>39</sup>

Reminding his father that he had petitioned for permission prior to his rash decision, Korkud clarified that all he desired was permission to both complete the pilgrimage and return to his post upon completion of his *hajj* obligations.<sup>40</sup> To buttress his case, Korkud provided the following pious arguments and historical precedents in favour of royal pilgrimage: innumerable individuals had preceded him on the path; the prophet Muḥammad himself had established the *hajj* as a rite of Islam; the original four righteous caliphs had conducted the *hajj* and visitation to Mecca and Medina while in power; and the celebrated 'Abbāsīd caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd (170–193/786–809) had fulfilled a personal vow by performing the *hajj* barefoot.<sup>41</sup> For these reasons, rather than being considered a transgression of royal custom, Korkud's decision should have been viewed as a legitimate performance of compulsory religious duties ordained by God and his prophets.<sup>42</sup>

In an attempt to demonstrate the primacy of divine concerns over worldly concerns of protocol, succession norms, and diplomatic intrigue, Korkud offered several pious references to the value of patience, trust, and benevolence.<sup>43</sup> By extolling the merits of pilgrimage and explaining the rewards due from God for one who completes the *hajj*, Korkud provided religious justification for his actions and refuted a series of counter-arguments. As Korkud argued, since performing the *hajj* qualifies by consensus as completion of one of the obligatory requirements of Islam, he was simply following God's command as presented through the tenets of the *sharī'a*.<sup>44</sup>

In addition to generally justifying pilgrimage as a religiously mandated experience, Korkud marshalled several *ḥadīth* accounts which further justified his specific course of action. According to these accounts, adult children are permitted to perform the *hajj* in place of their elderly parents – so Korkud was effectively undertaking the pilgrimage for his father's sake. As one is allowed to conduct business in the course of pilgrimage, Korkud could not be blamed for negotiating with the Mamlūks concerning either his own looming succession struggle or joint naval initiatives. As one must bring sufficient supplies to complete the full journey, there was nothing wrong with the ample supplies and sizeable retinue accompanying Korkud.<sup>45</sup> Finally, since one can hire a proxy to perform the *hajj* in one's place if physically incapable to do so oneself,<sup>46</sup> Korkud had an argument ready in the event that he would be unable to complete the journey.

In order to engage with Ḥanbalī Mālikī, and other critics who would reject tomb visitation as a improper and popular ritual accretion to an originally pure Islam, Korkud justified the visitation of tombs in general and Muḥammad's in particular.<sup>47</sup> To defend the prophet Muḥammad's status against those – like the followers of Shah Isma'īl – who might put forth rival claims to sanctity, Korkud described several miracles said to have been performed by the prophet.<sup>48</sup> As such miracles had demonstrated that the prophet Muḥammad is preferred over the rest of created beings, visiting his tomb is allowed. As protection against charges



of Sunnī betrayal, the prince clarified that his arguments favouring visitation of Muḥammad's tomb were not to be construed as 'Alid loyalist/Shī'ī – then the foremost ideological threat facing the Ottomans.<sup>49</sup> In order to justify his additional intent to visit Jerusalem, Korkud also described the merits of performing certain rituals while visiting the Islamic holy sites there.<sup>50</sup> To Korkud, the miracles and merits he had presented justified his intention to perform the *ḥajj* and visit Jerusalem in terms of a search for personal salvation springing from a love of God and the prophet which took priority over all else in his life.<sup>51</sup>

Korkud addressed standard arguments concerning the necessity of parental obedience to justify his own disobedience. As parental reverence is one of the basic tenets of Islamic belief, Korkud conceded that one owes one's parents benevolence and service. However, for Korkud, primary obedience was owed to one's mother, and one must care for one's other relatives as well as one's father.<sup>52</sup> In an inherent critique of Ottoman custom, Korkud argued that one must not store wealth for use against one's relatives, adding that cutting off one's relatives is like cutting off God.<sup>53</sup> Disobeying parents is one of the three most significant sins, along with ascribing partnership to God and giving false testimony. For this reason, one should fulfill one's parents' agreements after their deaths, maintain their commitment to all kinfolk common to them, and honour their friends as one's own – implying that Korkud was already preparing for his father's imminent demise and promising to carry on his legacy while offering to protect his rival half-brothers.<sup>54</sup> Korkud concluded his exploration of parental obedience by reiterating that: he could not possibly disobey his parents; his actions did not actually constitute disobedience; and his father should pardon him for attempting to perform the *ḥajj* as it was being done purely out of religious obligation.<sup>55</sup>

Korkud also addressed claims that sons have upon fathers – in return for which each son must always obey his father, except when ordered to ascribe partnership to God or pursue sinful acts.<sup>56</sup> In doing so, Korkud appealed to Bayezid's renowned image of personal piety while drawing a parallel between the Ottoman custom of fratricide and the parable of Ishmael nearly being sacrificed by his father Abraham. Korkud argued that Bayezid's heavenly reward would be great because he had obliged Korkud and his brothers to read the Qur'ān and learn the *sharī'a* disciplines, had trained them and taught them good behaviour, and had turned their thoughts and ambitions away from occupation with worldly distraction.<sup>57</sup> As Bayezid had done such an exemplary job raising his children, even if one of his sons were to nourish the father from his own flesh for his entire life, it would not match the service received from his parents for even one hour in the eyes of God. For this reason, like Ishmael, when he was to be slaughtered by his father, the dutiful Korkud would urge his father to do what had been commanded.<sup>58</sup> By praising his father's piety and paternal legacy, Korkud had played a powerful guilt card and clearly pointed out the contradiction between Bayezid's public display of piety and his refusal to allow Korkud to pursue his religious duties due to considerations of imperial *realpolitik*.

Having marshalled numerous pious arguments in support of his decision, Korkud turned to the modalities of personal communication. Stating that a believer's status is measured by one's fidelity to agreements, Korkud reminded his father of a childhood promise Bayezid had made that his good will towards Korkud would never change. In light of that promise, Korkud was eager to know his father's inclination towards him after receiving *Wasīlat al-aḥbāb*. Expressing frustration with

the impossibility of direct contact with his father – and demonstrating the severe psychological stress of court life – Korkud complained that those around his father informed him of nothing more than that his son had disobeyed his command and had opposed him. If he believed that Bayezid could change his opinion about him for a single hour, Korkud would never set foot in Ottoman domains again. On the other hand, if it were confirmed that his father's attitude towards him continued to reflect that childhood promise, then his joy and happiness would be renewed and he would return – especially since no one in this world could possibly oppose Bayezid's command. However, since Korkud refused to place his trust in correspondence emanating from capricious palace officials who misrepresented his father's real intentions, he asked his father to reply secretly with a hand-written message bearing his private seal and handed to 'Abd al-Salām. Once that had been done, Korkud promised to respond with a message bearing a secret stamp and seal.<sup>59</sup> The fact that Korkud demanded special channels of communications demonstrates the difficulty of communicating within the royal family with so many intermediaries involved, and implies that the prince believed he had secured some sort of specific promise from his father in the past. Considering that the pre-eminent court officials clearly favoured Korkud's half-brother Şehzade Ahmed, while the Janissary ranks favoured his other half-brother Selim,<sup>60</sup> it would appear that Korkud placed great hope in a personal connection to his father.

Expressing his own sense that death was near for both father and son, Korkud concluded *Wasīlat al-aḥbāb* by warning Bayezid that actions in this world affect one's station in the afterlife. While citing several verses and anecdotes about longevity, justice in the afterlife, and what constitutes good behaviour in this world, Korkud applied to his father's situation a lengthy interpretation of the *ḥadīth* account stating that each individual shall be resurrected in the state in which he dies.<sup>61</sup> Following this stark warning, Korkud offered the rather hollow reassurance that he was sure Bayezid would be rewarded for his piety in the afterlife.<sup>62</sup> As if to accentuate the proximity of death and the afterlife for his solitary reader, Korkud closed the work with a final set of famous *ḥadīth* accounts describing the rewards of heaven.<sup>63</sup>

## Cairo Exile

After a brief trip up the Nile, the joint Ottoman-Mamlūk delegation reached the Cairo suburb of Shubrā on 18 Şafar/7 June 1509.<sup>64</sup> Upon arrival, the delegation headed straight for a guest complex – described as the “piped courtyard” (*qā'āt al-barābikhiyya*) – in the suburb of Būlāq which al-Ghawrī had ordered vacated and fully furnished for Korkud. When they reached the guest quarters, they were treated to a lengthy feast arranged by the sultan – the sort of banquet large enough to signify that guests partaking of such generosity were beholden to the sultan.<sup>65</sup> In a wry sort of unspoken message, or diplomatic joke, the first *amīr* to greet Korkud – “the frightening one” – at the banquet was Korkmaz – “the one who is never frightened”. Following the feast, al-Ghawrī arranged for a full ceremonial procession to escort Korkud from his guest quarters to the citadel – a procession sufficiently impressive to later be compared to a public feast day.<sup>66</sup>

When the prince reached the sultan's reviewing stand, al-Ghawrī descended and the two men embraced – with Ibn Iyās (d. c. 931/1524) adding that Korkud

was said to have kissed the sultan's hand and placed it over his forehead.<sup>67</sup> When the Mamlūk sultan offered the prince a throne seat, Korkud declined the honour with the excuse that he had resigned his candidacy for any throne – which met with the approval of the assembled Mamlūk commanders.<sup>68</sup> It appears likely that Korkud publicly presented himself as a humble supplicant prior to meeting al-Ghawrī, and a well-rewarded guest upon departure.<sup>69</sup> Having finally met and consulted with al-Ghawrī, Korkud mounted his horse in front of the courtyard's fountained *maṣṭaba*, and rode back to his guest quarters with a fully equipped escort of Mamlūk commanders via a circuitous route providing much of the city a chance to glimpse the sultan's prestigious guest.<sup>70</sup>

Continuing the tenor of their initial welcome, al-Ghawrī extended full privileges to the guest delegation, including cash payments and a monthly stipend.<sup>71</sup> For the first few months of Korkud's stay, it appears that there was a busy schedule of social and political appearances. On 8 Rabī' I, 915/26 June, 1509 al-Ghawrī invited Korkud to a polo match at the main square in which the sultan personally competed with his leading commanders. Following the match, al-Ghawrī set out a banquet for himself and Korkud's delegation.<sup>72</sup> On the Friday of the same week, al-Ghawrī invited Korkud to a full-dress public ceremony on the occasion of the prophet Muḥammad's birthday (*al-mawlid al-nabawī*). That year's celebration, customarily attended by leading Mamlūk commanders and the four chief judges of the respective legal traditions, was said to be unusual in that al-Ghawrī dressed in fully formal attire (*al-shāsh wa l-qumāsh*) and arranged an extravagant ceremony for the occasion – all for Korkud's sake. When he arrived, al-Ghawrī rose to greet him and seated the prince at his right side – at a seating level higher than his own and directly over the Shāfi'ī judge.<sup>73</sup> The unusual deference shown to Korkud on this occasion suggests that his hosts chose to make quite a display of his twin credentials as Ottoman royalty and Shāfi'ī scholar.

Throughout Korkud's stay, al-Ghawrī appears to have done all in his power to impress the prince with Mamlūk wealth and power. On 19 Rabī' I, 915/7 July, 1509 Korkud was invited to another polo match, which this time boasted a javelin competition in addition to the requisite feast.<sup>74</sup> On 9 Jumādā II, 915/24 September, 1509 Korkud attended a second javelin competition, which on this occasion also featured a flame-throwing exhibition on the playing field.<sup>75</sup> At some point in early November, al-Ghawrī ordered the detachment of lancers who normally marched during *hajj* ceremonies to pass in procession with full military regalia in front of Korkud on the main square for his inspection.<sup>76</sup> In the same month, as the winter cold started to set in, al-Ghawrī arranged for Korkud to move from Būlāq to the residence of one of his commanders. This arrangement did not last, as within a short time Korkud returned to his Būlāq guest quarters. Perhaps Korkud and his retinue were proving to be difficult guests, or were beginning to overstay their welcome.<sup>77</sup>

According to Ibn Iyās, al-Ghawrī's generosity when hosting Korkud was so excessive that the chronicler considered it a bizarre matter, unprecedented in Mamlūk history. Implying either a sense of impugned pride or detected ingratitude, in the passage describing Korkud's departure Ibn Iyās reiterated proofs of al-Ghawrī's generosity: 2,000 *dīnārs* every month as living support,<sup>78</sup> ceremonial robes every time he went up to the citadel, horses with golden saddles and blankets – in addition to various gifts and other items the sultan had sent him. The sultan had stood to greet Korkud every time they met, and had seated him at a higher rank



than the chief Mamlūk commander. He had spent a great deal hosting Korkud, and the leading commanders had also lavished the prince and his retinue with several public feasts. As Ibn Iyās saw it, Korkud could not possibly have left Cairo without public and profuse gratitude.<sup>79</sup>

In spite of al-Ghawrī's efforts, Korkud was not overly impressed with the cultural refinement of the Mamlūk court. In a letter addressed to his *lala* (tutor) and written soon after his arrival in Egypt, Korkud stated that he had found "no one here to converse with according to my desire", and that "they even have no idea about good breeding and the like".<sup>80</sup> Implying that he did not wish to insult his hosts by displaying superior Ottoman craftsmanship, Korkud explained that he had not brought a certain ceremonial gold and silver sword because to wear such a sword there would have been an "affront" (*'ayb*).<sup>81</sup>

On 23 Ramaḍān 915/4 January, 1510, Korkud went up to the citadel, broke his fast with al-Ghawrī, and spent the night there.<sup>82</sup> Following a lavish procession to mark the beginning of the *ʿīd al-fiṭr* holiday just over a week later, Korkud and al-Ghawrī prayed together in the sultan's loge (*al-maṣṣūra*). Upon departure, Korkud proceeded in front of the sultan from the mosque to the citadel courtyard, together with all the Mamlūk commanders.<sup>83</sup>

On 17 Dhū l-Qa'da, 915/26 February, 1510 two weeks before the start of the *hajj*, one of Bayezid's officials and several retainers joined the lavish procession of that year's pilgrimage litter (*maḥmal*) throughout Cairo. The Ottoman official's presence at this ceremony, which marked the commencement of the annual pilgrimage caravan from Egypt to the Hījāz, suggests that he and his retainers were completing the *hajj* in Bayezid's stead. Korkud's absence, meanwhile, was attributed to his continuing failure to gain his father's permission to perform the *hajj* – and al-Ghawrī's consistent honouring of Bayezid's refusal.<sup>84</sup> Considering that Cem had previously gone on the pilgrimage with the Mamlūk sultan's express permission and that Korkud had received an invitation to do the same before he left, he should not have expected any trouble obtaining such permission from al-Ghawrī upon arrival.<sup>85</sup> However, as Korkud himself had previously argued the legitimacy of sending a proxy to fulfil one's pilgrimage obligations, he could not very well have protested Bayezid's sending a delegation in lieu of his own attendance.<sup>86</sup>

Korkud's resignation of worldly rule and search for piety reportedly continued into this period. According to a Venetian letter dated 4 March 1510, Korkud had become a "dervish" (*druis*). Although Bayezid had sent a message offering him a large province (*stato*) upon his return, Korkud replied that he would not return even if he were given government of the entire world, as he preferred to serve God.<sup>87</sup>

At some point in Korkud's stay, tensions arose between himself and his hosts. In a letter sent soon after his return to Antalya, Korkud stated that he had long petitioned for and prayed for Bayezid's permission to study and worship in or around Damascus or Jerusalem.<sup>88</sup> However, due to a combination of neglect and certain unstated precautions Korkud had taken against unnamed "vile beys" and "base soldiers" there, the prince realised that his pious objectives could not be met.<sup>89</sup> At some point, a Mamlūk envoy invited Korkud to write Bayezid a letter himself. Considering it too bold an action since he had already informed Istanbul about his actions, Korkud refused to write any such letter for several months. Instead, he reiterated to the Mamlūk official that his goal had long been to reside in an uninhabited place, concentrating on his own condition without mixing with

anyone. Korkud had not come to Egypt in order to remain in Cairo – essentially under house arrest. Since the Mamlūk court’s invitation was the original inspiration for his visit, if they were to consent to his residing elsewhere, Korkud felt that they should be the ones to inform Bayezid’s court. For his part, Korkud refused to inform Istanbul that he was planning to remain in Cairo – perhaps because such a statement would signify a final breach. As he saw it, after granting the Mamlūks several months to glorify themselves with such “people of kingdoms and rulers” (*ehl-i memālik ü mülūk*) like himself, Korkud had felt cheated. Meanwhile, his counterparts – rather disingenuously, perhaps – had protested that he was free to remain wherever he pleased.<sup>90</sup>

In the course of informing the Mamlūk court through an envoy that Korkud held them responsible for his abdication, “somehow inappropriate words issued forth and reached that great majesty’s [al-Ghawrī’s] powerful presence” – words for which the prince had hoped for a pardon.<sup>91</sup> Afterwards, an envoy came from Antalya, offering to send forth whatever items and materials Korkud may desire – a clear reference to Korkud’s earlier correspondence with his “*lala*”.<sup>92</sup> Since he needed to know where to have such items sent, Korkud asked al-Ghawrī for an explicit reply to his earlier petition requesting permission to reside somewhere near Jerusalem or Damascus. This request caused an open breach following its clear refusal, with a number of Mamlūk officials ganging up on Korkud and asking if “they” were waiting for him – suspecting the prince of preparing to flee to Shāh Ismā‘īl. At this point, Korkud grew angry, protesting that “I have no idea what evil suspicions they had about us”,<sup>93</sup> and attributing their suspicions to “the ignorance of some boors who were heedless of my conditions and attributes”.<sup>94</sup> According to Korkud’s account, the Mamlūk court coincidentally faced an open rebellion in its ranks and widespread looting – and nearly a coup – at the same time that Korkud’s request to reside in Damascus (al-Shām) was definitively turned down.<sup>95</sup>

The strain of exile, in addition to apprehension about his personal safety, appears to have gradually worn on the prince. At some point, Korkud requested that *ḍivān* officials send his personal physician and former scribe, ‘Alā’uddīn. Hinting that this letter had been written well into his stay and after a period of little contact, Korkud stated that if anyone were to ask, he had been residing in Cairo, continuously engaged in prayer. Although he had been persisting in fair health, it was no secret that he was “a sickly person who from the beginning has had a weak temperament and been liable to illness from the slightest mishap”.<sup>96</sup> Whether the prince was truly weak, something of a hypochondriac, concerned about poisoning while in the care of his Mamlūk hosts, or expecting some secret assistance from ‘Alā’uddīn, he insisted that no other doctor would be suitable or reliable. Considering that his uncle Cem was widely believed to have been poisoned while in exile, Korkud had good reason to be apprehensive about his health.<sup>97</sup>

### Return Negotiations

On 6 Jumādā I, 915/22 August, 1509 a couple of months after Korkud’s arrival, a Mamlūk delegation headed by ‘Alān, the deputy chief steward (*al-dawādār al-thānī*), had departed on an official trip to Istanbul.<sup>98</sup> By early September 1509, the delegation’s dispatch was noted by Venetian intelligence sources.<sup>99</sup> Charged with negotiating Korkud’s status, ‘Alān remained on this trip nearly

ten months – not returning from Istanbul until 10 Rabī‘ I, 916/17 June, 1510.<sup>100</sup> The following day Korkud was presumably informed of the results of ‘Alān’s visit, as he then reportedly attended that year’s public celebrations of the prophet Muḥammad’s birthday seated next to al-Ghawrī, in the presence of the chief judges and the leading commanders.<sup>101</sup> Just over a fortnight later, on 4 Rabī‘ II, 916/11 July, 1510, Korkud went up to the Cairo citadel to seek al-Ghawrī’s permission to return home, which he was granted. When he departed, the prince was escorted by a formal procession of guild chiefs and leading Mamlūk commanders led by Korkmaz – just as when he had arrived over a year earlier.<sup>102</sup>

As Korkud reported later, just as he was coming to feel that he could no longer remain in Cairo, Mevlānā ‘Araboğlu Bey Çelebi – who passed away a short time later – returned from the *hajj*. Mevlānā ‘Araboğlu informed Korkud that Bayezid was annoyed at his being kept in Cairo, and felt that the Mamlūks were harming his son. Complaining endlessly that Korkud had grown distant, Bayezid promised to show Korkud increased favour in order to comfort his feelings. Since his father had expressed increased yearning, some Mamlūk “weak-minded ones” (*hātır-ı fātire*) had grown agitated, and he had been reassured by Mevlānā ‘Araboğlu that he would not be accused of desertion, Korkud – realizing his weakened position vis-à-vis suspicious Mamlūk officials – then requested permission from al-Ghawrī to return to his post. According to Korkud, some members of the Mamlūk court felt that since the prince had come for the *hajj*, he should return via the Hījāz. Korkud stated that he could not accept such a condition because it would prolong his stay away from home – and because there were persistent rumors that Shāh Ismā‘īl was planning to either go on the pilgrimage himself or send his own *ka’ba* cover with a large army escort. Although al-Ghawrī had made it clear that his manner of departure expressed “a lack of satisfaction and thanks”, Korkud simply expressed relief that his return had been accepted.<sup>103</sup>

In a transaction suggestive of ransom, a 16 July 1510 Venetian report from Edirne confirmed that a Mamlūk envoy had arrived in Istanbul to receive wood (*legnami*) and other supplies for shipment to Alexandria. In addition, Kemal Reis (Camalli) had reached Edirne, leaving behind two galleys and a galliotta at Gallipoli. According to the report, Kemal Reis was set to take this fleet of Bayezid’s to Alexandria to bring funds (*danarı*) for Korkud in Cairo, in addition to the annual *zakāt* funds (*elemosina*) sent by the Ottoman ruler to Mecca.<sup>104</sup> Two weeks later, the same Edirne-based Venetian secretary reported that on 26 July 1510 a Mamlūk envoy had arrived to inform Bayezid that Korkud was prepared to return to his posting. According to the secretary, Bayezid was so pleased that he “sold his animals and slaves and devoted the proceeds to his [Korkud’s] *sancak*” – which financed a stipend increase from 2,400,000 *akçe* (*asprī*) to 3,000,000 *akçe*.<sup>105</sup> Considering that the fleet assigned to escort Korkud to Antalya was later intercepted with great loss, it would appear that such intelligence reports were quickly acted upon.<sup>106</sup>

The Mamlūk envoy referred to in the Venetian report was probably Kesebay, who relayed to Bayezid’s court a set of demands presented by al-Ghawrī on Korkud’s behalf – including a stipend increase request identical to that reported upon in the Venetian correspondence. Concurrent with Korkud’s departure, al-Ghawrī dispatched Kesebay to Istanbul to confirm Korkud’s return and clarify his subsequent status. In the palace translation of the original letter born by Kesebay,<sup>107</sup> al-Ghawrī referred to himself as a “co-partner” (*müfāvaza*) responding

to previous correspondence from Bayezid. After confirming Korkud's presence and the Mamlūk hospitality extended for his residence, he went on to compliment the prince on his uniquely broad learning and piety. According to the letter, Korkud had wished to travel throughout "the regions of Egypt", but it had been decided to keep him under court observation as he had remained in his father's service throughout the stay. At a couple of meetings, al-Ghawrī had tried to persuade Korkud that a son's obedience to his father was one of the most perfect of duties and most preferable forms of worship, and that "the attachment of a father's gaze upon his son is an entitlement". After Korkud had finally agreed to the principle of obedience as defined by the sultan, al-Ghawrī prepared the way, rewarded him with robes and other fine presents, and sent him back in good health and safety to Bayezid's service with a fleet of "sultanic ships" (*sulṭānlık gemileri*).<sup>108</sup>

Having announced Korkud's departure, al-Ghawrī made a number of demands concerning Korkud's status – as if requesting written confirmation of an earlier verbal understanding. The first request was a guarantee of Korkud's protection and Bayezid's compassionate treatment of the prince upon his return – implying that Korkud's execution would have been considered a breach of agreement by the Mamlūk court. Having addressed Korkud's treatment, al-Ghawrī requested a number of financial and administrative rewards – most of which reflected Korkud's prior assignments. These inducements included: the castles of Antalya and Alanya along with their surrounding villages; the villages of Manavgat *sancak*; and 12,000 *florins* from Midilli's (Lesbos) taxes. If those allotments failed to total 3,000,000 *akçe*, then they were to be supplemented with the "infidel taxes" (*kefere harāci*) from the districts "beyond Constantinople" (*Qoştantīniyye verāsında*), probably referring to areas across the Bosphorus from Istanbul.<sup>109</sup> Confirming that Korkud planned to re-enter full professional service, and worldly entanglements, all affairs of the aforementioned districts were to be transferred to his personal control rather than that of any *lala* or *defterdār*. Korkud was to have full discretion over appointments and dismissals of Antalya and Alanya's castle wardens (*dizdār*), as well as over all of their garrisons' affairs. In a demand that should have significantly boosted Korkud's succession chances, no one was to block or forbid Korkud's visiting any of his allotted districts. Bayezid's approval of such a "favour" (*in'ām*) for Korkud would be equally considered a "favour" for the Mamlūk court, because Korkud had attained "the status of one of our sons" (*bizüm oğlumuz meşābesindedir*). Suggesting a personal line of communication between al-Ghawrī and Bayezid, al-Ghawrī closed the substantive part of the letter by stating that Kesebay had been ordered to convey certain additional matters verbally.<sup>110</sup>

An Arabic letter said to be the Ottoman court's reply to al-Ghawrī's letter is preserved in Ferīdūn Ahmed Beg's (d. 991/1583) *münşe'āt* collection.<sup>111</sup> Overjoyed that Korkud had returned,<sup>112</sup> Bayezid granted most, but not all, of al-Ghawrī's demands presented by Kesebay on Korkud's behalf. In addition to having his safety guaranteed, Korkud was granted a portfolio consisting of Antalya, Alanya and Manavgat. Granting tax revenues amounting to 3,000,000 *dirhams*, the letter made no mention of additional revenues from regions behind Istanbul, control over appointments and dismissals of officials, or the right of free passage to any of his concessions.<sup>113</sup> Ferīdūn Beg's collection preserves

as well an Arabic letter said to be al-Ghawrī's response to Bayezid's reply. Thanking Bayezid for granting Korkud's needs, al-Ghawrī confirmed Korkud's concessions before closing the letter with an admonition not to allow anyone to undermine Korkud's position.<sup>114</sup>

### Return to Antalya

On 8 August 1510, a Venetian envoy reported that a messenger had reached Bayezid's court announcing Korkud's arrival in his *sancak*.<sup>115</sup> Korkud's return to Antalya was a highly risky endeavour due to the marauding activities of captains licensed by the Knights of St. John, especially since his capture – like the earlier exile of Cem – would have proven an excellent bargaining chip for the Knights. Indeed, in a detailed account of his return addressed to *ḍāvān* officials in Istanbul, Korkud explained the difficulties posed by enemy ships.<sup>116</sup> Because the Knights had been tipped off about his return, the Mamlūks assigned 20 ships to escort the prince and his retinue back to Antalya. Faced with the danger posed by the enemy fleet, they decided not to wait, instead setting out in a rush before the Knights had time to react. Luckily for Korkud, they never ran across the enemy fleet, and arrived safely in Antalya. The Mamlūk armada remained in Antalya for a week, during which time Korkud entertained them and presented them with gifts and ceremonial robes as best he could – and probably supplied them with military cargo as well. Having been sent on their return, the Mamlūk escorts were attacked by the Knights' fleet, which had been lying in wait. According to Korkud's account, although the Knights did not have more ships, the "Muslims" were found in a vulnerable position.<sup>117</sup> According to a summary account based on Korkud's and other letters, twenty Knights' ships surprised the "Muslims" while they were resting in a port on the Syrian coast.<sup>118</sup> In the battle which ensued, all who engaged the Knights died, and all who tried to flee were captured with their ships. In light of these results, Korkud recommended that a fleet scheduled to be sent from Istanbul to Egypt with a large cargo under the command of Seydī Yūnūs be postponed until such time as the sea was secure from enemy ships. As Korkud saw it, since the Knights currently had a greatly strengthened armada at their disposal, delay would be prudent.<sup>119</sup>

In another letter sent just after his return from Egypt, Korkud appealed for pardon, attempted to explain his actions and motivations, and detailed his perspective concerning what had transpired during his stay.<sup>120</sup> Refuting sentiments expressed earlier to his father that "the sight of my clan and people grew hateful to my gaze",<sup>121</sup> Korkud opened the letter by expressing the hope that "the homeland remain the most precious" (*lā zālat mawṭin al-akram*). Although acknowledging the trouble that his "despicable deed" had caused, Korkud pointed out that it had been "petitioned for to a sufficient extent" and excused it as being in God's name.<sup>122</sup> While expressing regret for all the difficulties that his trip had caused, Korkud blamed the rejection of his earlier petitions for his weak position by the end of his stay, and stated that he had since done all in his power to rectify the situation.<sup>123</sup> In order to secure restoration of his status, Korkud had reportedly sent several apologetic letters and gifts – and the resultant pardon was later portrayed as an exceptional outpouring of paternal mercy on Bayezid's part.<sup>124</sup>



## Conclusion

Various incidents and correlations suggest that Korkud and al-Ghawrî's relationship extended well beyond public motives of piety and hospitality. As Salih Özbaran has noted, several significant arms shipments and sea *ghāzî* reinforcements passed from Ottoman to Mamlūk territories in the last years of Bayezid's reign – particularly from Korkud's ruling area of western and southern Anatolia.<sup>125</sup> For example, several months prior to Korkud's 1509 departure, a Florentine merchant's agent in Valencia reported that "about 20 [Mamlūk] ships were sent to the south coast of Anatolia to be loaded with timber".<sup>126</sup> In 1509, the same year as Korkud's departure for Egypt, the Mamlūks and Ottomans jointly launched a fleet in the Red Sea intended to expel the Portuguese from their Indian Ocean outposts. Within months of Korkud's return to Antalya, an especially large Ottoman military shipment was said to have reached Egypt.<sup>127</sup>

Meanwhile, even as Korkud was en route to Antalya, negotiations and intrigue connected to the looming succession struggle were well underway. Bayezid was under considerable pressure to satisfy each of his sons, although he reportedly favoured Şehzade Ahmed (d. 918/1512).<sup>128</sup> Korkud, however, does not appear to have passively accepted his secondary status – the Venetian envoy in Edirne stated in a 28 August report that Korkud had reached an agreement with the Mamlūk sultan, whereby "he desired that one would be Lord [i.e., sultan] and the other would be a *paşa*, meaning *beğlerbeği* [i.e., provincial governor]"<sup>129</sup> While this statement does not clarify who would be "Lord" and who would be "*paşa*", it confirms that Korkud and al-Ghawrî were seen to have arranged a mutual assistance understanding of some sort. Such an arrangement might have been a factor when, in March 1511, Korkud abruptly boarded a ship laden with specie for Istanbul in an attempt to gain the throne by bribing the Janissaries to support his candidacy.

As the main royal backer of sea *ghāzî*s such as Hayrettin Barbarossa, Oruç Reis, and Kurtoğlu, it is possible that Korkud was the primary Ottoman agent behind early cooperative Mamlūk-Ottoman actions in the Indian Ocean against the Portuguese – especially considering the weakened state of Bayezid's rule in his final years and the constant possibility of *şehzade* initiative within the somewhat decentralised structure of Ottoman provincial rule at the time. If Korkud really was acting as such an intermediary, then his 915/1509 trip to Egypt would have been directly related to the shipment of materials made in the same year to support Mamlūk *ghazā'* against the Portuguese. In addition, such a role would suggest that it was no accident that Korkud's visit corresponded with Hussein al-Kurdî's 916/1509 expedition against the Portuguese at Diu. His involvement in such activities would also help explain both the Knights' attempt to capture Korkud's fleet upon his return to Antalya in the summer of 917/1510 and the financial resources Korkud brought to bear in his efforts to gain the succession in 916/1511. Finally, it would provide an additional explanation for Yavuz Selim's 922–923/1516–17 invasion of the Mamlūk empire: self-preservation in light of previous external interference.

Korkud's insistence on a believer's right to embark on the pilgrimage provided a powerful argument to justify his 14 month self-exile at a personally and politically sensitive time. For this reason, the combination of Korkud's pious stance displayed in *Wasīlat al-aḥbāb* and his strong negotiating position appears to have obliged Bayezid – and his *dīvān* officials – to pardon him and fully restore his governing

position. Whatever his real intentions, the *hajj* proved the perfect justification for this recalcitrant prince's self-exile.

## NOTES

1. This study was supported by a Fulbright-DDRA research grant and a writing grant from the Institute of Turkish Studies, Washington, DC.
2. Personal names associated with Ottoman personalities or individuals (Selim, Korkud), are transliterated according to modified norms of modern Turkish usage. When a term is universal within the Islamic World (*sharī'a*, *qānūn*), transliteration generally follows the Library of Congress norms of Arabic transliteration. Otherwise, transliteration follows norms for the language of the work cited, or the language with which the term is primarily associated.
3. For summaries of Korkud's life and brief descriptions of his writings, see M.T. Gökbilgin, "Korkud", in *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, volumes I–XIII (Istanbul: Maarif Matbaası 1940–), VI: 855–860; Gökbilgin, "Korkud", in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, volumes I–XI (Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1960–2002; second edition), V: 269; and İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, "II'inci Bayezid'in oğullarından Sultan Korkud", *Belleten*, 30: 120 (1966): 539–601.
4. Suraiya Faroqhi, *Pilgrims & Sultans: The Hajj under the Ottomans* (London: I.B. Taurus, 1994), p. 129. In light of his own childhood experience of palace chaos upon the death of his grandfather Fâtih Mehmed (d. 886/1481), and considering that a similar departure nearly two years later set off the exceedingly violent Şahkulu rebellion and fraternal succession struggle, Korkud must have been familiar with the considerable dangers of leaving his post without permission. Gökbilgin, 855–860; Uzunçarşılı, 539–601. For a detailed examination of these uprisings and the succession struggle which ensued, see Çağatay Uluçay, "Yavuz Sultan Selim nasıl Padişah oldu?", *Tarih Dergisi* 6/9 (1954): 53–90; 7/10 (1954): 117–142; 8/11–12 (1955): 185–200.
5. Şehzade Korkud, *Wasīlat al-aḥbāb bi i'jāz, ta'rif walaḍ ḥarrakahu l-shawq ilā l-arḍ al-Ḥijāz*, Süleymaniye: MS Aya Sofya 3529.
6. As Korkud told it, although Muḥammad had appeared often in the prince's dreams, this time he requested that the prince visit his tomb on a pilgrimage. In the dream in question, he saw the prophet facing away from him. When asked why his back was turned, Muḥammad replied that if Korkud had loved him, he would of course visit him. Korkud, 15b–16b.
7. Korkud, 15b–16b. None of Korkud's earlier extant letters include any such request for permission to go on the *hajj*. In a letter [Turkish State Archives E6684/8] written just after his return to Antalya in July–August 1510, Korkud repeated the assertion that he had petitioned several times for such permission.
8. According to Faroqhi [129], "no Sultan ever performed the pilgrimage. The only prince ever to do so was Prince Djem [Cem] (1459–95), unsuccessful competitor of Bāyezīd II, who visited Mecca when he was already in exile, and the Hejaz still a Mamluk dependency. Presumably the rationale was that the Sultan never should be too far away from the political centre of the empire and the Hapsburg and Iranian frontiers. Princes, on the other hand, might have used the pilgrimage as an opportunity for political activity not readily controlled by their royal relative".
9. Mustafa 'Ālī [*Künh ül-aḥbār*, volumes I–II (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi, 1997), II: 2: 913; Uzunçarşılı, 550] stated that the letter reached Bayezid on 28 Muḥarram 915/18 May 1509. The contents of the letter he described closely match those of *Wasīlat al-aḥbāb*, which was signed and dated 15 Şafar 915/4 June 1509 – about a fortnight later. As no extant letter matches that described by 'Ālī, either the historian was referring to *Wasīlat al-aḥbāb* and misquoted the date, or he was referring to a letter which preceded *Wasīlat al-aḥbāb* and is no longer extant.
10. Before leaving, Korkud fixed his officials' payrolls, ordered them to remain at their posts, and left the treasury untouched in order to keep local administration running. As a final measure, the prince left Antalya in the middle of the night through a secret passage, intentionally avoiding the city gates. Korkud, 17b–19a. The fact that provincial administration carried on without major disruption until Bayezid confirmed local officials in their places was consistent with the fact that Korkud had been long removed from daily governance by this time. Şolakzade, *Tārīḥ-i Şolakzade* (Istanbul: Mahmut Bey Matbaası, 1880–1881), p. 321.
11. While Korkud [*Wasīlat al-aḥbāb*, 18b] claimed to have taken only five palace servants with him for the purpose of assisting with ritual ablutions and the like, 'Ālī [II: 2: 912] and Şolakzade

- [321] stated that Korkud reached Egypt with five of his own ships carrying a sizeable retinue of 87 purchased slaves (*müşterâ kulları*) and 50 luminaries (*bellü başlu adamı*). Uzunçarşılı, 548.
12. Marino Sanuto, *I Diarii di Marino Sanuto*, eds. R. Fulin, F. Stefani, N. Barozzi, G. Berchet, and M. Allegri, volumes I–LVIII (Venice, 1879–1903), IX: 12. In this report – one of his earlier dispatches – Foscolo confused certain dynastic details. In later reports, Foscolo’s accuracy appears to have improved greatly. I am grateful to Mr Urs Goeskin for translating the Italian sources for this article.
  13. Ibn Iyās, *Badā’i’ al-zuhūr fī waqā’i’ al-duhūr*, ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā, volumes I–IV (Wiesbaden 1961–1975), IV: 152; Uzunçarşılı, 551.
  14. For a detailed examination of Cem’s extended exile in Egypt, Rhodes, and various principalities in Europe between 1481 and 1496, see İsmail Hikmet Ertaylan, *Sultan Cem* (Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1951); Nicolas Vatin, *Sultan Djem: un prince ottoman dans l’Europe du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle d’après deux sources contemporaines: Vāk ı’āt-ı Sultân Cem, Oeuvres de Guillaume Caoursin* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1997).
  15. Faroqhi, 129.
  16. TSA E5587. Although Korkud himself never referred to Cem in any of his correspondence or treatises, other commentators pointed out the parallel. Ibn Iyās, IV: 155; Uzunçarşılı, 555.
  17. When Cem visited Qaytbay, the Mamlūk sultan did not rise to greet him. In addition, Cem was not invited into the sultan’s citadel courtyard, and was not greeted by any celebratory feast or ceremonial procession whatsoever. Ibn Iyās, IV: 155; Uzunçarşılı, 555.
  18. Ibn Iyās [IV: 152] stated that news of Korkud’s arrival had reached Cairo at the beginning of Safar 915/late May 1509. Uzunçarşılı [551] estimated that he reached Damietta on 25 May.
  19. Ālī, II: 2: 913–914; Uzunçarşılı, 551–553.
  20. In a dispatch which reached Venice in August via Candia, Sir Marin de Molin – the Venetian consul in Alexandria – reported both that Korkud had reached Egypt, and that the Mamlūk sultan had ordered the procurement of timberwood as he wished to make an expedition against the Portuguese in India. Sanuto, IX: 27. Most of the report’s summary transcription is missing from the published edition.
  21. ‘Ālī, II: 2: 914–915; Uzunçarşılı, 551. Sir de Molin’s report also stated that Korkud had arrived without disembarking. Sanuto, IX: 27.
  22. Sanuto, IX: 27.
  23. Sudon later paid for his actions upon Korkud’s arrival. When the governor came to Cairo a couple of months later, al-Ghawrī had him beaten in his presence and financially penalized. Ibn Iyās, IV: 158; Uzunçarşılı, 551.
  24. ‘Ālī, II: 2: 914; Uzunçarşılı, 552–553.
  25. The delegation, headed by the deputy *amīr ākhūr* (stable master) Aqbāy, the *mihmandār* (chief of protocol) Özdemiş, and the *khāzin* (treasurer) Nanç, prepared a rousing welcome for the prince, featuring a large flame-throwing vessel which sailed ahead, announced the Ottomans’ arrival with a shower of flames, and carved an “Ottoman illustration” on the riverbank – perhaps the Ottoman *tuğra* (imperial seal). Ibn Iyās, *Badā’i’ al-zuhūr*, IV: 152; Uzunçarşılı, 552–553.
  26. By ‘Ālī’s description, the cooking staff alone required 40 files of camels bearing foods, sweets, and refreshments. To carry Korkud’s belongings, the Mamluks brought nine stables of horses, nine files of mules, and 23 files of various sorts of camels. To offload the prince’s ships and carry his delegation’s baggage, they brought 150 horses and 70 files of camels. As ceremonial gifts, the officials brought “9,000 gold coins, nine magnificent golden robes of honour, and nine fine, tulip-cheeked slave boys bearing jewel-studded and ornamental golden serving bowls (*toğuz bin nağd-i eşrefi ve toğuz päre hıl’at-ı zerîfet-i fâhire ve toğuz nefer hüsn-dâr ve lâle ruḥsâr gümânân ki ellerinde mürâşâ‘ ve zerrîn meclis alâtu qarîn-i zîb ü ziver...*).” ‘Ālī, *Künh ül-aḥbâr*, II: 2: 915; Uzunçarşılı, 552.
  27. The river procession was reportedly quite dramatic, with streams of fire shooting forth ahead of the flotilla. Ibn Iyās, IV: 152; ‘Ālī, II: 2: 915–917; Uzunçarşılı, 552–553.
  28. Korkud, 143a; Ibn Iyās, IV: 153; Uzunçarşılı, 553.
  29. Concerning his treatment, Korkud [*Wāsīlat al-aḥbāb*, 24b] stated: “indeed, the son has seen from him [al-Ghawrī] respect, honour, dignity, and hospitality that cannot be contained by any description or number (*fa-inna l-walad qad ra’ā minhu min al-ḥurma wa l-ta’zīm wa l-waqār wa l-ikrām mā lā yuṭāq waṣṭuhu wa lā ‘adda*).”
  30. Consistent with the private nature of the text, *Wāsīlat al-aḥbāb* remains extant in a single, signed copy. As with Korkud’s other Arabic treatises, the text was deposited in the royal family’s private

- collection, and remains part of the Aya Sofya collection into which that collection was later absorbed. On the final page, Korkud [*Wasīlat al-aḥbāb*, 143a] stated that he had written the text himself – and stamped his own *tuğra*, or private signature seal, as confirmation.
31. ‘Abd al-Salām was repeatedly referred to as the bearer of this text. Korkud, 25b–26a, 103b–104a, 119b–120a.
  32. Korkud, 25b–27b. In another passage, he was described as the “trusted *shaykh*, *imām*, ‘*ālim*, pious teacher, and ascetic ‘Abd al-Salām, one of the *shaykhs* and ‘*ulamā*’ of the blessed al-Azhar Mosque”, Korkud, 119b–120a.
  33. Korkud, *Da‘wat al-naḥs al-ṭāliḥa*, MS Gökbilgin, 423. For a discussion of this text, see Cornell Fleischer, “From Şeyhzade [sic] Korkut to Mustafa Ali: Cultural Origins of the Ottoman Nasihatname”, in *3rd Congress on the Social and Economic History of Turkey, Princeton University 24–26 August, 1983* (Istanbul, Washington, Paris: Isis Press, 1990), pp. 67–77.
  34. Korkud, 24b–25b.
  35. “. . . *al-muḥibb ilā ‘Āl-i* [sic] ‘*Uthmān ‘alā l-iṭlāq, wa l-mu‘idd naḥsahu bi-annahu wāḥid min awlādihiḥ li-‘iṣām mahabbatihi*”. Korkud, 24b.
  36. In the invocation, Korkud [1b–2a] praised God for guiding him to undertake the *hajj* and asked God to bless and protect the prophet Muḥammad.
  37. “*bughḥiḍa ḥatman li-shshākhī* [sic] *ru’yatu ‘ashīratī wa ashkhāṣī*”. Korkud, 2b.
  38. Korkud, 2b. This neglect of sovereign duties should have referred to Korkud’s extended scholarly retreat on the Antalya coast which he was said to have begun the previous year. According to Şolaḳzade [*Tārīḥ*, 320] this retreat began in early 914/May 1508. In *Da‘wat al-naḥs al-ṭāliḥa*, the text which Korkud would have completed at the very beginning of that retreat, there is a lengthy defense of the reality of dream imagery and its proper prominent role in human decisions. Şehzade Korkud, *Da‘wat al-naḥs al-ṭāliḥa ilā l-a‘māl al-ṣāliḥa, bi l-ayāt al-ḡāhira wa l-bayyināt al-bāhira*, Süleymaniye: MS Aya Sofya 1763, ff. 202a–215b.
  39. Korkud, 3a–11a.
  40. Korkud, 16b–20b. As per al-Ghawrī’s request, Korkud appealed for Bayezid’s permission to proceed from Cairo to the Hījāz. The sultan had argued that Korkud must obtain his father’s blessings in order for his pilgrimage to be completely in accordance with *sharī‘a* conditions. Korkud, 24b–27a.
  41. In the passage discussing Hārūn al-Rashīd, Korkud [22a–23a] pointed out that the caliph had eased fulfillment of this vow by having mats and rugs laid out on the path, a reference to the many improvements in Mecca and Medina for which he and his consort Zubayda were remembered. This passage counters a statement by Faroḳhī [8] that Ottoman sources never evoked the image of Hārūn al-Rashīd and Zubayda, because “Ottoman official discourse was oriented towards the present and recent past, rather than toward the already very remote history of early Islam”.
  42. Korkud, 21a–24a.
  43. To buttress his line of reasoning, Korkud [27b–38a] simply quoted – without commentary – several Qur’ānic verses and *ḥadīth* accounts counselling patience and urging restraint from anger.
  44. By doing so, Korkud [39b–45b] stated that he could count on completion of his religious duties, pride in its performance before all his associates, and God’s reward in the form of protection in this life and forgiveness in the hereafter. To back this argument, Korkud cited Qur’ānic verses and *ḥadīth* accounts which verified doctrinally that: the *hajj* is obligatory to any Muslim who can perform it; pilgrimage is one of the five pillars of Islamic faith; the *ka‘ba* in Mecca is the primary focus of the *hajj*; performing the *hajj* is rewarded with a place in heaven, while performing the ‘*umra* (pilgrimage outside of the appointed annual period) provides penance only for all sins preceding that ‘*umra*; only three mosques merit definitive peregrinations: Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem; and one who circles the *ka‘ba* 50 times emerges from the experience as free from sin as the day he/she was born. These *ḥadīth* accounts included several popular accounts. In one [41a–b], Muḥammad was heard to declare that the black rock of the *ka‘ba* came down from heaven as white as milk and only blackened due to the sins of humanity. In another [41b], Muḥammad said that the *ka‘ba* is to be given eyes and a tongue on Judgement Day in order to bear witness for whomever had touched it. In another, [41b–42a] Muḥammad was heard to say that the “column” and “tomb” were two hyacinths from heaven buried in the ground by God in order to prevent them from constantly illuminating everything from East and West.
  45. Korkud, 46a–52a.
  46. This point is not universally accepted, as Korkud himself pointed out. The Shāfi‘ī and Mālikī *madhhabs* accept the possibility, while the Ḥanafī *madhhab* rejects it. Korkud backed his own

- conclusion that *hajj* by proxy was acceptable by citing a *ḥadīth* whereby the prophet gave a woman permission to go on the *hajj* for her father. Korkud, 48a–52a.
47. Regarding tomb visitation, opponents cited *ḥadīth* accounts claiming that Muḥammad hated hearing it recommended that people state “our blessing is the prophet’s tomb” – perhaps because he had not yet died – and that “God curses grave visitation”. Supporters of the practice cited *ḥadīth* accounts verifying that: the earliest Muslims greeted the prophet’s grave after his death; those who visit his grave receive his intercession with God; and those who visit his tomb receive a wide variety of additional blessings. Included in the accounts supporting tomb visitation were various recommendations for ritual actions meant to be taken while visiting the tomb, such as lighting candles and reciting certain prayers. Korkud, 55b–66b.
  48. In this section, Korkud [66b–75a] cited *ḥadīth* accounts describing the following examples of miraculous events associated with the prophet Muḥammad: splitting the moon following popular request for a sign; the sun rising after it had already set so that dusk prayers could be said after they had been forgotten – an event resembling an eclipse; water pouring out of Muḥammad’s fingers for ritual washing when no water had been available; feeding 180 men when enough food had previously been available for only two men; trees reciting the confession of faith as well as moving toward the prophet and prostrating before him; and a tree trunk craving Muḥammad so much that it creaked and moaned until he touched it. Korkud argued that Muḥammad’s unique status explained why he could take comfort in him by leaving family, ancestors, and other relatives in order to witness his presence in such pure places.
  49. After presenting the pro-Shī‘ī viewpoint through a Qur’ānic verse stating that the role of the “people of the house [of Muḥammad]” (*ahl al-bayt*) is to remove the filth and purify society, Korkud quoted a *ḥadīth* account explicitly rejecting the claims of ‘Alid, ‘Abbāsīd, and Ja‘farī descendants to any special treatment on account of their genealogy. Korkud, 99b–102a.
  50. Korkud [54b–85a] consistently referred to Jerusalem as Bayt al-Maqdis. According to *ḥadīth* accounts cited by Korkud, a prayer in al-Aqṣā Mosque is equivalent to 50,000 normal prayers, while one offered in the Dome of the Rock is worth 100,000 normal prayers. In addition, Jerusalem is the place where: humanity will come to be sorted out on Judgement Day; prayers, sins and good deeds there are each worth 1,000 times normal units of each; two to four prostrations there render one as free of sin as the day one was born; and anyone who dies there dies as if he/she had died in the skies. Korkud, 77b–85a.
  51. Korkud, 75a–77b.
  52. Citing a Qur’ānic verse mandating benevolence to several types of persons, his lengthy interpretation of the verse argued that: mothers are more deserving than fathers or other relatives; one cannot enter heaven without caring for one’s parents in their old age; one must be committed to one’s relatives as well; caring for orphans leads to heavenly reward; believers must honour guests and not harm neighbours; one must care for one’s servants who do not have the same faith; and no one of bad character shall enter heaven. Korkud, 85a–93a.
  53. Korkud, 93a–97b.
  54. Korkud, 96b–99b.
  55. Korkud, 102a–104a.
  56. The claims sons have upon fathers included: providing education with mildness and compassion, defending one from pain until the age of discernment (seven years), entrusting one with pursuit of worship and reading the Qur’ān, and entrusting one with carrying out God’s commands as an adult. Korkud, 104a–106a.
  57. Korkud provided several *ḥadīth* quotes concerning the merits of reading and memorizing the Qur’ān, including the following: one who reads the Qur’ān receives a crown on Judgment Day, along with his parents; one who memorizes the Qur’ān receives preference equivalent to ten members of the prophet Muḥammad’s family; one who repeatedly recites the Qur’ān from beginning to end is the most beloved to God; one with no knowledge of the Qur’ān is like a house in ruins; every letter read from the Qur’ān is rewarded as ten good deeds; one proficient in the Qur’ān belongs among the noble scribes – and one who finds achieving this difficult gets double the reward; one who reads the Qur’ān and then forgets it will meet God on Resurrection Day as a leper; one who regards as lawful what is forbidden in the Qur’ān is not a believer; and one who reads the Qur’ān loudly is like one who gives charity publicly – and vice-versa. Korkud, 107b–117a.
  58. Korkud, 106a–107b.
  59. Korkud, 117a–121a. To demonstrate the sanctity of oaths, agreements, and secrets, Korkud [121a–128b] cited a number of Qur’ānic verses and *ḥadīth* accounts confirming such sanctity.



As was often the case with Korkud's choice of argumentation, three of the accounts cited suggest direct parallels to his own situation. On two occasions Korkud [120a–121a, 128b–129a] insisted that his father reply in his own hand and stamp – or the resulting order would not be considered legitimate.

60. Uluçay, 6/9: 53–90; 7/10: 117–142; 8/11–12: 185–200.
61. According to Korkud [129a–140b], this meant that one who continuously commits bad acts will be resurrected continuing to carry out that act which he had left off doing at the time of death. On the other hand, one who acts in good faith shall be spared that fate, reunited with other good people, and protected from the calamity of Judgement Day.
62. One of the accounts referred to an incident in which a financial promise made by the prophet was honoured after his death by his successors. Korkud's inclusion of this account implies that a verbal agreement had been made between Bayezid and Korkud concerning some sort of financial obligation. Another account referred to the prophet Muḥammad's daughter Fāṭima keeping a very important secret which the prophet had confided in her until well after his death – the secret of his own appointed time of death. As it makes little sense in isolation, the subtext of this specific *ḥadīth* account suggests a sensitive line of communications in place between Bayezid and Korkud's full sister Şofu Fatma Sultan – who on at least one occasion informed Korkud about developments at Bayezid's court. Finally, a third account states that a follower of Muḥammad refused to disclose to his own mother a secret mission which had been entrusted to him by the prophet – hinting that Korkud considered himself to be carrying out some sort of secret mission while visiting the Mamluks. Korkud, 121a–128b.
63. The *ḥadīths* which Korkud included here described heaven as a place whereby those who enter it remain in gardens and springs, have plentiful food and drink, have no need for bodily excretion, reside in a place which cannot be known on this world, and gain wide-eyed maidens for wives. Korkud, 140b–143a.
64. Before they had reached Shubrā, the sultan had assigned a scout and some tribal shaykhs (*kashshāf wa mashāyikh al-'urbān*) to accompany Korkud's delegation along the way, and to prepare feast materials for his arrival. Accordingly, all sorts of sheep, chicken, geese and other food supplies were sent to villages along the way. Ibn Iyās, IV: 153; Uzunçarşılı, *Sultan Korkut*, 553.
65. For five days, Korkud greeted each guest who had come to see him at this feast, including each of the Mamluk commanders, the head judges representing each of the four recognised legal schools, and the leading commissioners from among the guild heads. Ibn Iyās, IV: 153–154; Uzunçarşılı, 553. According to Mustafa 'Ālī [II: 2: 917], the feast boasted 500 sheep, 50 pots each of honey and butter, 53 platters of rice, 2000 chickens, 200 geese, and other great amounts of food. Leslie Pierce [*The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 19] has observed that an Ottoman ambassador stating that "I eat the sultan's bread" signified that he was in the imperial service, as if he were himself a member of the ruling household.
66. Ibn Iyās, IV: 154; Uzunçarşılı, 553–554.
67. Ibn Iyās, IV: 154; Uzunçarşılı, 554. Although such a clear sign of submission would not have played well to an Ottoman audience, it might have ingratiated Korkud with his host. Mustafa 'Ālī [II: 2: 918] portrayed the meeting slightly differently, stating that al-Ghawrī kissed Korkud's forehead and Korkud embraced the sultan. Although such matters of ceremonial detail may appear trivial, the attention devoted to Korkud's behaviour suggests that protocol at this and other ceremonies was a sensitive issue.
68. 'Ālī, II: 2: 918; Uzunçarşılı [554] felt that 'Ālī confused their first meeting with a later encounter.
69. Throughout the processions, Korkud was said to have been wearing a small "Turkman" turban of a quality inferior to those of others in his delegation, a yellow silk robe, and an open, woollen green garment over the robe. Upon arrival, the sultan stood and spoke with Korkud for an hour before presenting him with a ceremonial robe of honour, described by Ibn Iyās as a citadel product with well-polished gold weaving. Reportedly, at that point Korkud took off the garments with which he had arrived and dressed in the sultan's ceremonial gift robe. Ibn Iyās, IV: 154–155; Uzunçarşılı, 554–555.
70. Once the escort had been dismissed, al-Ghawrī provided their guests with supplies for yet another feast. At this point the sultan was also said to have sent Korkud bundles of magnificent garments and 20,000 *dīnārs*, half in silver and half in gold. Soon after, Korkud reportedly returned the favour by throwing a feast for al-Ghawrī. Ibn Iyās, IV: 155.

71. In addition, to Ibn Iyās's [IV: 155] statement that al-Ghawrî sent Korkud 20,000 *dīnārs* at the conclusion of his ceremonial welcome, Kemalpaşazade reported in later editions of the eighth volume of his *Tevārîh-i Âl-i 'Osmân* that Korkud received a 5,000 *florin* monthly stipend. Ahmet Uğur, *The Reign of Sultan Selīm I in the Light of the Selīm-nāme Literature* [Islamkundliche Untersuchungen-Band CIX] (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1985), p. 155, citing MSS Fatih 4221, Dār al-Kutub 8847/50. Hoca Sa'düddin [*Tâc üt-tevārîh*, volumes I-II (Istanbul, 1863), II: 132] placed the stipend at 3,000 *florins*, while Şolakzade [*Târîh*, 321] put the figure at 3,000 coins (*sikke-i hasene*).
72. On this occasion, Korkud successfully interceded with al-Ghawrî on behalf of a Mamlūk armourer (*mukah hil*) who had lost his job and been banished to Damietta. When Korkud was ready to leave the banquet, al-Ghawrî presented him with a red braided robe and a roan (*boz*) horse equipped with a golden saddle and horse blanket. Ibn Iyās, IV: 157; Uzunçarşılı, 555.
73. Ibn Iyās, IV: 157; Uzunçarşılı, 555.
74. Ibn Iyās, IV: 158; Uzunçarşılı, 555.
75. Ibn Iyās, IV: 160; Uzunçarşılı, 555.
76. Ibn Iyās, IV: 163–164; Uzunçarşılı, 555.
77. Ibn Iyās, IV: 164; Uzunçarşılı, 556.
78. According to a letter copied by al-Ghawrî's chief secretary (*kâtib al-sirr*) and sent from al-Ghawrî to Korkud, he had cost the Mamluk treasury 2,000 *dīnārs* for every month of his sojourn in Cairo. Ibn Iyās, IV: 167; Uzunçarşılı, 556.
79. As if to offer an example, Ibn Iyās reported that al-Ghawrî's hospitality for Korkud had even exceeded that shown by al-Zāhir Barqūq to the exiled ruler of Baghdad, Khān Aḥmad b. Uways, who had fled to Cairo in 788/1386–87 following his defeat by Timur. Ibn Iyās, IV: 186–187.
80. "bunda murādımca gıftı eder kimse yok, endām fülân hoş hiç bilmezler". TSA E6684/1.
81. Apparently lacking sufficient items for ceremonial display, Korkud had asked his "lala" to send the following: a silver-edged sword, a small rose peach-coloured sword with an inscription on the hilt, a simple red bow, a bow with a silver case, an older bow, and a new bow worked with mother-of-pearl – in addition to whatever clothing, shirts, turbans, and related items remained in his Antalya residence. TSA E6684/1; Uzunçarşılı, 557. In a follow-up letter, Korkud [TSA E6684/3; Uzunçarşılı, 557] asked his "lala" to fulfil his promise to send whatever necessities were desired by sending them with a Mamluk envoy then heading to Istanbul. The general nature of the second request suggests that Korkud was planning to remain in Cairo for an extended period when he sent the letter.
82. Although its significance is no longer clear, Ibn Iyās [IV: 166] reported that in the morning al-Ghawrî wore a white woollen outfit, along with a sable outfit from his own clothing.
83. When al-Ghawrî bestowed gifts on all the commanders, he presented one to Korkud as well. Ibn Iyās, IV: 167; Uzunçarşılı, 556.
84. The official who joined the journey was probably Mevlânâ 'Araboğlu Bey Çelebi, an Ottoman scholar sent to negotiate with Korkud, encourage his return home, and represent the Ottoman royal family during that year's *hajj*. In the event, Bayezid reportedly donated 40,000 *dīnārs* for this representative to personally distribute to the poor – or dervishes (*fuqarā*) – in Mecca and Medina. TSA E6684/8; Ibn Iyās, *Badā'i' al-zuhūr*, IV: 169; Mustafa 'Âli, II: 2: 918–920; Uzunçarşılı, 556.
85. Kemalpaşazade [*TAO*, VIII: 24] reported that Cem had obtained permission, stating: "‘azm-i Hicāz idicek, Sultāndan icāzet alub hacca gitmişdi. Şerā'it-i hacca, ki erkān-ı İslām'un biridir, yerine getirüb".
86. Korkud, 50b–52a.
87. The same letter reported on a Mamluk delegation to Bayezid's court which had been honourably received. The letter was written by Hieronimo Zorzi, formerly Sir Andrea of San Marcuola, and was sent on 4 March 1510 from Verbosana. Sanuto, X: 97–98.
88. TSA E6684/8.
89. "denî beglerden ve aşğa cündilerden daḥi ḥavf ve ihtiyāt ederdim". TSA E6684/8.
90. TSA E6684/8.
91. "dürlü ol şân-ı 'aẓîmîñ 'ızz-ı ḥużûruna gayr-ı münāsib kelimât şâdır u vâkı' oldı". TSA E6684/8.
92. TSA E6684/1, E6684/3.
93. "bilmezim ki bizim haqqımızda ne sū' zann etdiler". TSA E6684/8.
94. "ba'z-ı eclāf ceheleniñ ki benim aḥvālımdan ve evşāfımdan gāfledir". TSA E6684/8.
95. TSA E6684/8.
96. "maḥfî degildür ki evvelden za'îf mizâc ve ednâ 'arîzadan münḥarîf olur naḥîf kişiyim". TSA E6684/7. This letter is not dated.

97. Kemalpaşazade [Tevāriḥ-i Âl-i ‘Osmān, volumes I–X (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1997), VIII: 39] attributed Cem’s death to the “necessity of preserving universal order” (*‘ayn-i niẓām-i ‘ālem*), referring to the Ottoman custom of fratricide.
98. Ibn Iyās, IV: 160; Uzunçarşılı, 557. Considering that this was not the first time ‘Alān had made this sort of trip, it appears that the steward was effectively the primary Mamluk official in charge of Ottoman affairs.
99. In a report from Candia which reached Venice in September 1509, a letter was recorded as being forwarded from the consul of Syo [Chios?], reporting that “the son of the Turkish Lord – named Corchut – went to Alexandria; that the [Mamluk] sultan has kept him there; that he wanted to go to Mecca; and that he has sent an ambassador to the Turk [Bayezid]”. Sanuto, IX: 126.
100. Ibn Iyās, IV: 184; Uzunçarşılı [557] gave mistaken dates for the delegation’s return.
101. ‘Alān was said to have enjoyed excellent hospitality at Bayezid’s court – more than would be normally expected. Apparently al-Ghawrī was pleased with the results of the envoy’s trip, as he was treated to a splendid robe upon his arrival at Cairo’s citadel, a ceremonial procession upon his departure, and a raise. Ibn Iyās, IV: 184; Uzunçarşılı, 557.
102. To mark the occasion, the sultan rewarded Korkud with yet another splendid, golden-weaved robe produced by the citadel workshop. The escort accompanied Korkud all the way back to his guest quarters in Būlāq, sent ahead of him the flame-throwing vessel, and furnished a number of other vessels provisioned for extended stays. To escort and assist Korkud’s retinue until their departure from Rosetta, al-Ghawrī assigned several of his own Mamluks, and two of the same three officials who had first greeted the Ottomans the previous summer in Damietta, Özdemir the chief of protocol and Nanq the treasurer. Ibn Iyās, IV: 186; Uzunçarşılı, 558.
103. “*‘adam-ı riẓa ve şükṛ münfehim ola*”. Korkud accounted for his not sending any such explanatory letter from Egypt by explaining that he had not wanted to contradict any statements made in the course of negotiation efforts directly undertaken between Bayezid’s and al-Ghawrī’s courts. TSA E6684/8.
104. The report was one of two coded letters sent from Edirne by Lodovicho Valdrim, secretary to the Venetian envoy. Sanuto, XI: 164.
105. “*Il signor li piace; et havia venduto li animali e schiavi soi, et ha fato tornar tutto al suo sanzachato*”. Sanuto, XI: 294. This report was part of a coded letter sent by Valdrim from Edirne on 3 August.
106. TSA E6684/6; Gökbilgin, 857; Uzunçarşılı, 558–559.
107. TSA E5464/1; Gökbilgin, 857. Uzunçarşılı [558] transcribed most of this document, and Şahabettin Tekindağ [“Korkut Çelebi ile ilgili iki belge”, *Belgelerle Türk Tarih Dergisi*, 3/17 (1969): 40–42] provided a facsimile and modern Turkish translation of the text. The extant document appears to be a summary translation from Arabic to Ottoman Turkish done by palace chancery staff for the use of *divān* officials. The document [E5464/1] has no signature or stamp, and is missing the ornate introductory section required by protocol. Potentially ambiguous Arabic words are fully vowelised for clarity. The apparent reply to this letter, covered below, was in Arabic.
108. TSA E5464/1; Gökbilgin, 857; Uzunçarşılı, 557–558; Tekindağ, 40–41.
109. Gökbilgin [857] interpreted this phrase as meaning areas near Istanbul, while Uzunçarşılı [557–558] considered this phrase a reference to Rumeli.
110. TSA E5464/1; Uzunçarşılı, 558; Tekindağ, 40–41.
111. According to Feridūn Beg, the letter was written on the occasion of Korkud’s “return from the noble *ka’be*”. Feridūn Beg, *Münşe’āt üs-selāṭīn*, I: 356–357; Gökbilgin, 857. One cannot be certain whether correspondence contained in this and other *inshā’* collections are copies of actual letters, or re-creations of letters that ought to have been written. As with all of Korkud’s communications contained in Feridūn Beg’s collection, no corresponding copy of this letter remains extant at the Topkapı Sarayı archives. According to H.R. Roemer [“Inshā’”, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, volumes I–XI (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960–2002; second edition), III: 1241–1246], Feridūn Beg’s collection was completed around 1566, and contains a mixture of genuine correspondence and later creations.
112. According to the letter, Korkud had returned “the previous month of Rabī ‘ following the winter”, or July–August 1510. Feridūn Beg, I: 356–357.
113. Feridūn Beg, I: 356–357.
114. Feridūn Beg, I: 357–358.
115. Sanuto, XI: 417. The letter was sent along with several earlier reports from Edirne by Sir Nicolo Zustignam, formerly Sir Marco.
116. TSA E6684/6; Gökbilgin, 857; Uzunçarşılı, 558–559.

117. TSA E6684/6.
118. They were said to be resting in the port of “Bāqrāz,” in the “Çin” gulf. TSA E7661; Gökbilgin, 860; Uzunçarşılı, 559. The Topkapı Sarayı archival catalogue, prepared by Uzunçarşılı, identifies TSA E7661 as being sent from the grand vizier to Bayezid.
119. TSA E6684/6; Gökbilgin, *Korkut*, 857; Uzunçarşılı, *Sultan Korkut*, 558–559. According to a 1 October 1510 papal commendation to the Knights’ Grand Master Emerico d’Amboise, in this attack 15 of al-Ghawrī’s ships were captured and brought back to Rhodes. Sebastiano Pauli, *Codice diplomatico del Sacro Militare Ordine Gerosolimitano oggi di Malta*, volumes I–II (Lucca, 1733–37) II: 176, document No. 146. This engagement was covered in Bosio’s sixteenth-century narrative history of the Order of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem. Giacomo Bosio, *Dell’Istoria della sacra religione et illma militia di San Giovanni Gerosolimitano* (Rome, 1594–1602), pp. 492–495.
120. The letter was addressed to “*yūqbal al-arḍ*,” which likely refers to the grand vizier in this case. The introduction is in Arabic, and the remainder in Ottoman Turkish. TSA E6684/8; Gökbilgin, 856–857; Uzunçarşılı, 556, fn. 63.
121. Korkud, 2b.
122. “*ol hareket-i şenī ‘amñ bu i’tinā’ın nihāyeti yoğdı, lākin mīkdār-ı kifāyet ‘arż olunmuşdı*”. TSA E6684/8.
123. TSA E6684/8.
124. Hoca Sa’düddin, *Tāc üt-tevārīh*, II: 132; Şolakzade, *Tārīh*, 321. According to Şolakzade, upon his return to Antalya Korkud’s *hāş* stipend was set at 4,000,000 *akçe* and all of his officials were retained at their previous positions. There is no archival record of such a sizeable increase over his earlier stipend, and contemporary sources put the figure at 3,000,000 *akçe*.
125. Salih Özbaran, *The Ottoman Response to European Expansion: Studies on Ottoman-Portuguese Relations in the Indian Ocean and Ottoman Administration in the Arab Lands During the Sixteenth Century* [Analecta Isisiana XII] (Istanbul: Isis Press, 1994), p. 62.
126. The fleet, which was dispatched at some point in 1507–08, was attacked by the Knights. Özbaran, 90–91, citing Archivo Nacional de Torre do Tombo (Lisboa), Gateva 15, Mato 19, Documento 4, as cited by Godinho, *Os Descobrimentos* II: 136–137.
127. This shipment consisted of “300 *tūfeng* (arquebuses), 30,000 arrows, 40,000 *kantar* (about 50 kg each) gun powder, 2,000 oars, and copper”. Özbaran, 62, 90.
128. In a letter sent on 24 July, Sir Andrea Foscolo – the Venetian envoy in Istanbul – reported gossip that Bayezid wanted to appoint Ahmed as regent, pending his own retirement. Sanuto, XI: 294.
129. “*e vol uno sia signor, l’altro bassà over biliarbet*”. Sanuto, XI: 418. In the same report, it was stated that Selim was insisting on a Manisa posting and refusing to accept Caffa.